Migration and Education

EXPLORING THE NARRATIVES AND AGENCY OF CHILDREN WITH MIGRANT BACKGROUNDS WITHIN SCHOOLS

RESEARCHING HYBRID INTEGRATION

Edited by
Claudio Baraldi

ROUTLEDGE

'This book emerges from a European project focusing on migrant children's engagement with and integration in a host country's school system, and the impact this integration has on peers, teachers and parents. The CHILD-UP project highlights the educational agency of children, with a particular focus on relations that migrant children have with peers and teachers. Drawing on survey, interview and video data from nursery, primary and secondary schools in seven European countries, a rich body of data extend and refine key concepts within the fields of childhood and migration studies. Baraldi's book is brimming with insights and challenges on the school's monopoly of epistemic authority, the tension between hybrid and monolingual integration and the facilitation of children's agency. This book deserves to be read by academics, policy makers and educational professionals working with child migrants and their schooling.'

- **Michael Wyness**, *University of Warwick*

'This truly ground-breaking volume brings us the entirely new concept of hybrid integration. It solves the conundrum of how to integrate with new realities without losing cultural identity and celebrates the natural hybridity we all possess as a basic resource for travel. It is demonstrated by detailed research from a pan-European project. While the focus here is children with migration background and their families, plus recommendations for improved professional practice, it relates to all of us everywhere. It is of core relevance to migration, intercultural and postcolonial studies. We must thank Claudio Baraldi for bringing these new ideas to us.'

- **Adrian Holliday**, *Canterbury Christ Church University*

'*Exploring the Narratives and Agency of Children with Migrant Backgrounds within Schools* is a welcome resource for practitioners concerned with concrete pedagogical approaches for working with children and families in ways that directly support children's agency and engagement. Focus is consistently placed on the children's own perspectives, and how interaction in the classroom can support the development of children's voice and expression. The book additionally provides valuable evidence-based recommendations and insights for policy-makers at both local and national levels. It is particularly welcome at a time characterised by polarisation and extremist positions, where cultural diversity is no longer appreciated as the foundation of democratic, open and dynamic societies. Contributors approach these key issues in a nuanced and sensitive manner, bringing together perspectives and expertise from a wide range of research fields, to highlight the most important learnings from studies undertaken in multiple contexts across Europe.'

- **Helen Avery**, *Lund University*

Exploring the Narratives and Agency of Children with Migrant Backgrounds within Schools

This edited volume presents the results of a European research project – 'CHILD-UP' (Children Hybrid Integration: Learning Dialogue as a way of Upgrading Policies of Participation), which analyses the hybrid integration of children with migration backgrounds into schools across Europe.

Using qualitative data and theoretical foundations obtained through interviews and focus groups, the book ultimately centres the perspectives and experiences of both the children and the professionals working with them. In doing so, it explores the complex position migrant children occupy in host societies, their exercise of agency, challenges and inspirational local practices that support hybrid integration and innovative educational planning. It also analyses the facilitation of conversations concerning children's personal experiences and social relations, second language learning and language mediation, based on video- and audio-recordings of school activities.

The book will be of relevance to researchers, academics, scholars, and faculty in the fields of sociology of education, child development, migration and multicultural studies.

Claudio Baraldi is Professor of Sociology of Cultural and Communicative, Department of Studies on Language and Culture, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Italy.

Migration and Education

Series Editors

Dympna Devine
University College Dublin, Ireland
Nihad Bunar
Stockholm University, Sweden
Halleli Pinson
Ben-Gurion University, Israel

This book series examines issues of rights, (in)equalities and social justice in the analysis of education, migration and displacement. Set within the wider context of rising levels of global migration at a time of profound social, environmental and economic change, the series explores the reproductive power and positioning of education as a source of risk as well as opportunity for migrant and refugee children.

The series places a particular emphasis on the voices of those often marginalised in debates and policy analysis: migrant and refugee children, their families and educators across the education system. Through engagement with a range of theoretical and methodological frameworks the series will explore these multiple dynamics and positionings both across country/educational contexts as well as within migrant/refugee communities in both the global north and global south.

The series welcomes authored or edited contributions in topics relevant to migration and education, including topics such as inclusion and exclusion, racism and privilege, lived experiences of migrants, educational policy, pedagogical challenges and the role of schools as often contradictory sites in the realisation of internationally upheld rights for migrant and refugee children.

Books in this series:

Global Migration and Diversity of Educational Experiences in the Global South and North
A Child-Centred Approach
Edited by Shoba Arun, Khawla Badwan, Hadjer Taibi and Farwa Batool

Post-school Pathways of Migrant-Origin Youth in Europe
Edited by Emer Smyth and Merike Darmody

Exploring the Narratives and Agency of Children with Migrant Backgrounds within Schools
Researching Hybrid Integration
Edited by Claudio Baraldi

For more information about books in this series, please visit https://www.routledge.com/our-products/book-series/MAE

Exploring the Narratives and Agency of Children with Migrant Backgrounds within Schools

Researching Hybrid Integration

Edited by Claudio Baraldi

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2024
by Routledge
4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Baraldi, Claudio, editor.
Title: Exploring the narratives and agency of children with migrant backgrounds within schools : researching hybrid integration / Edited by Claudio Baraldi.
Identifiers: LCCN 2023003227 (print) | LCCN 2023003228 (ebook) | ISBN 9781032377810 (hardback) | ISBN 9781032377827 (paperback) | ISBN 9781003341772 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Children of immigrants--Education--Europe. | Children of immigrants--Cultural assimilation--Europe. | Children of immigrants--Europe--Social conditions. | Social integration--Europe.
Classification: LCC LC3747.E85 E97 2023 (print) | LCC LC3747.E85 (ebook) | DDC 371.826/912--dc23/eng/20230407
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2023003227
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2023003228

ISBN: 978-1-032-37781-0 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-032-37782-7 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-1-003-34177-2 (ebk)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003341772

Typeset in Bembo
by SPi Technologies India Pvt Ltd (Straive)

Contents

Editors and contributors

Sara Amadasi is research fellow in the Department of Studies on Language and Culture, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia. Her research interests concern the sociology of childhood, intercultural communication, qualitative and digital research methods. In 2020, she published her first book with Professor Adrian Holliday, *Making Sense of the Intercultural. Finding DeCentred Threads* (Routledge).

Chiara Ballestri graduated in Theory and Methodology of Anthropological Research on Contemporaneity and obtained her PhD in Humanities at the University of Modena and Reggio Emilia. She collaborates with the Department of studies on language and culture in the University of Modena and Reggio Emilia. She works on education and the promotion of participation, dialogical and intercultural mediation, and the analysis of narratives.

Claudio Baraldi is Professor of Sociology of Cultural and Communicative Processes at the University of Modena and Reggio Emilia. His research concerns intercultural communication, adult-children interactions in educational contexts and language mediation. For international publishers, he has authored/co-authored three books and edited/co-edited six books. He has published about 80 chapters and articles in international journals and volumes.

Shannon Damery is a post-doctoral researcher in the CEDEM at the University of Liège. With a background in providing frontline social services, her research interests still reflect this experience and include refugee issues, forced migration, home and homemaking, youth and childhood studies, arts and integration, and activism and political participation.

Ester di Napoli is Research Fellow of International Law at the University of Ferrara, she is an attorney based in Florence (Italy) and holds a PhD from the University of Padova. She is currently working as an independent consultant at the Italian Independent Authority for Children and Adolescents. Her main areas of interest and publications concern EU Private International Law in the field of Family and Children's Rights.

Thomas Droessler is a social pedagogue who works as a lecturer at the EHS Dresden, University of Applied Sciences for Social Work, Education and Care, and teaches on various topics in the Social Work and Early Childhood Education degree programmes. His research activities relate to issues in youth and childhood studies and social inequality. Further research activities concern topics in youth welfare research, provision of public services and social planning.

Federico Farini is Professor of Sociology at the University of Northampton. He leads the Research Centre for Psychology and Sociology. For 15 years, Federico has been working with children, families, and the communities to promote children's rights in several action-research projects, most recently in EU-funded projects with migrant children.

Lena Foertsch graduated in early childhood education and holds a master's degree in Psychosocial Counseling and Intervention. She works at the Centre for Research, Education and Counselling (ZFWB) in Dresden and lectures at the Evangelische Hochschule Dresden of Applied Sciences. Her focus is on education and the promotion of participation, social togetherness and other pedagogical strategies and methods in kindergarten and primary school.

Laura Gavioli is a Professor of English Language and English-Italian translation and an expert in institutional, cross-cultural interaction at the University of Modena and Reggio Emilia. Since the beginning of the 2000s, she has published work on interpreter-mediated interaction in public services, including a number of papers and edited volumes.

Anne Harju is an Associate Professor in Children and Youth Studies at Malmö University. Her research is oriented towards the understanding of childhood and children's everyday lives in a diverse and migrating world. She has also conducted studies within the field of education and urban studies with focus on different aspects of immigrant integration.

Tiina Hautamäki is Principal Lecturer at Seinäjoki University of Applied Sciences. She has worked in research projects and education in social and health care. She teaches social work and qualitative research methodologies. Her main research interests are social conditions of integration, changing welfare society and cultural aspects of well-being.

Henna Jousmäki works as a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at Tampere University. With her background in sociolinguistics, she has worked in research, education and administration in multidisciplinary settings regionally, nationally and internationally. Her current interests include social sustainability, participation and diversity in the contexts of immigration, education and working life.

Jane Murray is professor and co-leads the Centre for Education and Research University of Northampton. She is an educational researcher specialising in early childhood and primary education, social inclusion and participatory

research, including children as researchers. Jane has published extensively in the field of education, and she is Editor-in-Chief for the *International Journal of Early Years Education*.

Anna Ratecka defended her PhD in sociology at the Jagiellonian University in Krakow. Her research concerns migration and gender, sex workers' rights, and feminist theory.

Erica Righard is an Associate Professor at Malmö University. She holds a position at the Department of Social Work and is affiliated with Malmö Institute for Studies of Migration, Diversity and Welfare (MIM). Her research is interdisciplinary and is mainly focused on various aspects of social policy and social work in the view of international migration and transnational belongings.

Margund K. Rohr is Professor of Developmental and Educational Psychology at the EHS Dresden. Her research interests focus on life span psychology, the social embeddedness of development and learning, and emotional experience and emotion regulation in social relationships.

Angela Scollan is Associate Professor and a member of the Centre for Educational Research and Scholarship, Middlesex University. As a children's rights advocate for over 30 years, Angela has developed several programmes for rights-based Early Years education, also as trustee of TACTYC, pedagogical lead for QAA and member of the ECS Degree Network.

Krystyna Slany is a Professor at the Institute of Sociology at the Jagiellonian University. She specialises in social demography, migration issues and the sociology of family and gender issues. She has co-authored, edited and co-edited 11 books, and published more than 150 chapters and articles in national and international volumes and journals.

Magdalena Ślusarczyk is an Associate Professor at the Institute of Sociology at the Jagiellonian University. Her main research interests include sociology of education, especially inequalities in education and migration (with particular emphasis on the issue of transnational families). Author of numerous publications in these areas.

Justyna Struzik is an Assistant Professor at the Institute of Sociology, Jagiellonian University. Her research interests include social movements, citizenship in the realm of criminalisation and drug use. Her book *Queer Solidarity* was awarded as the best gender book by the Polish Gender Society in 2020, and received the Stanislaw Ossowski Award in 2021.

Petra Svensson Källberg has a PhD in Mathematics Education and works at Malmö University. Her research focuses on multilingualism in relation to mathematics education and multilingual students' opportunities to learn mathematics. She is a member of the research program *Disciplinary Literacy and Inclusive Teaching* at Malmö University.

Paulina Szydłowska-Klakla graduated in Psychology and Cultural Studies from Jagiellonian University in Cracow. She defended her PhD thesis about the acculturation experience of migrant children. She works as a psychologist with children and adolescents.

Marta Warat is an Assistant Professor at the Institute of Sociology at Jagiellonian University. Her scholarly interests revolve around the gender/policy nexus, social inequalities, democracy and citizenship. She has been a coordinator and researcher in several international and national studies focusing on gender (in) equality, citizenship and public policies.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Claudio Baraldi

The CHILD-UP project

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

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

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

DOI: 10.4324/9781003341772-1

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

Why the CHILD-UP project

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CHILD-UP research methodology

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

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

Quantitative research: the survey

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

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

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

Qualitative research: the interviews

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

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

Evaluative analysis: audio- and video-recordings

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

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

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

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

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

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

Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic

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

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

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

The ethical challenge

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

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

Structure and contents of the volume

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix

Table 1.1 Research areas

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

Table 1.2 Collected questionnaires

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

Table 1.3 Distribution of CMB and migrant-background parents

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

Table 1.4 Number of participants and interviews

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

Table 1.5 Recordings of activities and tests

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

Note

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

References

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chapter 2

The conceptual framework

Claudio Baraldi

Introduction

This chapter introduces the conceptual framework of the CHILD-UP research project. This framework is based on the combination of six conceptual dimensions that inform and shape the research design. These dimensions are: (1) the structural conditions of education and social life of children with migrant background (CMB); (2) facilitation as a method to create dialogue and to enhance children's agency; (3) hybrid integration as a no-essentialist view of diversity; (4) interpreting as language mediation aiming to enhance migrants' agency; (5) gender as a social construction and gendered agency; and (6) narratives as expressions of agency.

A preliminary observation is that the category of "children" is defined differently by different approaches; thus, how children are viewed and treated and their position in society are by no means universally similar. However, the 1989 UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), to which all European countries are signatories, defines children as all individuals under 18 years old. The UNCRC establishes that children's points of view should be considered in decisions affecting children's lives. It states the right of children to be treated as children first, to have their best interest assessed and taken into account as a primary consideration in all actions and decisions that concern them (Article 3), while other factors affecting their condition should be considered as secondary. For example, in the case of CMB, they should be treated first as children, regardless of their migratory status. Moreover, the UNCRC has introduced the right to have children's opinions and participation taken into consideration (Article 12) for the first time in the history of interventions and policies addressed to children.

Constraining structures

The application of the UNCRC is conditioned by social structures that define a generational order (Alanen, 2009) that distinguishes between adults and children in terms of decisional power, sometimes marginalising children's rights. Since the 1990s, structural limitations of people's social life have been associated with the interconnection among different social and cultural factors, which is labelled *intersectionality* (Crenshaw, 1994). This concept has become popular in social sciences

DOI: 10.4324/9781003341772-2

(e.g. Cho, Crenshaw, & McCall, 2013; Hankivsky, 2014; Mason, 2010) and has also been related to migration and intercultural relations (e.g. Antyas, 2012; Byrd Clark & Dervin, 2014; Ensor & Godziak, 2010; Kaukko & Wernesjö, 2017; Szalai, 2011). In brief, intersectionality means that "inequities are never the result of single, distinct factors. Rather, they are the outcome of intersections of different social locations, power relations and experiences" (Hankivsky, 2014, p. 2). Intersections are observed between several factors, such as race or ethnicity, gender, age, class, sexuality, abilities, geography, religion and migration. These factors may intertwine with the specific structures of politics, law, media, economics, education, families and healthcare, among others. It is the interrelation between factors and structures that may result in power relations and forms of discrimination. In particular, CMB's marginalisation and discrimination may depend on the intersection of factors and structures integrated into Western society (Twum-Danso Imoh & Ame, 2012).

However, intersectionality is associated with the narrative of the vulnerability and incapacity of children, obscuring their contribution to the construction of social relations. For instance, in the education system, the general narrative of children's incapacity triggers the need for adults to deliver knowledge, while children must simply learn it (e.g., James & James, 2004; Wyness, 1999). This narrative is strengthened in the case of CMB, particularly when their difficulties in language use and/or different forms of socialisation are observed. Against this background, the school can be assigned the task of "acculturating" CMB (Horenczyk & Tatar, 2012) through the conveyance of (1) knowledge (curriculum content, course content, etc.), (2) norms (rewarded and punished behaviors), (3) values (recognition of CMB as a cultural group), and (4) basic and tacit assumptions about diversity. Knowledge, norms, values, and assumptions about diversity are conveyed and evaluated in classroom interactions (Luhmann, 2002; Mehan, 1979), and structures of classroom interaction can lead to CMB's mere adaptation to the school context (Janta & Harte, 2016; Szalai, 2011). Thus, the education system frequently proposes predetermined knowledge, inviting CMB to adapt to educational expectations about their cultural identity (Baraldi, 2012). This definition of CMB as vulnerable, incompetent, and in need of mere adaptation hinders their potential exercise of *agency*.

Facilitation of agency and dialogue

The concept of children's agency is rather controversial (see Baraldi, 2014, 2022; Baraldi & Cockburn, 2018; James, 2009; James & James, 2008; Larkins, 2019; Oswell, 2013; Stoecklin & Fattore, 2017). In general, it relates to children's actions that are not simple outputs of children's experience of adults' inputs. In the CHILD-UP project, children's agency has been defined as children's active participation based on the availability of choices of action, which make their alternative actions available, and, therefore, can enhance change in social contexts (Baraldi, 2014) – for instance, classroom interactions – and children's personal trajectories of lived experience (Baraldi & Cockburn, 2018). While children's active participation

can happen at any time in communication, the achievement of agency needs the promotion of a child's right to active participation in relation to choice and social change, enabling them to gain epistemic authority (Baraldi, 2015b, 2021), that is, rights and responsibilities to access and produce knowledge.

Agency is not the outcome of individual actions; it is achieved in specific social conditions. The analysis of children's agency must focus on its social constraints (Bjerke, 2011; James, 2009; Kirby, 2020; Leonard, 2016; Mayall, 2002; Moosa-Mitha, 2005). Structural constraints of individual participation can be particularly inhibiting for children, who are included within a hierarchical generational order, for instance, in the education system, in which knowledge is conveyed by teachers on the one hand, and children's actions are evaluated by teachers on the other hand (Luhmann, 2002). This means that teachers are assigned much higher authority in producing knowledge, that is, *epistemic authority*, than children (Baraldi, 2021). This is shown by a long tradition of research on teacher–children interaction since the 1970s (Delamont, 1976; Mehan, 1979). More recently, however, research on teacher–children interactions has highlighted some mitigation of hierarchical forms of epistemic authority, depending on adults' promotional actions (e.g. Mercer & Littleton, 2007; Walsh, 2011), such as actions of scaffolding (Sharpe, 2008) or "revoicing" (O'Connor & Michaels, 1996).

Sociological research has also highlighted a more radical change in the education system based on the facilitation of children's agency (Baraldi, 2014, 2021, 2022; Baraldi & Iervese, 2017). Facilitation is achieved in specific interactions, including organised sequences of adults' actions that support children's agency and children's actions that display agency. In this view, agency is based on the facilitation of dialogue as a specific form of communication, which "implies that each party makes a step in the direction of the other", while it does not imply "that they reach a shared position or even mutual warm feelings" (Wierbizcka, 2006, p. 692). In adult–children interactions, dialogue is "the starting point, whereby children are consulted and listened to", ensuring that "their ideas are taken seriously" (Matthews, 2003, p. 268). Dialogue is both the form of facilitation, which can be defined as dialogic facilitation, and the result of facilitation showing children's mutual exercise of agency. Dialogic forms of interaction are visible in the organised sequences of facilitators and children's actions. Through dialogic facilitation, adults' actions support children's self-expression, take children's views into account, involve them in decision-making processes, and share power and responsibility with them (Hendry, 2009; Shier, 2001; Wyness, 2013). To sum up, facilitation is a form of communication designed to mitigate hierarchical forms of teaching and to encourage, enhance, and support children's agency.

Dialogue is based on: (a) the fair distribution of active participation in interactions (equity); (b) expressions of sensitivity to interlocutors' interests and/or needs (empathy); and (c) the treatment of disagreements and alternative perspectives as enrichments in communication (empowerment). Without these dialogic conditions, agency is only occasional (Davies, 1990; Kirby, 2020). Dialogic facilitation is a way of managing predefined assumptions, doubts, different stories and experiences, unpredicted emotions, divergent interpretations, and challenges. Thus, it is

possible to distinguish facilitation from hierarchical teaching. This difference is also a distinction between the enhancement and the lack of enhancement of children's agency, and thus between the upgrading and downgrading of children's epistemic authority, that is, their rights and responsibilities of producing knowledge in narrative forms. In particular, facilitating children's agency means dealing with children as persons who can express their own points of view, experiences, and emotions rather than dealing with them as fulfilling standardised roles, obeying orders, answering predefined questions, and showing school performances. Facilitating agency means empowering children's expressions of different points of view by showing sensitivity to these expressions. In summary, facilitating dialogue means promoting equity in the distribution of children's exercise of agency, while hierarchical interactions promote inequality in this distribution.

The CHILD-UP research project aimed to analyze children's ways of expressing agency, the structural conditions, and the possible ways of encouraging, enhancing, and supporting this agency in the education system. To this end, it was important to investigate children's and professionals' narratives and interactive classroom/group practices aiming to support non-hierarchical relationships between children and between children and adults.

Agency and learning

The fact that learning can be achieved through children's active participation in classroom activities has been well established (e.g. Davies, 1983; Dewey, 1955; Rogers, 1951). For instance, intercultural learning is considered as based on understanding and awareness of plural perspectives, relations among perspectives, mutual enrichments, equality, and cooperation (Grant & Portera, 2011; Guilherme, 2012; Huber & Reynolds, 2014; Mahon & Cushner, 2012; Portera, 2008; Radstake & Leeman, 2010). Again, learning is considered important in constructing meanings in social interactions, that is, to produce texts and oral stories, to compare different materials and stories and to give them a shared meaning, and share the outputs of activities (e.g., Edwards, Gandini, & Forman, 1998; Kirova, Prochter, & Massing, 2019). Learning is also considered important in using multimodality, that is, learning to combine written, oral, and visual forms of communication, and in managing different media (e.g. Barromi-Perlman, 2016; Goldfarb, 2002; Kirova & Emme, 2017; Labelle, 2012). However, it is important to understand the relationship between learning and agency. Children's active participation in learning differs from children's agency as an autonomous choice of action. While teaching can provide mitigated control of knowledge production, when children are considered as learners, the autonomy associated with agency cannot be fully recognised. Children's agency as a choice of actions is not a primary interest in participatory approaches to teaching, which can be understood as strategies to improve learning. Agency can be associated with learning when research focuses on the interaction to observe if children's exercise of agency shows interesting contributions to the interactional construction of meanings. This construction of meanings is the only possible cue to show (indirectly) learning.

Gendered agency?

Children's exercise of agency can be associated with gender. According to Butler (2004) and Connell (2009), gender is a structure of inequality, which is constructed and embedded at the institutional, individual, and interactional levels of every society. In this perspective, gender is a set of lasting and widespread patterns, norms, values, expectations, discourses, and narratives for identities and relationships. This determines a gender order, that is, a specific system of relationships characterised mostly by binary identities and hierarchical relationships between men and women.

Gender differences and identities are produced in communicative processes and in a situated way: Through their participation and, in particular, through their exercise of agency in interactions, children may stress differences and construct gendered identities, although sometimes they do not. However, gender is interpreted as an ongoing accomplishment displayed, performed, "done" in social situations and everyday interactions (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Thus, in social interactions, children can ignore, reproduce, or negotiate gender structures. They can adapt, "redo," and "undo" gender; they can reject and try to subvert gender dichotomy and hierarchy (Butler, 2004; Connell, 2009; Connell, 2010; West & Zimmerman, 2009). Research should not take for granted that gender counts; rather, gender may be investigated as an empirical phenomenon that may or may not be evident in social situations. Adult–child interactions are particularly important in the process of gender construction. On the one hand, these interactions can empower children and support their agency in negotiating meaning, actions, and power. On the other hand, they can reinforce gender stereotypes and roles, also leading to gendered forms of exploitation and abuse. The analysis of interactions and narratives can highlight if and how gender is relevant in understanding agency.

Narratives as expressions of agency

Children's agency can be shown through narrative production when children can choose the ways and contents of narrating their perspectives and experiences, thus influencing the social situations in which they are involved (Baraldi & Iervese, 2017; Baraldi, Joslyn, & Farini, 2021). Narratives are produced in communicative contexts (Fisher, 1987), particularly as storytelling in specific interactions (Norrick, 2007). According to Fisher (1987), all forms of communication are stories, situational and historically and culturally grounded, so that narratives are omnipresent in communication. Narratives are social constructions in which the observed reality is interpreted and "storied" in different ways (Baker, 2006) so that the same events and phenomena can be narrated from different points of view and through different sets of categories. Somers (1994) describes the ways of constructing narratives, differentiating between narratives of the self (ontological narratives), public narratives, conceptual narratives (including scientific concepts), and metanarratives concerning "the epic dramas of our time" (p. 619), for instance, migration.

Facilitation of the production of narratives can provide the opportunity to highlight meanings and types of narratives and identities of narrating participants (Bamberg, 2011), by enhancing and supporting their agency. In the interaction involving children, for instance, interviews and classroom activities, facilitation of narratives can include points of view and emotions associated with past experiences, present life, future plans, and expectations. Narratives are concerned not only with story contents but, above all, with the rights and responsibilities associated with the activity of narrating (Norrick, 2007), thus showing children's agency as an authority in producing knowledge (epistemic authority). Facilitation can enable the construction of new narratives (Winslade & Monk, 2008; Winslade & Williams, 2011) by enhancing children's agency and dialogue.

Through facilitation, each child can produce different types of narrative concerning the self (ontological narratives), events, relations, and places having particular relevance for them, including narratives and metanarratives of migration. A narrative can display the teller's (1) personal identity when it concerns personal experiences, ideas, emotions, rights, responsibilities, and choices; (2) gendered identity; and (3) cultural identity, when it concerns membership in a national or ethnic group. Investigating children's rights of narrating, that is, rights and responsibilities of producing knowledge (epistemic authority), means observing three important features (Norrick, 2007, 2013):

1 Each participant contributes to constructing and negotiating a narrative in the interaction as a listener, teller, co-teller, or elicitor of new narratives.
2 Narratives can receive different comments from different participants; in particular, each narrative can be followed by response narratives that refer to it, enhancing the production of interlaced stories.
3 The interactional production of narratives can present problems of tellability, for their transgressive contents and reactions to these problems.

Children's agency is shown through: (1) the autonomous telling and elicitation of narratives; (2) participation in dialogic interlacements of narratives; and (3) the absence of problems of tellability, as any narrative is allowed and supported. Since promoting children's agency means promoting children's choices, children's participation cannot be instrumental in achieving any predetermined objective. Such a predetermination would contradict the conditions of children's agency because children's choices would be subordinated to adults' agenda.

Defining cultural and hybrid identities

The analysis of structural constraints of children's agency, particularly the analysis of facilitation, may focus on so-called "multicultural classrooms." In several studies, the definition of the multicultural classroom is based on the presence of participants from diverse cultural backgrounds (see Grant & Portera, 2011; Mahon & Cushner, 2012). In particular, studies on intercultural education show that cultural meanings and identity can be handled in various ways (Gundara, 2000; Gundara &

Portera, 2008; Mahon & Cushner, 2012). These studies indicate that cultural identity is commonly associated with communication within specific cultural groups. Intercultural dialogue is thus considered an enrichment based on acknowledgment of difference among cultural identities (Alred, Byram, & Fleming, 2003; Grant & Portera, 2011; Guilherme, 2012; Portera, 2008). However, this can be considered an essentialist perspective which "presents people's individual behaviour as entirely defined and constrained by the cultures in which they live so that the stereotype becomes the essence of who they are" (Holliday, 2011, p. 4).

Essentialism takes for granted that cultural identities are determined before any communication is established, and communication becomes "intercultural" since people with different cultural identities participate in it (Baraldi, 2015a). The essentialist ideology determines a process of "othering" (Holliday, 2011) based on cultural stereotypes, for instance, assigning migrant individuals to ethnic categories (such as Chinese, Moroccans, Nigerians, and so on) associated with cultural identities. Non-essentialist views stress the prefix *inter-*, which indicates the importance of relationships and communication and warns against insisting on predefined cultural identities based on an ideological narrative of cultural belonging (Byrd Clark & Dervin, 2014). In this non-essentialist view, identity is seen as fluid and contingently constructed in communication (Baraldi, 2015a; Dervin & Liddicoat, 2013; Piller, 2011; Tupas, 2014). Some studies conclude that the concept of cultural identity can be replaced by the concept of hybrid identity (Baraldi, 2018; Jackson, 2014; Kramsch & Uryu, 2012; Nair-Venugopal, 2009), which means that identity is negotiated in communication processes through the manifestation of personal cultural trajectories (Holliday & Amadasi, 2020). In particular, children can show their personal cultural trajectories in communication. These manifestations of trajectories are negotiated in communication processes, so that they cannot be considered as manifestations of belonging to specific groups.

In this view, intercultural communication may mean either producing essentialist differences that block hybridity or producing threads that evidence hybridity (Amadasi & Holliday, 2017). The CHILD-UP research investigated the dialogic construction of threads, that is, of narratives showing hybrid forms of identity within classroom/group communication. Hybridity is conceived as the outcome of a complex intertwining of interactions designed to "open up many possibilities for how narratives can intertwine and express themselves" (Holliday & Amadasi, 2020, p. 11). In particular, the concept of "hybridity" refers to two aspects: (1) facilitation as production of interlacements of narratives of personal cultural trajectories in situated interactions; and (2) inclusion in these narratives of various conditions, events, and changes related to children's lived experience of migration. The implication of this approach is that the facilitation of narratives of personal cultural trajectories does not insist on cultural diversity and identity. In this non-essentialist perspective, classrooms/groups are the setting for the production of *small cultures*, that is, "cultural environments which are located in proximity to the people concerned" (Holliday, 2013, p. 3). Through facilitation, small cultures are based on sharing and interlacing different narratives about personal cultural trajectories.

In this view, the classroom – along with any other social context experienced by children – is conceived as "multicultural" since they support the production of diverse narratives of personal cultural trajectories rather than being the sum of individuals with different cultural identities. Intercultural communication may or may not be constructed in classroom/group interactions. Facilitation of children's agency creates the condition for participants' choices; however, it does not necessarily lead to intercultural communication, and it may or may not lead to the construction of cultural identities in interaction.

Hybrid integration

Against this background, integration in classrooms/groups is always *hybrid integration*, based on local negotiation of meanings. Hybrid integration is not a synonym for inclusion and is not distinguished from exclusion. Luhmann (1995) proposes the distinction between inclusion and exclusion, applied to society as a communication system: both inclusion and exclusion concern participation in communication. The meaning of exclusion is clear: it is exclusion from communication, for instance in education, politics, economics, or healthcare. However, the concept of inclusion as participation in communication is tricky.

Inclusion concerns persons rather than roles: excluding children means excluding their persons rather than the roles they fulfil, such that excluding a "pupil" from education means excluding the person of the child. The role of pupil (i.e., the role of learner) cannot be excluded from the education system unless the education system itself collapses. However, in the general conception of inclusion, including a migrant child in education may mean ignoring their person while supporting their role as a learner, since learning, for instance language learning, may be seen as a priority. Against this background, it is important to distinguish between participating by fulfilling a role and participating through personal expressions, that is, participating as a person. This distinction explains the importance of agency in understanding the inclusion of children as persons, and the association of inclusion with agency, based on the attribution of rights and responsibilities in producing knowledge (epistemic authority).

Against this background, all children can be understood as persons to be included, for instance, in the education system. Narratives of "personal cultural trajectories" show children as persons in communication; they show children's knowledge, experiences, and emotions. The narrated trajectories are defined as "cultural" since their narratives are based on past experiences, which give meaning to children's personal trajectories. While narratives of personal cultural trajectories are constructed in contingent communication systems, such as classroom interactions, the narrated trajectories were constructed through other contingent communication processes experienced by children in their past. Thus, personal cultural experiences can show children's diverse experiences. Diversity is the expression of these narratives, which are both contingently constructed in present communication processes and are based on past contingent communicative processes. The concept of diversity can be de-essentialised and associated with contingent and

fluid expressions of personal cultural trajectories in communication, that is, hybrid personal cultural trajectories. In this sense, diversity is necessarily hybrid even when the child's narrative is one of belonging to an ethnic or cultural group, even if the narrative evokes blocks.

Hybrid integration differs from inclusion. It is based on the *systematic interlacement* of personal cultural trajectories, that is, on the construction of threads. When several children participate in the communication process, for instance, in classroom interaction, their different narratives can interlace in a dialogic way. The adjective "hybrid" changes the concept of integration, which by no means reduces diversity. Hybrid integration means amplification, rather than reduction, of diversity, which is, however, expressed as dialogic interlacement of a plurality of narratives of personal cultural trajectories rather than as a casual sum of narratives of personal cultural trajectories. Hybrid integration means the enrichment of communication with various interlaced personal cultural trajectories based on the promotion of *all* children's exercise of agency in narrating their own trajectories. Hybrid integration can be distinguished from *disintegration* as the separation of narratives. Hybrid integration requires specific structural conditions, which must be compatible with personal expression. These are the conditions of facilitation.

Facilitation emphasises the shift from the top-down construction of knowledge, typical of the education system, to the bottom-up construction of knowledge. Bottom-up means starting from the local conditions of hybrid integration and moving beyond them, for instance, shifting hybrid integration from one classroom to other classrooms, to the entire school, to other schools, to the local community, and so on. The bottom-up process means shifting from local to local. All bottom-up processes are local, including those potentially relevant in the European Parliament; the United Nations Assembly; and the meetings of G8, G7, or G20. Despite the importance of the Internet and social media, local bottom-up processes are fundamental in making decisions, which always have an impact on local conditions and lived experiences. The experience of the pandemic – as well as the experience of the war in Ukraine – show the importance of local, situated interactions as basic ways of giving meaning to narratives of personal cultural trajectories, whether those of COVID patients or of ministers meeting together to face the problems of war.

Second-language learning, translanguaging, and language mediation

In the education system, as well as in any social system in which CMB are involved, a lack of language proficiency can prevent their exercise of agency. Thus, second-language learning is considered a primary strategy to integrate CMB in the classroom. Walsh (2011) suggests that second-language teaching can be realised through different "modes." The *managerial mode* has the function of transmitting information, organising activities, explaining materials, and managing changes among the other modes. It is based on the teacher's extended turns of talk to

explain or give instructions, while learners do not provide relevant contributions. The *materials mode* has the function of showing linguistic practices through the use of materials, promoting children's answers about the materials, checking and providing answers about the materials, and clarifying and evaluating. This mode is based on the Initiation, Response, Evaluation (IRE) scheme (Mehan, 1979), including focused questions, feedback on linguistic forms, and also forms of scaffolding to support children's correct answers. The *systems and skills* mode has the function of putting children in the conditions of producing correct forms and checking their use of language, giving correcting feedback, and highlighting correct answers. This mode is based on corrections, focused questions, repetitions and feedback on linguistic forms, once again scaffolding. Finally, the *classroom context mode* is the most facilitative one. It has the function of promoting clear linguistic expressions by giving context to them, that is, promoting oral communicative fluidity. It is based on facilitators' short turns, minimal repairs, feedback on contents, questions about themes, and clarification questions. Children are encouraged to produce extended turns of talk. The adoption of specific modes can be influenced by the language competence shown by the CMB. However, there seems to be no precise correspondence between the adopted modes and CMB's fluency.

A strategy to improve hybrid integration through the use of language is *translanguaging*. This term refers to the use of different languages in the classroom (Garcia & Wei, 2014; Wei & Lin, 2019). Translanguaging gives value to CMB's abilities to use their own native languages in the classroom while understanding other languages. However, a more important and effective way of preserving native languages as enrichments is *interpreting* (Cronin, 2006). Public Service Interpreting or linguistic and cultural mediation, as they are named in different countries, can help children and their families to participate in communication through the use of their own native languages. Thus, interpreters/mediators can be considered facilitators of migrants' exercise of agency in dialogic communication.

Since the end of the 1990s, Public Service Interpreting (PSI) has been analysed as an interactional achievement based on interpreters' coordination of interactions (Wadensjö, 1998). PSI can be considered a form of mediation (Baraldi, 2017), which may include intercultural adaptation (Baraldi & Gavioli, 2017). However, mediation as coordination of the interaction between participants who speak different languages, does not necessarily deal with the manifestation of participants' cultural identities. In a broader view, mediation is *language mediation*, that is, mediation between participants speaking different languages, not necessarily manifesting different cultural presuppositions or identities in the interaction (Baraldi, 2017). To provide language mediation, interpreters/mediators need to exercise agency (Baraldi, 2019), which is produced within the interpreter-mediated interaction and depends on the interplay of the conversational moves of all participants (Mason, 2009). Several studies show that interpreters' exercise of agency empowers migrants' active participation (Angelelli, 2004; Inghilleri, 2005; Mason & Ren, 2012). Interpreters' agency needs to be recognised and legitimised by institutional providers (Gavioli, 2015; Tipton, 2008). Recognition means acknowledging that interpreters' agency is based on other participants' attribution of rights and

responsibility of access to and production of knowledge, that is, attribution of epistemic authority (Baraldi & Gavioli, 2020).

Language mediation is based on a reflexive form of coordination (Baraldi, 2017). Reflexive coordination means that the interpreter's utterances focus on the conditions of the communication process, thus paving the way to alternative communications (taking opportunities, resolving problems, clarifying doubts). Reflexive coordination, therefore, describes what the interpreter's agency means in terms of mediation as coordination of the interaction. Baraldi and Gavioli (2016) show that reflexive coordination may be provided through renditions and non-renditions in dyadic sequences. Renditions provide the gist of what has been said by one participant, adapting or re-contextualising it for another participant. Non-renditions may clarify ambiguous, complicated, or incomplete utterances, which may make it difficult for the mediator to choose an appropriate rendition to clarify/explain what has been said.

In educational contexts, language mediation often occurs in teacher–parent interactions, parent–teacher conferences or meetings on a one-to-one basis. Some studies on interpreter-mediated interactions between teachers and migrant parents suggest a negative impact of interpreters' agency, which may lead to migrant parents' becoming assimilated rather than empowered. For instance, Davitti (2013) analyses conversations during mediated interactions between teachers and mothers in Italy and the UK, concluding that "interpreters' upgrading moves, by trying to elicit understanding in a context of minimal or absent uptake from the mothers, do not create any effective opportunities for the latter to express their thoughts and opinions" (p. 190). In her turn, Vargas-Urpi (2015, 2017) shows that interpreters' actions tend to exclude parents. Against this background, the CHILD-UP research investigated how language mediation can (or cannot) support the exercise of migrants' agency in teacher–parent meetings (see Chapter 9).

Conclusions: from a theoretical approach to field research

The CHILD-UP research project aimed to analyse facilitation of dialogic interactions involving children's agency as well as their parents' agency for language mediation. The research investigated how children's agency can be expressed through narratives of personal cultural trajectories and their results in terms of hybrid integration, particularly concerning the involvement of CMB and considering possible gender differences. The field research concerned the conditions of hybrid integration as realised (or not realised) through the exercise of agency of CMB. This means investigating how facilitative actions can promote CMB agency through the dialogic interlacements of narratives about personal cultural trajectories in classroom/group interactions. Overall research findings regard: (1) structural constraints of CMB's experience due to legislation, policies, education, and family life; (2) CMB's experience of school and peer relations; (3) CMB's use of language in classroom/group interactions; (4) narratives about CMB's condition as migrants; (4) facilitation of CMB's agency in classroom/group interactions; and

(5) to some extent, mediation of meetings between teachers and migrant parents. In the following chapters, the most important results of these research themes will be described, explained, and commented on.

References

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

Alred, G., Byram, M., & Fleming, M. (2003). An intercultural approach to second language education. In G. Alred, M. Byram, & M. Fleming (Eds.), *Intercultural experience and education* (pp. 1–30). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Amadasi, S., & Holliday, A. (2017). Block and thread intercultural narratives and positioning: Conversations with newly arrived postgraduate students. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *17*(3), 254–269.

Angelelli, C. (2004). *Medical interpreting and cross-cultural communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Antyas, F. (2012). Transnational mobilities, migration research and intersectionality. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, *2*(2), 102–110.

Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and conflict*. London: Routledge.

Bamberg, M. (2011). Narrative practice and identity navigation. In J. Holstein, & J. Gubrium (Eds.). *Varieties of narrative analysis* (pp. 99–124). London: Sage.

Baraldi, C. (2012). Intercultural education and communication in second language interactions. *Intercultural Education*, *23*(4), 297–311.

Baraldi, C. (2014). Children's participation in communication systems: A theoretical perspective to shape research. In M.N. Warehime (Ed.), *Soul of society: A focus on the leaves of children and youth*. Sociological studies on children and youth (pp. 63–92). Bingley: Emerald.

Baraldi, C. (2015a). Promotion of migrant children's epistemic status and authority in early school life. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, *47*(1), 5–25.

Baraldi, C. (2015b). Intercultural communication systems and discourses of cultural identity. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *6*(1), 49–71.

Baraldi, C. (2017). Language mediation as communication system. *Communication Theory*, *27*, 367–387.

Baraldi, C. (2018). Facilitating the construction of cultural diversity in classroom interactions. *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education*, *11*(1), 259–284.

Baraldi, C. (2019). Pragmatics and agency in healthcare interpreting. In R. Tipton & L. Desilla (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of translation and pragmatics* (pp. 319–335). Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Baraldi, C. (2021). Facilitating children's elicitation of interlaced narratives in classroom interactions. In L. Caronia (Ed.), *Language and social interaction at home and school* (pp. 317–350). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

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

Baraldi, C., & Cockburn, T. (2018). Introduction: Lived citizenship, rights and participation in contemporary Europe. In C. Baraldi & T. Cockburn (Eds.), *Theorizing childhood. Citizenship, rights and participation* (pp. 1–28). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Baraldi, C., & Gavioli, L. (2016). On professional and non-professional interpreting: The case of intercultural mediators. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *4*(1), 33–55.

Baraldi, C., & Gavioli, L. (2017). Intercultural mediation and "non-professional" interpreting in Italian healthcare institutions. In R. Antonini, L. Cirillo, L. Rossato, & I. Torresi (Eds.), *Non-professional interpreting and translation. State of the art and future of an emerging field of research* (pp. 83–106). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Baraldi, C., & Gavioli, L. (2020). Effective communication and knowledge distribution in healthcare interaction with migrants. *Health Communication*, *36*(9), 1059–1067.

Baraldi, C., & Iervese, V. (2017). Narratives of memories and dialogue in multicultural classrooms. *Narrative Inquiry*, *27*(2), 398–417.

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

Barromi-Perlman, E. (2016). Using visual reflective diaries of photographs of school building as a tool for empowering students in teacher training. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *15*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406916653760

Bjerke, H. (2011). It's the way to do it. Expressions of agency in child-adult relations at home and school. *Children & Society*, *25*(2), 93–103.

Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing gender*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Byrd Clark, J.S., & Dervin, F. (Eds.) (2014). *Reflexivity in language and intercultural education*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Cho, S., Crenshaw, K., & McCall, L. (2013). Toward a field of intersectionality studies: Theory, applications and praxis. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *38*(4), 785–810.

Connell, C. (2010). Doing, undoing, or redoing gender: Learning from the workplace experiences of transpeople. *Gender and Society*, *24*(1), 31–55.

Connell, R.W. (2009). *Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Crenshaw, K. (1994). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. In M. Albertson Fineman & R. Mykitiuk (Eds.), *The public nature of private violence* (pp. 93–118). Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Cronin, M. (2006). *Translation and identity*. London: Routledge.

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

Davies, B. (1990). Agency as a form of discursive practice. A classroom scene observed. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *11*(3), 341–361.

Davitti, E. (2013). Dialogue interpreting as intercultural mediation: Interpreters' use of upgrading moves in parent-teacher meetings. *Interpreting*, *15*(2), 168–199.

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

Dervin, F., & Liddicoat, A.J. (Eds.) (2013). *Linguistics for intercultural education*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Dewey, J. (1955). *Democracy and education. An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Edwards, C., Gandini, L., & Forman, G. (Eds.) (1998). *The hundred languages of children*. Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

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

Fisher, W. (1987). *Human communication as narration: Toward a philosophy of reason, value, and action*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Garcia, O., & Wei, Li (2014). *Translanguaging. Language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Gavioli, L. (2015). On the distribution of responsibilities in treating critical issues in interpreter-mediated medical consultations: The case of "le spieghi(amo)". *Journal of Pragmatics*, *76*, 159–180.

Goldfarb, B. (2002). *Visual pedagogy: Media cultures in and beyond the classroom*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Grant, C.A., & Portera, A. (Eds.) (2011). *Intercultural and multicultural education. Enhancing global interconnectedness*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Guilherme, M. (2012). Critical language and intercultural communication pedagogy. In J. Jackson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 357–371). Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Gundara, J. & Portera, A. (2008). Theoretical reflections on intercultural education. *Intercultural Education*, *19*(6), 463–468.

Gundara, J.S. (2000). *Interculturalism, education and inclusion*. London: Paul Chapman.

Hankivsky, O. (2014). *Intersectionality 101*. Simon Fraser University: Institute for Intersectionality Research and Policy.

Hendry, R. (2009). *Building and restoring respectful relationships in schools*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Holliday, A. (2011). *Intercultural communication and ideology*. Thousand Oaks & London: Sage.

Holliday, A. (2013). *Understanding intercultural communication. Negotiating a grammar of culture*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Holliday, A., & Amadasi, S. (2020). *Making sense of the intercultural. Finding DeCentred threads*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Horenczyk, G., & Tatar, M. (2012). Conceptualizing the school acculturative context. School, classroom and the immigrant student. In A. Masten, K. Liebkind, & D. Hernandez (Eds.), *Realizing the potential of immigrant youth* (pp. 359–375). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huber, J., & Reynolds, C. (Eds.) (2014). *Developing intercultural competence through education*. Pestalozzi Series, No. 3. Council of Europe Publishing.

Inghilleri, M. (2005). Mediating zones of uncertainty. Interpreter agency, the interpreting habitus and political asylums adjudication. *The Translator*, *11*(1), 69–85.

Jackson, J. (2014). The process of becoming reflexive and intercultural: Navigating study abroad and re-entry experience. In J.S. Byrd Clark & F. Dervin (Eds.), *Reflexivity in language and intercultural education* (pp. 43–63). Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

James, A. (2009). Agency. In J. Qvortrup, W.A. Corsaro, & M.-S. Honig (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of childhood studies* (pp. 34–45). Basingstoke, Hampshire u.a.: Palgrave Macmillan.

James, A., & James, A. (2008). *Key concepts in childhood studies*. London: Sage.

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

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

Kaukko, M., & Wernesjö, U. (2017). Belonging and participation in liminality: Unaccompanied children in Finland and Sweden. *Childhood*, *24*(1), 7–20.

Kirby, P. (2020). Children's agency in the modern primary classroom. *Children & Society*, *34*, 17–30.

Kirova, A., & Emme, M. (2017). Fotonovela as a research tool in image-based participatory research with immigrant children. In A. Kirova & M. Emme (Eds.), *Good question. Arts-based approaches to collaborative research with children and youth* (pp. 138–162). Victoria: University of Victoria.

Kirova, A., Prochter, L., & Massing, C. (2019). *Learning to teach young children*. London: Bloomsbury.

Kramsch, C., & Uryu, M. (2012). Intercultural contact, hybridity, and third space. In J. Jackson (Ed.) *The Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication* (pp. 211–225). Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Labelle, C. (2012). Using visual pedagogy to tell our stories. *Journal of Applied Communication*, *96*(1), 6–14.

Larkins, C. (2019). Excursions as corporate agents: A critical realistic account of children's agency. *Childhood*, *26*(4), 414–429.

Leonard, M. (2016). *The sociology of children, childhood and generation*. London: Sage.

Luhmann, N. (1995). Inklusion und Exklusion. In *Soziologische Auklärunf 6. Die Soziologie und der Mensch* (pp. 237–264). Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Luhmann, N. (2002). *Das Erziehungssystem der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

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

Mason, I. (2009). Role, positioning and discourse in face-to-face interpreting. In R. De Pedro Ricoy, I. Perez, & C. Wilson (Eds.), *Interpreting and translation in public service settings* (pp. 52–73). Manchester: St. Jerome.

Mason, I, & Ren, W. (2012). Power in face-to-face interpreting events. In C. Angelelli (Ed.), *The sociological turn in translation and interpreting studies* (pp. 234–253). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mason, N. (2010). *Leading at the intersections: An introduction to the intersectional approach model for policy and social change*. New York: Women of Colour Policy Network.

Matthews, H. (2003). Children and regeneration: Setting and agenda for community participation and integration. *Children & Society*, *17*, 264–276.

Mayall, B. (2002). *Towards a sociology of childhood: Thinking from children's lives*. Buckingham: Open University.

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

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

Moosa-Mitha, M. (2005). A difference-centred alternative to theorization of children's citizenship rights'. *Citizenship Studies*, *9*(4), 369–388.

Nair-Venugopal, S. (2009). Interculturalities: reframing identities in intercultural communication. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *9*(2), 76–90.

Norrick, N. (2007). Conversational storytelling. In D. Herman (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to narrative* (pp. 127–141). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Norrick, N. (2013). Narratives of vicarious experience in conversation. *Language in Society*, *42*, 385–406.

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

Oswell, D. (2013). *The agency of children: From family to global human rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Piller, I. (2011). *Intercultural communication. A critical introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Portera, A. (2008). Intercultural education in Europe: Epistemological and semantic aspects. *Intercultural Education*, *19*(6), 481–491.

Radstake, H., & Leeman, Y. (2010). Guiding discussions in the class about ethnic diversity. *Intercultural Education*, *21*(5), 429–442.

Rogers, C. (1951). *Client-centered therapy: Its current practice, implications and theory*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
Sharpe, T. (2008). How can teacher talk support learning? *Linguistics and Education*, *19*, 132–148.
Shier, H. (2001). Pathways to participation: Openings, opportunities and obligations. *Children & Society*, *15*, 107–117.
Somers, M.R. (1994). The narrative constitution of identity: A relational and network approach. *Theory and Society*, *23*(5), 605–649.
Stoecklin, D., & Fattore, T. (2017). Children's multidimensional agency: Insights into the structuration of choice. *Childhood*, *25*(1), 47–62.
Szalai, J. (2011). *Contested issues of social inclusion through education in multiethnic communities across Europe*. Budapest: Central European University.
Tipton, R. (2008). Reflexivity and the social construction of identity in interpreter-mediated asylum interviews. *The Translator*, *14*(1), 1–19.
Tupas, R. (2014). Intercultural education in everyday practice. *Intercultural Education*, *25*(4), 243–254.
Twum-Danso Imoh, A., & Ame, R. (Eds.) (2012). *Childhoods at the intersection of the local and global*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Vargas-Urpi, M. (2015). Dialogue interpreting in multi-party encounters: Two examples form educational settings. *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, *20*, 107–121.
Vargas-Urpi, M. (2017). Empoderamiento o asimilición? Estudio de dos casos de comunicación mediada en el ámbito educativo catalán. *Trans, Revista de traductologia*, *21*, 187–205.
Wadensjö, C. (1998). *Interpreting as interaction*. London: Longman.
Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.
Wei, Li, & Lin, M.Y. Angel (2019). Translanguaging classroom discourse: Pushing limits, breaking boundaries. *Classroom Discourse*, *10*(3–4), 209–215.
West, C., & Zimmerman, D.H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender and Society*, *1*(2), 125–151.
West, C., & Zimmerman, D.H. (2009). Accounting for doing gender. *Gender and Society*, *23*(1), 112–122.
Wierbizcka, A. (2006). The concept of 'dialogue' in cross-linguistic and cross-cultural perspective. *Discourse Studies*, *8*(5), 675–703.
Winslade, J., & Monk, G. (2008). *Practicing narrative mediation: Loosening the grip of conflict*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Winslade, J., & Williams, M. (2011). *Safe and peaceful schools: Addressing conflict and eliminating violence*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin.
Wyness, M. (1999). Childhood, agency and education reform. *Childhood*, *6*(3), 353–368.
Wyness, M. (2013). Children's participation and intergenerational dialogue: Bringing adults back into the analysis. *Childhood*, *20*(4), 429–442.

Chapter 3

The complex position of migrant children in European legislation and education

Shannon Damery, Magdalena Ślusarczyk, Ester di Napoli and Erica Righard

Introduction

In the EU context, it is generally agreed upon, legislatively, politically and culturally, that children and young people are entitled to fundamental rights, and, among other things, should thus be protected, listened to, and have access to education. All of the EU Member States have ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child ("CRC") (Liefaard & Doek, 2015; Tobin, 2019; UN, 1990), are party to the European Convention on Human Rights (which applies to all human beings, including children), and have adopted national legislation to protect children's rights. The effective reality of children's position, however, varies greatly. When it comes to children with a migrant background (CMB) who are adjusting to a new societal, cultural and educational environment, the disparity between legislation and formal protections and their daily reality is more complex (Fundamental Rights Agency, 2022).

To illuminate the educational situation of migrant background children in this context, this chapter focuses on four main issues: 1. key policy and legislation focusing on the treatment of migrant children in Europe, 2. migrant children's access to formal and informal education in project partner countries and how migrant children are enrolled and integrated into the formal education systems, 3. teacher training and resources to support children of a migration background (CMB), 4. and finally the structural space (or lack thereof) for children's agency in various educational contexts. We highlight two contrasting cases (those of Poland and Belgium) with differing histories of migration, approaches to integration and systems of education in order to further illustrate the impacts of the above-mentioned factors. The data for this chapter comes from the various phases of data collection of the CHILD-UP project. This includes the phase of desk research (which involved contributions from project partners about the local contexts); data from questionnaires that were distributed to families, children, and those working in schools and support services in the partner countries; and data from semi-structured interviews conducted with children, school staff, and support workers in Belgium and Poland.

DOI: 10.4324/9781003341772-3

Migrant children: a complex category caught between vulnerability and expectation

Childhood scholars highlight the complex position of children as being the bearers of both hopes and fears for the future of society. While children are considered vulnerable, this does not preclude them from also being a source of fear, suspected of criminality and, particularly when it comes to migrant youth, seen as security threats (Comaroff & Comaroff, 2005; Heath, Brooks, Cleaver, & Ireland, 2009). As Berry, Garcia-Blanco, and Moore (2015) point out, migrants, young people, and migrant young people are overrepresented in the media when it comes to acts, or suspected acts, of criminality. Public discourse also tends to focus on these instances long after the events have taken place (Berry et al., 2015). Research has shown that these negative portrayals, as well as policy that appears strict (or even hostile), have a negative impact on migrants and their overall welfare (Eberl et al., 2018; O'Toole Thommessen, Corcoran, & Todd, 2017). At the same time, policies that could counteract these negative impacts, such as policies ensuring access to social support or timely school enrolment, are sometimes not respected and become ineffective (O'Toole Thommessen et al., 2017).

Key to the work of the CHILD-UP project is an understanding that migrant background children are a diverse group and that migration is not always the main factor impacting their educational outcomes (Crul et al., 2019). Part of what is important in recognising the heterogeneity of the category of migrant children is the understanding that they may have diverse needs. At the same time, however, many educational practices that benefit migrant background children, such as creating the space for children to exercise their agency and using dialogic practices, improve the classroom experience of all children. This means that outcomes of the CHILD-UP project can have far-reaching impact. At the same time, CMB *do* have specific needs and face particular obstacles that also need to be addressed, both inside and outside of the classroom. Some effort at addressing these needs and obstacles has been made in legislation, but with varying degrees of success in terms of improving the daily lives of CMB.

International and European law and policies on the protection of children and their implementation

In this section we offer an overview of some laws and policies that were designed to protect the rights of children and, in some cases, migrant children specifically. These measures illustrate the evolving view of childhood and understandings and respect for children's agency.

On 20 November 2022, one of the broadest and most well-known international efforts to protect the rights of children, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, turned 33. It identifies children as autonomous and active holders of human rights, therefore launching an effective "cultural revolution" (Autorità garante per l'infanzia e l'adolescenza, 2019). The Convention is the most visionary international instrument ever adopted by the United Nations organisation.

The CRC is the cornerstone, at the international level, of children's rights, and it is the most widely ratified human rights treaty: today, its Contracting parties number 196 (with the United States of America being one of the only states that did not ratify it immediately, having only signed it in 2010). The CRC is the first binding international instrument – following the 1924 Geneva Declaration adopted by the League of Nations, and the 1959 Declaration of the UN General Assembly. The CRC not only clarifies and specifies the principles contained in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the 1966 International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, but also contains dispositions which introduce new rights, and in general sets forth a complete framework of children's rights protection, from birth until the age of majority.

The CRC does not contain provisions specifically dedicated to the "general category" of children involved in migratory flows. It does, however, set forth children's rights responding to specific needs arising from their condition of "movement": it is the case of Article 20, Article 22 (which applies to asylum seekers and mentions unaccompanied children) and Article 18 (which refers to legal guardians). Additionally, the CRC does not explicitly refer to the specific category of unaccompanied or separated children, but the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child clarified that it also applies to them in its General Comment no. 6 (2005) on "Treatment of unaccompanied and separated children outside their country of origin".

In 2017, in its Communication on "The protection of children in migration", the European Commission stated that "the number of children in migration arriving in the European Union, many of whom are unaccompanied, has increased in a dramatic way". The estimates of minor asylum applicants in the EU, given by the Commission, amounted to around 30 per cent in 2015 and 2016. Since 2010, the Commission noticed that there has been a sixfold increase in the total number of child asylum applicants.

The existing EU policies and legislation provide a solid framework for the protection of the rights of the child in migration covering all aspects including reception conditions, the treatment of their applications and their integration. However, there are currently severe gaps that might prevent children involved in migratory movements from effectively enjoying the rights enshrined in the CRC. Such concerns have been expressed on 1 February 2019, for example, by the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, which addressed its Conclusive Observations to Italy (among Member States, one of the mostly affected by migration, together with Cyprus, Greece, and Malta), highlighting the fields concerning asylum-seeking and refugee children (para. 34) and children in situations of migration (para. 36). With reference to inclusion purposes, in the field of education, the Committee recommended

> to accelerate the integration of the national student register and regional registers to identify all children of compulsory school age who do not attend school, are not in vocational training and not in an apprenticeship, and develop

> and promote quality vocational training to enhance the skills of children and young people, especially those who drop out of school

and to "implement a human rights-based approach to the entire educational system that is more inclusive towards children belonging to minority groups and migrant children and supports their aspirations". Now that Poland is in a situation of increased flows of child migrants due to the war in the Ukraine, we will see what concerns and recommendations will be put forth.

In March 2021 and February 2022, during the Covid-19 pandemic, the European Commission and the Council of Europe adopted two relevant soft law instruments in the field of children's rights: the first EU Strategy on the Rights of the Child (2021–2024) and the European Child Guarantee, and the Strategy for the Rights of the Child (2022–2027) entitled "Children's Rights in Action: from continuous implementation to joint innovation". The EU Strategy – a comprehensive Communication of the Commission to EU institutions – builds on six priorities, from children's participation to combating violence, to promoting child-friendly justice and digital skills, and helping children across the world. The second thematic area of the Strategy specifically relates to EU actions to fight poverty, promote inclusive and child-friendly societies, health and education systems: the EU Commission calls upon Member States and the European Union itself to pay special attention to migrant children – in particular, unaccompanied and separated ones – recalling its 2017 Communication. The Council of Europe Strategy, adopted the day before Russia invaded Ukraine, focuses on almost the same priorities, moving from freedom from violence, towards equal opportunities and social inclusion, access to and safe use of technologies, child-friendly justice, and children's rights in crisis and emergency situations. The priority area concerning equal opportunities and social inclusion relies on Eurostat data, according to which, in 2019, an estimated 22.5% of children in the EU-27 were at risk of poverty or social exclusion compared with 21.5% of working-age adults (aged 18–64 years) and 18.6% of older people (aged 65 years and over). Due to the fact that one of the main obstacles to ensuring children's access to equal opportunities is social exclusion, child poverty and the lack of equal access to quality education for all children in Council of Europe Member States is key. The Council of Europe points out that the proportion of children at risk of poverty and excluded from social services or equal access to education remains unacceptably higher among Roma and Travellers, migrants, refugees and internally displaced persons (UN Children's Fund, 2017).

As seen above, despite an ever-evolving view of children and childhood, and a desire to protect them as well as to make space for their agency, children still occupy a complex position in society. Many children, often those most in need of protection, do not easily benefit from the protections and initiatives offered by European laws and policies. And while a great deal of attention is focused on the health and wellbeing of children, how to support migrant children's learning is an area of growth at the European and local levels.

How migrant children are enrolled into the school system

As described in the previous section, international agreements and a great deal of state legislation aim to ensure that children in Europe benefit from certain basic rights, regardless of their migratory status (European Commission, 2019). This is true in all of the partner countries, even though responsibility for compulsory education rests with different governmental authorities, from the local level to mainly centralised state authorities. Despite these legislative efforts, migrant children still face barriers to accessing education, and particularly to entering school in a timely manner and being placed at a grade level that is commensurate with their abilities and needs.

This is especially true for undocumented and asylum-seeking children. For children who are in the asylum process there is an EU directive that states that they should be enrolled in school within three months of filing their application for asylum (EU Directive, 2013/33/EU), but enrolment may take longer than this, which creates further obstacles for an already vulnerable population (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2019, p. 76). In practice, there are bureaucratic processes that may delay school entry beyond the three-month period and, in some cases, children may be offered classes within reception and asylum centres that are not of the same quality or do not meet the same standards as those of mainstream schools (UNCHR, IOM, & UNICEF, 2019, p. 22). When it comes to undocumented children, the situation is even more complex. According to the UNHCR, only seven European Union Member States explicitly give undocumented children the right to access compulsory education, three of which are partners in the CHILD-UP project (Belgium, Italy, and Sweden). In most other cases in the EU,[1] since education is a right for all children, undocumented children are tacitly included and have the right to attend school (UNCHR et al., 2019, p. 22). This does not mean, however, that undocumented children can easily enter schools. In some cases, schools may require documentation for children to be enrolled and sometimes schools are mandated to report the absence of documents. This leads some undocumented families to avoid enrolling their children in school. Undocumented children may also not be eligible to attend non-compulsory schooling such as higher and pre-primary education (UNCHR et al., 2019, p. 23).

Beyond basic school enrolment is the issue of how and at what level migrant children are integrated into school. There are basically four approaches to this placement: 1. placing migrant children with children of the same age – regardless of the migrant child's educational experience, 2. placing them in a level below their age but one which may be more in line with their experience and current abilities, 3. placing them in transitional programmes separated from mainstream classes and specifically designed for migrant children newcomers who may not speak the local language (or due to differences between education systems would be placed in the incorrect grade because of their age or educational progress) and 4. some combination of these approaches. Our research found that people who are making placement decisions often don't have expertise in these matters

(CHILD-UP, 2020). Recent research finds that separated classes, or transitional programmes, are something of a double-edged sword. A positive aspect is that these specialised classes give migrant children the opportunity to focus on language learning and to be surrounded by classmates who understand the difficulty of school integration. Extended periods of time spent separated from the mainstream classroom, however, can have negative impacts on migrant children's sense of belonging and wellbeing in the school community (Koehler, 2017 referenced in European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2019). Additionally, it's important to remember, as Crul et al. (2019) stress, children of a migrant background are diverse and do not all face the same challenges. For example, CMB who attend private schools or European Schools may be able to continue their education from the point they left off in their country of origin and without having to first learn the local language.

Poland and Belgium have very different histories of emigration and immigration, and yet many similarities when it comes to the use (or lack thereof) of resources to support migrant children in classrooms. Belgium has a longer history of immigration, and while it was politically resistant to officially taking up the mantle of 'country of immigration', it undeniably has a great deal of experience welcoming newcomers. Poland, on the other hand, is not only host to far fewer migrant children in terms of actual numbers, but it is traditionally a country of emigration with less experience in legislating integration and integrating migrant children into the school system.

Poland is an example of the case-by-case practice[2] of placing CMB in schools. The headmaster of the school has the responsibility to review any existing documents about the child's educational background and can then decide what classes and grade level the child should be placed in. In some cases, the decision is based on age; in others, it's based on proof of educational experience, etc. (*Regulation of the Minister of National Education of 30 July 2015*). Transitional programmes do exist, however; they were only introduced in 2017, but are quickly multiplying (Regulation of the Minister of National Education of 23 August 2017). In 2021, there were already 22 of these programmes in seven schools in Wrocław alone (Kozakiewicz, 2021), and the influx of Ukrainian children after 24 February 2022 also necessitated the acceleration of the process of installing more of these programmes in more schools.

By contrast, in Belgium, transitional programmes are the norm. Both the French and the Flemish Community education systems offer separated programmes for language education and school preparation for newly arrived CMB. These programmes are not obligatory, and some newcomer children go directly into mainstream classes. There is also a time limit in place, meaning that children usually spend no more than an academic year outside of mainstream classes. "While children who attend them often feel positively about the experience, they still stress that they would like to have more interaction with local children (UNICEF Belgium, 2018: 83)" (CHILD-UP, 2020, p. 17); "These classes may have unintended consequences and sometimes make children feel scrutinised and segregated, especially due to their long duration" (CHILD-UP, 2020, p. 17).

Research has found that a focus on language acquisition should not come at the expense of learning in other subjects (Nilsson & Bunar, 2016), and even when placed in transitional classes, it is essential for CMB to still spend time with children from mainstream classes (CHILD-UP, 2020, pp. 17–18). In the CHILD-UP project, we did not find many examples of this being achieved.

Teacher and support worker training

Teachers typically spend more time with children than any other service providers or support workers, and they are undoubtedly a key component of children's wellbeing in school. In addition to teaching course content they are expected to integrate newcomer children into the classrooms, manage relationships between children, ensure the course content is understood, recommend services and support when students are struggling, etc. Teacher training varied widely between the partner countries, which is important because training in multicultural issues can help teachers in supporting migrant children's integration into their schools. In the results of the quantitative portion of the project (the above-mentioned questionnaires), the teachers sometimes reported high rates of multicultural training, but a slightly different picture came to light during the qualitative portion of the project. In interviews with teachers, it became clear that the results of the questionnaires were not straightforward. In some cases, teachers questioned the content and utility of these types of training; in other cases, training on these topics was considered insufficient or too infrequent. For example, the teachers in Poland mostly have formal teacher education, which reflects the obligation to hold a MA/BA degree in education. Most of them declared that they had also completed multicultural training (as seen in Table 3.1 below from CHILD-UP, 2020a). When asked about this, however, they only mentioned it as a part of their formal education during their basic study. It is notable that the majority of

Table 3.1 Professionals' training in multicultural issues

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

CHILD UP, 2020a

teachers in Poland had worked quite a long time in schools (one-third had been working for more than 26 years, and almost half of them for 16 to 25 years), which shows that multicultural training has already been included in the training programme for a long time. While this could mean that they have had a long history of experience in implementing these measures, it also means that this training is not based on the needs of the current population of CMBs. During interviews, it became clear that teachers are aware that there are other circumstances and individual differences, in addition to migration, that also affect the children's school performance. They try to recognise the children's strengths and efforts despite the lack of desired results. Similar to what teachers reported, the psychological and pedagogical counselling centre's staff in Poland admitted that children who migrate, apart from the experience of migration, also experience developmental difficulties, such as developmental language disorders or dyslexia. It often turns out that a diagnosis made at an earlier stage, not long after arrival in the host country, proves to be incorrect and needs to be verified. The diagnosis of learning difficulties is made even more difficult due to the language barrier (which can be said to be a common obstacle, and not just a phenomenon in Poland). The counsellors admitted that they do not have access to translators or psychological and pedagogical tools in different languages. This issue was one seen in several countries, and was also an issue of concern in Belgium.

In Table 3.1 (CHILD-UP, 2020a), we see that less than half of the teachers who completed the questionnaire in Belgium reported having had training in multicultural issues. Similar to the case in Poland, intercultural education is part of the standard teacher training (and this has been in place since the year 2000) (MIPEX, 2015; OECD, 2018), but teachers reported a lack of more in-depth or targeted training. In interviews with teachers, they reported being aware of certain training programmes, but stated that it was difficult to get time off work to attend these courses. There seems to be an expectation that teachers will use their personal time and resources to grow their teaching skills rather than this being part of their work (which was also an obstacle reported by teachers in Poland). Teachers in Belgium were hopeful, however, that this would change with the passage of new legislation. In the French-speaking Community, new legislation mandates "continuous professional development" which would increase required yearly training, but many of the offers that focused on teaching migrant children are part of the additional *voluntary* training programmes (OECD, 2017, p.10). In the Flemish Community, uneven distribution of experienced teachers was highlighted as a key issue in the education system, but during the phase of CHILD-UP research there were efforts underway to change this (OECD, 2017). The redistribution of experienced teachers will likely benefit both CMB and non-migrant children and these teachers can also become multipliers in their new schools as they share their experience with colleagues (CHILD-UP, 2020, pp. 23–24).

A lack of up-to-date and robust training on the issues facing CMB, and how to work with them in classrooms, creates several obstacles. CMB must quickly overcome language and cultural differences, and for those who have fled war or

violence, they may also be dealing with significant trauma. This often culminates in lower educational achievement for CMB, and also to classroom behaviour that is considered problematic by teachers and school staff (Głowacka-Grajper, 2006). In addition to special resources, both inside and outside schools, teachers are seen as essential in helping migrant children overcome these obstacles. In reality, however, teachers are often under-trained and also lack adequate support. Due to a lack of understanding and a lack of tools to respond to particular behaviours, teachers sometimes label children as 'poorly behaved', or as learning disabled (Grzymała-Moszczyńska & Nowicka, 1998; Januszewska, 2008; Klaus, 2011) and the impact of these perceptions do not necessarily end at the door of the classroom. They can even influence policy targeted at migrant children (CHILD-UP, 2020). In Belgium, two interviewed teachers were concerned with the negative perception of CMB. They found that their colleagues often had lower expectations of CMB than of non-migrant students. "I think there is some kind of subconscious bias towards foreign students, definitely. They [teachers] underestimate them [foreign students] from the beginning" [BE_T8_F]. This harkens back to what Oakes (1985) explained, as described in the local project report for Belgium, is a significant obstacle for migrant students in education (CHILD-UP, 2021).

Availability and use of targeted resources and support for CMB

Another key issue for the integration of migrant children is the resources that are meant to be available to them versus the actual availability of these resources and if they are taken advantage of. In many cases, of which Poland and Belgium are prime examples, there are mandated resources that should be made available to migrant CMB, but these resources are sorely underutilised. In the case of Poland, an important part of the new migrant population during the period of research was made up of 'return migrants', meaning those who left Poland to work abroad and then later returned to Poland.[3] The children of these migrants are technically Polish citizens, even though they may have never lived in Poland and may not speak Polish. They fall into something of a policy gap. Because they are Polish citizens, they are not eligible for various resources that are offered to other migrants. This group, and their adjustment to Polish society, has not been widely studied (Anacka & Wójcicka, 2019). All CMB in Poland, even those with Polish citizenship, have the possibility to benefit from Polish language instruction and classes that offer extra support in subjects where the student may be struggling. In general, CMB can attend these classes as long as they need the extra support (usually up to three years), but CMB who are Polish citizens (children of families returning to Poland) can attend these classes for no more than one year.

Therefore, children who are not considered migrants, but who have the same lack of Polish language ability as 'migrant' children, are not entitled to the same support. According to educational regulations, children who are not Polish citizens

and who are subject to compulsory education, are entitled to assistance provided by a person who speaks the language of the child's country of origin. This assistant should be employed as a teacher by the headmaster and assistance is granted for no more than 12 months. In addition to serving as a mediator, this person should also help migrant children in understanding the teacher and course contents. Not all schools, however, are willing to employ these kinds of teachers and wages are usually very low. This makes it difficult to find properly qualified candidates (i.e. with pedagogical education) (Wynagrodzenie nauczyciela wspomagającego, 2010). Once again, this support is not available for children with Polish citizenship (CHILD-UP, 2020).

What is rather striking and important is that many teachers reported being unaware of any language support initiatives for migrant children, and this held true in both the quantitative and qualitative data.

Although most of the teachers in Poland know and can use another language, predominantly English, some teachers (typically those who are older) can also speak Russian, French, German and/or Ukrainian. Most teachers use only Polish in their teaching, but some did declare that they had used resources to support children with linguistic challenges. The most popular technique to support language learning in the classroom was allowing the use of translation or helping pupils in another language. According to informants, although it's possible for schools in Poland to hire an interpreter or mediator there are special regulations that can make this difficult. This form of support for migrant children is little known or else schools lack the necessary financial means.

> First, I tried to get an assistant for her [Nigerian pupil]. I hadn't thought of getting an assistant for Ukrainian children before. However, I contacted [name] and she told me that I could apply to the Department of Education [municipal office] for a full-time position for such a cultural assistant. I was granted half-time, i.e. 20 hours.
>
> (PL_T7_F)

At the same time, teachers indicated problems with systemic inequalities. They were convinced that small schools in rural areas are much less likely to receive support for the integration of migrant children than schools in large cities (CHILD UP, 2021a).

In Belgium, return migration is not such an important component of the migration flows to the country, but there is a similar issue of underutilisation of resources. In interviews with teachers in Belgium, almost none of the teachers reported having used the SETIS – the social interpreting service in Wallonia that offers interpreting, free of charge, for use in hospitals and schools, etc. Teachers did not often know this service was available and, even when they did know, they questioned its necessity – stating that they used their students to interpret for them in parent–teacher meetings, for example. The issues of under-trained teachers is compounded by not just the lack of resources, but also the lack of uptake of

resources. In some cases, teachers and school staff don't know resources exist, while in other cases they don't see the value in them. For example, one social worker in Belgium said they thought some training programmes on working in multicultural classrooms existed, but that they weren't easy to find: "Yes, I think there are training programmes about the work with those persons [migrants], but still you have to find them" (BE_SW1_F). This social worker also said she was sceptical about whether these types of training programmes would actually be useful.

In all of the partner countries, there were examples of a lack of awareness on the part of officials and school actors about the importance of intercultural assistants and interpreters and what exactly their role is. Teachers themselves were not always positive about the assistants' activities in the classroom. This may be because of the limited number of hours he or she spends in the school, as mentioned above in the case of Poland, or because it is difficult to agree precisely on how to work and cooperate with the subject teacher. In general, linking existing resources with those who could benefit from them, as well as lack of knowledge about available resources, were common issues that further complicated the school integration of CMB.

Structural space (or lack thereof) for children's agency

Children's agency is often the focus of youth and childhood studies and it's also enshrined in the UNCRC (Article 12; Schrama & Freeman, 2021). Children have the right to express their views freely in all matters affecting them, and to have them considered ("given due weight"), in accordance with their age and degree of maturity (i.e. their "capacity of discernment"). While children's agency is progressively being acknowledged, there are many instances in which it remains overlooked. Research has shown that supporting children's agency also improves their wellbeing in school and can support their hybrid integration (Baraldi, Farini, & Ślusarczyk, 2022). A key component of the CHILD-UP project was to understand if and how migrant children's agency was supported in school settings. Teachers, interpreters and social workers were asked whether or not they supported children's dissent, encouraged creative ideas, accepted autonomous discussion, etc. The results of this inquiry from all the partner countries are seen in Table 3.2 (CHILD-UP, 2020a).

The table shows that teachers reported that they were supportive of creative new ideas and encouraging children to express themselves. They also felt they were supportive of students having autonomous discussions (A lot = 58.5%), and questioning the teacher (A lot = 54.5%). Very few teachers, however, reported that they supported children in their activities outside of the classroom/school (A lot = 34.5%) (CHILD-UP, 2020a).

In interviews conducted with CMB in Poland, there were few references to opportunities to show their agency, as seen in the following quotes from the local report from Poland (CHILD-UP, 2021a). It is usually up to the teacher to decide when and how something will be learned and how to organise classes.

Table 3.2 Support of agency a lot - quite a bit - to some extent

	n.	%	*n.*	%	*n.*	%
1 Support and encourage initiatives	190	46.0	46	41.8	133	42.4
2 Accept autonomous discussions	241	58.5	49	44.5	159	50.6
3 Support and coordinate autonomous proposals	189	45.7	47	43.1	142	44.9
4 Support and encourage creative ideas	190	46.3	50	45.5	156	49.8
5 Support dissent	223	54.5	36	33.0	132	42.0
6 Encourage articulation of interests	241	58.5	61	55.5	180	57.3
7 Encourage initiatives not connected to profession	139	34.5	28	25.9	148	47.1

CHILD-UP, 2020a

I: Well what then, you didn't fight for yourself?
CH: Well, that's when I said to a teacher that it wasn't very fair, that for example my friend had done the same task as me and why did she get more points than me when I should have got the same amount, and you said that it was a bit of a different system of evaluation, because with her it was like a grade neither for minus nor for plus.

(PL_I10_G)

The most common situations were to question the grade received or the way the grade was given. The second situation indicated here is the practice in some schools of peer assessment of behaviour and involvement in class and school life. What seems to be important is that such an approach has the potential to help students develop a sense of responsibility and agency:

I: How do you decide on the mark for your behaviour? Does the teacher decide alone or do you decide too?
CH: As I remember we always decided what the grade would be.
I: What did it look like?
CH: We wrote the name on the blackboard and a teacher said, for example, how many was negative comments someone had, or if he/she got any, and then we had to decide whether it was 4 or 5, or an A for behaviour.
I: How did you feel about it?
CH: I felt good about it.

(PL_I9_G)

Students appreciated these moments where their voices and opinions were heard and valued, but they were not numerous. This was also the case in Belgium, where the

majority of classroom activities were in lecture format with the students remaining passive receivers of knowledge imparted by teachers. In interviews with students, however, they highlighted instances in which they enacted their agency despite the lack of space provided for this in the school system. In some cases, this took the form of fighting for their rights and expressing their opinions in unsanctioned ways, as is illustrated in the following quotes from the local report from Belgium (CHILD-UP, 2021).

> We tried to give our opinion on the infamous decision that girls can't dress how they want. Some decided to put posters on the walls etc., and the management sent the educators to tear them up. We did not understand. We asked for explanations and the only answer we got was 'yes, it is the management which imposes that on us. You can't say anything. These are the regulations which have been in place.' […] There were a lot of posters all over the school and when we saw the educators, especially female educators, remove these posters and tear them up in front of us, we felt a bit like, I'm not going to say dirty, but a little humiliated. We were saying to ourselves that we are not supported.
>
> (BE_I3_G)

In the following quote, the student said that the school never did enough to integrate new migrant students, so the students took on this role themselves.

> Like last year, for example, we had a newcomer. We integrated him well enough into our group so that he does not feel different. He had more support from us than from the management. … I think the management doesn't realise, but they try to be there but without being there; it's not enough for a new person who has just arrived.
>
> (BE_I3_G)

In interviews with professionals in Belgium, teachers also seemed ambivalent about certain aspects of teaching and teaching styles that would support children's agency. While many interviewed teachers said they preferred, and used, teaching methods that supported children's agency, they also found that these methods were not widely used by colleagues.

> They like that we listen to them, that we understand them and not when we tell them that you must be silent and that's all. That's the problem, in fact. It's when you say to the student, 'you're shutting up, I'm right'. Even if I'm wrong, I'm right because I'm a teacher.
>
> (BE_T1_F)

Table 3.3 (CHILD-UP, 2020a) is focused on children's employment of their agency and if they are able to share their opinions and influence what happens in the classroom. The table shows the responses of all the children who completed the questionnaire compared with CMB who completed the questionnaire. A majority of children felt they could speak freely (73.7%), but fewer children reported

Table 3.3 Differences between all children and CMB's perceived agency

	All children	*CMB*
	%	%
1 Speaking freely about thinking differently	73.7	73.3
2 Speaking freely about feelings and preferences	72.8	68.7
3 Participation in school decisions	67.2	**69.0**
4 Participation in classroom design	61.5	**64.1**

CHILD-UP, 2020a

they could participate in decisions concerning activities that took place in school (67.2%). What's key, and is highlighted in the report from the qualitative portion of the research (CHILD-UP, 2020a), is that there are no significant differences in the responses from children with a migration background and children overall. CMB felt less able to share their feelings, but they felt more able to participate in decision making processes.

This highlights again the key point of Crul et al. (2019) that there are numerous elements that influence children's wellbeing in school, and migrant background children are not a homogenous category. While more than half of children responded positively to questions about being able to exercise their agency, there's still more that needs to be done. This is especially true if we consider agency as a key element of not only children's hybrid integration into schools, but also children's wellbeing and success in school overall.

Conclusion

Despite widespread agreement amongst scholars and professionals about children's rights and agency, there is a clear gap between policy and practice. This is true from the supranational down to the local level. For example, while children's agency and voice have a place in the UNCRC, it is not always clear what this looks like in practice or how a child's level of maturity is gauged. EU directives require that migrant children have access to education within three months of arrival in the host country, but this is not always achieved or the level and quality of education provided is questionable. At the level of individual schools, children and teachers who completed the questionnaires reported feeling that children could express themselves and that their opinions were valued, but in interviews this finding was often contradicted, with children explaining that their voices were silenced. Similarly, most state- and regional-level requirements for teacher training programmes include some kind of focus on working in multicultural environments, but in reality this training is often inadequate. This shows that these competences are valued at a higher level and have made their way into governmental discourse, which is clearly positive, but there needs to be a stronger focus on implementation. The same can be said of available resources, which often exist are but are difficult

to access or are unknown to practitioners. The findings detailed in this chapter showed up in many diverse contexts, as was highlighted with the examples from Poland and Belgium, and this shows the widespread applicability of these findings. The obstacles migrant children, and practitioners supporting them, face are often similar despite differing legislative attempts to address them. While there is useful and well-meant policy, legislation and regulation focused on supporting migrant children, this does not always result in space for agency or an on the ground understanding and addressing of their needs, particularly when it comes to their integration into schools.

Notes

1 With the exception of Hungary, Latvia and Lithuania, which all explicitly exclude undocumented children from schooling.
2 This term is used in this report to mean that children are based on a grade level on a case-by-case basis in which their specific situation and skills are considered in the placement proceedings.
3 Accession period began in 2004 when 10 new EU countries (out of which eight—the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia were countries from the ex-Soviet Bloc). https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11614-016-0244-4

References

Anacka, M., & Wójcicka, A. (2019). *Impacts of return migration in Poland*. Vienna, Austria: ICMPD.

Autorità garante per l'infanzia e l'adolescenza. (2019). *La Convenzione delle Nazioni Unite sui diritti dell'infanzia e dell'adolescenza*.

Baraldi, C., Farini, F., & Ślusarczyk, M. (2022). Facilitative practices to promote migrant children's agency and hybrid integration in schools. Discussing data from Italy, Poland and England. *Language and Intercultural Communication*. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2022.2096054.

Berry, M., Garcia-Blanco, I., & Moore, K. (2015). *Press coverage of the refugee and migrant crisis in the EU: A content analysis of five European countries*. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from www.unhcr.org/56bb369c9.html

CHILD-UP. (2020). (rep.). *THE ACHIEVEMENT GAP Obstacles and Opportunities in the Integration of Children with migrant background in Schools – CHILD UP Practice Analysis*. European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the grant agreement No 822400.

CHILD-UP. (2020a). (rep.). *MS10 Report on the analysis of quantitative data*. European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the grant agreement No 822400. Retrieved from https://www.child-up.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/CHILD-UP-Report-on-the-analysis-of-quantitative-data_FULL.pdf

CHILD-UP. (2021). (rep.). *Local report (Belgium) How do you feel about school? Local report of interviews with children, and professionals on their school experiences*. European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the grant agreement No 822400. Retrieved November 27, 2022, from https://www.child-up.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/CHILD-UP-D5.2-Belgium.pdf.

CHILD-UP. (2021a). (rep.). *Local report (Poland) How do you feel about school? Local report of interviews with children, and professionals on their school experiences*. European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the grant agreement No 822400. Retrieved November 27, 2022, from https://www.child-up.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/CHILD-UP-D5.2-Poland.pdf.

Comaroff, J., & Comaroff, J. (2005). Reflections on youth: From the past to the postcolony. In F. DeBoeck & A. Honwana (Eds.), *Makers and breakers: Children and youth in postcolonial Africa* (pp. 19–30). Trenton: Africa World Press Inc.

Crul, M., Lelie, F., Biner, Ö., Bunar, N., Keskiner, E., Kokkali, I., Schneider, J., & Shuayb, M. (2019). How the different policies and school systems affect the inclusion of Syrian refugee children in Sweden, Germany, Greece, Lebanon and Turkey. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-018-0110-6

Eberl, J., Meltzer, C.E., Heidenreich, T., Herrero, B., Theorin, N., Lind, F., Berganza, R., Boomgaarden, H.G., Schemer, C., & Strömbäck, J. (2018). The European media discourse on immigration and its effects: a literature review. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, *42*(3), 207–223.

European Commission. (2019). *Commission staff working document: Country report Finland 2019*. Brussels: European Commission. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/file_import/2019-european-semester-countryreport-finland_en.pdf

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice. (2019). Integrating students from migrant backgrounds into schools in Europe: National policies and measures. Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

European Union: Council of the European Union. (2013). *Directive 2013/33/EU of the European Parliament and Council of 26 June 2013 laying down standards for the reception of applicants for international protection (recast)*, 29 June 2013, OJ L. 180/96–105/32; 29.6.2013, 2013/33/EU. Retrieved November 27, 2022 from https://www.refworld.org/docid/51d29db54.html

Fundamental Rights Agency. (2022). Guardianship systems for unaccompanied children in the European Union: Developments since 2014. In *FRA - European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights*. Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2811/23358. Retrieved from https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2022-guardianship-systems-developments_en.pdf

Głowacka-Grajper, M. (2006). *Dobry gość. Stosunek nauczycieli szkół podstawowych do dzieci romskich i wietnamskich*. Warszawa: ProLog.

Grzymała-Moszczyńska, H., & Nowicka, E. (1998). *Goście i gospodarze. Problem adaptacji kulturowej w obozach dla uchodźców oraz otaczających je społecznościach lokalnych*. Kraków: Nomos.

Heath, S., Brooks, R., Cleaver, E., & Ireland, E. (2009). *Researching young people's lives*. London: Sage.

Januszewska, E. (2008). Dzieci uchodźców z Czeczenii w polskiej szkole. In M. Kulesza & K. Szyniszewska (Eds.), *Czeczeni w Polsce. Próba zrozumienia procesów integracyjnych*. Warszawa: Instytut Profilaktyki Społecznej i Resocjalizacji Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego

Klaus, W. (2011). *Integracja – Marginalizacja – Kryminalizacja, czyli o przestępczości cudzoziemców w Polsce*.Warszawa: Stowarzyszenia Interwencji Prawnej.

Koehler, C. (2017). Continuity of learning for newly arrived refugee children in Europe. NESET II ad hoc question No. 1/2017. Vilnius, Lithuania: NSET Publications.

Kozakiewicz, K. (2021). *Wrocław wie, jak przygotować cudzoziemskie dzieci do nauki w Polsce. Coraz więcej uczniów w klasach powitalnych*. Wyborcza.pl. Retrieved November 26, 2022, from https://wroclaw.wyborcza.pl/wroclaw/7,35771,27180828,wroclaw-wie-jak-przygotowac-cudzoziemskie-dzieci-do-nauki-w.html

Liefaard, T., & Doek, J.E. (Eds). (2015). *Litigating the rights of the child. The UN convention on the rights of the child in domestic and international jurisprudence*. Berlin: Springer.

MIPEX (2015). *Sweden*. Retrieved May 01, 2020, from http://www.mipex.eu/sweden

Nilsson, J., & Bunar, N. (2016). Educational responses to newly arrived students in Sweden: Understanding the structure and influence of post-migration ecology. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *60*(4), 1–18.

O'Toole Thommessen, S.A., Corcoran, P., & Todd, B.K. (2017). Voices rarely heard: Personal construct assessments of Sub-Saharan unaccompanied asylum-seeking and refugee youth in England. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 81, 293–300.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.

OECD. (2017). *Education policy outlook: Belgium*. Retrieved from www.oecd.org/edu/profiles.htm

OECD. (2018). The resilience of students with an immigrant background: Factors that shape well-being. Paris: OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264292093-en.

Regulation of the Minister of National Education of 30 July 2015 concerning admission procedures, Dz. U. z 2015, poz. 1202. (2015).

Regulation of the Minister of National Education of 23 August 2017 on Enrolment of non-Polish Citizens to Public Nursery Schools, Schools, Teacher Training Centres and Facilities, as well as Organisation of Additional Polish Language and Remedial Classes, and Classes Focused on the Language and Culture of the Country of Origin, Dz.U.2017.1634. (2015).

Schrama, W., Freeman, M., Taylor, N., & Bruning, N. (Eds.) (2021). *International handbook on child participation in family law*. Cambridge: Intersentia.

Tobin, J. (Ed.) (2019). *The UN convention of the rights of the child*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

UN. (1990). *The United Nations convention on the rights of the child*. Retrieved from http://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/crc.aspx

UNHCR, IOM, & UNICEF. (2019). *Access to education for refugee and migrant children in Europe*. Retrieved November 26, 2022, from https://www.unhcr.org/neu/wp-content/uploads/sites/15/2019/09/Access-to-education-europe-19.pdf.

United Nations Children's Fund (2017). Education Uprooted. New York. Retrieved from https://www.unicef.org/media/48911/file/UNICEF_Education_Uprooted-ENG.pdf

Wynagrodzenie nauczyciela wspomagającego. (2010). Retrieved February 21, 2020, from http://oswiataiprawo.pl/porady/wynagrodzenie-nauczyciela-wspomagajacego/

Chapter 4

It takes a village to enable participation and integration

Examining the meaning of social relationships from different perspectives

Lena Foertsch, Chiara Ballestri, Federico Farini, Anne Harju, Krystyna Slany, Magdalena Ślusarczyk, Tiina Hautamäki, Henna Jousmäki and Margund K. Rohr

Introduction

What do migrant children (CMB) need in order to settle in well in a new school and a new country? What is needed to foster CMB's integration and their participation in learning and development? Often these questions are answered by either looking at children's individual abilities or by illuminating institutional, structural and societal conditions (Popyk, Pustułka, & Trąbka, 2019). For example, with regard to individual abilities, consideration is given to how well the child speaks or learns the language of the host country, how children cope with the stress of transition and show resiliency, or what social and cognitive skills, expectations or attitudes they bring with them (e.g., Esser, 2006; Shaheen & Miles, 2017). Similarly, studies examine how children develop their identity in face of the challenge of arriving in a new cultural context and how this affects their school adjustment and further development (e.g., Fröhlich, Martiny, & Deaux, 2020; Spiegler, Sonnenberg, Fassbender, Kohl, & Leyendecker, 2018). With regard to contextual influences, research has focused on the impact of aspects such as societal norms and attitudes, stereotypes and prejudice, existing policies and differing education systems, or institutional conditions such as school diversity (e.g., Crul, Lelie, Biner, et al., 2019; Dizon, Selak, Ramalho, & Peiris-John, 2021; Entorf & Lauk, 2008; van de Vijver, 2018). However, less attention is paid to the impact of social relationships with peers, teachers, and other professionals and how children (and professionals) actively shape these relationships, thus contribute themselves to their integration and participation (Dizon et al., 2021; Popyk et al., 2019). The present chapter exactly addresses the role of these co-constructive relationships inside and outside school on migrant children's participation and hybrid integration, their learning and identity development (see Chapter 2). To draw these relationships into focus, this chapter will review data from qualitative interviews with children and professionals working with them, which were conducted as part of the

DOI: 10.4324/9781003341772-4

CHILD-UP project. The chapter is structured as follows: In a first step, theoretical and empirical evidence on the central concepts will be presented. Subsequently, the association between social relations, integration and participation will be illuminated. For this, asymmetrical and symmetrical relationships are distinguished. Using language as an example, the next step is to elaborate the dynamic interaction between hybrid integration, agency and identity formation (see also Chapter 7). In the final step, implications and conclusions for practice are presented.

Conceptual framework

Integration, participation, and identity formation are multi-layered and sometimes quite controversial concepts; the lack of consensus is mirrored in the multitude of definitions, theoretical considerations and approaches (Fisher, Evans, Forbes, Gayton, & Liu, 2018). Underlying all of them is that they concern dynamic processes involving an interplay between individuals and their environments over time. Moreover, they are intertwined with each other: expressing oneself, one's needs and values, expectations and experiences through language and actions, within the context of social possibilities and constraints, impacts cohesion with others and reflects a balancing of identity aspects.

Capturing these interdependencies and interrelations, Esser (2001) distinguishes four types of social integration: (a) *Culturation* refers to the acquisition of knowledge and cultural competences, including language and linguistic skills; (b) *Placement*, which includes the assumption of positions and the conferring of rights, is made possible by culturation; (c) *Interaction*, made possible by culturation and placement, describes the establishment of social relationships and social interactions, for instance, with peers or between teachers and learners; and (d) *Identification*, also dependent on the previous dimensions, is the emotional engagement with the new social system. In order to identify with a new community, this identification must be valued positively and seen as beneficial. Thus, all four dimensions are needed to achieve integration. It is clear that integration requires knowledge and cultural skills, the assumption of positions and the granting of rights and opportunities that enable migrants to act with agency, participate in interaction and feel a sense of belonging to social groups and the social community. A process of identity development and identification can only take place if migrant children are culturally placed and interact, i.e. if they experience agency, participation and social belonging.

Of course, children do not belong to just one group, but are constantly in contact with many different social relationships. For example, migrant children interact with different family members and friends in their country of origin and in their host country. They often belong to several language groups, practice different rituals and customs from different religions, or have different social roles in different groups. Each group can contribute to the development of identity and self, they can complement each other or diverge. The self-concept of who one is can be shaped and changed throughout life and depends on various aspects, such as traditional cultural conditions, individual characteristics and self-perceptions, and

choices and interests (e.g., hobbies, friendship groups). This polygamous affiliation is represented through hybrid identity formation (Brooker & Woodhead, 2008).

Here, integration (in school) is defined as the active participation of children in negotiating their identity in the sense of combining the culture of their country of origin with the culture of the host society (Ślusarczyk, Slany, Struzik, & Warat, 2022). The focus is primarily on the empowerment of participation and agency of migrant children in social contexts and social interactions (Baraldi & Iervese, 2014). According to Baraldi (2022), agency is seen as a construction of unpredictability in communication systems in which children's decisions, actions and participation are dependent on social structures. Through integration processes, identity and self-perception can change.

In summary, this chapter considers integration to be established and shaped by multi-layered social processes, namely the ability and opportunity to interact and act (i.e., culturation), through the placement and empowerment of agency and participation, and leading to a hybrid identity (see Chapter 2). These social processes are not experienced passively, but actively (co-)produced and shaped by individual actors such as migrant children and professionals working with them. In this chapter, we describe, based on quotes from CMB and from the perspective of professionals, how they experience integration at school and the influence of social relations on the integration process.

Epistemological status of the data

The chapter is based on the qualitative data from six countries (i.e., Finland, Germany, Italy, Poland, Sweden, Great Britain) that were collected over a one-year period between 2020 to 2021. It is important to note that each country surveyed in pre-defined regions, and that, therefore, no generalisation or country-specificity should be suggested. More concretely, the results presented are not intended to be a comparison of countries in terms of integration, but rather show, through a broad sample, the relevancy of social relationships and co-constructive processes for migrant children's integration, participation, and identity formation. However, a central commonality was the Corona pandemic and its impact on schools and the whole education system, although this again varied from country to country and from region to region. Due to existing access restrictions, interviews with children and professionals had to take place partly by telephone or online.

In each of the countries, recruitment took place in regions with a high proportion of migrants, sometimes contrasted with regions that had a low proportion or differed in terms of existing infrastructure (Table 4.1). For example, in Germany, the interviews were conducted in the states of Hamburg (1.85 million residents) and Saxony (4.06 million residents). While all participants live in densely populated areas with good infrastructure, the proportion of migrants is higher in Hamburg (about 34.4%) than in Saxony (about 9.4%). Similarly, in Poland, the research was conducted in an urban area in the southern part of Poland (Kraków), which has been experiencing a steady, increasing influx of migrants and migrant

Table 4.1 Overview of recruitment regions in each country

Country	*Regions*
Finland	South Ostrobothnia and Tampere region
Germany	Hamburg and Saxony
UK	London Borough of Barnet and the London Borough of Merton, Mitcham
Italy	Northern Italy
Poland	Lublin voivodship and Lesser Poland voivodship.
Sweden	Malmö City

children in recent years. On the other hand, the surveys took place in small communities close to the eastern state border with the centre for foreigners located there.

In total, the chapter refers to 81 individual and focus group interviews with children and to 140 interviews with professionals (e.g., teachers, social workers; Table 4.2). Among the children are children who are immigrants themselves, children whose parents are immigrants, and non-migrant children.

Interviews were structured by guiding questions, which were agreed upon with the help of common grids by all participating countries. The interviews were recorded, anonymised and subsequently analysed in a structured, regimented procedure. In the text, the quotations are identified as shown in Chapter 1. In this chapter, relevant aspects of the topic of social relations from different perspectives and different contexts will be elaborated.

Social relationships and their meaning for integration and participation

It is undeniable that social relationships play a crucial role in developmental and educational settings, including but not limited to belonging, participation or mutual support (Arslan, Allen, & Tanhan, 2020; Brazelton & Greenspan, 2000; Hascher, 2004; Ryan & Deci, 2000), and that social relations reflect a core ingredient of children's emotions and well-being at school (Gläser-Zikuda & Fuß, 2004; Hagenauer & Hascher, 2018). This is also replicated in the views of the children interviewed within the CHILD-UP-project. All children, regardless of origin, describe the importance of social relationships for their well-being at school: "I genuinely like my school a lot and I got on very well with my classmates and teachers" (IT_F9_G); "Mainly comfortable with my friends, the most important things having friends so do not feel alone at school" (UK_F17_B); "I used to go to another school and I was feeling sick all the time … because I hated the place. … not many people were nice. … [and] if you don't like [the] people, no place is OK" (UK_F25_G).

In line with Esser (2001), children also emphasise that their relations with peers and teachers are essential for learning and participation G: "Then you want

Table 4.2 Sample description, including professionals and children, in the six countries

	Finland	*Germany*	*Italy*	*Poland*	*Sweden*	*Great Britain*
Professionals (n_{total})	20	17	49	30	20	56
Teacher	13/0	6/1(2)	43/0	17/1(5)	12/0	42
Social Workers	7/0	9/0	6/0	8/0	8/0	14
Children (n_{total})	17	29	n.a.	67	30	500
Children	0/7(17)	25/2(4)	0/33(n.a.)	27/6(40)	0/10(30)	0/20(500)
Thereof migrant children	17	26	n.a.	51	n.a	300 (estimated on the basis of data from the CHILD-UP questionnaires)

Note. Number of Interviews/Focus Group Interviews (Participants).

everyone to be friends, and friends are important for learning" … B: "For concentration, you do not have to think 'Where would I be now on the break? Would people laugh at me?'" (SWE_F7_GB); "If we know each other, we know what others don't like and what we don't like … If you get along with someone, it is much easier to tell him what you think" (IT_F9_B); "The boys more or less taught us [to play soccer]. … And then we just learned it and kept on doing it. And then we got better and better at it. And I practiced a lot with my friends" (G_I33_G).

Focusing on integration, teachers stress the need of CMB to talk with other children about their culture, their needs and expectations, which might be different from those of children without migration experiences. In line with the notion of culturation (Esser, 2001), they perceive communication on this as an important foundation for integration:

> They need to be heard and to be listened to, so they need someone to give them the floor. … and to be welcomed not only by me, but also by their classmates … But they lack this element, that is, being the bearer of a culture that the others don't know and that can make the difference in terms of their growth and that of the others.
>
> (IT_I35_T_F)

Thus, both children and teachers alike acknowledge the importance of social relations. However, the interviews also highlight that children's well-being, social relationships in school and school belonging are not always and necessarily linked to the subject matter, to school performance and academic success. While teachers see children primarily in their role as students and stress the primacy of academic performance, children themselves place more emphasis on personal expression and social relationships. This leads to the discrepancy that children can have a positive experience of school, even if they have difficulties with learning. "Now I am going to be honest I am not doing that well, but yes, I do like school I would choose to come even if I could not come because I like my friends better than staying home" (UK_F25_B).

Participation can promote both social and school-related development. For instance, it increases children's sense of autonomy and expression of their personal preferences, needs, and skills. Allowing children to help decide which methods, learning pathways and learning content are used increases their motivation and can lead to better performance (e.g., Rohlfs, 2011; Ryan & Deci, 2000). At the same time, active participation can also influence the atmosphere in a school and classroom, which is particularly crucial for children's well-being (e.g., Hascher, 2004; Freiberg, 1999). A positive atmosphere seems to be characterised above all by interactions that show children they are valued (Schwab, Lindner, Helm, Hamel, & Markus, 2021). In the following quotes, children describe this positive atmosphere in their own words. They perceive agency when they are given the opportunity to ask questions, face a beneficial culture of error, are confronted with positive challenges, as well as experience appreciation and shared interests. "They

[teacher and children] always help me and … we have group tables, where you can ask the group in case you don't know what to do" (G_F24_G); "So, I think it's good … We have good teachers who stand up and help when you need help" (SWE_F3_G).

> I: Challenging in a good way. What do you mean there? B: I mean, it is hard. But these difficulties will help us in the future. For example, if I get a difficult task, then I learn something new … Or if I happen to do something wrong, I learn from that mistake, and in high school I will be able to do it better ….
>
> (SWE_F10_B)

> G: Like when … I was chatting with my friend who is not here anymore she's in another school and Mr. S. said 'we are all interested' and I thought 'oh, we should stop' but she said 'we are interested can you speak for everyone?' and I was not sure but I started and she was like 'very interesting, do you have any question for F.?' and I thought 'wow it feels good'. I: To share your story? G: It looked like it was important.
>
> (UK_F15_G)

> One thing that I would like to change in school is the ability of students to be free to disagree with teachers and that they are not afraid … because I think students feel intimidated by that and that's not right … [that] someone is avoiding saying what they think because they are afraid of being punished.
>
> (IT_F11_G)

Some of the children describe a fear of making mistakes and being judged by their peers and teachers, which affects their participation and their self-perception. For instance, quantitative data from CHILD-UP (see Chapter 3) and previous studies (Ehm, Duzy, & Hasselhorn, 2011) have shown that CMB are more likely to be motivated in school than native-born children, but often have lower grades. As a valuable resource that should be more fully utilised, this motivation depends on a number of factors and can, of course, change over time. The factors described by the children are mainly characteristics that make them different from the group. Thus, rather than emphasising otherness, highlighting differences such as perceived language deficits in the host country, or dividing children into different groups, it is necessary to emphasise their commonalities and simultaneously acknowledge the individuality of each child (see also Chapter 8). School can serve as a safe place where children are taught that they are a resource for the community as they are. For example, Ohm (2021) shows that the perception of linguistic diversity in the classroom has an essential function for the emergence of shared experience as a basis for democratisation. Furthermore, he argues that

students' multilingual abilities must be seen as an essential aspect of their personal identity. The following narrative by a girl shows that many factors can play a role in this. First, there are language barriers, which influence the girl's self-efficacy and feelings of competence and control. Second, the child describes being afraid of becoming a target of social exclusion because of her skin colour. This has a negative impact on the child's self-image. "I would like to participate more, but I am afraid of making mistakes, and I'm also afraid (?) in front of other people, because I am another colour and so I am afraid that someone might start targeting me" (IT_F29_G).

This section shows that social interactions, well-being, integration as well as participation and agency at school are closely associated with each other. Social relationships can provide opportunities and constraints, can foster or hamper learning and development. For instance, if children feel excluded in the school environment because of perceived differences, their self-esteem might suffer. They might develop a self-image within the social structure that is characterised by negative ways of thinking. If such ways of thinking are reinforced through (non-)interaction with the environment, this can have an impact on personal identity. To understand the importance of social relationships for hybrid integration in school, it is necessary to take a closer look at what social relationships in school mean.

Types of social relations in school

The interviews distinguish between different types of relationships in children's everyday (school) life. It was Piaget (1932/1983), who first described two kinds of social relationships with different structures. On the one hand, he mentioned children's relationship to adults (e.g., parents, teachers), which is traditionally but not necessarily characterised by differences in knowledge and power; on the other hand, he highlighted the meaning of peer relationships. Youniss (1980) expanded on these types of relationships and referred to them as symmetrical and asymmetrical. Those relationships are not only structured differently, but may also have different effects and provide the child with distinct opportunities for learning and development (Oswald, 2009).

According to Youniss (1982), in traditional asymmetrical relationships, children are often required to adopt the opinion of adults via a power imbalance, whereas in peer relationships, there is a co-constructive process and thus a negotiation on equal footing. In this vein, the interviewed children describe frontal teaching in classrooms and methods that emphasise a power and knowledge imbalance between adults and children as 'boring' and 'unbearable':

> My teacher in history … talks the whole lesson long, does not write anything on the chalkboard …. I try to understand and takes notes …. [But] if she asks me and I cannot answer, it feels bad. … I count the minutes, these 90 minutes [until the lesson is over].
>
> (G_I44_G)

> B1: Some teachers are tired and others more passionate. B2: It affects a lot. For those who are boring, you cannot even listen to them. You end up in your world of thought and then you miss what the teacher says, and this leads to a worse grade.
>
> (SWE_F2_B)

Children are also very sensitive to demonstrations of power, such as yelling or scolding, or unfair treatment, which is perceived in a particularly negative way, and has a strong negative impact on children's motivation, agency, and well-being. "Well, fair teachers, that's the first thing [a school need]" (PL_I23_G).

> … when I was in 5th grade, there was this bad lady … I said that I forgot how to translate words, and she didn't speak, but shouted. … then I said to her can you repeat the word, she shouted at me and said she had repeated it several times and there was really only one.
>
> (PL_I11_B)

In summary, the presented interview quotes demonstrate that children are aware of asymmetrical relationships with their teachers. They want adults to actively shape these relationships and do not want them to abuse the imbalance in competence and power; instead, they want that their competences, interests, and concerns are also seen and respected.

With regard to peer relationships at school, Youniss (1982) emphasised that peers are all learners and must cope with the same developmental and normative tasks (e.g., transition to secondary school). Thus, peers usually have similar levels of cognitive and socio-emotional development, share similar experiences, and face comparable challenges. Studies on early childhood show that children are positively attuned to their peers. As early as seven to ten months of age, children exhibit fewer negative emotions and are more lively and explorative with other children than with adults. Specific forms of interaction develop early on, demonstrating children's efforts to create community and togetherness by establishing or emphasising commonalities (Schneider-Andrich, 2021). Eckerman, Whatley, and Kutz (1975) showed that, given a choice, children as young as two years of age prefer to interact with peers rather than adults. Friendships develop primarily when children and adolescents spend time together on a regular basis (Afshordi & Libermann, 2020). Accordingly, early and contemporary approaches, such as those by Youniss (1980) and Oswald (2009), emphasise the importance of symmetrical relationships for children's well-being, learning and development.

Nowadays, children are seen as capable social agents (see Chapter 2), who are able to independently shape their environment and are embedded in social domains in a participatory way. Based on this understanding of children as active (co-)producers of their development, symmetrical and asymmetrical relationships can be seen from different perspectives. The distinction between the two types of relationships has become more flexible and fluid, and both relationships are possible between children and adults. Asymmetrical relationships are not necessarily

limited to teacher–child interactions and symmetrical relationships are not exclusive to peers. Consequently, both types can be observed among children. In the children's narratives, for example, a lack of equality among classmates is pointed out: "Someone may feel superior to someone else" (IT_F4_B). It appears that this sense of superiority can also be attributed to cultural differences: "with my classmates I had that problem a little bit … Well, one boy … a Polish boy … said [that] Ukrainians are shit…" (PL_I17_B). But it is also connected to feelings of competence and to perceived eligibility to participate, as shown in the quote above introducing a girl who wants to participate, but does not feel capable of doing so and fears social exclusion because she has a different skin colour (IT_F29_G). In contrast, despite adults' more powerful and ostensibly more knowledgeable starting position, there can also be symmetrical aspects between adults and children (Baumrind, 1991; Oswald, 2009) if the adults in the interaction take children seriously, show interest in their opinions and experiences, and view them as active and competent. Accordingly, some teachers try to connect with children by establishing a kind of symmetrical relationship with them:

> I adopt a symmetrical approach from the beginning … I do not put myself in the position of an adult because I am talking to a child, I try to have an equal relationship. This allows me to connect with the child.
>
> (IT_F5_T_M)

> B: We had so much fun when [our teacher] was telling stories of him going to school and that he did not like it …. I: How did it make you feel? B: Fun and it looked like me actually. G: That teachers are like us. I: So you will be like them when you get older? G: Maybe.
>
> (UK_F16_GB)

This striving to establish more symmetrical relations is also desired by the children. They want to be recognised. Children particularly value teachers' empathy and interest. When asked about the 'coolest' teacher, a girl answers: "… definitely the lady who teaches biology and chemistry, because I think she's the best at talking to children and she's just very understanding" (PL_I10_G). Another child describes a good teacher as one who is "able to explain well … even if you do not understand, they should try to explain in different ways until we understand" (SWE_F8_G).

Nevertheless, the children also emphasise that the relationship between teachers and students must still be different from that between peers. They do not want to become friends with teachers, but rather still see the teacher as a person who challenges and empowers them. "our teacher, I think she's cool, because she's strict. … Some don't find that so nice, but others do, like me. Because it's better when she's strict, then you learn more" (G_I33_G); "Some of them teach creatively and they just are nice persons and to somewhat behave like students, not as friends … when they have a reason to praise someone, they do this very well" (G_I36_G). Teachers should be persons you can rely on, not only, but particularly during an emergency, and turn to with confidence. If there are unsolvable conflicts between peers, adults

should be there to help and take a neutral view. Accordingly, one child states: "If it becomes too much of a problem, we can ask the teacher or our parents, otherwise we can do it ourselves" (IT_F31_B).

In summary, symmetrical and asymmetrical relationships are perceived and distinguished by both children and teachers. In terms of relationships between teachers and children, the interview extracts show that it is not so much a question of differences in knowledge and competence, but rather that attitudinal and power imbalances are seen as a more critical challenge that needs to be addressed. While children want to be taught and guided in terms of their achievement, they also want power imbalances to be reduced and to feel that their competences and needs are seen. Looking at peer relationships, the quotes illustrate that these relationships are not symmetrical per se, but are shaped and co-constructed by children's subjective assessments along different dimensions.

Conflicts seem to occupy another unique position in the structure of the two types of relationships. When conflicts arise between peers, they can usually be resolved by the children themselves. If this is not the case, they can be helped to take a 'top-down' view of the conflict. The role of the adult is then to shape the environment so that the children have the opportunity and tools to resolve the conflict. However, if the conflict is between teachers and pupils, the effects can be more pronounced and long-lasting (e.g., UK_F10). This shows that teachers have an important influence on the atmosphere, social relations and fairness in the classroom. This allows teachers to emphasise social interaction, promote children's well-being and emphasise participation and inclusion.

In addition to the relationship between children and teachers, it is important to recognise that the child is not an island, but is embedded in a system consisting of different social relationships, such as peers inside and outside school, teachers and other professionals, and the family (e.g., Dizon et al., 2021; Popyk et al., 2019). Accordingly, it takes the whole village to shape hybrid integration, agency and identity formation. These social relationships are not independent of each other; rather, they interact, sometimes directly and observably, sometimes indirectly and more unconsciously. In the following interview extract, a teacher describes the meaning of parental work and collaboration with other professionals in order to work successfully:

> My main tasks include … contact with the student, contact with the parents, taking care of plans and cooperation with [other professional groups]. Then, I would also emphasise the meaning of social relations, the power of social relations, in order to support the students.
>
> (SWE_I1_T_M)

Teachers and social workers stress the importance of working with parents. It is important to involve and communicate with parents, to value families and to consider the resources and challenges they bring to the table. A teacher utters: "I think it's very important to know that the motivation comes from the child and that the parents also support that, so you have to be in constant contact" (G_I2_T_F).

For the development of CMB, in particular, it is important that their family and their culture of origin are seen and valued:

> Integration is an activity whose aim is the mutual enrichment of two different nationalities … the feeling that I give something of myself, that I share something, but I also experience such trust. My personality is enriched, my life becomes more colourful, my perspective on the world broadens. Integration is a win-win situation.
>
> (PL_I1_T_F)

CMB are often seen in a process of negotiation between their culture of origin and the culture that surrounds them.

> A teacher describes this balancing: [The children] … end up a bit in the middle. From home, they have a culture where other things are important. Like getting married … then they are in school, where they see that school is important. So, they end up in the middle there. It's a lot of work for them.
>
> (SWE_I6_T_F)

This process can have a strong impact on the child's identity. On the one hand, there are children who strongly reject one or even both the culture of origin and the culture of the host country; on the other hand, there are children who show strong interest to unite both cultures in their identity or prefer each culture in different situations. For example, in experiencing different aspects of their identity, some children make a clear distinction between the school environment and the family environment (Ellis & Klusáková, 2007). The next section will elaborate on how social relationships relate to children's identity development.

Social relationship and their meaning for development of the self and identity

Self and identity are two closely related concepts (Baumeister, 2005) that refer to knowledge about oneself such as about one's abilities, appearance, preferences, or personality characteristics. Both concepts also encompass an understanding of important social relationships, perceived group memberships, ethnicity, and culture, but also the (consistent) classification of past and future in an individual's narration about himself or herself (Alsaker & Kroger, 2020). Ethnicity specifically may play an important role in identity formation. If children who identify themselves as members of an ethnic minority and share their attitudes, values and feelings, are excluded and/or rejected by the majority group and the mainstream social environment, the development of a positive sense of cultural belonging can be hampered (Romero & Roberts, 2003). The concept of hybrid identity shows how children can integrate different cultural aspects into their own identity through negotiation (Holliday, 2011). For instance, for CMB, it means integrating aspects

of the country of origin and the host country, but forming a hybrid identity can also apply to non-migrant children (Chapter 2).

The formation of self and identity is a lifelong, actively shaped and dynamic interactional process. The older children get the more complex their view of the self becomes. As children develop cognitively and socio-emotionally, the self becomes more independent of others' ascriptions, social comparison processes, and social feedback. Children rely more and more on their own observations and reflections, the self becomes more stable and independent of situational variation (Harter, 2012, 2015). Nevertheless, social relationships are an important reference point for the development of self, especially within transitions. Peers and teachers represent important sources of information for knowledge about oneself, one's skills and characteristics, and have a powerful influence on one's self-evaluation (Harter, 2015). More specifically, as illustrated by the following quotes on the meaning of mother tongue tuition, others directly and indirectly shape development of the self: "Mother tongue tuition is the king's path, I think, for integration. … [It] is good particularly for those who want to develop both their Swedish and other cultural personality" (SWE_M2_M); "You could say that mother tongue teachers and study supervisors are the only persons …, who can help students to integrate in a very good way or bad way" (SWE_M4_F);

> Yes … the main thing is language …, but I am not fully comfortable with that because I wonder if we are the ones who are not ready, children never come without a language, they often have more than one, it is us, we are structured around one language only.
>
> (UK_I23_T_M)

Here, the examples discuss how language fosters and hinders identity formation and hybrid integration. However, it is not language per se, but language as a socio-cultural tool and cultural grounding, the experiences and expectations that go along with language. Teachers' examples suggest that awareness and engagement with different cultural experiences can facilitate agency and integration, and strengthen the development and living out of hybrid identities.

An approach that complements the aforementioned developmental perspective and is fruitful when considering the development of hybrid identities is the Social Identity Theory by Tajfel and Turners (1979). According to this theory, identity can be viewed along a continuum between two poles: the personal and the social identity. Personal identity describes knowledge about oneself as a person, which is often acquired through comparison with others (Stets & Burke, 2000). It includes individual traits, characteristics, preferences, and abilities, such as whether one is extraverted, likes sports, or is talented in languages. Haslam (2004) describes that such comparison takes place on a so-called 'I'- and 'you'-level. It focuses on the individual and allows children to describe themselves in relation to and interact with each other. In contrast, social identity is not about the individual, but relates to the perception of being part of a group. Group members share characteristics and attributions; the entire group compares itself with other groups on a

'we'-level. Accordingly, self-relevance and perceived similarity with other group members determines group membership (Scheepers & Ellemers, 2019) and thus well-being at school:

> I: And how is it between you students in L2? G: People, there are people like me. … We feel connected, because we are all immigrants in Germany … learning the same stuff and … trying to learn the same language. Thus, we all understand each other. But in my normal classroom they all speak German and I am the immigrant one, so they don't understand how I feel among them.
>
> (G_I47_G)

Finding common ground is not just about speaking the same language: "G: We mix, but for the most part, we spend our time in those groups where we feel most comfortable simply. I: And what else do you have in common. G: Interests" (PL_F5_CH). Perceived similarity in terms of (language) competencies and migration experience, but also with regard to needs, values, and interests, is extremely important for a sense of (group) belonging. As a result, the groups appear homogeneous to a certain extent and the individual group members become somewhat interchangeable (Fischer, Jander, & Krueger, 2018). Individuals tend to belong to multiple social groups, which manifests in different social identities elicited, for instance, by the different contexts in which one moves, and group membership is accompanied by various emotions (Scheepers & Ellemers, 2019). Accordingly, a girl in the following quote describes that she perceives her class as a community, but also identifies sub-groups, which are characterised by different interests:

> We have many common points and many different ones. For example, one common point is that we all like to talk in class … and quite a lot … play instruments. And then it's also quite different …. For example, we have small groups. One group is always so smartly dressed, so modern and always so loud … another group, they … don't care what the others think of them …the groups always keep to themselves a bit. But you can always see which group you belong to, because one of them does it this way and that way.
>
> (G_I36_G)

The following example illustrates the negotiation of personal and social identity and points to the necessity of shared interests and values in order to 'find common ground':

> B: In class, we do have a close relationship with each other … [with] Finnish people, we can connect if they come to us and we can talk to each other. I: Does it mean that it is sometimes difficult to make friends with Finnish pupils? … B: Yes, it is indeed difficult to make friends with them. … It doesn't mean

> that they don't like us, no. We just don't have common things to talk about. … we don't have anything to talk about.
>
> (FI_F1_B)

The quote illustrates that finding common ground is difficult and entails ambivalences and uncertainties. On the one hand, it concerns the question of who actively makes an effort and how (i.e., "we can connect if they come to us"); on the other hand, the perception of common ground is not fixed. In the example, aspects such as social well-being, the ability to make small talk (surface-level common ground) and the need to have more general topics to talk about (deeper common ground) are touched upon. The child describes that commonalities are important for making connections with each other and building deeper friendships. Thus, intercultural competence presupposes not only a common language, but also a certain degree of shared standards of perception and communication, shared knowledge, issues and values, as captured, for example, by Esser's (2001) notion of culturation.

Furthermore, it is possible to have personal relationships with individual members of either one's own group (ingroup) or other groups (outgroup). The social valorisation of a group can enhance the self-image of the ingroup and the self-esteem of its members, while at the same time possibly devaluing the outgroup (see, for example, quotation PL_I17_B). In the school context, devaluation might manifest in bullying, exclusion of students, and even racism toward minority groups (Rastas, 2005). The following conversation between two children exemplifies such group-processes with regard to gender:

> G: If … he quarrels with me, he has a whole group of boys and I have a whole group of girls behind me, and then it becomes a group. … I think it gets worse and worse because it gets bigger. B: Yes. …, it can lead to a big, I would say war between girls and boys, that can destroy our whole sense of community.
>
> (SWE_F6_GB)

Here, the girls and boys are seen not as individuals, but as group members, allowing an intergroup conflict to arise. In line with Social Identity Theory, the interviews emphasise that differentiation between groups and (self-)categorisation as well as demarcation and not belonging are part of natural group processes, which are context-dependent, but carry a risk of conflict, exclusion and discrimination. "I: Have you had situations where you or someone else was treated worse? G: I don't know if I was, because almost nobody liked me because I'm from another country" (PL_I9_G).

Summing up, Social Identity Theory points to the balancing of personal and social identity aspects. Several implications for practitioners can be derived. The challenge and the opportunity for teachers and other professionals is to create a group that encompasses all children, yet, at the same time, acknowledges their individual differences. Two girls summarise this issue as follows: "G1: … this

school is very good because there are no groupings, like everyone is friend with everyone. G2: Everyone is different. G1: … Everyone is with everyone. So this school … is good for everyone actually" (SWE_F9_G).

From the children's perspective, social skills and the structural opportunity to get to know each other are particularly important for creating a group that encompasses everyone. Children refer to possibilities related to seating arrangements (see also Laursen & Faur, 2022), group work, joint activities such as sports, or personal exchange in the form of informal talks: "Well, a girl sat down with me … and [still] sits with me and she's a very nice girl, because she sat with me from the first day" (PL_I14_G); "My favourite activities involved group work because it helps you approaching your classmates, to make friends … the teachers would then try and put us with this classmate to strengthen the relationship" (IT_F21_B); "I didn't know many words … that are not used in school. On … a class trip, I talked to a friend and she taught me words … of a girl's everyday life, for example, pimples, pores or something" (G_I43_G); "For me the best thing … is break time, when I … didn't know anyone yet, it was talking with the others to get to know each other better" (IT_F31_G). While children often consider time at school to be most important, social workers and teachers also emphasise the significance of providing opportunities for children and their families to connect, support, and spend time in social relationships, such as peer relations, outside of school. "There is this place where they have a football field, [and] … do an after-school program, it is very inclusive and so Italian and foreign kids become friends, then there is the town square where they mee." (IT_I30_T_F); "To be able to do many activities, for example, they would like school time to be longer, they would like to play sports with others, they would like to spend more time with their classmates outside of school" (IT_I21_T_F). However, it should be noted that there is considerable inter-individual variation among the children in the connectedness of the relationships within and outside of school. Not a few report that they only have contact with their classmates at school. Moreover, the interviewed professionals note that identity issues remain even years after arrival in the host country.

Language as an example of the dynamic interdependencies between integration, agency and hybrid identity

Language and its importance illustrate well how the concepts of integration, agency, and hybrid identity are intertwined and can be promoted or inhibited by social relationships (Esser, 2006). A widely held belief is that CMB must first learn the language of the host country before they can be integrated (see Chapter 8): "Strengthening their language is an absolute need, language as a vehicle of coexistence … as a means of establishing social relations" (IT_I7_T_F). At the same time, social relationships also enable – or impede – learning, whereby learning should not be defined narrowly (as is sometimes done in the school system), but should also be understood in terms of integration and identity formation (Kinossalo, Jousmäki, & Intke-Hernandez, 2022). Thus, relationship building starts before

students speak the same language. Accordingly, an Italian teacher stresses that CMB "aspire to be accepted by others, they invest a lot, especially at the beginning, in learning from their peers rather than from us" (IT_I11_T_F). The meaning of establishing peer relations at the beginning is also exemplified by the quote from a migrant girl, whose teachers supported her in learning, but also in getting to know her classmates by allowing the students to use internet translators. The girl could rely on these relationships, thus creating a good base for learning. The quote also exemplifies the interplay of language and social interaction as a gradual process that takes time.

> G: At the beginning, I was using flashcards so everybody could understand English … and also help me translate for the students. And some of them tried to communicate with me in English. So it was good. I: Did you make any friends at school? G: Yeah. I made many friends. … recently I was spending time with [my friend] after school. Like, for example, go to the park, we sit under the swing. We talk to each other and then go home. I: And … did your classmates help you with learning? G: Yes. … She helped me.
>
> (PL_I22_G)

Similarly, the following extract illustrates that to children, personality is more important than language, thus problematising the view of language as the first necessary prerequisite for integration.

> B: It is not about where a person is from if the person is good and honest, yes, we can be friends. G1: When I came for the first time, it was a bit late and I did not know anyone and I could not speak so well … but I made friends before learning to speak well because I think my friends trust me and I was kind. G2: Yes, she was. I: It's the individual person that matters to you. G2: Yes.
>
> (UK_F9_GB)

Schools are steady contexts to build relationships and offer great opportunities to form friendships because children see each other on a daily basis, have the same rhythm and routine of the school week, and face similar types of tasks and requirements. Accordingly, the children emphasise that what is important is not language, but rather personality, shared interests and values. This is especially true for younger children. However, as children grow older, the importance of language for belonging, participation, and identity increases, as the following quotes illustrate:

> B: We have many friends in the school. … He is also my friend. Because the four of us speak the same language. I: Are you friends with those who speak the same language or are you friends with others? B: No, there are also those who … know me. … But not a real friend. Like a real friend in the homeland.
>
> (SWE_F4_B)

> B1: Because first thing, you want to make a friend, you need to communicate. You need a language. … when [name of friend] came, it was like we got out to shop, we chatted all the time. Like, we had it fine. I: What role does language have when it comes to being friends? B2: It has a lot.
>
> (SWE_F5_BB)

Thus, language becomes more important for peer relations and friendships in order to express oneself and communicate with others. At the same time, language – and the way its meaning is conceptualised in school contexts – affects what opportunities for participation children perceive and the extent to which they experience themselves as having agency: for example, whether they believe they have something to contribute. Problems are often attributed to one's personal failings and affect children's self-concept and self-esteem (Crone, 2016). This is especially true for older children, who ascribe more importance to language for creating cohesion and participation and use language to tell others who they are and what makes them tick.

> I have this boy who is from Hungary. And I am best friends with him. …. We also speak German, but with other Germans, I am not so close with them. … I don't talk so much in class. … But with my friend, we talk together …, because he doesn't know German either. … That's why I can talk to him.
>
> (G_I42_B)

> How I feel in [school] is not … so good. At the beginning, it was even worse for me. So I felt somehow that everyone was looking at me. … I don't feel like I belong there. … So really the classmates were so fast and I always felt like I couldn't contribute anything good. So then group work and I always felt like such a zero-person.
>
> (G_I44_G)

> In my opinion, let's say foreign people, participate (less) or someone who has greater difficulties in a subject avoids asking questions. … I've noticed that some foreigners, especially when they first arrive, greet the teacher and then don't say anything during the lesson … they are either ashamed or afraid of making mistakes.
>
> (IT_F21_T_F)

With regard to identity, a shared language may also represent shared backgrounds and therefore lead to a shared social identity and social belonging, as the following interviews with three children demonstrate:

> B: Because … you connect to the person directly that we come from the same country, we have the same background. So you get a connection with

> that person. G: You have something in common. I: Do you have it automatically then? G: No, it depends. I don't talk to every single Arab I see here [in Sweden].
>
> (SWE_F2_GB)

Using language as a mediating process, it becomes clear that social relations influence hybrid integration, agency and identity formation. Contrary to what is often assumed, it is not always language that comes first, but a dynamic interplay that is influenced by aspects such as age, previous experience, perceived similarity and cultural values.

Implications for practice

This chapter focuses on the significance of social relationships for hybrid integration, participation and identity formation. In doing so, children are understood as active co-constructors of these processes by shaping social relations and social contexts. Social relationships, whether symmetrical or asymmetrical, form the foundation for children's well-being, enable or hinder agency and hybrid integration. This co-constructivist perspective not only concerns the school and educational context, but all interrelated contexts in which children move (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998).

Our results show that professionals need to be aware of social relationships' potential, with regard to not only well-being and learning, but also concerning children's motivation and academic achievement. For example, CMB are particularly motivated to perform well at school – and it is precisely this school performance that teachers focus on. However, this motivation is also particularly susceptible to social influences as shown by our examples on participation and communication, a fact that is usually not sufficiently taken into account. Accordingly, in their work, teachers must find answers to a series of questions such as: How does interaction in the classroom strengthen or hinder each child's agency and participation? How can the teacher succeed in building a relationship with each individual student, but also with the group, in order to support children in expressing their desires and needs, discussing topics with each other, exchanging views and experiences, and questioning attitudes and content? How does the composition of the peer group and cohesion affect the development of a hybrid identity? In this vein, teachers and other professionals must more thoroughly exploit the potential of social relations for learning and participation (Esser, 2001), for instance, by creating a good atmosphere in class, making themselves available as moderators and confidants, and objectively resolving conflicts among peers as needed. Accordingly, the interviews emphasise that teachers should give peers time to get to know each other on a personal level, carry out joint activities, specifically strengthen cohesion, and find common ground, for example, through group work and field trips. Peer-mentoring programs, learning tandems, or peer learning constellations are good ways to harness the potential of symmetrical relationships. Joint excursions, sports and space to get to know each other's interests

are just as important as group work in the classroom. It is important, however, not to encourage groups to separate themselves from others, but to ensure that participants flow fluidly into and out of different groups and that no boundaries are erected that could cause discrimination, exclusion or racism. This can be ensured, for example, by frequently randomly assigning groups to group work. Methodically, this can be introduced by establishing similarities, shared interests and values. Thus, professionals need to create opportunities for children to get to know each other on an individual level, for instance, by stimulating personal exchange about each other's experiences and desires and establishing joint activities that allow for seeing new facets. This is a foundation to be laid in the classroom for activities outside the classroom and school. One concrete idea would be for children, together with their teachers, to create a portfolio for each individual child in which special highlights, developmental steps and educational stages are recorded. These folders are oriented towards the resources and strengths of the individual child and record their biography in a temporal and subjective dimension. These portfolios belong to the child and can, on the one hand, record and make transparent the child's social networks and interests and, on the other hand, encourage the child to exchange with peers, professionals and parents about the portfolio's contents.

Furthermore, our interviews also make it clear that in the work with CMB, asymmetrical and symmetrical aspects of relationships should be taken into account and consciously shaped. The interviews also demonstrate that both relationship types are not mutually exclusive but interwoven, they go beyond asymmetrical relationships between professionals and children to shed light on the importance of symmetrical interactions as well. Adults have to find the right balance between guidance and instruction on the one hand, recognition of children's competence and relinquishment of control and power on the other. These ambiguities are not easy to negotiate. Children want guidance, supervision, and to be taught content and competencies, but, they also want to be seen in their abilities and encouraged to try out and develop them together with and alongside others. This is emphasised by teachers and social workers as well as by the children themselves, for example, when it comes to solving problems and conflicts. One example for a practical implementation is the creation of 'neutral' spaces in the form of a room or a table where problems and conflicts can be solved constructively. Ideally, the children must have the possibility to find and use this place independently. This requires a jointly established structure and rules for problem-solving skills. Furthermore, there must be the possibility of low-threshold supervision by teachers or social workers and it must be ensured that someone has the needs, rights and safety of the children in mind and enforces them. It should also be ensured that children with language deficits have the opportunity to express themselves and that they are listened to.

It is also important to keep group processes in mind with respect to identity formation. Here, it is important to break down group categorisations such as those based on ethnic characteristics, and create a group that sticks together based on similar interests, positive common activities, and social cohesion. Even the children's seating arrangement does not have to be fixed, but can be rotated to allow

everyone to get to know each other better or that children can learn from each other and exchange ideas. Students can also take on the role of the teacher and vice versa. This allows for a change of perspective, promotes empathy and can strengthen the children in their respective expertise. It also shows teachers what school and the social fabric can be like from a child's perspective. Extracurricular and school activities in which all children are involved and can contribute their skills also help them to get to know each other better and limit boundary formation.

At the same time, professionals have to apply their knowledge in interactions and take children seriously, show interest in their opinions and experiences, and see them as active and competent. It is important to recognise children's experiences, appreciate their culture and actively support the development of their individual identity. In this way, children learn about recognition and appreciation, can accept these positive factors and develop their identity, while also learning to appreciate other people, no matter where they come from. CMB may face extra challenges in identity formation, especially if there are differences between their culture of origin/family culture and the dominant culture of the surrounding environment. Here, social contexts and feelings of (not) belonging play a major role for navigating individual challenges such as learning and using a new language, the fear of making mistakes or of talking in front of others, dealing with novelty, and managing one's own and others' expectations. This is also the case when considering group-level challenges such as dealing with commonalities and differences, establishing similarity and common ground, and shaping group membership and breaking down group boundaries.

The CHILD-UP interviews make clear that both, children with and without a migration background, as well as professionals would like to see more space and time for exchange, for getting to know each other and each other's cultures, needs and expectations. All this is necessary to find common ground from which social relationships can arise and grow, friendships can be formed and strengthened. Here, it is particularly important for the development of CMB that their family and culture of origin are seen and valued. Thus, teachers should support the migrant child's hybrid identity by encouraging participation not only by the child, but their entire family.

Hybrid integration, agency and identity development are multi-layered, and subject to a dynamic process at the intersection of the individual and social environment. Paying more attention to agency and individual developmental challenges can strengthen the hybrid integration and well-being of the whole group. Ultimately, developing a hybrid identity by exploring and adopting values from both the family culture and the dominant culture can bring additional benefits (e.g. Marcia, 1980).

Finally, the area of language is a good illustration of how hybrid integration, agency, and identity formation are interconnected. Thus, exchange and communication are considered essential by both the children interviewed and the participating teachers and social workers. This is not only about language in the narrower sense, but also about the expression of aspects relevant to identity: How can a common language be found in a class? What is necessary for a child to be able to

talk about interests, beliefs, and experiences? This also suggests that teaching is more than just the imparting of learning content, but also the promotion of cohesion, children's personality development, and support for identity formation.

References

Afshordi, N., & Libermann, Z. (2020). Keeping friends in mind: Development of friendship concepts in early childhood. *Social Development*, *30*, 331–342.

Alsaker, F.D., & Kroger, J. (2020). Self-concept, self-esteem, identity. In S. Jackson, & L. Goossens (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent development* (pp. 90–118). London: Psychology Press.

Arslan, G., Allen, K.A., & Tanhan, A. (2020). School bullying, mental health, and well-being in adolescents: Mediating impact of positive psychological orientations. *Child Indicators Research*, *14*, 1007–1026.

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

Baraldi, C., & Iervese, V. (2014). Observing children's capabilities as agency. In D. Stoecklin & J.M. Bonvin (Eds.), *Children's rights and the capability approach. Challenges and prospects* (pp. 43–66). Dordrecht: Springer.

Baumeister, R.F. (2005). Self-concept, self-esteem, and identity. In V. Derlega, B. Winstead, & W. Jones (Eds.), *Personality: Contemporary theory and research* (pp. 246–280). San Francisco: Wadsworth.

Baumrind, D. (1991). Parenting styles and adolescent development. In J. Brooks-Gunn, R.M. Lerner, & A.C. Petersen (Eds.), *The encyclopedia on adolescence* (pp. 746–758). New York: Garland Publishing.

Brazelton, T.B., & Greenspan, S.I. (2000). *The irreducible needs of children: What every child must have to grow, learn, and flourish*. Cambridge: Perseus Publishing.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P.A. (1998). The ecology of developmental processes. In W. Damon & R.M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology (Vol. 1). Theoretical models of human development* (pp. 993–1028). New York: John Wiley.

Brooker, L., & Woodhead, M. (2008). *Developing positive identities: Diversity and young children. Early childhood in focus (3)*. Milton Keynes: Open University.

Crone, K. (2016). *Identität von Personen: Eine Strukturanalyse des biografischen Selbstverständnisses* [Identity of persons: A structural analysis of the biographical self-concept]. Berlin, Boston: DeGruyter.

Crul, M., Lelie, F., Biner, Ö., et al. (2019). How the different policies and school systems affect the inclusion of Syrian refugee children in Sweden, Germany, Greece, Lebanon and Turkey. *CMS*, 7, 10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-018-0110-6

Dizon, L., Selak, V., Ramalho, R., & Peiris-John, R. (2021). Factors influencing the negotiation of ethnic identity among 1.5 and second-generation Asian migrants: A mixed methods systematic review, *Journal of Adolescence*, *89*, 95–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2021.04.005

Eckerman, C.O., Whatley, J.L., & Kutz, S.L. (1975). Growth of social play with peers during the second year of life. *Developmental Psychology*, *11*, 42–49.

Ehm, J.H., Duzy, D., & Hasselhorn, M. (2011). Das akademische Selbstkonzept bei Schulanfängern. Spielen, Geschlecht und Migrationshintergrund eine Rolle? [Academic self-concept in first-year school students. Do gender and migration background play a role?] *Frühe Bildung*, *0*, 37–45.

Ellis, S., & Klusáková, L. (2007). *Imagining frontiers contesting identities*. Pisa: University Press.
Entorf, H., & Lauk, M. (2008). Peer effects, social multipliers and migrants at school: An international comparison. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *34*, 633–654.
Esser, H. (2001). *Integration und ethnische Schichtung* [Integration and ethnic stratification]. Mannheim: Mannheimer Arbeitspapiere.
Esser, H. (2006). *Migration, language and integration*. Berlin: WZB.
Fischer, P., Jander, K., & Krueger, J. (2018). *Sozialpsychologie für Bachelor*. Wiesbaden: Springer.
Fisher, L., Evans, M., Forbes, K., Gayton, A., & Liu, Y. (2018). Participative multilingual identity construction in the languages classroom: A multi-theoretical conceptualisation. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *17*, 448–466.
Freiberg, H. J. (1999). School climate: Measuring, improving and sustaining healthy learning environments. *Learning Environments Research*, *2*, 331–334.
Fröhlich, L., Martiny, S.E., & Deaux, K. (2020). A longitudinal investigation of the ethnic and national identities of children with migration background in Germany. *Social Psychology*, *51*, 91–105.
Gläser-Zikuda, M., & Fuß, S. (2004). *Wohlbefinden von Schülerinnen und Schülern im Unterricht* [Student's well-being in the classroom]. Bern, Stuttgart, Wien: Haupt.
Hagenauer, G., & Hascher, T. (2018). *Emotionen und Emotionsregulation in Schule und Hochschule* [Emotions and emotion regulation in school and college]. Münster, New York: Waxmann.
Harter, S. (2012). Emerging self-processes during childhood and adolescence. In M.R. Leary & J.P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 680–715). New York & London: Guilford.
Harter, S. (2015). *The construction of the self: Developmental and sociocultural foundations* (2nd edition). New York & London: Guilford.
Hascher, T. (2004). *Schule positiv erleben. Ergebnisse und Erkenntnisse zum Wohlbefinden von Schülerinnen und Schülern* [Experiencing school positively. Results and findings on student well-being]. Stuttgart: Haupt.
Haslam, A. (2004). *Psychology in organizations: The social identity approach*. London: Sage.
Holliday, A. (2011). *Intercultural communication & ideology*. Abingdon, New York: Routledge.
Kinossalo, M., Jousmäki, H., & Intke-Hernandez, M. (2022). Life-story pedagogy for identity: Through linguistic and cultural recognition to participation and equity. *Journal of Applied Language Studies*, *16*, 99–119.
Laursen, B., & Faur, S. (2022). What does it mean to be susceptible to influence? A brief primer on peer conformity and developmental changes that affect it. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *46*, 222–237.
Marcia, J.E. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Aldeson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (pp. 159–187). New York: Wiley.
Ohm, U. (2021). Die Berücksichtigung sprachlicher Vielfalt in Schule und Unterricht. Perspektiven für Demokratiebildung im Fach Deutsch als Zweitsprache [The consideration of linguistic. diversity in schools and classes. Perspectives for democracy education in the subject german as a second language]. *Praxis Forschung Lehrer*innen Bildung. Zeitschrift für Schul- und Professionsentwicklung*, *3*, 8–22.
Oswald, H. (2009). Persönliche Beziehungen in der Kindheit [Social relationships in childhood]. In K. Lenz & F. Nestmann (Eds.), *Handbuch Persönliche Beziehungen* (pp. 491–512). Weinheim: Juventa.
Piaget, J. (1932/1983). *Le jugement moral chez l'enfant/Das moralische Urteil beim Kind* [The moral judgment of the child]. München: dtv.

Popyk, A., Pustułka, P., & Trąbka, A. (2019). Theorizing belonging of migrant children and youth at a meso-level. *Migration Studies – Review of Polish Diaspora*, *171*, 235–255. https://doi.org/10.4467/25444972SMPP.19.011.10261

Rastas, A. (2005). Racializing categorization among young people in Finland. *Young*, *13*(2), 147–166.

Rohlfs, C. (2011). *Bildungseinstellungen. Schule und formale Bildung aus der Perspektive von Schülerinnen und Schülern* [Educational attitudes. School and formal education from the perspective of students]. Wiesbaden: VS.

Romero, A.J., & Roberts, R.E. (2003). Stress within a bicultural context for adolescents of Mexican descent. Cultural diversity and ethnic minority. *Psychology*, *9*, 171–184.

Ryan, R., & Deci, E. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *55*, 78–88.

Scheepers, D., & Ellemers, N. (2019). Social identity theory. In K. Sassenberg & M. Vliek (Eds.), *Social psychology in action* (pp. 129–143). Cham: Springer.

Schneider-Andrich, P. (2021). Frühe Peerbeziehungen und Kindergruppen. Ein Überblick zum Forschungsstand. [Early peer relation and children groups. A research overview]. *Frühe Bildung*, *10*, 65–72.

Schwab, S., Lindner, K.T., Helm, C. Hamel, N., & Markus, S. (2021). Social participation in the context of inclusive education: Primary school students' friendship networks from students' and teachers' perspectives. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *37*(5), 834–849.

Shaheen, M., & Miles, T. (2017). The mental health and psychological well-being of refugee children and young people: an exploration of risk, resilience and protective factors. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *33*, 249–263.

Ślusarczyk, M., Slany, K., Struzik, J., & Warat, M. (2022). (In)visible learners or school as a space for negotiating integration? Challenges of working with migrant children through the lens of teachers. *Edukacja Międzykulturowa*, *4*(19), 127–138.

Spiegler, O., Sonnenberg, K., Fassbender, I., Kohl, K., & Leyendecker, B. (2018). Ethnic and national identity development and school adjustment: A longitudinal study with Turkish immigrant-origin children. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *49*, 1009–1026.

Stets, J., & Burke, P.J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *63*, 224–237.

Tajfel, H., & Turners, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–37). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

van de Vijver, F.J.R. (2018). Immigration policies: Relevant for developmental science. *Human Development*, *61*, 1–3. https://doi.org/10.1159/000485363

Youniss, J. (1980). *Parents and peers in social development*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Youniss, J. (1982). Die Entwicklung und Funktion von Freundschaftsbeziehungen [The development and function of friendship relationships]. In: W. Edelstein & M. Keller (Eds.), *Perspektivität und Interpretation* (pp. 78–109). Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Chapter 5

Gendered practices at school

The experiences of migrant children and professionals' practices and views

Marta Warat, Anna Ratecka, Margund K. Rohr, Justyna Struzik, Paulina Szydłowska-Klakla, Thomas Droessler and Lena Foertsch

Introduction

The experiences of migrant children in the school environment are shaped by a range of social, economic, political, and cultural factors. The manner in which children perceive their identity, express their sense of belonging, and build their social relationships is also dependent on the school environment itself. Teachers, peers, school staff, and intercultural mediators can, through their involvement in the daily life of the school, enhance or moderate pupils' sense of agency and safety, autonomy and participation (Chapter 4). One aspect of school life which is less frequently analysed in relation to migration is the gendered dimension of students' experiences. Despite the growing interest among researchers in the gender dimension of migration, it is often taken for granted that the experiences of migrant pupils are homogeneous (Jørgensen, Dobson, & Perry, 2021). Gender is still rarely explored in the realm of migrant children's experiences, identities, and school practices (Laoire, 2011).

One important question that can be raised in the context of migrant children's experiences at school is whether and how professionals – teachers, social workers, mediators – problematise gender and ideas of gender equality in their daily work with children and their families. Therefore, this chapter will analyse how professionals working with children with migrant background (CMB) understand and respond to the gender-differentiated needs of pupils. We want to look at tools they use to weaken gender stereotypes and empower children, while also analysing situations in which these stereotypes are reinforced or not problematised. In addition, we want to juxtapose the experiences of professionals with those of the children, following a research approach, which is focused on the voice of the children themselves.

The analysis presented here is based on qualitative research conducted as part of the CHILD-UP project. The research, conducted in seven European countries, involved individual and group interviews with professionals working with CMB and the children themselves. The aim of the project was to understand how schools can enhance CMB's participation in school and community life. The gender

DOI: 10.4324/9781003341772-5

perspective in the research was horizontal – this means that gender was included as a sensitising category at each stage of the research.

Childhood, migration and gender in the school settings

Migration studies in the past have frequently neglected the perspective of children and young people, assuming that their experiences are always mediated by the perspectives of adults (parents and guardians) or the institutions providing care for minors (Slany & Strzemecka, 2015; Struzik & Pustułka, 2017). Consequently, the social sciences have produced an image of childhood not as a field for the construction of autonomous identities, subjective relationship-building or decision-making by children, but rather as one which is dependent on the 'adult world' and its institutions, including school (White, Laoire, Tyrrell, & Carpena-Méndez, 2011). With the emergence of child-centred approaches in social research (Chapter 2), children have increasingly become direct participants in research and thus their voices are beginning to be perceived as those of full participants in migration studies (Dreby & Adkins, 2012; Slany & Strzemecka, 2015). With the opening up of children's experiences of migration processes, attitudes to their role in both migration itself and in shaping the transnational dimensions of family, school life, and peer relations, co-creating local communities and constructing more fluid, dynamic identities, drawing on both elements of the culture of the country of origin and the host country, have also changed. The experiences of CMB are now seen not so much as a reflection of adult worlds and decisions, but rather through the notion of agency, autonomy and children's own language (White et al., 2011). This does not mean the abandonment of the role played by macro-structural factors such as systemic racism, class inequalities or the education system or the influence of the family of origin in shaping children's experiences, but showing how CMB navigate complex social relations and how they form their sense of belonging. Accordingly, Slany and Strzemecka (2015) underline that children's agency cannot be explored without considering the possible impact of their social environment, including family and school.

Many researchers following a child-centred approach in their research have additionally emphasised the need to move away from treating CMB as a homogeneous group, calling for their diversity of experiences to be recognised, if only by virtue of their host country's language skills, ethnicity, parents' socio-economic status or gender (Jørgensen et al., 2021). This last dimension is of relevance to us, as it constitutes the framework for the analysis presented in this chapter. Referring to the gendered dimension of children's and young people's experiences, after other researchers (Connell, 2009; Deutsch, 2007), we draw attention to the constructivist nature of the concept itself, revealing the social production of gender roles, identities, expressions and practices, as well as their changing and dynamic nature. At the same time, we refer to research indicating the contextualisation of gender and gender-related practices, influenced by a range of social, economic, cultural or political factors (Connell, 2009). Thus, on the one hand, gender is

shaped by the resources and capital available to us; on the other hand, through our everyday choices and activities, the possibility to make gender constructs, roles and expectations associated with them is more flexible and dynamic. This is particularly relevant in the context of school-aged children, whose identities, relationships, and activities are influenced by family, peers, school, and community environments.

The picture is further complicated in the case of CMB, whose experiences are simultaneously shaped by the culture of their country of origin and that of their host country. In the context of our research, an important element in the discussion of the construction of CMB's gendered experiences is the school environment, together with students' relationships with teachers and other professionals who work with them, and their peer relationships. Following Devine (2009, p. 523), we treat school as "as a social space in which agents are positioned according to their access to particular capitals", recognising, on the one hand, the influence of capitals on the positioning of CMB, and on the other hand, emphasising their agency in shaping their everyday life.

In line with Laoire (2011), we employ the notion of serious games (Ortner, 2006) to explore children's agency. Serious games allow us to grasp various aspects of the CMB's subjectivity whilst simultaneously analysing the complex entanglements of power, inequalities, and solidarity which are part of their experience, hence CMB in schools "engage in the micropolitics of social life, involving both routine and internationalized action" (Laoire, 2011, p. 303). Drawing on the concept of agency of projects and agency of power, children's action "contain the potential to disrupt particular plays of the game in the case of individuals, and the very continuity of the game as a social and cultural formation over the long run" (Ortner, 2006, p. 151). This problematisation of agency could be useful in showing the "ways in which gender dynamics both reinforce and complicate the children's complex social positioning" (Laoire, 2011, p. 303). Importantly, the complex positionalities of ethnicity, age, class, and gender constitute the various ways in which children engage in serious games and exercise agency. Such practices include juggling "not only multiple linguistic codes and their social valences but also conflicting sociocultural expectations, moral frameworks and notions of personhood" and creating "autonomous arenas for action" (García-Sánchez, 2010, p. 524).

Notably, the agency of CMB can be analysed through their relations with teachers as it might be both enhanced by this group (e.g., by using working methods based on dialogue, participation and cooperation) and reduced (e.g., by applying a traditional teacher–student model, in which the former is the source of knowledge, and the child remains merely a 'passive' recipient). It can also vary in terms of forms, needs, and activities if we take into account gender diversity. In this chapter, we will therefore look at how the school environment organises, reinforces or undermines the gender aspect of CMB's experiences. We will base our analysis on both the voices of the children themselves, following a child-centred approach, and of professionals working in the school.

Methodology

The empirical data used in the analysis presented in this chapter stems from the qualitative research conducted in the CHILD-UP project. It focuses on 284 semi-structured individual and focus group interviews with professionals – teachers, social workers, and mediators, as well as 110 focus group interviews and 65 in-depth interviews with children conducted in Belgium (Brussels and Wallonia), Finland (Southern Ostrobothnia; Tampere region), Germany (Hamburg, Berlin and Saxony), Italy (Modena, Genova, Reggio Emilia), Poland (Lesser Małopolskia and Lublin voivodship), Sweden (Malmö) and the UK (London) (c.f. Chapter 1). The qualitative approach was chosen as it allows exploration of individual's experiences and perspective regarding children's agency and participation. It also explores the difficulties and opportunities the school poses for CMB. As the study coincided with the COVID-19 pandemic, its impact on children's experiences of education and peer-relationships were taken into account and integrated in the guidelines for interviews. In all countries, the interviews were conducted based on the same guidelines, but to capture the cultural, political and policy context, they were adjusted to the country context and to the situation of particular interviewees. The interviews were conducted face-to-face (especially in the initial part of the study) and via online interviews, due to social distancing requirements and other regulations aimed at shielding participants from the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The study with professionals was conducted between March 2020 and March 2021. The interview sample comprised professionals who already had considerable experience of working with CMB. To capture the variety and diversity of voices, we approached teachers from all school levels, working as class teachers, subject teachers, teachers of a local language as a second language, school assistants, and youth and leisure instructors. The sample of social workers was also diverse as it included social workers working in the school and in a reception centre as well as those working directly with migrants and those working primarily with the entire family. The largest proportion of professionals came from the studied countries, but some also had a migration background (e.g., in Germany). Participants were recruited through convenience and snowballing sampling, with the support of gatekeepers and stakeholders (such as non-governmental organisations, foundation offering trainings to professional, social support centres). In most cases, the participants were identified by the head of the institution who initiated contact with them and the interviews were conducted after receiving appropriate permission to access individuals in institutions they work in (Table 5.1).

In the case of the children, the interviews were conducted between February 2020 and June 2021. Children were invited to take part in the study either through schools or day care centres or after being approached by professionals (such as cultural assistants, pedagogues) who cooperated with the research teams. While the individual interviews were carried out only with CMB, the focus group interviews (FGIs) were conducted with the entire classes or groups of children, including both migrant and non-migrant children. The number of children taking part

Table 5.1 Sampling – professionals

Country	*Teachers*		*Social workers*		*Mediators/interpreters*		*Professionals in reception centres*	
	No. of interviews	*No. of FGI/ no of FGI participants*	*No. of interviews*	*No. of FGI/ no of FGI participants*	*No. of interviews*	*No. of FGI/ no of FGI participants*	*No. of interviews*	*No. of FGI/ no of FGI participants*
Belgium	10	–	2	–	1	1/4	0	–
Finland	13	–	7	–	4	–	–	3/10
Germany	8	4/14	9	–	2	1/3	–	–
Italy	43	–	6	–	1	8/21	6	–
Poland	17	1/5	8	–	–	1/7	2	–
Sweden	12	–	8	–	5	–	–	–
UK	42	–	14	–	–	–	–	–

Table 5.2 Number of interviews with children

Country	*Number of FGI*	*Number of FGI participants*	*In-depth interviews*
Belgium	4	89	11
Finland	7	16	–
Germany	23	52	27
Italy	33	513 approx.	–
Poland	6	40	27
Sweden	10	30	–
UK	20	500 approx.	–

in the FGIs varied between 2 (in Finland and Germany) and 24 children (in Belgium) (see Table 5.2). The children taking part in the study were mainly from ISCED 0 (Germany, Italy), ISCED 1 (Belgium, Finland, Germany, Italy, Poland, Sweden, UK), ISCED 2 (Belgium, Finland, Germany, Italy, Poland, Sweden) and ISCED 3 (Belgium, Germany, Italy, Sweden). The participants were heterogenous regarding gender and ethnic background. Parents gave written consent to their child's participation in the study, and the child gave verbal consent before being interviewed or participating in the focus interview. Both parents and children were informed of the anonymity of the study and the voluntary option to withdraw from the study.

During some of the interviews, children were assisted by a teacher, their parents, siblings or mediators. Their presence was related to the organisational aspect of the study (e.g. bringing children to the interviews) and, in some cases, it was a result of formal requirements set by school to ensure the safety of children. The presence of a mediator and an (elder) sibling was often an additional advantage as they helped with translation or provided additional information on the studied topic(s). The latter was especially important during the interviews with children experiencing difficulties in adaptation at schools who decided to share their stories mostly thanks to the support and encouragement of the mediator present in the room.

As all of the professionals were working with CMB, they provided useful information on the educational experiences, agency, and peer relations of the children, and shed light on the interplay of educational policies and the local opportunities and measures which impact on the hybrid integration of such children into the school system and their agency (Chapter 2). As a result, it was possible to identify similar tendencies across the countries while also highlighting the distinctions and differences.

The interviews with professionals and children were recorded and analysed separately by the research teams from each partner country. To ensure confidentiality and anonymity, all personal information allowing for the identification of interviewees was removed. Thematic analysis was applied to interpret data from the interviews. It was conducted independently by the research teams in each country based on the same guidelines.

Gender, culture and migration

The process of migration has an enormous impact on gender identity construction, revealing various dimensions of children's agency. Students with experience of migration face similar developmental challenges and corresponding aspects of socialisation into gender roles to children without any experience of migration. However, what differentiates them is the experience of being a migrant in a new country and the concomitant acculturation process (which is about adopting and rejecting elements of the culture of the country of emigration and maintaining and rejecting elements of the culture of the country of origin and these cultures that the child encounters also consist of stereotypes and gender roles) with the developmental process (Motti-Stefanidi, Berry, Chryssochoou, Sam, & Phinney, 2012; Oppedal, 2006; Sam & Oppedal, 2002). Despite the fact that individualisation broadened possibilities to change their own life, gender identity is always, to some extent, shaped by children's families of origin, peers or social institutions such as school. Consequently, children construct their identities using norms from different cultural and social contexts: those coming from their family and their cultural knowledge, those of peers and belonging to school community (Phinney, 1992).

Manoeuvring between cultural norms

A useful approach to examining these individual, family, and societal aspects was developed by Nowicka (2008), who claims that in the context of migration the recognition of the culture of origin takes place on two levels: subjective and reflected. While the first term refers to an individual's sense of (not) belonging to a culture, and thus feeling alienated within it, the second tells us how we are perceived and treated by others. Both levels are important in our study, but they are discussed differently from the perspectives of professionals and children themselves. For professionals, especially teachers, cultural differences emerging in various constructions of gender roles were less or more noticeable depending on the CMB's culture of origin. In the case of children with relatively close cultural backgrounds, for example, Ukrainian children in Poland, the differences between migrant and non-migrant children are perceived as being less significant. Not recognising differences or considering them unimportant also translates into specific teaching practices and school activities. In the above-mentioned example, teachers consider gender roles to be either the same or very similar to those in the host country, thus they are not subjected to any special reflection or action. At the other end of this continuum are the situations of students coming from cultures considered to be quite different in terms of norms and values. An example of this could be children from Chechnya in Poland. In this case, the perception of Chechen culture and the Muslim faith as being distant from Polish culture and conservative makes gender constructs in migrant children's roles and behaviours highly visible. However, those constructs are perceived by professionals as problematic because they do not fit the dominant cultural patterns of the host country. Noticing differences between cultural norms and values is further strengthened by the generation

gap, which is clearly visible at the subjective level. According to the professionals, first-generation migrant children are still close to their culture of origin and may alter their behaviour or gender roles to make them more consistent with their culture of origin.

Attitudes toward gender equality can also be difficult for some of those who are just beginning the acculturation process and where the norms of their culture of origin might still be more important and dominant for them. Rules in a new school, for example related to the requirement to attend physical education (if they did not have these kind of subjects before, as in the case of the Chechen female adolescents) or sex education classes (during which topics are discussed which are perceived as taboo in certain cultural contexts) can be a barrier to self-expression, and developing a sense of feeling safe and accepted in a new place. The situation in which CMB are forced to follow rules which are against their culture might intensify their adaptation problems and enhance cultural misunderstandings. During a focus interview with boys from Chechnya conducted at a refugee centre in Poland, one boy pointed to the difference in a way P.E. classes are organised at school, admitting that, contrary to the requirements in Polish school, "There is no P.E. in Chechnya for older girls, only for little ones" (PL_F3_CH).

Somewhat different is the situation of second-generation migrant children, who, immersed in a new culture, may have conflicting feelings about pursuing the gender roles expected by their parents and families. For them, their peers from the host country are an important point of reference as well. As noted by some professionals and children, this process of identity construction is also related to a more reflexive approach towards the acceptance of rules set by parents.

> It is frequently even harder for second-generation immigrants because they are pleased that they are safe and somehow got their lives started, but that second-generation might be in pain between these cultures even more than that first generation because they don't have the same culture to preserve – they don't know it properly – when a different kind of culture is cherished at home, they don't immerse themselves in Finnish culture either.
>
> (FI_FGI1_SW2_F)

Often, varying expectations engage children in a conflict of loyalty between family and peers, leading to difficult experiences and feelings of being torn apart. If one perspective begins to dominate, it can be linked to a feeling of distance from either family or peers. These situations also affect professionals who look for ways in which they can support children – both boys and girls – in gaining agency and (re)framing their relations with family and peers. In Sweden, the restraints put on girls by gendered norms at home led to "disruptive behaviour" at school (SWE_SW5_F). As a Swedish social worker commented, the restriction put at home on girls resulted in exercising freedom at school, where gender norms were more flexible. As a consequence, some girls "live out their adolescence in school, as they cannot do it after school" or engaged in school absenteeism (SWE_SW5_F).

Thus, here, school provides a space of agency of power, an opportunity to exercise resistance to parental control and restrictive gender norms.

This is further exemplified in a case raised by social workers in Finland, who observed a gender transformation of migrant girls. Some of them began to question the gendered expectations of their community as a result of their integration with Finnish peers and exposure to the notions of gender equality, which is a significant part of the school curriculum as well as an important societal value. In some cases, this resulted in conflicts at home that even led to violence and the emergency placement of children:

> When parents didn't think it was right that their children were influenced by their Finnish peers. It created conflicts and sometimes they escalate, even leading to a placement of a child, for example if there is violence at home because a girl has challenged the rules. There have been emergency placements and even (kids being) taken into care, of course then there are also some other problems.
>
> (FI_SW4_F)

According to some professionals, the conflicting expectations especially occurred in gender conservative communities with strong patriarchal power relationships. In some of the Muslim families described by teachers and social workers in the study, daughters were often expected to be obedient and devoted to family life instead of continuing their education. This is clearly reflected in a quotation from a teacher working with students of Chechen descent who recalled the following story:

> One girl said that she was going to get married. And I replied: What do you mean? She was in the first year of secondary school, at hairdressing school. She said she would still like to study, but she was already engaged. She already has a boyfriend, a family. (…) Her older sister was also forced to marry. They were together for 3 months and she ran away from that boy because he beat her.
>
> (PL_T13_F)

This example illustrates the conflict which might be experienced by both parents and children related with loyalty towards their culture of origin and ethnic groups as they share some structural barriers such as ethnic discrimination. According to Katsiaficas (2018), children sometimes have to rely more on their families to survive and succeed. Therefore, not all of the children in her study rebelled against their parental expectations, mirroring the comments of some of the professionals in the study:

> There are (…) differences. I feel that sometimes parents are more interested in helping a boy than a girl. As if they would already uh their role uh as later as a housewife (…). I have also experienced that. (…) That is then crap. If such conditions prevail, because the girls, I don't know, in this culture whether

> one culture at all nor whether one may say that culture. (…) but I say that where the children HAVE come from (-). I say it this way, it is probably usual to marry the girls very early and the boys must then, so to speak, are the progenitors. Girls do not go to work, they are only housewives who are then prepared for the activity as a housewife and that is not possible here. That the children must also learn something here, the girls must also learn something. We are (…) with us there are no differences, in the sexes. Now you even talk about which gender you feel you belong to, yes. Therefore, we are developed quite differently than I say as a leading industrialised country.
>
> (G_T4_F)

Professionals in Finland and Italy also reported that in the case of migrant children originating from countries where a tradition of honour culture is present (such as Albania, where traditional female and male roles are defined by *kanun*, i.e. customary law which contrasts with the gender norms accepted in Italian society), girls stay at home more, helping with household chores. They were subjected to greater parental supervision compared to boys, which sometimes limited their educational aspirations as well as participation in peer groups, extracurricular activities, or even in participation in some classes. This also applied to some Muslim families from the Middle East.

> Being part of a second-generation migrant family already helps the children in their growth process and belonging to certain nationalities certainly has its influence. For example, a prominent role is played by *kanun* in the Albanian community. Whilst not an official law but rather one of tradition, it regulates the relationship between men and women, between husband and wife. So these young people have to deal with living in a country that is strangely open to the situation of women and at the same time in a family where this does not happen and is not recognised. (…) The theme of double belonging is, in my opinion, still a very hot topic.
>
> (IT_SW3_F)

The patriarchal model of the family also affected boys, although the gendered behaviours of boys were rarely problematised by professionals. Teachers noted that the agency of migrant boys was perceived as being less restrained by gendered norms than girls. The professionals in Finland, Italy and Poland claimed that boys were given more freedom than girls and their participation in activities outside the home was widely accepted (e.g., being able to participate in extracurricular activities). On the other hand, teachers noticed that boys also bore an onerous duty to "protect the honour of the family", as in the situation mentioned below by a Polish teacher. Therefore, according to teachers' opinion, behaviour which does fit into the dominant culture is easily questioned and made visible:

> We had a situation when a girl was teased by other children. Then a brother or a cousin would come and punish the Polish boys.
>
> (PL_T5_M)

> For example, if you organise an extracurricular activity, generally the male is allowed to come and take part in all the activities, but the females are very restricted (…) hardly any of the females are allowed to come while the males take part in everything and this clearly facilitates them but also in the relationships the male boys have fewer difficulties in relating to the males of other nationalities, girls tend to isolate themselves more, to stay among their group.
>
> (IT_T16_F)

Boys played the "traditional" male role, "defending" (in the sense of protecting) their sisters against other boys, which also involved engagement in violence and fights. Such situations could be seen as trying to stand up to the pattern of hegemonic masculinity steaming from the culture of their country of origin, part of which is the traditional model of gender roles.

The contradictory expectations and constraints arising from the overlap of family and school context may develop a sense of children's agency. Interestingly, this process was discussed first and foremost in our study in relation to the positions of girls. More specifically, it was demonstrated in the accounts of both children and professionals where they mentioned how girls manoeuvred between different patterns of gender norms in order to carve out a space of agency, and as well the strategies that professionals use to mediate those differences. These situations pose challenges for both the school environment – if a girl chooses to pursue (sometimes traditional and perceived as oppressive by professionals) gender roles arising from the culture of origin – and for the family – if a girl is drawn closer to (maybe more progressive) gender role norms from the host country. In the latter, being rooted in the culture and societal norms of the host country also means internalising its values. This is a manifestation of the agency of the girls, but also the result of the process of acculturation and socialisation, which is clearly visible for teachers in relation to the girls' education path but also for the girls themselves:

> Girls want to continue their education, they want to stay in Poland, continue studying, and educate themselves. They link their plans to it. They are not girls looking for husbands anymore. No, these girls think differently. Probably girls are more ambitious, more hardworking, girls have a more ambitious attitude than boys.
>
> (PL_T4_F)

> I want to work in the Border Guard, because when we went to the Border Guard for questioning, there were women working there, and I liked that.
>
> (PL_F1_CH)

The preceding statement confirms the change observed by professionals, resulting from girls´ experiences and observations of possible jobs performed by women in the host environment. She speaks positively about the prospect of working as a

border guard which may be due to the need to experience agency, strength, and power.

Most of the children did not perceive many differences in boys and girls being treated in a different way by teachers, but there are some examples such as a statement by a girl claiming that girls are less frequently asked questions in maths lessons (PL_I3_CH_G), something arguably related to gender role stereotypes rather than specific gender roles in the culture of origin.

G: Boys are better at maths, and girls are better at Polish, at English, at PE. And boys in religion.
I: Boys in religion? Do not joke. You're also good at maths.
G: Yes.
I: Well, that's right, and yet you say the boys are better, when you are a great student here in maths.
G: Because Jurek always answers such difficult questions. If I know the answer and raise my hand, the teacher doesn't ask me.

(PL_I3_CH_G)

Gender stereotypes

School is not only a place where cultural gender norms are (re)defined, but also a place where gender stereotypes are created, reflected upon, and perpetuated. Gender stereotypes refer to representations of typical characteristics and behaviours of men and women, of boys and girls. While the former are perceived as agentic, achievement-oriented, and assertive, the latter are usually described as warm, caring, and emotionally competent (Kite, Deaux, & Haines, 2008). There are numerous studies that have highlighted the role of stereotypes in the school context, for example, with regard to academic motivation and performance (Brown, 2019; Jones & Myhill, 2004; Muntoni & Retelsdorf, 2018; Starr & Simpkins, 2021), with the perception of students' engagement and diligence (Heyder & Kessels, 2015), or the assessment of school misconduct or behavioural problems (Glock & Kleen, 2017; Heyder, van Hek, & Van Houtte, 2021). This is also prominent in the opinions of the professionals in our study. A German teacher reflected on how gender stereotypes affect her work and highlighted the need for self-reflection:

> I think so, but sometimes you're so stuck in your basic attitude. I see that from the outside, too, that I say, well, now you've done something so typical of girls again. That's how it really has to be now. I mean one can promote girls just as boys. And if a girl enjoys maths, then that's great and if she can explain it to a boy, then even better.
>
> (G_T2_F)

The quotation illustrates how opportunities for girls and boys in school depend on the attitude and accordant practices of teachers. No matter whether

professionals are aware of their own assumptions and prejudices on gender norms and gender roles or not, their behaviour reproduces gender stereotypes. In this context, it is useful to make a distinction between explicit and implicit, unconscious and automatically elicited attitudes of professionals (e.g., Pit-ten Cate & Glock, 2019). The latter, in particular, is relevant for work in educational contexts, which often requires teachers to work on different tasks simultaneously and to react quickly. This differentiation between explicit and implicit stereotypes is reflected in the interviews with the professionals across all countries.

Gender stereotypes become visible, among others, when teachers and social workers reflect upon working in gender-mixed groups, sports, the need for gender-heterogeneous teams of professionals, or the changing aspirations of children with a migrant background:

> Differences in behaviour show that boys are allowed to do more or bring themselves to the fore more aggressively, while girls tend to be cautious in mixed groups. A lot of girls are really very, very shy and just (…) feel more comfortable in groups of girls.
>
> (G_SW4_F)

> There may be more girls backing up if there is something and the boys take up more space. Are loud and this that (…) And it may not always have to do with the things going on inside the classroom but you they just must be heard and noticed, that it is more so that the boys take that role. So, there I notice quite a big difference.
>
> (SWE_T10_F)

> Boys are generally more interested in physical education. And boys are more active, but the girls work harder. They have less trouble doing what the teacher asks, but it's not a migrant non-migrant question. Boys need to have a competition to engage and girls don't seem to need this motivation.
>
> (BE_T7_M)

Interestingly, professionals talked mostly about stereotypical traits in relation to school subjects and activities. While boys were perceived as better at PE and maths and express stronger need for recognition and leadership, girls were described as sensitive, shy, hard-working, with a low sense of agency as well as being associated with excellence in the social sciences and humanities. The gender differences in these areas appeared to be universal, i.e. observed among children regardless of their (non-)migration background. This distinction based on gender poses a challenge for professionals, as in their opinion boys and girls should be provided with different role models (male and female accordingly) due to their varying skills and needs.

> I'm also glad that I have four male colleagues. Because they have a different way of dealing with the children. And that's good. Therefore, that's a good

> it has to be a mixture. Only women for boys is not good. There logically you can't get out of your skin as a woman either. So if that/uh if the boy somehow whistles up the tree and stands free-handed on top and says, look, and so, then all my female educators go, ah, come down there and so. While the male educator says, try to see if you can get a little higher. Or climbs up behind.
>
> (G_T9_F)

While such an approach is seen as a way of dealing with gender stereotypes and ensuring the equal treatment of boys and girls, it may also perpetuate gender stereotypes. Besides reporting the gender differences in the context of school subjects and feminine/masculine traits, most professionals said that gender does not play a role for their work with the children, that it is all about addressing children's individuality and that there are no gender borders. This is comparable across all participating countries and reflects to some extent the desire to overcome prejudices and confront discrimination. For instance, one teacher stated:

> Yes, maybe a little, when the child comes from a certain country and religion, so it is possible to see small differences between boys and girls (…) But is not flashy.
>
> (FI_T1_F)

Similarly, with regard to academic achievement and the occurrence of school problems, another teacher notes:

> No, I do not think it is a large (…) No, I have never thought that it should be something for boys and for something for girls, but it is actually the same things I see that … Those who have the difficulties are actually both boys and girls.
>
> (SWE_T5_F)

This is also perceived for the experience of negative emotion:

> No. When it comes to girls and boys, it does not matter. It can be (…) They can be anxious, regardless of gender. It's not like I have to call on the boys more than the girls. I do not experience that.
>
> (SWE_T9_M)

An interesting illustration comes from an educator who worked with preschoolers in the kindergarten. He ascribes gender-stereotypical characteristics and behaviours to the opposite sex in order to illustrate that the professionals in his institution have overcome gender stereotypes. He even exaggerates this by pointing out that the male princesses are more beautiful than the female ones. He claimed:

> No, for God's sake, nothing is separated. Well, we also have the boys who parade through the kindergarten every day dressed up as princesses and the girls who are waiting to see when soccer is finally going to be played. That is of course cared for. So there is no distinction made. And that is, here our boys princesses are the most beautiful, that is/No, so there/it is also not the toys somehow so distributed, that is for a boy, that is for a girl. Nah, of course not.
>
> (G_T9_F)

Their narratives indicate that professionals try to reflect on gender stereotypes, and aim at diminishing the gender gap, but are still affected by gender stereotypes.

(Re)defining gender through relations with parents

Another context where professionals problematise gender concerns parental engagement. Here, the visibility of gender practices for professionals increases along with the recognition of family involvement in CMB's education. Professionals argued that the position of a mother and a father (and their relationship) in a family translates into student–teacher relations in a classroom. This phenomenon is noticed especially in families with a dominant position of father and the subordinate status of mother. From the professionals' perspective, the differences in children's cultural expectations and experiences towards male and female teachers resulting from the patterns observed in their families are clearly a reason for challenges in their pedagogical work. For example, an educator from a day care centre reported:

> We then had (…) [a boy], who simply did not accept women, that is, he never accepted us as [female] educators, because (…) at home (…) women (…) simply have nothing to say, but the dad has something to say there (…) he knew, from women, so we had the feeling, I [the boy] do not have to be told anything.
>
> (G_T11_MFF)

Gender differences were also identified and problematised in reference to the patterns of parental engagement in school-related matters. According to professionals, mothers are often involved in their children's school life and in the process of teaching or monitoring school affairs. However, as noted by some teachers in Poland, it is often the father in some Muslim refugee families who plays a key role in conflict situations as a person primarily responsible for disciplining the child. In these two contexts, gender becomes visible for teachers. While for some of them it is an issue of intervention to prevent girls' exclusion or lower educational achievements, for others it is a way of building a positive relationship with a parent of the same gender.

> T: I really had an incredible relationship with the father, and with the child, who felt really good in the class. When the son left, I had the little sister. It

was not the same thing there. She was not entitled to speech therapy, and there was less help for the little sister. I could always communicate with the mom about her, but not the dad. There is still a difference. The little sister, yes she blossomed, but not as much as the brother. (…)

I: So you would sometimes say among parents of migrant children, the expectations are going to be different with regard to gender?

T: Yes, it does happen, yes. Fortunately, it is not in the majority of cases.

(BE_T2_F)

Peer relations: gendering children's agency

Gender is also important in the context of peer relations. As already noted, CMB "subvert, transgress, and reinforce different forms of identification and gendered expectations" (García-Sánchez, 2010, p. 526), and this happens both in the context of their immigrant communities and also in the dominant, school environment. The "new fields of practice after migration are inflected by gender dynamics" (Laoire, 2011, p. 305), including the way children spend their spare time with (or without) peers, the shape of those relations and how children negotiate their position in peer circles. All of these factors provided new insights into the understanding of gender differences expressed in the school context.

When we analysed our data through a gendered lens we noticed that the way pupils talked about interactions with each other during classes, how they spent their spare time (including extracurricular activities), illustrated the formation of their identity at the intersection of gender and migration. In all aspects, CMB faced a challenge of navigating between the values and norms of their culture of origin and the norms and values which predominated at school, especially those related to gender norms or gender segregation. While managing these different social and cultural expectations, children encountered barriers in forming friendships and intra-class interactions, including those related directly to the organisation of work in class. One of the cultural mediators in Sweden mentioned a situation where a newly arrived boy was asked to get help from a girl from his class:

> He said 'No, I do not want to ask her'. So he thinks it's impossible to ask a friend, and especially if she's a girl. I can ask that guy he said, but not her (…). So in the beginning it will always be difficult.
>
> (SWE_M4_F)

This narration clearly shows the reluctance to participate in gender-mixed groups, which can be explained by relating this experience to the culture of origin. Similarly, girls who were brought up in a gendered segregated communities perceived the presence of boys as problematic and limiting their "self-expression". Being in a girls-only space allowed them to feel safe and thus fully participate in classes. The resistance of both migrant girls and boys to participate in mixed-gender groups can be seen as an exercise of their agency of power, one that enables them to foster and enjoy safe relationships, share similar cultural codes and easily

communicate with peers. In some cases, when there was a close-knit ethnic community, children mainly had relationships with peers from their closest group. As one of the Italian professionals mentioned:

> I often see that the girls in the Chinese community maintain very few relationships outside with the boys at school, very few. They are a very closed community, they don't participate in trips, parties, projects of various kinds.
>
> (IT_T6_F)

The pattern of establishing friendships mainly with children of the same gender and language was very common in our study. Usually, if pupils managed to locate peers of the same language and gender in their class, they became close friends. A shared language, ethnicity or religion facilitated their inclusion in the peer group, providing a sense of belonging and safety. Yet close integration with other CMB with similar characteristics could be interpreted as both an effect of difficulties with integration with local kids, as well as an obstacle to be more involved with children outside their community (Evans & Liu, 2018; Strohmeier & Spiel, 2003). Leaning towards children speaking the same language could be illustrated by this interview with a boy from Ukraine in a Polish school:

I: Well, and tell me, and in the school itself, how many of your classmates do you have who are from Ukraine, or Belarus, or Vietnam, you know, from where, the UK, or something like that, are there any?
CH: Well, three of them are from Ukraine, four from Poland and everything.
I: Do you like each other? And who do you like more, the Polish or the Ukrainian children?
CH: From Ukraine, because they understand me.
I: Oh, you talk to each other, yes. Do you hang out after school, too? Do you do something together?
CH: Yes.

(PL_I20_CH_B)

The capacity to be understood comes to the fore as a key factor determining the choice of close friends, when the dimensions of gender and nationality/culture clearly overlapped. Children's disposition and tendency to form gender-exclusive peer relations is coupled with the need to feel safe and understood, something that might be difficult to achieve in a broader peer group in the new country.

Limited inter-gender relations can also be ascribed to the different behaviour patterns between boys and girls. As already mentioned earlier, boys were perceived as louder and more physical than girls. This phenomenon was observed in Sweden, Poland or as in this quotation coming from one of German interviewees:

> Some boys are so bad, from our class. (…) For example, they say a bad word. (…) they always, even though I haven't done anything, they always break my satchel and other girls' satchels and then they say bad words again.
>
> (G_F24_FF)

> During lessons this boy, he plays around during lessons instead of concentrating. During breakfast, they are very noisy as well and in after school care, at the playground to disguise and with the beanbag, they usually beat each other instead of negotiating a game and play it.
>
> (G_I23_F)

Boys' behaviour is perceived as disruptive and results in girls avoiding their company. The girls, collectively or with the help of the teacher, find ways to deal with the resulting conflicts. For example, girls seek out places that boys don't play or engage in activities that boys don't like as much. At the same time, children actively reflected and resisted the gender stereotypes to which they are exposed, opening up spaces and opportunities for themselves. The following quote of a 9-year-old girl from German school illustrates this:

> Sometimes I think it's stupid that the boys say that we, as girls, are not as strong and that we don't play soccer as well and that we can never learn to play soccer as well. That we'll never be as strong as them or something.
>
> (G_F30_FF)

In this case the girl actively questions the assumed male dominance in sport and positions herself as someone challenging the gendered norms as well as boys' belief of superiority. By doing so, this 9-year-old engages in actively changing the gendered scenarios of success and capacities.

Another feature of social interaction that is influenced by gender norms was physical distancing. In one case, a Finnish professional mentioned different patterns of physical proximity among kids, with Finnish children being more physically distanced than CMB. This was particularly discernible in the case of boys, where one teacher noticed that "the need for personal space is like smaller for them and they can like touch each other overtly" (FI_T7_F). She was considering addressing this case in a conversation with the boys as it was perceived by her Finnish peers as an indicator of their (possible) (homo)sexuality.

Addressing gender segregation: strategies of professionals

Our study illustrates how gender is discerned and problematised by professionals, but it also examines the strategies adopted by teachers, social workers, and cultural mediators to overcome divisions based on gender or migration status and their intersection. For teachers, finding a balance between insistence on participation (as a way to integrate children) and acceptance of the constraints created by gendered norms presented a challenge. Despite being aware of cultural differences, teachers – sometimes unconsciously – exercised pressure on children to conform to dominant masculine/feminine roles, or to dominant patterns of gendered interactions, thus putting constraints on their agency. In our study, there were cases illustrating teachers' lack of understanding of CMB's need to preserve their own culture and identity, which, in fact, is a component of the integration process.

> Culture remains and influences their way of thinking, it is a bit difficult to take them out of the cultural or family context, it is difficult to take them out of it. (IT_T4_F)

These situations could be seen as putting pressure on professionals who try to balance the integration and inclusion strategies with respecting the identity and cultural background of the children. Although the preservation of culture as such was (also) a challenge for hybrid integration, the process of gaining agency is not linear and cannot always be equated with the unambiguous internalisation of gender equality norms, for example.

The narrative of another teacher from a Polish school could be also an illustration of disregarding a pupil's way of experiencing gender divisions for the sake of her inclusion in a planned activity. During a dance class, one of the migrant girls refused to take a boy's hand, since for her this constituted a transgression of gendered norms in Islam, the religion she was brought up in. As the teacher told the interviewer:

> We had preparation for the teacher's day and we performed a Belgian dance. One girl refused to shake the boy's hand. I started talking to her, I showed her videos that in other dances you can touch, and nobody gets hurt. I showed her some of these dances. I told her: "Here, the boys won't hurt you either. Just put your hand closer to his hand." And she tried. The dance turned out very well.
>
> (PL_T9_F)

This example showcases the teacher's need to convince the girl to take part in the dance with boys puts her in a position in which she felt reservations about breaking a cultural code she found important. Finally, she "tried", in order to comply with the teacher's persuasion and power. In a similar way, teachers' attempts to promote integration through networking within class by mixing children at their desks by gender (Italy) can be also seen as acting against the desire of the girls to stay within their safe girls-only environment. Both examples reveal the tension between the gender norms in two different cultural contexts, pointing to the significant role of teachers as figures who can either enable or hinder children's autonomy, freedom and respect towards the culture of their origin.

Our study also provides examples of positive strategies of empowering CMB by ensuring a safe space for children, an "enabling atmosphere" where they can feel understood. Such examples are even provided in relation to gender-sensitive areas, such as sport, where different issues concerning gender norms emerge as problematic and with a need for intervention. The example from the Polish school where a PE teacher negotiated the participation of a girl of Chechen origin in a sports class by showing her examples of Muslim women playing sports in specially designed suits and watching volleyball games of the Iranian female team together (PL_T5_M), is illustrative here. Such an approach, one based on cultural sensitivity, proved to be a successful strategy that provided the pupil with the requisite

tools to translate her cultural norms into a new context without compromising her integrity. Thus, the teacher's flexible approach to gender-specific norms, recognising the needs of pupils to have their own spaces and adjusting their teaching methods to the developmental trajectories of the children, had an important impact on children's' agency, empowerment, and self-esteem. This flexible approach recognises the various needs children have in regard to gender peer relations and can be illustrated by the following statement of a German teacher:

> So the thing is, it comes in from the children. And we try to resolve it. And we tell them: now listen, even if you're a boy, it's still necessary or it's good if you work with a girl. Because there are different reasons. So it's not so important now that you are a girl or a boy. A girl can play soccer just as well as you can. Or the girl would also like to play soccer. But we also give them the freedom to say okay, you're making an all-boys soccer team or an all-girls team: because we also have space there, such a soccer cage, so that they can also play soccer there. Uh, then we just make a girls' day, because they simply notice that they play differently and then they also want to have a day for themselves, so that is then already seen that they also have the desire. But there are now not necessarily the whole time separately or so. With the material one pays attention also there: one looks already that one has different material there, because they have there also another access. But it is not separated now. It is said that what is important for boys is just as important for girls.
>
> (G_T2_F)

Another issue is how children can be judged at home for the knowledge they "brought" from lessons. In this regard, teachers in Poland and Germany stress that some content should be introduced with caution or additional contextual explanations. Being aware of possible loyalty conflicts, they want to maintain children's positive relations with their families. At the same time, teachers have a sense of responsibility to develop and/or reinforce the integration of CMB through a culture-sensitive approach by conducting lessons in which new cultural norms are explained and discussed. This proved to be very useful for children who became informed about the new context, were aware of the possible differences and with time could use this knowledge to combine cultural norms from both cultures. Thus, through the tools and methods based on mutual respect, professionals were able to shed light on cultural diversity and gender roles, as well as develop critical thinking, cognitive and emotional skills. They see themselves as being responsible for opening children's minds to other points of view, as in this comments form a teachers from Germany and Italy.

> I'll talk about it, but does it really have to be like that? Why does it have to be like that? What do you think is good about it? So that the children can simply reflect on it again, […] and there I just have to look and I just sometimes can't

> take them out of their circle. I mean I don't have a normal class, but a DaZ class and I just always have to make sure that they don't come home with ideas where they then get terrible problems at home? Then with their parents, too. Yes, it is sometimes a culture shock for the children and you have to be a bit sensitive about it.
>
> (G_T2_F)

> The female has a very precise role of subordination, of obedience, because they have no power. These terms came up in various circumstances, themes that we then also explored in depth (…) we did some groups where we talked about the roles between men and women in Italian society, even doing a bit of recent history with respect to voting rights, emancipation with respect to the theme of work, because working here, in this structure, the theme was very evident. When we did it, we also asked the young people to tell us what their experience, knowledge or habits were, and they all repeated that women must obey men.
>
> (IT_SW8_M)

For teachers in countries with a gender-equal curriculum – such as in Finland – patriarchal gender norms are problematic in several ways. As the gender-sensitive approach is used in teaching and equality between men and women is highly valued and widely accepted, professionals emphasised the importance of conducting educational activities aimed at deconstructing gender stereotypes. They are offered to both girls and boys, as without students' commitment it would not be possible to develop their self-esteem and increase their awareness about social and cultural norms affecting the opportunities for girls and boys.

> If it is unequal treatment based on sex – here in the country is not supported and it is right to think that there must be equality. Gender is not a limit, or here it is not… and yes, they are empowered when they understand it. And on the other hand, regarding boys, they can also be under such pressures and expectations on what they should be like. It's not only girls who are empowered by that type of conversation. With the boys, such a contradiction arises between their family expectations and more diverse culture. It applies to both.
>
> (FI_SW4_F)

Children also longed for role models and asked teachers to be more active in addressing gender roles. For example in Germany, two younger girls expressed their wish that teachers should "make a clear statement, like, girls can also become as strong as you, or can/if they want, they can also play soccer so well, or something like that maybe." Another girl added: "For example, there are also girls who are really strong. Or also women." (G_F30_FF)

This was a clear message that girls needed to feel supported and empowered in their aspiration to realise agency, as well as the agency of projects. Teacher engagement in the negotiation of gender and cultural norms varied and, as the abovementioned examples show, it could be both successful and enhancing children's agency as well as creating pressure on children to conform to mainstream norms. To a considerable extent, it depended on the professional experience gained from working in a multicultural environment, the knowledge of sometimes complex children and their family trajectories, and, most of all, empathy and creating an "enabling" space for children to engage in agentic behaviours.

Conclusion

Our research aims at answering the question of whether and how professionals problematise gender and ideas of gender equality in their work with children and their families. What kind of factors contribute to the visibility of gender? What strategies do they apply to counterbalance gender differences in the school context? The analysis of the interviews allowed us to distinguish three interrelated contexts which make gender discernible and problematised by professionals: (1) performing cultural norms by children and gender stereotypes; (2) relations with parents and their inclusion in the education process; (3) peer relations.

Based on the analysis, we argue that professionals are aware of gender differences between children in the school context. Most of them highlighted different cultural norms and expectations attributed to girls and boys as one of the most important reasons for the different functioning of girls and boys. Clearly, the proximity of the culture of origin and the host country, as well as the duration of their stay, are conductive to the lower visibility of gender differences. Migration in this context creates a certain agency frame for developing a gender identity which is based not only on the values passed on by parents in the socialisation process, but also the values prevailing in the host society, especially among their peers. Therefore, if children conform to the dominant cultural norms or manoeuvre between the expectation of family, peers and school, it makes CMB's gender "invisible" and accepted by the professionals without any deeper reflection. On the other hand, some children were not in a position to exercise the "agency of project", to use Ortner's concept, and act against their family gender norms, especially in communities based on a patriarchal model of the family and a clear separation between genders. In such cases, children's (usually girls') gender was problematised by professionals to stress the limitations of their educational paths.

Considering gender from a different angle, some research showed that the perception of gender by professionals occurs under the influence of gender stereotypes (e.g. Glock, Baumann, & Kleen, 2022). A similar conclusion is reached in our analysis. Gender as a factor differentiating girls and boys is present in the narration of professionals who, to some extent, normalised stereotypical roles. They perpetuate gender stereotypes by dividing children in the feminised/masculinised school subjects or assigning them stereotypical behaviour, such as a lack of

self-confidence or emotionality for girls and a need for agency as well as leadership for boys. For teachers using this strategy, gender is visible in the preconceived stereotypes which justified children's choices and opportunities, but it can also have an impact on the teacher's work. With the increased knowledge and awareness of gender stereotypes, teachers become more reflexive. They notice the impact of gender stereotypes not only on the children, but also on their own actions. In this context, they demonstrate positive reactions and encouragement towards challenging gender stereotypes. Interestingly, gender stereotypes are often mentioned by professionals in relation to girls and gender seem to play a more important role than their migration background.

Another context in which gender is brought into the focus is in the relationship between professionals and parents. This process is discernible on two levels. Firstly, the school becomes an extension of home and gender relations enacted at home are brought to school settings by children. Secondly, gender is visible for professionals when engaging parents in educational processes: while mothers are typically involved, in the more traditional families the most difficult issues are dealt with by the fathers.

In line with the argument recognising children's agency, our study shows that professionals' perception of gender also relies on performing gender by CMB, especially in relations to their peers. In this case, gender is visible though the patterns of making friendship and intersects with factors such as ethnicity or language. Professionals noticed the reserve of children in some cases towards creating mixed-gender groups and a stronger sense of safety and security among peers of the same sex. The gender-based peer networks overlap with relationships based on the same cultural values or/and language, with the latter even facilitating friendship to a greater extent.

Similar to Sanders (2000), we claim that professionals fulfil an important role in recognising and extinguishing gender bias in the school context and advancing gender equality. Yet our study illustrates that the awareness about gender differences does not necessarily translate into supportive strategies. While some professionals seek more inclusive methods and tools and are open for a variety of gender identities, providing that they are not in contrast to human rights, others – for the sake of equality and (girls') emancipation – adopt strategies that question or limit the children's right to perform gender roles which are embedded in the culture of origin country and they lack sensitivity towards gender norms which are not in line with the dominant cultural norms. In this context, the school is a space where students are expected to adapt to the new culture in terms of gender roles.

References

Brown, C.S. (2019). Sexualized gender stereotypes predict girls' academic self-efficacy and motivation across middle school. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *43*, 523–529.

Connell, R.W. (2009). *Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Deutsch, F.M. (2007). Undoing gender. *Gender and Society*, *21*, 106–127.

Devine, D. (2009). Mobilising capitals? Migrant children's negotiation of their everyday lives in school. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *30*, 521–535.

Dreby, J., & Adkins, T. (2012). The strength of family ties: How US migration shapes Children's ideas of family. *Childhood*, *19*, 169–187.

Evans, M., & Liu, Y. (2018). The unfamiliar and the indeterminate: Language, identity and social integration in the school experience of newly-arrived migrant children in England. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, *17*, 152–167.

García-Sánchez, I.M. (2010). Serious games: Code-switching and gendered identities in Moroccan immigrant girls' pretend play. *Pragmatics*, *20*, 523–555.

Glock, S., Baumann, T., & Kleen, H. (2022). German teachers' implicit and explicit attitudes toward female and male Muslim students and reactions to social exclusion. *Social Psychology*, *53*, 178–183.

Glock, S., & Kleen, H. (2017). Gender and student misbehavior: Evidence from implicit and explicit measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *67*, 93–103.

Heyder, A., & Kessels, U. (2015). Do teachers equate male and masculine with lower academic engagement? How students' gender enactment triggers gender stereotypes at school. *Social Psychology of Education: An International Journal*, *18*, 467–485.

Heyder, A., van Hek, M., & Van Houtte, M. (2021). When gender stereotypes get male adolescents into trouble: A longitudinal study on gender conformity pressure as a predictor of school misconduct. *Sex Roles*, *84*, 61–75.

Jones, S., & Myhill, D. (2004). 'Troublesome boys' and 'compliant girls': Gender identity and perceptions of achievement and underachievement. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *25*(5), 547–561.

Jørgensen, C.R., Dobson, G., & Perry, T. (2021). Migrant children with special educational needs in European schools–A review of current issues and approaches. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *36*, 438–453.

Katsiaficas, D. (2018). Infusing the study of social responsibilities with an intersectional approach. *Envisioning the Integration of an Intersectional Lens in Developmental Science. New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, *161*, 39–56.

Kite, M.E., Deaux, K., & Haines, E.L. (2008). Gender stereotypes. In F.L. Denmark & M.A. Paludi (Eds.), *Psychology of women: A handbook of issues and theories* (pp. 205–236). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Laoire, C.N. (2011). 'Girls just like to be friends with people': Gendered experiences of migration among children and youth in returning Irish migrant families.

Motti-Stefanidi, F., Berry, J., Chryssochoou, X., Sam, D.L., & Phinney, J. (2012). Positive immigrant youth adaptation in context: Developmental, acculturation, and social-psychological perspectives. In A.S. Masten, K. Liebkind, & D.J. Hernandez (Eds.), *Realizing the potential of immigrant youth* (pp. 117–158). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Muntoni, F., & Retelsdorf, J. (2018). Gender-specific teacher expectations in reading. The role of teachers' gender stereotypes. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *54*, 212–220.

Nowicka, E. (2008) *Hermes, Odyseusz – greckie powroty do ojczyzny*. Kraków: NOMOS.

Oppedal, B. (2006). Development and acculturation. In D.L. Sam & J.W. Berry (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology* (pp. 97–112). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ortner, S.B. (2006). *Anthropology and social theory*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Phinney, J.S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 7, 156–176.

Pit-Ten Cate, I.M., & Glock, S. (2019). Teachers' implicit attitudes toward students from different social groups: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, 2832.

Sam, D.L., & Oppedal, B. (2002). Acculturation as a developmental pathway. In W.J. Lonner & D.L. Dinnel (Eds.), *Online readings in psychology and culture*. Bellingham: Western Washington University.

Sanders, R. (2000) Gender equality in the classroom: An area for correspondence. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, *3–4*, 182–193.

Slany, K., & Strzemecka, S. (2015). Gender roles and practices in Polish migration families in Norway through the eyes of children. *Studia Migracyjne – Przegląd Polonijny*, *3*(157), 157–181.

Starr, C.R., & Simpkins, S.D. (2021). High school students' math and science gender stereotypes: Relations with their STEM outcomes and socializers' stereotypes. *Social Psychology of Education*, *24*, 273–298.

Strohmeier, D., & Spiel, C. (2003). Immigrant children in Austria: Aggressive behavior and friendship patterns in multicultural school classes. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, *19*, 99–116.

Struzik, J., & Pustułka, P. (2017). Transgressing the "Luggage Metaphor". Children and pets as migrants in the context of contemporary international mobility from Poland to Norway. In A. Feuerstein & C. Nolte-Odhiambo (Eds.), *Childhood and pethood in literature and culture. New perspectives in childhood studies and animal studies* (pp. 37–53). New York & London: Routledge.

White, A., Laoire, C.N., Tyrrell, N., & Carpena-Méndez, F. (2011). Children's roles in transnational migration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *37*(8), 1159–1170.

Chapter 6

Participation and hybrid integration in primary and secondary schools

Federico Farini, Sara Amadasi, Jane Murray, Angela Scollan and Magdalena Ślusarczyk

The actions that make facilitation

Based on empirical observation of interactions involving migrant background children (CMB) and non-migrant background children across several countries, this chapter discusses excerpts from classroom interaction that illustrate successful ways to support hybrid integration in the education system (see Chapter 2). This chapter therefore addresses the facilitation of children's agency, displayed as authorship of knowledge in classroom interactions. The chapter discusses how different forms of facilitation, or different phases of the same process of facilitation, can be underpinned by the combination of several actions.

The interactions discussed in this chapter are part of the CHILD-UP project data repository which includes questionnaires, interviews with children and professionals working with them and, crucially for this chapter, 180 activities, video- or audio-recorded across 90 groups, involving 1,524 children (Table 6.1).

Across all contexts of the research, the classrooms participating in the CHILD-UP project were connotated by the presence of CMB, albeit with some relevant differences related to the location of the classrooms. The data reported in Table 6.2 does not refer to the percentage of CMB in each country across schools. Rather, it refers to the classrooms where activities were recorded. Activities in Swedish contexts were related to the teaching of Swedish as second language in lower secondary schools and were therefore attended solely by CMB.

Baraldi (2008, 2014) and Baraldi, Joslyn and Farini (2021) present a non-exhaustive list of facilitative actions: questions to invite clarifications and further discussions; acknowledgement tokens confirming and appreciating others' positioning; comments to support the ongoing interaction; formulations aiming to secure a shared understanding of the gist of previous turns of talk and their implications. Notwithstanding a varied morphology, actions are facilitative if they contribute to the aim of facilitation, that is, positioning children as agentic authors of valid knowledge, thereby creating expectations of fair distribution of participation in interaction (equity), sensitivity for others' interests and needs (empathy), and self-determination (expectations of personal expressions). Researchers have examined how facilitative actions create a favourable context for agency in a range of social situations (Baraldi, 2014; Baraldi & Gavioli, 2020;

DOI: 10.4324/9781003341772-6

Table 6.1 Children participating in CHILD-UP activities

	No.	%
Primary schools	786	51.6
Lower secondary schools	422	27.7
Higher secondary schools	316	20.7
Total	**1,524**	**100**

Table 6.2 Percentage of CMB in the participating classrooms

Country	*% CMB*
Belgium	6.3
Finland	46.1
Germany	21.8
Italy	40.1
Poland	17.2
Sweden	100
UK	60.7
Participating classrooms average	**49.4**

Black, 2008; Bohm, 1996; Gergen, McNamee & Barrett, 2001). Data from CHILD-UP research allows identification of the main facilitative actions that proved effective in promoting children's agency as the presupposition of hybrid integration.

Invitations to contribute

An invitation to contribute can promote both the beginning of the process of communication and its continuation, for instance by inviting details to be added or asking questions to the current speaker (Baraldi et al., 2021). There is a variety of invitations. *Inviting to talk* is the most ubiquitous facilitative action. Invitation to talk is the basic tool for facilitators to promote engagement in conversation, for instance through prefacing, interlocutory and verbal forms. *Inviting to ask* specifically favours further expansion of an ongoing contribution by inviting other participants to ask questions. *Inviting to add and expand* facilitates the engagement of bystanders as authors of knowledge by commenting on ongoing contributions or adding more content. As invitations to add and expand are pivotal for the development of interlaced narratives, they play an important role in creating conditions for the negotiation of hybrid identities.

Questions

Questions are a key facilitative action to support children's access to the role of authors of knowledge. The main types of question, with different implications for the promotion of agency, are: (1) *focused questions* that invite a short answer, such as a yes or no, or a choice between two alternatives (Farini, 2011; Margutti, 2006; Raymond, 2003); (2) *open questions* that create more favourable conditions for expanded answers. Focused questions promote a risk-free participation of children, albeit often in minimal forms. Open questions do not present their recipients with clear expectations about their answers. Risk-avoidance reactions that are averse to engagement in conversation, such as silence, can follow open questions. Nevertheless, when effective, open questions promote richer forms of participation (Farini & Scollan, 2021).

Different types of questions can be combined. Data from CHILD-UP show that open questions can be followed also by a series of focused questions, to check and clarify meanings of contributions. Focused questions can be used as ice-breakers to engage children with a low-risk form of participation and followed by open questions to enhance more complex contributions, where agency is displayed as authorship of knowledge.

Facilitative actions of minimal feedback

Continuers, repetitions, and acknowledgement tokens are actions of minimal feedback that show engagement with children's contributions. They have an important function that support children's active participation and production of narratives through "active listening", that is, sensitivity for personal expression (Voutilainen, Henttonen, Stevanovic, Kahri & Peräkylä, 2019). *Continuers* are the most minimal action of feedback that invite children to continue to talk. They include interrogative confirmations, short confirmations, and para-verbal signals (Gardner, 2001). *Repetitions* are another action of minimal feedback that reproduce the previous turn or part of it, thus showing listening and encouraging further talk (Wong, 2000). Repetitions, of words or parts of sentences, show listening more explicitly than continuers.

Acknowledgment tokens are a third action of minimal feedback that recognises the importance of specific aspect of children's contributions. Acknowledgement tokens can show positive feedback more clearly than continuers and repetitions. They have the function of showing recognition of the interlocutor's right of talk. This type of feedback is not merely effective in supporting continuation of talk, because it also displays appreciation and the consequentiality of children's agency.

Facilitative actions of complex feedback: formulations

Formulations are complex actions of feedback. Formulations summarise the gist of previous utterances and present them to the authors of those utterances.

Formulations allow mutual understanding of previous turns at talk to be confirmed (Heritage & Watson, 1979). Formulations can work in conversation as (1) *explications*, to clarify the meaning of previous turns at talk (Chernyshova, 2018); and (2) *developments* of previous turns, to prefigure or introduce possible implications of them (Peräkylä, 2019).

Formulations are a powerful type of support for children's agency as authorship of knowledge. Research suggests that formulations are used in educational interactions to check mutual understanding (Skarbø Solem & Skovholt, 2017), to manage conflicts (Baraldi, 2019) and to promote dialogue in the classroom (Baraldi, 2014). In CHILD-UP data, formulations frequently follow question-and-answer sequences: facilitators start with a question, then formulate the children's answers. Within more complex turns at talk, formulations can be introduced by acknowledgement tokens and followed by questions to check their validity. The use of questions after formulations uses the power of questions to enhance recipients' immediate reactions. Data suggest that adding questions after formulations is more effective with open questions. An empirical indicator of the success of formulation in promoting children's agency may consist in children's expansions (Baraldi et al., 2021). Expansions indicate children's willingness to use formulations as platforms for authorship of knowledge; thus, expansions signal that formulations are successful in enhancing agency.

When formulating the gist or the implications of a turn at talk, or several turns at talk, the facilitator accesses the role of author of knowledge. It is a side-effect of the use of formulations that can be mitigated reflexively through facilitation, by adopting actions that reposition children as the authors of knowledge, such as invitations to talk or to add to the formulated gist of previous utterances.

Facilitators' personal contributions

Facilitators' personal contributions are facilitative actions that can be particularly effective because they make relevant expectations of personal expression and empathy, that is, two core components of dialogue (Baraldi & Iervese, 2017; Hendry, 2009). Data suggest that facilitators' personal contributions, if successful, are most effective in securing the sustainability of facilitation over the course of the interactions, with additional implications for trust building. Nevertheless, facilitators' personal contributions need to be carefully measured to avoid the risk of shifting the focus of communication to facilitators' actions. In a more stringent way than formulations, when producing a personalised contribution the facilitator positions him/herself as an author of knowledge: this can temporarily reposition children as recipients of adults' knowledge.

Three main types of facilitators' personal contributions emerge from CHILD-UP data. *Personal comments* as a type of "upshot formulations" (Antaki, 2008) that, rather than elaborating the gist of previous utterances, introduce new topics of conversation, which are therefore authored by the facilitator. *Appreciations* provide affective support to children's agentic participation, targeting specific contributions. Appreciations can address both children's attitudes displayed by the stories

they share and children's decision to participate. *Personal stories* can be used by facilitators to show personal involvement in the interaction (rather than role-based involvement) as well as empathic closeness to children. By sharing personal stories, facilitators display they have a "story" to tell too, thus inviting children to perceive them as committed persons, rather than as interpreters of role-based routines. But, most importantly, a facilitators' choice of risking trust in children by sharing personal stories is a powerful way to invite children to trust the interaction (Farini, 2019).

Nevertheless, it is important to highlight that personal stories are the riskiest facilitative action because they entail adults' access to a higher epistemic authority and the repositioning of children as recipients of adults-owned knowledge.

Facilitation in primary schools

This section discusses examples from activities in primary schools in Italy and in the UK that illustrate practices that have been successful in the use of facilitation. As previously discussed by Baraldi, Farini and Ślusarczyk (2022), English teachers tend to be more active than Italian facilitators. Their contributions (questions, formulations, comments) are continuous, and they continuously engage with children's contributions. Italian facilitators, rather than contributing with several facilitative actions, frequently leave the floor to children who take initiatives. The types of facilitative actions observed in Italian settings are not different from those in England; rather, they are less frequently used, in favour of leaving the floor to children. As for all excerpts in this chapter, participants' identities were codified to allow recognising their position in the interaction, whilst preserving their anonymity (Table 6.3).

Excerpt 1 is based on the reading of a poem in a London primary school. Children are invited to reflect on adults' feelings. This excerpt shows a successful facilitation, based on a complex series of turns supporting and appreciating children's agency. In this excerpt, the conditions for hybrid integration are co-constructed by children and the teacher, as they share personal meanings of intergenerational relationships, via the production of narratives related to their lived experiences.

Table 6.3 Participants (Codes)

Code	*Description*
Tm/Tf	T(eacher), m(ale)/f(emale)
FACm/FACf	FAC(ilitator), m(ale)/f(emale)
M1	M(ale) Child, numbered as for order of appearance
F1	F(emale) Child, numbered as for order of appearance
M1m	The additional 'm' indicates migrant background (when discernible)
C/Chd	Non-identifiable C(hild)/Children

01 Tm: busy. So, what does that mean, then? We are so busy with our grown-up needs that we I say we, are completely unsuspecting of the perils and mischief that surrounds them, the children
02 M1: unsuspecting and preoccupied
03 Tm: so, if you know what preoccupied means, don't worry about writing it down. But do you know what unsuspecting means?
04 F1: that means you can't see it.
05 Tm: what can't they see?
06 M2: you being silly or
07 F2: you doing a crime. hey can't see
08 M3: they can't see your imagination
09 Tm: fascinating. What do you mean?
10 M3: they can't see what you're thinking
11 Tm: they are so busy with their adult lives, and why are adults busy? What are we busy with?
12 M4: because they are busy with work
13 Tm: work
14 M4: teaching or something
15 Tm: work. What else might we be stressed about or busy with?
16 F3: children
17 M1: if they don't earn the right money, they don't have enough food for their children
18 Tm: money and food, that's a worry, isn't it? So, adults are so preoccupied sometimes with their own life, that maybe they don't engage in the imagination side of things. What about children, you tell me?
19 F1: they can't say their true emotions sometimes
20 Tm: what so you think an adult sometimes can't see a child's emotions all the time
21 F1: sometimes
22 F3: I think they are never happy because they never go into their imagination anymore. They are preoccupied
23 Tm: because they are preoccupied, they cannot go into the adult, not adult sorry, the child's memory. They almost forget how it is to be a child and to have fun maybe? That's interesting. Do you think that's a fair comment about adults?
24 F3: yeah
25 Tm: how do you see adults? Do you see adults like that? Or do you see adults as these fun things that run around with their imaginations?
26 Chd: ((laugh))
27 M5: they are preoccupied for a lot of the time.
28 Tm: right. Do you as children wish the adults sometimes had more time to, like, have that imagination?
29 M5: yeah. Like your parents, if one of them works, you don't really get to see them as long

30 Tm: I agree. I only see my girls for half an hour when I get home, but I always try and like, if she wants to play a shop game, then I can pretend we are in a shop. Are we in a shop?
31 Chd: no
32 Tm: no, but she is imagining it. So I try and get into that imagination with her.
33 F5: that's a nice thing to do
34 Tm: that's a nice thing to do, isn't it?
35 Chd: yeah

In turn 1 the teacher introduces the theme of busy adults who are not able to see children's problems. Interestingly, M1 adds to the term "unsuspecting" used by the teacher, the term "preoccupied" (turn 2). The teacher's following questions to promote expansion about the meaning of unsuspecting (turns 3 and 5) are responded to by F2, M2 and M3. M3. In turn 8, M3 says that adults cannot see children's imagination, attracting the teacher's attention (turn 9). The teacher provokes M3 to explain further. In the following turn, the teacher develops a possible implicit meaning of M3's turn, but she does not ask for M3's approval of this development; rather she provides an open question that invites expansion, enhancing M4's new initiative that focuses on adults' work (turn 12 and 14). M4's expansion is supported by the teacher with the use of minimal actions of feedback. In turn 15, 'work' is not a repetition, because M4 has already expanded his previous statement. Rather, 'work' is a formulation that summarises the gist of the previous sequence of turns. The teacher invites further expansion with an open question. In turn 17, M1's personal initiative interlaces with F3's previous turn and expands it. In the complex turn 18, the teacher provides two formulations about adults' behaviours, first formulating implicit meanings of children's comments, then summarising the gist of the whole sequence of turns 1–17 to present children with a link between preoccupation and inability to see children's imagination. Finally, she asks a question that positions children as authors of knowledge. In the following turns 20 and 23, other formulations contribute to support children's participation. In the same turn 23, two formulations are followed by appreciations and a new question to scope children's points of view. In turn 25, the teacher asks a series of focused questions, followed by a displacing comment ('Or do you see adults as these fun things that run around with their imaginations?'), provoking children's amused reactions and further comment from M5. After validating M5's comment, the teacher provides his own personal comment, positioning himself as a person rather than a role. His personal comment brings the teacher's own personal and family life into the conversation, displaying trust in children as well as expectations of equality, empathy, and personal expression. In turn 32, the teacher continues to share personal experiences, a positioning in the conversation, which is appreciated by F5, who upgrades her epistemic authority as a peer-participant in the teacher's authoring of personal stories.

Excerpt 2 is taken from an interaction recorded in a primary school in Genoa (Italy). In this excerpt, children discuss a narrative about acceptance that was

introduced by M3m. The protagonists of this conversation are two children, M3m and F1m, both with migrant background. This excerpt illustrates how facilitation supports the position of migrant children as authors of valid knowledge which is essential because only if participants' voices are valued, hybrid integration can be constructed.

01 M3m: I am (?)
02 FACf: I didn't understand you know?
03 M3m: I am a little hurt (.) I am already sure that my classmates have already accepted me as I am for how I do things, and therefore I am (I'd like to be) - more to meet new people. I like having friends, classmates, but meeting new people is nice to discover new things too. I don't want to be - that is, to be happy you have to know it's not like you have to stay with your usual friends, with your classmates, you have to be with other people, even those people they know and who don't all get along
04 F1m: then I (.) am a little bit all three more to: Luca than Filippo, because in any case Aurora says she has the anxiety to study a lot but if you follow the lessons and do what you have to do, in the end it is not hard
05 FACf: mh
06 F1m: and (second) in any case I look more like Filippo, because it is important to feel good in a group, (.) because in any case and: it is nice to be accepted by others, because if you are accepted first, now you feel like you have improved (2.0) like before I said that sadness makes you grow (.) in fact some children (.) and like before they were not accepted but just with sadness and people have managed to improve and therefore now they are accepted
07 FACf: but sorry I can think of something compared to what she says then she, if I understand correctly, you said that these children have managed to be accepted because they have improved (…) so the acceptance is from you who accept, but also from the person who (.) improves?
08 F1m: (?) [it's not
09 FACf: [no? (…) I got it wrong?
10 F1m: yes because [(?)
11 FACf: [I got it wrong yes or yes I got it right?
12 F1m: no it seems to me that you did not understand what I meant
13 FACf: then say it again
14 F1m: I mean that and: a person improves himself (.) also with the help of others but more alone (…) no because it seems to me that you said that the other person improves (.) therefore: ((gesticulates)) that is, I mean I (…) impr[ove

15 FACf: [help me because I don't understand (.) a little bit I don't understand because of the noise from outside
16 M4: (?)
17 FACf: go on then
18 M4: I don't understand a thing about what F1 said
19 FACf: yes
20 M4: and: earlier what she said earlier that about the sad child that if you are sad it helps you to grow
21 M2: can I say it? I understood it
22 FACf: go on
23 M2: then F1 in my op- that is, from what I understand she means that if one is sad and is perhaps excluded by others, she tries to improve her behavior to be accepted by everyone
24 ?: ah
25 F1m: yes
26 FACf: yes then it that was what I understood well
27 F1m: ah

In the beginning of the excerpt, M3m introduces his own personal narrative, talking about trust in classmates' acceptance and about his interest in making friends. Instead, F1m refers to the characters of the narrative proposed by the facilitator; however, she also makes references to her personal views. She states that she feels good when in a group, and she also highlights the importance of acceptance. The facilitator upgrades children's epistemic authority by asking for confirmation twice through focused questions (turns 9, 11), after a formulation of F1m contribution in turn 7. These questions and the formulation show interest in children's opinions. In turn 12, F1m says that the facilitator misunderstood her, and the facilitator invites her to repeat her contribution. In turn 15, the facilitator invites F1m to help her understanding. This turn further upgrades F1m's epistemic authority because it makes explicit that F1m holds the knowledge whilst the facilitator struggles to understand. In turns 18 and 20, M4 asks for clarification about F1m's contribution too. In turn 21 and 23, M2 engages in the conversation by offering his personal interpretation of F1m's point of view ("if one is sad and is perhaps excluded by others, she tries to improve her behavior to be accepted by everyone"). This interpretation is finally validated by F1m in turn 25. In turn 26, the facilitator suggests she understood well but formulated badly, again preserving the position of F1as competent communicator of her own opinion.

Facilitation in lower secondary school

Lower secondary schools are characterised by a transition between childhood and adolescence, which is culturally connoted in the education system by socially-constructed expectations of pre-adolescents' problematic acceptance of teaching, where they are expected to be the recipients of adult knowledge (Rossi

& Baraldi, 2009). Therefore, it was interesting to analyse CHILD-UP data to observe preadolescents' participating in interactions which do not show a primary intention to teach, that is, when preadolescents' active participation in dialogic interactions is facilitated and they are promoted in displaying agency as authorship of knowledge.

Excerpt 3 is taken from an activity in the context of teaching Swedish as second language; thus, all children are CMB. The activity aims to combine learning of the Swedish language with support to children towards developing a conscious consumer culture related to food and the skills to share their knowledge.

01 F1m:	ok, we have made a vitamin C smoothie and it contains raspberries, blueberries, vanilla sugar, honey, and ginger and milk. ((Reading)) raspberries protect eyesight and have (?) Raspberries contain minerals and vitamins that are good for the body. Honey is good for
02 F2m:	yes, for health products
03 F1m:	ginger is good for the digestive process, and milk contains proteins, minerals and vitamins
04 Tm:	nice work
05 F2m:	((reading)) Vitamin C contributes to a better immune system, it normalises the function
06 Tm:	yes, so you get less sick
07 F2m:	exactly, it also contributes to not being so tired and exhausted
08 Tm:	hm, makes one more alert
09 F2m:	exactly
10 Tm:	great, thank you very much. Eh, this thing with ginger. You may have heard of it, that you usually use it when you have a cold, and sometimes you have it in your tea, it softens up the throat
11 F1m:	so, one can have ginger and lemon
12 Tm:	yes, exactly, and in lemon, what vitamin do we have there?
13 C(?):	C-vitamin
14 Tm:	yes, vitamin C. Turns to the whole group: Please taste (their smoothie)
15 C (?):	it tastes strange, I didn't think it would taste like that
16 Tm:	haha, and now, let's go to the next group (the spinach group)

The activity begins with an introduction of the purpose of the activity, which is to taste ingredients and discuss flavours and textures. The children are then divided into four groups and instructed to make a smoothie. Each group focuses on one of four nutritional themes: iron, protein, vitamin C, and spinach. Children are invited to seek information about the nutrients they chose for their smoothies, then to select two or three of the nutrients that they think are important and to justify why. The excerpt concerns the last phase of the activity. In turns 1, 2, 3 and 5, F1 and F2 explain collaboratively the vitamin C smoothie they have produced, reading what the group has written. In turns 4 and 10, the teacher appreciates the

work. In turns 6 and 8, the teacher confirms and formulates what F2 has said. The formulation is validated by the girl. In turn 10, the teacher comments, and F1 upgrades her own epistemic authority by adding to the teacher's comment. The teacher validates F1's display of knowledge, although adds a question that could be interpreted as a way of claiming back epistemic authority. The teacher confirms F1's reply, invites the children to taste the smoothie and moves to the next group. As in Excerpt 2, facilitative actions such as formulations, appreciations and questions converge to upgrade children's epistemic status which is condition for hybrid integration because hybrid integration is possible only if all participants are positioned as authors of knowledge.

Excerpt 4 was recorded in a lower secondary school in Genova (Italy), during an activity based on the "methodology of narration and reflection". Here, children introduce and discuss a narrative about the integration of newcomers from the perspective of relationships and friendship. Excerpt 4 illustrates how a varied range of facilitative actions (actions of minimal feedback, questions, formulations as explications, facilitator's personal initiative as appreciation) successfully promoted the status of CMB as authors of knowledge, supporting the construction and sharing of personal narratives, which is essential component of person-centred, non-essentialist hybrid integration.

01 FACf:	ok are we in line with what we said earlier with your answers?
02 M?:	more or less yes
03 FACf:	more or less
04 ?:	we are always on that subject
05 FACf:	still on the subject eh
06 M2:	eh (.) in my opinion ours is a bit I mean (talks) both of friendships (which eh that of the) study method and it is that (which was said both) (?) and M1 is a bit- is summary let's say
07 FACf:	fine
08 M2:	we did [a-
09 FACf:	[a summary well
10 M3:	well, maybe a newcomer who comes I don't know from another city and does not know (how to settle in here) and maybe , the parents would like that he to be able to find new friends
11 FACf:	mh (.) well, you say if there was a particular distance condition etcetera etcetera
12 M3:	like someone who comes from a new school a new country wants - maybe the parents want mh (.) to settle in I mean (?)
13 ?:	(to be comfortable)
14 M3:	yes
15 FACf:	I didn't understand
16 ?:	(he feels comfortable)
17 F4m:	like me at the nursery
18 FACf:	(louder)

19 F4m: like me at the nursery I didn't have many friends- I mean (.) I wasn't happy because (.) it was a little different (let's say) but in primary school (.) I managed to make friends I mean they accepted me (?)

20 M1: for example this year for those who start high school and maybe don't have middle school mates- the parents want them to settle in and for example this year with the distance learning and it has not helped a lot because in any case being distant it is not so much possible to (socialise)

In turns 1–5, the facilitator negotiates the conversation topic with children, using facilitative actions such as a focused question (6.1.2) in turn 1, to investigate children's points of view on the meanings developed so far in the conversation, and two repetitions (6.1.3) in turns 3 and 5 to show active listening and encouraging further talk. In turns 6 and 8, M2 intervenes to explain the difference between the work he did with his group and the work of other groups, supported by the facilitator's appreciation (6.1.5). In turn 10, M3 introduces the theme of newcomers who can find more difficulties in being included and may be pressed by parents to make new friends. This narrative is supported by the facilitator in turn 11 through a formulation (6.1.4) that elaborates the gist of M3's turn. The formulation gives the opportunity to M3 to clarify his perspective and carry on his narrative. M3 narrative is used by F4m, a child with migrant background, as an opportunity to introduce her own personal story, which she interlaces with M3's. In turn 17, F4m shares the memory of a negative experience in the nursery school, but she also adds that in primary school friendships worked better and she felt accepted. In turn 20, M1 takes the initiative to add an example of the transition to higher secondary and the implication for the stability of the existing network of friendships.

Facilitation in higher secondary schools

Data from higher secondary schools were largely collected in Italian schools, where children engaged in activities with external experts trained in the use of facilitation, rather than with teachers as in the other national contexts. Therefore, the excerpt presented in this section will not illustrate an interaction where teachers access the role of facilitators, but it presents the work of a trained facilitator. As with almost all data from this setting, Excerpt 5 relates to an activity in a vocational schools, where children with migrant backgrounds are generally more numerous than in other schools. Excerpt 5 illustrates the main characteristics of facilitation observed in higher secondary schools. The most evident characteristic is that formulations are less frequently used in this setting than in primary and lower secondary schools. Trained facilitators more frequently provide positive connotations of children's contributions, in particular personal comments as appreciations and validations. At the same time, facilitators more often take the risk of problematising children's contributions, albeit systematically accompanying problematising comments with

positive connotations. With regard to the themes of the interactions, they mainly concern interpersonal relations, classroom relations and personal aspects

01 FACf1:	F6 I would love to know the: your point of view about what was said also with also I would love to hear that of F2 (.) that are the people I see because I don't see the others (.) what do you think about what was said?
	(0.3)
02 F6m:	mh: well I aghhh I agree in part that is I agree on what F5 said
	[also a little bit on what F3 said
03 FACf1:	[that is? Repeat yourself, repeat yourself so we can make a summary
04 F6m:	that is, that (…) ah: there are many people who are practically made fun of
05 FACf1:	mh
06 F6m:	and: (…) well (0.2) well like me well, however: there are people that well F? said right that sometimes m: someone tries to talk to those people that are shy right?
	(…)
07 FACf1:	mh
08 F6m:	there are people that: they try to talk too
09 FACf1:	mh mh
10 F6m:	and there are people, like F3 said, who well they talk [to them] and they don't answer
11 FACf1:	ok
12 F6m:	so
13 FACf1:	I stop you for a moment because you have said something important even if you have said it a little bit a little bit quickly because it is probably difficult for you to say it, isn't it? that you have felt mocked, you are one of those who are mocked
	(…)
14 F6m:	yes
15 FACf1:	ok and so you feel teased you don't feel it as a joke it's not a joke for you
16 F6m:	no
17 FACf1:	ok [it is very important
18 F6m:	[a joke from my point of vie-
19 FACf1:	eh
20 F6m:	that is a joke from my point of view ah: - well a joke is ok, I don't say- God, well it is ok to joke but to joke in a heavy way that is no more a joke
21 FACf1:	ok so according to you who jokes should understand what the limit is, that is you play the game for a while and then after a while that's enough

22 F6m: yes
23 FACf1: do you think you are clear in making others understand when it is enough for you?
(0.2)
24 F6m: well, in my opinion, if someone sees that someone else is made fun of, he/she notices it, right? well
25 FACf1: you think you are therefore clear, that is, your facial expression changes
26 F6m: yes yes
27 FACf1: ok so F6 is telling you so I don't know if F6 was among those people who maybe [didn't express it but
28 F3: [yes (??)
29 FACf1: in this case she is saying it she is really saying that she feels mocked so there is not even the justification to say "but [I don't notice" she is telling you this
30 F6m: [(they had understood it)
31 F3: no I already knew it, in fact I mean in the last days of school
32 FACf1: mh
33 F3: anyway I tried to integrate myself with her, but she is not one of those people who turns around and doesn't speak to you
34 FACf1: ok right right we are talking to you ((to those we see that are interacting)) [no? because (??)
35 F6m: [but I tried
m: I tried to talk to them I tried to talk to them too
(0.2)
36 FACf2: that is, with the person?
37 F6m: go, say
38 F3: no I don't have to say anything
39 FACf2: F6 [(??)
40 F6m: [well to make an example with a person with whom I often with a person with whom I often talk to is F5 well

Excerpt 5 is taken from an activity aimed to facilitate the production of narratives on relations, conflicts, and inclusion in the classroom. The design of the activity consists of a series of three meetings; Excerpt 5 is taken from the second one. In turn 1, the facilitator asks F6m about her opinion on a conflict that had been previously commented upon by F2 (not shown in the excerpt). The long, three-seconds pause shows some hesitation of F6m, before she chooses to ignore the request channeled by the question, expressing some measure of agreement with F5 and F3 instead. In turn, 3 the facilitator asks F6m to clarify her point, create the opportunity for the F6m to explain that she refers to a situation whereby many classmates are made object of derision from others. A narrative of issues related to inclusion and interpersonal relations is produced, supported

by facilitator's display of active listening via actions of minimal responses feedback (turns 5, 7, 9, 11). Developed across turns 4 and 10, F6m narrative includes a reference to her own experience as object of derision (turn 6), which is picked up by the facilitator returns in turn 13. The facilitator values the importance of F6m personal story, acknowledging the challenge of sharing it as it concerns negative experiences. In turn 13, the facilitator takes a personal initiative to deliver a supportive and positive comment on F6m participation, acknowledging her status as author of relevant and valuable knowledge. In turn 14, F6m confirms that she was indeed made the object of mockery; the facilitator systematically support F6m status as author of knowledge in the interaction via facilitative actions such as a question (turn 15) and actions of minimal feedback (turns 17 and 19). The series of facilitative actions succeed to promote an extended turn of talk (turn 20). Two questions are used by the facilitator to promote the expansion of the narrative (turns 21 and 23). The facilitator delivers a series of three formulations as explications in turns 25, 27 and 29 to summarise the gist of F6m extended narrative. In turn 30, F6m takes a personal initiative to highlight that the classmates were aware of her difficult situation as object of mockery. This personal initiative generates a new theme in the interaction, thus lending itself as an instance of agency. F3 takes the role of speaker to comment on F6m's previous turn, and to share her experience of failed integration with F6m. In turn 34, another person initiative is taken by the facilitator, to prevent any stigmatisation against F6m, who accesses the role of speaker to say that she tried to engage with her classmates too. Two conflicting narratives (initiated by F3 and F6m respectively) interlace in the final part of Excerpt 5, suggesting that by promoting agentic participation, facilitation also promotes the expression of several voices and different perspectives. Creating the conditions for the expression of different opinions entails more potential for conflict; nevertheless, the possibility to express divergent opinions is a condition for dialogue, therefore for hybrid integration. Research suggests that a positive management of conflict, based on the understanding of it as opportunity for mutual knowledge and understanding is within the realm of facilitative practices (Baraldi and Farini, 2011).

Mixed forms of facilitation and directive facilitation

It is important to acknowledge that children's epistemic status can also be upgraded utilising forms of facilitation where adults retain more control over the interaction, with the implication that children's agency may be somehow limited. This is the case for mixed forms of facilitation and directive facilitation.

Mixed forms of facilitation

Mixed forms of facilitation add adults' guidance to facilitation. They are based on adults' expanded turns of talk which provide comments or explanations about relevant and positive meanings produced by children.

CHILD-UP data suggest that there might be scope for using mixed forms of facilitation in situations where expectations built around the traditional forms of education are strong and a sudden change towards facilitation could harm participants' trust in the adults and the interaction. It remains true, though, that forms of facilitation where adults retain some degree of control over the development of the interaction and position themselves as superior epistemic authorities may impact negatively on children's agency. The choice of mixed forms of facilitation should be carefully considered and coherent forms of facilitation should be preferred. CHILD-UP data suggest that coherent forms of facilitation are more effective in promoting hybrid integration through the support of agency. The excerpt below, taken from an activity in an English Primary school, offers an example of mixed facilitation and its implication for children's agency.

Excerpt 6 concerns a discussion around personal experiences and family memories of war in London. The excerpt illustrates situations in the CHILD-UP data connoted by the oscillation between facilitation and more directive actions. The excerpt begins with M1's initiative. M1 criticises another child's comment in a rather articulated and competent way, thus upgrading his own epistemic authority within a discussion about war in Sierra Leone.

01 M1: my statement is, so you know how we were doing the group economics thing? From M2 point of view, you know how England is a very first world country? Sometimes they want more than they have, so they take from poor countries which have good resources. No offence, but England is like a first world country but it isn't well resourced in like food and other stuff, so they take from different countries, so people started to think that they didn't want to do that so that's how war broke out

02 Tm: ok?

03 M1: like in my country, in my family's country, Sierra Leone

04 Tm: so Sierra Leone said we shouldn't be giving all our resources to these rich countries, and others said we have to. And some people are trying to keep it to themselves, and that's how the war break loose?

05 M1: families were torn apart. I think there was almost 2 million people that died in that war

06 Tm: ((to children)) Did you hear that? Because of one resource, one natural resource, almost 2 million people died in Sierra Leone. Even going back to the diamonds, the blood diamonds is probably one of the most famous well-known single type of resource. I mean, there's still people that mine the diamonds and gold, and they have illegal mines, and people die I would say if not weekly then certainly monthly. because they work in terrible conditions and they get stuck underground and no one saves them, and I've just watched a documentary on this actually, people go and attack their mines, and these miners are unarmed and work for like a penny a day, a penny a day. But are they armed, these miners?

07 F1: no
08 Tm: they're armed with like a shovel. But is their shovel any good against a gun? So it's still going on today. That war was probably, I don't know, do you know?
09 M1: it was 1997 because that's what my family was telling me about
10 Tm: end of 1997 ((to children)) do you know how long it spanned for?
11 M1: my mum said it was something like 7–5 years
12 Tm: 7–5 years. To lose 2 million people in 7–5 years is an awful lot of people in the country, and all over a natural resource which, think about the apocalypse we are reading about in that book, all of us agreed that a diamond necklace became absolutely (.) absolutely
13 Chd: useless
14 Tm: useless, but 2 million people died just because someone with a lot of money in another country wanted it. Is that right?
15 F1: no
16 Tm: nut again, during that war, if it's going on for 5–7 years, is anyone supporting them to finish it from the rich countries?
17 M1: no
18 Tm: the UN might have tried to get involved. Was it the UN?
19 M3: mister? In Afghanistan my grandad always says that they tried to get, I think, resources or something, they said no but then it was a war a long time ago before this one. I think it was for less than 20 years and 1.5 million people died
20 Tm: but again, it's a war about natural resources by the sounds of things, and money. So what's driving this?
21 M3: money. My grandad says it was for money, the Russians, and the American and English people before want to take all from Afghanistan
22 Tm: wanting more. Wanting more. Wanting more. What's that?
23 Chd: greedy
24 M3: greed can lead to war.
25 Tm: this is a good chat we're having. If we all sort of shared, and found better systems, then would this happen? We say that, but then I give it all to a really nice year six class bunch, if you got it all and another group nothing, any of you would feel naughty? Nasty?
26 F1: no
27 Tm: but if, what would happen in the group left with nothing?
28 M4: anger
29 F2: frustration
30 Tm: anger, frustration and fighting. Fighting, interestingly, in a poor country, [civil
31 F3: [war
32 Tm: can you see how it plays out? Are any of you sitting there going 'Oh my goodness'? I had rich countries getting richer, poor countries getting poorer, and one poor country kept getting poorer and poorer and poorer to breaking point, and they couldn't agree on what to do

next and the best thing to do for their resources, they started to argue, but really upset, which is basically the same as having a [civil
33 M5: [war
34 M1: exactly the same as Sierra Leone
35 Tm: exactly the same as Sierra Leone
36 M1: but they didn't have their independence taken like Afghanistan I think. My mum told me that they got their independence in like 1970 something
37 Tm: often, fledging countries, young countries, your brother taught me so much about that, by the way ((the older brother of M6, now in secondary school)), your brother, I'm an expert now. But when countries breakoff into smaller countries, they can then often be fighting over resources, land
38 M6: Kosovo
39 F4: it's happened all over the world, but sort of, Israel and Palestine
40 F5: I wanted to ask M6 what happened in Kosovo?
41 M6: yeah, they had a war, Kosovars, and Serbians
42 Tm: they have been at war for ages over who owns which bit of the country. Kosovo and Serbia, haven't they M6?
43 M6: there was a big war there
44 Tm: we are talking millions of people dying for resources, land, and money, aren't we? When you get land you get more
45 F5: money
46 Tm: and?
44 Chd: resources
45 Tm: exactly. Yep. Now I'm going to ask you to please put your books under your desk, desks clear please where are your notepads?

In turn 2, the teacher acknowledges M1's comment using a question, therefore combining the acknowledgment of M1's comment with an invitation to expand. The child expands his narrative, and the teacher produces a formulation that develops the meaning of his reference to the war in Sierra Leone. This formulation is based on the teacher's knowledge of the civil war; for this reason it could be interpreted as a way to infuse educational contents in the conversation. However, the question that follows the formulation as development is an invitation to M1 to maintain the role of co-author of knowledge. M1 appears to understand the function of the question, because he does not provide a direct answer, but he continues the ongoing narrative. In the long turn that follows, the teacher first acknowledges M1's epistemic authority, then he positions himself as co-expert, expanding M1's narrative to include educational contents related to aspect of the war that were not included in M1's narrative. In turn 8, the teacher again acknowledges M1's epistemic authority, and again in turn 10. Thus, M1 can continue to upgrade his own epistemic authority, systematically supported by the teacher, also via a partial repetition of the child's turn at talk (turn 12). At the end of turn 12, however, the teacher invites the children to complete his statement, and after the children's

completion, he repeats it to establish what is the valid knowledge. This is followed by a teacher's expansion to add more educational content and a new question that invites participation (turn 14). This question, as well as the following one (turn 16) do not enhance children's participation therefore, in turn 18, the teacher asks a new question. Despite the expectation of an answer projected by the question, M3 takes the initiative to introduce a personal story, based on family memories in Afghanistan, thus initiating an unpredictable development of the interaction (turn 19). The teacher accepts M3's initiative, but he works to embed it within the educational theme 'war to access resources', thus upgrading his epistemic authority and control over the interaction, typical of mixed forms of facilitation. The teacher does so by introducing the theme with a question in turn 20. M3 aligns with the expectations projected by the teacher's question (he provides an answer) whilst trying to relate the answer to his narrative based on knowledge absorbed from the family, independent of school teaching. Whilst the teacher tries to develop an educational theme, M3 continues to position himself as the author of new knowledge, independently from teaching, by adding a comment (turn 24). The teacher does not provide direct feedback on M3's display of knowledge; rather, he appreciates children's participation generically, and produces a series of interrelated questions to promote children's reflection, including an open question to promote participation (turn 25). After some contributions from children, the teacher provides a formulation as development (*fighting*), repeating it three times.

In turn 34, M1 intervenes to upgrade his epistemic authority, which is confirmed by the teacher. This confirmation enhances M1's production of new knowledge based on his family's experience (turn 36). In turn 37, the teacher introduces a new theme. The teacher prefers to introduce a new theme which is not interlaced with M1's narrative. This is a cue for the teacher's attempt to control the interaction, therefore a cue for mixed forms of facilitation. However, the teacher's attempt to control the development of the interaction is balanced by his claim that his knowledge is based on learning from the older brother of M6. In turn 38, M6 contextualises the knowledge shared by the teacher. Subsequently, F4 takes the initiative and F5 asks a question to M6, who responds, again advocating his epistemic authority. In turn 42, the teacher acknowledges M6's claim of high epistemic authority, inviting the child to confirm his turn at talk. M6 confirms, but he avoids an explicit acknowledgement of the teacher's epistemic authority. In the final phase of the excerpt, the teacher asks questions that need to be completed, driving the interaction towards a return to teaching.

Directive facilitation

Compared to mixed forms, *directive* forms of facilitation are connoted by more frequent adults' comments and explanations, combined to normative recommendations. Directive forms of facilitation further decrease the potential of communication to upgrade children's epistemic authority. For instance, within directive facilitation, the adult is the main provider of knowledge *for*, rather than *with*, children, establishing adult authority in the classroom. In some circumstances, the

position of an adult as a superior epistemic authority becomes so prominent that directive facilitation morphs into forms of *participated teaching* that resemble the methodology of scaffolding (Wood, Bruner, and Ross, 1976). Scaffolding is centred around adults' actions that are devoted to support children to actively participate in the process to achieving knowledge (Sharpe, 2008). Scaffolding promotes participation of children to learning; however, it is methodologically founded upon teachers' monitoring of children's learning, which includes evaluation of children's performances against pre-determined standards. Facilitation empowers children as learners but also as authors of knowledge, whereas scaffolding only recognises the importance of participation in empowering children as learners (Pascal and Bertram, 2009), and disregards them as authors of knowledge. Facilitation is therefore more apt to upgrade children's epistemic status and their display of epistemic authority in classroom interactions, which is a condition of hybrid integration.

The excerpt below, taken from an activity in a lower secondary school in Poland, lends itself as an example of the consequence of the teacher's position as exclusive epistemic authority: the support of children's participation becomes a control of children's participation. Excerpt 7 was recorded during a Polish language lesson. It displays a typical form of scaffolding and its implications for children's participation.

01 Tf: well then, listen, my dears, I think that we can already now, slowly, move on to what we're going to talk about today. Let's do some short summary of what we said during the last lesson in relation to the sentence structure, concerning components of the sentence
02 M1: compound and non-compound ones?
03 Tf: and I'm going first to ask you about such few information as a reminder, then you'll get Xeroxed copies with such a simple exercise to do, and in the meantime, you may, of course, talks to each other, as usual. K., we can start with you. First, I (?) just to remind you, what statements we call sentences?
04 M1: these are such statements that have a predicate, that is a verb
05 Tf: mhm, all right. M2, remind us, what is the second, the so-called main part of the sentence, besides the predicate?
06 M2: can you repeat that please, Sir, because I haven't heard it?
07 Tf: and yes. Besides the predicate, we have one more part of the sentence, which we call the main part. What is it called?
08 M2: subject
09 Tf: that's right. If we're looking for a predicate in a sentence, we're looking for what, M3? You have a sentence, and you're to find a predicate, what are you looking for?
10 M3: a verb
11 Tf: you're looking for a verb, that is, you're looking for some act?
12 M3: actions=
13 Tf: =ion. (?), if we're looking for a subject, we're looking for what?
14 M3: we're looking for someone, so to speak, who does such an action

15 Tf: very well
16 M3: or a noun
17 Tf: we're a looking for a doer of such an action. All right. F1, could you remind us what sentences we called non-compound sentences?
18 F1: non-compound sentences are those, where there is one predicate.
19 Tf: good. And besides that predicate, can there be anything else in such a sentence, or rather not?
20 F1: that thing like a comma, or words like: and, or.
21 Tf: but would they be in a compound or a non-compound sentence?
22 F1: just to make it compound
23 Tf: to make it compound, then we can add new elements. All right. M4 perhaps. M4 reminds us, how we call elements that we add to a non-compound sentence to obtain the one that has clauses, or is a compound sentence. They have such a common name, how are they called, do you remember?
24 M4: attributes (?)
25 Tf: very good. These are attributes. They are usually divided into subject attributes, object attributes and that's how, M?, what two groups appear in a sentence?

After the presentation of the topic of the lesson (turn 1), the teacher asks a question concerning previous lessons in turn 3. The question is used neither to promote agentic participation, nor to promote children's authorship of knowledge. Rather it is used to verify children's learning. The teacher acknowledges children's answers in turn 5, adding a new question to pre-defined recipient. This is the typical organisation of scaffolding, where the teacher tries to balance giving the floor to children's self-selection and securing everybody's engagement in the interactions, which is key to the success of scaffolding. In turn 9, the teacher asks a question to M3, who gives a very short answer and in turn 11 she scaffolds M3's participation suggesting to M3 the correct answer and assessing very positively M3's answer in turn 15, also inviting him to continue in turn 16. This way of supporting answers and providing final positive evaluation is repeated in the following exchanges with F1 and M4. Scaffolding means supporting children's participation but also confining it within teacher-defined boundaries.

Scaffolding may support children's participation, but it is much more doubtful that it can support children's agency, because children's choice is greatly restricted by the teacher's control of the interaction. In the example of scaffolding offered by Excerpt 7, the teacher asks questions or proceeds to explain new topics without allowing students space to participate autonomously. As a result, whilst it promotes a form of children's participation, directive facilitation replaces agentic participation with teacher-centered transfer of knowledge, particularly when it morphs into participated teaching. What is lost is children's access to the role as co-authors of knowledge, because the acknowledgement of their epistemic authority is absent.

Conclusion

The excerpts discussed in this chapter are illustrative of a general conclusion, supported by evidence from CHILD-UP data: facilitation can successfully promote children's access to the status of authors of knowledge across all age groups. Children's position as authors of knowledge, that is, their high epistemic status, is the fundamental condition for the negotiation of hybrid identities, because hybrid identities need that all participants are recognised high epistemic authority in interactions. Although the excerpts presented in the chapter concern primary and secondary schools, it is worth noting that facilitation was more common in higher secondary schools, where the level of satisfaction shown by participants in the recorded activities was the highest (80%). These schools were located in Italy, where diffuse and consistent use of facilitation was related to: (1) previous training in the use of facilitation; (2) the position of facilitators as outsiders who do not ordinarily work with the classroom, thus partially escaping the expectations of hierarchical relationships and limited agency built over time through teachers-pupils interactions. In situations where the facilitator was an outsider, a relative freedom from mutual expectations of hierarchical relationships enhanced children's agentic participation.

Whilst less common than in higher secondary schools, facilitation was nevertheless more frequent in primary schools than in lower secondary schools. However, the excerpts presented in this chapter illustrate successful facilitation with lower secondary school children, inviting reflection about the influence of adults' expectations. This setting is the context where communication between adults and children is expected to be more difficult due to limited trust of children in adults, as well as difficult socialisation during the transition towards adolescence. The recommendation from our findings is to reflect on the impact of expectations on decision-making and approaches to working with children, including possible resistance against the use of facilitation to promote their agentic participation in educational settings.

Data from seven national contexts suggest some degree of continuity in the relationship between the use of facilitation and children's ages. This is suggested by the wide range of national contexts represented in the chosen excerpts. However, as noted with regard to higher secondary schools, data also suggest that Italian settings are connoted by a more diffuse use of facilitation, probably as a consequence of the use of professional trained facilitators external to the classroom, who can position themselves outside hierarchical relationships that build up over time through daily interactions in educational settings.

Nevertheless, data also indicate that even in situations where teachers have not undertaken training in the use of facilitation and in situations where schools do not have access to external facilitators, the use of mixed forms, or sometimes forms of scaffolding, may offer some support to children's active participation. Whether, and how, active participation develops into agentic participation depends on whether children are allowed sufficient space for making autonomous choices in their responses to adults' actions that would have some potential for the promotion

of agency, such as invitations to talk, and invitations to ask or to expand questions. Facilitating migrant children, with all children, to access the role of authors of valid knowledge in classroom interaction, displaying high epistemic authority, is an essential condition for dialogue. Dialogue, on its part, is the only form of communication that can foster a negotiation of hybrid identities centred on personal meaning of personal experiences, rather than culturalist expectations of essentialist identities.

References

Antaki, C. (2008). Formulations in psychotherapy. In Peräkylä, A., Antaki, C., Vehviläinen, S., & Leudar, I. (Eds.), *Conversation analysis and psychotherapy* (pp. 26–42). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Baraldi, C. (2008). Promoting self-expression in classroom interactions. *Childhood*, *15*(2), 239–257.

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

Baraldi, C. (2019). Using formulations to manage conflicts in classroom interactions. *Language and Dialogue*, *9*(2), 193–216.

Baraldi, C., & Farini, F. (2011). Dialogic mediation in international groups of adolescents. *Language and Dialogue*, *1*(2), 207–232.

Baraldi, C., Farini, F., & Ślusarczyk, M. (2022) Facilitative practices to promote migrant children's agency and hybrid integration in schools: Discussing data from Italy, Poland and England. *Language and Intercultural Communication*. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2022.2096054

Baraldi, C., & Gavioli, L. (2020). Managing uncertainty in healthcare interpreter-mediated interaction: On rendering question-answer sequences. *Communication and Medicine*, *15*(2), 150–164.

Baraldi, C., & Iervese, V. (2017). Narratives of memories and dialogue in multicultural classrooms. *Narrative Inquiry*, *27*(2), 398–417.

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

Black, L. (2008). Deliberation, storytelling, and dialogic moments. *Communication Theory*, *18*, 93–116.

Bohm, D. (1996). *On dialogue*. Oxon: Routledge.

Chernyshova, E. (2018). Explicitation sequences in conversation: Some considerations on formulations, candidate inferences and grounding. *Travaux neuchâtelois de linguistique*, *68*, 51–58.

Farini, F. (2011). Cultures of education in action: Research on the relationship between interaction and cultural presuppositions regarding education in an international educational setting. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(8), 2176–2186.

Farini, F. (2019). From the child to the pupil to the child. Trust based on categorical inequalities and the quest for alternatives towards a more inclusive education. *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education*, *11*(3), 246–264.

Farini, F., & Scollan, A. (2021). Meanings and methods of pedagogical innovation. In C. Baraldi, E. Joslyn, & F. Farini (Eds.), *Promoting children's rights in European schools. Intercultural dialogue and facilitative pedagogy* (pp. 67–88). London: Bloomsbury.

Gardner, R. (2001). *When listeners talk: Response tokens and listener stance*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Gergen, K., McNamee, S., & Barrett, F (2001). Towards transformative dialogue. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *24*(7/8), 697–707.

Hendry, R. (2009). *Building and restoring respectful relationships in schools*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Heritage, J., & Watson, R. (1979). Formulations as conversational objects. In G. Psathas (Ed.) *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp.123–162). New York/London: Irvington.

Margutti, P. (2006). 'Are you human beings?' Order and knowledge construction through questioning in primary classroom interaction. *Linguistics and Education*, *17*(4), 313–346.

Peräkylä, A. (2019). Conversation analysis and psychotherapy: Identifying transformative sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *52*(3), 257–280.

Pascal, C., & Bertram, T. (2009). Listening to young citizens: The struggle to make real a participatory paradigm in research with young children. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, *17*(2), 249–262.

Raymond, G. (2003). The structure of responding: Conforming and nonconforming responses to yes/no type interrogatives. *American Sociological Review*, *68*(6), 939–967.

Rossi, E., & Baraldi, C. (2009). The promotion of children's and adolescents' social participation in Italy and Scotland. *Children & Society*, *23*, 16–28

Sharpe, T. (2008). How can teacher talk support learning? *Linguistics and Education*, *19*, 132–148.

Skarbø Solem, M., & Skovholt, K. (2017). Teacher formulations in classroom interactions. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *63*(1), 69–88.

Voutilainen, L., Henttonen, P., Stevanovic, M., Kahri, M., & Peräkylä, A. (2019). Nods, vocal continuers, and the perception of empathy in storytelling. *Discourse Processes*, *56*(4), 310–330.

Wood, D., Bruner, J., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *17*, 89–100.

Wong, J. (2000). Repetition in conversation: A look at 'first and second sayings'. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *33*(4), 407–424.

Chapter 7

Narratives and practices on agency and participation of migrant children in early childhood education

Thomas Droessler, Chiara Ballestri, Lena Foertsch, Angela Scollan and Margund K. Rohr

Introduction

Promoting integration and participation of children with migration background (CMB) is of great importance against the backdrop of growing diversity in Early Childhood Education and Care in European countries (ECEC; e.g., Preiss, 2013; Sulzer, 2013). For migrant children, day care facilities and centres are the first and one of the most important educational and socialisation institutions in the host society. They have a key position within the network of societal measures and actors promoting the integration of migrant children and their families. "In day care centres, refugee children make contact with their native peers and can get to know the foreign culture and language. They gain experience with the values and norms of the host country" (Riedel & Lueders, 2016, pp. 138–139). At the same time, children and teachers from the host country can make contact as well and experience a range of habits, languages and expectations in everyday interactions (e.g., Farini, 2019). Authors such as Stepick and Stepick (2010), Bryan (2010), and Devine (2013) provoke migration to be considered via the enrichment value that migrant children and their families bring to host countries and to educational contexts in terms of enhancing cultural and economic exchange and diversity. In addition, day care facilities offer opportunities for both parents with migration background and professionals to make initial contact with each other and lay the foundations for a parent partnership where parents, professionals and children contribute and engage with each other (Allen, Maureen, Whalley, & Scollan, 2019; Busch et al., 2018; Busch, Kohl, & Leyendecker, 2020; Gambaro, Neidhoefer, & Spiess, 2019). Parent partnership provides an opportunity for professionals working with and for families and children to acknowledge and accommodate cultural differences and experiences. In order to seize and benefit from these opportunities, it is therefore essential to understand the professional responsibilities and roles, as well as the meaning of child participation and parental involvement, for all stakeholders (Allen et al., 2019; McDermott, 2008). Moreover, empirical studies show that, given the quality of ECEC, attendance at day care institutions can have a positive effect on migrant children's development and integration (Becker & Schober, 2017; Diehm, Kuhn, Machold, & Mai, 2013; Lorenz, Wertfein, & Danay, 2018; CARE Project, 2014). It is regularly emphasised that important prerequisites for

DOI: 10.4324/9781003341772-7

children's later success at school are created in day care centres. Thus, day care centres can make an important contribution to educational equality and equal opportunities for all children, even CMB (CARE Project, 2014). However, the enrichment value that migrant families and their children bring requires time, commitment, understanding, dialogue, resources and funding. Corresponding expectations lead to demands on professionals working across ECEC provision (Cameron & Moss, 2020), which are particularly challenging in light of recent refugee movements in Europe (Giardiello & Haikio, 2019). Tensions arise when the resources available for the children and families of migrants are not sufficient for ECEC provision. For instance, Devine (2013) argues that the value of migration can change from an enrichment to a threat if services are under-resourced to support for instance the language needs of CMB and the professionals working with them. Thus, the fact of having a migrant background makes CMB addressees of specific integration policies and related educational programmes and activities, which is not only a matter of resources and professional competences. It also implies an ambiguity between treating CMB as children with special educational needs on the one hand and recognising these children as equal to their peers, for example in terms of agency and participation, on the other.

Addressing this interplay between opportunities and challenges, the CHILD-UP project emphasises the potential of active participation of CMB on their hybrid integration (Chapter 2). It is assumed that CMB's hybrid integration is supported by the expression of children's agency based on their active consideration of interests, needs and competences, recognised as their agency (Baraldi, 2014). When CMB can participate, they experience themselves as an active, contributing part of a social context, which in turn has a positive effect on their sense of belonging and their integration (Chapter 4). In this sense, it is crucial which preconditions and possibilities for active participation are attributed to migrant children by e.g. pedagogical professionals, and to what extent they are conceptualised as agents.

On the basis of interviews conducted within the CHILD-UP project, this chapter examines how professionals in ECEC settings perceive CMB in terms of agency and participation, and how they deal with them from an educational perspective. Of particular interest is whether and to what extent professionals consider the fact of a migrant background to be relevant to their pedagogical work and what needs or requirements they associate with the pedagogical treatment of CMB. In addition, the chapter, based on the analysis of video-taped educational activities, offers strategies to promote the agency and active participation of CMB, thus fostering their hybrid integration.

Agency, participation and hybrid integration in contexts of early childhood education

Theoretical background of the CHILD-UP project is the idea that active participation of CMB in the context of their social experiences can have beneficial effects on their hybrid integration. According to Baraldi, participation is closely related to agency, whereas "agency means showing the availability of choices of action,

opening different possible courses of action, so that a specific course of action is one among various possibilities" (Baraldi, 2014: 73). The concept of agency refers to children's decision-making where their choices are not determined by the choices of others. Agency in a sense of active participation is evident in the availability of options for actions, since these options provoke change in the interaction (Baraldi, 2014; Baraldi & Cockburn, 2018; James, 2011; James & James, 2004; Leonard, 2017). Discourses on children's agency and thus their participation are ambiguous, consisting of tensions between narratives and legal as well as professional standards and practices. Traditional pedagogical discourses consider children as incompetent in constructing and accessing knowledge as a prerequisite for their full participation, which, incidentally, is provided by adults and they simply have to learn it (James & James, 2004). James (2011) critically points out that children's full participation is conceptualised as a future one, presupposes competency, which must be acquired by adult facilitated participation. Thus, 'competency' is something that is acquired the closer one is to becoming 'adult'. For CMB, this perception of the need to develop the competency to fully participate is even more pronounced, inter alia based on linguistic deficits and expected difficulties in the adaptation to the cultural rules, norms and expectations of the education system. Accordingly, there is a demand for educational institutions to ensure that CMB can adapt to educational expectations (Baraldi, 2012) and thus gain the competences to actively participate in (educational) interactions. However, the concept of children has changed significantly over the last thirty years (e.g., Murray, Swadener, & Smith, 2019). Children are conceptualised as subjects who make an active contribution to their social contexts (Alanen, 2005; Alderson, 2008; Gabriel, 2017; Honig, 1999; James, 2011; Leonard, 2017; Prout, 2000). This results in a pedagogical approach that positions children as agents who shape their individual developmental and educational processes and thus are seen as active stakeholders of their education (Friedmann & Vietze, 1972; Laewen & Andres, 2003). Such pedagogical approach is nowadays hegemonic in ECEC, where children are positioned as active constructors and authors of their lived experiences, knowledge and are participants of their own learning (Alderson, 2010, 2012; Baraldi, Joslyn, & Farini, 2021; Bruce, 2012, 2020, 2021; Pascal & Bertram, 2012, 2018, 2021; Reed & Walker 2015; Tovey, 2012).

Nevertheless, it is questionable if and to what extent such conceptualisations comprise CMB. A first question concerns whether there is enough consideration for the possible needs of migrant children in order for them to meaningfully participate actively in educational contexts. Shaping education may require language and cultural tools, and this cannot be underestimated. But the focus on cultural and linguistic support may foster an essentialist perspective that views migrant children and their ability to participate from a deficit perspective, e.g. in terms of (lacking) cultural adaption or language skills and their educational promotion. Results of recent empirical studies on educational work with CMB show indications of essentialising views that focus on addressing educational or integration needs. Using data from the 2018 TALIS study, Spensberger and Taube (2022), for instance, identified a high significance of diversity-related narratives

for pedagogical professionals in day care centres in Germany, consisting of the necessity to value cultural differences between children, an emphasis on intercultural learning and on a multiculturalist approach that prioritises respecting other cultures. However, educational professionals mainly hold an interventionist approach, which was based on a deficit model of CMB, resulting in the situation that, "despite this optimistic assessment of attitudes in ECEC, diversity-sensitive practices seem to be hardly used" (p. 256). Busch et al. (2018), who investigated experiences and perceptions of educational professionals in care for refugee children in Germany, resume that aspects of cultural and linguistic understanding represent the greatest challenge for frontline professionals. A similar conclusion was drawn by a study of the German Youth Institute (Baisch, Lueders, Meiner-Teubner, Riedel, & Scholz, 2017), which shows that day care centres displayed a strongly essentialist perspective. More specifically, they gave priority to the need of training to provide professionals with knowledge about the children's countries of origin, pedagogical guidelines for their care, migration-sensitive familiarisation concepts and psychological care for children (Riedel & Lueders, 2016, p. 141; Scholz, 2021). In a comparative study, Silva, Bajzáth, Lemkow-Tovias, and Wastijn (2020) investigated knowledge and awareness of professionals in ECEC institutions in Italy, one of the contexts of the CHILD-UP research, Spain and Hungary. The authors investigated how professionals perceive the role of ECEC for the integration of CMB. Across all national contexts, educators attributed an important role to day care facilities in the cultural, linguistic and social integration of CMB and their families. Nevertheless, Silva and colleagues underline the necessity to question the link between theory and practice, between practitioners' beliefs, and the ones of [migrant] families, negotiating meaning and promoting cultural understanding of the multiple "faces of diversity" (Silva et al., 2020, p. 10). As for the German studies, a demand and need for training in interculturality and diversity was expressed across the countries to better understand the needs of migrant children and their parents and to provide effective educational support. Again, a deficit model seems to be coupled with an essentialist perspective on cultural identity.

In view of such deficit perspectives on the integration and participation of CMB, which consider cultural and linguistic prerequisites necessary, a second question concerns the cultural and even pedagogical framework of children's agency and active participation itself. In their critical review of the implications of the agency concept, Betz and Esser (2016) highlight that the discussion may be biased towards a Western perspective. Klocker (2007), and again Betz and Esser (2016), note that agency in recent studies is distinguished between "thick" and "thin". *Thin agency* means a form of children's agency, which lacks possibilities to choose or participate actively. This is due to stronger social control or traditional generational relationships in contexts that do not offer many alternatives or options. Klocker (2007) clarifies *thick agency* as a context that promotes a range of options, choices or alternatives in contrast to a restricted and limited environment. According to Klocker, Betz and Esser outline that: "there are, after all, some privileged children who have achieved the goal of 'thick' agency, and others who have to make do with a 'thin' agency"

(Betz & Esser, 2016, p. 50). Beside cultural connotations, capabilities and possibilities of children's active participation and agency can be limited for CMB in educational contexts due to limited competence in the use of language and limited adaptation with the expectations of education. These elements add to the limitation of children's agency when traditional educational communication has little focus on dialogue and participation. Such disadvantage, if not addressed, would not only create a *de facto* situation of thin agency for migrant children. On the other hand, approaching migrant children as a category in deficit, in need of 'more education' reproduces categorisations and possibly marginalisation, and does not support integration from a position of equality.

The fundamental dilemma, which is reproduced in the contexts of CHILD-UP research, concerns the position of migrant children vis-à-vis their integration in the educational context. Integration can be understood as the outcome of special education provision for migrant children, aimed to 'fill the gap' between them and the other children, thereby creating the condition for their active participation. However, active participation can also be detached from the achievement of adaptation: if migrant children are valued in the here and now for the knowledge and skills that they bring into education, integration can take a person-centred approach, where diversity is valued as a resource for education rather than a problem to be fixed.

The concept of hybrid integration that underpins the CHILD-UP project can overcome both horns of the dilemma by rejecting an essentialist conception of diversity as something that defines people regarding their cultural background (Holliday, 2011). Integration is considered a process where two or more culturally connotated diversities get together, and the outcome can be assimilation of one into the other or multiculturalism. *Hybrid* integration rejects essentialism for a constructivist meaning of cultural identities. Cultural identities are contingently constructed and negotiated during social interactions, where narratives of the self or narrative of cultural belonging are exchanged, mediated through the filter of personal experiences (Holliday & Amadasi, 2020). For this reason, the concept of hybrid integration allows to value different narratives of cultural identities that emerge in interaction whilst preserving the value of personal agency and participation. In terms of educational practice, hybrid integration is a result of dialogue and interactive negotiation, even consisting of the negotiation of narratives about culture that are mediated through the filter of children's personal experiences (ibid.). This makes it possible both to enhance the different narratives of cultural identities that emerge in interaction and to promote everyone's personal agency and participation equally, giving everyone equal opportunities for expression. In line with this theoretical background of the CHILD-UP project and addressing the pedagogical foundations of professionals, the analysis of the narratives that emerged from the interviews with professionals inform about how they perceive CMB in terms of agency, participation and hybrid integration. Video-taped observations of pedagogical activities with CMB in turn give an inside perspective on how professionals value CMB's agency through dialogue and active participation and thus may promote hybrid integration.

Methods and contexts

The chapter discusses data collected in ECEC contexts in Germany and Italy. As in Western Europe in general, also in Italy and Germany ECEC facilities have a key position within the measures aiming to promote migrant children's integration. Day care centres are the first educational institutions migrant families come into contact with, and where CMB "…make contact with their native peers and can get to know the foreign culture and language. They gain experience with the values and norms of the host country" (Riedel & Lueders, 2016, pp. 138–139). Accordingly, the omnipresence of the migration issue and the related tasks and challenges for educational institutions is reflected in integration strategies and conceptual frameworks with regard to structural conditions and educational practice in ECEC in both countries. In Germany, ECEC is part of the children and youth welfare system. Thus, the general legal framework of ECEC is defined at the federal level, formulated in the Children and Youth Welfare Act. Professional regulations and guidelines, however, are given by the responsible authorities of the federal states, which leads to 16 different ECEC curricula. Sulzer (2013) indicates that migration is included in the ECEC curricula of all 16 federal states of Germany and is considered as an essential structural and professional challenge. Nevertheless, she argues, some curricula define culture as a diversity characteristic of all children, and others position CMB in a specific 'cultural group'. The curricula reflect this conceptual tension, oscillating between devising specific content for specific target groups, with the risk of categorising them as a group in deficit, and devising content without any consideration of the diverse life situations of families. For instance, the ECEC curriculum of the Free State of Saxony, where a substantial part of CHILD-UP activities in Germany were conducted, does not explicitly address migrant backgrounds and corresponding strategies or measures of integration, which, however, are outlined in the Immigration and Integration concept of Saxony (Saxon State Ministry of Social Affairs and Consumer Protection, 2018). Concerning the ECEC curriculum, there is a more encompassing reference to diversity:

> Diversity must be harnessed as educational potential.… Integration through shared participation in the everyday life of day care centres makes it possible to address aspects such as 'dignity', 'otherness', 'exclusion' or 'compassion' with children and to strengthen self-confidence. Heterogeneity, i.e., difference, then equally means experiencing and living acceptance and tolerance as well as mutual consideration and help.
>
> (Saxon State Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs, 2011, p. 69)

In Italy, preschool is part of the integrated education system and the first step in education. It has a duration of three years, is accessible to children between the ages of three and five and is not compulsory. Preschools can be both state and maintained schools. Over the years, increasing migration processes have meant for schools a shift towards new educational tasks that focus on fostering well-being, interchanges, knowledge and appreciation of diversity and integration.

However, an ambivalence is noticed relating to this shift. The emphasis on (i) bilingualism (ii) cultural trajectories and (iii) personal trajectories coexists with an approach focused on (iv) teaching Italian as a second language and (v) fulfilling the curricula. Whilst (iv) and (v) fuel a 'filling the gap' approach, where pathways and assessments position migrant children as children in deficit, (i), (ii), and (iii) bring about the idea of equality in diversity, where migrant children are not categorised as children in deficit but are valued for the knowledge and skills (particularly language competences), they bring into the classroom (MIUR, 2014).

ECEC in Germany and Italy is characterised by similar tensions and ambivalences regarding the position of migrant children: ultimately, the ambivalence concern whether to catgorise migrant children as a separate group, in need of education special care, or to take a person-centred approach, where diversity is related to the personal meaning of cultural trajectories.

The data discussed here come from interviews conducted with professionals, and from video-recordings of educational activities in day care centres. The interviews aimed at gaining a better understanding of the living environment of children of kindergarten age, both with and without a migration background. Fourteen educators in Germany and six educators in Italy were interviewed individually or in focus group interviews. In Italy, the six educators interviewed were all women working in kindergartens with several years' experience in settings with a large proportion of children of migrant origin. One of them was trained in a methodology that promotes storytelling and dialogue with children in the classroom. These interviews were analysed based on themes such as: experiences of working with migrant families and children; children's educational needs; narratives of integration; the evaluation of peer networks; and the involvement of parents (for educators). Interviews with professionals further allowed capturing different approaches to integration and to the promotion of children's participation and agency. In particular, quotes were selected in order to observe what kinds of narratives are produced by teachers regarding agency, language skills, promotion of participation, and hybrid integration. In fact, as we have observed in this volume, if children's personal participation is promoted, it creates the possibility for everyone, even those with more communication problems, to share stories, trajectories, life paths and skills that are sometimes also cultural elements but always filtered by personal experience that allows comparisons, connections, hybridisations.

The video-recordings aimed at observing educational practices that promote children's hybrid integration by facilitating dialogue and participation in child care, schools and other educational settings. In this process, the practices encompassed different areas such as second language teaching, intercultural education or workshops that promoted dialogue and participation among and with children. The schools and educational settings chosen are areas where there is a presence of migrant children and activities have been carried out for years to promote participation and agency to enable the hybrid integration of all children. In Germany, eleven educational encounters were video-recorded across two ECEC settings, involving six groups of children. In Italy, 17 educational encounters were

video-recorded across six ECEC settings, involving nine groups of children. Observations were undertaken in the preschool year, thus, the children were five years old in Italy and between five and six in Germany. The video-recordings were transcribed to allow a detailed analysis of educational practices. In particular, teachers' and children's turns of speech were analysed to understand which actions (most) facilitate children's participation and agency and with which actions children in turn exercise that agency. Turns of talk are communicative actions that are analysed in the sequence in which they occur because their meaning depends on the context and particularly on the preceding and subsequent actions. In the educational context, the most famous sequence of turns is the question, answer and evaluation triplet, which, however, leaves little room for children's participation, as opposed to turns such as open-ended questions, formulations and continuers, as we will see better in the analysis. In the analysis, for reasons of space, only one case from the Italian data will be presented in order to exemplify what are the best practices and therefore which teachers' actions promote hybrid integration of children and which actions of children express agency.

Migrant Children's Integration and Participation in ECEC: Empirical Findings

Teachers' narratives about migrant children and their agency

The first general result of the analysis of teachers' interviews is that an ambiguity concerning the position of migrant children remains, when professionals state that CMB are initially perceived like everyone else. Some educators share an idea that CMB should not be categorised as such. Rather, a person-centred approach is preferred, apparently challenging essentialist views.

T: There is no/no distinction is made between the children.
I: Okay (.) and the cultural, the multicultural is there then?
T: That is there so to speak, yes.
I: And it is thematised and.
T: And it is addressed and sometimes not.
I: Yes.
T: That is uh so if I say, if a child introduces a topic, uh that it wants to report something about its country, about its home country, uh then it is introduced in such a way that it, what do I know, that the children each report their country or, uh, it is said, which animals are there. You can, you can make a project out of anything. And um, it could also be, I don't know, that the Spanish child likes Fireman Sam. Well, then the topic is 'Fireman Sam'. And then, that has nothing to do with a migration background (laughing) or anything, it's simply the child's theme. And that is, uhm, taken up and thematised.

(G_T10_F)

Migration background is approached as a component, among others, of a person-centred identity. Cultural diversity may be recognised as an important variable and it can be valued as a resource for education. Nevertheless, it is not the main variable that affects the identity of the child and it is not associated with the perception of specific pedagogical needs. From a pedagogical point of view, if the focus is rather on the child as a person and the migrant background is part of, but not essential for, personal identity, then educators' demand for special provision dedicated to migrant children is not in the first place, contrasting with the results of previous research.

> I see the educational needs of children of this age group being a lot about, I mean, the need for play, as well as the need for relationships with peers, the negotiation of rules, the negotiation of play, the negotiation of shared spaces and materials.
>
> (IT_T14_F)

Interviews with educators working in ECEC settings suggest that CMB are not primarily seen as a separate group in need of special educational provision. This is ancillary to a personal, rather than cultural, frame of reference for the position of children in the context of the educational encounter where, freed from the image of 'childhood in need', they can access the status of agents of their own education as CMB, like those children of the host society. From a moral stance, the idea is that children should be seen as equal and must be treated equally. From a pedagogical stance, age in terms of individual development and its promotion, rather than cultural background, seems to be the lense through which educators look at children when planning educational provision. Differently from cultural background, age is a variable that differentiates each cohort of children from other cohorts, but does not create differences within the individual cohort. With age as the key variable considered by educators, the pedagogical approach moves towards age-related provision that does not differentiate between children based on their migration background.

However, the priority of age against migration background for the positioning of children does not entail that cultural diversity is completely overlooked; rather, it is considered a part of the personality of CMB and an educational opportunity given the respective interest of the child. Thus, children's migrant background is seen as a component of a multifaceted identity that contributes to make each child unique. The uniqueness of the child is a tenet of ECEC, under the influence of Montessori's pedagogy (Montessori, 1967). The recognition of this uniqueness in turn forms the basis of a pedagogy of equal perception and educational treatment of children. It is therefore possible to distil from the interviews with educators in Germany and Italy a continuing process of coupling and decoupling of education and cultural identity (if linked to migration background). Migrant background of children is considered a component of unique trajectories based on the person, rather than a standardised role of 'the migrant child'. The essentialist approach that

could be noticed when reflecting on the results from previous research, if not marginal, is at least accompanied by a person-centred approach to the child in education.

> T: It is not categorised into thinking, oh this is a child with a background: uh migration background, or whatever, or from this and that culture, but it is simply a child of this day care centre. […] And yes, accordingly the children experience equal treatment in that sense.
>
> (G_T12_FFFMM)

> Depending on each child, that is, it also depends on how they are, on their personality […] then it also depends on their character, not only the linguistic or cultural difficulties, but also on the character, there are children who are shy, there are children who find it more difficult to relate to others outside the family.
>
> (IT_T23_F)

For the educators interviewed, for a child to have migrant background or not, it does not make much difference in terms of access to thin agency or thick agency. There are differences in participation among children, and such differences are observed. Nevertheless, differences in the form of participation among children, more or less active, more or less autonomous, are related to personal, rather than cultural, differences. It is the unique personality of the child that facilitates or hinders active participation and engagement with other children and education.

However, as previously anticipated, educators are not indifferent to children's migrant background. Although migrant background does not make a difference on its own, and children are not seen as migrants first, migrant background is still an important component of personal identity. Educators converge in recognising that knowledge of the cultural background of children is important to work better with them. It is important to highlight, to use the words of one of the interviewees, that the background of children is 'partly important' and should not become pivotal for the categorisation of children. Working well with children is easier if there is cultural awareness; yet the reference for any interaction with the child is the unique person, not the standardised role of "the migrant child". In the excerpt below, taken from an interview in Germany, the educator combines the idea of equality of all children with the acknowledgement that cultural knowledge can help working with children. However, such knowledge is a resource to facilitate the 'acclimatisation' of the child as a unique person. Cultural knowledge is not the foundation of special educational provision for a category of children, the ones with migrant background, that are positioned as children in need. Developing cultural awareness is both a methodological and an ethical component of pedagogical work that refers to the sensitivity of the educational setting towards each child's personal trajectory.

> I: In your practice, so to speak, do you think about it, do you find it important to use the term migration background when talking about a child or

to think about it as well, or would you say that this rather leads to the fact that I always think yes, separately, some with, others without.

T: Uhm so it is uh partly yes, it can be important, because with an acclimatisation and so on, that you have a bit of background knowledge and so on, but it is so in my experience, lived differently here.

(G_T12_FFFMM)

In the array of variables potentially related to a migration background, language is probably the one that participants in the interview consider more influential for children's possibility of active participation and agency in educational interactions.

Linguistic competence in the mainstream language of education is considered by the educators very important for the integration and participation of children. Difficulties in linguistic production do not imply that children are prevented from active participation and from the access to an agentic role in educational interactions. Nor do they imply that children with limited linguistic competence in the language of education are positioned within a paradigm of deficit. For educators, migrant children with limited proficiency in the language of education must overcome additional hurdles, besides personal inclinations, to participate actively in the educational encounter. Limited language skills are considered as limiting the opportunities of migrant children to participate by expressing their feelings, views or wishes not because of any deficit of children. Children are competent speakers of one or more other languages. It is the social context, hegemonised by the use of the hegemonic language that transforms their linguistic background in an obstacle to overcome in order to engage actively with educational interactions.

It depends on how much they understand because having such little language. Simple as that, they struggle to express themselves and so it is very poor as a language. They listen, in my opinion they listen a lot and they internalise in the sense they understand, but then they struggle to express themselves.

(IT_T9_F)

In this sense, the excerpt presented above may be read as a plea for ensuring migrant children's participation regardless of their skills in the hegemonic language of education, because their agency should not be limited by unfavourable circumstances in the context of ECEC provision. However, different views on the position of children from a minority linguistic background also emerged from the interviews. In particular, the idea that children's active participation is possible, and should be facilitated, even with limited proficiency in the language of education is accompanied by the idea that linguistic adaptation is essential for active participation and should be expected. Whilst there is a fundamental trust in children's ability to participate actively, the possibility of active participation is subordinated to linguistic adaptation.

The excerpt below illustrates this demand for linguistic adaptation. By emphasising that German is used as the language of communication with the Syrian child in the sense of equal pedagogical treatment, on the one hand the educator assumes the child as agent. On the other, he implicitly refers to linguistic adaptation as an

essential requirement for communication, and an expectation for the child. Thus, pedagogical motive is introduced through the back door, which is explicitly related to the migration background of the child in question. Learning the mainstream language of education is propaedeutic for participation. Within this approach, linguistic adaptation predates active participation, reversing the approach previously discussed, where participation is considered achievable even without linguistic competence in the mainstream language. Although not discussed during the interviews, these two concurring views of the relationships between linguistic adaptation and active participation underpin two different approaches to migrant children agency: on the one hand, agency is the outcome of a process of learning and adaptation; on the other hand, agency is the possible context for learning and adaptation.

> Yes, good. No, but I don't treat them differently than other children. (.) I just pay more attention. Of course, I speak German with these children. I try not to, when I'm in the garden and a child from Syria wants something from me, (.) I speak German with him, yes? Because (.) But also no (.) I treat if he does something, uh, dangerous and he also gets it from me […] Yes? Big eyes, the same and no.
>
> (G_T8_M)

To sum up the themes discussed in this section of the chapter, it is possible to identify three main threads emerging from the analysis of interviews with educators working in German and Italian ECEC settings. The first thread is the rejection of the migration background as foundation for the categorisation of children. Migrant children are not grouped in a special category, with specific expectations and specific provision. The approach of educators seems to be centred on the idea, nowadays dominant within the professional culture of ECEC, of the unique child. Each child is approached as a unique person, as opposed to the temptation of categorising him within a socially-connotated group.

The second thread complements the first. Although firmly within a person-centred approach, the migration background of children, when related to cultural diversity, is not overlooked. Rather, possible cultural diversity is observed as a component of that rich personal identity that contributes to make each child unique. The migrant background is part of personal trajectories, rather than used to construct the category of 'the migrant child'. The essentialist approach, emerging from previous research, cannot be confirmed by the analysis of interviews with educators for the CHILD-UP project.

The third main thread concerns the centrality for children's active participation, of linguistic proficiency, which clearly emerges from all other culture-related variables. Two approaches could be identified when analysing interviews and have been illustrated with the use of exemplary excerpts. One approach considers participation achievable even without linguistic competence in the mainstream language; for the other approach, linguistic adaptation predates active participation. It has been argued that those two approaches probably can underpin two different views of the relationships between language and agency: on the one hand, agency is the outcome of a process of learning and adaptation (language adaptation as a precondition of participation); on the other hand, agency is the possible context

for learning and adaptation (participation creates conditions for linguistic adaptation). However, the two approaches are not necessarily opposed to each other. Rather, they point to the relational nature of agency (Esser, 2016), which means that agency can be understood interdependently as both outcome and context of learning and linguistic adaptation. In pedagogical terms, this reflects an ambiguity between considering CMBs' ability to participate and possible limitations due to their language skills, and ensuring both-participation and linguistic support-in practice.

Observation of educational practices: promoting migrant children's hybrid integration through dialogue

The narratives shared by educational professionals working in ECEC brought to light different themes: the promotion of active participation and the primacy of the person over the cultural origin or the migrant background; the recognition of diversity as a tool for a more sensitive person-centred approach; the professional's views on the relationship between linguistic proficiency in the language of education and opportunities for active participation.

In ECEC, the focus on assessment of performances (measurement of learning) is less pronounced than in later stages of education. Research has explored the implications for children's agency of the combination of two opposing forces in ECEC. Reduced pressure towards the achievement of curricular goals should allow more opportunities to facilitate children's agency (Farini & Scollan, 2019). However, the expectation of limited competences attributed to children of this age in terms of decision-making and the expression of autonomous perspectives can be an obstacle to the promotion of their participation and agency. This is often even more evident in the case of CMB (Baraldi, 2015). Although the results of the interviews showed that migrant background as such is not a criterion in this respect from the point of view of the professionals, it is nevertheless perceived as a significant influencing factor, for example in terms of language, for CMB's agency and active participation. In this respect, the question is not only how the participation of CMB can be practically established and promoted. It is also about how cultural diversity can be valued and used to promote hybrid integration.

Observing educational practices through the video-recorded activities in German and Italian ECEC settings provided a unique opportunity to observe how the ambiguity surrounding the promotion of young children's agency was translated in pedagogical practices. In line with the aim of the CHILD-UP project, the promotion of children's agency was observed in relation to its implications for creating favourable conditions for hybrid integration. Based on the idea that observing children's participation (and this can include participation in contexts where facilitation is used) provides opportunities to not only learn about them, but also from them (Scollan & Mc Neill, 2019). In this section of the chapter, one excerpt from a video-recorded and transcribed educational encounter is presented. The excerpt was selected as exemplary of facilitation of children's active participation, CMB and all children.

The excerpt, chosen here as an example, irrespective of the national contexts of the video survey, is from an activity facilitated by an educator from outside the setting. It is common for Italian ECEC settings to hire external experts to design activities. In this excerpt, the activity is called "philosophy with children", aimed at promoting children's active reflection around philosophical concepts. The excerpt concerns a segment of the activity when the facilitator interacts with migrant children; it begins with the facilitator (FAC) introducing the activity: the children are invited to choose what they would need to live happily on an island (turn 1). The excerpt indicates that the children participate actively, displaying agency as epistemic authority, that is, they have access to the status of authors of knowledge. The facilitator supports and co-authors children's narratives about fundamental needs of a happy life, providing feedback and support, in particular acknowledging children's proposals through a variety of contributions: (1) frequent repetitions making explicit reference to children's contributions (turns 3, 17, 23, 47, 55 and 57); (2) formulations of children's contributions to make implicit contents explicit (turns 7, 11, 13, 15, 21, 43 and 49), summarising their gist (turns 19, 59) and proposing possible developments of children's contributions whilst preserving children's status as authors of knowledge (turns 25, 30 and 34). Other actions to support children's authorship of knowledge are confirmations (turn 36) or completions of their contributions (turn 11). This variety of facilitative actions have different functions, but they are underpinned by one aim: to validate the access of children to the status of authors of knowledge, even when faced with the expectation of difficulties for migrant children to actively participate in the interactions. The success of facilitation is displayed by the flow of the interaction, where children produce narratives spontaneously, without the need for the facilitator to trigger participation, for instance by using questions. Questions are used to further facilitate participation: open questions (turn 27, 30, 41, 45) and only one instance of focused question (turn 51).

Excerpt (F1, F3, F4, M2, M3, all migrant)

1. FACm: attention! well look at me you all because now begins the most difficult part where you need imagination. I ask you to speak one at a time when you have ideas raise your hand, and we share them together is that ok? The first question is this: we are pretending to be on a ship and going to this island (.) to make it a beautiful place, if you can, it must be the most beautiful place possible to live. What do you think are the first things you need to live well on this island? The first needs, the first things to think of, does anyone have any ideas? (.) of the needs we might have [of the
2. M1: [building houses
3. FACm: for example, M1 says as first needs build houses
4. M1: or else when it rains (…) you have to go to a place like the forest where it rains less
5. FACm: but building houses is certainly a need, F1

(…)
6. F1: you must have food
7. FACm: F1 says let's go find some food or you must have it somehow you must have it, F2
8. F2: we can find a treasure
9. FACm: she says while we are there we could also try to find out if there is a treasure. Let's hear F3, M2 and F4 in a row, F3
10. F3: we can drink
11. FACm: water?
(…)
12. F3: yes
13. FACm: you have to make sure you can drink, M2
14. M2: a shop so we can go and buy food.
15. FACm: you would also put a shop among the first needs: that we have (…) F4
16. F4: sleep
17. FACm: sleep says F4
18. F4: ((nods))
19. FACm: so some a places to sleep, we have the house M6 was talking about before, and in the house there will certainly be a place to sleep too, M3
20. M3: and we can (2) also eat spaghetti
21. FACm: so he starts to say we have food it has already been said that we needed food, and he starts to say however food can mean so many things let's be more precise and see what foods we want what foods we need and here it could [be
22. M4: [vegetables
23. FACm: he says vegetables see! he [says] spaghetti, let's go on with M5
24. M5: me I would eat: (??)
25. FACm: I understand, then let's do like this: the need for food is there, then you wil prepare a nice menu of the island, the basic things to eat on the island, let's go on with the first needs M6
26. M6: in the woods: it rains less but: you can get lost.
27. FACm: mh what can you do to not get lost on the island M1?
28. M1: we can bring the compass!
29. Tf?: sh
30. FACm: one at a time then because M6 remembered before the question of the houses and he says going into the woods you can get lost, let's see M1 says but with the compass - it's a remedy F5 (2) please (.) do you agree with: M1? (…) can you think of other ways not to get lost F5? What could be done? M2
31. M2: we can take a torch
32. FACm: a to- then here are some st-
33. ?: a compass

34. FACm: a compass so F5, M1, M2 start thinking that on the island some tools could be useful too a torch to light up when it's dark, a compass, let's see F3

(…)

35. F3: when it's so dark, we have to turn on the torch (.) with the light.
36. FACm: exactly (.) F4 F4
37. ((not understandable))
38. F4: we go to sleep
39. FACm: pardon?
40. F4: we can go to sleep

(…)

41. FACm: where?
42. F4: in bed
43. FACm: sure (.) when it's time (.) will go there. M4
44. M4: we can also turn on the torch when it's dark
45. FACm: yes M8 (.) did you want to say something to build -, what did you say? No? F1
46. F1: we can also buy clothes and shoes
47. FACm: ah F1 thinks that among the needs we have there could also be clothes and shoes
48. F1: ((nods))
49. FACm: but F1 you said something, that we could buy them (.) to buy them we need
50. M1: money!
51. FACm: money, will money be needed on this island or could you live on an island even without money in your opinion?
52. ?: without money
53. F1: maybe we need to look for it
54. M1: if it's just us: no money
55. FACm: if it's just us, M1 thinks that it would be possible without money.
56. M6: ((nods)) because have - if one goes: ah: where there is where there is the forest and in front of you there are some pine trees you can take (.) some pieces of pine tree
57. FACm: ok you see that according to M1 you could also live without money in the island where you go if you are only you M3
58. M3: ah: (4) we go to bed when the light ah: there is no more light then we turn on the torch
59. FACm: yes pay attention to the question the question though was what are the things we will need to live well on the island so far you have told me food and you have also said what kind of food, houses, places to sleep, compasses and torches so we don't get lost in the woods, clothes and shoes, about money F1 says if we want to buy things we will need money, but M1 says if we go only us on the island as long as we are alone we can also do without (.) F3

This example of a video-recorded and transcribed activity represents how professionals can promote children's agency, expression of their epistemic authority and therefore hybrid integration by engaging with a range of facilitative actions and styles that are attuned and authentic in response to context and the sensitivity of participants. All narratives, experiences and points of view in the data appreciated and promoted participation, and led to interlacements of personal, cultural, inter-connected narratives which is the base for creating hybrid integration.

The observation supports the idea that when children are valued as social agents in the here-and-now and their access to the status of authors of knowledge is facilitated, they are able to construct and co-construct narratives of personal and cultural identities that can be exchanged in the negotiation of hybrid identity towards hybrid integration.

The meaning of CHILD-UP project's findings for the ECEC

Analysis of the qualitative data from CHILD-UP allowed the views of professionals working with and for children to be taken into account. It also allowed, via the analysis of video-recorded educational interactions, to discuss a range of facilitative actions that proved successful in promoting children's agency as authors of knowledge. Accordingly, against the backdrop of theoretical and conceptual approaches on CMB's integration in ECEC settings, the chapter observed both the narratives that those working in this field produce on these issues and the corresponding, exemplary practices in both senses of the word. It became apparent that the views of the pedagogical professionals on children are not based on the possibility of an individual migration background. Rather, the professionals emphasise general narratives about the children, their development, their needs and their pedagogical accompaniment and support, as well as individual characteristics of CMB, their personality, both from a general pedagogical perspective and with regard to their integration. Nevertheless, the migration background is taken into account by the professionals, especially in relation to language skills, which are seen as important for successful participation. However, difficulties associated with this do not necessarily limit the agency of CMB, but are considered as an obstacle to children's opportunities of self-expression and their participation. Therefore, language skills, linguistic competences and their promotion need to be sensitively considered in pedagogical work to ensure CMB's participation. On the basis of the presented video observation and its analysis, appropriate strategies have been identified as to whether and how the paradoxes of promoting CMB integration can be overcome in practice. In pedagogical interactions, agency and participation of CMB can be promoted, if they are given the opportunity to communicate in interactions, to express their own perspectives and thus change the course of action, regardless of language or other challenges caused by migration. Such strategies have the potential to mitigate cultural essentialisations and attributions by emphasising children's contributions to interactions as the starting point for their further progress, rather than their individual cultural backgrounds. In this, the concept of hybrid

integration manifests itself in a very practical way, when belonging is produced situationally, with the participation of all children and professionals.

The chapter concludes by arguing that children's agency is the essential condition for the integration of migrant children, which does not imply categorising them as a 'deficit group' within a 'filling the gap' approach. Hybrid integration can overcome the paradox entailed by all 'deficit approaches', where support to migrant children is accompanied by their categorisation as a group connotated by a condition of deficit. Hybrid integration can do so because integration is not understood as cultural adaptation or intercultural learning: integration is co-construction of identities where the cultural dimension is filtered through the uniqueness of the person. Hybrid integration is therefore a promising concept for ECEC which is underpinned by the concept of the unique child.

References

Alanen, L. (2005). Kindheit als generationales Konzept. [Childhood as a generational concept] In H. Hengst & H. Zeiher (Eds.), *Kindheit soziologisch* (pp. 65–82). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Alderson, P. (2008). *Young children's rights: Exploring beliefs, principles and practice*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Alderson, P. (2010). Younger children's individual participation in all matters affecting the Child. In B. Percy-Smith & N. Thomas (Eds.), *A Handbook of children and young people's participation: Perspectives from theory and practice* (pp.88–96). Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Alderson, P. (2012). Rights respecting research: A commentary on the 'right to be properly researched: Research with children in a messy, real world'. *Children's Geographies*, *10*(2), 233–239.

Allen, S., Maureen, L., Whalley, M.E., & Scollan, A. (2019). *Developing professional practice in the early years*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Baisch, B., Lueders, K., Meiner-Teubner, C., Riedel, B., & Scholz, A. (2017). *Flüchtlingskinder in Kindertagesbetreuung. Ergebnisse der DJI-Kita-Befragung "Flüchtlingskinder" zu Rahmenbedingungen und Praxis im Frühjahr 2016*. [Refugee children in day care. Results of the DJI-Survey "Refugee Children" on framework conditions and practice in Spring 2016] https://www.dji.de/fileadmin/user_upload/bibs2017/Fluechtlingskinder_in_Kindertagesbetreuung.pdf

Baraldi, C. (2012). Intercultural education and communication in second language interactions. *Intercultural Education*, *23*(4), 297–311.

Baraldi, C. (2014). Children's participation in communication systems: A theoretical perspective to shape research. In N. Warehime (Ed.), *Soul of society: A focus on the leaves of children and youth. Sociological studies on children and youth*, *18*, 63–92.

Baraldi, C. (2015). Promotion of migrant children's epistemic status and authority in early school Life. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, *47*(1), 5–25.

Baraldi, C., & Cockburn, T (Eds.). (2018). *Theorising childhood*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

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

Becker, B., & Schober, P.S. (2017). Not just any child care center? Social and ethnic disparities in the use of early education institutions with a beneficial learning environment. *Early Education and Development*, *28*(8), 1011–1034.

Betz, T., & Esser, F. (2016). Kinder als Akteure–Forschungsbezogene Implikationen des erfolgreichen Agency-Konzeptes. [Children as stakeholders–Research related implications of the successful agency concept] *Diskurs Kindheits- und Jugendforschung*, *11*(3), 301–314.

Bruce, T. (2012). *Early childhood practice*. London: Sage.

Bruce, T. (2020). *Educating young children: A lifetime journey into a Fröbelian approach. The selected works of Tina Bruce*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Bruce, T. (2021). *Friedrich Fröbel. A critical introduction to key themes and debates*. London: Bloomsbury.

Bryan, A. (2010). Corporate multiculturalism, diversity management, and positive interculturalism in Irish schools and society. *Irish Educational Studies*, *29*(3), 253–269.

Busch, J., Bihler, L.M., Lembcke, H., Buchmüller, T., Diers, K., & Leyendecker, B. (2018). Challenges and solutions perceived by educators in an early childcare program for refugee children. *Frontiers in Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01621

Busch, J., Kohl, K., & Leyendecker, B. (2020). Erziehung und Migration? Unterstützung des Bildungserfolgs neu zugewanderter Kinder in Kita und Grundschule. [Education and migration? Educational success of newly arrived children in day care and primary school]. In P. Genkova & A. Ricken (Eds.), *Handbuch Migration und Erfolg* (pp. 297–311). Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien.

Cameron, C., & Moss, P. (2020). *Transforming early childhood in England: Towards a democratic education*. London: UCL Press.

CARE Project. (2014). *Curriculum quality analysis and impact review of European Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC)*. Available at: https://ecec-care.org/fileadmin/careproject/Publications/reports/new_version_CARE_WP4_D4_1_Review_on_the_effects_of_ECEC.pdf (accessed 5.12.2022).

Devine, D. (2013). Value'ing children differently? Migrant children in education. *Children & Society*, *27*(4), 282–294.

Diehm, I., Kuhn, M., Machold, C., & Mai, M. (2013). Ethnische Differenz und Ungleichheit. Eine ethnologische Studie in Bildungseinrichtungen der frühen Kindheit. [Ethnical differences and inequality. An ethnological study in early childhood education facilities] *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, *59*(5), 644–656.

Esser, F. (2016). Neither 'thick' nor 'thin'. Reconceptualizing agency and childhood relationally. In F. Esser, M.S. Baaeder, T. Betz, & B. Hungerland (Eds.), *Reconceptualising agency and childhood. New perspectives in Childhood Studies* (pp. 48–60). Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Farini, F. (2019). From the child to the pupil to the child. Trust based on categorical inequalities and the quest for alternatives towards a more inclusive education. *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education*, *11*(3), 246–264.

Farini, F., & Scollan, A. (Eds.) (2019). *Children's self-determination in the context of early childhood education and services. Discourses, policies and practices*. Berlin: Springer.

Friedman, S., & Vietze, P.M. (1972). The competent infant. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *49*(4), 314–322.

Gabriel, N. (2017). *The sociology of early childhood: Critical perspectives*. London: Sage.

Gambaro, L., Neidhoefer, G., & Spiess, C.K. (2019). *The effect or early childhood education and care services on the social integration of refugee families*. Available at: https://www.diw.de/de/diw_01.c.694707.de/publikationen/diskussionspapiere/2019_1828/the_effect_of_early_childhood_education_and_care_services_on_the_social_integration_of_refugee_families.html (accessed 5.12.2022).

Giardiello, P., & Haikio, T.K. (2019). Wider issues in early childhood education. In N. McLeod, & P. Giardiello (Eds.), *Empowering early childhood educators: International pedagogies as provocation*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Holliday, A. (2011). *Intercultural communication and ideology*. London: Sage

Holliday, A., & Amadasi, S. (2020). *Making sense of the intercultural. Finding DeCentred threads*. London: Routledge

Honig, M.-S. (1999). *Entwurf einer Theorie der Kindheit*. [Outline of a theory of childhood] Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

James, A. (2011). To be (come) or not to be (come): Understanding children's citizenship. *The Annals of the American Academy*, *633*(1), 167–179.

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

Klocker, N. (2007). An example of 'thin' agency: Child domestic workers in Tanzania. In R. Panelli, S. Punch, & E. Robson (Eds.), *Global perspectives on rural childhood and youth: young rural lives* (pp. 83–94). New York: Routledge.

Laewen, H.-J., & Andres, B. (2003). *Bildung und Erziehung in der frühen Kindheit. Bausteine zum Bildungsauftrag von Kindertageseinrichtungen*. [Early childhood education. Building blocks for the educational mission of day care facilities] Weinheim, Basel & Berlin: Beltz.

Leonard, M. (2017). *The sociology of children, childhood and generation*. London: Sage.

Lorenz, S., Wertfein, M., & Danay, E. (2018). Flüchtlingskinder verändern Kitas. Herausforderungen und Situationsveränderungen für Teams. [Refugee children change day care facilities. Challenges and changes according to teams] *Frühe Bildung*, 7(4), 183–190.

McDermott, D. (2008). *Caring relationships among parents, children, schools and communities*. London: Sage.

Ministry of Education, Universities and Research (MIUR). (2014). Linee guida per l'accoglienza e l'integrazione degli alunni stranieri. [Guidelines for the reception and integration of foreign pupils] Available at: https://www.miur.gov.it/documents/20182/2223566/linee_guida_integrazione_alunni_stranieri.pdf/5e41fc48-3c68-2a17-ae75-1b5da6a55667?t=1564667201890#:~:text=Essa%20prevede%20che%20il%20numero,tra%20istituti%20dello%20stesso%20territorio (accessed 5.12.2022).

Murray, J., Swadener, B.B., & Smith, K. (2019). Epilogue: Imagining child rights futures. In J. Murray, B. Swadener, & K. Smith (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of young children's rights* (pp. 552–556). Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Pascal, C., & Bertram, T. (2012). Praxis, ethics and power: Developing praxeology as a participatory paradigm for early childhood research. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, *20*(4), 477–492.

Pascal, C., & Bertram, T. (2018). Effective early learning: A praxeological and participatory approach to evaluating and improving quality in early childhood education. *Revista da FAEEBA. Educação e Contemporaneidade*, *27*(51), 105–120.

Pascal, C., & Bertram, T. (2021). What do young children have to say? Recognising their voices, wisdom, agency and need for companionship during the COVID pandemic. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, *29*(1), 21–34.

Preiss, C. (2013). *Bildung, Betreuung und Erziehung in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft. Hintergründe und bildungspolitische Ansätze*. [Education, care and upbringing in the immigration society. Backgrounds and educational policy approaches] Available at: https://www.weiterbildungsinitiative.de/publikationen/detail/bildung-betreuung-und-erziehung-in-der-einwanderungsgesellschaft (accessed 5.12.2022).

Prout, A. (2000). Children's participation: Control and self-realisation in British late modernity. *Children & Society*, *14*(4), 304–315.

Reed, M., & Walker, R. (2015). *A critical companion to early childhood*. London: Sage.

Riedel, B., & Lueders, K. (2016). Flüchtlingskinder in der Kita – Zugänge gestalten, Kooperation stützen! [Refugee children in day care – Shaping access, promoting cooperation!] *Kinder- und Jugendschutz in Wissenschaft und Praxis*, *61*(4), 138–142.

Saxon State Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs. (2011). *Der Sächsisches Bildungsplan–ein Leitfaden für pädagogische fachkräfte in Krippen, Kindergärten und Horten sowie für Kindertagespflege*. [The Saxon educational plan – Guide for pedagogical staff in crèches, kindergartens and after-school care centers as well as for child day care] Weimar: Verlag das Netz.

Saxon State Ministry of Social Affairs and Consumer Protection. (2018). *Zuwanderung und Integration gut gestalten. Zusammenhalt leben Zuwanderungs- und Integrationskonzept II des Freistaats Sachsen*. [Immigration and integration shaping well. Living cohesion, immigration and integration concept II of the Free State of Saxony] https://publikationen.sachsen.de/bdb/artikel/31175

Scholz, A. (2021). Moderating uncertainty: The reception of refugee children in the German early childhood education and care sector. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *34*(4), 3665–3687.

Scollan, A., & Mc Neill, E. (2019). Discourses/2. Ireland: Listening to children's voices in Irish social work through cultural and organisational filters. In F. Farini & A. Scollan (Eds.), *Children's self-determination in the context of early childhood education and services: discourses policies and practices* (pp. 151–167). Amsterdam: Springer.

Silva, C., Bajzáth, A., Lemkow-Tovias, G., & Wastijn, B. (2020). Encouraging intercultural attitudes and practices in contemporary ECEC services. Insights from the research conducted in Italy, Spain and Hungary. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, *28*(1), 90–103.

Spensberger, F., & Taube, V. (2022). Diversität in der frühkindlichen Bildung, Betreuung und Erziehung. [Diversity in early childhood education and care] In D. Turani, C. Deybel, & S. Bader (Eds.), *Kita-Alltag im Fokus–Deutschland im internationalen Vergleich* (pp. 225–263). Weinheim: BeltzJuventa.

Stepick, A., & Stepick, C.D. (2010). The complexities and confusions of segmented assimilation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *33*(7), 1149–1167.

Sulzer, A. (2013). *Kulturelle Heterogenität in Kitas. Anforderungen an Fachkräfte*. [Cultural heterogeneity in daycare centers. Requirements for professionals] Available at: https://www.weiterbildungsinitiative.de/publikationen/detail/kulturelle-heterogenitaet-in-kitas-anforderungen-an-fachkraefte (accessed 5.12.2022).

Tovey, H. (2012). *Bringing the Fröbel approach to your early years practice*. London: David Fulton.

Chapter 8

Epistemic authority and hybrid integration in the view of language ideologies in classroom discourse

Erica Righard, Petra Svensson Källberg, Sara Amadasi, Shannon Damery, Krystyna Slany and Thomas Droessler

Introduction

This chapter is about language use in the view of agency and participation in multilingual classrooms. It responds to questions about how teachers relate to, make use of and strengthen children's production of knowledge, i.e. epistemic authority (Chapter 2), through language competences in the multilingual classroom, including in second language teaching. In line with Barwell (2009), a broad understanding of the multilingual classroom is applied; a classroom is considered to be multilingual if two or more languages are used overtly in the conduct of classroom activities. Classrooms are also considered to be multilingual if students *could* use two or more languages in the learning situation, even if this does not actually occur. As we will show, multilingualism in the classroom is not only manifest in varying ways, but also understood and related to by teachers in varying ways across our material, as the two quotes from Sweden below illustrate:

> The important thing is to always try to get the students to speak, that's the most important thing, because they speak (..) We have students with us who speak very little Swedish, they mainly speak, for example, Arabic. So that it is only inside the classroom that they meet Swedish. And then I get (..) I think it's my job to make sure they actually speak Swedish.
>
> (SWE_T4_F)

> It is not obvious that the teaching needs to be 100 percent in Swedish, but I usually say that "but let the student write in the language he can, and then he can translate it into Swedish. But let him show his knowledge regardless of language." Language should not be an obstacle, but it should be an asset at this school.
>
> (SWE_T6_F)

While the first quote illustrates how Swedish language is referred to as the baseline for classroom activities, the second exemplifies a more open attitude to how different languages can be used in classroom activities. This means that the first

DOI: 10.4324/9781003341772-8

example signals that the primary step is to learn the language of instruction, in this case Swedish; only when this is achieved can participation in other teaching and learning activities occur. Contrastingly, the second example provides a more flexible approach, where learning can occur in varying languages. In the research literature, these different approaches are discussed in terms of the monolingual vs. the bi-/multilingual ideology in education (e.g. Gogolin, 1997). While the monolingual norm typically produces a dichotomy between native and non-native speakers (Dewaele & Saıto, 2022; Firth & Wagner, 1997), in which non-native speakers from a deficit perspective are viewed as incompetent to the extent that they do not speak the language of instruction, the bi- or multilingual norm questions this. This native speakerism ideology (Holliday, 2018) not only affects the learners; it also dominates the teaching profession, not least with regard to language teaching, where the idea that the best teacher to teach a language is a native speaker dominates, the so-called "native speaker fallacy" (Phillipson, 1992), which has been extensively critiqued in the research literature (e.g. Canagarajah, 1999; Holliday, 2005; Holliday & Aboshiha, 2009; Llurda & Calvet-Terré, 2022). In fact, the critique of the native–non-native speaker dichotomy goes back to at least the late 1990s, when Firth and Wagner (1997) published their influential article about Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research (see Gardner, 2019 for a review of the field). Of relevance for this chapter is not only that native and non-native speakers' interactions are predefined as problematic, but also that diversity within each group is ignored. Importantly, aspects related to such identity categorisations of native and non-native speakers are assigned exogenously and might lack emic relevance, that is they may be irrelevant to the students categorised. In the view of this chapter, this is an important insight, since agency as choice of action (Chapter 2) is assumed to have a strong relation with personal identities and the opportunity to recognise and give space to hybrid forms of identity. Moreover, although for a long time neglected, language and cultural variation in the classroom also involves teachers with migration experiences (Kayi-Aydar, 2019), and, as our analysis will show, this has relevance for their roles as facilitators of dialogue in multilingual and multicultural classrooms.

This chapter contributes with reflections on how the use of different languages can constitute a resource for participation and learning in the multilingual classroom. Theoretically, the chapter builds on and extends the discussions in Chapter 2; we relate the theoretical framework of children's participation, epistemic authority and hybrid integration in the classroom (Chapter 2) to what in research is discussed in terms of the monolingual vs. the bi- or multilingual ideology in education. The chapter primarily draws on two sets of data, data collected through interviews with teachers and video-recordings in second language teaching classrooms in selected localities in Belgium, Germany, Italy, Poland and Sweden, but data collected through surveys are to a limited extent also included (Chapter 1). Although the empirical analysis draws on material collected in five countries, they are to be read as exemplifying tendencies within the overall material. No claims are made about differences between countries, rather similar variations are found within each country.

Below we first discuss the overall theoretical concepts of the CHILD-UP project (Chapter 2) in relation to the literature on monolingual and bi- and multilingual ideologies in education. Next, we present our methods of data collection and analysis, and following on this the analysis of our data, which is divided into three parts. The first part sets focus on the reproduction of the deficit perspective. Drawing on interviews with teachers, we present how teachers focus on students not only as "problems", but also as solutions to these. We aim to show how challenges in the multilingual classrooms tend to be disconnected from the teachers' role, and reduced to the characteristics of the children. In the second part of the analysis, we focus on how teachers narrate their strategies to overcome challenges in the classroom, as regards language diversity. While these strategies overall are rooted in the monolingual norm, there is some variation and multilingual norms are also present. The third part of the analysis draws on video-recordings and considers the dynamics of mono- and bi-/multilingual norms in second language teaching classrooms. It illustrates variations of facilitation of dialogue and shows how teachers might overcome evaluations around children's language competences in the second language teaching classroom, and instead create alternative spaces for dialogue and the promotion of children's agency. The chapter is concluded with a discussion about the implications of the results.

Agency, facilitation of dialogue, and epistemic authority in the view of language use

The educational system is permeated by a narrative of children as incompetent and in need of competence from teachers who deliver relevant knowledge; it is in view of this that it has been described as a model of development where development is "naturally occurring" and something that can be observed and regulated (Walkerdine, 1984). In the case of children with migration backgrounds, this narrative is amplified due to discourses of these children as non-native, and in lack of (school country) language and cultural competences (Gitz-Johansen, 2004). Overall, this hinders their potential exercise of agency (Chapter 2). In the CHILD-UP project, children's agency is defined as active participation based on children's self-defined choices of action, for instance children's personal trajectories of lived experiences (Holliday, 2013). This can enable children to gain epistemic authority, i.e. rights and obligations to access and produce knowledge. In the classroom, the traditional structure of epistemic authority is based on a hierarchical differentiation of roles between the teacher and students. While the teacher conveys knowledge to students, the latter must learn and will be evaluated on the basis of their learning outcomes. This traditional structure is reflected in classroom interactions, where the common and dominant form is based on the IRE (Initiate-Response-Evaluate) sequence (Baraldi, 2021; Margutti, 2010; Veronesi & Demo, 2020). In the IRE sequence, the actions of the student are generally confined to responses that are evaluated by the teacher.

Agency is not the outcome of individual ability but depends on interactions in the classroom as well as on the wider societal context. In the CHILD-UP

project, there is a strong and general attention to the possibility for the teacher to take on a central role in the enhancement of classroom dialogue (Chapter 2). Strengthening dialogue means to enrich interactions with a wider variety of personal narratives which, when interlaced with each other, amplifies expressions of diversity and, in turn, hybrid integration. There is a fundamental difference between facilitation of dialogue as a method to enhance learning and to enhance agency. While participatory approaches can be understood as strategies to improve learning of predefined learning goals, agency as choice of action is focussed on the amplification of complexity which is generated by children's personal narratives. Overall, participatory approaches tend to involve losses of teacher control of content, and several studies have reflected on the relation between teacher control of learning content and student participation (Emanuelsson & Sahlström, 2008; Pollard, 1982; Waterhouse, 1991). For instance, in a comparison of two mathematics classrooms, Emanuelsson and Sahlström (2008) point to a dilemma: when consistency of content is dominant, participation is scarified, and vice versa. In the view of these results, the authors discuss the role of the educational system to foster critical and engaged citizens, stressing the relevance of participatory approaches, even when it is at the cost of teacher control over learning contents. While Emanuelsson and Sahlström discuss student participation and (loss of) teacher control in relation to mathematics content, in our empirical material student participation and teacher (loss of) control regards participation more generally in the view of language and cultural diversity in the classroom and, in a longer perspective, options for hybrid integration. While our data, as much previous research, tend to reproduce a distinction between native and non-native students as a given dichotomy as well as discourses of (so-called) non-native children as in lack of (school country) language and cultural competences, the data also contain alternatives to this. These alternatives present teacher narratives of students' language variation as a resource instead of a deficit, and one which can enhance student agency as choice of action and possibly pave the way for hybrid integration. It is in relation to these empirical findings that we have found the literature on mono- and bi-/multilingual ideologies helpful.

The monolingual ideology in education has been critiqued for a long time. More than three decades ago, Jim Cummins introduced the notion of "deficit vision", to describe situations when a student's knowledge, both theoretical and experiential, encoded in other languages than the language of instruction is ignored or degraded. This focus on deficits entails that attention is focused on the student's limitations of the language of instruction and ability to learn through this specific language, instead of the language capabilities the student actually has and how these can be used for learning (Cummins, 1984, see also Firth & Wagner, 1997). In response to this critique, and to the view of (national) languages as separated entities in multilingual persons' linguistic repertoires, theories of *translanguaging* have entered educational research more recently (Creese & Blackledge, 2015; Otheguy, García, & Reid, 2015). From a translanguaging perspective, (national) languages as bounded entities are irrelevant, including first and second languages;

language systems are not separated in multilingual persons' linguistic repertoires. This approach aims to disrupt monolingual ideologies and language hierarchies; it views multilingualism as a resource in which language systems are synthesised. From a translanguaging perspective, all words, grammatical structures, idioms etcetera that are available to the speaker constitute the full range of the speaker's language repertoire (García & Wei, 2014), which is used dynamically and flexible in continuous flows that are restricted only by their interlocutors' language resources. Further, translanguaging as pedagogy, in which multilinguals' fluid use of their full ranges of language resources are valued, for example by encouraging multilinguals to use all available languages and by using semiotic resources that display several languages, has recently entered the educational arena. This contributes to the strengthening multilingual learners' agency and epistemic authority in the multilingual classroom.

Building on these insights, a large number of studies have shown how ideologies of monolingualism and multilingualism play out in a variety of contexts. For example, Chronaki, Planas and Svensson Källberg (2022) showed how certain dialogues in translanguaging practices have the potential to create "cracks" in the authoritative status of monolingual and monologic mathematics curricula and subvert epistemic violence and enable agency from "below". Altogether, this line of research points to a strong agreement as what concerns the role of students' home languages in the learning process: "bi/multilingualism facilitates the acquisition of additional languages and improves cognitive functioning in individuals" (De Angelis, 2011, p. 218). In this chapter, we aim take this discussion one step further, and consider both how it impacts on agency as choice of action and how it relates to teachers' actions of facilitation in classroom interaction.

Research methodology: data collection and analysis

The analysis presented in this chapter is based on interviews with teachers and video-recordings of class-room activities in five countries. Hence, it is based on a selection of all data collected within the CHILD-UP project. In total, our data consists of 105 interviews with teachers (10 individual interviews in Belgium, 8 individual and 14 group interviews in Germany, 43 individual interviews in Italy, 17 individual and 1 group interview in Poland, and 12 individual interviews in Sweden) and three video-recordings (one from Germany, one from Italy and one from Sweden). The teachers work at varying levels of education (ISCED 1–3). The collection and analysis of data followed the same procedure across all countries, but the sampling strategy varied depending on the local context. It was qualitative, resembling what is usually described as convenience sampling (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). Hence, in our analysis we make no claims of generalisation within or between countries. Instead, the contribution lies in understandings of varying dynamics and comparisons between teachers' different approaches to language use *per se* in classrooms. Nevertheless, and as indicated in the final

discussion, while we make no claims, the material points to some cross-country variation. This can be due to varying national and local educational and migration contexts, as well as to our sampling.

The interviews followed a semi-structured guide which was translated into national languages and adapted to local contexts by each country team of the CHILD-UP project, who also conducted the interviews and first analysis. The interview guide was broad in its scope, and in this chapter we analyse answers that depict various aspects of teachers' narratives about language use in the classroom. The interviews were conducted in 2020 and 2021, and severely impacted by restrictions implemented due to the ongoing coronavirus pandemic, though in varying ways in each country. Overall, with only a few exceptions, interviews were conducted via online communication platforms. Moreover, while the target number as stipulated in the project plan varied between the countries, in several countries the achieved number of interviews were below this. All interviews were recorded and transcribed. In the analysis, interview quotes were organised into a grid with fixed questions, and in each country a report was written responding to the same set of questions (the reports are unpublished working materials). All reports were written in English, and the analysis in this chapter, builds on the preliminary analyses presented in these.

Video-recording were collected in all country cases in 2021 and 2022. In most countries, it was possible to pursue recording in real classrooms, but in some cases it was managed via online communication platforms. The recordings were translated to English and a report with analysis of all video-recordings was written by the work-package leader. For this chapter, we have made a qualitative selection of three excerpts, aiming to illustrate how varying modes of language use in terms of monolingual and bi-/multilingual ideologies as manifested in second language teaching activities. This means that the analysis is qualitative, aiming at deeper understanding of the dynamics of these phenomena.

Teachers' perceptions of children as problem and solution for learning and classroom participation

The monolingual norm is strong throughout our empirical material. This is in line with previous research and unsurprising. In this section, we have a prime interest in how this is reproduced in teachers' narratives; nevertheless, it is noteworthy that this is also confirmed by data collected through questionnaires, which indicates that only just under 14% of teachers resort to children's native language while teaching and a little less than 9% use several languages in teaching. In the interviews with teachers, there is a widespread understanding of non-native children as deviant to sometimes implicit but overall strong norms about which languages to use and what cultures that are relevant frames of reference. It should also be noted that the material is not all unitary, but contains variations, as is attested to by one teacher interviewed in Belgium. Instead of forcing students to speak Dutch all the

time, she points to the role of the teacher. She felt that in her school the teachers "focus a lot on the individual, like the lack of knowledge of the students, and less on 'what can I do as a teacher?' But I think that's quite general for every school" (BE_T8_F).

Narratives of the "language barrier" refer to deficits of migrant children as regards proficiency in the language of instruction. Limitations on communicating in the language of instruction (or even a complete inability to do so) means that they cannot follow the teaching or communicate with the teacher and classmates. In the interviews, it is repeatedly claimed that the first need is for the children of migrant background (CMB) to learn the language of instruction as a means of communication and to build social relations.

> They lack the technical language and that is a big problem. A very big problem, because if they are eleven or twelve years old and can't understand a scientific text, even if it's very simple and they can't read it.
>
> (G_T4_F)

> Strengthening their language is an absolute need, language as a vehicle of coexistence, not so much to learn about literature and poetry, but precisely language as a means of establishing social relationships.
>
> (IT_T7_F)

Significant for these narratives is that the problem is defined with the child, not the classroom discourse, i.e. the inability of the teacher to involve all children in classroom interactions. In contexts where migrant children speak native languages from the same language family as the host country, and in effect learn the language of instruction at a fast pace, these children are problematised to a lesser extent compared to migrant children from other countries. In our study this is evident in the case of Poland, where children who speak languages from the Slavic language family (Russian, Ukrainian) learn Polish faster than students who, for instance, speak English. On the other hand, in the Swedish case, which was conducted in an immigrant-dense and poor neighbourhood, connected with negative discourses in politics and media, all children are lumped together as having problems with their language, independently on whether they have migrant background or not. While it is not clearly stated in the interview, the underlying meaning is that this depends on the characteristics of the residents of the school neighbourhood as an "immigrant neighbourhood".

> As for the boys and girls from Ukraine and the east of us, it's actually easy because these children learn Polish very quickly.
>
> (PL_T7_F)

> The largest challenge is that our students have a very weak language. As a large majority, the vast majority have a really weak language. And then we talk

> about all ethnic backgrounds. It does not really matter. I have students with an ethnic background other than Swedish who have better languages than those with a Swedish background, or ethnic Swedish background. So, it really does not matter. But I think it's a big, big problem that students come here and have such weak language.
>
> (SWE_4_F)

In view of the critique by Firth and Wagner (1997) discussed above, the hierarchical order between native and non-native students is blatant in our material; however, additional categorisations are also at play. In the first case the hierarchical order is tuned-in between different migrant groups, and in the second the non-native category is extended to all students, plausibly because the school is categorised as an "immigrant school". Nevertheless, in both cases the "problem" is defined with the children, though in varying ways.

Teachers often recognise that students, also with migrant background, aspire towards good achievements in school. However, it is just that the language barrier is in the way, and the only way to overcome this barrier is for the student to learn the language of instruction. Once the language barrier is overcome, they can achieve good results, as the following quotes illustrate.

> They are very motivated to study, but I think that Swedish itself is an obstacle, because they do not have the vocabulary and so on. But they do their best, I really think.
>
> (SWE_T5_F)

> As soon as the language problem is somehow solved, these children are very resourceful, willing to learn but, above all, highly skilful. Foreign children are often the most meta-cognitive children.
>
> (IT_T13_F)

> The sister of the girl from Turkey has already left school, she went to high school. She learned Polish very quickly. The brother overcame barriers very quickly, they participated in math, English competitions.
>
> (PL_T3_F)

It is in the view of this that we have entitled this section as teachers' perception of students as problems *and* solutions. That is, while the deficit perspective is strong, and problems are defined with the CMB, so are the solutions. It is the child that is expected to learn the language of instruction, and when this is done, he or she can participate in classroom interactions and learn the expected. Both the problematisation and the problem solution are disconnected from the teacher and his/her practice. We shall now turn to the role of the teacher as manifest in our material.

Multilingualism, student participation and the teachers' roles as facilitators of dialogue

In view of the fact that the deficit perspective is so dominant, it is relevant to investigate the role of teachers as facilitators of dialogue, here with a particular focus on language use. While our empirical material is dominated by the monolingual norm, it also contains examples of bi-/multilingual approaches and facilitative approaches which try to empower dialogue by overcoming any forms of evaluation on second language fluency. The presented analysis is not focused on how these different approaches are balanced in the material, but on the dynamics between these, and what we can draw from this in order to improve practice in the sense of strengthened student participation for all students.

An understanding of learning as occurring in sequential steps, in the sense that the language of instruction must first be mastered, before learning and/or agency can occur, emerged as a dominant narrative in the teacher interviews. This sequentiality subordinates migrant children's agency to second language learning, and is, in the view of translanguaging as a theoretical perspective (García & Wei, 2014), invalid and unjust, leading to inequality among students, both as regards learning as well as power hierarchies (Cummins, 1984). Overall, in the interviews it is claimed that the way to overcome the "language barrier" is that the migrant child/student learn to speak the language of instruction. The strategies to achieve this outcome varies, depending on various factors. On a general level, the quantitative survey showed that 42% of teachers declared to resort to language and cultural mediation and 26% to resources for learning native language. Moreover, according to the survey almost 57% of the teachers declared to have received training in multicultural issues. This stands in stark contrast to what comes out from the interviews. Instead, in the interviews, there is a narrative claiming that teachers do not have relevant training for this, and that while organisational support is varied it is also overall weak; indeed, sometimes it even encounters resistance. Hence, what strategies that are employed depends on the local context, but also on the creativity of the individual teacher. In practice, this can involve ad hoc translation interventions, as the quote below illustrates.

> We often have to deal with a situation [that the child does not speak Polish or Russian]. For example, we had a girl in the third grade, from Mongolia. She grew up to be a wonderful girl, but she could not speak Polish [or Russian]. The teachers who taught her used to run to me or to the English teacher [for help]. Now she speaks excellent Polish, writes excellent Polish, passed the exam very well, so it's possible.
>
> (PL_T5_M)

This strategy is enmeshed in a monolingual norm, in the sense that teachers try to find strategies that can "compensate" for the language deficit of students. It is not a strategy that has developed from insights valuing each students' full ranges of language

resources. Teachers who are multilingual themselves can use this as a resource in their teaching. This means that students can participate in, if not their native language, then at least a language they master. This participation impacts on learning and agency.

> An important factor which helps children adapt and function in the school environment is the flexibility of a teacher. I use active methods, communicate with them in Russian as well.
>
> (PL_T13_F)

Sometimes translation strategies actively involve multilingual students in the class as well. Teachers might, for instance, turn to the class and ask how a specific word or expression is said in Arabic or any other language present among the students. This is both a way to engage students' native language resources and connect these with the learning content, and a way to reach out to students who do not have enough proficiency in the language of instruction. Further, this is also a way of recognising and valuing the home languages of students, also when they do not master these well. Overall, this is a strategy to strengthen students' positions/identities as multilingual knowledgeable students and to foster epistemic authority in that sense. This strategy does also, at least to a certain extent, entail a loss of control for the teacher:

> I also had a student today who did not (…) it was a math task and no, we could not (…) I could not explain well enough to her. So, then I got a boy who speaks her language and yes, I thought it still seemed like she understood better when he explained to her. Or he just said the answer, I do not know.
>
> (SWE_T11_F)

However, the material also indicates that this sometimes becomes more challenging when students have reached high proficiency in the language of instruction. Once this is achieved, students might be reluctant to use their native language in class. It is unclear whether this is due to the fact that students, as one teacher expresses it, "really already think in the language of instruction" (G_T2_F) or whether native languages are not recognised as valuable and, in effect, students try to "erase" it:

> One of the most important things we don't do is to value the fact that they are bilingual because it is very much a part of them, something that, when they enter school, they erase. Even those who, in some way, maintain a partial knowledge or relative use of their language of origin, perhaps through their grandparents, are ashamed, they don't talk about it, they don't bring it up. It is just as if the school says, 'we will do our best to fill you with English, but please get the other languages out of here'.
>
> (IT_T13_F)

Working with concepts and expressions as well as students' narratives in several languages takes time. In the view of this, but not limited to this aspect, all translanguaging activities are a matter of allocated resources from the school management.

> I can think a bit that, as I said, language again rules because we need a little more time to go through concepts, different concepts, put them in different contexts and then work on. And sometimes it can actually be about very (??) simple concepts, that is, if you can now say so, which many may not know about. But I think it's also something that does not slow down, but it is also something that is important. And then it kind of takes maybe a little longer to get to where we should, because we have to take care of the foundational first, before we move on.
>
> (SWE_T5_F)

This openness towards using various languages in the classroom discourse is also present with regard to examinations. As in the case of classroom interactions, also here can it reflect both monolingual and bi-/multilingual ideology. For instance, in order to minimise the impact of low proficiency in the language of instruction, along with curricular problems, in one case described in an interview, CMB are given adapted examination sheets with, among other things, shorter and simpler instructions. Moreover, they are also given more time for the examination and are allowed to use bilingual dictionaries. Nevertheless, and as critiqued by the teacher in the quote below, the instructions on the worksheet are presented in the language of instruction.

> The regulations do not foresee it being that difficult (…) She will only have a dictionary, but it is a different vocabulary for example in math. And the examination sheet for foreigners is based on the readings that are supposed to be read in all European nations, but the African context is not taken into account. We would like the assistant to be present during the examination, but there is no chance for that. P. would have to have a certificate of special education, but she is a very intelligent girl, so there is not a chance for that.
>
> (PL_T7_F)

Hence, this strategy is more characterised by an attempt to compensate for students' deficits, than to value and make use of the resources and knowledge they actually possess, which may impact on their results and their future possibilities in education. Our material also contains examples that stretches further, and comes closer to a bi-/multilingual ideology. Here students are allowed to do exams in their native language, which are translated to the language of instruction in order for the teacher to do the evaluation. Naturally, this option depends on the resources in teaching, but not solely, it is also a matter of attitude towards language use in education.

> It is not obvious that the teaching needs to be one hundred percent in Swedish, but I usually say that 'but let the student write in the language he can, and then he can translate it into Swedish. But let him show his knowledge regardless of language'. Language should not be an obstacle, but it should be an asset at this school.
>
> (SWE_T6_F)

What comes out strongly from the interviews is the lack of training among teachers as well as the lack of relevant teaching materials and tools. Many teachers invent their own strategies in reaching out to non-native speakers. One strategy described in interviews, is to "spread out" the CMB in different classes, as the quote below illustrates. In this approach, the full ranges of language resources migrant children posit are not valued at all.

> I also had a class with five migrant pupils for a short time. These were children from Chechnya, one girl from Crimea, two children from Ukraine. It is very hard to work then. For what methods do we use? In group work, we try to make sure that there is a foreign child in each group, so that they learn something from a Polish child. But if there are many children, it is difficult.
>
> (PL_T12_F)

An alternative to placing the CMB in different groups could be to group the children who speak the same languages in the same group so that they potentially can use these for learning and agency. Such lack of teachers' training in how to act in the classroom is emphasised across our interviews. This means that much depends on the individual teacher, and his or her innovative approach. Further, there is also a lack of relevant teaching materials and tools:

> If they don't understand Polish, how can I get them interested in another language? What methods should I use? I needed more materials, experience, cultural knowledge, and help. We tried to learn to respond to the needs of all groups: so that our [Polish] children would not lose, and the new children would learn, too. Now, it's good that there is the Internet, you can look for things.
>
> (PL_T13_F)

While this is a dominating narrative across our material, it also contains examples of more structured methodologies; however, these strategies also tend to depend on the individual teacher. In this chapter we are interested in approaches that have potential to strengthen children's agency; these include the use of synonyms and visual aids. Online translation tools for translating certain words, but also discussions in class about the meaning of what the teachers call difficult words, are also mentioned. One teacher says that she reads the texts beforehand and picks out what she thinks are difficult words for the students. She then prepares herself for working with them in class. Another method mentioned is to work with wordlists, in which you have columns of the different languages presented in the class.

> I actually try to start a lot from translanguaging, so that many times when we create wordlists, I put a column with (…) where we have words in English or Swedish in one and then I add mother tongue and Swedish.
>
> (SWE_T2_F)

According to this teacher, some students reacted negatively when she started to add a column for the mother tongue: "In the beginning they reacted, thought 'what mother tongue, I do not know what (..) huh'. No, then it is nothing for *you*. But for some students, it is very crucial whether they have that column or not." Some teachers use the teaching and learning cycle (Gibbons, 2002) in their work with scaffolding. The cycle consists of four phases in which a specific text genre is (1) introduced, (2) modelled, (3) practiced together and, finally, (4) individually performed by the students.

> Then you end up with that they shall produce a whole text on their own in the last step. So, it's a way to scaffold. And really, you could say that it pretty much permeates my way. Because every time I do something, I show it like this, I become a model for the students.
>
> (SWE_T2_F)

> We work a lot with writing joint texts, we work a lot according to the circle model, that we start in the joint and then we break it down to finally be able to do it ourselves. So that, yes (…) And then there is very, very much visual support, very much
>
> (SWE_T11_F)

However, the scaffolding in line with the teaching and learning cycle per se does not recognise or make use of languages other than the language of instruction. Instead, scaffolding focuses on developing students' subject specific language and/or academic language of instruction. However, while students' native language resources are not encouraged and employed by scaffolding per se, sometimes teachers combine this with other methods to do so. In this way, students are enabled to engage with their different language resources when they feel it is appropriate; it stimulates them to connect the teaching content with their native languages.

As we will see in the next section, while these activities are meaningful examples of how the monolingual ideology overall is still dominant in schools, they also represent a potential context where personal expression is promoted and thus, the sequentiality of language learning as necessary to children's agency is contested and overcome.

Teachers' facilitation of participation in action

In this section, we present three excerpts from interactions that were video-recorded during second language learning activities in schools or refugee centres. They are selected to illustrate varying modes of language use in terms of monolingual and bi-/multilingual ideologies as manifested in second language teaching activities.

The first excerpt was collected in Italy during an activity with unaccompanied adolescents who do not yet speak Italian fluently (SPAC). Two migrant adolescents, coming from Albania, participated in this lesson. In this excerpt, the facilitator adopts

what can be defined as a very simplified classroom context mode. The classroom context mode is one of the prevalent modes of teaching second language (Walsh, 2011), which promotes clear linguistic expressions while empowering oral communicative fluidity. The classroom context mode is the most facilitative one. In the interactions, it presents short turns, minimal repairs, feedback on contents, questions about themes with the purpose to clarify certain aspects, and scaffolding. In the classroom context mode, children are encouraged to produce extended turns. However, in the context of second language classes the difference between facilitating dialogue as choice of actions and doing it to improve learning becomes evident through the teaching goals. The adoption of a monolingual approach represents the clearest proof that the main goal of the teacher is not children's agency, but language learning.

The first excerpt, although showing an interaction enabling the production of children's narratives through facilitation, it represents a monolingual approach, which therefore does not give children the possibility to choose what language to adopt in the interaction.

Excerpt 1

01 FACf: and what do you usually eat M2 for breakfast?
02 M2: for breakfast croissants, biscuits?
03 FACf: a? ((making the gesture with his finger)) a brioche?
04 M2: not one (0.2) [I don't know
05 FACf: [three? ((making the gesture with his fingers)) four? ((with gesture))
06 M2: (four) hhh
07 M1: I don't eat anything
08 FACf: you don't eat anything?
09 M1: ((shakes head))
10 M2: why [(??)
11 FACf: [but are you having a drink? Do you drink coffee?
12 M1: no coffee because I stay in bed
13 FACf: ah!
14 M1: only when there is SPAC I have coffee
15 FACf: well all days then
16 M1: when there is no SPAC I stay in bed
17 M2: (??)
18 FACf: when there is no SPAC you stay in bed
19 M1: yes and when there is SPAC (??)
20 FACf: so Monday Tuesday ok yesterday you didn't come, Tuesday [Wednesday Thursday ((counting on fingers))
21 M1: [yesterday (always wake up to go to CPIA[1])
22 FACf: fine but what time did you go to CPIA
23 M1: nine
24 FACf: nine? Eh then that is why you couldn't come
25 M2: (??)

26 M1: (??) CPIA twice
27 FACf: two two days a week no to CPIA? ((gesturing with his fingers))
28 M1: three days a week
29 FACf: three days
30 M1: yes
31 FACf: fine good
32 M2: CPIA two (…) you smart ((pointing at M1))
33 M1: hhh (what you say)
34 M2: (?) he goes CPIA two

In Excerpt 1, the conversation revolves around a question about the children's breakfast. In turn 1, the facilitator asks a simple question. In turns 3 and 5, after M2's hesitancy, the facilitator proposes possible answers with the help of gestures as a form of scaffolding. It is interesting how hand gestures are a preferred option over the request on behalf of the facilitator to resort to another language (Albanian in this case) that might help M2 to express himself. In turn 6, M2 answers with a laugh and M1 takes the floor (turn 7) to say that he does not eat anything for breakfast. In turn 8, the facilitator asks for confirmation, obtaining a non-verbal answer. The facilitator's next question overlaps with M2's question about the reasons for lack of breakfast. M1's answer is acknowledged by the facilitator with a manifestation of surprise and M1's clarification is implicitly contradicted by the facilitator. Turn 15 does not represent a way to evaluate M1's previous turn; rather it encourages him to go on, clarifying his point about going to the refugee centre to learn Italian as a second language (CPIA). In turn 18, the facilitator repeats what M1 has said and in turn 20 she again adopts body language to check the days in which days M1 was having or not having breakfast. In turn 19, M1 makes a clarification, which is not very audible, which is followed by the facilitator's encouragement of further clarification. M2 takes the floor again in turns 32 and 34 to comment on M1's presence in the refugee centre. Clearly, the lower fluency or confidence of M2 represented an element which prevented him to participate in the interaction.

Another example of the effect of the monolingual approach – and a glimpse of the possible and positive ones of a multilingual approach – is visible in Excerpt 2, which was collected during a lesson in an introductory class in Sweden. The nine participating students are all newly arrived in Sweden with limited Swedish language skills. They have different language and cultural backgrounds; six of them are boys and three are girls. The students' home languages are Bengali, Urdu, Dari, Serbian, Arabic, Albanian and English (since the student had lived and gone to school in London; however, her home language is also Arabic). Two of the boys and one of the girls are fluent in English. The female teacher has Swedish as her mother tongue and communicates in mainly Swedish with the students. However, she also uses English and body gestures in her communication.

The theme of the lesson how to talk about weather and climate conditions, exemplified by, among others, floods in India. The lesson built on the "IPA-method"

(Individually–Pairs–All, authors' translation from Swedish *EPA, Enskilt–Par–Alla*). The students first worked on finding words (in Swedish) in pictures that related to the theme individually (I), thereafter sharing the identified words in groups (P), which was followed up by a whole-class conversation (A) about the words. One group consisted of the three girls (group 1); one group consisted of the two boys who were fluent in English and another boy (group 2); and a third group consisted of three boys (group 3). It means that the students in the groups did not share home language with everyone in the group. Here we provide an English translation of the original interaction in Swedish. The words in bold were originally pronounced in English.

Excerpt 2

01 Tf:	this, you talked about it ((points to one of the pictures)), what is this? What do you do on it? Someone was asking if it is a rocket. But it is not
02 M1:	oil
03 M2:	**ship**
04 M1:	oil rig
05 TF:	oil rig it says in the article. You can also call it oil platform ((writes the word on whiteboard next to the picture))
06 TF:	what do you do here? Do you know M2? ((points at M2))
07 M2:	I know but I cannot explain it in Swedish
08 Tf:	no, M2 eh sorry, M1 ((points at M1)). What can you do? What do you do?
09 M1:	**in English or Swedish?**
10 Tf:	**whatever you want**
11 M1:	**oil rig, which is the**
12 M3:	oil drill
13 Tf:	what do you do down here? ((points at the picture))
14 M1:	**ah, oil**
15 Tf:	oil
16 M1:	oil
17 Tf:	oil
18 M1:	oil
19 Tf:	oil, you want oil so they
20 M3:	drill
21 Tf:	drills
22 M1:	hm
23 Tf:	so they drill, rmmm ((sounds like a drill)), down there, very far down and then they can take up oil
24 M1:	mm
25 M3:	**nice**
26 Tf:	what will they do with the oil?
27 M3:	M2
28 M1:	**car use, use in cars**

29 Tf: we use it in the cars
30 M3: bus
31 Tf: yes, bus
32 M1: **and I just**
33 M4: we sell it
34 Tf: we sell, yes
35 F1: boat
36 Tf: boat, yes you must have
37 M3: **airplane**
38 Tf: oil for many things
39 M?: **cannot hear**
40 Tf: many things need oil

In this interaction the teacher applies a materials mode (Walsh, 2011), which implies the use of materials to display linguistic practices. This is done through the promotion of answers about the materials, which will be then checked, clarified and evaluated. This mode therefore grounds on the IRE scheme, which implies focused questions, feedback on linguistic forms and scaffolding.

Excerpt 2 opens with a question from the teacher asked to start an evaluation of language skills of children. In turns two, three and four there are several answers, two of them in Swedish and one in English. In turn 6, there is another question from the teacher, to which M2 would be able to answer, but, he specifies, not in Swedish. Interestingly, his implicit request to reply in another language, which is not Swedish, is denied by the teacher. The participation of M2 is compromised and he will not intervene any longer in this excerpt.

As in Excerpt 1, the choice of the teacher not to invite M2 to share it in his mother tongue has therefore a negative effect on his participation. Even M3's invitation to M2 to answer, in turn 27, does not lead to any intervention from M2. However, when M1 (turn nine) asks whether he must reply in English or in Swedish, the teacher gives him the opportunity to choose. This opens the possibility for M1's contributions, both in English (turns 11, 14, 28, 32) and in Swedish (turns 37, 25), even if in Swedish he just repeats the word "*olja*". Following M1, M3 also intervenes by speaking in English (turns 25, 37). Although, the teacher adopts a directive form of facilitation (Chapter 6), oriented to language skills teaching and evaluation – without supporting dialogue and children's personal expression – it is interesting to notice how, when she leaves open the possibility for children to choose what language to adopt, this promotes their participation. However, this choice is made possible only when the alternative option is represented by a dominant language, still thus overlooking the possibility to resort to less widespread languages.

Excerpt 3 was recorded in Germany, with the participation of three ISCED2 girls with migrant background in lower secondary school. The three girls sit side by side, and the teacher, seated in front of them, is talking about a book about a specific wish of an Arabic girl (Wadjda), thus starting with a material mode (Walsh, 2011).

In turn 1, after referring to Wadjda's wish, the teacher introduces the classroom context mode, by asking the children if having a bicycle is their biggest wish. F2 and F3 reply that it is not. However, these answers set the conditions for the teacher's new question about wishing a bicycle. In turn 5, F2 refers implicitly to the societal conditions for her reply, which the teacher tries to explore through a new question, in turn 6. In turns 7 and 9, F2 explains what she was referring to, supported by the teacher's active listening in turns 8 and 10, where she provides minimal feedback, repeats F2's answer and asks a more specific question about the content of the book. Here the teacher turns to a material mode and this reveals that her last questions intended to check children's learning. In turn 12, the teacher's minimal feedback enables F3's articulated answer. In these turns, however, the teacher evaluates the children's language skills, only proposing her view about the story of the book.

Excerpt 3

01	Tf:	well (.) and (.), it should not necessarily be about Wadjda's bicycle ((stands up and leaves the scene toward the chalkboard)) and because of this I said at the beginning (.) A bicycle, my biggest wish. (.) ((teacher comes back and takes her place)) You all have a bicycle yet. You probably need a new one. Is a bicycle your biggest wish? ((referring to the biggest wish of the protagonist figure of the book))
02	F2:	no
03	F3:	no
04	Tf:	why could be a bicycle a biggest wish?
05	F2:	because, in some countries it is not so easy to get a bicycle?
06	Tf:	because there aren't bicycles or why?
07	F2:	no. (?) it is too expensive, isn't it-
08	Tf:	mhm
09	F2:	there is no money for that
10	Tf:	ok, there is no money (..) Well, you know something from the book, right? What is her problem?
11	F3:	well, first she was not allowed, so girls in her country were not allowed to have a bicycle ((teacher nods frequently))
12	Tf:	mhm
13	F3:	however, she did not care. She also had less money (.) She had to- well, work for that. For the bicycle
14	Tf:	it still was her biggest wish, wasn't it. She managed to get it in a way ((Stands up from her chair)) Ok

Conclusion

The overall aim of the chapter is to contribute to the discussion on how teachers' facilitation of classroom activities can be understood in view of mono- and bi-/

multilingual norms. For this purpose, the chapter connects literature on children's agency as choice of action and hybrid integration (Chapter 2), with literature on monolingual and bi-/multilingual ideologies in education. The analysis draws on two sets of data: interviews with teachers and video-recordings of classroom activities. The analysis of interviews presents what problems and solutions teachers experience concerning teaching and learning in the multilingual classroom, and how their role as facilitator of dialogue and promoter of agency and hybrid integration in the classroom can be understood. The analysis of video-recordings of classroom activities, describes teachers' varying modes of facilitation of dialogue, and how these in different ways relate to language competences present in the classroom and function to promote or hinder hybrid integration. In the following, we shall expand on the results of the analysis and discuss its implications in a wider perspective.

The analysis shows how teachers relate to multilingualism as deficits, for example in narratives of migrant students' "language barriers" as regards proficiency in the language of instruction as a problem. Further, it shows how teachers' perceptions of challenges in the multilingual classrooms tend to be disconnected from the role of the teacher and reduced to the characteristics of the children. That is, putting both the problem and the solution with the migrant children. More specifically, the analysis shows how teachers perceive an adoption of the language of instruction as a necessary precondition to learning and exercise of agency. In contrast to this, the analysis also shows how teachers provide contrasting narratives in that they regard all languages as resources and central to children's epistemic authority, for example when letting the migrant students take tests in their native languages and when jointly working with wordlists and concepts in different languages in the classroom. This can be seen as traces of translanguaging practices which have the potential to create "cracks" in the monolingual norm (Chronaki et al., 2022) as well as to strengthen agency and promote hybrid integration beyond language learning. While we see the same tendency across all of our cases, it also gives some kind of a hint that the extent to which such "cracks" can be found is not evenly distributed in our material. Nevertheless, whether this is due to national and local variation in the educational setting or to migration experiences, and to what extent it is due to our sampling, is not possible to estimate in a solid way.

Further, the analysis also shows how teachers must face and manage multilingualism individually without institutional support. This lack of institutional support structures must be understood in addition to the lack of control that teachers experience in relation to strengthen student agency, not least in the multilingual classroom. Data on interaction in second language learning classroom illustrates how ambivalences underlined in the interviews with teachers are manifest in classroom activities. The monolingual ideology permeates the educational environments of the European countries involved in the CHILD-UP project. This is not least obvious through all video-recorded activities within the project, where only a few examples of interactions involved different languages. Our field research

shows that teachers and facilitators rarely encourage students to use different languages to express their views or ideas beyond the language of instruction. In addition, when they occasionally do, it was typically in a dominant language such as English instead of students' home languages. However, in our data, there are glimpses of "cracks" where spaces for alternative practices can be developed. This is evident in several of the quotes included, but also in the second excerpt of video-recorded activities, where a weak acceptance of another language (English) is manifest, and in the third excerpt, where facilitation enables children's knowledge co-construction and thus the expression of different views. In our interpretation, such practices strengthen students' participation in classroom interactions. However, and importantly, this connects to another aspect highlighted in the interviews and the interactions: the monolingual ideology does not only manifest on practices and narratives which devalue multi-language competencies, feeding the dichotomy between native and non-native pupils. It also fosters narratives and practices which define a hierarchy between languages, in which the use of some languages is considered more appropriate than others. Consequently, students' multilingual resources are not recognised and valued, and their possibilities of acting in an agentic manner and having epistemic authority are hindered. This calls for further research and development in practice on how teachers' facilitation of participation and dialogue can include multilingual approaches to enable agency for all students. Further, the chapter theoretically argues that children's language competences should be integral to understandings of their epistemic authority. Empirically, it shows that while this is not a widespread understanding among our research participants, there are examples of teachers who provide practical insights to the meaning of this. This begs for further research into how such strategies can be developed and transferred across classrooms and localities, with the purpose to strengthen all children's epistemic authority in education.

Note

1 SPAC and CPIA are two different services which provide Italian language courses to people with a migration background and unaccompanied minors who have different fluency levels in Italian.

References

Baraldi, C. (2021). Structural variations of classroom interaction: Implications for the education system. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/09620214.2021.1902371

Barwell, R. (2009). Multilingualism in mathematics classrooms: An introductory discussion. In R. Barwell (Ed.), *Multilingualism in mathematics classrooms. Global perspectives* (pp. 1–13). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism*. London: Oxford University Press.

Chronaki, A., Planas, N., & Svensson Källberg, P. (2022). Onto/epistemic violence and dialogicality in translanguaging practices across multilingual mathematics classrooms. *Teachers College Record*, *124*(5), 108–126.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*, sixth ed. London: Routledge.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *35*, 20–35.

Cummins, J. (1984). Wanted: A theoretical framework for relating language proficiency to academic achievement among bilingual students. In C. Rivera (Ed.), *Multilingual matters 10: Language proficiency and academic achievement* (pp. 2–19). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

De Angelis, G. (2011). Teachers' beliefs about the role of prior language knowledge in learning and how these influence teaching practices. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *8*(3), 216–234.

Dewaele, J.M., & Saito, K. (2022). Positive psychology can help overcome the pernicious native speaker ideology. *The European Educational Researcher*, *5*(2), 225–234.

Emanuelsson, J., & Sahlström, F. (2008). The price of participation: Teacher control versus student participation in classroom interaction. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *52(2)*, 205–223.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, *81*(3), 285–300.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Gardner, R. (2019). Classroom interaction research: The state of the art. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *52*(3), 212–226.

Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Gitz-Johansen, T. (2004). The incompetent child: representations of ethnic minority children. In H. Brembeck, B. Johansson, & J. Kampmann (Eds.), *Beyond the competent child. Exploring contemporary childhoods in the Nordic welfare societies* (pp. 199–228). Roskilde: Roskilde University Press.

Gogolin, I. (1997). The "monolingual habitus" as the common feature in teaching in the language of the majority in different countries. *Per Linguam*, *13*(2), 38–49.

Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holliday, A. (2013). *Understanding intercultural communication: Negotiating a grammar of culture*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Holliday, A. (2018). Native-speakerism. In J.I. Liontas (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching, Volume. 1*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Holliday, A., & Aboshiha, P. (2009). The denial of ideology in perceptions of 'nonnative speaker' teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, *43*(4), 669–689.

Kayi-Aydar, H. (2019). Language teacher identity. *Language Teaching*, *52*(3), 281–295.

Llurda, E., & Calvet-Terré, J. (2022). Native-speakerism and non-native second language teachers: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444822000271

Margutti, P. (2010). On designedly incomplete utterances: What counts as learning for teachers and students in primary classroom interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *43*(4), 315–345.

Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *6*(3), 281–307.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Veronesi, D., & Demo, H. (2020). Whole-class interaction and inclusion in primary school: A case study. *Italian Journal of Special Education for Inclusion*, *8*(1), 274–290.

Walkerdine, V. (1984). Developmental psychology and the child centred pedagogy. In J. Henriques, W. Hollway, C. Urwin, C. Venn, & V. Walkerdine (Eds.), *Changing the subject: Psychology, social regulation and subjectivity* (pp. 148–198). Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Chapter 9

Language mediation in schools

The case of parent–teacher meetings

Claudio Baraldi and Laura Gavioli

Introduction

In Chapter 8, it was shown that communication obstacles due to low language competence of migrant families appear as more relevant in parent–teacher interaction than in teacher–pupil interaction. CHILD-UP surveys in fact reveal criticalities. More specifically, it is teachers, more than parents, who look at communication with parents critically: only 56.6% of teachers against 83.5% of parents declare that parent–teacher communication works well. However, parents more than teachers attribute the obstacles to language skills: 34.2% of migrant parents against 21.9% of teachers in fact mention language skills as a problem in the survey. Despite language skills not being mentioned explicitly (or not so frequently), the audio-recorded interviews with the teachers show that they perceive the importance of communicating with parents accurately and acknowledge the necessity of coping with language obstacles as part of parent–teacher communication improvement.

Parents who have little or no competence in the local language are supported by interpreting services, provided by either professional interpreters or cultural mediators. The interpreting activity provided by such personnel is then crucial for the achievement of school–family contacts and relationships. The literature on interpreting in the public services (see e.g. Mason, 2006; Wadensjö, 1998), including studies of parent–teacher conferences (see e.g. Davitti, 2015), has long shown a non-reductive idea of the translation activity that takes place in the interaction. Far from simply reproducing text in another language, renditions are contextualised in communication considering participation opportunities, multiple perspectives and explicitation of assumptions. Interpreter-mediated interaction is thus a situated activity, making sense of the participants' contribution in relation to each other and to the interactional, institutional context in which the interaction takes place.

This chapter provides an analysis of interpreter-mediated parent–teacher interactions in Italian schools, the only ones in the CHILD-UP project in which language-mediated parent–teacher interactions were collected. There were some reasons for this unique collection. The first is that in most of the countries involved in the project, the pandemic made it impossible to collect the recordings. In other countries, such as, for instance, the UK, recording was possible, but the migrant families were proficient enough in the local language to communicate with the

DOI: 10.4324/9781003341772-9

teachers without the help of a language-service. A third reason is that, in Italy, only 25.5% of the teachers consider that teacher–parent communication works well, the lowest percentage among the seven European countries involved in the survey; even though the criticalities may not concern language alone, language mediators are called to support parent–teacher talks, possibly with the intent of mitigating at least part of the problem (the linguistic/cultural one). A fourth reason may be that, differently from other countries, in Italy, lack of language skills is more frequently observed by teachers (26.1%) than by migrant parents (22.6%), a figure suggesting that the schools may have institutionally implemented interpreting services, which are consequently used more frequently. Even if Italy was the only case, an additional reason for not discarding the data is that they provide evidence of interpreting in a scarcely explored public setting, that of schools. These reasons provide the background to understanding the conditions in which interpreting service works in Italian schools and also explaining why the Italian case is worth inquiring.

Our chapter is organised as follows. The second section, following this introduction, discusses studies in interpreter-mediated interaction, with a focus on the school setting. The third section describes our research data and methodology. Our analysis is then provided in two different sections describing interpreting sequences occurring in our mediated interactions: (a) dealing with teachers' expressed concerns and (b) rendering the different types of patients' reactions. Conclusions are drawn about teachers, mediators and migrant parents' participation in mediated parent–teacher meetings.

Interpreter-mediated interaction as a form of language mediation

Language mediation and agency distribution

Wadensjö (1998) has highlighted the importance of considering interpreting in the public services as an interactional achievement, combining two conceptually distinctive activities: translating the participant's contributions and coordinating their interaction. Renditions may modify the text of previous utterances to meet interactional purposes and interpreting can also be provided by asking for clarification or repeat, explicating the context behind utterances, inviting participants to start or continue talking. In other words, coordination makes sense not only of rendered contents but also of the expected participants' contributions to the conversation. In order to coordinate the interaction, interpreters exercise agency, in e.g. selecting the contents and adjusting them in ways as to make them relevant for the interlocutors' participation (Baraldi, 2019).

Some studies have highlighted the ways in which interpreters' agency can be enacted through the use of language. For instance, interpreters exercise agency in interpreting and rendering the linguistic items by making their meaning explicit for the achievement of community services, thus facilitating access to service seekers (Leanza et al., 2014). Interpreters can also participate in side conversations, adding details, simplifying jargon, and soliciting migrants' narrations of their

lifeworld (Penn & Watermeyer, 2012). In general, interpreters' exercise of agency has been observed in relation to the possibility of empowering the migrants' actions (Angelelli, 2004, 2012; Inghilleri, 2005; Mason & Ren, 2012; Tipton, 2008a). When analysed in the interaction, however, it is clear that interpreters' agency is not an interpreter's sole initiative. To be such, exercise of agency needs to be recognised and legitimised by both the institutional providers and the service seekers attributing interpreters the rights and responsibility to "interpret" what the participants say in the *hic et nunc* of the specific situation. In Chapter 2 of this volume, this idea has been referred to as "epistemic authority" (Heritage, 2013, see Baraldi & Gavioli, 2021; Gavioli, 2015 for a discussion of epistemic authority in interpreter-mediated interaction).

Interpreters' agency is exercised through both renditions and so-called "non-renditions", two concepts put forward by Wadensjö (1998) to distinguish between what can be considered translation of others' contributions and what can instead be considered interpreters' own contributions, e.g. when asking for clarification or repeat. Renditions provide the gist of what has been said by one participant, adapting or re-contextualising it for another participant (Baker, 2006). Non-renditions are produced in monolingual sequences with either institutional providers or migrants, and with the aim of clarifying ambiguous, complicated, or incomplete utterances. Interpreters' agency can facilitate interlocutors' participation both through monolingual, dyadic sequences in which opportunities are given to clarify one participant's point of view, and through renditions in which contextual information is provided and the goals of the encounter made explicit. Of course, the interpreters' exercise of agency may not always have a facilitative effect in communication (Tipton, 2008b) and accidents may occur, sometimes depending on the skills of the language professionals involved. We will not, however, get into this problem in this chapter (hindering aspects of interpreters' exercise of agency are discussed in e.g. Baraldi & Gavioli, 2021).

Interpreter-mediated interaction as language mediation in educational settings

Interpreter-mediated interaction has been examined in different settings, but very few studies have focused on educational contexts. Those who did concentrated mainly on teacher–student communication, particularly in contexts in which sign-language interpreting is used (see e.g. Winston, 2004; Slettebakk Berge, 2023). Studies on parent–teacher interaction are dealt with in Tipton and Furmanek (2016), who note the agentic participation of interpreters. In their discussion, interpreters are shown as displaying agency, as being involved participants with social responsibility associated with the intention of supporting pupils' learning.

The first study to delve into conversational data collected in school settings was Davitti's much-quoted paper published in 2013, analysing conversations involving teachers, language mediators and mothers in Italy and England. Her research highlighted that, through their renditions, the mediators oriented to upgrade the

teachers' assessments, by adding positive discoursive elements about the children's performance. Such upgrading, Davitti noted, made the assessments acceptable for the mothers and enhanced their agreement, while refraining them from commenting on or challenging the evaluations, and from responding to teachers' recommendations. A later study by Davitti published in 2015 provided a more nuanced analysis, including the possibility of positive effects of mediators' upgraded renditions on mothers' active participation.

A further study by Vargas-Urpi and Arumí Ribas (2014) analysed a single interpreter-mediated interaction between a Spanish teacher and a Chinese mother. They showed that, in this interaction, the mediator uses both renditions and non-renditions, and quasi-pedagogical intentions emerge from expanded renditions in particular. Vargas-Urpi (2015, 2017) also showed that mediators' actions tend to exclude the parents, either by substituting their possible answers or by engaging in dyadic sequences with the teachers. Another result of this study was that the mediator's modified renditions of the teacher's utterances show an orientation to partially adapting teachers' contributions to what the mediator expects the migrant mothers can actually understand.

The few available studies on parent–teacher interaction thus show an orientation of the mediators to interpret the pedagogic activity with both negative and positive outcomes. While on the one hand, upgrading the teachers' assessments might acknowledge the family effort in helping in their children education, on the other it may reduce parents' active participation in doing more. Moreover, while adaptation of assessments to the parents' expectations might improve their understanding, on the other it may attribute parents not enough competence in dealing with the teachers in the educational matters regarding their children.

In this chapter, we look at the mediators' translating and coordinating activity in dealing with teachers' concerns. We analyse the display of the mediators' exercise of agency in the challenging attempt to give migrant parents a chance to participate in meetings with the teachers. Parents' reactions show that their involvement is in fact achieved and that their reactions can be convergent or non-convergent with the teachers' concern. Non-convergent reactions interestingly include the parents' perspective on their children's home life, a perspective, normally not taken in the expression of teachers' concerns and which may or may not be taken up by the teachers in subsequent talk.

Data and method

All the data were recorded in Italian schools and consist in end-of-term parent–teacher, interpreter-mediated meetings illustrating the children's reports and discussing their general performance at school. In the CHILD-UP project a collection of 18 encounters was planned, but in fact we ended up with more, as we had the opportunity to record meetings taking place remotely during the pandemic. The total collection thus gave us 28 recordings: 25 in primary schools, 2 in nursery schools and 1 in a secondary school. In order to avoid

interference due to different types of schools, we focus on the largest sample from primary schools only.

The 25 encounters include 10 language-cultural mediators providing interpreting service, 39 teachers (11 interactions with 1 teacher; 14 with 2 or 3 teachers) and 25 parents, one per encounter, mothers or fathers. The languages involved, besides Italian, are 6: Albanian (2), Arabic (3), Chinese (10), Punjabi (1), Twi (4), Urdu (5). The total recorded time is 7h 11' and the average duration of each encounter is 18'. The encounters are either in person (14) or online (11). The children participate in 14 encounters. Space in this study is not enough as to discuss child participation in parent-teacher meetings, but some preliminary findings can be seen in Baraldi and Ceccoli (2023).

The encounters were collected with audio-digital instruments and then transcribed with the ELAN annotation tool to allow the transcript link to the audio. The transcriptions were carried out using the Jeffersonian set of symbols (see Hepburn & Bolden, 2013). Dealing with transcriptions in the different languages was not easy and involved both researchers and mediators working side by side. Final transcripts include: a line in the parents' language (using the appropriate alphabet), a transliteration in the Latin alphabet to allow for representation of overlapping talk, an almost word-by-word translation in Italian and lines in the teachers' language, Italian. Comments by the mediators were sometimes included to explain some relevant contextual features. The data shown in this chapter provide simplified transcripts, including one line per speaker plus their translations in English. Some comments between double brackets are added to facilitate understanding of "contextualising events" such as laughter or implicit reference to the participants.

The data show that teachers' concerns are recurrent and demanding for the mediators in that school–family collaboration is sometimes heavily challenged. The discussed concerns mainly regard the pupils' skills in the Italian language and the necessity that families give their children opportunities to learn Italian, but other skills or child behaviour may also raise concern. Teachers' concerns are reacted to by the parents in different ways and parents sometimes take initiative, providing additional explanations about their points of view, asking questions or objecting to the teachers' concerns.

Such complex interplay is rendered by the mediators, who coordinate the contributions both exercising their agency and allowing for exercise of agency by the other interlocutors. Renditions of teachers' talk may be split in parts to facilitate their understanding by the parents, or may involve expansions and explications contextualising the concerns or making suggestions clear. Renditions of parents' talk seem instead to involve less re-contextualisation and modification and offer the family perspective quite openly. It is interesting to note though that when school–family collaboration is considered good enough, thus raising appreciation rather than concern on the parts of the teachers, little or no mediators' expansions are given, and indeed we may have direct communication in Italian, suggesting that appreciation can be understood, and possibly reacted to more easily, by migrant parents.

Mediators' renditions of teachers' concerns for family support

Mediators' renditions of teachers' concerns are complex and may include explications and questions to the parents. We have identified two main types of renditions belonging to two categories identified by Wadensjö (1998), expanded and multi-part. Both the expansion and the splitting in parts, however, show specific characteristics, which are presented below in their basic forms. Expanded renditions explicate the teacher's concern and add either a good auspice or (practical) suggestions; multi-part renditions explain the teachers' concerns over the child as a sort of preliminary context from which some consequences can be derived.

Expanded renditions and their coda

Expanded renditions involve explication of teacher's concerns plus an addition of content on the part of the mediator. Such addition is structured as a "coda" in the mediated stretch of talk, basically covering the final part of it and contains either a good auspice or practical suggestions to cope with the teachers' expressed concern. Let us see one example of the first case and two of the second.

In Excerpt 1, the teacher's concern is that, by working solely on his own, the child does his homework in a hurry, with not enough concentration. She suggests that the mother can help him at least with maths that, being based on numbers, requires little knowledge of Italian. The mediator's rendition in turn 36 expands the teacher's appreciation of the child working on his own, renders the suggestion that the mother can help a bit and concludes by expressing good wishes: "he will get better marks inshallah".

Excerpt 1 (Arabic) [TEAf – teacher female; MEDf – mediator female]

035 TEAf: no va bene ma anche in- per matematica si vede ovviamente che lavora da solo ma non è un problema quello (.) però dovrebbe farli un pochino più (.) lentamente: (.) sono dei calcoli (.) sono delle parti di di memorizzazione (.) si deve concentrare un po' di più (0.6) magari la mamma comunque sulla matematica un pochino lo può aiuta:re perché alla fine (.) non è come l'italiano dove (.) c'è un problema di lingua (.) sì sono (.) delle operazioni in colonna sono le tabelline (.) potrebbe un pochino:: (.) insomma seguirlo perché so che lavorare da solo può essere un pochino più difficile (.) però lui in classe segue (.) eh:: (.) comunque:: (.) è:: bravo
well that's fine and even in mathematics one can see that he works alone that's not a problem (.) but he should do them ((the exercises)) a bit (.) more slowly (.) it's calculation (.) it's exercises on retention (.) he needs to concentrate a bit more (0.6) maybe mum in some way on maths can he:lp him a bit because after all (.) it's not like Italian in which (.) there's

a language problem (.) yes, it's (.) arithmetic operations it's times table charts (.) she could a bit:: (.) I mean she could keep an eye on him because I know that working alone can be a bit harder (.) but in class he follows (.) eh:: (.) in any ca::se (.) he's:: good

036 MEDf: hena el ustada bitae irriyadiaat bitul lak hata hia min khilal ettamarin arfa anaho byaemal altamarin liwahdu bas da mush mushkil(.) bitul lak ashan hua kuis (1.0) bi mh mh (.)raki arf (.) alit' lik bravo (.)bas hia bitul lak enek mumkin tisadih fi lbiyt (.) alashan erriyadiaat hua eibara an 'arqam (.) yaeni mumkin tisadih (.)u mumkin hataa (1.0) y yigyb 'ahsan (.) in sha' allah
here the maths teacher is telling you that she too knows through his exercises that he works alone but this is not a problem (.) she is telling you because he's going well (1.0) mh mh (.) you know that - (.) she said he's good (.) but she is also telling you that you can he::lp him at home (.) because maths is made of numbers (.) this means you can help him (.) and it is also possible that that he takes better marks (.) inshallah

As can be seen in the example above, the mediator's rendition is elaborated beyond her expression of good wishes, but good wishes are one way in which mediators expand their renditions of teachers' concerns, highlighting possible solutions and their positive consequences for the child.

The following two examples show mediators' explicated renditions, adding practical suggestions to the parents. In Excerpt 2, the teacher's concern regards the possibility that the child does not have enough opportunity to use the Italian language. In turn 125, she addresses the child asking if she goes to the cinema with a friend (S, in the transcript). The (implicit) suggestion is explicated by the mediator in her rendition in turn 125, in which she explicitly invites the mother to let her child go to the cinema more often, as films are all in Italian:

Excerpt 2 (Chinese 1) [TEAf – teacher female; MEDf – mediator female]

125 TEAf: eh eh con la S andate al cinema? Andate::
eh eh with S do you go to the cinema? You go::

126 MEDf: 让她们去看电影啊，反正意大利都是意大利文电影嘛，多让她们去那些-
let them go to the cinema, films are all in Italian language, let her go frequently-

While Excerpt 2 gives a rather simple example of the type of change that is involved in this expanded rendition (basically an explicated suggestion), Excerpt 3 gives a more complex picture. Here, after a long comment in which she praises the child, particularly for her performance in maths, the teacher expresses concern that the girl's competence in Italian may stop her from improving adequately. In turn 52 below, the conclusion of the teacher's comment is an explicit praise.

Excerpt 3 (Twi) [TEAf – teacher female; MEDf – mediator female; PARf – parent female]

052 TEAf: m:h la porto ad esempio perché è una bambina che .hh con una grande: volontà: e una grande attenzione (.) #è::# mh è un modello positivo per tutti
m:h I take her as a model student because she is a girl who .hh with strong: will: and great dedication (.)#she is:::# mh a positive model for all

053 MEDf: mh 3nti w) no wa hunu se w) no w)n y3 italian teacher (.) w)no w) y3 maths teacher (.) 3nti no ne subet no di3 w) se even though kasa no k)raa (.) wa hunu se kasa no 3nti a ma 3ny3 ni nyinaa na w) tumi (.) w) tumi y3 bu- w) no a tumi w) noa tumi use na adwene kase wa ninyinaa w) sheda kyee n3 nyinaa 3nti nani agye se ne sub[ject]=
mh so consider that she is not the Italian teacher (.) she is the math teacher (.) so in her subject even though the language (.) she has seen that because of the language she does not always succeed (.) she can do but< she can she can use her brain you see that maths (.) using her reasoning to do it even if she hasn't learnt the language yet and even if she hasn't completely understood yet she's((the teacher is)) happy for what concerns her sub[ject]=

054 PARf: [a:h]

055 MEDf: =matemat- matemaths no w) y3 adi3 (.) w) y3 adi3 the way
=mat-maths she's good (.) she's good for the method

056 PARf: yeah (o[k a y])

057 MEDf: [w) si fa] 3 y3 a yi wei try se w) b3 te asi3 3nna w) mo se italy kasa no still no w) sheda da hunu y3 w) shdea kyee y3 bu- ne solution ne se 3bia)bia nka w) ne nkrofuo di agoro aa nkwada w) mo ka kasa no (.) 3 no b3 bua no a ma comunication aba nt3m (.) wa hunu se kasa no more w) ka no more w) ne mbrofo no 3ka no (.) te more a w) te [instead]=
[she uses for what she tries to understand and they say that the Italian language she hasn't learnt it yet but< a solution might be that she plays with people or children speaking the ((Italian)) language (.) that will help her develop her communication competence (.) consider that the language the more you speak it the more you speak it with the whites (.) the more you learn it [instead] =

058 PARf: [e::h]

059 MEDf: =se w) ne ghanafuo nk)aa
=of going out only with Ghanaians

In her rendition in turn 53, the mediator clarifies the teacher's concern, distinguishing between the child's excellent competence in maths and a not terribly good knowledge of the Italian language. In the rest of her rendition, covering the last part of turn 57 and turn 59, a practical suggestion is added by the mediator: the child should play with "white" children, rather than only with Ghanaians.

"Contextualising" multi-part renditions

The second type of rendition is more complex. It shows up as a long multipart rendition roughly divided into two parts, the first describing a teacher's concern for the child (expression of worry for inappropriate behaviour, possibilities that some obstacles impede improvement, or that too little is done to enhance improvement), the second drawing a consequence of such concern for the child. The first part "contextualises" the second which then comes as a coherent conclusion to the first part. While in the first part the teacher's concern is rendered to the parents as a "de facto" situation, the consequence is drawn by the mediators and the parents together (and can be initiated by one or the other).

Let us illustrate the case through two examples. In Excerpt 4, the concern rendered in the first part is a heavy one in that the child does not attend school properly. The family is trying to move the child to a different type of program (so-called "full-time"), a possible reason for her non-regular attendance. So the teachers lengthily express concern for the child, a concern that has been rendered by the mediator to the mother who replied that the girl often does not want to get up and go to school. In the excerpt, the gist of the concern is rendered as a multi-part rendition in turns 162–167, the consequence is drawn by the mediator in turn 168, shared by the mother in turn 169 and further reinforced (with a practical suggestion, as in the pattern of expanded renditions shown above) by the mediator in the last turn in the excerpt.

Excerpt 4 (Chinese 2) [TEAf – teacher female; MEDf – mediator female; PARf – parent female]

162 MEDf: 这个希望你们家长能够让她明白(.)学校是要去的，就是她的责任okay?
I hope that you parents can make her understand (.) that school has to be attended, it's her duty, okay?

163 PARf: (??)要自己盯一下
I should keep an eye on her

164 MEDf: 我知道她的性格有点强硬L的， 就是她的脾气很倔-
I know that L has a strong personality, I mean she's very stubborn-

165 PARf: 对对对对
yes yes yes yes

166 MEDf: 她想干嘛就干嘛，在学校也这样
she does what she wants to do even at school

167 PARf: 嗯
yes

168 MEDf: 但是我们是大人，趁她现在年龄还小需要我们耐心一点多辅导就是教导她一下
but we are adults, we have to be patient and advise her while she's a small girl

169 PARf: 我们也要多用点心哪
we need to do more

170 MEDf: 对对，多用一点心， 不能继续再让她这样任性下去了，这样如果你们家长不配合的话， 他们老师在学校的时间毕竟有限嘛，八点到一点钟，不可能五个小时都盯着她看吧，是不是? Okay?
yes, be careful, you cannot go on allowing her to be so capricious, so if you parents do not collaborate, the time teachers have at school is not much after all, from eight to one, they cannot keep eyes on her for five hours, can they? Okay?

In Excerpt 5, the teacher's concern regards the fact that the child stopped attending the afterschool activities, which were highly beneficial to him. The concern is portrayed in a multipart rendition in turns 159–165. The consequence is drawn by the father in turn 166 ("no") who also supplies the solution to the expressed concern, that is the child will get back to afterschool service soon. It is interesting to note that the mediator fully supports the solution suggested by the child's father.

Excerpt 5 (Chinese 3) [TEAf – teacher female; MEDf – mediator female; PARm – parent male]

159 MEDf: 老师说(.)就是A这个孩子呢(.)很聪明(.)也很机灵哦(.) [okay]
the teacher is saying (.) that A this boy (.) is very intelligent (.) and also clever (.) [okay]
160 PARm: [mh]
161 PARm: 主要就是说(.)呃:: 刚开始(.)就是说(.)开学的时候(.)他不是有去那个doposcuola嘛
but principally it is that (.) uh:: at the beginning (.) I mean (.) at the beginning of the school year (.) he attended that afterschool program didn't he?
162 PARm: mh
163 MEDf: 课后辅导班 (.) 对吧?
afterschool service (.) right?
164 PARm: mh
165 MEDf: 后来是没有去上了(.)对吗?
after that he stopped attending (.) right?
166 PARm: 没有三月份又会让他去上的
no I will have him go again in March
167 MEDf: ah okay 那就最好了
ah okay that would be fantastic

Excerpts 4–5 thus show that when mediators render the teachers' concerns to the parents some significant re-elaboration is involved, by expanding the reasons for such concerns, expressing hope that a solution is found, or giving suggestions on possible solutions. The mediators also help the parents grasp the reasons for the teachers' concerns by giving them the opportunity to proffer what may be a teacher's educational conclusion, e.g. that their little girl needs more guidance or that

their child needs joining programs supporting their skills – as shown in Excerpts 4 and 5. Access to the "school world" and the teachers' expectations is made plain for the parents in the mediators' renditions, to the point that the parents display their reactions in ways which are clearly relevant uptakes of the teachers' contributions. In what follows, we will look at such parents' reactions more extensively.

Parents' reactions

Parents' reactions are sometimes elicited by the mediator (e.g. with a question like "do you have any questions?"), but more often they are spontaneous contributions. Spontaneous contributions come in two main forms. One is a short feedback, normally a response to a question that is immediately rendered to the teacher(s) and then taken up as a prompt to suggest or even insist on what needs to be done to improve the child's school performance. Another form of parents' reactions is more elaborated and comes in the form of a short narrative focusing on the child's life at school or at home. We have called these reactions "narrating reactions".

Both forms of reaction can be convergent or non-convergent with the teacher's concern. Convergent reactions are in line with the teacher's concern and rest on the idea that more support can be given to achieve children's higher performance at school. Non-convergent reactions normally shift the focus from the child's performance at school to some other aspect of their lives. The narrating reactions, in particular, draw a picture of the child that is in contrast with the one shown in the teachers' contributions and provide an alternative view of the child.

Unlike the renditions of teachers' concerns, the mediators' renditions of the parents' reactions show little or no expansion. Renditions of convergent reactions are indeed straightforward and close, and mediators do not engage in dyadic talk with the parents before or during their renditions. Clarification seems to be not needed in these cases. Even in the case of non-convergent reactions, renditions to the teachers are only slightly explicated, while little dyadic talk with the parents is used. Overall, it seems that, in both cases, parents' contributions are offered to the teachers openly and directly. When parents' reactions comply with teachers' assessments, teachers' reactions are confirmatory and supplemented with suggestions about how to work on the child's performance at school. When parents' reactions are non-convergent, instead, opportunities to shift talk's topic from the child's school performance to their life at home display some resistance in the teachers' contributions, being either dropped, or taken up but immediately reinterpreted in the light of the child's performance as a student. The excerpts below show the parent's reaction, the mediator's rendition and the teacher's reply.

Convergent reactions

Convergent reactions are probably the most frequent and they are normally compliant with the teachers' concern and/or the consequences highlighted. Convergent reactions show the parent's will to collaborate. Short feedback is normally of two

types: "yes, I will"/"yes, let's do" or "I'll ask my husband/her father". See an example of both cases:

Excerpt 6 (Urdu 1) [TEAf – teacher female; MEDf – mediator female; PARm – parent male]

134 MEDf: lehaza aap ise is tarah ki kitabe khreed kar de ta ke vo ghar me bi thora parh sake
now you'll buy him a book of this type so that he can read a bit also when he's home

135 PARm: okay me ise khreed kar du gi
okay I'll buy it to him

136 MEDf: okay [ha detto adesso:]
okay [she said shortly:]

137 TEAf [allora ascolta] (0.6) siccome siamo- contente di continuare a seguirlo a casa
[now listen] (0.6) as we are- happy to go on helping him at home

Excerpt 7 (Albanian 1) [TEAf – teacher female; MEDf – mediator female; PARf – parent female]

207 PARf: aa në rregull e pys edhe burrin (.) nëse është dakord po:
aaah okay I'll ask my hubsband (.) if he agrees yes:
(1.3)

208 MEDf: la mamma sta dicendo che chiede un po' anche: a suo marito se è d'accordo così poi ti dirà [se::]
mum is saying that she will ask also: her husband if he agrees so afterwards she will tell you [if::]

209 TEAf: [certo] <certo certo>
[certainly] <certainly certainly>

As shown in the excerpts, the mediator's rendition is close, substantially a repetition of the parent's contribution, and the teacher's acceptance is immediate (see the overlapping mediator–teacher talk in Excerpts 6 and 7).

Excerpt 8 shows an example of a convergent narrating reaction. In turn 203, the teacher concludes her assessment saying that the child has improved and in turn 204, the mediator translates this conclusion. In turns 206, 208, 210 and again 218, 221 and 227, the mother's contribution is a long narrative about the child's strong engagement in learning Italian. The mediator renders the mother narrative's details to the teacher who provides appreciation (turn 212), continuation feedback (turns 214, 216) and agreement (turn 220). Despite a misunderstanding occurring in turns 218–220 (the mother says that the child is so good that she corrects her father's Italian and the mediator's ambiguous rendition is instead understood as being the father who helps the child), the concluding teacher's contribution is perfectly consonant with the mediator's summarised

rendition of the mother's talk: by repeating the same words used by the mediator, the teacher confirms that, from her perspective too, the child is trying hard (see turns 222–223).

Excerpt 8 (Urdu 1) [TEAf – teacher female; MEDf – mediator female; PARf – parent female]

203 TEAf: ecco (.) per noi è effettivamente molto migliorata M (.) su questo possiamo (.) davvero dirlo
right (.) for us M has really improved a lot (.) on this we can (.) really say that

204 MEDf: chendi sade vaste cafi betar ho gai e
she says that for us she has improved

205 TEAf: e inoltre (.) ci- ci- ci tiene ci prova e ci tiene molto [secondo me]
moreover (.) sh- sh- she cares she tries and she cares a lot [in my opinion]

206 PARf: [nai onu na] che lo che onu scioq e sciuru sciuro vicih andi pi e na school te onu italian sikhan da scioq e gio kugih vi ethu sikh che giandi te o ghar già che boldi è fer ma ode babà colu pucihdi a kher manu te samgih te ni andi ona colu pucihdi chende ne che cafi lafaz boldi e aghe ni so ondi (.) e te sahi boldi e
[no you can say] that she has a strong will because she's coming to school from the beginning and she has a strong will to learn the Italian language anything she learns here when she comes home she repeats she utters the words I ask her father what she's saying because I cannot understand he says she utters many Italian words she didn't know before (.) and she speaks well

207 MEDf: ha detto prima quando non capiva non diceva niente (.) a casa non diceva neanche a nessuno=
she said before when she didn't understand she didn't say anything (.) at home she didn't speak to anyone

208 PARf: =or te ciote baia nal vi boldi rendi e gio sikh che giandi e
=even with her small siblings she tells what she learns

209 MEDf: adesso da quando: (.) sta imparando (.) quando torna a casa (.) parla coi suoi fratelli quelle parole nuove che [impara]
now since: (.) she has started learning (.) when she comes home (.) she tells her small siblings those new words that she [learns]

210 PARf [vei italian] zuban vicih gal cardi e apni zuban vicih nahi kardi giadu ethu school viciu giae sarà din
[she speaks Italian] not her language when she gets back from school

211 MEDf: quando torna dalla scuola allora parla con suoi fratelli anche in italiano (.) [prova:]

when she gets back from school then she speaks with her siblings also in Italian (.) [she tries]

212 TEAf: [bene]
[good]

213 MEDf: qualsiasi- cioè quelle parole che impara (.) le ripete [in casa]
any- I mean those words she learns (.) she repeats them [at home]

214 TEAf: [mh]

215 MEDf: mi ha detto io non capisco ma io chiedo dopo a suo papà cosa ha detto papà dice sì che dice questa parola eh ma ha detto che sì sta imparando delle paroline: (.) così però sta provando ha detto adesso qualcosa di imparare ((laughing)) l'italiano:
she told me I don't understand but afterwards I ask her father what she said and dad says yes that she utters this and the other word eh but he said that she ((the girl)) is learning new little words: (.) she is trying she said now she ((the mother)) has someone to teach ((laughing)) Italian:

216 TEAf: mh

217 MEDf: ha detto prima
she said before

218 PARf : te je koi lafz ghalat bole te papa dasde ne ke enj bol
she helps her dad when he gets some word wrong eh

219 MEDf: lo aiuta papà e quando sbaglia qualche parola:: eh
((literally and with a mistake in Italian)) *him helps dad when he gets some word :: wrong eh*

220 TEAf: mah sì lo sbagliare [ci mancherebbe]
well yes getting words wrong [that's normal]

221 PARf: [te onu scioq] e giacan bacea nu honda na e scioq e italian sikhan da pela sal ayi nhi he te hun aui e (.) te bolne te sikhne da scioq es
[*she has strong will] as children have (.) she has a strong will to learn the Italian language before she didn't come to school (.) she has a strong will to speak*

222 MEDf: vuole imparare italiano
she wants to learn Italian

223 TEAf: sì vuole proprio impararlo (.) vuole proprio imparare a leggere si capisce eh ci prova (.) quindi è la M che dovrà insegnarle l'italiano
yes she really wants to learn it (.) she really wants to learn how to read it is evident eh she tries (.) so it is M who has to teach her Italian

It is interesting to note that no expansion of parents' talk is provided in the mediator's renditions in all of the cases above. Rather, some additional contribution, besides their positive acceptance, is provided by the teachers who either repeat confirmation (as in Excerpt 7), or elaborate on what can now be done with the child: care for him at home (Excerpt 6) or who may teach her more Italian (Excerpt 8).

Non-convergent reactions

Similarly to convergent reactions, non-convergent parents' reactions can be provided either as feedback to the mediator's rendition, or as a narrating reaction. Let us have a look at two examples showing non-convergent feedback.

In Excerpt 9 below, the teacher expresses concern for the parents showing interest in the child's school activity and suggests that, if they are not at home, such interest can be shown by calling the child frequently on the phone asking if all is fine with school and checking that the homework was done. The excerpt shows the mediator's multipart rendition contextualising the teacher's suggestion as a coherent conclusion to the recommendation that the parents should show interest in the child's performance at school. In a short dyadic sequence with the father, covering turns 232–236, the mediator first explores how many times a week father and child talk to each other. In turn 237, the father finally says that they speak to each other rarely and mainly through voice messages. Such reaction is rendered explicitly to the teacher who evaluates the contribution as non-convergent ("eh", turn 239 and 241) and then explicitly suggests what to do (turn 241).

Excerpt 9 (Chinese 4) [TEAf – teacher female; MEDf – mediator female; PARm – parent male]

232 MEDf: 你们一个星期通话几次? 你打电话给她
how many times a week do you hear from each other? Do you call her

233 PARm: 我们跟她(.)我每个星期都会上来一次的嘛
we with her (.) I get back once a week

234 MEDf: 每个星期都会上来一次?
you get back once a week?

235 PARm: 对
yes

236 MEDf: 但是，你们当中会通话几次?
but, how many times do you hear from each other?

237 PARm: 基本上没什么事情都话，我们很少通话，就是偶尔聊一下微信就是
normally if there are no issues, we hear from each other seldom, we only hear from each other with Wechat

238 MEDf: 所以就是说 eh:: tornano su una volta alla settimana e telefonicamente si sentono quasi niente
that's the point ((in Italian)) eh:: they come back home once a week and on the phone they hear from each other practically never

239 TEAf: eh

240 MEDf: solo coi messaggi vocali a volte
only with voice messages sometimes

241 TEAf: eh no è meglio che si sentano per telefono sì sì sì può fare
eh well it would be better if they heard from each other on the phone, yes yes it can be done

In Excerpt 10 below, the teacher's concern consists in making sure that the child has enough opportunities to speak Italian. It is rendered through an expanded rendition with practical suggestions about how to give the child such opportunities (turn 167). The parent's reaction is found in turn 171 (an immediate reply to the mediator following a short sequence involving the teacher and the child (not shown)). The mother confirms that the girl has opportunities to speak (turn 171), but is not convergent with the mediator's conclusion in turn 172 ("with Italians"), a divergence that is made explicit in turn 173 ("they're all Chinese"). In this excerpt, as in the previous one, the mediator renders the non-convergent parent reaction to the teacher, who evaluates it as non-convergent ("eh eh", turn 175) and provides a more explicit suggestion to give the child more opportunities to speak Italian.

Excerpt 10 (Chinese 1) [TEAf – teacher female; MEDf – mediator female; PARf – parent female]

167 MEDf: 老师是希望，就是以他们这个年龄，就是说希望你们家长能够给他们足够的空间，可以自由的，就是跟朋友约好啊，去图书馆啊，去外面吃个什么东西啊，就是尽量的让他们出去-
what she is saying, I mean at their age, I mean it would be necessary that you parents could leave them more space, that they could be free, I mean to arrange with their friends, to go to the library, or go out to eat something together, try and let them go out more often-
((three turns omitted))

171 PARf : [都跟朋友出去的
she goes out with some friends

172 MEDf: [跟那些意大利人啊
[with Italians

173 PARf: [都是中国人
[they're all Chinese

174 MEDf: ha detto la mamma che esce spesso ma solo coi cinesi e parlano solo in cinese
mum said that she goes out frequently but only with the Chinese and they speak only Chinese

175 TEAf: eh eh parlano solo il cinese hhhh (.) però ad esempio c'è la ragazza che fa motoria da noi
eh eh they speak only Chinese hhhh (.) but for example there's the girl who teaches gym at our school

176 MEDf: mh mh

177 TEAf: eh:: secondo me lei è molto carina sia la ragazza sia la squadra perché poi sai con la squadra si fan tante cose al di là del gioco
eh:: it seems to me she's very nice both the girl and the team as you know with the team one can do many things besides playing

178 MEDf: mh mh

179 TEAf: dopo si va insieme si va a far le partite insomma si ampliano:::
after playing one goes together one goes for the matches I mean one broadens:::

The parents' reactions to the teachers' concerns are typically rendered back to the teachers immediately by highlighting their non-convergence. Non-convergent parents' reactions are evaluated by teachers as "not so good" and are normally accompanied by an explicit suggestion about how to cope with the problem and help the child achieve better school performance.

Let us now pass to two examples of narrating parents' reactions. The two sequences are different in that they show different types of management on the part of the mediator: while in the first case the rendition of the parent's non-convergence is rather direct and straightforward, in the second the mediator's contribution slightly mitigates the parent's reaction to the teacher.

In Excerpt 11, the teachers' assessment of the child at school is good, but they highlight that the girl does not work on her homework properly. The mediator's rendition includes the teachers' assessment and an expansion suggesting practical parents' support to their child doing homework. In turn 19 below, we can see such expansion. In turn 20, the mother's response comes in the form of a narrative focussing on the child's life at home, with a little sister who does not let her do her homework and the child working on it hard at night when her sister is asleep. The mediator renders promptly, even before the mother has actually finished (see the mediator's false start in turn 21), providing a close rendition of what happens at home. In turn 26, the mother completes her narrative, in broken Italian, insisting on her daughter's doing her homework, but doing it late at night.

Excerpt 11 (Albanian 2) [TEAf – teacher female; MEDf – mediator female; PARf – parent female]

19 MEDf: ((part of the turn not shown)) por thotë ka nevojë që njerëzit ti rrinë te koka (.) mami babi që ti rrin te koka (.) në mënyrë që të:: edhe përsa i përket leximit sepse më shumë vështirësitë thotë i ka në të lexuar dhe në të shkruar (.) jo në matematikë (.) [mësues-]
((part of the turn not shown)) *but she ((the teacher)) says that she ((the child)) needs someone to be with her (.) mum dad to be with her (.) so that:: also for reading because the main difficulties she ((the teacher)) says that she ((the child)) has them in reading and in writing (.) not in maths (.) [the teach-]*

020 PARf: [K ka një prob-](2.1) K ka një Problem (.) se ka go- ka motrën një vjeç e gjys (.) ajo edhe me mbyll derën e dhomë::s mh nuk e lë:n mh të(.) të përshtat- ta ketë mendjen aty te mësimet (0.8) i mer diarion ja zhgaravit (.) nuk nuk e lë një sekondë (0.7) vjen momenti që kur të vij burri (.) ajo do detyrohet ti bëj detyrat se ajo e vogla flen (.) edhe

është njëçikë më e qetë po është orar që asaj i flihet një çikë gjumë edhe është njëçikë (.) nuk është në gjendje që ti bëj (.) nuk e lë (.) jam me një fëmijë të vogël në shtëpi prandaj po them

[K has a prob-] (2.1) K has a problem (.) because she has the chil- she has a sister of one year and a half (.) she ((K)) even if she shuts the door of her room:: mh she((the little sister)) doesn't let: mh to (.) adapt- to keep her attention there on her homework (0.8) she ((the little sister)) takes her diary she scribbles on it (.) she doesn't let her down a second (0.7) it comes to a point that she ((K)) is obliged to do her homework when my husband comes home (.) because the little girl is asleep (.) and she ((K)) is slightly more at ease but this is a time when she ((K)) falls asleep and she's a bit (.) she is not able to do them ((the homework)) (.) she ((the little sister)) doesn't let (.) I'm with a small baby at home so this is why I say this ((meaning: I know what it means))

(1.0)

021 MEDf: sta dicendo [che il proble-]
she's saying [that the proble-]

022 PARf: [është shumë e vështirë për K] (0.9)aq sa ka arrit përshembull ësht- është shumë brava (.) e shoh se e ka me qejf sidomos matematikën (.) e ka shumë:
[it is very difficult for K] (0.9) what she achieved for example is- she is very good (.) I see she likes it mainly mathematics (.) she has too:

(2.0)

023 MEDf: sta dicendo che K è una bimba che (.) è vero è bravissima però c'è il problema che lei ha una fa- ha una fr- eh: sorella piccolina: che ha un anno e mezzo (.) .hh e quindi:: (.) non la lascia (.) le prende il diario che l:- scarabocchia: (.) o:: li prende i compiti quindi non la lascia mai tranquilla a studiare (.) e K (.) è davvero brava per quello che fa perché dice che si mette a studiare quando viene il padre dal lavoro quindi l'aiuta un po' lu:i (.) e la sorelli- la sorellina è andata::: a dormire (.) però è tardi quindi non è un orario dicia[mo per]
she's saying that K is a girl who (.) that's true she's excellent but there's the problem that she has a ba- she has a br- eh: little sister: who's one and a half (.) hh and so:: (.) she doesn't let her (.) she takes her diary that s:- scribbles: (.) or she takes the homework so she never lets her study in peace (.) and K (.) is really good for what she does because she ((mum)) says that she ((K)) gets down to study when her father comes home from work so he: helps her a bit (.) and the sist- the sister has gone::: to bed (.) but it's late so it's not time for let['s say for]

024 PARf: [po']
[((in italian)) a bit]

025 MEDf: studiare per [una bimba]
studying for [a child]

026 PARf [è un po'] tardi (.) otto per esempio (.) alle otto un po' più tardi perché stanca tutto il giorni (.) viene un orario: (2.1) anche io sono troppo: (.) non lascio niente
[((in broken Italian)) it's a bit] late (.) eight for example (.) at eight is a bit late because she tired all the day (.) comes a time: (2.1) me too I'm too (.) I leave nothing
(0.5)
027 TEAf: eh ho capito però (.) ehm:: (.) cioè non possiamo comunque (.) giustificarla
eh I understand but (.) ehm:: (.) I mean we cannot in any case (.) justify her

The narrating reaction of the mother shows an alternative perspective on the teacher's concern, inviting the teacher to consider the circumstances under which the child operates. The narrative focuses on the child's life at home sharing her needs and spaces with those of a little baby. It is interesting to note that the teacher's reply in turn 27, after the mother's contribution, shifts the focus back to the child as a student whose behaviour "cannot be justified".

Excerpt 12a follows a teacher's report of her scolding the child who was found beating a classmate. Even if the teacher understood that the child responded to her mates' constant provocations, she stresses that, when such provocations arise, children should tell the teachers. After the mediator's rendition of the teacher's report, recommendation and attempt to have the child speak to her (only the latter rendition is shown in turn 174 below), the mother's non-convergent narrating reaction is initiated. The mother's narrative is split in several parts which are rendered to the teacher one after the other, getting different types of reactions from the teacher. In turn 175, the mother's narrative shifts the focus from the teacher's to the child's perspective of the events and describes the child's desperate reaction after being scolded. In turn 176, the mediator renders the teacher's recommendation suggesting that the child should have told the teacher. In turn 177, the mother does not take up the mediator's suggestion, thus declining to accept the teacher's recommendation, and repeats that the child was desperate after being the only one seen and scolded. The mediator's rendition is introduced with a brief summary in turn 178. The details of the mother's narrative are, however, provided after a teacher's acknowledgment (turn 179), focusing in particular on the desperate reaction of the girl who, when in a rage, stops talking. The mediator's rendition is interrupted by the mother's reaction to the teacher's recommendation that the girl should tell her when some mate is provocative. This mother's piece of narrative in turn 181 is followed by the teacher's response to the mediator's previous rendition about the girl's desperation. In handling the mother's narrative continuation with the teacher's response, the mediator renders the teacher's contribution and not the mother, thus mitigating the mother's defence. The teacher's response in turn 182, rendered in turn 183, drops the mother's narrative perspective and re-establishes the view prospected by her previous recommendation that the child needs to speak to the teachers when her mates are aggressive to her.

Excerpt 12a (Urdu 2) [TEAf – teacher female; MEDf – mediator female; PARf – parent female]

174 MEDf: chendi e che me H nu vi achea che urdu vicih pucih chec dass qu mareai (.) cafi bar pucihea lechin giadu galti car le fer ni boldi fir ine dassea coi ni fir zahri gal e me dantna si-
she ((the teacher)) says I told H to ask her ((the child)) in Urdu why you beat them she asked many times when she ((the child)) makes a mistake then she stops speaking so I ((the teacher)) naturally had to scold her

175 PARf: school vicih koi vi masla honda gis time ethu car(.) giandiabya teacher colu dant pave ya kisse bache nal koi gal hove gis time ethu car giandi e ethu hi rondea giandi e giu hi appardi e rondea time nal pele ciup carwa k fer pucian fer dassdi e chiendi che pele ali ne mugie tang chia -tha pir aur aik italian bacie ne tab maestra ne nahi dekha giab many mara tab dekha
if anything occurs at school or she is scolded by the teacher as soon as she gets out of school she starts weeping and she weeps all the way home then I calm her down then I ask what happened she said that first A and another Italian child annoyed me the teacher didn't see them when I beat them the teacher saw me

176 MEDf: lekin e kendi e me pucihdi rahi a lekin oss time das dendi te fer na dant pendi
but she ((the teacher)) says I asked her ((the child)) if she had told me in that moment what was going on I wouldn't have scolded her

177 PARf: chendi jab mane usco mara maestra ne dekha or mugie danta
She ((the child)) says that when I beat them she ((the teacher)) saw me and scolded me

178 MEDf: quello che le abbiamo detto prima
same as we said before

179 TEAf: okay

180 MEDf: che lei quando succede qualcosa a scuola e la maestra sgrida qualche bambino (.) allora appena esce dalla scuola comincia a piangere (.) e arriva a casa: eh e allora dopo con calma lei chiede dopo di-=
that she when something happens at school and the teacher scolds some child (.) then as soon as she gets out of school she starts weeping (.) and she arrives at home: eh and then slowly she ((the mother)) asks afterwards to-=

181 PARf: =acsar ghar (.) ja ke dasdi he che mamma mugie italian bacie tang carte hain mane maestra ko btaya b he che vo mugie tang karte (.) lekin
=sometimes (.) she tells me that Italian children annoy me (the child)) and I told the teacher (.) but

182 TEAf: ma non si tratta di piangere o di che (.) basta semplicemente (.) eh: (.) dire che cosa succede perché se no non riusciamo a darle una mano in questo senso

this is not a matter for weeping or anything (.) she just needs (.) eh: (.) to say what's going on because otherwise we cannot give her a hand in this sense

183 MEDf: o andi e oda ron da maqsad ni bas enna dass dea kare che ki gal hoi e fer assi odi help kara ghe
she says there's no need for weeping she just needs to say what's going on then we help her

The continuation of the mother's narrative in Excerpt 12b below is again non-convergent, highlighting that it is part of the child's personality to stop talking as a reaction to problems. The mediator follows again bit by bit summarising the parent's narrative and stressing the core of it on the girl's personality and sensitivity. It is interesting to note that the mediator's reduced renditions in turns 185 and 187 call for the attention of the teacher ("mh?", turn 188) and leave the mediator the floor to render the full last bit of the mother's narrative in turn 189, collaboratively concluded by the teacher, the mediator and the mother (turns 190–192).

Excerpt 12b (Urdu 2) [TEAf – teacher female; MEDf – mediator female; PARf – parent female]

184 PARf: o saim giandi e matlab fer onu e ho gianda e che bola che acha
she gets scared she closes into herself this means she thinks what shall I say what shall I answer

185 MEDf: si spaventa
she gets scared

186 PARf: saim giandi e (.) ghar vi odi ei halat e giadu koi kam kharab ho giae ya bai nal larai ho giae he te us time onu puciho saim giandi e boldi nai te fer kafi time bad giado gussa le gianda te fer boldi e che è kam hoea
she gets scared (.) even at home if she does something wrong or if she argues with her siblings if we ask she gets scared she stops answering after some time anger goes and then she says this is what happened

187 MEDf: sì anche a casa ha stesso comportamento
yes, also at home she has the same behaviour

188 TEAf: mh?

189 MEDf: anche a casa stesso: (.) stesso comportamento perché anche con i fratelli quando succede qual- qualcosa allora (.) dopo si arrabbia non parlano non risponde dopo finché- cioè va via la rabbia
even at home same: (.) same behaviour because even with her siblings when something happ- happens then (.) she gets angry they don't talk she stops answering then until- I mean when anger goes

190 TEAf: dopo- esatto
after- exactly

191 MEDf: riprende:-=
she restarts:-=

192 PARf: =vei cafi time bad (.) das ciordi e
=*after some hours (.) she tells*
193 TEAf: okay allora: (.) che questa cosa (.) anche in casa se riescono (.) a darle una mano: proprio perché se no (.) rischia di (.) di essere lei penalizzata in certe cose
okay so:: (.) that this thing (.) also at home if they succeed (.) to give her a hand: really because otherwise (.) she risks (.) being hindered in some cases

This time the teacher does not drop the mother's perspective completely. She accepts that it is part of the child's personality and sensitivity to respond to problems in this way but calls for the help of the family to work together so that the girl can control her behaviour and cope with the school's expectations, thus re-establishing her authority in defining the boundaries of "good" behaviour (see turn 193).

Discussion and conclusions

This chapter has shown the work of language mediators in rendering talk between migrant parents and teachers while coordinating the meeting and giving support to the interlocutors in responding to each other relevantly. This is a key issue since, as some teachers said in the interviews, without full cooperation between schools and migrant families, working with children is really hard. This chapter has also shown the challenges arising in communication between teachers and migrant parents and the work mediators do to contextualise the teachers' expectations on the one hand and the parents' participation in coping with such expectations on the other. Although the data have been collected in one single country, the analysis reveals aspects characterising interpreting in specific interactional contexts that may help consider ways in which language mediation can support migrant parents' agency more in general.

As mentioned in the second section of this chapter, the literature has stressed both advantages and problems of mediators' work in parent–teacher interactions. Studies have, however, overlooked an existing gap between teachers' authority – associated with knowledge deriving from their educational role – and parents' low authority in supporting their children's efforts in coping with the requirements of the education system. Our findings show two main facets of this gap. On the one hand, teachers' concerns cover a large part of parent–teacher encounters and their expectations for the parents to cope is made visible in the mediators' explicated renditions, in which suggestions are given about how to work on the children's school performance and good wishes are expressed that the child's performance improves. The "school knowledge" is thus made clear to the parents seeking their support for their children's education. On the other hand, the parents' knowledge contribution, e.g. in giving details about their children's life at home or about aspects of their personality, even when rendered closely and clearly, is barely made relevant by the teachers. This dismissal takes two forms. First, teachers show

interest and appreciation for parents' responses only when these responses converge with teachers' assessments or requests. Second, non-convergent parents' responses are systematically dropped by the teachers in the interaction, either by explicitly assessing them as non-convergent and suggesting a solution, or by re-interpreting parents' narratives into appropriate school behaviour.

Against this background, the mediators' agency is visible in two ways. First, by working on the rendition of the teachers' concerns so as to make them both accessible and acceptable to the parents. Explications of the school system's expectations and encouragement in reaching high(er) school performances both have this function. Second, the mediators make the parents' reactions openly and immediately available to the teachers, offering such reactions to the teachers' attention and evaluation. With both teachers and parents, then, mediators exercise agency in choosing multiple forms of renditions for the participants' production of knowledge (Baraldi & Gavioli, 2014), focussing on the conditions of the ongoing communication process and redirecting it (Baraldi, 2017; Baraldi & Gavioli, 2016).

A question which may arise at this point is to what extent mediators' renditions support migrant parents' agency and hybrid integration (see Chapter 2) in the education system. While the data show that the mediators succeed in soliciting a teachers' reaction to parents' talk, such reaction re-establishes school performance, rather than opening talk on possibly useful details about the children's life out of school. Teachers maintain their rights to confirm or deny the value of parents' production of knowledge, showing reluctance to accept the hybridisation of their and the parents' knowledge. So while mediators do support parents' efforts in producing their knowledge, they do not challenge the teachers' authority. Our results then suggest that if any changes might be produced in the school system, they need to be thought of and implemented at a higher organisational level. But our results also suggest that more family-centred approaches need to be urgently implemented for school systems to develop into more hybrid while more welcoming environments for migrant children.

References

Angelelli, C. (2004). *Medical interpreting and cross-cultural communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Angelelli, C. (2012). Challenges in interpreters' coordination of the construction of pain. In C. Baraldi & L. Gavioli (Eds.), *Coordinating participation in dialogue interpreting* (pp. 251–268). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Baker, M. (2006). Contextualization in translator- and interpreter-mediated events. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *38*, 321–337.

Baraldi, C. (2017). Language mediation as communication system. *Communication Theory*, *27*, 367–387.

Baraldi, C. (2018). Formulations as a way of providing renditions in mediated interactions: A single case analysis. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice*, *11*(3), 248–269.

Baraldi, C. (2019). Pragmatics and agency in healthcare interpreting. In R. Tipton & L. Desilla (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of translation and pragmatics* (pp. 319–335). Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Baraldi, C., & Ceccoli, F. (2023). Problems of children's involvement in interpreter-mediated meetings between their teachers and their parents. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*. https://doi.org/10.1515/eujal-2022-0024

Baraldi, C., & Gavioli, L. (2014). Are close renditions the golden standard? Some thoughts on translating accurately in healthcare interpreter-mediated interaction. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, *3*, 336–353.

Baraldi, C., & Gavioli, L. (2016). On professional and non-professional interpreting: The case of intercultural mediators. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *4*(1), 33–55.

Baraldi, C., & Gavioli, L. (2021). Effective communication and knowledge distribution in healthcare interaction with migrants. *Health Communication*, *36*(9), 1059–1067.

Davitti, E. (2013). Dialogue interpreting as intercultural mediation: Interpreters' use of upgrading moves in parent-teacher meetings. *Interpreting*, *15*(2), 168–199.

Davitti, E. (2015). Interpreter-mediated parent-teacher talk. In L. Grujicic-Alatriste (Ed.), *Linking discourse studies to professional practice* (pp. 176–200). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gavioli, L. (2015). On the distribution of responsibilities in treating critical issues in interpreter-mediated medical consultations: The case of "le spieghi(amo)". *Journal of Pragmatics*, *76*, 169–180.

Hepburn, A., & Bolden, G. (2013). The conversation analytic approach to transcription. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 57–76). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Heritage, J. (2013). Epistemics in conversation. In Jack Sidnell and Tanya Stivers (eds), *Handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 370–394). Boston: Wiley-Blackwell.

Inghilleri, M. (2005). Mediating zones of uncertainty. Interpreter agency, the interpreting habitus and political asylums adjudication. *The Translator*, *11*(1), 69–85.

Leanza, Y., Miklavcic, A., Boivin, I., & Rosenberg, E. (2014). Working with interpreters. In L.J. Kirmayer, J. Guzder, & C. Rousseau (Eds.), *Cultural consultation: Encountering the other in mental health care* (pp. 89–114). New York & Dodrecht: Springer.

Mason, I. (2006). On mutual accessibility of contextual assumptions in dialogue interpreting. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *38*, 359–373.

Mason, I, & Ren, W. (2012). Power in face-to-face interpreting events. In C. Angelelli (Ed.), *The sociological turn in translation and interpreting studies* (pp. 234–253). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Penn, C, & Watermeyer, J. (2012). Cultural brokerage and overcoming communication barriers: A case study for aphasia. In C. Baraldi & L. Gavioli (Eds.), *Coordinating participation in dialogue interpreting* (pp. 269–296). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Slettebakk Berge, S. (2023). A shared responsibility for facilitating inclusion in school settings where sign-language interpreting is provided. In L. Gavioli & C. Wadensjö (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of public service interpreting*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Tipton, R. (2008a). Interpreter neutrality and the structure/agency distinction. In C. Valero-Garces (Ed.), *Research and practice in public service interpreting and translation*. Alcalá: Universidad de Alcalá.

Tipton, R. (2008b). Reflexivity and the social construction of identity in interpreter-mediated asylum interviews. *The Translator*, *14*(1), 1–19.

Tipton, R., & Furmanek, O. (2016). *Dialogue interpreting: A guide to interpreting in public services and the community*. Abingdon & New York: Routledge.

Vargas-Urpi, M. (2015). Dialogue interpreting in multi-party encounters: Two examples form educational settings. *The Interpreters' Newsletter*, *20*, 107–121.

Vargas-Urpi, M. (2017). Empoderamiento o asimilición? Estudio de dos casos de comunicación mediada en el ámbito educativo catalán. *Trans, Revista de traductologia*, *21*, 187–205.

Vargas-Urpi, M. & Arumí Ribas, M. (2014). Estrategias de interpretación en los servicios públicos en el ámbito educativo: estudio de caso en la combinación chino-catalán. *Intralinea*.

Wadensjö, C. (1998). *Interpreting as interaction*. London: Longman.

Winston, Elizabeth A. (Ed.) (2004). *Educational interpreting: How it can succeed*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Chapter 10

Conclusions

Claudio Baraldi

Introduction

This final chapter summarises the most important research findings described in the book, outlines the impact of these research findings, and explains how they can affect educational organisations and policies. The titles of the following sections are formulated as questions inviting reflection on the most important findings extracted from the research presented in Chapters 3–9 against the theoretical background introduced in Chapter 2.

This reflection aims to understand the possibilities and challenges for the implementation of hybrid integration in the education system. Hybrid integration results from the encounter of non-migrant children and children with migration background (CMB) in specific social contexts, such as classrooms and groups. Hybrid integration is based on the combination of cultural elements of both the country of origin and the host country in an original and unique synthesis. It implies that all children – including CMB – exercise agency in narrating their personal cultural trajectories (Holliday & Amadasi, 2020). Giving importance to the whole classroom/group avoids an isolated consideration of CMB, contextualising challenges and opportunities of CMB's agency in the education system.

For reasons of space, the chapters in this book could not present all findings of the complex CHILD-UP research project. To increase the understanding of the overall analysis, this concluding chapter will also integrate Chapters 3–9 with a few additional elements of knowledge derived from the CHILD-UP research.

How do legislation and political climate count in the experience of children with migration background?

Chapter 3 has provided an understanding of the European legislative and political context in which hybrid integration could be implemented. According to the UN and European principles, all CMB should enjoy the same rights, have access to education, and be involved in child-centred communication about any procedure involving them and their rights. Public services should ensure respect for the best interest of CMB – according to the UN Convention of the Rights of the Child – and solutions for hybrid integration challenges. Against this background, CMB

DOI: 10.4324/9781003341772-10

and their families should be encouraged to interact with the local education system and community.

However, political, administrative and logistic barriers can block or delay the process of hybrid integration. The political climate is frequently negative toward migration processes, and public narratives in nation-states stress security concerns and fears of being overwhelmed by migrant flows. The crisis determined by the Ukrainian war confirms rather than denies this type of narrative, since the warm welcoming of Ukrainian asylum seekers underscores the importance of other migration flows. Some political discourses, for example, in Italy, explicitly mentioned the difference between the "real" motivations of Ukrainians and less legitimised types of asylum seeking. This crisis has confirmed that the political support of migration is not generalised.

In particular, the analysis of national policies shows that barriers to accessing schools can hinder CMB's hybrid integration. Several CMB do not benefit from preschool and kindergarten classes. CMB may experience significant delays in starting school, and once they enter a classroom, they can face further obstacles, such as stereotyping and discrimination. CMB have lower school performance outcomes than non-migrant children and may not be placed in a grade level or programme that is commensurate with their experience and needs; hence, there is a lack of support for their learning. CMB's native languages are not supported, and there are different approaches to incorporating CMB into mainstream classes, with some schools offering separate programs for second language learning.

To sum up, there is a relevant contradiction in the treatment of CMB. International agreements aim to ensure social attention to their needs and have their point of view considered in decisions about their lives. European countries sign these agreements, but what happens in practice often contradicts them; thus, the position of CMB in social systems, above all in the education system, is particularly complicated. However, the CHILD-UP research shows that this contradiction can influence but does not determine CMB's lived experience of education, which is much more nuanced than the negative context shows.

What are the possibilities of exercising agency in schools?

The CHILD-UP survey shows that most CMB believe they understand teachers, have good skills for schoolwork, or can manage school tasks as well as other children (Chapter 3). In general, CMB and non-migrant children tend to answer along similar lines but, for many aspects, CMB are slightly more positive in their general feeling toward school, although they are slightly less confident with their skills. The individual and focus group interviews show that most children, including CMB, value school as an important relational place (Chapter 4). Children value greatly those activities that enable positive social relations, including personal expressions, teachers' appreciation of personal abilities, and positive challenges. They expect to be active in co-determining matters that concern them. Children wish for a non-hierarchical, friendly school that promotes good relations,

particularly between children and teachers, and includes children's personal narratives and feelings. Children declare that they can take responsibility for their education and aim to receive a child-centred teaching by bringing personal experiences and knowledge into the classroom and taking decisions about their participation. In short, they ask for the possibility of exercising agency in the education system.

Accordingly, children positively evaluate the school experience when they can change something in it, that is, when they feel a sense of influence on school activities and can form social relationships according to their own needs, thus showing their agency. Meanwhile, teachers and other professionals are expected to take children's agency seriously, showing interest in their opinions and experiences, and seeing them as active and competent. The importance of recognising children's agency through these expectations is underlined by several teachers, who aim to perform these things that are expected of them, thus trying to establish symmetrical relationships with the children (Chapters 4 and 8). Nevertheless, asymmetrical communication with teachers seems to be dominant in the education system (Chapter 4), and internal hierarchies in this system strongly limit children's agency (Chapters 7 and 8). Teachers produce an ambivalent narrative of the value of children's personal expression and active participation in decisions and planning. The survey shows that most children feel they can speak freely about what they think, feel, and prefer, but fewer children report that they feel they can participate in decisions about school activities and that they can express their ideas about the classroom design. Moreover, teaching is criticised by children as not focused on dialogue. Thus, children's confidence in the education system can be undermined by hierarchical forms of teaching (Chapters 4 and 8).

The survey also shows the ambivalence of CMB's participation in communication with teachers. On the one hand, CMB are more frequently respectful of asymmetrical relations with teachers than native children (Chapter 3). CMB more frequently listen carefully to teachers and let teachers know their needs and wills. On the other hand, CMB perceive more difficulties in speaking about their feelings and preferences, although they feel more frequently involved in decision-making and designing the classroom. Cases of indifference or even discrimination towards CMB are reported in some interviews, and this may lead CMB to refrain from sharing their troubles with teachers (Chapter 4). Some CMB describe their fear of making mistakes and of being judged by their teachers and classmates, and this negatively influences their participation and their view of themselves. Thus, teachers' limited or ambivalent consideration of CMB's conditions can strongly limit the latter's exercise of agency.

Against this background, both children and professionals consider peer relations as extremely important for CMB's school experience and social life out of school, and children confirm that peer communication is an important support for their agency. CMB report receiving important support from other children in symmetrical relations (Chapter 4), although classmates may also perceive CMB's inadequacy in school performances and in speaking the local language (Chapters 4 and 8). The interviews highlight the usefulness of teachers' encouragement of peer relations and joint activities, thus strengthening children's agency through positive peer relations.

Thus, several teachers give relevance to CMB's belonging to peer groups, and some children declare that they belong to sub-groups in the classroom, characterised by different interests (Chapter 4). However, teachers observe that belonging may lead to consider children as group members rather than persons, leading to the rise of intergroup conflicts, despite the negotiations to find common ground.

Chapter 4 shows that several teachers find the enhancement of sensitivity to cultural stereotyping and discrimination difficult, and show an essentialist approach to culture (see Chapter 2) by emphasising the need for cultural identity for CMB. Teachers also see CMB's needs and expectations as different from those of non-migrant children. They observe that, on the one hand, CMB face cultural challenges; on the other, they are in the process of negotiation between the culture of origin and the host culture. Teachers (and other professionals) also show the belief that CMB's cultural identity is relevant for years after the migration process. All in all, the challenge of dealing with social norms/values and cultural expectations is perceived in an ambivalent way by the professionals who work with CMB (see also Chapter 7 for preschools). While some acknowledge hybrid identities as a resource that need to be supported, others are concerned with the challenge of dealing with different cultural identities. This challenge is interpreted by teachers as the creation of a community that encompasses all children, avoiding discrimination and exclusion by breaking down group categorisations, for example, based on ethnic belonging, and at the same time acknowledging their individual differences. The widespread recognition of CMB's identity as both cultural and personal is paradoxical. Essentialism can interfere with hybrid integration, and the school experience can lead to enhancing the paradox.

Another challenge for CMB's hybrid integration concerns the use of language in schools. Chapter 8 shows that a monolingual approach is widespread in schools. School initiatives mainly concern L2 teaching and learning, while language mediation and, above all, support of CMB's native languages are much less frequent. Teachers tend to attribute language problems to CMB rather than to the inadequacy of educational methods and interactions. They are convinced that the potential of CMB's exercise of agency is limited by their lack of language skills. Thus, CMB must first learn the language of the country of arrival before they can be integrated (Chapter 4), and knowledge of this language is considered very important to attend schools, to create relations with peers, and to face any social experience, avoiding marginalisation and segregation. This is mirrored by the evolution of children's view of language use. While younger children emphasise that sharing interests and values counts more than language in peer relations, language becomes more important for older children's self-expression in peer relations.

The way of teaching a second language, as a dominant activity aimed to integrate CMB, is ambivalent (Chapter 8). On the one hand, the monolingual approach is reproduced through monolingual teaching, with the partial exception of the Swedish case, in which switches from national language to English are allowed. In the Swedish case, however, translanguaging, that is, the use of different languages in the classroom (Chapter 2), is limited and tailored to the teachers' good knowledge of English. On the other hand, the use of classroom context mode, based on participation in communication rather than on learning specific language skills (Chapter 2), shows a

facilitative way of teaching, reducing top-down conveyance of knowledge and enhancing CMB's exercise of agency in conversations. Thus, second language classes can both produce facilitation of CMB's agency and reproduce monolingual communication so that their impact on hybrid integration is ambivalent.

How can children's hybrid integration be facilitated?

Hybrid integration can be enhanced and supported in classroom or group interactions by facilitating the interlacing of children's narratives of their personal cultural trajectories (Chapters 2, 6 and 7). The analysis of facilitated meetings shows that facilitation can enhance and support children's agency and dialogic interlacements of narratives of children's personal cultural trajectories. In facilitated interactions, CMB can exercise their agency: They can express themselves, take initiatives and lead the conversation, defend their positions, and reject possible undesired interpretations in a dialogic form of communication involving the whole classroom. Facilitation is based on the design of actions enhancing and supporting children's agency by upgrading children's authority in producing knowledge, that is, children's epistemic authority (Chapter 2; see also Baraldi, 2022). The research findings show that the ways of facilitating and the types of facilitated activities vary in different educational, social, and cultural contexts. However, they also show some common challenges for facilitation. The analysis of the research findings leads to the following categorisation of facilitative forms in classrooms and groups (Chapter 6).

1 *Facilitation* includes a mix of: (a) questions that enhance participation, showing a genuine interest in children's points of view and their clarification; (b) formulations that summarise, make explicit, or develop the gist of children's narratives or contributions; (c) minimal responses that show active listening and attention, favoring fluidity of the interaction (see also Baraldi, 2022).
2 *Facilitation* is *mixed* when it includes some facilitators' comments and explanations that stress the relevant and positive narratives produced by the children. Frequently, these comments and explanations are provided at the end of sequences of several contributions from children.
3 *Facilitation* is *directive* when it includes facilitators' frequent, sometimes systematic, comments, explanations, and normative recommendations. These actions show the facilitator's provision of relevant knowledge for children by establishing a mitigated upgrading of epistemic authority. Directive facilitation can also evolve in traditional teaching based on scaffolding (Chapter 6), thus mitigated in its evaluative dimension.

The analysis shows that children's exercise of agency decreases from facilitation to directive facilitation (and from mild directive facilitation to traditional teaching). Thus, while all these forms of facilitation may be effective in the classroom, they have different effects on hybrid integration, and facilitation is the most effective way of enhancing and supporting hybrid integration. The analysis also shows that facilitation is distributed differently in different types of schools (Chapter 6). In

particular, it is interesting that facilitation is frequently effective in upper secondary schools, which, however, have been observed in a few countries (Chapter 1). In Italy, the choice to employ external expert facilitators may have promoted successful facilitation, which may be interesting for further applications of facilitation in the education system. Facilitation also seems easy in primary schools, while lower secondary schools seem to be the most difficult context of facilitation. Interestingly, facilitation can also work well in preschools (Chapter 7), and this shows that the facilitation of agency and hybrid integration is not limited by children's age.

The analysis also shows that facilitation can enhance the production and interlacing of children's narratives. Children can choose ways and contents of narratives about personal experiences encapsulated in metanarratives (Chapter 2), such as migration or the pandemic. Both facilitators and children can contribute to the production of narratives. Facilitators can enhance and support children's initiatives in telling their personal stories, as well as fluid transitions and interlacements between these stories. Children can choose whether to rely on personal narratives and if and to what extent they can interlace them with other narratives. Chapter 6 shows the production of personal narratives related to CMB's migration and diversity, highlighting the struggle to be accepted, memories of experiences in different countries, and experiences of changing countries and school.

The analysis of post-test questionnaires administered after facilitated meetings (Chapter 1) shows that a large majority of children strongly appreciate facilitation (69% in general and 80% in upper secondary schools). It is important that 70% of CMB consider facilitation enjoyable and effective. There are no relevant differences between boys and girls and between non-migrant children and CMB: this equal way of evaluating the activities means that hybrid integration is effective in facilitated meetings. Fun, learning new things, involvement, self-expression and sharing opinions and experiences are much appreciated. During the meetings, the very large majority of children perceived respect, understanding, and appreciation, and reacted very positively to classmates' self-disclosure. Questionnaires and focus group interviews confirm the importance of dialogue and support of personal expressions in the success of facilitation. Focus group interviews also show that children can distinguish between successful facilitation and less successful directive facilitation.

How is gender relevant?

The narrative of gender is particularly important among professionals, although with different emphases and definitions (see Chapter 5). First, gender differences are combined with the condition of CMB and their families, although with different emphasis on diverse origins of migrants and varying generations. The professionals' most important and widespread narrative regards generational differences, in particular migrant families' different socialisation of boys and girls, discriminating girls and socialising boys to a traditional definition of masculinity. On the other side, new generations, in particular girls, can deviate from and even reject their families' cultural norms about gender roles, thus showing their agency.

This mismatch is associated with engagement in relations with non-migrant peers. However, it is also observed that peer relations can reject mixed-gender groups, in case of cultural differences and language barriers, but also when mere gender differences about ways of acting become relevant in communication. The emergence of CMB's agency is also associated with school experience and professionals' strategies of intervention; this shows the professionals' narrative of their own ability to change CMB's personal beliefs and ways of acting through some strategies aimed to show sensitivity for and to empower CMB's agency, sometime against the "traditional" culture of families.

Professionals' narrative of their strategies reflects the metanarrative of the power of education in changing personal believes and ways of acting. However, the education system may also construct stereotypes about gender and migration, particularly through professionals' strategies of persuasion of CMB to change their non-compliant cultural ways of acting. Despite their good intentions, professionals prevalently narrate the relation between gender and migration in essentialist ways, assigning importance to top-down educational ways of enhancing hybrid integration, sometimes associated with stereotypes and pressures.

A few interviews with children confirm the relation between peer groups and gender and the importance of teachers' interventions; however, the gender issue seems to be much less relevant among children than among professionals. Moreover, with only one exception regarding peer relations, we did not observe gender differences in the recorded classroom/group interactions. Participants (facilitators and children) neither oriented their actions to gender meanings, differences, and identities nor produced categorisations and narratives of gender. This is particularly interesting in the classroom interactions that included topics with the potential to develop gender models and expectations. Another important observation is that both boys and girls participated actively in these interactions without significant differences. Finally, gender was almost irrelevant in children's evaluation of facilitation, with the only exception that boys more frequently declared that they mocked classmates and were more frequently bored and annoyed; this exception confirms some potential challenges of gender-mixed group relations.

The contradictory picture emerging from the CHILD-UP research leads to observe that, while gender differences can be subtle and children may be unaware of them, enhancing and supporting children's agency implies that children's views and ways of participating in classroom/group interactions are primarily important to understand (possible) gender differences and problems.

What was the impact of the pandemic on children's experience?

The COVID-19 pandemic was an important challenge for research and school activities (Chapter 1). In the interviews, teachers stressed that CMB had frequent difficulties with online teaching, introduced in response to the outbreak of the pandemic. This is due not only to the digital divide and digital illiteracy, but also to the insufficient support from teachers and peers. Moreover, the lockdown

affected CMB's language skills. The topic of the pandemic was also introduced in interviews with children and some facilitated meetings. Children's dominant view is negative since online teaching resulted in fatigue and difficulties in maintaining well-being, health, and social and interpersonal relations, as strong limitations of opportunities to spend time together. However, the research also shows the children's ambivalent ways of narrating the pandemic. Although the majority of them stressed negative effects, some positive aspects of the lockdown were also highlighted, including the value of "real" friendship, the opportunity to stay closer to parents, more comfort in attending online classes while staying at home, and – for adolescents – more autonomy in studying and managing their time. Thus, the impact of the pandemic on children's agency was two-fold. On the one hand, children's voices and opinions were not taken into account, and children were reduced to "learning machines" (Amadasi & Baraldi, 2022). On the other hand, children could exploit the lockdown to express themselves in affective relations, and adolescents could develop their sense of autonomy and responsibility.

Finally, while the pandemic delayed the field activities and created several challenges in recording interviews and activities, it also allowed experimentation of online facilitated meetings and research, showing how children could participate remotely in facilitated interactions by exercising agency. This enhances an interesting reflection on the ways of supporting children's agency despite relevant, unpredictable challenges (Amadasi & Baraldi, 2022).

To what extent can parents be involved in school communication?

The opinion that families strongly influence children's school experience is widespread in educational policies and organisations. In the interviews, teachers and social workers emphasised the importance of involving parents, communicating with them, valuing their contributions, and taking into account the resources and challenges they bring (Chapter 4). However, a lack of understanding of the school system functioning, language barriers, and failure in school communication are important factors hindering migrant parents' participation (Chapter 3). Without clear structures guiding parents' involvement, there is a discrepancy between schools' expectations regarding parents and the extent to which parents participate. Thus, the challenge for the education system is providing the conditions for migrant parents' effective participation.

The analysis of the survey data shows the mismatch between parents' and teachers' opinions about parent–teacher communication (Chapter 9). Teachers' positive assessment of communication with parents is much less frequent than parents' positive assessment of communication with teachers. The perception of obstacles in parent–teacher communication is also different, but one of the biggest barriers is recognised in parents' lack of language skills, which influences the capacity of parents to support their children in the school context, participate in communication with teachers, and understand the school requirements. In this context, language mediation (Chapter 2) can be an effective way of supporting parent-teacher communication.

In some Italian primary schools, the analysis of language mediation in parent–teacher meetings, sometimes with children's participation, shows a recurrent challenging structure (Chapter 9). On the one hand, teachers provide long monologues and mostly negative assessments of CMB and parents' commitment in helping children. Teachers do not ask parents to comment or explain their children's behaviors, nor do they propose any form of collaboration with parents. They focus on: (a) the poor Italian language competence and scarce motivation of CMB; and (b) the lack of parental support and the necessity that parents help their children more. This can explain their negative assessment of parent–teacher communication.

On the other hand, mediators' attempts to enhance parents' participation in the interaction are based on renditions of teachers' monologues and parents' reactions (see also Baraldi, forthcoming). First, mediators approach renditions of teachers' assessments and requests to parents by expressing good auspices, providing practical suggestions and contextualising the assessments. Second, mediators address parents' convergent and divergent reactions to teachers' assessments and requests through accurate renditions, in particular when parents diverge from teachers' assessments by telling of personal aspects of children's experience. Moreover, mediators may explain to parents how the education system works and what they can do with it. This analysis shows that mediators add significance to teachers' production of knowledge, both expanding and contextualising it, and accurately report parents' production of knowledge in the interaction.

Mediators' action supports both parents' responses and narratives in the interaction, and parents' future action outside the interaction by suggesting solutions for them. Thus, mediators are engaged in a relevant but solitary exercise of agency in enhancing and supporting parents' agency, creating the conditions of hybrid integration in the mediated interaction. However, mediators' exercise of agency does not downgrade teachers' authority, since teachers preserve their rights to confirm or deny the value of parents' production of knowledge. Thus, mediators' renditions support parents' actions without challenging teachers' monologues and without introducing effective parent–teacher dialogue. Two interactions in preschools, which have not been analysed in Chapter 9, show teachers' effective encouragement of parents' participation by asking questions or giving instructions about what to do for and with their children, which facilitates mediators' work and improves dialogic parent–teacher communication. This shows the importance of teachers' involvement in promoting parents' agency, in coordination with mediators.

Finally, children also participate in some mediated interactions (Baraldi & Ceccoli, 2023). In these cases, the teachers mainly addressed the parents by talking indirectly about the children. On those rare occasions when the children are addressed directly, or take initiatives, mediators are harnessed in the parent–teacher interaction and compelled to follow it rather than support children's initiatives. Therefore, it seems that children's agency in parent–teacher meetings is not empowered by teachers and mediators.

This analysis suggests reflecting on the ways in which language mediation can enhance and support migrants' exercise of agency and the teachers can support

effective mediation. Difficulties of parent–teacher communication can be a serious challenge to the production of hybrid integration in the education system. Mediators exercise agency to support migrants' agency, thus acting as facilitators of their exercise of agency in the interaction, but this work meets serious challenges due to a lack of coordination with teachers.

What are the most important tools based on the CHILD-UP research?

The CHILD-UP research project has produced practical tools to implement children's agency and hybrid integration in the education system, listed below.

1 Generation of a *digital archive* including video- and audio-recordings and transcripts of interactions across national contexts and age ranges, data from interviews and questionnaires, thus incorporating the participants' voices, and analytical notes that contextualise the examples of facilitative methods. The archive allows the users to compare the contexts of their work with CMB with other settings in different contexts. The data can be used to design facilitative activities for children's agency and hybrid integration.
2 Generation of *research-based guidelines* for methods of facilitation, based on the analysis of best practices across the participating countries. The guidelines aim to give theoretical and practical orientation to professionals working with CMB who are interested in enhancing dialogue, agency, and hybrid integration.
3 Package for *professionals' face-to-face training*, which can be used for group sessions, offering data-driven knowledge and materials. The training package offers guidance for professionals who aim to train others in the use of methodologies to promote children's agency and hybrid integration, facilitating peer discussion. The training package is designed to allow room for flexibility and adapt to different contexts of delivery, as well as to the creative contributions of trainers and trainees.
4 *Massive Open Online Course* (MOOC) developing the training package for online delivery to allow European-wide distribution of training. The MOOC is a tool for self-learning which includes learning materials and opportunities for professionals' reflection, as well as resources for self-assessment of learning. The MOOC is based on a modular framework, including videos and documents such as transcripts and slides, available to an unlimited number of users with different backgrounds, professional profiles, and aspirations.
5 Package for *self-evaluation* of school and classroom activities. Tools for self-evaluation can support professionals to monitor and reflectively assess their practices with children and the achievement of hybrid integration.

The integrated system of these five outcomes aims to provide professionals, in particular teachers and facilitators but also social workers, mediators and any other professional working with CMB, with a complete set of tools to produce the

conditions of hybrid integration in classroom or groups. This can transfer the impact of the research project from the scientific field to the field of educational practices.

What are the scientific and educational impacts of the CHILD-UP research?

The CHILD-UP research project aimed to achieve an important impact in the scientific field and to transfer it to the educational and political communities at the local, national and European levels. The scientific impact includes a variety of aspects.

First, the scientific impact of this research includes a methodological reflection on the way of constructing knowledge by moving from desk research on legislation and policies to quantitative analysis to interviews and recordings of facilitated activities. This research has shown the importance of producing high variety and complexity of research findings to explain children's lived experiences of education and hybrid integration, showing that all children, and CMB in particular, *can* express their agency and under what conditions.

Against this background, the CHILD-UP research has produced a unique set of children's and professionals' views of migration, (hybrid) integration and (support of) agency. Second, it has explored the meanings of facilitation as enhancement and support of children's agency as authorship of choices and knowledge, expression of personal cultural trajectories, engagement in dialogic communication with peers and adults, describing the most important facilitative actions. Third, the CHILD-UP research has described the conditions of hybrid integration based on the dialogic interlacing of different personal cultural trajectories. Fourth, it has shown possibilities and limits of ways of dealing with language use, that is, language mediation, translanguaging and second language teaching. Finally, the CHILD-UP research has provided important knowledge about challenges of and innovation in adapting to unpredictable conditions, such as the pandemic.

The CHILD-UP research has also highlighted weaknesses regarding teachers' (and other professionals') support of agency and hybrid integration. In particular, it has shown the ambiguity in professionals' views of cultural differences. However, the research has shown that agency, dialogue and hybrid integration are not only desired by children, but can also be made possible in the education system, although they are far from being generalised in this system. The CHILD-UP research has shown that hybrid integration is based on the involvement of both CMB and non-migrant children and that an approach to hybrid integration requires awareness of the complexity of classroom interactions and relations, children's personal cultural trajectories and their interlacements, as well as parent–teacher communication.

The CHILD-UP project suggests the importance of bottom-up practices that implement friendly schools, based on systematic facilitation of children's personal expressions of feelings and experiences, creative ideas, dissent and initiatives. First, bottom-up practices are new ways of interacting in classrooms and groups of

children by implementing facilitative methods open to children's needs and interests, thus supporting CMB's responsibilities in their own education, school decisions and classroom design. Second, bottom-up practices are teachers' responsibility for adapting facilitative actions locally, depending on age, gender, language proficiency, local migration processes, as specific conditions of hybrid integration and collaboration of schools and stakeholders in constructing local knowledge. Third, bottom-up practices improve interactions with migrant parents (and children) by using language mediation properly, based on coordination with teachers, to collect migrants' view on agency and hybrid integration in schools and families. In principle, language mediation is the best way of breaking the monolingual approach in society (Cronin, 2006), but in the education system it requires the effective collaboration of teachers. Finally, bottom-up practices include the construction of specialised and interactive digital archives to disseminate this knowledge.

The CHILD-UP research has provided materials to discuss these bottom-up practices in data-driven training and reflective sessions improving professionals' awareness of the ways of enhancing and supporting children's (and parents') agency, by confronting different conditions, risks and challenges of hybrid integration. These sessions can inform teachers about their own and others' beliefs and contributions in interactions and the effects of these beliefs and contributions on communication with CMB (and their parents). The relevant outcome of the CHILD-UP research concerns professionals' awareness, communication skills and a general competence that can be applied to encourage and support dialogue among children and adults.

The results of the CHILD-UP project lead us to reflect on the possibility of extending the facilitation of CMB's agency and hybrid integration to all teaching contexts. The ambition is not suggesting that facilitation of agency can replace teaching tout court, but implying that facilitation can be introduced in each class, at each age, and in each specific situation, alongside teaching, with important effects on the construction of positive interlacements of adults' and children's personal cultural trajectories.

References

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

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

Baraldi, C. (forthcoming). Interpreter-mediated interactions between teachers and migrant parents. In B. Dendrinos (Ed.), *Mediation as linguistic and cultural negotiation of meanings and plurilingualism*. London/New York: Routledge.

Baraldi, C., & Ceccoli, F. (2023). Problems of children's involvement in interpreter-mediated meetings between their teachers and their parents. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*. https://doi.org/10.1515/eujal-2022-0024

Cronin, M. (2006). *Translation and identity*. London: Routledge.

Holliday, A., & Amadasi, S. (2020). *Making sense of the intercultural. Finding DeCentred threads*. London: Routledge.

Index