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

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 second-ary 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 facil-itation in the education system. Facilitation also seems easy in primary schools, while lower secondary schools seem to be the most difficult context of facilita-tion. 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 inter-lacing 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 diver-sity, 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 facili-tated 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 differ-ent emphasis on diverse origins of migrants and varying generations. The profes-sionals' most important and widespread narrative regards generational differences, in particular migrant families' different socialisation of boys and girls, discrim-inating 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.