



The role played by ECEC in promoting social inclusion of children of immigrant families: the outcomes of a research conducted in Italy, Spain, and Hungary

Journal:	<i>European Early Childhood Education Research Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Research paper
Keywords:	Children from Immigrant, Refugee, Roma Families, intercultural training needs, ECEC services, disadvantage, diversity

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

The role played by ECEC in promoting social inclusion of children of immigrant families: the outcomes of a research conducted in Italy, Spain, and Hungary

This paper presents the results of a European survey, entitled “Multicultural Early Childhood Education”, carried out between 2017 and 2018 under the Erasmus Plus program, in three Countries: namely, Italy, Spain, and Hungary. The goal was to explore intercultural training needs of Early Childhood Education and Care professionals, in order to make them able to meet the needs of Children from Immigrant, Refugee, and Roma Families, and their families. It was a comparative study about the cultural background of educators, through the analysis of their competences and training needs, with respect to the issue of multiculturalism and interculturality, with a focus on the “good practices” promoted within the educational contexts of partner institutions. The survey was conducted using a semi-structured questionnaire, administered to a sample of educators and pedagogical coordinators working in ECEC services of Florence, Barcelona, and Budapest. The outcomes of the analysis of the data collected has shown that strengthening the relationship between ECEC services and immigrant families represents an important goal, in order to guarantee and promote the integration of children and their families.

Keywords: diversity; Children from Immigrant, Refugee, and Roma Families; intercultural training needs; ECEC services; disadvantage.

1. Introduction

European Countries are increasingly marked by a plurality of differences of social, cultural, linguistic, ethnic, religious, etc. In the second half of the 20th century, the historical pluralism related to the evolution of individual Countries generated new forms of cultural hybridisation and contamination (Ceruti, in Callari Galli, Cambi, Id. 2003). While dominating the contemporary global scenario, migration processes are transforming present-day societies, shortening the distances between Continents and Countries, bringing peoples and cultures together, and changing people’s lifestyle,

1
2
3 therefore reducing the distance between “us” and “them” (Susi, 1999).
4
5

6 Facing the abovementioned phenomena, pedagogical and educational research has played
7
8 a central role in identifying models and practices, which might help answer the challenges
9
10 posed by new social conditions. In time, these models and practices have gradually turned
11
12 into a field of pedagogical research and intervention, under the name of intercultural
13
14 education (Damiano, 1999). This discipline emerges not only as a response to specific
15
16 needs characterising pupils with a migrant background (e.g. maintaining their native
17
18 language); more than else, it intends to be an educational proposal addressing all pupils:
19
20 having they an autochthonous or migrant background (Silva, 2005). While crossing
21
22 school subjects, intercultural education implies a review of school programs and
23
24 textbooks; moreover, it considers language in its function of communication and as a tool
25
26 of, and for, cultural identification. It is indeed a matter of a pedagogical perspective,
27
28 shared by experts at European level now, which is the result of a reflection originated in
29
30 the Seventies, further developed in response to many demands made by the European
31
32 Commission and the Council of Europe.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Since then, the European institutions have issued several Directives, Recommendations,
40
41 and financial lines, aimed at reminding the Member States the need to promote inclusion
42
43 policies to fight educational poverty and social exclusion (European Commission,
44
45 17.2.2011; Id., 2.3.2013; Id., 26.4.2017; Eurostat, 2013; Eurydice, 2009; on this subject,
46
47 see also Guerin, 2014, and Heckman, 2012). In fact, immigration requires a joint political
48
49 commitment of all European Countries, calling for a common engagement of institutions
50
51 and local services (police headquarters, social and health facilities, schools, Early
52
53 Childhood Education and Care services, etc.) in implementing social cohesion strategies
54
55 (EC, 2010; 2015; European Commission – General Directorate for Education and
56
57 Culture, 2016). As from the early 2000s, the European Union has devoted increasing
58
59
60

1
2
3 attention to ECEC, by highlighting its function not only in terms of children's positive
4 development, but also as a sort of "guarantor" in promoting equal educational
5 opportunities for all children, and a full social and cultural inclusion for them and their
6 families as well (European Commission, 8.9.2006; Id., Eacea, Eurydice, and Eurostat,
7 2014). Indeed, preschool services have been increasingly playing a determining role in
8 socialisation and in integration processes of children and their parents, and – more broadly
9 – of local community as well (European Commission, Eurydice, and Eacea, April 2009;
10 Id. – General Directorate for Justice, 2013). Nowadays, ECEC services have come to
11 reflect our heterogeneous social reality, inasmuch as they welcome an increasing number
12 of children and families with a migration background (Eurostat, 2018; Istat, 2018).

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
So that ECEC services can really become contexts of social inclusion – especially for
children having a migration background, and their families – it is necessary that Early
Childhood professionals receive both initial and ongoing training focused on intercultural
education (Harte, Facundo, and Stepanek 2017; Silva 2004). In fact, education staff needs
specific competences and skills, which would enable them to read the cultural pluralism
characterising – through its social, economic, religious, linguistic, and so on – today's
ECEC services. Initial training for educators has included intercultural topics into its
programs for some time, and intercultural education has become a teaching subject within
University courses in Early Childhood Education (Fiorucci, 2011); notwithstanding, a
great deal of educators are actually precluded from the possibility to acquire, during their
initial training, accurate skills and competences regarding reception of immigrant
children and their families. This oversight is further due to the fact that, in many European
Countries, educators are not to date required to get an initial education provided by
University (i.e. initial training), and, in many cases, not even a continuing professional
training (i.e. in-service training). Finally, the situation is underpinned throughout

1
2
3 European Countries by the shortage of an empirical research on educators' needs, focused
4 on their intercultural skills and competences; without this kind of knowledge, it is actually
5 not possible to contribute to identify effective educational strategies in this regard (Silva,
6 2004; Id., 2008).
7
8
9
10
11

12
13 From the above, it emerges that the analysis of intercultural training needs of
14 professionals working in ECEC services addressed to the age group 0-3 is of primary
15 importance (Peeters, Sharmahd, 2014). This is precisely the perspective the EU Project
16 entitled "Multicultural Early Childhood Education +" (MECEC+) was based on; hence a
17 summary of the results of the Project is reported herein. The MECEC+ Project was
18 inspired by the idea that intercultural training represents an essential requirement for
19 educators and other childcare professionals; it is actually a priority for them to acquire
20 theoretical and practical tools that may enable them to read today's sociocultural reality,
21 in order to perform their own tasks and functions as best they can (Portera, 2014).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **2. Methods**

37
38
39
40

41 Training needs of educators have been explored through a semi-structured
42 questionnaire model, with multiple choice and open-ended questions, drafted jointly by
43 all Partners. In order to explore educators' training needs on intercultural relationships,
44 before proceeding with the elaboration of this research tool, an exploratory survey on the
45 reference population has been conducted, aimed at collecting information on the contexts
46 the questionnaire is addressed to (Sharmahd, 2012). Subsequently, after having specified
47 research goals (Gattico, in Id., Mantovani, 1998), we defined the areas and the constructs
48 to be investigated, subdividing the questionnaire into six main topics: namely, knowledge
49 of the phenomenon; intercultural training needs; initial training; ongoing training; the
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 relationship with families; the approach with other “diversities”. Then, once the items the
4 survey should be structured in were established, the questions that had to be administered
5 to educators were elaborated; their order of presentation has been based on a funnel
6 succession, therefore passing from general questions to more specific ones, in order to
7 give the respondent the opportunity to focus, think and re-think on the subject of
8 interculturality (Bove, 2009).
9

10
11
12 A semi-structured questionnaire was created from here, consisting of 31 closed-
13 ended questions (multiple-choice and filter questions), and three open-ended questions.
14 The questionnaire was administered to a sample of educators and pedagogical
15 coordinators working in ECEC services of the Metropolitan areas of Florence, Barcelona,
16 and Budapest. The research carried out preliminarily highlighted the most relevant issues
17 for the training of educational staff (Peeters, Vandebroek, 2011) on interculturality; the
18 construction of the questionnaire took into account these indications. Hence, the subject
19 areas investigated were the following: knowledge of the migratory phenomenon, and of
20 refugees, asylum seekers, and minorities; knowledge and skills acquired in initial and
21 ongoing training, with respect to the management of ethnic, linguistic, cultural and
22 religious diversity present in ECEC; the ability to establish positive relationships with
23 children’s parents, involving them in ECEC services’ life effectively. The questionnaire
24 elaborated was then shared with the other Project Partners, who adapted it to their own
25 contexts. Each Partner then proceeded to carry out the empirical survey, after identifying
26 the sample.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 We choose to use an online questionnaire because, if compared to traditional
52 methods, it has many advantages, ensuring:
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 • a speeder survey management: the timing of the survey is lower than a
4 survey carried out employing traditional methods (such as, for example, ordinary mail,
5 phone, or face-to-face interviews);
6
7

8
9
10 • a quick data monitoring and data analysis; execution times are reduced.
11
12 The opportunity to be able to enter and analyze data just contemporarily to their
13 availability is a fundamental feature of online surveys, which positively affects execution
14 times, by reducing them significantly;
15
16

17
18
19 • a reduction in costs: research conducted online has a lower cost, compared
20 to similar surveys carried out employing traditional methods;
21
22

23
24 • a non-intrusive data-detection: a questionnaire completed online is
25 actually a questionnaire the user decided to respond to, on the request of very few external
26 agents. Therefore, this improves not only the spontaneity of questionnaire replies, but
27 also their fidelity. Furthermore, anonymity allows respondents to be truly themselves, to
28 give their opinions even when inconvenient or ‘unpopular’;
29
30
31

32
33 • the achievement of different targets: thanks to the online administration, it
34 is possible to cover a wide geographical territory.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 The outcomes of the analysis of the data collected in the three Partner Countries
43 are synthetically illustrated here below, and some useful indications to educators and
44 pedagogical coordinators will be given, in order to improve the reception of children and
45 the involvement of their families.
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 53 **3. RESULTS**

54 55 56 57 58 ***3.1 The Italian context*** 59 60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

As far as the Italian context is concerned, the survey has been conducted in Tuscany. The respondents encompassed by the research are all members of educational services personnel employed by ARCA Social Cooperative (Arca Cooperativa Sociale): most of the interviewed are operating in Florence and its surroundings, as well as in other Tuscan Municipalities where ARCA Social Cooperative operates (cf. <https://www.arcacoop.org/firenze/nido-d-infanzia-asilo-scuola-dell-infanzia-spazio-gioco-ludoteche.html>, last access: 28.5.2019). The sample of 101 educational workers (Early Childhood educators and pedagogical coordinators) who answered the questionnaire offered sufficient data to draw a number of research findings, also formulating some relevant conclusions and recommendations. The questionnaire replies obtained allowed us to outline the professional profile of educators working in ECEC. In Tuscany, most of educators are women, aged between 18 and 40 years. They usually are full-time employees, with a stable contract. In addition, most of interviewees has a degree in a pedagogical field (Pedagogy, Education, Early Childhood, or equals).

The research was specifically aimed at knowing the involvement of ECEC professionals with Children from Immigrant, Refugee, and Roma Families (CIRRF), as categories usually perceived as “diverse”. In this context, more than half of the interviewed (57,4%) answered to be not much familiar with the condition of CIRRF present in the territory they are working in. Nevertheless, in front of such a situation, it is interesting to observe that a half of the personnel interviewed (49,5%) believe to be aware of the immigrant parents’ needs, though not sufficiently.

It is also interesting to know that, regarding the necessary intercultural and educational tools for receiving CIRRF and their families, only few educators (4%) maintain to have that kind of skills, and 68,3% feel like having them, but not sufficiently.

1
2
3 In light of these facts, most of the interviewed (58,4%) state to need for an intercultural
4 training that could help them better meet the needs of immigrant children and their
5 families. The areas in which they do feel a particular lack of intercultural skills to manage
6 them better are daily routines (change, sleep, lunch, etc.), structured activities, free play,
7 and managing of the relationships with parents. Several educators said that they really
8 “feel the need for an intercultural training” (17%), in relationship with families and in
9 managing it. They said that the actions that could improve the relationship between their
10 educational services and immigrant families should be preferably aimed at arranging
11 (group and individual) meetings: meetings on the most significant educational issues
12 (42%); among parents (37%); aimed at facing specific problems of each class (9%);
13 including systematic individual parent-teacher talks (25%). Aside from the questionnaire
14 replies, some respondents added: meetings aimed at combating judgments and prejudices;
15 improving communication; organizing intercultural events with the participations of
16 everyone (children, parents, grandparents, and educators); cultural mediation; translating
17 documents and information. As it emerges from those last statements, educators generally
18 think that there is a need for a linguistic-cultural mediation service; moreover, they guess
19 that it would be important to translate the documentation and information sent by
20 educational services to families also into the languages of immigrant parents.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Regarding communication and dialogue between services and educators, some
45 respondents answered that, according to them, families perceive ECEC services as
46 important services for their children, and for them as well. Educational services are
47 actually seen as safe and welcoming places, in which their children can be looked after;
48 as contexts offering useful time to children, to be spent with people taking care of them;
49 as spaces offering the possibility to share and exchange experiences with other children,
50 in a process of common growth. Accordingly, an ECEC service is seen as an opportunity
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 for integration, of their children and themselves; a “first step” towards integration into
4 the hosting society; a community, based on aggregation, hospitality, and involvement,
5 offering the possibility to establish and enjoying new friendships; a place where children
6 can reciprocally socialize, while learning other language(s); a possibility for promoting
7 integration of CIRRF (both children and families) while helping all of them to valorize
8 their own culture; last but not least, a resource helping children to improve the potential
9 of their inclusion into the mainstream society.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 In conclusion, the presence of CIRRF and their parents in ECEC services puts all
22 professionals in front of new duties and unseen challenges, which go well beyond the
23 welcoming practices in educational services (Urban, Vandenbroeck, Van Laere, Lazzari,
24 Peeters, 2012). What is required of educators and pedagogical coordinators – and in
25 general to all educational staff – is to start a renovation process that invests both the
26 educational plane and the one of the relationships with the families. This process therefore
27 aims at promoting the full inclusion of the “children of immigration” (Colombo, Leonini,
28 Rebughini, 2009).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 ***3.2 The Catalan context***

43
44
45
46

47 The questionnaire was sent online to different Regions in Catalonia (namely,
48 Bages, Solsonès, Anoia, Barcelonès, Segarra, Vallès Occidental, Baix Llobregat, Segrià,
49 Berguedà, Moianès). The questionnaire was sent to 67 educators working in 280 ECEC
50 centers addressed to the age group 0-3 in Catalonia. The questionnaire replies provided
51 by educators give relevant information, which makes possible to reflect on some aspects
52 that might be relevant when tackling diversity in Catalan nurseries.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The first aspect emerged, regarding CIRRF's families and intercultural education
4 initiatives, is educators' awareness of the fact that they feel like they do not know enough
5 about how to effectively deal with cultural diversity, intercultural education, and/or how
6 to meet families' needs. It can also be observed a positive response in their willingness to
7 learn more on intercultural approach. Moreover, the great majority of educators is aware
8 that CIRRF and their families suffer from prejudices. Over 50% of educators considers
9 that the current pluralism does not represent a real problem in the daily life of services;
10 instead, the other half seems to be aware that it does (46,7% "not much"; 11% replies
11 "no"; 37%, "quite", and 4,8%, "yes"). Besides, there seem to be still some unresolved
12 aspects between the (CIRRF' and non-CIRRF's) families, and between CIRRF's families
13 and educators.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 As regards the question: "in your opinion, which type of relations do establish
29 between local children and those children born in other Countries?", most of educators
30 replies to question 22 "excellent" (37%), or "very good" (32,2%; 19,3% replied "quite
31 good"). However, when the same question is asked on the subject of the relationships
32 between autochthonous and non-autochthonous families (rather than children, as in
33 question 21), a majority of educators guesses the relationships "excellent", or "very
34 good". This actually highlights how pluralism in educational contexts does affect some
35 internal relationships between adults, even though replies do not seem very dramatic at
36 first glance (even though, making a comparison with question 21, these subtle differences
37 emerge). The replies to the question: "do you consider that there are relational difficulties
38 between educators and CIRRF's families?" reinforce the impression that there are still
39 some unresolved issues in educators-CIRRF's families relationships); thus, although 50
40 % replies "no"; 35,4% replies "yes, on both sides"; 8% "felt by the educators", and 6,4%
41 "felt by families". Concerning the question: "in an affirmative case, what type of actions
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 could improve the relations between the educative services and families?”, educators
4 believe that, to effectively cope with these problems, more meetings and different types
5 of activities addressed to parents ought to be planned. Also most of them replies that a
6 linguistic and cultural mediation with families is sometimes necessary (72,6%; 24,2%
7 replies “always”).

8
9
10 Besides what stated above, most educators is aware that CIRRF’s families
11 typically attend the meetings (60%); if it is not, they reply that maybe is due to: work-
12 related reasons (24,2%); a lack of understanding of the language (22,6%); the fact that
13 families do not consider their participation important (22,3%). Besides, to the question:
14 “your service organizes meetings and lifelong learning sessions on interculturality
15 addressed to families?”, 69,3% answered “no”; conversely, 24,2% replies “yes, from time
16 to time”. This poses a problem, because this lack of training on intercultural topics may
17 lead educators to ignore some relevant aspects concerning their own cultural role and
18 impact (for example, by accidentally promoting, as “cultural agents”, values conflicting
19 with those of CIRRF). They would also probably have an insufficient awareness of more
20 interculturally respectful (and useful) strategies to communicate with CIRRF and their
21 families.

22
23
24 Specifically regarding the difficulties that might arise within the relationships
25 between educators and families, a majority of educators (45,2%) believe that they are
26 linguistic; 20,9% that they are due to cultural obstacles; 14,5%, economical. Anyway, we
27 must point out that, in order to correctly read these data, we have to consider that, in
28 Catalonia, the number of speaking Spanish CIRRF can vary greatly (Benito, Gonzalez,
29 2007). Anyway, concerning the fact that most educators show to be aware of not having
30 sufficient knowledge about intercultural education and relationships, their interpretation
31 that the possible difficulties are linguistic sometimes might be a misinterpretation of what
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 actually occurs. Indeed, these problems may be instead due to economic circumstances
4
5 of CIRRF's families, or cultural differences: for example, some situations may be due to
6
7 a cultural misunderstanding.
8
9

10 11 12 ***3.3 The Hungarian context*** 13 14 15

16
17 The questionnaire has been submitted online to 97 professionals working in Early
18
19 Childhood Education and Care services run by the JEB (ECEC services in Józsefváros,
20
21 Budapest). ELTE University Budapest and JEB adapted some questions on the basis of
22
23 the particular local context the questionnaire was distributed. The questionnaire was sent
24
25 to the ECEC services located in the 8th district in Budapest.
26
27

28
29 In order to show its results, we would like to highlight the following aspects. The
30
31 educational services involved welcome many CIRRF. It therefore seems appropriate to
32
33 reflect on the ideas that educators may have regarding these children and their families,
34
35 which in Hungary are at high risk from social exclusion. Hungarian educators feel quite
36
37 confident about their knowledge, educational approaches, and ability to promote
38
39 integration of children with a diverse cultural background; anyway, most educators feel
40
41 the need to expand their knowledge, especially in structured activities and routines. They
42
43 also suggest that, in carrying out structured activities, it would be needed to “incorporate”
44
45 the tools provided by art education to reduce differences, therefore mitigating
46
47 disadvantage. Besides, it would be useful to learn about different cultures; to present
48
49 visual techniques, from different cultures; to propose storytelling, poems, fairy tales, and
50
51 folktales of different cultures; to sing in different languages.
52
53
54

55
56 Regarding CIRRFs' families, research stressed the need for strengthening
57
58 cooperation between parents and educators. ECEC professionals do not have enough
59
60

1
2
3 skills to include, and to work, according to an intercultural perspective, in everyday
4 situation. A lack of “visions” by educational teams to deal with intercultural situation and
5 with culturally diverse families and children also emerges. Concerning the question: “are
6 you familiar with the condition of immigrant, refugee and/or Roma families present in
7 the territory you are working in?”, most Hungarian educators claim that they have got all
8 necessary intercultural education working methods (37,50%); anyway, there is a tendency
9 to consider immigrant families only as families with low socioeconomic status.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
The results of the questionnaire show how urgent the need for being able to explain to educators, from a pedagogical point of view, that intercultural education ought to be applied independently of whether there are problems, or not, and independently of whether there are foreign families/children, or not, is. It also emerged that some difficulties, for educators, in getting tools and skills to effectively deal with CIRRF. According to the replies, Hungarian educators think that professional training is crucial to effectively approach and manage “diversity” in educational contexts.

We can therefore conclude that there are no areas that could really be considered satisfactory (more than 75%): the results stress the presence of significant, even urgent, training needs across all areas. Educators, at international level, have almost universally acknowledged the importance of establishing good relationships with families, also encouraging their involvement in ECEC services’ daily life. The way these relationships are conceptualized and put into practice, however, varies greatly depending in the contexts, and it is “shaped” by the history and the traditions of ECEC in particular contexts, such as national and local pedagogies, which are underpinned by a different concept of “childhood”, of the “child”, and of ECEC professionals as well. Moreover, we also must consider those ideologies linked to early education and family, such as what

1
2
3 the purpose of early education is, how children grow, what is best for them, and what a
4
5 “good family” is (Kang et al., 2017).
6
7
8
9

10 **4. Conclusions**

11
12
13
14
15 This paper shows the most relevant outcomes of the European survey conducted
16
17 in Italy, Spain, and Hungary, focused on Early Childhood Education and Care
18
19 professionals’ training needs. In the survey, we aimed at discovering what they need to
20
21 close the gaps they experience when it comes to the needs of Children from Immigrant,
22
23 Refugee, and Roma Families (CIRRF). The comparative study employed a semi-
24
25 structured questionnaire, adapted according to the different contexts, therefore used in all
26
27 Countries involved in the Project. According to the goal of the study, several conclusions
28
29 emerge from the analysis of the data collected. The response rate provides sufficient data
30
31 to formulate relevant conclusions and a practical guidance.
32
33
34

35
36 First, it is important to emphasize some findings of the research population
37
38 participating the survey. All respondents are in-service professionals of ECEC services
39
40 (265: 87 in Hungary-Budapest, 101 in Italy-Tuscany, and 67 in Spain-Catalonia), both
41
42 teachers and coordinating staff. The data showed that the distribution of staff by
43
44 experience was different and uneven across the three institutions participating the
45
46 research. In addition, the results shows a significant number of new staff members due to
47
48 retirements of older staff. There can or cannot be a connection between the findings about
49
50 age and experience as ECEC professional, and training needs, nevertheless in this
51
52 research they are the current group of educators and coordinators.
53
54
55

56
57 From the analysis of the data emerges that the element that many respondents, in
58
59 all three Countries, indicate to feel is the need of a specific training on working with
60

1
2
3 “diversity”. Moreover, the data shows that, within educators, different levels of
4
5 intercultural knowledge are experienced. As the Italian example shows how almost half
6
7 (49,5%) of the responding professionals believe to be not as fully aware of the immigrant
8
9 parents’ needs. It also demonstrates how the need for intercultural training is not only
10
11 limited to the daily routine and childcare activity, but also within the relationship with
12
13 parents.
14
15

16
17 Regarding Early Childhood professionals’ training needs, some respondents
18
19 replied what the “right” tools and methods are supposed to be, in order to identify
20
21 educators’ training needs. Conversely, others described the tools and methods used to this
22
23 purpose, within their services. According to the format of the training, the Early
24
25 Childhood professionals therefore consider different learning organization methods
26
27 useful. Approaches such as fighting prejudices, training on communication, planning
28
29 intercultural events, translating information and cultural mediation were suggested. Many
30
31 of them aiming at effectively managing ethnic, linguistic, cultural, and religious diversity
32
33 present in ECEC services, and at establishing a positive relationship with children’s
34
35 parents, also involving them.
36
37
38
39

40 Hence, the comparative study carried out in Italy, Hungary, and Spain underlines
41
42 that (out of the analysis of skills and training needs, with respect to the issues of
43
44 multiculturalism and interculturality, and focusing on the “good practices” promoted in
45
46 partner institutions’ educational contexts) the long-term aim is to improve the inclusion
47
48 of children in disadvantaged contexts, through the development of knowledge, skills, and
49
50 attitudes useful to ensure equal opportunities in the subsequent school pathway, having a
51
52 positive impact on the development of all children and their families as well.
53
54
55
56
57

58 **5. Debate**

59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Research on the topics of “diversity” and interculturality needs shows that ECEC services represent privileged contexts where putting into practice social inclusion praxis, not only addressed to children, but also to their parents (Picchio, Mayer, 2019). However, it is necessary for ECEC staff to get a solid knowledge of the social and cultural reality of children’s families, and specific intercultural educational skills, useful to work with these children and their families. Although ECEC services find themselves heterogeneous for both linguistic and ethnic-cultural reasons, their educational staff actually is often lacking those skills necessary to identify and understand the specific needs of such users, therefore proposing effective actions to meet them. Our research has actually confirmed this lack in Partner Countries, also showing ECEC staff is aware of this.

On the other hand, the question of the inclusion of immigrant children and their families cannot be seen as an emergency issue, to be answered on an occasional basis; on the contrary, it must be addressed acting upon stable models and educational practices, founded on the awareness that the social reality is physiologically ever changing (Suarez-Orozco, Qin-Hilliard, 2004). The work of ECEC educators thus becomes more challenging, since it requires the knowledge of the reality of the families that inhabit the territory they operate in; the ability to revise one own interpretative patterns of cultural differences, sometimes modifying their organizational modalities and educational practices.

Hence the importance of knowing the social context children with a migration background and their parents, also to better understand the point of view of mothers and fathers, their educational styles, etc. A training based on the principles of interculturality is therefore needed: a training which could provide educators with the ability to interpret the needs of parents with a background of migration; to suspend judgment on them, at the

1
2
3 same time acquiring and putting into practice effective communicative skills; in a word,
4
5 a professional training in intercultural education, focused on those approaches and
6
7 methodologies useful to interact with children with a “diverse” social, cultural, and
8
9 linguistic background.
10
11
12
13
14

15 **Notes (Abbreviations)**

- 16 • **CIRRF:** Children from Immigrant, Refugee, and Roma Families.
- 17
- 18 • **ECEC:** Early Childhood Education and Care
- 19
- 20 • **MECEC:** Multicultural Early Childhood Education and Care
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

26 **References**

- 27
28 Benito, R. and I. Gonzalez. 2007. *Processos de segregació escolar*. Barcelona: Fundació
29 Jaume Bofill.
- 30 Bove, C. 2009. *Ricerca educativa e formazione. Contaminazioni metodologiche*. Milan:
31 FrancoAngeli.
- 32 Callari Galli, M., F. Cambi and M. Ceruti. 2003. *Formare alla complessità. Prospettive*
33 *dell'educazione nella società globale*. Rome: Carocci.
- 34 Colombo, E., L. Leonini and P. Rebughini. 2009. “Different but not Stranger: Everyday
35 Collective Identifications Among Adolescent Children of Immigrants in Italy?”.
36 *Journal of ethnic and migration studies*, 35(1): 37–59.
- 37 Damiano, E. 1999. *La sala degli specchi. Pratiche scolastiche di Educazione*
38 *interculturale in Europa*. Milan: FrancoAngeli.
- 39 European Commission 8.9.2006. Communication from the Commission to the Council
40 and to the European Parliament, *Efficiency and equity in European education and*
41 *training systems*, COM(2006)481 final. Brussels ([https://eur-](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2006:0481:FIN:EN:PDF)
42 [lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2006:0481:FIN:EN:PDF](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2006:0481:FIN:EN:PDF), last
43 access: 1.6.2019).
- 44 European Commission, Eurydice, and Eacea April 2009. *Integrating Immigrant*
45 *Children into Schools in Europe: Measures to foster communication with*
46 *immigrant families and heritage language teaching for immigrant children*.
47 Brussels: Education, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency
48 ([http://eurydice.indire.it/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Integrazione-](http://eurydice.indire.it/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Integrazione-scolastica_IT.pdf)
49 [scolastica_IT.pdf](http://eurydice.indire.it/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Integrazione-scolastica_IT.pdf), last access: 28.5.2019).
- 50 European Commission 17.2.2011. Communication from the Commission, *Early*
51 *Childhood Education and Care: Providing all our children with the best start for the*
52 *world of tomorrow*, COM(2011) 66 final. Brussels ([https://eur-](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0066:FIN:EN:PDF)
53 [lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0066:FIN:EN:PDF](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0066:FIN:EN:PDF), last
54 access: 28.5.2019).

- 1
2
3 European Commission. 2013. Commission Recommendation of 20.2.2013, *Investing in*
4 *Children – Breaking the cycle of disadvantage*, C(2013)778 final
5 (http://ec.europa.eu/justice/fundamental-rights/files/c_2013_778_en.pdf, last access:
6 21.5.2019).
- 7
8 European Commission, Eacea, Eurydice, and Eurostat 2014. *Key Data on Early*
9 *Childhood Education and Care in Europe. 2014 Edition. Eurydice and Eurostat*
10 *Report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union
11 (http://eurydice.indire.it/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/KD_ECEC_2014_IT.pdf, last
12 access: 22.5.2019).
- 13
14 European Commission – General Directorate for Education and Culture 2016, *Great Start*
15 *in Life. The best possible education in early years*, Background Paper 2016
16 ([https://ec.europa.eu/education/sites/education/files/great-start-in-life-](https://ec.europa.eu/education/sites/education/files/great-start-in-life-background_en.pdf)
17 [background_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/education/sites/education/files/great-start-in-life-background_en.pdf), last access: 28.5.2019).
- 18
19 European Commission 26.4.2017. Commission Staff Working Paper, *Taking stock of the*
20 *2013 Recommendation on “Investing in children: breaking the cycle of disadvantage”*,
21 SWD(2017) 258 final. Brussels.
- 22
23 European Commission 17.1.2018. Proposal for a Council Recommendation on promoting
24 common values, inclusive education, and the European dimension of teaching,
25 COM(2018)23 final – 2018/0007 (NLE), Brussels.
- 26
27 European Commission – General Directorate for Justice (DG JUST). 2013. *Barcelona*
28 *objectives: The development of childcare facilities for young children in Europe with*
29 *a view to sustainable and inclusive growth*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the
30 European Union.
- 31
32 European Commission. 2018b, July. *Changes in child and family policies in the EU28 in*
33 *2017. European Platform for Investing in Children: Annual thematic report*. Brussels.
- 34
35 Eurostat. 2013. *Population at risk of poverty or social exclusion by age group (%)*, 2011
36 (http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=ilc_peps01&lang=en, last
37 access: 4.5.2019).
- 38
39 Eurostat. 2018. *Eurostat Regional Yearbook 2018*
40 (<https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/lucas/data/primary-data/2018>, last access:
41 4.3.2019).
- 42
43 Eurydice. 2009. *Tackling Social and Cultural Inequalities through Early Childhood*
44 *Education and Care in Europe*. Brussels: Education, Audiovisual and Culture
45 Executive Agency.
- 46
47 Fiorucci, M. 2011. *Gli stranieri siamo noi. La formazione interculturale degli operatori*
48 *dell’educazione*. Rome: Armando.
- 49
50 Goodman, A., and P. Gregg, Eds. 2010. *Poorer children’s educational attainment: How*
51 *important are attitudes and behaviour?* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation
52 (<http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/poorer-children-education-full.pdf>: last access:
53 23.5.2019).
- 54
55 Guerin, B. 2014. *Breaking the cycle of disadvantage. Early Childhood interventions and*
56 *progression to higher education in Europe*. European Union.
57 (https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR553.html, last access: 1.6.2019).
- 58
59 Harte E., H. Facundo, and M. Stepanek. 2017. *Education of the EU migrant children in*
60 *EU Member States*, Policy Brief commissioned by European Commission’s
Directorate – General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion
([https://www.google.it/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=2ahU
KEwizzdTVwM3iAhXRzIUkHX5iDlcQFjABegQICRAC&url=https%3A%2F%2F
ec.europa.eu%2Fsocial%2FBlobServlet%3FdocId%3D16679%26langId%3Den&usq
=A0vVaw1rybsU1su_NkORFy1Y1ZtB](https://www.google.it/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=2ahUKEwizzdTVwM3iAhXRzIUkHX5iDlcQFjABegQICRAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Fec.europa.eu%2Fsocial%2FBlobServlet%3FdocId%3D16679%26langId%3Den&usq=A0vVaw1rybsU1su_NkORFy1Y1ZtB), last access: 1.6.2019).

- 1
2
3 Heckman, J.J. 2012. *The Case for Investing in Disadvantaged Young Children: the case*
4 *for investing in disadvantaged young children*. Policy Brief 1/2012. Brussels.
5 European Expert Network on Economics of Education (EENEE).
6 Istat. 2018 (<http://dati.istat.it/>, last access: 29.5.2019).
7 Kang, J., E. M. Horn, and S. Palmer. 2017. "Influences of Family Involvement in
8 Kindergarten Transition Activities on Children's Early School Adjustment". *Early*
9 *Childhood Education Journal*, 45(6): 789-800.
10 Kintrea, K., R. St. Clair, and M. Houston. 2011. *The influence of parents, places and*
11 *poverty on educational attitudes and aspirations*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation
12 (<http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/young-people-education-attitudes-full.pdf>, last
13 access: 14.5.2019).
14 Lemaitre, G. 7.5.2010. *Educational outcomes of the children of immigrants: Background,*
15 *results and policy implications*. OECD International Migration Division.
16 Mantovani, S. and E. Gattico, Eds. 1998. *La ricerca sul campo in educazione. I metodi*
17 *qualitativi*. Milan: Mondadori.
18 Peeters, J. and N. Sharmahd. 2014. "Professional development for ECEC practitioners
19 with responsibilities for children at risk: which competences and in-service training
20 are needed?". *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 22(3): 412-424.
21 Peeters, J. and M. Vandenbroeck. 2011. "Child Care Practitioners and the Process of
22 Professionalization" in L. Miller and C. Cable, Ed. *Professionalization and*
23 *Management in the Early Years*, 62-74. London: Sage.
24 Picchio, M. and S. Mayer. 2019. "Transitions in ECEC services: the experience of
25 children from migrant families". *European Early Childhood Education Research*
26 *Journal*, 27(2): 285-296.
27 Portera, A. 2014. "Intercultural Competence in education, counselling and
28 psychotherapy". *Intercultural Education*, 25(2): 157-174.
29 Sharmahd, N. 2012. *Ricerca educativa e servizi per l'infanzia*. Azzano San Paolo: Junior.
30 Silva, C. 2004. *Dall'incontro alla relazione. Il rapporto fra scuola e famiglie immigrate*.
31 Milan: Unicopli.
32 Silva, C. 2005. *L'educazione interculturale: modelli e percorsi*. Nuova edizione
33 aggiornata e integrata. Tirrenia (PI): Del Cerro.
34 Silva, C. 2008. "La relazione tra genitori immigrati e insegnanti nella scuola
35 dell'infanzia". *Rivista Italiana di Educazione Familiare*, n. 2: 23-36.
36 Silva C. 2014. "La participation des parents immigrés à la crèche. Modèles et activités".
37 *Rivista Italiana di Educazione Familiare*, n. 2: 33-40.
38 Silva, C. 2015. *Lo spazio dell'interculturalità. Democrazia, diritti umani e laicità*. Milan:
39 FrancoAngeli.
40 Silva, C. 2016, Ed. *Educazione e cura dell'infanzia nell'Unione Europea*. Pisa: ETS.
41 Silva, C. 2016. *L'internazionalizzazione della ricerca sull'educazione e cura nella prima*
42 *infanzia in Europa*, in C. Silva, Ed. *Educazione e cura dell'infanzia nell'Unione*
43 *Europea*, cit.: 55-74.
44 Suarez-Orozco, M. M. and D. B. Qin-Hilliard. 2004. *Globalization Culture and*
45 *Education in the New Millennium*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
46 Susi, F. 1999, Ed. *Come si è stretto il mondo. L'educazione interculturale in Italia e in*
47 *Europa. Teorie, esperienze e strumenti*. Rome: Armando.
48 Urban, M., M. Vandenbroeck, K. Van Laere, A. Lazzari and J. Peeters. 2012. "Towards
49 Competent Systems in Early Childhood Education and Care: Implications for Policy
50 and Practice". *European Journal of Education*, 47(4): 508-526.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60