GOETE Newsletter

No. 4, April 2012

Contents

Contact:

GOETE Research Project

goete@coordination.eu

www.goete.eu

Editorial

Dear readers,

We are glad to present you the fourth newsletter of the GOETE research project. GOETE aims at analysing how educational trajectories of young people are regulated as a result of complex interactions in different European education systems. The study "Governance of educational trajectories in Europe" (GOETE) investigates how access of children and young people to different stages of education is enabled or restricted, how coping with educational demands is being facilitated through formal and informal support and how it is being negotiated between different actors what kind of education actually is relevant for society at large as well as subjectively for the learners.

This GOETE newsletter brings an update on the progress in our research, and articulates some reflections on policy issues in France and Italy. If you want to subscribe to the GOETE newsletter please click here: http://www.goete.eu/subscription

With best regards from the GOETE coordination team

GOETE Project News

The last GOETE Consortium Meeting was held in Rennes, France, from February 20th to February 23rd 2012. Prof. Dr. Patricia Loncle and her team welcomed as many as 50 representatives from all partner teams who attended the meeting to discuss research related issues such as comparative analysis and dissemination strategies of the GOETE project.

One topic pervading all discussions during the Rennes meeting was the discussion of first findings of comparative analysis. Also, as GOETE addresses its research question by adding different components of quantitative and qualitative data collection that allow for an articulation of different perspectives, extended methodological discussions around mix-method integration took place. GOETE includes not only international comparative - of eight EU member states - but also multilevel analyses (at individual, school and education system levels), all of which aim at providing a more emcompassing picture of the institutional and informal mechanisms of governance that regulate educational trajectories at local, regional, national and European level, and especially their interactions at different levels.

The integration of different data sets and types of - qualitative and quantitative - findings may be seen as an important preparation for the thematic analyses that started during the meeting.

During the Rennes meetings the GOETE consortium started a new phase of the research project, switching the work mode to thematic analyses. In this new work phase the different empirical findings are drawn together into an overall thematic and comparative analysis that are undertaken in GOETE along five different axes: *life course, access, coping, relevance and governance of education.*

Analyses are expected to contribute to the development of a theoretical understanding of education in European knowledge societies; to model different patterns in terms of regimes of governing educational trajectories; and to formulate recommendations for policy and practice.

As refers to the later, activities were started in all participating countries aiming at the dissemination of the project findings both into the scientific community and to policy and practice concerned with children's and young people's educational trajectories inside and outside school, on the local, regional, national and European level. A variety of forms, tools and channels have been chosen in order to secure widest possible representation. Apart from communicating findings, also concrete processes of dialogic educational planning at local level are being conducted as are also units of further training for educational professionals in all GOETE countries. In the coming months, GOETE researchers will be busy with these activities, that are vital for the overall success of the research project.

GOETE Consortium, France February 2012

Reflection on National Education Policy: School Zoning in France

Simon Jahnich, France

INTRODUCTION

In 2007 Nicolas Sarkozy right after being elected President announced that school zoning regulations would be first relaxed and then dropped altogether. This action was presented as a measure to foster the free choice of families and to create new opportunities for families from lower economic backgrounds, living in decayed urban areas. Surprisingly, this measure was also part of the programme of the socialist candidate. In the following lines, the text first discuss how this consensus raises issues about the context that made the end of school zoning so tempting for both the right-wing party and the left-wing party (I). Second, it also raises questions as to the aims of such a decision (II). Finally, the text discusses a number of aissues concerned with the consequences of this decision for the French school system (III).

I- The system before the reform

School Zoning was implemented in the 1960's as an administrative tool to allocate resources and educational offers on the national territory. It allows the national authority to plan the building of new schools according to the demographic previsions. At this time, each zone had to present a standard offer of educational paths. This standard offer had to give equal opportunities to every French student to succeed. School zoning lately became a way to support social diversity. School zones were designed to embrace a city or a neighbourhood. All students living in this area must enrol in the school designated as their "zoned school".

Throughout the year, zones had slowly differentiated from each other. The basic offer defined by the Ministry of education was adapted to the profile of students. Oberti showed that options and special routes were more available in advantaged area (Oberti, 2007). Highly educated families well organised and aware of the right path to make it to the top of the school system advocated for options and special courses. They boost modifications of the standard educational offer to fit their needs.

In the meantime segregation in urban areas increased. Middle class families fled the block of council flats and the upper class gathered in specific area. The system of zoning that should allow diversity started cracking.

In 1989 the government allow students who would take specific options to enrol in a different school than the one assigned by the zoning system. This kind of special dispensation was named "derogation" and became more and more used by highly educated families to dodge the school zoning.

Moreover private Schools were held apart from the school zoning. Well off families could thus avoid enrolling in the school of their zone by choosing to send their children into private schools.

Because of these flaws school zoning was presented as an outdated tool that was no longer able to maintain social diversity within schools. And this social diversity was proved to be essential to trigger greater academic achievement and to reduce inequality (social mix effect). Moreover it was ineffective to promote integration which has been seen by political actors as the first aim of School since its creation in the XIX century.

II- Free market principle: A new opportunity for poor fellows.

Acknowledging the limits of School zoning, politics presented the disappearance of this system as the only solution to tackle the problem of social diversity. In order to make the system more egalitarian, the lower class had to be freed from the constraints of the school zoning.

It clearly contradicts the findings of Mons who proves that total free choice could lead to greater inequalities. (Mons, 2007) This solution was also condemned by numerous actors of the educative system particularly principals from disadvantaged urban schools.

To allow lower class families to choose their school, the reform implemented by M. Sarkozy has given them the priority to enrol in the school they would choose. The only condition is that free places should be available in the demanded school. The priority given to the lower class families was supposed to be supported by indicators (statistics about successful carreer and failure) which should make information about the school system simpler and available. This information has never been provided.

During the 2007 presidential campaign, none of the two favorite candidates advocated for the redesigning of the School zoning which could have been a valid solution. The suppression of the school zoning had the advantage of being very popular and easy to sell to the different classes of the society. For some critics it appeared as a renouncement to Policy action.(Oberti, 2007)

III- The illusion of free market choice: a catastrophe for lower class students.

Four years after the reforms, it is already possible to examine some tremendous impacts of this reform on the French system.

Schools labelled as disadvantaged (*ambition réussite*) have lost part of their student. Some have resisted thanks to an aggressive marketing toward families and children. Among the population that have benefited from the relaxing of the school zoning, most of them are well informed families. The number of derogation asked by lower class families has not significantly increased corroborating the findings of sociologist who studied the U.K and New Zealand reforms.

During our field work on GOETE project, numerous actors pointed at this measure as something that has worsened the situation of their school. P. Merle in his article clearly deconstructs the contradiction that led this reform. He shows that the reform was ambiguous. The reform aimed at fostering social diversity while legitimating the previous system of derogation. It was announced as a break but has confirmed the phenomenon earlier denounced.

To explain this contradiction between what was promoted and what was really observed, P. Merle compare the situation of three territories. He examines three cases before the reform and after the reform. He concludes that the reform has favoured advantaged families whereas disadvantaged families did not benefit from the reform. They were not informed and did not pay attention to this reform. He also shed the lights on an unexpected effect. The reform increased the number of derogation (mostly among advantaged families). In the meantime the capacity of schools did not increase proportionally and it caused a mismatch. As a result family wishes were refused and it led to the impression that family choice had decreased.

Finally the reform of School zoning in France has fixed the French school system more firmly into the classification of "school system with zoning and special dispensation" which is presented by Mons as one of the most inaccurate to foster equity.

Bibliography

OBERTI, M. Le piège du libre choix, Mouvement N°52 nov-déc 2007

OBERTI, M. (2007) L'école dans la ville. Ségrégation-mixité-carte scolaire, Presses de Sciences Po.

MONS, N. (2007) Les nouvelles politiques éducatives, Education et Société, PUF

Video Workshop with Students in France

Laetitia Mellottée, France

In GOETE local case studies (Work Package 6) student essays and video material were collected as part of the attempt to generate dense, qualitative material in order to 1) allow a closer look into the dynamics of the governance of educational trajectories, 2) generate a deeper understanding of the local space of the schools and their cooperation with the other local institutions; 3) analyze the climate in the school environment through the experiences of the current students, students who have recently graduated, their parents, teachers and experts.

In France, the GOETE team decided to have video mateiral rather than written essays. This decision is part of a dialogic process in which reseachers adapt their work to best suit the local context and at the same time achieve the research goals to the fullest. In the French context, teaching methods are usually very conventional, and written work and marks are the commonest way to evaluate pupils. Yet, our field work pointed out to a paradox situation in which most students were not at ease with this academic way of expression, especially in a disadvantaged school where level of achievement is low and theoretical learning are not praised neither by students nor by a large part of teachers. For this reason, we definitively agreed that written essays were not an appropriate way of expression for our students. Further, students were really interested in all kinds of video media (Internet, smartphones, TV, cinema), even when they are not so familiar with the work behind the scenes.

Consequently, the French team decided to propose to a school to realise a film related to our research issues. In addition to this film made by students, it appeared very interesting to film a documentary about the workshop. Denis Larcher, multimedia director of the Public School of Health (EHESP, Rennes) accepted to be the director of the movie. For this purpose a workshop was developed and conducted with envolvement of the French GOETE team. This will be briefly presented next.

Aims of the workshop

- enable students to discover how a movie is built
- related academic learning (writing, reading) to an attractive method of work
- gather material for the research (the film, discussions, essays and the making of)
- involve students and make them work on issues relates to the educational system

Participants

The team observed than in the studied school in Rennes, teachers try to institute alternative pedagogical methods based on oral expression and participation of students. When we presented our project to the principal, he was very enthusiastic and helpful. The problem we had to face was to find hours in the very loaded time schedules of students for the workshop. We agreed together that we had to find a volunteer teacher and give the workshop during class's hours. Fortunately we met a teacher of French who find the project interesting and compatible with his lessons and teaching methods. He found interesting to integrate the film project to the work students were doing about building a story and dialogues. He proposed to involve his class of students of the last year of lower secondary school which gathers pupils who used to have a particular support in French as they are migrants. Consequently, we are working with a small class of 18 students counting 6 students with a special support in French, 2 students repeating the year, 1 or 2 students temporary enrolled as they have just arrived in France and other regular students of the neighbourhood. Four adults are involved in the workshop: two fieldworkers of GOETE team, the film director and the teacher. As far as possible, we have meetings to organise and discuss about the promising advances or the difficulties the class may encounter in the project.

Organisation of the workshop

Even if the workload of the school and of our team complicate the organisation of the workshop, we try to go into the class each Thursday morning (from 1 to 2 hours).We decided to involve students at the most in the project and asked them to choose students for being in charge of the documentary about the workshop. During each session, two students (a cameraman and a sound engineer) have to catch the most important moments (discussions, acting, etc.). All steps are realised by/with students or presented to students so as to be sure they agree and understand the project.

Still in progress, the workshop is divided in several steps:

- from September to December - building the scenario: General presentation of the project, choice of a theme related to GOETE concerns in the WP6 survey and writing of the framework of the film. Students decided to work on the theme of transition between lower secondary and upper secondary school, "Tomorrow, I clear off !". We worked several sessions on the writing of the story (characters, plot, places, etc.).

- January to March - the shooting: Students are divided into different tasks (technical team, actors, script, etc.) and are in charge of the shooting of the film under the direction of Denis Larcher.

- April and May - editing: Denis Larcher and some students will edit the movie and the documentary about how the movie was made.

Reflection on National Education Policy: Who is disadvantaged? Immigrant children in Italy between school and city policies

Eduardo Barberis, Silvia Demozzi and Federica Taddia, Italy

Introduction

Disadvantages in education and transition from education to work are often associated with ethnicity and migration. We have a large and growing body of literature on this and, even if we see exceptions for such a statement (e.g., the school performance of Asian minorities in the U.S.), this trend seems confirmed in many countries. This sets out a cummulative effect affecting the following trajectories in education, society and in the labour market. Migrant pupils are disadvantaged in terms of enrollment by type of school, duration of education, achievement, drop-out, and thus in life and labour chances. The degree of such disadvantage is dependant on the national education systems (e.g., selective vs. comprehensive ones) and on the contexts their embedded in, framing how difference is treated: usually, the educational attainment of pupils with migration background (CMB) is comparatively higher in countries with lower levels of economic inequality, high investments in childcare and a well-developed system of preschool education (Parreira do Amaral et al. 2011).

Thus, the interaction between ascriptive features and institutional arrangements is object of research on educational inequality in many countries, also to see how migration and ethnicity are interwoven with other features, both cultural (e.g., parental education styles) and structural (e.g., socio-economic status, citizenship rights, coping institutions).

Even though it is now hard to define Italy as a "new" immigration country – since it has been experiencing more immigration than out-migration for more than thirty years now, it is anyway clear that immigration has reached significant numbers and become a political and policy issue decades later than in most of Continental Europe.

In this respect, Italy is fully within a "Mediterranean" model of migration (King 2002; Baldwin-Edwards 2005), characterized by, *first*, specific migration processes:

- late, usually started in a post-Fordist socio-economic stage;
- as a consequence, with destandardized access to the labour market, in mature industries, traditional sectors and low tiers of post-Fordist secondary and tertiary sectors;
- fast-growing, including a fast shift to mature stages of migration processes with the settlement of families;
- not (only) post-colonial, and hence plural, origin countries;

Second, a treatment of migration consistent with its welfare state model (residual, family-based with passive subsidiarity, fragmented, category-based) and its nation- and state-making (weak and evolving territorial unbalances; weak rule of the law).

Since the growth of migration peaked just in the last 15 years, a new cycle of migration resulting from family reunification, pressure on welfare and educational institutions is quite recent. Given this background, we can wonder if Italy has a model of integration for its immigrants. If we think about grand narratives that, besides their successes and failures, characterize the debate in many European immigration countries – the Dutch multiculturalism, the English race relations, or the French intègration républicaine – the answer is probably: no, it hasn't. And this is probably tied to the lack of a grand nation-making narrative itself (Triandafyllidou 2002; Melotti 2008).

Though, we can see a mode – if not properly a model – quite consistent with its political culture and welfare state-making, whose main features are:

- an emergency coping of the issue (Ambrosini 1999), with the lack of planning and vision;
- the gap between formal rules and actual practices, that grounds a contradictory discourse on migration where security issues intertwine utilitarian discourses, with mass regularization of undocumented migrants, and with pro-immigrant coalitions (Caponio & Graziano 2011; Zincone 2006);
- the delegation to Third Sector;
- the localism (Caponio 2008), engendering a postcode lottery of social rights in context-based mixes and degrees of denizenship: available rights are likely more tied to local cultures and resources than to national rules.

In the field of immigrant policies, the main trend resulting from this mode is toward a so-called "intercultural" paradigm, that basically means a local declension of something blurred, in-between assimilation and multiculturalism, that scholars think as positively flexible

(Chaloff 2006), but also inconsequential, lacking policy tools to achieve assimilation (e.g., equal treatment) and multiculturalism (e.g. formal acknowledgment of diversity) (Saint-Blancat & Perocco 2005; Liddicoat & Diaz 2008).

The education system is no exception to this: compared analyses on parents and children's educational career shows that it is part of the intergenerational reproduction of disadvantage (Checchi & Flabbi 2007; Barberis et al. 2010), and also policies show a relevant weakness.

The Italian education policy and disadvantage

First of all, it should be highlighted that the Italian school system is comprehensive: disadvantaged groups are not taught separately from mainstream school population, and the schools offer a universal education setting, through with specific projects and professionals to address specific problems. Since the 1970s, after a long and rich debate, there aren't special schools for physically or mentally impaired pupils (but for very rare and specific cases), and all following comprehensive choices started from there.

Thus, schools and local authorities built up their know-how incrementally within local public-private partnerships... and individual goodwill, given the actual problems in teacher training (blocked for three years now) and retraining. And this became more and more true starting from late 1990s/early 2000s, when decentralization and regionalization became a keystone of new institutional reforms: school autonomy and the federal constitutional reform redistributed competences, power and responsibility, though with inconsequential resources, paving the way to a "decentralization of penury" and blame-avoiding strategies in the State retrenchment (Kazepov 2010).

As a consequence the relief network can be very variable, and including many different actors: schools, welfare agencies, peers, but also sport clubs, religious associations, volunteering and other Third Sector bodies (Filippini, Genovese, Zannoni, 2010).

So, since 2001, social policy is a regional matter, including school assistance, both for cash (scholarships, grants, contributions) and in-kind measures (transportations, meals, textbooks and teaching materials, etc.),

variously implemented together with Provinces and Municipalities.

In this context, emerging risks, like the ones concerning the integration of CMB, found fragmented answers: support teachers are not foreseen (unless pupils are disabled), and more or less professionalized and institutionalized intercultural and linguistic mediators became relevant to help teachers and school staff communicating with pupils and their families. They are often provided by local authorities as well as by associations and organizations working at local level, though the continuity of the service is often challenged by funding usually coming from temporary projects and by the lack of clear national professional rules and practices.

As we will see later, this has an influence on immigrant pupils' trajectories, building unsecured and wavering careers, where expectations are curbed by an obtrusive denizenship that cuts life chances.

As a consequence, coping strategies CMB put into practice can be different, like, among the others:

o   mimetic strategies ("behave as an Italian would"), doo- med to failures when clashing with daily and institutional discrimination;

o   downward assimilation and reactive identities, finding a shelter in deviant subcultures;

o   selective acculturation, trying to exploit own skills (and positive effects of statistical discrimination) to find a way in specific fields.

Summing up risks for CMBs

There are two main different risk trajectories for newcomers and long-stayers: the first group feels excluded, the second is going toward a downward assimilation.

In this respect, the importance of achieving in school should not be underrated. Somehow, a relevant share of CMB living in Italy for more than 5 years seem to "give up". Actually, in comparative terms we can see that newcomers "fight" much more to achieve: using

a private tutor to improve their knowledge and skills, spending more time studying at home. According to our research in GOETE, in Bologna and Ancona non-Italian pupils used private tutors more than Nationals, with a peak in 1-to-5-years residents in Bologna, where more than half of them used a tutor, vs. a general average of 37%.

Thus, it looks very important to close the gap as soon

as possible, since this has an effect not only on school career, but on self-esteem – an issue that can be seen on assertivity scales, where CMB are more discouraged about their ability to cope with problems, trying hard (especially newcomers) and relying on their skills (especially long-residents), and much less interested in the "voice" options at school, since their trust or knowledge for chance of expressing their views at school is limited.

Furthermore, long-stayers seem quite "disenchanted": poor feeling of belonging, lowest religious support in their coping network, more skepticism about school and work. They are also much more keen at moving to a different place to find a job (even much more than recent migrants, that one could expect to feel less belonging to their new locale), for reasons that are not only acquisitive, but also based on self-expression. 86% of them would move to a different city (vs. 71% of Nationals), and 68% to a different country (vs. 45%).

From a welfare institution point of view, we can thus see that support agencies fail to cope properly with newcomers and to make up for their limited social resources;

as time passes, a spiral of demotivation and downward assimilation starts, likely based also on fallen expectations.

Though, school is just part of the problem – as we will see in the last chapter: sometimes it even plays a role exceeding their strict remit (as the time spent by some children in afternoon social activities shows); somehow their educational task is achieved, though in a quite assimilationist way, as the gap between nationals and CMB becomes smaller for those spending more years in the Italian education and belonging to generations born in Italy show (Della Zuanna et al. 2009; INVALSI 2010), and with an excessive burden on families.

Though, the main issue seems an inconsistent support network, with a poor involvement of support professionals and of out-of-school activities and bodies. We will try to sort this issue out in the last part of this paper, with a qualitative point of view on definition of disadvantage and coping and governance according to principals, teachers, parents and pupils.

Defining and coping immigrant disadvantage in local case studies in GOETE

Who is disadvantaged according to students, parents and teachers?

As we mentioned above, Italy is characterized by a low intergenerational mobility, so that people from poorly educated parents are at higher risk in their educational career, of underachieving, being dropped out and ending up in vocational schools.

Therefore, the GOETE project aims at analysing the role of school in re-conceptualising education in terms of lifelong learning by combining a life course and a governance perspective which should be able to cope with socio-economic disadvantage. To achieve this goal, it is necessary to understand what success and failure in education depend on.

Is children's school achievement affected by problematic family life, housing conditions and poverty? Or is it much more affected by immigrant backgrounds? To what extent do success depend on the support pupils can get informally or formally? Are, finally, mobbing and bullying indications of increasing stress and pressure which will affect young people's career perspectives?

GOETE investigates how students, especially those from deprived social backgrounds, cope with educational demands. It analyses measures of active inclusion through formal and informal support inside and outside school and how formal, non-formal and informal

learning are related within education systems in general and in educational trajectories in particular.

These research questions have been especially addressed in local case studies, aimed at understanding how educational trajectories evolve from the interaction between institutional structures, educational practice and individual agency. So, different perspectives of all relevant actors inside and outside school have been investigated through focus groups, individual interviews, expert interviews and classroom research.

Local studies tried to examine differences in educational achievement mostly focusing on those pupils more at risk of scholastic failure such as immigrants and students with poor socio-economic background: thus, three schools (one per each city) were chosen because located in disadvantaged areas and/or having important shares of pupils with immigrant or lower class background.

In the following lines, we will summarize the emerging issues coming out from focus groups and interviews trying to define "who is disadvantage at school" in the opinion of teachers, parents, but also students themselves.

First of all, we have to underline a significant difference between Bologna and Ancona on the one hand (North and Centre) and Catania (South) on the other. Due to the different immigration rate (as mentioned above), the inclusion of CMB among the disadvantaged is not the same.

Leaving aside disability and learning disorders as factors characterizing educational disadvantage all over the country, we can see that in Bologna and Ancona one of the main disadvantaged groups according to our interviewees are exactly CMBs, while in Catania those coming from families involved in illegal activities. So, we will focus mainly on first two cases.

In all the local cases, interviewed parents usually consider school and education as relevant to succeed and to overcome disadvantage: they have often a lower level of schooling than their children and do not want them to follow their footsteps. Though, most of them also state the importance of the economic factor: without money, it is difficult to give children great opportunities of education.

> "In my opinion, unfortunately [children's] future doesn't depend on education, but on money and social status. Meritocracy does not exist either in the public sphere nor in the private... And, after all, even if it would be existed, in Italy there's no money". (Mother, Ancona)

This opinion is quite shared by parents. In Catania, most parents barely have a lower secondary school license: what really matters to them is to find a way to get a salary at the end of the month and this issue affects also their children's choices and views on education and work.

Not by chance, also in the GOETE survey, immigrant and lower class parents state that there are difficulties standing in their child's way of achieving the desired level of education (up to 60% against a total average of 30%).

So, wealth is somehow considered a determinant of future success, and this can have a strong effect on expectation of future careers and social mobility for many disadvantaged groups, including CMB.

If money is among the most relevant issues, motivation is also quite important. In this latter respect, every interviewee passes the buck over the responsibility. On the one hand, parents are generally critical towards nowadays society that, in their opinion, makes children spoiled and anxious to consume. On the other hand, teachers point out the gap between their teaching (on

the relevance of education, on social values like respect and equality) and what pupils learn in other environments outside the school. Together with media, parents are exactly among the most blamed: actually, poorly supportive families, together with immigrant background, are the features that for most interviewees define risk of disadvantage.

> "Most of them want a pragmatic job, to work for one's bread and butter. The word "education" sounds empty to them". (Teacher, Catania, referring to her pupils).

> "These children lack emotional grounds. They are ravaged by those parents back in their adolescence; they are forty, but they look like fifteen years old. This lack of responsibility affects children dangerously, and at school one told me: "yesterday I couldn't do my homework, since I've been all the day with my mother"; "Where?"; "Mom had her back tattooed, and I spent all the day in the tattoo shop" (Teacher, Ancona)

Immigrant parents are somehow considered different, though lacking social and human capital to help their children enough. Some parents and teachers blame immigrant families because of their supposed lack of motivation in integrating their children and because of their poor communication with school. Actually, the interpretation of some teachers is that immigrant parents do not take care of their children the way they should: "it is a cultural issue, they do not have a lease on life" (Teacher, Bologna). Besides immigrants, such remarks refer to Roma children, isolated from a cultural and a geographical point of view.

> "There is a hope for these children only if they have the possibility to interact with different realities. This is what we try to do here at school" (Teacher, Bologna).

> "The reasons of educational disadvantage are principally two: our pupils do not know neither to read nor to write. And they aren't able to stay too many hours in the same place (a classroom) respecting rules" (Teacher, Bologna).

Some difficulties and disadvantages are somehow perceived as time-bounded, as for lacking integration due to short stays and school attendance.

> "They always stay at home, they do not go to birthday parties. They have not been integrating yet". (Step Father of two Romanian Children rejoined with their mother at the age of 14).

Though, there are also signs and confirmations of downward assimilation trends. Actually, an interesting

emerging issue is that Italian pupils with learning or relational difficulties tend to get along better with immigrant pupils.

> "My son's best friend is from Senegal" (Italian mother of a child involved in an episode of bullying, Ancona).

> "My daughter get along well overall with foreign girls" (Italian mother of a child involved in an episode of bullying and with learning disorder).

Besides this, there's also a perception of a structural disadvantage and the need for specific coping measures to close the gap as soon as possible to avoid problems to become chronic. And the need of education tools to face a radical change in society, where cultural diversity is becoming more and more common, as the quotations below illustrate:

> "School pays more attention to pupils who have been just arrived from abroad… to foreigners… because they have to reach our level in short time". (Italian pupil, Ancona).

> "It's difficult to take into account all individual needs, especially if there are more than 20 pupils per class! Teachers do a lot of work, due to personal will and motivation. I do not know how much do it really come from in service teacher training…" (Mother, Bologna).

How to cope with CMBs' disadvantage

All in all, school staff feels somehow overwhelmed by their task. Actually, if the definition of disadvantage includes "big" structures (social values and – to a lesser extent – pupils' culture) it could be that their role is perceived as limited and underrated.

So, motivation is an important issue also for school staff, and the perception of appropriateness in coping with disadvantage is often tied to a personal investment more than to a proper institutional structure or to a relevant training. This is true especially for disadvantage referred to CMB, since no specialized training path (if not some refresher courses) have been attended by our interviewees.

> „Teachers do a lot of work, due to personal will and motivation. I do not know how much do it really come from in service teacher training…" (Mother, Bologna).

Obviously this engenders well known problems of fragmentation, continuity and accountability of actions. Within schools coping strategies in the last years started to be more and more defined – more on the grassroots level than due to national guidelines and policies. It was a learning by doing ("we have the art of getting by" Teacher, Bologna), that built up a local know how, later on shared at local, regional and national level.

> „Despite expenditure cuts and personnel shortage, I think that teachers always did all they could do: they were always available, even in the afternoons when they asked pupils to stay at school for refreshing lessons." (Mother, Ancona)

> „This school does a lot: they organize afternoons at school to keep pupils far from the street…But, pupils are too many: some of them unfortunately remain outside with no place in educational centers or afternoons groups." (Teacher assistant, Bologna).

Intercultural education, coping paths for newcomers (e.g., assessment of skills) are more and more well-known issue within the school system, though without adequate "protection" by norms and policies. Thus, generalization of experiences and good practices risks to be limited:

- with no ripple effect outside school, due to a weak network linking schools with local institutions;
- due also to a week network with some families that do not recognize the educational role of school: "pupils get different messages and end up without catching which is the whole meaning" (Teacher, Bologna).
- with no continuity and professionalism, due to a low level of institutionalization: measures are usually financed by projects, and just schools with planning and project-making skills – in a context of school autonomy – can be "safe" on continuity; on the other hand, professionals considered as more and more relevant, like intercultural mediators and facilitators, suffer from a limited availability, and a not so clear professionalization.
- with no continuity with upper secondary schools due to a lack of supporting projects after the end of lower secondary school. Educators and teacher say that parents recurrently ask: "And then? What about next year? Where should my child go? And where will you be?"…

In this respect, we can compare the different organization models in Ancona and Bologna.

In the first case, we have a strong horizontal networks

10

among schools: on their own, they agreed guidelines and procedures to welcome new-coming CMBs and to assess transitions to following school grades.

For example the "Commissione dorica" get together teachers from lower and upper secondary schools to assess transition problems of pupils, also defining an evaluation test on skills and knowledge helping teachers to fine-tune education according to needs.

This helps overcoming local level fragmentation, and shows a concern for problems arising from a misunderstood interpretation of school autonomy. Though, this self-organization is not matched with an easy involvement of other local actors.

The gap with the municipality is quite relevant: on the school side, it is perceived as a weak counterpart, mainly a cash supplier for side projects, while a stronger coordination and planning role would be desired. On the municipality side, there's an aggregative interpretation (March & Olsen 1989) of its role in the field of education: no intention to suggest policy addresses, just a provision of cash to support emerging needs. So, the same issue (a cash provision for side measures) finds strikingly different interpretations: it is considered as unconcern by school, and as the best way of expressing concern by the Municipality.

There are also other factors of conflict: another relevant one is the role of municipal social service, perceived as poorly collaborative by school staff, so that relevant cases are not coped at best.

In the second case, the coping network is much more articulated. Local institutions collaborate with school in the field of intercultural education and CMBs' integration: in this respect, the cases of CD/LEI (Archive and Lab for Intercultural Education) and "Centri Anni Verdi" are quite meaningful.

The CD/LEI was created in 1992 with an Agreement between the Municipality and the Province of Bologna, the Local Education Office and the University (Department of Education). From 2002 the Centre is part of the Education Office of the Bologna Municipality and, for this reason, it cooperates with territorial agencies and foundations to promote several projects inside and out of the schools.

In particular, the centre supports and encourages the schools to run intercultural projects and joining transnational networks. It helps educational services to set up intercultural tools that schools use to cope with cultural diversity. To promote these aspects CD/LEI offers:

training, information, counselling and documentation services to teachers, intercultural mediators, educators, social workers, students and families;

intercultural training (e.g. seminars, workshops) for teachers, school staff and social workers on themes related to intercultural education, citizenship, cooperation, human rights and equal opportunities;

intercultural counselling concerning the inclusion of migrant students in school (e.g. information desk on norms regulating foreign students, projects, evaluation and case analyses);

documentation (e.g. Multicultural Library and Archive of intercultural experimentations) which have been run by local schools.

"Centri Anni Verdi" are afternoon educational centers run by professional educators, who care for the educational intervention and daily relationships with families, schools and territory. They provide learning experiences, fun and relational moments aimed at preteens (11-14 years) in the city of Bologna, within an educational context in which the listening and participation are the fundamental prerogatives. They have about 140 children enrolled.

Together with schools, regular meetings with teachers are set in order to monitor the progress of children attending; they also define pathways for individual support: workshops and activities are co-designed. Centri Anni Verdi choose to work together with local services and educational agencies to promote a more targeted intervention in the development of existing resources within the community of life of pre-teens, creating shared projects to receive and offer possible answers to the needs and demands of children (See also www.aspirides.it).

Conclusions

CMB are actually disadvantaged within the school system, due to an institutional setting unable to cope with diversity in a structured manner. The cycle of falling into disadvantage starts with an insufficient safety net for newcomers, in which the comprehensive education system turns to be an assimilationist machine, with a selective and subaltern inclusion of CMB and the blaming of those cut out, that defines non-deserving risk groups (mainly: male pre-adolescents with a long migration history). This paves the way for demotivation

and downward assimilation, thus reinforcing negative stereotypes and blaming.

School staff is usually quite aware of resulting problems and risks of disadvantage for CMB pupils. Probably, to them the risk is clearer as far as newcomers are concerned: grassroots actions for welcoming them are quite defined, though not always easy to implement due to resource and skills problems.

On the other hand, not rarely long-stayers are considered "like Italians": this implicit assimilation underrates their problems of fallen expectations when clashing with legal obstacles (citizenship issue) and direct and indirect discrimination (Colombo, Domaneschi & Marchetti 2011).

Notwithstanding these limits, schools are quite active in promoting intercultural education: though, from an institutional point of view, the main failures is that school autonomy risks to turn into isolation, especially in a period of retrenchment. On the one hand, the state school policy targeting CMB as a disadvantaged group is extremely weak: it should be enough to say that the only norm that was echoed in the public debate concerned the maximum share of non-Italian pupils per class...

Besides funding owed to school having an high share of non-Italian pupils, there's a missing policy line supporting the coping of pupils' disadvantages. This has obviously an influence on institutionalization and the building of a steady know-how.

So, in a more and more federal State, we could assume that regional and local institutions play a focal role. This is however just partly true: first, the implementation of local autonomy is still ongoing, with blurred competence boundaries; second, the decentralization has not touched enough the resource allocation, so at the moment we are Cdecentralizing penuryd (Mény & Wright 1985), in the Italian case in a way very consisted with its fragmented welfare state. That is: much responsibility on families, coping by emergency more than by planning, unsure resources and measures, linked with short-term projects.

Due to a lack of check and balances in the territorial governance, we see strong path-dependency in local networks, with weaker and poorer areas not able to catch up and with problems in building working inter-institutional actions to cope with multi-problematic cases and new need profiles.

References

Ambrosini M. (1999) Utili invasori. Angeli, Milano [Useful invaders]

Baldwin-Edwards M. (2005) Migration into Souther Europe, Mediterranean Migration Observatory Working Papers, 6.

Barberis E. et al. (2010) Governance of Educational Trajectories in Europe: Country Report Italy. Mimeo.

Caponio T. (2008) (Im)migration research in Italy. A European comparative perspective. The Sociological Quarterly, 49(3): 445-64.

Caponio T. & Graziano P.R. (2011) Towards a security-oriented migration policy model? Evidence from the Italian case. In: Carmel E., Cerami A., Papadopoulos T. (eds.) Migration and Welfare in the New Europe. The Policy Press, Bristo.

Chaloff J. (2006) Innovating in the supply of services to meet the needs of immigrants in Italy. In: OECD (ed.) From immigration to integration. Local solutions to a global challenge. Oecd, Paris.

Checchi D., Flabbi L. (2007) Intergenerational mobility and schooling decisions in Germany and Italy: the impact of secondary school tracks. IZA Discussion Papers, 2876.

Colombo E., Domaneschi L., Marchetti C. (2011) Citizenship and multiple belonging. Representations of inclusion, identification and participation among children of immigrants in Italy. Journal of Modern Italian Studies, 16(3): 334-47.

Dalla Zuanna G., Farina P., Strozza S. (2009) Nuovi italiani. Il Mulino, Bologna [New Italians]

Filippini F., Genovese A., Zannoni F. (2010) Fuori dal silenzio. Volti e pensieri dei figli dell'immigrazione. Clueb, Bologna. [Breaking the silence. Faces and thought of immigrant children]

INVALSI (2010) Rilevamento degli apprendimenti – SNV. Prime analisi. Invalsi, Roma [Survey on learning – National Evaluation System. First results]

Kazepov Y. (ed.) (2010) Rescaling social policies: towards multilevel governance in Europe. Ashgate, Farnham.

King R. (ed.) (2002) Migration in Southern Europe: new trends and new patterns, Studi Emigrazione / Migration Studies, 145 (monographic issue)

Liddicoat A.J., Diaz A. (2008) Engaging with diversity: the construction of policy for intercultural education in Italy. Intercultural Education, 19(2): 137-50.

Melotti U. (2008) Migratory policies and political cultures in Europe: Is there something new? In: Heinrich Boell Stiftung (ed.) European Governance of Migration. Heinrich-Boll-Stiftung, Berlin.

Mény Y., Wright V. (eds.) (1985) Centre-Periphery Relations in Western Europe. Allen and Unwin, London.

Parreira do Amaral M. et al. (2011) Governance of educational trajectories in Europe. State of the Art Report. Mimeo (available on www.goete.eu).

Saint-Blancat C., Perocco F. (2005) New modes of social interaction in Italy. In: Cesari J., McLoughlin S. (eds.) European Muslims and the Secular State. Ashgate, Aldershot.

Triandafyllidou A. (2002) Italy: Nation Formation, the Southern Question and Europe. EURONAT project State of the Art and Historical Report. Mimeo (available at www.eui.eu)

Zincone G. (2006) The making of policies: immigration and immigrants in Italy. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 32(3)

The GOETE Research Consortium