



# Deliverable

---

## D5.5 Final Report

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Deliverable Responsible: | University of Modena and Reggio Emilia (UNIMORE) |
| Deliverable due date:    | 31/10/2024                                       |
| Actual submission date:  | 30/10/2024                                       |
| Version:                 | Final  |



The project has received the financial contribution of the *Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund (AMIF)* under the Grant Agreement number: 101038620 — MUST-a-Lab — AMIF-2020-AG.

## Table of contents

|   |              |
|---|--------------|
| <b>1. Introduction</b>  | <b>p. 2</b>  |
| <b>2. Concepts for the analysis of Policy Labs</b>                        | <b>p. 2</b>  |
| 2.1 Policy Labs as a form of participative democracy                      | p. 2         |
| 2.2 The analysis of facilitation  | p. 4         |
| <b>3. Research methodology</b>  | <b>p. 5</b>  |
| 3.1 Analysis of questionnaires  | p. 5         |
| 3.2 Analysis of semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions    | p. 6         |
| 3.3 Analysis of interactional processes in PL-meetings                    | p. 7         |
| 3.4 Analysis of follow-up documentation                                   | p. 8         |
| 3.5 An interlaced analysis  | p. 8         |
| 3.6 Ethics  | p. 9         |
| <b>4. Composition and organisation</b>                                    | <b>p. 9</b>  |
| 4.1 Composition of the PLs  | p. 9         |
| 4.2 Organisation  | p. 14        |
| <b>5. Facilitation of migrant participants' agency and dialogue</b>       | <b>p. 17</b> |
| 5.1 Respondents' views on participation and conditions for agency         | p. 18        |
| 5.2 Facilitation  | p. 19        |
| 5.3 Facilitation in the plenaries in C1 and C2                            | p. 21        |
| 5.4 Facilitation in small group workshops                                 | p. 28        |
| 5.5 The challenge of supporting migrant children' agency                  | p. 35        |
| 5.6 The problem of language barriers                                      | p. 37        |
| 5.7 Facilitation in C3-C6   | p. 38        |
| 5.8 Summary   | p. 40        |
| <b>6. Relations between migrants, stakeholders and policy officers</b>    | <b>p. 41</b> |
| 6.1 Facilitation of unbalanced epistemic authority                        | p. 41        |
| 6.2 Specific problems of distribution of epistemic authority in C1 and C2 | p. 43        |
| 6.3 Dialogic collaboration  | p. 45        |
| 6.4 Problems of distribution of epistemic authority in C3-C6              | p. 47        |
| 6.5 Summary   | p. 50        |
| <b>7. Personal expressions and decision-making</b>                        | <b>p. 51</b> |
| 7.1 The primacy of personal expressions                                   | p. 51        |
| 7.2 Decision making in final plenaries                                    | p. 53        |
| 7.3 Summary   | p. 56        |
| <b>8. Participants' assessment of the Policy Labs</b>                     | <b>p. 56</b> |
| 8.1 Participants' general assessment                                      | p. 56        |
| 8.2 Participants' qualitative views on micro-experiments                  | p. 58        |
| <b>9. Follow-up of PL recommendations</b>                                 | <b>p. 60</b> |
| <b>10. Conclusions on effectiveness of the Policy Labs</b>                | <b>p. 62</b> |
| <b>References</b>   | <b>p. 68</b> |

## **1. Introduction**

The objective of this **final report** is to analyse the Policy Labs (PLs) implemented in the context of the MUST-a-Lab project. This analysis combines (1) the participants' comments and evaluation of different aspects of PLs, collected both through close-ended questionnaires and semi-structured interviews and focus groups; (2) the ways of facilitating the PLs, i.e. the participants' contributions to the PLs observed in recordings and listed in a short report. The analysis aims to show if and how participation and facilitation in PL-meetings can support the achievement of the PLs and with which consequences to the exercise of migrant participants' agency. Thus, this analysis aims to contribute to the understanding of the PL method.

The report is divided in 9 chapters and a concluding section that summarises its main results. Chapter 2 explains the theoretical background of the analysis, including both the meaning of a PL as a participatory initiative in public policies, and the way in which these initiatives may be facilitated. Chapter 3 introduces the methodological choices and features of the evaluative research of the MUST-a-lab project, stressing the different ways of collecting the data. Chapter 4 concerns the composition and organisation of the PLs. Chapter 5 concerns the challenges of participation and the ways of facilitating migrants' agency, dialogue and the production of narratives in PL-meetings. Chapter 6 focuses on the challenge of distributing participation and agency among migrants, stakeholders, policy officers and policymakers. Chapter 7 deals with the relation between the objective of producing proposals and recommendations (decision-making) and an interest in expressing personal experiences, above all among the migrants. Chapter 8 presents the most important aspects of participants' assessment of the PLs. Chapter 9 concerns the follow-up of the project. Chapter 10, finally, summarises the most important results of the research and includes some concluding remarks on the effectiveness of the PL-method.

## **2. Concepts for the analysis of Policy Lab.**

### **2.1 Policy Lab as a form of participative democracy**

A PL is a relatively small group of people (about 20-25) that gathers and focuses on empowering public policies, in particular, public actions and strategies at a local level. A PL gives voice to citizens by supporting their choices in representative processes, recommending public decisions. A PL is based on a method that involves several stakeholders in the reformulation of policy challenges and combines the different perspectives activated in the process of reformulation. Thus, the PL-method is proposed as an innovative form of participatory practice.

Theories of participative democracy urge to provide opportunities for individuals to participate in decision-making and to enhance reform of political systems (Pateman 1970, 2012), thus reducing social inequalities and transforming "thin" democracy, restricted to experts or professional politicians, into "strong" democracy, exercised by active citizens (Barber 1984). This objective may be reached through the production of collective decisions in structured

interactions (Cohen 2007; Michels & De Graaf 2010; Pimbert & Wakeford 2000), based on a variety of ways of acting, including rational deliberations, empathy and dialogue (Bächtiger et al. 2008; Curato et al. 2017). The Competence Centre for Deliberative Democracy defines participatory democracy as a governance approach that emphasizes the engagement of citizens through co-creation of deliberative practices, helping to shape public policies. Citizens are involved in the co-design and co-implementation of policies (Amnå 2006; Bherer et al. 2016; Michels & De Graaf 2010).

Participation in deliberative practices is based on the implementation of so-called *mini-publics*, that is deliberative settings based on the recruitment of a limited number of participants through either random selection or self-selection (Min & Wong 2018), including consensus conferences, citizens' juries, and citizens' assemblies (Chwalisz 2019; Drury et al. 2021; Green et al. 2019; Hartz-Kap 2005 Hartz-Kap & Briand 2009; Karpovitz et al. 2009; Knobloch & Gastil 2021; Legacy et al. 2014; Morrell et al. 2022; Niessen & Reuchamps 2019; Richards 2018). **A PL is a specific type of mini-public.** Williamson and Barrat (2022) distinguish four ways of implementing mini-publics: (1) involving people; (2) collaborating with people; (3) empowering people; (4) "deep democracy". **PL's combine the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the 3<sup>th</sup> strand implementing collaboration with people while empowering them.**

The impact of mini-publics on citizens' involvement in public decisions may be considered limited, due to the small number of people involved in setting the agenda. Thus, it is suggested to incorporate mini-publics in the overall policy cycle that includes different deliberative moments (Chwalisz 2019; Elstub et al. 2016; Ming & Wong 2018; OECD 2021; Youngs 2019) and combines different forms of participation (Carson & Elstub 2019; Dacombe & Parvin 2021; Elstub 2018; Flinders & Dommert 2013). **A PL is included in a policy cycle in which public decisions and local strategic planning are granted by local administrations and a group of local stakeholders.**

Mini-publics aims to achieve good policies, exploiting the participants' competence in reaching the best outcomes for democracy (Landemore 2017; Min & Wong 2018). However, they are also a manifestation of mutual respect among citizens (Gutmann & Thompson 2004), based on empathic mutual understanding, leading to appreciate different views and making it easier to understand the benefits of diversity (Hannon 2020). In mini-publics, interactions can be based on empowering talk and "friendly and collaborative spaces of discussion" (Bherer et al. 2016: 226), enhancing participation and inclusion, appreciation and respect of diversity, and perspective-taking (Eliasoph 2016; Green et al. 2019). **In PL's, a collaborative and dialogic method is used to address the gap between existing policy results and the implementation of recommendations for new policies.** PL's propose and test **innovative solutions at a laboratory scale, generating a participatory policy process by improving social and interpersonal relations to reach recommendations for the public policies.**

Several studies stress the difficulty to affect hierarchical decision-making (Michels & De Graaf 2010; Parvin 2021), power, hegemonic discourses, inequalities and marginalisation of disadvantaged people and minorities (Bartels 2014; Chambers 2003; Dacombe & Parvin 2021; Gherghina et al. 2021; Kadlec & Friedman 2007; Post 2011; Premat 2009). **In MUST-a-Lab,**

**PL's focused on migrants' most important needs in local policies.** PL's were based on **active participation of both stakeholders and migrant-background participants** in implementing policies based on migrants' specific needs and issues. The PL's were designed to enhance and support the production of **narratives about diverse personal cultural trajectories** (Holliday & Amadasi 2020).

Promotion of active participation and equality in mini-publics is based on **facilitation**, which is an important **structure of mini-publics** (e.g., Dillard, 2013; Drury et al. 2021; Escobar, 2019; Karpovitz et al. 2009; Kuhar et al., 2019; Moore, 2012; Roundtree et al., 2024; Von Schneidmesser, et al., 2023; Williamson and Barrat 2022). Different functions, forms and ways of facilitating mini-publics have been highlighted in this literature. Guidelines to select facilitators and facilitators' training are also important for the implementation of mini-publics (Kadlec & Friedman 2007). In MUST-a-Lab, **PLs were based on facilitation of migrants' active participation and a transnational facilitators' training** was organised to enable facilitators to play a competent and active role in the PL-meetings.

## **2.2 The analysis of facilitation**

In MUST-a-Lab, the study of PL **facilitation** was based on previous research suggesting that the main function of facilitation is enhancing the conditions of dialogic interactions, including: (1) equity in participation distribution and opportunities, (2) empowerment of participants' views, (3) empathic and affective communication among participants and (4) production of narratives (Baraldi, 2022). Facilitation is an interactional achievement, which is based on both facilitators' and other participants' actions, and focuses on the conditions for participants' personal expressions and autonomous choices (**agency**) in talking and deciding, and privileging the objective of enhancing and supporting empathic mutual understanding (Baraldi 2022; Gergen et al. 2001; Wierbizcka 2006). Facilitation encourages, enhances and supports participants' agency as the production of choices, contributing to change social structures and narratives (Baraldi, 2022). In MUST-a-Lab, migrant participants' agency means personal engagement in effective policies. Agency is based on the attribution of **rights and responsibilities in producing knowledge**, which is called **epistemic authority** (Heritage & Raymond, 2005). This knowledge is generally produced in narrative form. Based on previous research (see Baraldi, 2022 for a summary), it is possible to say that facilitation is frequently based on the following facilitative actions, understood in the context of the interaction, in their interlacement with other actions.

1. Invitations to talk, specifically (a) to present, (b) ask, (c) add/expand, or (d) comment.
2. Questions, which can be (a) focused questions (e.g., yes or no, choice between two alternatives), focused to clarify participants' contributions (b) open questions to several interpretations.
3. Minimal responses signalling attention and active listening, such as continuers ("mh mh", "yes", "okay") and repetitions of words/short sentences, as ways of stressing interest in talk.
4. Formulations which modify the gist of participants' previous contributions, by (a) showing understanding (or doubts about understanding) and (b) promoting further actions from the participants, thus creating spaces for clarifications. Formulations may summarise previous stretches of talk, make talk explicit/clear, or develop talk thus enhancing further participation.

5. Comments, which create new meanings, authored by the facilitator, stressing or reducing the relevance of previous contributions. Comments are facilitative if they enhance reflections or stress different preferences. They are not facilitative if they (a) deviate or interrupt current narratives, (b) conclude a conversation on a specific theme abruptly.
6. Appreciations, which provide affective support to participants' actions. Appreciations are different from evaluations, which are hierarchical actions that assess participants' performances.
7. Management of interruptions of others' talk, regarding the meaning expressed by the interrupting participant, through clarification, show of interest, short feedback, or no feedback. All these actions can be facilitative, but the facilitator needs to make choices based on what contribution can be considered more relevant in the current process. What is non-facilitative and hierarchical is sanctioning the interruption.
8. Facilitative management of conflicts by (a) inviting to reflect, (b) opening a conversation to understand reasons and perceptions, (c) avoiding any labelling. Conflict management is hierarchical when it establishes a right/wrong distinction (labelling and sanctioning one participant) or it invites to dismiss the conflict.

This report also focuses on the **narratives** of personal cultural trajectories which were enhanced by facilitation, that is personal experiences/views/emotions produced in the interaction (Baraldi & Iervese 2017; Baraldi et al. 2021). Analysing narratives means considering: (1) how participants (including facilitators) contribute as tellers or co-tellers (support of another teller); (2) interlacements (comments, response narratives); (3) difference between first person and vicarious narratives (one participant narrates about or for another participant) (Norrick, 2007).

In summary, this final research report aims to produce new and innovative knowledge on the ways of organising and facilitating PLs, focusing on participants' views, interactional achievements and the production of narratives. Thus, it aims to understand what organisation and what methods can promote dialogue and agency in PL's and show how PL's can support migrant participants' exercise of agency and involvement in dialogue, and the challenges of decision-making.

### **3. Research Methodology**

The evaluative research in MUST-a-Lab was based on a mixed-method approach, tailored to the specific characteristics of the partnership.

#### **3.1 Analysis of questionnaires**

The questionnaire was used to understand MUST-a-Lab participants' views on and assessment of PL-meetings, concerning opportunities to exercise agency, dialogue and facilitation. The data were collected at the end of each meeting so that each individual filled out the questionnaire as many times as the number of meetings s/he participated in. Thus, the percentages reported in this report do not correspond to the total number of participants, but to the total number of filled questionnaires. The questionnaire included **12** general questions for each PL-meeting plus 4 questions that specifically focused on the final PL-meeting. Thus, three

types of data were collected and analysed: (1) data concerning the three PL-meetings together; (2) data showing possible differences among the three PL-meetings; (3) data showing possible differences among (first generation) migrants, descendants (second-generation migrants) and non-migrants. However, the analysis showed that this categorisation presented some limits: (a) 28.6% of second generation migrants declared they were facilitators (16.1%) and/or members of the local administration (12,5%), thus they were not end-users of the policies under debate; (b) 18.1% of the first generation migrants declared they were facilitators (11.4%) and members of the local administration (6.7%), thus they were not end-users of policies. Therefore, some overlappings between the migrant condition and other roles can be observed. For technical reasons (missing data), these overlappings could not be registered in the analysis of the questionnaire. In particular, the **relatively high overlapping regarding the descendants can have influenced the percentages for this category**. Anyway, the questionnaire was very successful: according to the data registered by the city partners, the questionnaire covered **87.6%** of participants in the three PLs. The questionnaire shows that a large majority of the participants in the PL-cycle was female (68.5%).

### **3.2 Analysis of semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions**

To understand participants' perceptions of PLs we also made use of **semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions**. In two cities (C1-C2) the semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions were conducted by experienced researchers. Moreover, all interviews with the PL-facilitators were conducted by the research team. Where professional researchers could not be employed (C3-C6), data were collected by facilitators working as researchers.

The interviewers were asked to focus on some important topics. Guidelines and instructions were provided by the research team. The **guidelines for the semi-structured interviews** complied with four characteristics: (1) delivery of a preliminary structure with interchangeable questions to guarantee a flexible interview scheme, adapted to the respondents' contributions; (2) instruction about monitoring the content and the topic of the interview; (3) adoption of a non-directive interview approach, by asking open-ended, follow-up questions; (4) direct responsive interactions between the interviewer and respondents. The **guidelines for the focus groups** similarly instructed interviewers to promote respondents' perspectives in a flexible, interactive way, (1) recommending to select a balanced group of participants representing the target demographics, (2) containing tips about preparatory procedures and (3) formulating a set of facilitation and brainstorm techniques.

The semi-structured interviews and focus groups discussions aimed to gain insight in the way participants **perceived the participatory possibilities and the interactional dimensions** of the PL-meetings. An important consideration is that the research assumed that four broad categories of participants attended PL: **(1) participants with a migrant background as end-users** of policies; **(2) stakeholders** from civil society, grassroot, private and non-governmental organisations; **(3) local policy officers and policymakers**; **(4) facilitators**. However, a clear-cut distinction between these categories revealed to be unrealistic. As mentioned above, the migrant condition and other roles of participants could overlap, depending on the demographic reality of the participating cities. While PLs were based on a shared methodology in all cities,

some cities have a more diverse, even superdiverse (Vertovec, 2007) population than other cities, where cultural diversity is not as pronounced.

Participants in the semi-structured interviews were **24** (4 in each city, including 7 stakeholders belonging to civil society organisations, 4 representatives of migrant communities (3 second-generation), 7 administrators (one migrant-background), and 6 facilitators (one for each city, one with migrant-background)). Females were 21 and males 3. Participants in focus groups were **41** (7 in C1, C3 and C6, 9 in C2, 5 in C4 and C5), including 18 stakeholders (one second-generation migrant), 16 representatives of migrant communities (6 first-generation), 6 local administrators, including one first-generation migrant. Females were 31 and males 10.

Half of the interviews and the focus groups were collected after the second PL-meeting and were transcribed verbatim, the other half were collected after the third PL-meeting. Half of those interviews were documented in summative individual reports. Participants in all interviews and focus groups were asked about participatory possibilities, composition and setting of PLs, methods, outcomes, types of language and facilitation styles that were employed during the PL-meetings, exercise of agency, sharing of narratives and decision-making possibilities. Respondents that took part in the second round of interviews were also asked about their satisfaction with the outcomes of the PL. All semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions were conducted locally in the native language of the participants and then translated into English by the research team. All interviews with the facilitators were conducted by the research team. The analysis followed inductive reasoning but was based on a short literature review, and mixed pre-defined coding with emergent posteriori coding protocols. The software NVIVO was used to identify and analyse patterns and themes, by using the following pre-defined codes: participation, agency, equity, sharing experiences, decision-making, language, conversational space, atmosphere, motivation, method, organisation, role, outcomes, satisfaction. During the analysis, these codes were elaborated, emergent (sub)codes were identified and the codebook to analyse the data was refined.

### **3.3 Analysis of interactional processes in PL-meetings.**

Where professional researchers could be employed (C1-C2), this part of the research was based on **videorecording of the PL-meetings**. **Videorecording** allowed the collection of data concerning the ways in which (1) facilitated interactions were realised as sequences of actions, (2) narratives were produced in facilitated interactions, (3) agency was produced in facilitated interactions. Transcriptions of recordings were useful for the detailed analysis of interactions. In the literature there is only one paper explicitly discussing the use of videorecording of facilitation (von Schneidemesser et al., 2023), but it does not focus on the interaction, it concerns organized, short experiments, rather than real mini-publics and it does not provide transcriptions. Another paper, that of Dillard (2013) only reports some single turns of facilitation and Roundtree et al. (2024) declare they have videorecorded online assembly meetings, but they did not analyze these recordings. In MUST-a-Lab, important ideas from Conversation Analysis (Heritage & Clayman, 2010; Sacks et al., 1974) were useful to analyse interactions, making clear the importance of (1) actions to achieve interactions, which can be observed as organised sequences of turns of talk; (2) pauses and overlapping that influence the connection between turns; (3) “turn design” of actions, showing exercise of agency and



facilitative actions. **A total of 6 meetings in C1 and C2 were videorecorded and transcribed.** The collection and analysis of data concerned the interactional practices enhancing participation and narratives during the PLs, focusing on facilitation. The analysis concerned successful and unsuccessful facilitative and dialogic practices, enhancement of participation and agency and the production of narratives.

Where professional researchers could not be employed (12 meetings in 4 cities: C3-C6), data were collected by combining an observation grid of important actions and a report describing the meaning of this grid. Data collection was based on **participant observation**, taking notes about facilitative actions, active participation and narratives. The grid and the detailed guidelines, including 6 sections, were provided by the research team. Each cell of the grid was filled with a number, corresponding to the total amount of identified actions for the cell, roughly the same types of action analysed through the videorecording. The observers were invited to comment on the grid through short written reports. Selected local facilitators were trained to use the guidelines and the grid, and to write the reports. However, it was difficult to compare the data regarding PLs in C3-C6, because the interpretations of actions may have been different in different cities. Moreover, the grid only represented **actions** and could not take in account the interaction as a specific object of analysis, thus comparison with data collected in C1-C2 was also difficult.

### **3.4 Analysis of follow-up documentation**

The purpose of the part of evaluative research was to observe whether and how the recommendations produced at the end of the Policy Lab cycle have been implemented by the city administrations, particularly highlighting the decisions at the political level. To achieve this goal, the reports produced by the cities, which summarised the actions carried out to implement the recommendations, have been analysed. These reports were structured using a template (WP4diary) designed to provide information related to WP4. Synergy between WP4 and WP5 was implemented to avoid duplications of documentation.

The analysed supporting documentation, produced in the cities, includes 58 minutes of meetings, 37 documents of dissemination (brochure, press release, invitations, ppt presentations), 9 internal documents (reports, e-mails), and 2 officials documents (deliberations). In chapter 9, we present both the recommendations and the actions regarding their implementations. This chapter summarises the result expanded in D5.4. The recommendations are presented to better understand their follow-up in terms of policies. In addition, several meetings and actions have been organised during the follow-up phase where the Policy Lab cycle, and the related methodology, have been presented to implement actions at a local level. These meetings and actions are also summarised in deliverables D4.1, D4.2. and D4.3.

### **3.5 An interlaced analysis**

The data analysis in chapter 4 is prevalently based on the interviews/focus groups collecting the view of the participants. The following chapters 5-7 are based on the interlacement between

the interviews/focus groups collecting the view of the participants and the recordings/participant observation, collecting data on the interactional process during the PL meetings, with some additional elements from the questionnaire. Normally, the analysis in these chapters starts with the views of the participants (confirmed by quotations from the interviews/focus groups) and continues with the process analysis (confirmed by transcriptions of videorecorded sequences of interaction), looking at similarities and differences of results based on the two methods. In Chapter 8, the analysis is mainly based on questionnaires and interviews/focus groups. In Chapter 9, the analysis is based on the documentation of initiatives and decisions aiming at applying the PL recommendations, by local administrations in C1-6.

### 3.6 Ethics

A final, important note concerns **ethics**. The research: (1) involved migrants, as potentially vulnerable individuals, and, in some cases, children as persons unable to give legal informed consent; (2) included the collection and processing of sensitive personal data about gender, age, conditions of migrants, language proficiency and personal experiences. The data were collected, used, and stored **according to the EU General Data Protection Regulation 2106/679** and **in compliance with existing national laws about data protection**. All participants joined the research on a voluntary basis and had the opportunity to meet the researchers and express their will. Informed consent was delivered regarding the collection and processing of the data. All participants were provided with an accessible information sheet, including (1) information on law requirements about ethical issues, (2) an offer of opt-out option, (3) an explanation of the methods used to collect, store and use/communicate the data, in particular specifying: (a) that data were made accessible only to researchers; (b) the way in which researchers aimed to store the data; (c) who was the responsible for ethics issues; (d) the ways in which the data were transferred and collated for analysis. Consent was demonstrated through signed agreement. All sensitive data were stored on a secure protected server in a password-protected area. The datasets were processed and shared only by the researchers, following a specific protocol for the confidential and anonymous collection and treatment of all collected data, separated from personal identity information at the point of transcription. All names were deleted and replaced by numbers and letters.

## 4. Composition and organisation

### 4.1 Composition of the PLs

The MUST-a-lab project enrolled three categories of participants: **(1) representatives of migrant communities (RMC)** as end-users of the local policies, **including first-generation (F-G) and second-generation (S-G) migrants**; **(2) stakeholders (SH)** from various civil society, grassroot, private and non-governmental organisations; **(3) policymakers and policy officers from local administration (local administrators LA)**. The following table includes the data about the numbers of **participations in all meetings** for each city and overall (elaboration from D3.3). The numbers in the table do not reflect the total numbers of individual participants, but the number of participants in the three meetings together, so that each

individual is included as many times as the meetings s/he attended. This table also makes clear that **nor a strict delineation of the three main participant categories, nor a continuous representation of all target groups was always a reality.**

| <b>PLs Composition</b>                      | C1   | C2   | C3   | C4   | C5   | C6   | Total |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| Migrants in NGO/associations/Private Sector | 0    | 4    | 21   | 2    | 0    | 12   | 39    |
| Migrants in Local Administration            | 0    | 8    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 9    | 17    |
| Migrant citizens                            | 31   | 11   | 2    | 25   | 17   | 5    | 91    |
| Non-Migrants in NGO/associations            | 29   | 17   | 24   | 30   | 41   | 39   | 180   |
| Non-Migrants in Local Administration        | 10   | 4    | 15   | 17   | 3    | 37   | 86    |
| Non-Migrant Citizens                        | 5    | 5    | 0    | 2    | 2    | 1    | 15    |
| Total                                       | 75   | 49   | 62   | 76   | 63   | 103  | 428   |
| % migrants on the total number              | 41,3 | 46,9 | 37,0 | 35,5 | 26,9 | 25,2 | 34,3  |
| % migrants excluding local administrations  | 41,3 | 30,6 | 37,0 | 35,5 | 26,9 | 16,5 | 30,3  |

**In C1** a rather clear separation between participation of F-G migrant citizens on the one hand, and non-migrant local stakeholders on the other (41% of participations concern migrants) was maintained. **C4** and **C5** were similar to C1, but with lower percentages of participations of migrants (35% in C4 and 27% in C5). **In C2** several stakeholders and policy officers with a migrant-background (more than 24%) and migrant 30% of migrant end-users (among them three migrant-background children, two in PL1, two in PL2, one in both PLs, no one in PL3), two migrant parents and a migrant-background citizen who attended all the meetings. **C6** is like C2, but with much lower overall percentages (25% overall and 16% of emigrant end-users). **In C3** mostly migrants belonging to local associations (about one third of participations) took part. Overall, about 34% of participations regarded migrant origins, 30% excluding people who were not targeted as migrant citizens/stakeholders in the PL. The age of the target groups was also different in the different cities. For instance, **C2** included mainly S-G migrant pupils, while **C1 and C3**, mainly migrant young people (prevalently F-G migrants attending university in C1 and young migrants attending associations in C3). These differences of age and position in the social context most probably also affected the distribution of migrants' agency.

The second table concerns the number and origins of facilitators in the six cities (also in this case, each individual is included as many times as the meetings s/he attended).

| <b>Facilitators</b>      | C1 | C2 | C3 | C4 | C5 | C6 | Total |
|--------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| Migrant Facilitators     | 2  | 3  | 5  | 3  | 0  | 2  | 15    |
| Non-Migrant Facilitators | 4  | 8  | 3  | 4  | 8  | 3  | 30    |
| Total                    | 6  | 11 | 8  | 7  | 8  | 5  | 45    |

Facilitators participated **45** times in the meetings. The highest number of facilitators' participations was in **C2**, the lowest number in **C6**. Interestingly one third of the facilitators had migrant origins. The number of migrant facilitators' participations was particularly high in **C3**, followed by C2 and C4.

In the following sections, we will zoom in on the main categories, discern subgroups within those categories and discuss what respondents shared about their own and other's roles within the PL's.

#### **4.1.1 Representatives of the migrant community**

The analysis of the semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions revealed that all respondents considered the presence of RMCs very important and the RMCs themselves stated that their presence was needed for a PL-deliberation on integration to succeed. However, respondents in most cities noticed a fluctuating attendance and sometimes an underrepresentation of this category of participants. Across cities some interesting patterns emerge.

In **C1**, **C4** and **C5** several F-G migrants were involved. In **C2** children and parents of the migrant community took part and SHs and Las were enthusiastic about their presence, but also noticed they were underrepresented. Two children took part and in PL1 and a youngster replaced one of the children that had turned ill in PL2. Despite the appreciation for their presence and competence, most respondents agreed that the children constituted too small of a subgroup for their voice to fully be heard and that this created unbalanced interactional dynamics.

In **C1** and **C3** young people constituted an important subgroup of RMC. At least one third of the participants in **C1** were F-G migrant young students and this proportion probably contributed greatly to their possibility to exercise agency. However, one SH proposed there could have been an extra introductory PL-meeting consulting F-G young migrants to get their needs clarified. Additionally, she claimed that not only the institutional or cultural background was important in selecting participants for a PL-cycle, but also the age group and the different communicative methods different generations use. In **C3**, where the main focus was on youth participation, half of the PL places were reserved for **young people** between 17 and 25 years old. About 60% of them had a migrant background.

“The young peoples’ realities and their needs are a bit distant from ours and what we have done is to adapt to their needs so that their participation was facilitated. It is important that participation projects should be adapted to those for whom they are intended” (policymaker, C3).

#### **4.1.2 Local administrators**

The analysis of the semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions also revealed that all categories of respondents recognised the importance of LA and made a distinction between policy officers (members of the administration) and policymakers with executive powers (council members or assessors). Policy officers were rather constant in their attendance of the PL-meetings, while some policymakers showed a more fluctuating participation. In **C2**, for instance, respondents appreciated that politicians recognised the relevance of the project and contributed from their own personal perspectives, but they noticed that these assessors only attended the first part of PL1 and that only one returned for a part of PL3. In **C6**, the district migrant-background councillor described how she had made a personal effort to take part in the project.

“I really pushed through to take part because I thought I could really explain the rights’ movement in society [...] as a Muslim myself. [...] All the organisations, all the parties, all the people [working] together: if we can converse and communicate about human rights with each other to understand them better, then we can propagate human rights better” (F-G migrant LA, C6).

The councillor stressed that her migrant experience was important to understand nuances about integration and bring about change in human rights’ policies. In **C3**, an elected policymaker

claimed that elected politicians should **listen more to the migrant citizens** they represent and make policy decisions for. She stressed that listening to the migrant young people had made her political vision grow but that more change is still needed in integration policies. In **C3** the migrant young people first expressed being weary of their official attitude and attire, but also claimed that this distrust evaporated during the PL-cycle. Las reported that **their presence was essential for the method to work and the ideas to be implemented**. A policymaker in **C1** shared this point of view.

“If there is no political representative, it becomes or it risks becoming a group that talks to each other, expresses problems, even solutions, not just problems, but between them and therefore has no, no consequence. And therefore the presence of the administration [...] was important” (policymaker, C1).

#### 4.1.3 Stakeholders

Regarding the presence of stakeholders, the analysis yielded interesting results. Many SH deemed their own presence necessary, but SH of grassroots organisations were sometimes critical about the presence of more formal SH, claiming they took up too much space. According to some respondents, involvement and interesting exchanges occurred mainly when different participants collaborated during the PL-meetings, **finding common ground and working on concrete ideas**. Respondents from different cities emphasised that participation was brought about by **the participants’ commitment to collaborate and find solutions**. SH from **C4, C5** and **C6** found it easier for participants to interact meaningfully if they already were acquainted, worked together or simply were more experienced than others.

“I find very important the combination on the one hand between exchange (expertise that comes together there), but at the same time also the joint goal to implement something [...] There were some who had more direct professional contact with the group and others less. Accordingly, some were more involved and others less. But that also simply had to do with experience” (SH, C6).

Other respondents highlighted that within the SH group **some important sectors**, such as the education, employment and/or health sectors **were missing** in some of the PL-meetings in their cities. When included during the end of the PL-cycle, these sectors helped while outreaching to the RMC.

#### 4.1.4 Facilitators

The number of facilitators per city varied within the partnership. According to the respondents and the facilitators themselves, two facilitators (on an average number of 20-25 participants) are a minimum requirement. However, due to budget and time constraints, several small-group workshops were not facilitated by designated facilitators – so that other participants, mainly LA, stepped in – or were not facilitated at all. Most facilitators were not officially trained for multicultural deliberations prior to their engagement with the local PL. The only city that outsourced facilitation to trained facilitators was **C1**. The facilitator from **C1** that took part in the semi-structured interview already worked as a trained mediator and a psychologist before she participated in the PL. She reported that her work skills were useful to establish a relationship with the group.

“I think my role as a mediator helped me and allowed me to pick up on aspects, during the meetings, just to facilitate (...) I mean, if I probably hadn’t (...) if I wasn’t a mediator now or, anyway, hadn’t done these studies, it would have been a bit complicated for me to be able to understand, and to

understand the questions or ask questions, so I think it was fundamental” (facilitator, C1).

The precise prerequisites for a PL were new to her, and she initially struggled with uncertainties. She claimed that it was very important to have received the transnational training in the first year of the project in which most MUST-a-lab facilitators participated. This experience allowed her to put herself on the side of the participants and better understand their perspective and allowed her to meet facilitators from other cities, being part of a larger local and transnational network. One of the success factors of the MUST-a-lab approach was working in facilitation teams, allowing exchange with each other, coordination of large groups together and work in synergy also through online meetings, which were also mentioned by the facilitators of **C2-C6**, who, prior to the MUST-a-lab project, were not officially trained in multicultural deliberations. The latter group stated that facilitation was of paramount importance to engender equitable interactions. However, most of them also expressed uncertainty about their own facilitation skills. Despite the transnational training, they reported a need for more clarity about the roles and functions of facilitation, even more training and more practice.

Some **facilitators were also LA and part of the organising teams** in **C2-C6**. These facilitators-organisers and the other respondents provided mixed reflections about these multifaceted roles. On the one hand, they liked that facilitators were also personifying the project management team and had built a certain relation with it before the PL-meetings. This was particularly true for RMC respondents. On the other hand, the facilitators-organisers claimed maintaining all these roles was difficult.

“I have been working as a facilitator before when I was not involved in the project and this time I was involved as a project manager in the project and this also affected my role as a facilitator, because all of the participants knew me personally and I think that helped me a lot as a facilitator. When I think of the first policy lab, I think that was the most challenging policy lab for me [...] There were a lot of question marks, also regarding the project: ‘How will this work? How will the micro experiments work? What do you expect from me? How many resources do we need to put in the project and so on and so forth?’ So there were a lot of questions also addressing me as a project manager and not as a facilitator. This is why I had to switch roles constantly. It made me feel I had to bear a lot of responsibility” (facilitator, C6).

The facilitators agreed that roles and responsibilities need to be defined and clarified at the start of the PL-process. Clear roles and positions can also enhance trust among participants.

#### **4.1.5 Motivation of participation**

All respondents claimed they were **highly motivated** to join the MUST-a-lab project and attend the PL-meetings. For most respondents, the **local topic** of the PL was the highest incentive to enrol. Many claimed that these topics had not been approached in such a co-constructive manner and with such plurality of participants. Other motivations ranged from personal life experiences (mainly RMC), over a professional sense of responsibility and networking possibilities regarding solutions for integration policies (mainly SH and LA and to a lesser extent facilitators), to becoming familiarised with the perspective of others, learning opportunities and having impact on local policy (all categories of respondents).

The participation rate In the PL-meetings of all cities went up and down, and in some cities diminished in terms of diversity. The questionnaire shows that overall migrant participants decreased from 47.4% to 34.5% from PL1 to PL3 – especially decreasing in PL3. In the interviews and focus group discussions most RMC mentioned they had initially planned to personally attend each meeting. Some respondents made clear that their (momentary) absence was due to personal/practical reasons or other professional engagements. Most respondents found the **fluctuating presence and turnover** of participants **problematic** and claimed it slowed down the process, the relational bonds and interactive dynamics considerably. Some respondents mentioned frustrations about the difficulty of attending some PL-meetings and claimed it would be useful to make up a clear planning in advance. Some respondents, mainly SH in C6 and RMC in C3, claimed this fluctuating presence cannot be avoided in long term projects and added that it felt reassuring that other participants from the same category would take their place.

## 4.2 Organisation

### 4.2.1 Preparation phase

Many RMC and SH listed the **enthusiastic talks** that were given by the local project organisers during informative sessions. According to respondents of the local organising teams, it was not always easy to decide who to address during the capacity building activities. In most cities, many respondents claimed that they reached out to organisations they already knew. According to the RMC and the SH, however, these preparatory talks contributed greatly to their involvement in the exchanges and clarified why these exchanges were relevant for them. Some respondents mentioned that the preparation phase in general and the preparatory workshops in particular made clear what was expected from them during the PL-meetings. However, some respondents claimed exact expectations about their roles in the project **were not clear at first and only crystallised later**. This may explain the initial insecurity, predominantly of the RMC. Concern about predictable and understandable goals and attitudes was voiced repeatedly in C3. For the young people the workshops in the preparation phase were not sufficient. Particularly, for those who had no prior experience it took some more time to adjust to the PL requirements. The young people **suggested to provide more preliminary sessions to get acquainted with interactions and dialogic practices**, a suggestion that also came from one SH about the S-G young participants in C1. One RMC and one LA in C2 highlighted that it was important that the informative sessions were not too numerous and appreciated the relative anonymity of the other participants, i.e. the fact that they did not know each other well before the PL's.

### 4.2.2 Organisation of the PL-cycle

The **sequence of the three PL-meetings** in the second year was the same for all cities. PL1 aimed to collect ideas and challenges about integration, particularly from the RMC's. PL2 aimed to define and design a selection of local micro-experiments to address these challenges. These experiments were subsequently supposed to be carried out by groups of PL-participants. During PL3 these pilot activities were evaluated with all the participants and recommendations for future policies were discussed and formulated.

#### 4.2.2.1 Interval

In the set-up of MUST-a-lab a period of 6-8 months was foreseen between PL2 and PL3 to carry out micro-experiments. Yet, many respondents agreed that this **interval was too long**. First, **not all participants were involved in the micro-experiments**, thus they did not hear anything or very little about the progress that was made. Some respondents also claimed they were not made aware that they were to carry out the micro-experiments. Several respondents (mostly SH and LA) claimed that they lost clarity about the goals, connection with the other participants and a sense of urgency because of the long interval between meetings. The SH and LA in **C4** suggested they would prefer more tightly interlinked PL-meetings, although PL3 was organised two months after PL2, because the city joined the partnership at a later stage.

“I would organise policy lab meetings shorter after each other. There were two months in between and maybe you can make this only one month. There could be an improvement regarding the continuity” (SH, C4).

#### 4.2.2.2 Number of meetings

Several respondents raised the question whether the PL-method would not generally benefit from a **higher number of meetings**. SH from **C3** and **C5** stressed the importance of continuity when addressing integration issues within a local community. They also claimed more meetings would allow them to delve deeper into certain topics and suggested to increase the number of participants on the long run. One RMC in **C1** also claimed that more PL-meetings would be advisable. Many respondents would even prefer a continuation beyond the scope and the timeline of the MUST-a-lab project.

#### 4.2.3 Organisation of PL-meetings

Respondents appreciated the **flexibility** of planning and timing of the PL-meetings, trying to accommodate the challenges of participants’ life and work realities. All cities undertook efforts to consider participants’ availability. **C1**, **C2** and **C3** split a PL-meeting in two days, **C4** organised meetings on a Saturday, **C5** adapted planning to the RMC, organising PL-meetings in the evenings. These adaptations contributed to the motivation of the participants, but they also created differences in the length of PL-meetings, within the same city and across cities.

#### 4.2.3.1 General set-up

In all cities, the PL-meetings were divided in plenaries and small-group workshops. There was some sort of informal reception moment on arrival, sometimes involving a collective check-in, followed by icebreakers, plenary moments during which all participants discussed and deliberated together, (a) small-group workshops enhancing interactions, and (b) collective check-out(s). Most respondents reported that the **combination of icebreakers, plenary sessions, small-group discussions and informal moments** gradually helped them to reach high levels of participation. The small-group workshops were mostly used to share ideas and personal experiences, brainstorm and get to know the different views of participants. The plenaries were used for icebreaking activities, collective sharing of experiences, summaries of the results of the workshops, debate, decision-making and collective check-out moments. The combination of collective and more focused interactions was important for equal distribution of participation and decision-making.



Time employed in plenaries and small group workshops was different in different cities. In **C2**, PL1 and PL2 were concluded with a plenary summarising the results of the workshops; in PL3 there was not a final plenary, and the meeting was concluded with the workshops. In **C1**, in all PLs the introductory plenaries were long, and the workshops were shorter than in **C2**. Moreover, in **C1**, PL3 was divided in two parts, in two different days, and the plenary in day one was not followed by workshops. In both **C2 and C1**, the final plenaries were used to summarise the results of the workshops. However, in **C2**, in PL3 there was no final plenary. In **C3 and C5**, all PLs started with introductory plenaries, followed by workshops and/or other plenary discussions. The same happened in **C4**, except for PL2, when the introductory activity was held in small groups. In **C3, C4 and C5**, there were final plenaries in all PL meetings. In **C6**, there was a prevalence of small group workshops, except for PL3, in which there was a final plenary.

#### **4.2.3.2 Plenaries and small group workshops**

PL-sessions across the partnership consisted of plenaries and small group workshops. Plenaries consisted of ice-breaking activities and general discussions, frequently in the final phase of the session, but in some cases (e.g. in **C1**) also in the first part of it. Small group discussions were organised in all cities, but they differed in length and method of organisation. The small group session in PL3 was based in all cities on the method of word café, which implies that small groups move among different tables to discuss specific themes.

Regarding the plenaries, most respondents were enthusiastic about the initial **ice-breaking** activities that facilitators selected at the beginning of initial plenary sessions. Ice-breaking activities were perceived by the respondents as useful mainly to get to know each other and share personal stories. Relational aspects were prioritised over concrete techniques.

According to the facilitator from **C6**, too much emphasis on creative activities in the initial phases of the project sometimes stood in the way of really getting to know each other. Yet, the facilitator also noted that, especially because new participants were introduced up to the last PL, a systematic introduction technique would have been helpful at the beginning of each PL-meeting. Many respondents claimed they wanted more time to get acquainted with other participants.

Regarding the remainder of the plenary sessions, all categories of respondents in all cities liked the **collective nature** and reported that the atmosphere was **respectful, inviting and constructive** and that **a lot of important information was shared, and important decisions were collectively made**. Most SH and LA perceived plenaries as spaces where all participants, including RMC, could freely speak their minds. RMC that spoke the local language fluently claimed they were comfortable, and they could contribute equally to most plenaries. However, RMC that did not speak the local language well did not always find it easy to speak in front of a large group. Moreover, the length of the plenaries and the amount of information that was shared made it easier to **lose sight of the main goals and topics**. In **C6**, for instance, one LA compared the plenaries to a shop where one may get lost because there are too many products to buy.

“In the big group, each person was giving their own opinion for so long, that the time was over. [This way] you don’t get to an end, you don’t have a result and nobody really knew what we were talking about. I think it’s just like a shop. If a shop has a thousand similar products, you get confused. What do I buy? For one is present in a thousand options. And also, no matter what the topic is, the discussion is

the same, each one says something and in the end nobody knows who said what and what we wanted” (F-G migrant LA, C6).

**Small-group workshops** were mainly used for brainstorming about policy challenges and needs, for discussing and developing micro-experiments and for drafting policy recommendations in PL3. Most respondents from all categories in all cities stated that working in small groups was one of the success factors of the PL-meetings. Some described the small-group workshops as the **‘core’ or ‘heart’ of the PL-meetings**. Some small group workshops included facilitators for each table, others had none, and still others were based on a semi-facilitated structure.

#### **4.2.4 Venues and informal moments**

The analysis of the interviews and focus group discussions made clear that many respondents attached a lot of importance to the **venue of the PL**, claiming it was important that the space was accessible and multifunctional, and that it left room for informal encounters during the breaks. In **C2**, both the RMC and one SH explained that the informal, yet neutral venue and the outlay of that venue contributed to their sense of feeling welcomed into the first PL-meeting. The facilitator and project manager of **C4** explained how much thought she had put into finding and setting the right space for interactions in PL-meetings.

In most cities informal moments laid the foundations for trust, a sense of safety and equal participation. The facilitator in **C3**, for instance, mentioned a coffee place where the young participants got together. Getting acquainted on a personal level in this informal setting contributed to higher levels of participation and a general feeling of safety in the PL-meetings. Several SH claimed that informal moments created opportunities for the spontaneous narrative of personal experiences, enhancing a more layered cohesion of the group. In **C4**, respondents appreciated that the lunches were catered by an association that tied in with the MUST-a-lab theme, hiring refugees and providing jobs for them. SH in **C6** added that the project manager had foreseen a technique to promote informal encounters by creating a pin board, feeding into the need to get acquainted with one another more, especially because the composition of participants changed throughout the PL-cycle. Respondents from the focus group in **C1** also saw other means of fostering informal bonds between participants, by connecting through a whatsapp group. In sum, an accessible venue and space, communication methods and moments that contribute to informal exchange and spontaneous and creative discussions reportedly contributed to relations and sharing of personal narratives.

## **5. Facilitation of migrant participants’ agency and dialogue**

Chapter 2 introduced the concepts of facilitation and agency, particularly focusing on facilitation of agency in producing knowledge (proposals) and narratives of personal experiences during PL-meetings. Agency is a specific way of participating in PL-meetings, by making choices and proposals. This chapter summarises the most important results about the views on participation in general and on agency specifically, and the ways in which facilitation of agency was achieved in PL-meetings. Since we have more data about C1 and C2 than about C3-4, we will focus more on the results from these cities.

## 5.1 Respondents' views on participation and conditions for agency

Most respondents that took part in the interviews and focus group discussions viewed participation as long-term involvement, committing to the goals of the PL in relational terms, through the gradual creation of a **process of building trust and creating equitable bonds** between participants. The goals and the rules of engagement were frequently defined as emergent qualities, that slowly took shape and were substantiated and focused as the PL-meetings progressed. Respondents referred to having gone through a **learning process** to open up and share ideas through long-term participation.

Several interviews in **C1**, for instance, described the initial participation as slightly unequal; participants did not know each other yet and were not familiar with the method. These obstacles were overcome with time, knowledge, and networking. In **C3**, all respondents, but especially the younger ones, reported differences between the levels of participation in the beginning and at the end of the PL-cycle, and claimed they needed to get acquainted with the PL-method before they could participate fully.

“We needed to open our mind to what participation is. We needed to separate it a bit from the concept that participation is only for some people or that it only interests a certain type of people” (S-G young migrant, C3). “I used to listen to someone who works in the city council, because they are people in suits and ties, super serious, super formal and they are not like that [...] I have felt very comfortable talking to them and working with them” (S-G young migrant, C3).

The participants' positive views about Involvement in PLs was confirmed by the questionnaire: it was easy to get involved for **81.1%** of participants. F-G migrants were the category that responded more positively (**84.8%**), but S-G migrants responded less positively (**66.1%**). The S-G migrants did not feel involved particularly in PL1 (50%). These data are probably explained at least partly by different expectations. Interestingly, involvement was **higher in PL2** for both categories (respectively 91.2% and 78.3%). This indicates that **proposals of micro-experiments were perceived to involve participants more than formulating recommendations**.

**Social relations and knowledge were both deemed essential by all respondents for the exercise of agency.** One RMC in **C5** referred to a PL as a family and painted a very vivid picture when describing her PL-experience:

“I see the policy labs as a family gathered around a table to have dinner. They are laughing, talking and sharing. In a family you feel safe, different things can be shared and you are equal” (F-G migrant, C5).

The metaphor of the family emphasises togetherness, safety and equality in PL-meetings. In **C3**, one young person stated that, although each participant started from a different point of view, they all worked in the same direction when they progressed in the PL-cycle. Other respondents appreciated the opportunity both to **express their opinions and personal experiences** on different topics and to **share knowledge, listen to different perspectives, possibly change their mind and make decisions together**. A safe inter-group dynamic was the stepping stone for the exercise of agency and the balanced distribution of epistemic authority in PL-meetings. **Such dynamic was greatly influenced by the facilitators.**

“I would say that I felt very comfortable, and I would also say that the facilitators played a very important role. They always found a way to encourage you to express yourself and dig deep into your thoughts to find a common idea” (F-G young migrant, C1).

The results of the questionnaire are ambivalent about the participants’ perceived exercise of agency, particularly regarding the migrants. Active listening worked very well, as **90.4%** of participants claimed they discovered new ideas from other participants, but a much lower percentage reported they could propose new ideas (**55.2%**) during the interactions. These data did not change much during the PL-cycle, although the percentage regarding proposing ideas was slightly higher in PL2 (57.3%). F-G migrants claimed they proposed new ideas more frequently (63.8%) and S-G less frequently (41.1%). The **level of interlacements** was perceived as low: only **57.3%** reported they proposed new ideas based on others’ contributions (only 39.3% S-G migrants). **Non-migrants claimed they were more involved in interlacements** (61.5% vs. 58.1% of F-G migrants). The questionnaire also shows high levels of **self-expression**, concerning interest in talk, and sharing opinions/experiences with others (from 73.1% to 85.3%). However, **only 50.4% of participants shared their feelings**. Sharing of feelings diminished in PL3 (44%), where the focus was on collectively formulating recommendations. The highest percentage of sharing feelings was declared by the F-G migrants (63.8%), confirming the higher involvement of F-G migrants, despite possible language barriers. Particularly in PL3, 23.1% of S-G migrants claimed they could share feelings as opposed to 63% among F-G migrants. Expression of different points of view was not particularly appreciated (62.7%), especially in PL3 (59.5%) where F-G migrants were keener to express different points of view (66.7%). Very few participants observed important conflicts (3.5%), but only 70.5% of F-G migrants observed absence of conflicts; while 77.6% of participants perceived that their talk was shared, fewer F-G migrants (68.6%) thought so. **F-G migrants reported that participated with great interest and involvement, but many also perceived some problems in sharing their contributions.**

Very positive outcomes of the questionnaire concerned the reception of others’ talk: respondents claimed they found other participants’ points of view important (96.3%) and interesting (93.1%), and claimed they trusted others (89.3%). Moreover, a low level of problems was observed (4.3% getting bored and 3.7% feeling annoyed). However, only 44% of the respondents claimed that questions were asked (28.6% S-G migrants), 64.5% claimed they could give their point of view when responding to other contributions and 73.6% (62.5% S-G migrants) reported they joined others in their talk. These data confirm the low level of interlacements that was observed although questions increased in PL3 (50.9%; 36.8% S-G migrants), probably in connection with the discussion of micro-experiments, as the videorecording in C1 could explain (but there were no S-G migrants in C1). The videorecording of the short PL3 in C2 shows that probably in small group workshops the number of questions increased. The observational reports do not provide elements to explain this result. Finally, the questionnaire also shows the importance of **engaging in dialogue** (89.1%) and of **supporting personal expressions** (82.4%) in PL-meetings. Participants **assessed collaboration between different actors very positively** (91.2%), although positive assessment of F-G migrants decreased in PL3 (77.8%). This can be explained by the fact that in PL3 the discussions on micro-experiments and recommendations required less collaboration between F-G migrants and SHs, as the videorecording in C1 confirms. In PL3 in C2 there were no F-G migrants. There are no sufficient elements the observations in C3-C6 to explain this point.

## 5.2 Facilitation

According to the respondents to interviews and focus groups across all cities, overcoming participation hurdles, promoting equal speaking opportunities, balancing out epistemic

authority and stimulating the exercise of agency **were mostly realised by facilitators**. The respondents greatly appreciated **how facilitation influenced the exchanges**. This finding is confirmed by the findings of the questionnaire: **92.8% of participants appreciated facilitation very much**. During the interviews the facilitators themselves claimed that equitable participation requires **skilful facilitation**. Four functions of facilitation were considered relevant in all cities and by all types of participants.

**Function 1. Mediating and clarifying the goals of the exchanges.** In most cases clarifications were provided verbally, but respondents also appreciated visual components of facilitation. In C3, for instance, respondents claimed that facilitation, as supported by visual materials, made them more motivated to engage. In C4, facilitation used graphic elements, creating ‘visual vignettes’ that could help all participants, but especially those who were not fluent in the local language.

**Function 2. Contributing to a safe group dynamic and trust.** This function was mentioned by most respondents. Facilitation resulted in more invested interactions.

“There were a few times when one person spoke less, but in those cases the facilitators asked them to give their opinion. So, we could all contribute equally” (S-G young migrant, C3).

**Function 3. Guiding or safeguarding speaking turns.** This function was reported by many respondents.

“Facilitators did a very good job. They built a safe environment and most of the participants were open and comfortable. They made sure every participant had the time and space to talk” (SH, C5). “No one invaded each other’s space, everyone was allowed to speak, also thanks to the work of the facilitators. It was very helpful to have a facilitator who made the topic easier” (F-G young migrant, C1).

**Function 4. Helping different participants overcoming language barriers.** According to the respondents, language barriers were created for two reasons: (1) participants did not speak the local (and hence the PL operational) language (well); (2) they were not acquainted with the specific technical jargon used in PL’s. Facilitation ranged from slowing down the interactional pace over repeating talk to translating talk. Respondents observed that the facilitators **invited them to talk, asked questions and actively listened to their explanations**. One SH in C3 took over the role of a facilitator, taking a listening stance and asking more questions, thus giving young people more turn-taking potential.

“I tried to be more of a facilitator or at least it was my intention to give a voice to the young people who were working with us. Basically, what I have done is asking a lot of questions and trying to reformulate the proposals that came from them in a more technical language” (SH, C3).

All the respondents in all the cities reported several dialogic techniques (visualisation, brainstorm techniques) which helped participants generate ideas, involved different participants, broke barriers in roles and supported interactions: the lotus flower technique, which could generate numerous ideas, the spider technique, the most popular among those that were covered in the transnational training across cities and the persona technique, which was more controversial. A respondent from C3 reported that this latter technique helped her to break her “fear” of interacting with the policy makers, but in C6 it was perceived as reinforcing stereotypes. In C3, the S-G migrant facilitator said that the combination of brainstorm

techniques, visualised mind maps, and the habit of changing the composition of the small groups allowed RMCs to express themselves and to interact more closely with the SH and the LA, as well as to produce solutions and give opinions and ideas to make difficult decisions in the PL-sessions. Respondents also focused on the way techniques facilitated interpersonal connection or aided reflection and planning.

“All the information we got through creative techniques and presentations helped me to understand the concept and genuinely comprehend it. I did not know so much about social issues, integration, inclusion, migration. I was pushed beyond the surface level to analyse topics and information and I was challenged to think about different viewpoints” (SH, C5).

The facilitator from **C1** observed it was useful to learn tools that could be used in the context of a PL-meeting, but also claimed that most techniques that were seen in the training were a bit difficult to put into practice. This led the facilitation team to select some of the suggested techniques and simplify others. In **C2**, one RMC said that the combination of writing and drawing increased children’s engagement visibly. Other participants observed that drawing motivated the children to share their stories in the larger group. Respondents also appreciated techniques that involved **moving and meeting other participants** in between the fixed exchanges, sometimes combined with verbal brainstorm techniques.

“I think that one of the best practices was the gymkhana, in which you put some continuous papers on some tables, and we were rotating to come up with ideas and solutions for each paper/topic” (S-G young migrant, C3).

In sum, most categories of respondents across cities pointed out that the most successful techniques were those that prompted interaction and involved participants’ creativity. Interaction was understood as **sharing different perspectives**, presenting **new and concrete ideas** and **supporting the decision-making process**.

As was mentioned in the methodology, videorecording of PL meetings was possible only in C1 and C2. Therefore, facilitation was only examined in detail in these two meetings. In what follows we will look at the data of these cities in more detail. In **C1**, the two facilitators in PL1 and PL2 participated in the transnational training. Before PL3, one facilitator resigned, and a new facilitator was recruited. In PL2 and (to a lesser extent) in PL3, a public officer frequently contributed to coordinate the meeting, acting as co-facilitator. Two additional facilitators and two public officers coordinated the small group workshops in PL3. In **C2** four facilitators participated in PL1 and PL2, and three in PL3. Three of them participated in the transnational training. One trained facilitator coordinated the plenaries in all PL-meetings; the other facilitators coordinated the workshops. The facilitator who did not participate in the transnational training had the specific task to support the S-G migrant children’s participation in PL1 and PL2 (there were no children in PL3).

### **5.3 Facilitation in the plenaries in C1 and C2**

Most respondents were **enthusiastic about the icebreaking and check-out activities during the plenaries**. Facilitators selected techniques and tools that facilitated a safe group dynamic and space. A stakeholder in **C1**, for instance, liked the structural simplicity of icebreaking and the facilitator claimed icebreaking helped participants increasingly share stories and exercise

agency. This view was corroborated by other respondents, also RMC. Some respondents in other cities were more critical of such moments at first, but later recognised their function of getting acquainted and laying the foundations for a safe and equal group dynamic. Another benefit of the icebreaking techniques was that they helped to **structure an equitable conversational space** and safeguarding the turns of RMC. Facilitated plenary sessions were considered important by all respondents. Plenaries promoted: (1) **social relations**, connecting and uniting all participants, particularly in check-in and check-out moments during which especially RMC shared personal experiences and narratives and (2) **deliberations**.

### **5.3.1. Organisation of the plenaries in C1 and C2**

There were some **organisational differences between C1 and C2**. In **C1** the introductory plenaries were long and articulated. In PL1, facilitation of migrants' and stakeholders' narratives showed important challenges and experiences of F-G young migrants. In the introductory plenary in PL2, the first half was effective in promoting RMC ideas and suggestions, but the second half evidenced some problems of coordination among the two facilitators and the public officer in collecting participants' proposals. In PL3, two introductory plenaries in two different days were organised to allow the participation of all RMC, both introduced by a video produced by the local administration. The presentation of micro-experiments was repeated twice and was much more detailed and participated in the first introductory plenary than in the second one, except for a specific micro-experiment (the construction of a map for newly arrived migrants), which was largely discussed during both plenaries. RMC were very active during the first plenary, but less active in the second one. In **C2**, apart from initial instructions, icebreaking and summaries, an introductory plenary with facilitated dialogue was only organised in PL3. In PL1 and PL2, the plenaries followed the small group workshops and were used to summarise their results. In the introductory plenary in PL3 the micro-experiments were presented. The facilitator introduced the micro-experiments and asked questions to develop the participants' opinions. The three micro-experiments were described by their coordinators, including the only S-G RMC in the meeting (a S-G filmmaker with migrant background was there for professional reasons). The discussion was short, due to the small number of participants, and focused on the criteria of feasibility and scalability of the micro-experiments. This discussion showed that the micro-experiments were constructed with the involvement of students and the SH coordinating micro-experiments clarified the importance of students' participation. However, the students did not participate in PL3, therefore, they did not have the opportunity to tell of their experiences and their views were only narrated vicariously by the organisers of the micro-experiments. Only the micro-experiment described by RMC referred to issues of diversity and inclusion.

### **5.3.2 Facilitative actions and exercise of agency during the plenaries in C1 and C2**

In both **C1** and **C2**, facilitation was frequently based on (1) **verbal and non-verbal minimal responses and short repetitions**, showing active listening and thus supporting the flow of RMC's or SH's narratives; (2) **affirmative and interrogative formulations**, used to support in more active and evident way both active listening of RMC narratives and the following flow of RMC's contributions; (3) **promotional and clarification questions**, aiming to solicit and

enhance RMC's narratives. Other frequent facilitative actions were **thanking** for contributions and **invitations to talk**. Let's consider **some examples**.

**Extract 1** (C1, PL1, preliminary plenary). The facilitator (F2f) effectively supports a young migrant's long narrative about university degrees and jobs, including his experiences, through (1) several minimal responses (turns 2, 4, 8, 10, 18) and a repetition (turn 8), showing active listening and thus inviting the participant to continue; (2) a short formulation making the content of the previous long turn explicit (turn 16); (3) several promotional questions to enhance the development of the narrative (turns 8, 12, 14).

1. M8m: so eh I don't know if we say sharing my experience will help us understand more or less uhm (.) uhm this concept which has started (?) because in reality (.) it is what happens and what is the reality in the sense that (.) let's say in my opinion at the base (.) there's let's say the objectives the State requires us to achieve (.) namely to hold some let's say job jobs sorry and (.) that
2. F2f: ((nodding))
3. M8m: when let's say where there is a lack
4. F2f: ((nodding))
5. M8m: and for that I'd say that (.) I already (.) already from Cameroon because I'm Cameroonian (.) it's known that those who who ask for a visa to come and study in Italy (.) u:hm there are some areas in which (.) one has more likelihood of getting a visa for (.) I'll make [an example]
6. F2f: [for example] yes
7. M8m: for example for those studying (.) agricultural engineering mh (.) a little (let's say) nursing pharmacy they have more likelihood of getting a visa to come and study here in Italy (.) those who instead have want to do- wanted to do medicine (.) it's a bit more let's say a bit more complicated and beyond that once they're here in Italy and after university (.) the other difficulty is that at times (.) what you've studied and what you'd like to do uhm (.) with the offers you have let's say (.) there are job offers (.) the title yes is interesting (it concerns) what you want to do but when you look into it (.) perhaps when you go during during the job interview and you notice that also within companies there are jobs let's say reserved ((gesture for inverted commas)) to foreigners [eh
8. F2f: ((nodding)) [did you happen did you happen to see this in your work experience?
9. M8m: yes (.) so I (.) knowing exactly what I wanted to do
10. F2f: ((nodding))
11. M8m: I saw a let's say I found a company the company for which I work now (.) which did exactly what I liked (.) and so I set myself to working (.) for a month as a volunteer (.) a way to a way for me (.) to show (.) what I'm able to do and during that that period there uhm I turned out to be very competent for that which is the job I wanted and so (.) they kept me (.) and today I think that if I hadn't don- done that (.) perhaps I would have anyway ended up in (that place) there where (.) let's say that (place) ((which is)) reserved HH to the foreign public let's say (.) so this is it (?) [in reality]
12. F2f: [but do you know] anyone do you have acquaintances friends who has a has had an experience (.) (?) not like yours?
13. M8m: yes yes
14. F2f: not directly like yours
15. M8m: yes I know I know a guy who (?) let's say a boy as well let's say a computer engineer (.) who saw a job ad and when he got there his job was (.) to sit in front of a computer and check let's say the things let's say doing nothing watching the screen and in case of warning ((he was)) to say (.) that is a job that also one who has not (.) has not don- I mean let's say who has not studied
16. F2f: hasn't been to university
17. M8m: hasn't been to university sure (.) can do



18. F2f: ((nodding))
19. M8m: so this guy u:hm and then also (.) for one who (.) finishes let's say university (.) it's a let's say it's a (.) let's say it's more let's say convenient for an entrepreneur to employ you even though (.) there's something that doesn't (add up) with their training that they can offer in the sense that (.) when you are let's say newly graduated you're (an apprenticeship) so (.) s- you don't pay the let's say the entrepreneur perhaps even if he pays (on him) he pays little very little so (for him) it's convenient and it's known that yes (.) a foreigner the objective is to (.) quickly find a job because otherwise (.) the visa expires and he gets in a loop in which u:hm perhaps they can't can't get out anymore in the sense that if exp- if their residency permit expires (.) if their passport expires to renew the passport you need to have a valid residency permit (.) to have< HH to renew the residency permit you need to have a valid passport and so ((rotate his hands))

**Extract 2** (C1, PL1, final plenary). F1f invites a young migrant to talk (turn 1). The migrant provides a long narrative about the importance of training on labour rights for migrant young people (turn 2), supported by F2f through two formulations (turns 3, 5) and a minimal response (turn 7). Finally, F2f invites another migrant to take the floor.

1. F1f: please M5f
2. M5f: u:hm I don't know to me I really liked (.) the matter of training and work u:hm (.) and I think it is necessary to do training on labour law (.) regarding young people so that they can (accept) jobs (.) which correspond to the- to their expectations (.) so they can first of all then avoid maybe some conflict of a legal nature (.) so (.) also other expenses deriving from this (.) and surely also training regarding the consultants working in jobcentres or anyway also (.) how can I put it and (.) tutors in general who deal with the boys and girls (.) u:hm (.) always from the perspective of guaranteeing (.) mm (.) greater freedom of choice to people (.) because if you have no knowledge of labour law (.) of how a contract is drawn up of wha- a contract binds you to (.) the risk is perhaps to accept a contract that (.) it is a type of job that (.) they disguise like something extremely beautiful appealing they give you a high wage (.) but what is (.) the actual mm the actual contribution that you have to give to that job? (.) many times (.) these clauses (.) are not specified (.) or they don't even get included In the job contract (.) once you get there to do the job they tell you (.) oh but this job actually works like this you have to work more hours (.) are they paid for? No no (.) they're not paid for (.) thi- this works like that (.) and maybe the worker doesn't know that they have (.) in that moment (.) such bargaining power as to say (.) if you do not abide by this contract I (.) can also not work or simply work the hours which are (.) stated in the contract (.) and for me there are no consequences (.) but rather for you (.) since you are not compliant (.) this is something I've often come across throughout all of my work experiences (.) that they e- employers really exploit ignorance a lot (.) about labour law and so (.) I think it's necessary for people to have (.) at least some minimum knowledge
3. F2f: and then you also talked about (.) traini:ng [especial- for the professionals]
4. M5f: [for the professionals] eh yes (.) I was thinking perhaps of training also for students in schools (.) slightly lighter about the existing types of contract what are the clauses the clauses (.) which you always find in a job contract (.) and instead a faster course ((that is)) more (.) more advanced for the professionals (.) so that perhaps (.) a professional might know how how (.) to behave (.) when looking at a job contract with an immigrant (.) with a (.) with a residence permit about to expire (.) and all that (.) which are already (more) technical terms really (?)
5. F2f: so both in schools and (.) specifically for the consultants themselves
6. M5f: yes but (.) for example also the administrative staff in general (.) who at times send you back (.) yes only to finish (.) who sometimes send you back perhaps [precisely] to the foreigners' centre because they don't know the reg- the registration regarding the foreigner (.)
7. F2f: [okay]
8. M5f: it becomes even more complicated for a person who (.) has some rights (.) and has to comply with some constraints ((that are)) different from perhaps the Italian ones
9. F2f: ((nodding)) tanks M5f

10. M5f: you're welcome

11. F2f: M17m did you want to say something? (.) Did you raise your hand?

In **C1**, in **PL1** and **PL2**, further examples of RMC's narratives regarded the following themes: (1) discrimination in mandatory school, based on teachers' lack of training and lack of ability to give value to migrants' competence and encouragement of migrants' attendance of vocational schools; (2) selection of university degrees when asking for the visa, disappointment for the jobs offered and personal difficulties of finding a good job after an internship; (3) difference between internship and work contract, which is essential for a residence permit, so that if migrants cannot find a good job in a short time, they are compelled to accept any job, even if it has nothing to do with their studies; (4) necessity of training for public officers interacting with migrants about support of migrants when residence permit is expiring; (5) importance of bilingualism to find a job; (6) importance of institutions providing a list of possible jobs for migrants.

In **C1**, the young RMC were also particularly active during the **first introductory plenary of PL3**. They presented a micro-experiment regarding migrants' job rights and participated in the following discussion. Several RMC were also involved in a long discussion on the micro-experiment about a map for migrants, taking the floor to suggest several changes in the map. RMC also suggested some changes of the micro-experiment about second language teaching. In general, there was a significant collaboration between the RMC.

**Extract 3** (C2, PL1, final plenary). One migrant citizen (MCf) stresses the need of migrant students to feel welcome and safe in school and the necessity of a culture-sensitive support for teachers and supervisors, thus also supporting migrant students. She adds personal experiences about racism and discrimination, determined by lack of knowledge, which does not allow to deal with problems in schools. The facilitative actions supporting this narrative are clarification questions (turns 3, 9), a repetition (turn 5), minimal responses (turns 7, 15) and a formulation (turn 11), plus an initiation of a formulation, interrupted by MCf (turn 13).

1. F1f: Okay, well, did you guys have anything else?
2. MCf: We had one more but briefly because it has actually already been discussed a bit. Um, that students with a migration background also need space where they feel welcome and safe, those are two different things. Uhm.
3. F1f: Safe and welcome?
4. MCf: Yes.
5. F1f: So safety and-
6. MCf: Yes, welcome and safety.
7. F1f: Yes.
8. MCf: Um, and what does that look like concretely um, there we wrote that there should be a culture-sensitive support for teachers and um, supervisors, because they are expected to understand that, but how should they understand that well yes, that's not something that you just um, get presented with or that you have to research that yourself, but like pedagogical study days exist for new learning methodologies, maybe there should be culture-sensitivity too.
9. F1f: Yes. And does that have to do with knowing um, about other cultures?
10. MCf: Among other things, yes, but also, for example, how to deal with personal experiences and then there was also a post-it of recognising racism and discrimination and how to deal with that.
11. F1f: Ah, so yes, safety among students you actually link to, to um, support for teachers.
12. MCf: Yes.
13. F1f: So if, if all-
14. MCf: If a teacher is strong, he can also create a safe environment. But if he doesn't know how that he should handle certain situations because of lack of knowledge around culture or lack of

knowledge to how to handle certain crisis situations or other things, that that gives them tools actually.

15. F1f: Yes.

**Extract 4** (C2, PL3, introductory plenary). The participants are MCf, a policymaker (PMf) and a filmmaker with a migrant background (FMf). F1's facilitative actions include: an invitation to talk (turn 1), several minimal responses (turns 3, 7, 11, 14, 16, 25) and a formulation in three turns (27, 29, 31) to reach a conclusion.

1. F1f: Okay. Okay. Anything else? Good.
2. PMf: I was wondering, because we are now talking about successes and successes and (..) What if the experiment fails? I also find that super interesting (?) If that happens.
3. F1f: M-hm.
4. PMf: So can you successfully (..) I mean, I think that- that, that we can make room for that too
5. F1f: Yes.
6. PMf: Sometimes.
7. F1f: M-hm. Yes. [er]
8. PMf: I don't know if it fits here, but we talk a lot about success. I find that hugely stressful ((laughter)) when it comes to getting successful.
9. ((laughter))
10. PMf: But the testing ground can also fail grandiosely, but can still...
11. F1f: Yes.
12. PMf: be successful in the mind, I guess.
13. MC: Yes, I do follow that- that's not part of success criteria, but there has to be something after the experiment, [um] quality or things or create space for [um] lessons learned.
14. F1f: Yes, yes.
15. MCf: Then you have actually taken it out, because [um] if you haven't then [um] you risk the fact that you will do the exact same experiment again next time, because you haven't thought about why.
16. F1f: M-hm.
17. MCf: Or what-what exactly went wrong?
18. PMf: Yes.
19. MCf: Something like that. Those are the things you need to know (?) Need to know.
20. MS1m: I think it's also just important if you just start from these criteria, that you make a good start. And the fact of whether it succeeds or fails, yes sometimes ge- um that's also um
21. PMf: Yes.
22. MS1m: Is that also due to um by um external factors where you- where you
23. MCf: Yes.
24. MS1m: Having to deal with it huh.
25. F1f: Yes.
26. MCf: M-hm. Yes.
27. F1f: So external factors also um um play an important role. And we can also get something out of unsuccessful experiments
28. FM: Learning.
29. F1f: hanging out
30. MCf: Learning something.
31. F1f: Huh. Getting out or learning something. Okay. Good.

Facilitation also enhanced migrants' autonomous initiatives. In **C1**, in the final phase of the introductory plenary in PL2, **some RMC positioned as informal facilitators**, moving from the impression that other participants were not sufficiently involved.

**Extract 5** (PL2, C1). While F2f is concluding a formulation about the contribution of M1f (turn 1), M1f herself signals that a stakeholder is trying to take the floor (turn 2) and F2f gives the floor to the stakeholder (turn 3).

1. F2f: to give you to give you some food for thought (.) M1f was saying but why can't we also have that li- while we are getting trained on labour law why don't we also include topics related to citizenship (.) so (.) the idea behind it is to propose courses HH it comes to mind or some short training cycles connected to these topics perhaps also including some themes of that kind (.) so what is our challenge? (.) shall we implement a certain training proposal? (.) This is just some food for thought
2. M1f: S15m [wanted to say]
3. F2f: [S15m]
4. S15m: uhm (.) I haven't haven't understood I don't remember if we have identified (.) the target because (.) we were talking about university students before but you ((meaning M1f)) keep on mentioning schools and I think of high schools (.) I think (.) so on the one hand (.) high schools for us (.) as Municipality etcetera isn't it?

In **C2**, only MCf participated in all plenaries as RMC. She participated very actively, mainly manifesting an interest in diversity (vs. similarity, which was sometimes supported by some LA and SH). She was able to express her views and exercise agency, frequently collaborating with other participants during the PL-meetings.

During the **plenary in PL1**, MCf was very active in producing narratives of diversity (see **extract 4 above**). Specifically, MCf: (1) talked of the problem of role models, stressing the importance of ethnicity in their interpretation, but also the risk that the role model puts high pressure on students and pushes them to emphasize ethnic identity, and the importance of diversity in teaching staff, so that school can represent the variety of society and pupils from different cultural background can identify with all teachers; (2) sustained that migrant pupils' sense of safety is weakened by racist situations, particularly against those who are not fluent in the local language. **Extract 6**. Pof dismisses the idea that teachers should know everything about migrants (turns 1, 3), which was proposed by MCf, but MCf objects that knowledge is an asset and suggests the importance of knowledge for dialogue and respect for migrant students, without prejudices, adding that equal opportunities are important for students' feeling of support (turns 6, 8).

1. Pof: Because people huh you have to, it is on the one hand, it is, it is on the one hand indeed that exchange of that knowledge and on the other hand we should also not you know, we should also not fall into the trap of, of having to know everything.
2. MCf: No.
3. Pof: No, it is like that you say, fifty years, yes and then, and even then we will not do things like that you do for a hundred years. And on the other hand that is also, because that should not fall on us too tightly.
4. MCf: It's not a burden too huh.
5. Pof: No, it's not a burden. Absolutely.
6. MCf: That's an asset. And that's really just to exchange and get even more out of it. There is always room for improvement and you can always just learn from another and that is in the two directions, because we have now always had a one-way traffic and I think x said that very nicely, we still had dialogue and discussions and so on and different opinions and views, it is actually mainly about that respect. Indeed, if there is a respect and a humanity and then pupils feel very much, because that's something natural, you don't have to be taught that, if you know that your teacher respects you, then the teacher's question arrives very differently than if you know that the teacher has a prejudice or a ready judgment. So I think respect had a very big um, big role in that.
7. Pof: Yes.

8. MCF: And why that's important, I think that goes without saying. Um, the pupil who has equal opportunities naturally feels supported and equal.

## 5.4 Facilitation in small group workshops

### 5.4.1 Some notes on organisation of small group workshops in C1 and C2

In **C1**, the small group workshops were not facilitated in **PL1**. From the analysis of videorecording, it was clear that in one workshop, two RMC participated very actively; one was very competent in the local language and the SH looked at her as an expert. The other one was much less competent, but she was anyway very active in narrating her experience, supported by a policy officer. A third RMC was prevalently silent.

In another workshop, the two RMC were rather inactive and one SH acting as informal coordinator ignored one RMC who only asked some questions to the other two RMC. In **PL2**, the four workshops focused on suggestions for micro-experiments and were more effective than the workshops in **PL1**, because they were better structured. The facilitators invited the participants to identify some words and actions also using images (photos or drawings). Then, they provided guidelines to identify and describe the micro-experiments; thus, the participants' work and collaboration were productive and focused. However, in both meetings, initiative was taken by the participants who were more skilled in conversation. In **PL3**, small group workshops were organised as a world café, which implied that small groups move among different tables (six in this specific case) to discuss specific themes and formulate recommendations. Each table dealt with the micro-experiments and other themes proposed during **PL2**, with the task of recommending future policies. In fact, the "small groups" were coupled duos of one SH and one RMC. Each table was monitored by a facilitator. Facilitators were the two official facilitators, two public officers and two members of the staff of the International Institute of Sanremo (IIHL), who participated in this meeting.

In **C2** all small group workshops were facilitated. During **PL 1** and **PL2**, there was a workshop in which only SH and LA participated, while the RMC were talking in other groups. Facilitation supported S-G migrant pupils' participation in one workshop in **PL1** and **PL2**. In **PL3**, facilitators mainly collaborated in constructing the recommendations, rather than facilitating this construction.

### 5.4.2 Participants' views on small group workshops

Most respondents, from all categories in all cities, reported **high** and, in most cases, **inclusive levels of participation in small group workshops**. Small groups reportedly promoted **closeness** and a **sense of safety and connection** and fostered the possibility of getting to know other participants on a more personal level. LA and SH generally felt at ease in small-group exchanges. However, they were less confident about RMC participation. On the one hand these groups of participants observed that the safe and smaller scale context could support RMC personal expressions. On the other hand, they claimed that RMC might have struggled in the small-group discussions. In some cases, facilitators helped to involve RMC. In other cases, other SH took up a facilitative role helping to solve these problems. In **C2**, one F-G parent confirmed that even in small groups she did not always get the chance to speak.

“Even in the small group, not everyone got a chance to speak. I experienced myself that others were talking a lot. It is not easy to say this because you have to dare to do that, to interrupt people. There was also a moderator who did not facilitate this” (F-G migrant parent, C2).

In most cases, in all cities at least part of the small-group workshops was facilitated. From the perspective of the respondents, **facilitation was beneficial to the depth and the ease of the conversation**. F-G migrant parents in **C2**, for instance, were satisfied with the way facilitation occurred in small groups, making it easier to follow the flow of the conversation and contribute.

“We had a facilitator who did a good job. She made sure we had breaks, often asked clarifying questions, asked about other experiences, made us think and so we could delve deeper. This was helpful. It was more than a conversation. Everyone was active and thought along” (F-G migrant parent, C2).

When facilitators were present in small-group workshops, they clarified specific terms and tried to help others to getting their point across. According to the facilitator from **C1**, repeated small-group exchanges were of pivotal importance to engender trust and the exercise of agency of all participants:

“The small group unblocked these things and made it possible in fact in PL3 to really have everyone participating, giving their opinion, really talking in any way, making themselves understood in any way, trying to make a contribution [...] because they understood the value and importance of this project so much as to give their own experiential connotations of their life experience, of the things they did (.) I remember a girl from the large group who, towards the end, really told her experience (.) she expressed herself clearly and she was one of those in the PL0 who hardly spoke, she had difficulty understanding the language and I was really very, very happy because in my opinion this is the goal” (facilitator, C1).

Small groups also generated **direct interactions** between participants, which resulted in **more targeted discussions** and the possibility to **co-create practical ideas and solutions**. These co-creation possibilities grew over time. Some respondents claimed it was important to support the small groups’ conversational space, and to help clarifying its focus to involve RMC. In **C1**, the policymaker claimed that the **absence of formal facilitation created a void** in which she felt invited to step in. She took a step back when she noticed this was happening because she did not want to undermine the work of other participants. In **C2**, an LA observed these dynamics in small group workshops that were not facilitated as well. She also claimed that participants needed more time to investigate from which angle they were approaching the topic. One LA in **C4** expressed similar views.

“Perhaps sometimes in small groups, there were times when we – when I say we, I really mean the group – wondered about the whys and wherefores, but above all, it was perhaps linked to the time, we had very short times, I think that was the difficulty. Working in small groups is very interesting, but you need time precisely to be able to set the themes, the processes, the action plans, and time was too limited, I think” (S-G migrant LA, C4).

The facilitator in **C5** used the word “teachers” when she spoke of SH’s that helped the RMC to express themselves during the small-group discussions. We have no data from RMC of **C5** to know how they perceived these dynamics. In **C3**, where no formal facilitators were present, RMC highlighted and valued the occasional effort of SH or LA to take up that role and reformulate what they said. The LA in **C2** suggested using the **circle method** in the small groups, creating prompts where participants could self-organise small-group discussions. However, these possibilities should be seen as an evolutionary achievement and require time and experience of all participants involved.

In conclusion, small-group workshops were considered important moments in the PL-meetings by all types of respondents, with same advantages over the plenaries: promotion of **social relations, brainstorming and deliberation**. As the PL-cycle progressed, small-group discussions increasingly became more outcome oriented, as they shifted from exploratory talks to the selection of micro-experiments and the formulation of recommendations. However, in some cities, expert SH and LA sometimes took up more space and weighed on the choices, especially in workshops that were not facilitated.

### 5.4.3 Facilitation of small group workshops in C1

The different ways of conducting the workshops resulted in different outcomes in the discussion. **In what follows, we describe facilitation in C1 and C2 in more detail.** During the facilitated small group workshops in PL3, the facilitators supported the young RMCs' agency and were able to enhance collaboration between the participants. The facilitators left the floor to the participants, providing some formulations, minimal responses, confirmations of the RMC proposal, checking the RMC agreement. And soliciting them to take the floor.

**Extract 7.** F3f provides several minimal responses (turns 5, 7, 11, 33, 37, 39, 43, 45, 50, 55), but she also adds some collaborative suggestions, in line with the task of the workshop (turns 25, 27, 29, 31). Moreover, after a long sequence in which the stakeholder has taken the floor, F3f is able to involve the migrant directly (turn 41), thus enhancing a collaborative phase.

1. M11m: I've already found a thing that's needed
2. S2f: me too tell me
3. M11m: the money
4. S2f: more mon- e:eh H
5. F3f: more money
6. S2f: I indeed have I: (have ope-) this topic I will say it later (.) I have a big (.) I mean if I am a person that comes from the (.) from any other country to ((national state)) who is looking for (?) etcetera etcetera (.) maybe the last thing they think of is voluntary work ah I for instance to the boys whom with whom I work (.) they are desperately in search of a job
7. F3f: sure
8. S2f: and then pos- so it is very difficult to think that (.) people with a migration background (?) are interested in voluntary work so maybe
9. M11m: (?) wrong
10. S2f: no it is not completely wrong before (.) I must s- have a base I mean a place where to stay and food
11. F3f: sure
12. S2f: and so if you guarantee this somehow because I'm in a community ((for minors)) because I'm in a family etcetera (.) voluntary work can be very useful [but]
13. M11m: [yes] because it can help then through [other people]=
14. S2f: [that's it]
15. M11m: =to find [a job]
16. S2f: [but] for instance my boys who we many many times propose voluntary work to we tell them you can put it in your CV it's important etcetera they say yes (.) but I need the m- to work I [need the money]
17. M11m: [to work]
18. F3f: maybe:
19. S2f: so this is a problem [but]=
20. M11m: [yes]

21. S2f: well alright this now is a bit [beyond this that st-]
22. M11m: [well no it isn't]
23. S2f: let's consider that we are already seeking
24. M11m: a solution
25. F3f: maybe a kind of voluntary work which might be interesting for a migrant is (.) to help [other migrants]
26. S2f: [other migrants yes]
27. F3f: for example with the language perhaps [one already speaks a bit (of Italian)]
28. S2f: [that for sure (.) but let me repeat it] (.) I mean it must be anyway a person who already know that when they get home they have some food [to eat H (.) otherwi:se (.) anyway that's okay]
29. F3f: [sure (.) yes (.) yes (.) this for sure no this] is an excellent because (.) in the end it's a- it ascribes somehow to this area [no I mean]=
30. S2f: [m:mh]
31. F3f: =the desirable improvement would be that (.) they were I mean precisely that perhaps to manage to understand what is (.) the reason for a migrant not to be (.) independently of precisely the problem of survival H often
32. S2f: yes that's right (.) anyway the knowledge and the participation to voluntary work
33. F3f: yes
34. S2f: solving the problem H is difficult (.) (?) associations
35. F3f: yes they said it would be I mean it would be important that the association (.) managed to better communicate [which activities]
36. S2f: [apart from greater] clarity we happened to have I mean (.) just saying some some I mean that we had great demand
37. F3f: m:mh ((nodding))
38. S2f: and fewer volunteers but at the same time ((we had)) places where (we send) people to do voluntary work which (.) how to put it (I'm not saying) they were closed but which first required a series of for example o:f (.) how can I explain of of trainings of (.) or for example we went to do voluntary work at the dog shelter but (.) they didn't show us a dog for six months H
39. F3f: eh okay
40. S2f: I mean so anyway also (how can I say) t- t- t- t- no I wouldn't know how to say this thing [like (.) (?)]
41. F3f: [what do] you think about it?
42. M11m: I'm thinking about it [because]
43. F3f: [okay]
44. M11m: =it's not my:
45. F3f: okay
46. M11m: [I mean we have]=
47. S2f: [greater]
48. M11m: =split up well because in the end we have (?) hers [(.) is perfect]  
S2f: [eh no no indeed] (.) solving the problem]
49. which is knowledge and participation to the voluntary associations ((reading)) (.) yes what always also comes to my mind anyway is communication and information clarity
50. F3f: m:mh ((nodding))
51. M11m: (?) information [because they never]=
52. S2f: [(?) e:h so]
53. M11m: =really disclose which are the vol- voluntary [associations]
54. S2f: [I mean also] (.) to know like like the rules for example under sixteen years they don't tak- don't take anyone
55. F3f: m:mh ((nodding))



In some cases, however, some facilitators took the floor too frequently, adding comments and suggestions, thus downgrading the young RMC epistemic authority, or actively collaborating to produce the recommendations.

**Extract 8.** In turns 2-6, F4m provides an autonomous suggestion. In turns 10-14, he comments on what S16m said, and in turn 17 he provides a new long comment, leading to the conclusion of the conversation, and in turn 19 he provides a new suggestion. In practice in this sequence there is only a very directive facilitation.

1. M18m: because in Pakistan (?) universities schools universities (?) my teacher teaches English English is the (?) language (?) they can speak (too) in English but when I came here (?)
2. F4m: because in the recruitment of civil servants
3. M18m: yeah
4. F4m: foreign language
5. M18m: yeah
6. F4m: is not considered a requirement (unless you are) the top level
7. S16m: now I star- (.) I saw that last year (.) around October and November the Post Service made (.) [a public selection]
8. F4m:[a specific] public selection
9. S16m: ((that was)) specific for personnel [of a mother tongue other than Italian]
10. F4m: [dealing with foreigners] (.) (?) it is something (?) all countries of migration already have
11. S16m: yes yes
12. F4m: been doing for years it's clear that Italy has fewer years as
13. M18m: yes
14. F4m: importing country H somehow welcoming
15. M18m: H
16. S16m: no indeed
17. F4m:so (.) it's like this alright I dunno have a look if you want to add something (.) anyway we've already said an important thing about the map (.) said something important which does not concern the specific recommendation (.) because it's already decided that the hybrid and multilingual map is already:
18. S16m: no I'd say that (.) here we can add Police Headquarters u:hm
19. F4m:ASL
20. S16m: yes AUSL u:hm (.) Jobcentre (.) oh and yes it's true Jobcentre (.) Revenue Agency (.) perfect

#### **5.4.4 Facilitation of small group workshops in C2**

Since only two children took part in PL1 and PL2 in C2 and preferred to stay together in the same small group workshop, the workshops focusing on what children need to do well at school did not include the migrant children. A care coordinator in a school (S1f) took the lead of these workshops, despite the participation of a facilitator who never stopped or limited the care coordinator's leadership. The S-G migrant citizen (MCf) was very active, stressing the importance of orienting proposals to migrants, but she was indirectly contradicted by S1f, who insisted on a wider concept of diversity, not necessarily related to migration. S1f suggested that the discussion was not only about migrants and was not only focused on "colour", and stressed the risk that native people would be "pushed in the background". MCf anyway pursued and supported the importance of migration and diversity. The first small group workshop in **PL3** only included one SH with migrant-background (MS1m, a filmmaker who helped with a micro-experiment). S1f took the floor very frequently to explain the micro-experiment that she had coordinated. In this case, however, the facilitator was more active, providing minimal

responses, but also suggestions to move to recommendations. F4f also actively collaborated to recommendations. In the second workshop, facilitated by F3m, MCf led the conversation about the micro-experiment she organised and F3m prevalently acted as a co-constructor of recommendations.

In the small group workshop in PL1 on “feeling welcome at school”, two S-G migrant children (MCH1f and MCH2f) participated very actively, expressing their views on possible changes in the school system. However, **facilitation was particularly complicated in this workshop**. According to the child who was interviewed, the bond with the facilitator and the constant presence of the other child felt safe. The child spoke very favourably about working with the facilitator, who explained difficult words to her and helped her and the other child to express themselves by using artistic brainstorm techniques and drawing. Other respondents confirmed that facilitating children with a fixed facilitator ensured their participation. On the other hand, some respondents wondered whether facilitation had sometimes taken away opportunities for the children to exercise agency.

The videorecording shows that the children’s proposals were very rich, including decoration of the classroom, a plural approach to religion in school, time to learn about different cultures rather than listening to taught religion, the importance of reading in other languages in the classroom, the implementation of a specific website flagging an important value, such as a girl with headscarf, a country day in school... **Extracts 9**. Facilitative actions of children’s proposals include a minimal response (turn 4), and appreciations (turns 2 and 6).

1. MCH1f: But also that other religion that was not a Catholic school where I used to be and ehm, there I could follow my own faith and everyone say ehm, that can follow their own faith and then I had such an- the first, first teacher who ehm, then always had such a play, a colouring day and then the other time it was really about ehm, our faith that we had to share, that was taking turns and then we got a teacher where we also got to colour, a day of colouring and a day of religion class.
2. F1f: Hmm. Say, I like those ideas you all said.
3. MCH2f: I have an idea.
4. F1f: Yes.
5. MCH2f: That the pupils with a migration background can spend a day like that um, um, learning about their culture instead of the teacher teaching religion, that the pupils with migration background.
6. F1f: I think that’s a very nice idea.

Frequently, however, **F2f took a very directive positioning**, rather than facilitating the children’s agency.

**Extract 10**, MCH1f, supported by MCH2f, claims that when Muslim students stay home to celebrate Ramadan, the other pupils are unhappy to go to school, proposing that all pupils should be allowed to stay at home, thus giving an official status to the Muslim feast and involving teachers in explaining the feast. F2f’s provides several comments on this (turns 2, 9, 12) and suggestions (turns 7, 14, 16).

1. MCH1f: And then go celebrate and the children in our class, for example, don’t like that very much and neither do I, because then I have to miss things from school and ehm, then that that, for example, also just that there is no school, that there are so-
2. F2f: Yes, indeed, that there is just more consideration, also for other religious holidays than just the Christmas holiday, for example. We could perhaps eh-

3. MCH1f:: Because I mean the children in my class, they also think it's unfair that, um, they get lessons and, and that we then-
4. MCH2f: And that they actually get to celebrate with us, so the day after.
5. F2f: Yes. Where can we write that?
6. MCH1f:: Um, actually anyway, yes.
7. F2f: Is that maybe here that you don't discriminate and that you don't just-
8. MCH1f:: But actually not, also not-No huh.
9. F2f: Um, that's actually being yourself, but that's more in the policy than uhm-
10. MCH2f: Yes.
11. MCH3m: But also here anyway, so it's also about the holidays of your faith actually.
12. F2f: Yes, but this is part of decorating lol and holidays is not really part of decorating. So I see that more as a policy of, but yes-
13. MPf: Yes and, yes and yes, maybe event yes that's other category that we-
14. F2f: Or that all that is taken into account at the school itself or that the teacher also explains to the children who are there then how that is because they are not there today, for example, because of the Sugar Festival.
15. MCH1f:: Ah but they know that, the children in my class do know that, but they still think it's unfair. Or for example that those can go to school then, but just play games there or something.
16. F2f: Yes, that you also don't have to catch up a lot afterwards.

Despite this directive form of facilitation, the two children took some initiatives that re-oriented the conversation, expressing their autonomous views and **upgrading their epistemic authority**.

The children's initiatives included experiences of dance, proposal of films with an intercultural content, workshops about a "day at school of all other cultures" based on children's personal choices. Facilitation of these initiatives was ambivalent. Some facilitative actions were appreciations and formulations. However, F2f also added numerous comments and suggestions. **Extract 11**. The children take initiatives about a broken vegetable garden in school and the interest in repairing it, followed by a narrative about actions against bullying. F2f provides a comment (turn 3), several suggestions (turns 7, 9, 32, 34) and the replacement of MCH1f's points of view (turns 17, 19). MPf, a F-G parent actively contributes to the conversation through clarification questions and confirmations. This, however, does not stop the children's initiatives.

1. MCH1f: At our school now it's not but we had a destroyed vegetable garden and destroyed by the (unintelligible). So it didn't survive long here. Especially that vegetable garden, which was just near a football pitch-
2. MPf: Ah yes, yes, yes.
3. F2f: That's kind of unfortunate.
4. MCH1f: Yes and also people are starting to get into that as well, especially kids from the first.
5. MPf: Okay, then we are done. And then what?
6. MCH2f: Um, then we have 15 minutes to use the images to come up with ideas that answer the original question, lol. What do children need to feel welcome at school?
7. F2f: Yes and really with concrete actions so hey, so for example maybe how can Ketnet's (local TV chain for children) campaign help so that everyone feels welcome for example? There's really a dance of that isn't there? Or a song?
8. MCH1f 1: Um, is that so, from wait huh.
9. F2f: That's kind of nice that everyone learns the song or dance huh.
10. MCH1f: But that wasn't a dance, that's just a song of eh-
11. F2f:: Or a song, yeah. That's l- maybe cool.
12. MCH1f: But that, there is such a movement, so then you have your four dots here, then you do so, so, so and then
13. F2f:: You all know that? Ah.
14. MPf: Ah no, it wasn't?

15. MCH1f: No, that's a new one. The old one was different.
16. MPf: You guys always sing in the morning or something?
17. F2f:: Yes, indeed. To start the day with indeed. Write ma- no, no, write here .
18. MCH1f: The first one was like ehm ((doing the movements)).
19. F2f:: I still remember everything and I always have to think about that.
20. ((laughter))
21. MPf: Really? I learned it yes, last year.
22. MCH1f: You show the four dots, then you had to do so and, and so then you have to pass four dots to someone
23. MPf: Ah yes, yes. Yes, the Ketnet action or yes, watching on television well yes, together that's
24. MCH2f: Now that is so big week against bullying, but actually that may be something that comes back like that every month.
25. MCH1f: The year against bullying.
26. MPf: Yes, indeed, yes.
27. MCH2f: Yes.
28. F2f:: That it's not just one week, but a structural you know
29. MCH1f: Yes. But actually it's um, always, but then that week is da-, that's looked at even harder.
30. F2f: Or that your class or your school has its own um, campaign against bullying, not necessarily following the Ketnet campaign, but really that the school has its own campaign um, with its own video or something, with its own students ehm-
31. MCH1f: just that the school makes its own song.
32. F2f:: Yes, its own song, yes, that's part of it eh. That would also be nice huh, that you all think together what do we want in that song about against bullying? Yes.
33. MCH1f: Or every class, because the whole school together, that's a bit-
34. F2f:: Every class, every class can make a stanza or so and then that comes together in one song, for example. I'm just saying something huh.
35. MCH1f: Yes.
36. MPf: Yeah, yeah sure.

It is remarkable that, despite a frequent directive facilitation, the children were able to upgrade their epistemic authority by taking initiatives, thus showing their exercise of agency.

In **PL2**, MCH2f could not participate because of illness. MCH1f was less active than during the workshop in PL1, but anyway took some initiatives. However, F2f did not promote her new proposals. Thus, the final proposals for micro-experiments did not reflect the complexity of the proposals expressed in PL1, particularly by the children. As in the other cases, F2f frequently provided suggestions or comments, rather than supporting the child's agency. In another small group workshop in **PL2**, coordinated by a care coordinator in the school (S1f), one S-G migrant adolescent participated for the first time. He took a few initiatives, such as a critical view about the demotivation of girls with headscarves, suggesting discrimination, and the observation that there is no different background among teachers, suggesting the organisation of a meeting with trainee teachers. Sometimes, S1f invited him to express his point of view in ambivalent ways, that is investigating his motivation rather than supporting his agency.

### **5.5 The challenge of supporting migrant children' agency**

In **C2**, the **S-G migrant children** had **several difficulties** to follow **the language** that was used in the plenary sessions in PL1 and PL2. The child who was interviewed claimed that plenary sessions were linguistically more challenging than small group workshops.

"F2f explained everything very well, but sometimes I really had a group of difficult words, and I did

not ask F2f because I was so focused on something else and then I did not know what it was about because the words were so difficult. But I do understand that because they are adults, they use more difficult words than children do. So yes, that is normal” (S-G child; primary school, C2).

F2f explained the words to her and checked if she understood what was being discussed by the other participants. However, when asked how her participation could be increased, the child said it took time for her to trust people and that no one would be able to make her speak more than she had done in large groups.

Recordings confirm that facilitation of **S-G migrant children’s agency** was difficult during the final plenaries in PL1 and PL2 (the children did not participate in PL3). The children’s point of view on the report of the workshop they did not attend (on the needs of children and teachers) was not asked during the plenary. Thus, the children were addressed very late, to report on the workshop in which they participated. Moreover, the children did not take initiatives, showing that they did not feel to be ratified participants (Goffman, 1981) and the adults did not make sufficient efforts to create a warm context for children’s exercise of agency. In PL1, the children reported about some contents of the workshops. In some cases, facilitative actions worked well, as minimal responses, formulations, questions and check of understanding. However, F2f frequently replaced the children’s contributions with her own, acting as an autonomous participant, commenting on the children’s contributions, rather than as a facilitator.

**Extract 12.** F2f provides a correction of MCH1f’s view (turn 3), interrupts and replaces the girl’s comment (turn 10), expands her contribution with the aim of explaining it (turns 12, 15). Despite her attempt to support MCH1f’s narrative (turns 4, 6, 9), F1f recognises F2f as an interlocutor (turns 11, 13), thus indirectly downgrading the child’s epistemic authority. Despite this directive facilitation, MCH1f claims her right to produce knowledge on her own proposals (turns 14, 16).

1. F1f: Can I ask something, something, something extra, can I ? Um, what was the first, sorry? What, what was that about?
2. MCH1f: Um. Respect, yes, yes.
3. F2f: Respect for each other, so mutual respect.
4. F1f: And you heard it um, when you say respect, is it about the teacher then going to have respect for pupils for pupils or is it also about um, pupils among themselves or what is it about, for, for you two?
5. MCH1f: Um, um, um, actually for example people with no migration background, that they then have respect for people who do have migr-, migration, migr- migration background.
6. ((laughter))
7. F1f: What a word huh! Okay, so that’s what it’s about eh, mainly.
8. MCH1f: Yes.
9. F1f: Okay. Um, and the next one was?
10. F2f: And sorry to interrupt, but here the word safety with that respect was also important.
11. F1f: Ah yes.
12. F2f: So it’s why, we put that together so somewhat that you well (.) you feel safe if you feel that there is respect for each other and then that they had put some with that.
13. F1f: Okay.
14. MCH1f: Um, being who you are. That you can be yourself and wait huh.
15. F2f: And not be a number huh.
16. MCH1f: Ah yes, at school, that, for example, you are not number one, number nine, you are number ten and- But that you are then addressed by your name.

In PL2, MCH2f did not participate because she was ill. MCH1f's participation was more limited than in PL1. Her voice was largely reported by F2f. While the child perceived the facilitator's actions as form of help, the recordings show something different: F2f applied a directive form of facilitation, maybe interpreting her task as support of a "good" performance and "correct" suggestions. Since the children were absent in PL3, they did not participate in elaborating the recommendations. There were several reasons why the children couldn't be in charge of micro-experiments. First, their initial primary school dropped out of the project. Second, with the new school year and new secondary school there was not enough time to set up and implement the experiment that they wanted to implement (talent day for pupils). Moreover, an interview with one of the children in the beginning of the school year shows that she was not that invested in the project anymore, and the other child was not available for the interview.

## 5.6 The problem of language barriers

**Some RMC were foreign-language speakers and had more difficulty to follow the flow of the conversation and participate.** In C5, for example some respondents claimed that facilitators should have created more collective moments where RMC could contribute on a more equitable level.

Sometimes RMC who did not understand the local language searched for solutions themselves. The policymaker in C1, for instance, gave an example of two RMC's who were highly schooled and fluent in English and tried to reach out in English, where facilitators translated for them. The LA offered that official **translators would perhaps be a good idea**, although she was quite hesitant on how translation would work exactly.

"I don't know, because translation is always a mediation anyway, isn't it? And therefore also the emotional dimension is lost if there is someone who has to translate so I don't know if that (.) and however it is clear that at that moment there (.) there was a barrier for someone, surely" (policymaker, C1).

In C4 interpreters were systematically enlisted to help non-native speakers express themselves. Respondents claimed that the use of interpreters was imperative for foreign-language speakers to participate. Some SH's and LA's with a migrant background explained the importance of interpreters for facilitation. Yet, according to the facilitator, after some challenges with an interpreter, the project team decided to use English as the interacting language and used untrained but more prepared student translators. This was challenging for some of the SH's, but worked out in the end. The facilitator in C1 claimed that the choice of avoiding formal translators helped most of the RMC's to exercise agency. This is confirmed by the recordings, showing that the facilitators supported the migrants' agency **when the young migrants showed difficulties in speaking the local language**. Thus, the young migrants could participate actively despite their language problems.

Facilitative actions that supported narratives despite language barriers were formulations, minimal responses and repetitions, and translation of migrant's contributions. **Extract 13.** F1 invites the migrant to take the floor (turn 2) and supports her confused narrative through a question (turn 4), two minimal responses (turns 6, 10) and a formulation (turn 8).

1. M3m: n- n- nev- I'm I'm not saying that everybody is like that but I mean (.) maybe they're exceptions
2. F1f: thank you (.) M6f would you like to tell us something
3. M6f: yes
4. F1f: you too were at the [meetings weren't you?]
5. M6f: [yes yes (.) yes] because from the first and also from the third but the second I wasn't there H I I didn't know what (happened) (.) but from the first internship because also I in this momen:t (.) tha:t you call many people for correct information but someone said so and so (.) when I: (.) a:nd (.) he:re
6. F1f: yes
7. M6f: yes like this it's correct information before I always confused between internships and part-time  
[a:nd (?)]
8. F1f: [so] you had confused news[so] you had confused news
9. M6f: always a lot because (.) I call also: CAF also I spoke to (manager) also to (?) various (?) internships
10. F1f: internships

### 5.7 Facilitation in C3-C6

Different from the situation in C1 and C2 the data about facilitation in **C3-C6 were collected through a grid, without distinctions between plenaries and small group workshops, as described in the methodological section (chapter 3)**. In the grid, facilitators were indicated as F1 and F2. The facilitators could be more numerous than two (e.g. in C2 and C4), but the grid was discussed and approved at the beginning, when only two facilitators were foreseen in the project. The decision about who was F1 and who was F2 was made by the partners. The following table shows the number of actions that the observers assigned to the two facilitators, according to the categories included in the grid.

| <b>Participants</b>  | <b>F1</b> | <b>F2</b> |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| <b>Types of action (number of times)</b>   |           |           |
| Invitation (to present, to ask, to add/expand)   | 147       | 97        |
| Focused question (requiring yes or no, or a choice between two alternatives)           | 65        | 58        |
| Open question (e.g. What do you think about this opinion?)                             | 92        | 62        |
| Minimal response (e.g., mh mh, yes, okay, I see, oh!)                                  | 61        | 52        |
| Repetition (of word or short sentence)   | 31        | 27        |
| Formulations (summarising, making explicit, clarifying, developing a content/view)     | 138       | 97        |
| Commenting participants' statements  | 80        | 54        |
| Assessing or sanctioning a participant's contribution                                  | 18        | 25        |
| Appreciating a participant's contribution  | 106       | 73        |
| Ignoring a participant's contribution (staying silent, changing theme of conversation) | 0         | 0         |
| <b>Ways of acting (number of times)</b>  |           |           |
| Interrupting other talk  | 5         | 4         |
| Opening conflicts  | 12        | 10        |
| Reacting to conflicts  | 21        | 11        |
| Taking initiatives   | 54        | 38        |

| <b>Expressions of agency (number of times)</b>            |           |           |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| Expression of personal points of view                     | 34        | 12        |
| Telling about personal experiences                        | 25        | 25        |
| Expression of emotions                                    | <b>39</b> | <b>33</b> |
| <b>Themes in the participant's talk (number of times)</b> |           |           |
| Events/facts  | 24        | 32        |
| Belonging to a specific group                             | 6         | 3         |
| Belonging to the local community                          | <b>31</b> | <b>25</b> |
| Cultural difference                                       | 2         | 2         |
| Cultural integration                                      | <b>41</b> | <b>31</b> |
| Hybridity (mixing of different cultural aspects)          | <b>42</b> | <b>42</b> |
| <b>Positioning (number of times)</b>                      |           |           |
| Equal positioning   | <b>50</b> | <b>38</b> |
| Hierarchical positioning                                  | 29        | 12        |
| Defensive positioning                                     | 0         | 1         |

The first section of the table shows that some facilitative actions are more frequent than others: question (focused and open) is the most frequent type of action; other frequent actions are invitations to talk, formulations and appreciations. Minimal responses are much less frequent than the other types of action. Apparently, active listening, which was rather frequent in C1, overall was practised infrequently. However, it is difficult to observe minimal responses without videorecording.

The reports that accompanied the grids and were filled out by the local observers (research facilitators) confirm the data that are summarized in the table. Invitations were mainly used to encourage participants in presenting themselves (C3: *tell us what your name is, and what is your profile*) and expressing their ideas (C3: *we need you to express yourselves in some way, because if not it is complex*). Open questions were very frequently cited (C3: *What are you thinking? Any more contribution?* C5: *What do you know about local social services, such as the job center, which helps migrants in job finding?*). Facilitators' questions often addressed the participants to encourage the expressions of their views, opinions, and experiences (C3: *How do you see it, PmF1? What do you think?*). Questions often enabled the sharing of experience: for example, in C4, during a plenary in PL1, the facilitator asked a question to a RMC, who shared her personal experiences on childcare issues as a mother.

The table shows that the facilitators' comments and initiatives seemed rather frequent in C3-C6. However, according to the observational reports, it seems that facilitation was based most of all on invitations, questions, and formulations, although with different frequency and intensity; on the contrary, other types of actions were not so frequently cited. Therefore, due to the limited amount of contextual information, the features of the comments and the initiatives mentioned in the table remain unclear. Particularly, facilitators' comments, which can upgrade facilitators' epistemic authority, were rather frequent according to the table. The videorecording shows that, while these comments were rare in C1, the facilitator frequently commented children's actions and narratives in C2. On the contrary, facilitators' assessments,



which significantly downgrade the other participants' epistemic authority, were not frequent in C3-C6, as well as in C1 and C2.

Sometimes, the reports underline facilitators' comments and assessments. For example, in C5, during the first plenary of PL1, the facilitators assessed the participants' contribution and commented on the results. In C3, however, other facilitators' comments seemed to encourage their expressions (*It is important that we all come to a consensus on this*). In C3, during PL1, F1 reacted with a critical comment to support one RMC's contribution about "representation". F1 stressed the importance of the representation explicitly by expressing her opinion (*I was once told that things that are not named do not exist. We all need to feel represented in some way. The secret is how we feel represented, how I want others to see me so that I can give them a name because if there is no name a word does not exist*). This critical comment upgraded the epistemic authority of the facilitator.

In the grid, facilitators' hierarchical positioning is rather frequently observed, possibly associated with comments and assessments. However, the grid also shows that the facilitators never ignored the other participants and interrupted the participants' narratives very rarely. This is confirmed by the reports, in which facilitators are often described as collaborative and supporting.

Other data in the grid are more controversial. First, it seems that the facilitators reacted to conflicts rather frequently, but the videorecording in C1-C2 did not show any participation in conflicts. Second, it seems that the facilitators expressed emotions more frequently than they expressed points of view. Yet there are no specific examples in the reports and the interpretation of emotional expressions may be very subjective and may depend on cultural differences among the countries. Finally, it seems that, in some cases, the facilitator provided narratives of experiences. The reports show that facilitators' feelings, opinions, and experiences, were less frequent in C4 and C6 (*C4: they distributed the floor, offering reformulations and clarifications, without interrupting or giving personal opinions*). Apparently, the facilitators also stressed cultural integration, rather than cultural differences, and belonging to the local community rather than to specific groups. Thus, it seems that the facilitators aimed to stress the unity of the local community, but their actions also enhanced hybridity. However, these data were not shown in videorecording in C1-C2. According to the report in C5, during PL3, F1 explicitly stressed the topic of hybridity by encouraging one RMC's expression, F1 referred to the mix of different cultural aspects and F2 talked about cultural integration.

## 5.8 Summary

To sum up, the data show that facilitation worked well both in plenaries and small group workshops and, certainly in C1 and C2 where it was possible to record the PL-meetings. From the analysis of videorecording, it became clear that facilitative actions included promotional questions and formulations in both cities and minimal responses above all in C1 and in PL3 in C2. However, in C2, especially in small group workshops and plenaries with children, one facilitator also upgraded her epistemic authority through comments and suggestions. This sometimes also happened in C1 in the facilitated word café.

In C1, the analysis showed that the F-G young RMCs were able to narrate their experiences (above all in PL1) and to participate in proposals and recommendations, thus exercising their agency. In C2, only one S-G RMC was able to exercise full agency, despite some challenges to her narratives of cultural identity from a SH. The S-G migrant children met several difficulties in displaying their agency and narratives due to a directive form of facilitation, but they were anyway able to produce proposals and take initiatives, thus showing their motivation in exercising agency.

The general overview of data from **C1-C6** shows a few discrepancies between the generally more optimistic view emerging from qualitative interviews and the questionnaires, which anyway were prevalently positive. Particularly, the questionnaires show that some challenges about participation and facilitation in PLs were perceived, as the next chapter will show, particularly by F-G RMC, although these RMCs share a very positive assessment of facilitation.

## **6. Relations between migrants, stakeholders and policy officers**

According to the analysis of the different data sets relations between migrants, stakeholders and administrators were not always equitable. In this section we will look at this in more detail and focus on the analysis of the different data sets.

### **6.1 Facilitation of unbalanced epistemic authority**

According to the questionnaires the relation between different categories of participants had interesting dynamics. Firstly, involvement of NGOs and local administration was very positively assessed by the very large majority of respondents (respectively 79.7% and 82.4%). Participation of NGOs was particularly appreciated in PL2 (87.1%), but appreciation decreased in PL3 (76.7%). Generally, appreciation for NGO members was less frequent for F-G migrants (respectively 71.4% and 72.4%), particularly in PL3, where they assessed much less positively engagement of local administrations (**51.9%**) and NGOs (**63%**). Positive assessment of F-G migrants decreased in PL3 also for collaboration between different actors (77.8%) (see also **section 1**).

According to the respondents in interviews and focus groups relations between participants were not always equal. Indeed, many respondents claimed that **SH and LA took up more time and space, displaying epistemic authority**. All categories of respondents were concerned about the limited conversational space or **narratives of vicarious experience**, where other participants were speaking for RMC. Mostly, and despite the focus on integration policies, **the voices of more formal stakeholders, policy makers and educational partners sometimes sounded louder**. According to all types of respondents' conversational space and epistemic authority was not evenly distributed during all **plenary sessions**. Especially migrant representatives who did not speak the local language fluently, youngsters and children had more difficulties to take the floor, although many stakeholders and public officials also claimed that they held back during plenary sessions. Technical jargon and experience with debating in

groups probably contributed to these (momentary) imbalances. In general plenaries were commended for the fact that they united all participants and made collective goals visible. Additionally, icebreaking activities and check-ins of the initial plenaries were mentioned frequently as spaces where personal narratives were shared and turn-taking was structured. In this sense these icebreaking activities can be linked to the informal lunches, coffee breaks and other pauses.

Concerning small-group discussions respondents were equally very positive about the collaboration with other participants, be it in smaller compositions, allowing more targeted discussions. Nevertheless, some unbalanced relations and turn-taking occurred in these settings as well, especially if small-group workshops were not facilitated.

Many respondents, mainly SH, some LA and RMC, pointed out that non-migrant voices imposed themselves on those of RMC, creating **unbalanced relations between participants**. According to many SH, especially **unfacilitated small groups were sometimes problematic**. In **C4**, for instance there were claims of formal facilitation to balance out the hierarchical dynamics in small-group workshops.

“We needed more facilitation because the institutional partners took the role of facilitators, meaning that they also took the role while they were not the facilitators. They ended up guiding the conversations” (facilitator, C4).

When experts were assigned the role to mediate (e.g., in **C6**), respondents sustained unequal relations still occurred. Moreover, although the respondents generally showed great appreciation for facilitation, many stressed that at the end of PL1 and during PL2 when the discussions started to centre around the outcomes, more explicit attention to the voices of RMCs would have been appropriate. In this respect the facilitator in **C1** said it was not always easy to give the floor to everyone, since there were active participants who tended to overbear the others. But she also claimed that hurdles were overcome over time, leading to equitable participation, based on linear and direct questions that often helped to free up the space to the participants who otherwise would not get the chance to speak. One SH in **C1** also reported that the space was not equally distributed and indicated that intervening or stepping in is part of a facilitator's job and that the facilitation team could have done this more often. The same respondent pointed out that initially, during plenaries, sometimes the facilitation team seemed overwhelmed by the discussion. The LA in **C6** and the facilitator in **C1** also claimed that some LA's were too present in some of the exchanges. One LA in **C5** highlighted the risk that having too many LAs present during PL-meetings may result in them taking up too much conversational space.

Despite the generalised success of facilitation, at least with adult and young RMC's during the PL-meetings, the videorecording confirmed the findings of the questionnaires and the interviews. The analysis shows that facilitation upgraded the epistemic authority of anyone taking the floor, even when speaking for a long time and more fluently than others, thus frequently promoting the SH's and LA's agency more than the RMC's agency. This was clear with S-G migrant children in **C2** (see Chapter 5), but it was a rather generalised challenge. The SH's and LAs in all observed cities took the floor frequently and provided long narratives and the facilitators who coordinated the plenaries frequently supported their agency. By facilitating

the exercise of agency for all categories of respondents, paradoxically facilitation sometimes upgraded the epistemic authority of participants that were more fluent. The facilitators made several efforts to facilitate the RMC's contributions and their actions were effective, but the analysis shows that they left too much voice to the SH (in **C1** above all in PL1) and to the LA (in **C2** in all PLs and in **C1** in PL2). Thus, in several phases of the PL-meetings, there was an upgrading of epistemic authority of some very active SH and LA, sometimes talking on behalf of the RMC and claiming their knowledge of their needs.

The distribution of epistemic authority (and agency) between the RMC on the one hand, and the SH/LA on the other, was more frequently balanced in **C1** than in **C2**, where (1) LA and SH were much more numerous than in C1, although some SH and LA had a migrant background; (2) LA and SH took the floor very frequently and for a long time; (3) it was difficult to balance the contributions of children and adults (see Chapter 5); (4) only one S-G RMC (MCf) participated in PL3, thus contributing to recommendations. In **C1**, the F-G RMC opportunities to exercise agency were frequently reduced in PL1, but the facilitators were active in giving the floor to them, when possible, and this enhanced their participation in PL2 and above all PL3. Moreover, in C1 the SH and LA intended to help the young RMC by commenting on their specific and general conditions and sometimes supporting their agency (above all in PL2 and PL3).

## 6.2 Specific problems of distribution of epistemic authority in C1 and C2

Due to the extensive analysis of video-recording in C1 and C2, it is possible to highlight some of the problems in the distribution of epistemic authority in more details. In **C1**, in **PL1**, the facilitators were able to promote RMC participation after long sequences in which the SH took the floor. The facilitators (1) encouraged the SH participation despite their very long turns of talk and (2) were sometimes slow in moving to promote the RMC participation.

Supported by the facilitators' facilitative actions, some SHs stepped in when the migrants were asked to talk and created long speaking turns.

In **Extract 14**, for instance F1f shows the intention to ask the RMC for information about difficulties to get work contracts, clarifying that she is not asking this to the SHs (turns 1, 3). However, rather than maintaining her original intention of promoting the RMC contributions, F1f follows the stream of the conversation. PO2f prevents the RMC participation by taking the floor (turn 4), then F1f accepts that S2f takes the floor (turn 10).

1. F1f: I wa- wanted to ask the boys and girls (.) well not of the associations not to the representatives of the associations HH exactly if (.) for them (.) these problems (.) can be interesting to to analyse if if you too have found these difficulties (.) also I mean I don't know of difficulties when a job contract is shown to you (.) which can be more varied (then if) you want to tell us about them (.) we are here also for this and to understand precisely (.) which problems we can work on together and (.) and which things we can improve (.) so I'm also asking precisely the girls and the boys (.) uhm to try to tell us even only in short if they if they agree or disagree I mean (.) in relation to those things which are coming out
2. PO1f: (?) points exactly
3. F1f: or if there is something which you don't find clear also (.) that we may try to explain it again (.) to explain it again better
4. PO1f: there's some (.) some information more (.) I mean also integrated (.) on the jobcentre on what a temping agency is on the very ((service of information for youth people)) here which has an activity (.) to accompany ((you)) (.) which then sends you to a second level for example to (.) training institutions or to the said temping agencies (.) how many of you know that here

at ((service of information for youth people)) ((service of information for youth people)) there's an employee dedicated to this thing? Raise your hand (.) who knows it?

5. P: M1f
6. P: HH
7. PO1f:: PO2 we need to ask ourselves some questions HH
8. PO2: eh ((smiles))
9. F1f: (?) I didn't raise my hand to (.)
10. S2f: PO1f I can (.) precisely on this topic isn't it? I want (.) I'll ask a question (.)  
[more than anything]=
11. F1f: [yes]

On the one hand, the difficulties of some SHs to support the objective of PL1 indicates they may not have understood the meaning and the goal of the PL. On the other hand, the rigid application of facilitation, without making a distinction between RMC's and SH's, was problematic.

Similarly, in a non-facilitated small group workshops in PL1, there were problems between SH and RMC, In these cases, however, the interaction was more nuanced because some RMC could actively participate in the interaction. In **Extract 15**, for instance, S23f asks information and clarification to M1f (turns 1, 3, 9) and the floor is open to the RMC contributions (turns 4, 8, 22, 26). Thus, M1f can show her agency by producing knowledge. However, the example also shows a few turns in which S23f upgrades her epistemic authority, providing suggestions and correcting the proposal of M1f (turns 9-21).

1. S23f: she was saying earlier ((referring to M1f)) better focused training
2. M1f: yes
3. S23f: about what?
4. M1f: I mean because I've changed job and instead of having some general training (.) more on on the on (.) on the precise job I mean (.) if to me
5. M14m: more specific
6. M1f: eh?
7. M14m: more specific
8. M1f: yes more specific I mean if I consider school work experiences (.) if (.) a student that goes that is in third year goes for a school work experience they have them make photocopies (.) which has nothing to do with their career path (.) but it is considered as an opportunity
9. S23f: so it is a training (.) but are you talking about on-the-job training?
10. M1f: yes on-the-job (.) [that is I mean the tra-]
11. S21f: [so more qualifying internships]
12. M1f: yes
13. S23f: more qualifying internships
14. M1f: yes
15. S23f: internships ((that are)) more qualif- int- experiences (.) on-the-job ((that are)) more qualifying
16. M1f: yes ((nodding))  
S23f: more qualifying
17. M1f: yes ((nodding))
18. S23f: I mean also more (.) relevant with reference to
19. M1f: yes yes yes
20. S23f: more qualifying
21. M8m: well I I would like (.) let's say to find training which gives to each jobs as jobs (?)
22. S23f: ((nodding))
23. M8m: because let's say a student who let's say has no scholarship (?) is a problem (?) I mean a job ((that is)) reserved to students (.) in Germany for example (.) u:hm when you find let's say when you choose a job to do (.) a job ((that's)) reserved for (let's say) for students

24. S23f: university ((students))
25. M8m: yes university students yes that's it (.) so uhm let's say (.) the owner of the job is in contact with your university (.) so when when you work (.) they pay you a percentage (.) a percentage goes (.) into university fees and then (.) they have an amount of hours that you can do

In **C1**, in **PL2**, the plenary interaction was more nuanced than in PL1, since the facilitators decided to promote a more varied turn-taking from the beginning through a specific technique (launching a ball to all participants). Thus, RMCs could participate with long turns, though overall SHs turns continued to be longer. For long phases in the interaction, the plenary was co-facilitated by F2f and PO1f, while F1f signalled who was interested in taking the floor, in particular paying attention to the RMCs. Interestingly, collaboration between SH and RMC in non-facilitated **workshops** improved as a result of this strategy. During the plenaries in **PL3**, problems were basically solved. Analysis of the video-recordings show that during the **first preliminary plenary session in PL3**, the instances where SHs took the floor for a long time were very rare and facilitation of RMCs' agency worked well. In the **second plenary**, F1f gave the floor to one SH who spoke for a long time, but the RMCs were also invited to contribute and were able to show their agency concerning the micro-experiments.

In **C2**, the **final plenary in PL1** was characterised by the SH and LA very long contributions and overwhelming participation, which defined a hierarchical structure of the plenary, based on frequent exchanges among LA and SH. These long narratives risked vanishing the objective of the PL, that is giving voice to the RMC, although the S-G migrant citizen was also very active. The facilitator did not stop the flow of talk, rather increasing it through formulations, minimal responses and a few repetitions, some questions, as well as suggestions about connection of narratives and needs.

### 6.3 Dialogic collaboration

We have seen that in **C2**, one S-G RMC was very active during the meetings. She actively collaborated with the SH in the formulation of proposals, in small group workshops and recommendations in PL3, above all supporting the value cultural diversity.

In Extract 16 (from PL2), the discussion concerns the possible selection of teachers as influencers. F3m and MCF converge on the selection of a teacher from the city. Then, MCF, S8m (a primary school director) and S1f (care coordination of primary school) collaborate in defining the identity of the teacher. It is interesting that, in turn 6, MCF suggests two features of this identity: woman and immigrant, adding that this is the identity of the teacher in the present (turn 8). In turn 15, MCF suggests finding the teachers in another place and the other participants (including the facilitator) agree with this proposal.

1. F3m: And then a teacher from M.
2. MCF: Yes! A teacher from M. ((silence)) Teachers from M.
3. S8m: Yes, for me, it doesn't have to be just one teacher.
4. MCF: No, I don't think so.
5. S1f: I would also, I also see it rather with different types of teachers.
6. MCF: Yes, that might be women, immigrant
7. S1f: Yes, I think you should try that too.
8. MCF: That so different types but those are the teachers now.

9. S1f: I am thinking who you can put in front of that cart.
10. ((Silence))
11. S8m: I would, uh, I do know a teacher who would love to do that.
12. S1f: Yes, I have some in mind too. But they are all women.
13. F3m: Yes.
14. S1f: That's going to be the problem.
15. MCF: But I don't necessarily think that they have to be teachers from M. We can start with teachers from M., because we have them. But then if we have to be diverse, and we don't have any in M.
16. S8m: Then we must go and find them somewhere.
17. MCF: Then we have to go and [find them somewhere and
18. S1f: [you have to find them somewhere.
19. MCF: Then I don't mind that they're not necessarily from M.
20. S8m: No, that's true. That's right.
21. F3m: Indeed. There are still several environments.

However, MCF was rather solitary in this action. Overall, the small number of RMC, their intermittent presence, and the constraints of S-G migrant children's agency did not create the conditions for important forms of dialogic collaboration involving the RMC. In C1, the RMC were more numerous and participated rather systematically; thus, at least in some situations, creating situations where their participation in collaborative dialogue was more evident. These interactions supported by the facilitators, but also emerged in episodes of dialogic collaboration with the SH. Interactions between SH and RMC were sometimes collaborative also in **small group workshops in PL1 and PL2**, where the SH supported the contributions of the migrants.

In the PL2 introductory plenary, for instance, the RMCs frequently took the floor. In some cases, the SH gave them the floor directly. In small group workshops, the RMC narrated their experiences and talked of the use of communication among young people, the importance of visual communication on social media and the necessity to adapt to these types of media systematically. The RMCs' narratives were actively supported by some SH's, through confirmations and appreciations, supportive comments and reception of proposals, questions, supportive translation, minimal responses and repetitions, formulations. In **Extract 17** for example M5f's proposal (turns 1, 3) is supported by S14f's question (turn 2), and S19f repetition (turn 4), a short formulation (turn 8), a confirmation and an appreciation (turns 13, 18), and a promotional question (turn 16). PO2f also supports the RMC participation (turns 10, 12 and 15).

1. M5f: so I would perhaps provide training first to the youngsters (.) so the various types of jobs (.) and training (.) to the professionals who deal with these things
2. S14f: shall we write here (.) for youngsters and professionals?
3. M5f: training in labour law (2) ((that is)) easy for the youngsters
4. S19f: youngsters
5. M5f: easy without adding the types
6. S19f: and
7. M5f: a:nd the professionals (?) more accelerated
8. S19f: the adults
9. M5f: yes yes yes professionals in general
10. PO2f: well since you have done your studies ((addressing M5m)) you could organise some little course for us designed for the boys and girls
11. M5f: HH
12. PO2f: no? HH (.) you go there (.) [you do your (?)]
13. S14f: [it would be nice]

14. M5f: HH I didn't pass it with honours though
15. PO2f: [oooh well we'll make do] [oooh well we'll make do]
16. S14f: [well we'll make do] (2) what was your final result? (.) thirty without honours?
17. M5f: no no no HH a very average mark
18. S14f: it's okay it's al- okay very good

**Extract 18.** M11f provides suggestions in broken local language and mixes some words in English (turns 4, 6, 8, 10). S14f shows understanding (turns 4-7), formulates the turn in English (turn 7), repeats in English (turn 11), asks a question (turn 13), confirms, and comments the migrant's suggestion (turn 15).

1. S14f: more meetings (.) exactly a:nd worshops (.) how many? more meetings (.) exactly a:nd worshops (.) how many?
2. M11f: eh
3. S14f: e:eh HH
4. M11f: how (?) outside I always (?) HH from big **ship**
5. S14f: oh yeah ship yes yes yes oh yeah ship yes yes yes
6. M11f: (?) children
7. S14f: oh for the Carnival **you carry during in the streets**
8. M11f: yes yes yes
9. S14f: o:h okay
10. M11f: also like **you know in** (.) u:hm (.) **Christmas**
11. S14f: Christmas
12. M11f: (?) write yes
13. S14f: and how long (.) to do this?
14. M11f: this i:s (.) after three months
15. S14f: jeez ((addressing the other participants)) three months HH

Finally, during the **first plenary in PL3**, collaboration between RMC's and SH's was particularly frequent.

**In Extract 19** three stakeholders collaborate with M1f, first confirming her point of view (turn 5), then adding confirmative comments (turns 7-9).

1. M1f: anyway something positive maybe s- is (from what I have u-) because I'm quite a faultfinder (?) negative things but from what the others have said that it was useful that they really managed to put it into practice (.) [I mean that they left]
2. S2f: [yes]
3. S5f: [usefulness]
4. M1f: here precisely with some notions [in their heads]
5. S9m: [nice] true
6. M1f: and which was useful
7. S5f: so that (.) that they address the nee- they have found an offer which has met the need
8. M1f: that's it
9. S2f: yes we only need to sort of (.) monitor the type of communication but the concepts (.) (had been) were useful

#### **6.4 Problems of distribution of epistemic authority in C3-C6**

Despite its limitations, the grid that was used to gather data in C3-C6 confirms the prevailing trend in relations between non-migrant SH/LA and RMC for **C3-C6**. The numeric differences of turns between migrant and non-migrant participants could be linked to the higher number of non-migrants (see **Chapter 3**) in the PL-meetings. However, some differences are so relevant that they seem to indicate a difference in participation.



| <b>Participants (P = participant; f = female; m = male; M = migrant; L = local).</b> | <b>Pf L</b> | <b>Pm L</b> | <b>Pf M</b> | <b>Pm M</b> |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>Types of action (number of times)</b>   |             |             |             |             |
| Invitation (to present, to ask, to add/expand)                                       | 74          | 64          | 6           | 2           |
| Focused question   | 93          | <b>124</b>  | 19          | 18          |
| Open question  | 116         | 107         | 26          | 25          |
| Minimal response (e.g., mh mh, yes, okay, I see, oh!)                                | 188         | 102         | 76          | <b>139</b>  |
| Repetition (of word or short sentence)   | 90          | <b>105</b>  | 46          | <b>95</b>   |
| Formulations   | 180         | 153         | 89          | 83          |
| Commenting participants' statements  | 155         | 138         | 69          | 47          |
| Assessing or sanctioning a participant's contribution                                | 52          | <b>91</b>   | 15          | 10          |
| Appreciating a participant's contribution  | 125         | 117         | 50          | 39          |
| Ignoring a participant's contribution  | 19          | <b>21</b>   | 0           | <b>18</b>   |
| <b>Ways of acting (number of times)</b>  |             |             |             |             |
| Interrupting other talk  | 33          | 30          | 12          | 13          |
| Opening conflicts  | 24          | 12          | 25          | 22          |
| Reacting to conflicts  | <b>39</b>   | <b>24</b>   | 27          | 17          |
| Taking initiatives   | 78          | 53          | 41          | 25          |
| <b>Expressions of agency (number of times)</b>                                       |             |             |             |             |
| Expression of personal points of view  | 134         | 144         | 93          | 85          |
| Telling about personal experiences   | 107         | 116         | 96          | 76          |
| Expression of emotions   | 100         | 93          | 73          | 58          |
| <b>Themes in the participant's talk (number of times)</b>                            |             |             |             |             |
| Events/facts   | <b>115</b>  | <b>102</b>  | 73          | 45          |
| Belonging to a specific group  | 40          | 17          | 37          | 45          |
| Belonging to the local community   | 82          | 102         | 34          | 34          |
| Cultural difference  | 27          | 12          | 43          | 93          |
| Cultural integration   | 73          | 80          | 40          | 75          |
| Hybridity (mixing of different cultural aspects)                                     | 63          | 98          | 26          | 63          |
| <b>Positioning (number of times)</b>   |             |             |             |             |
| Equal positioning  | <b>157</b>  | <b>94</b>   | 57          | 50          |
| Hierarchical positioning   | 40          | 45          | <b>0</b>    | <b>6</b>    |
| Defensive positioning  | 11          | 1           | 11          | 11          |

The grid shows that the number of non-migrants' actions is overwhelmingly higher than that of migrants' actions (2114 vs. 872), with the only partial exception of minimal responses and repetitions, which are much more frequent than other actions among the migrants (108), showing that probably the migrants tended to reduce their contributions to the minimum. The more active contribution of non-migrants also concerns comments (293 vs. 116), assessments (143 vs. 25) and interruptions (63 vs. 25). Moreover, non-migrants ignored the interlocutors more frequently than migrants (40 vs. 18).

Opening conflicts was also more frequently observed for migrants and reactions to conflicts for non-migrants. Given that the video-recordings showed a very limited number of conflicts, this observation could be based on peculiar ways of looking at conflicts by the observants in C3-C6,

Following the grid, differences are less apparent for expressions of points of view and experiences, although the contributions of non-migrants still prevail (501 vs, 350). Given the higher number of non-migrants, these data seem to confirm the migrants' interest in self-expression, which was also observed in the analysis of the videorecording in C1 and C2.

Another interesting difference that stems from the grid is the difference between cultural integration and belonging to the community, which was more frequently expressed by non-migrants (337 vs. 183), and between cultural differences and belonging to specific groups, which was more frequently expressed by migrants (218 vs. 96).

According to the reports that the research facilitators in C3-C6 filled out and accompanied the grids, migrants' participation was in fact more nuanced and mainly related to the sharing of personal experiences and emotions, especially during PL1, which was less goal-oriented in all cities. According to the reports, during PL1, migrants expressed very personal feelings, experiences and points of view, rather than claiming general or personal problems associated with migration. Relevant exceptions were observed in **C3**, where a discussion about cultural differences and hybridity took place in the plenary, and **C4**, where, during a small group discussion, a migrant woman shared her feeling of discrimination as a woman without children, since all policies for migrants privilege families. During PL2 and PL3, which were more goal-oriented, RMC's participation seems to have been hindered by the upgrading of LA's and SH's epistemic authority.

**Another noteworthy finding stems from C3.** During the PL2, some plenaries in this city were presided by LA and technicians, who were in control of the conversation; in this situation the RMC took a passive stance and listened without openly expressing their opinions, despite some facilitators' attempts to involve them in the discussion. A similar observation was made in **C5**, in PL2, during a preliminary presentation of the local services for migrants. Even though this presentation was followed by some questions, this method reduced the opportunities of participants to exercise agency. In **C4**, finally, participation of LAs was very high; they even positioned themselves hierarchically as speakers in some plenaries. Even if RMC could share their experiences in these circumstances, the institution provided the themes for the plenary, thus reducing participants' agency in selecting them. Moreover, during PL3, in a small group discussion one LA was very active and seemed skeptical for a local participant's (too) ambitious proposal.

In **C3-C6**, even if migrants expressed a lot of personal experiences and emotions, their participation was sometimes hindered by local SH/LA, as in C1 and C2 (and in one case by the interpreters in C4).

In **C5**, in PL3, although the discussion was about the RMC difficulties, two SH took the floor giving information, explanations, and opinions. In **C4**, in PL1 the SH expressed opinions and/or proposals. In PL2, during the small group workshops, sometimes the RMC were very active, but the discussion was dominated by some SH and one RMC was completely excluded, although at the end of the discussion the facilitator was able to restore a balanced participation. In **C6**, in PL1, the SH leadership was clear, while RMC prevalently listened to them. Furthermore, a confrontational and aggressive action was observed towards one RMC who interrupted a SH, apparently with strongly conflicting statements. In

**C4**, during PL1, an interpreter took a hierarchical positioning by taking the floor, interrupting the discussion, and challenging a participant.

The upgrading of SH epistemic authority was the main challenge for the facilitators, who tried to rebalance and redistribute the turns of talk, through direct questions to RMC or using participatory techniques.

**C3**. During a discussion in PL1 (interpreted as conflict) on “common identity”, one LA interpreted “common identity” as a loss of cultural identity and individuality, while a young RMC considered it as a space of hybridity and mixed identity. One RMC emphasized the feeling of being part first of a family and culture, then of the culture of the place where he was born and lives. The hierarchical positioning of LA was reduced by the facilitators through the adoption of participative techniques. Sometimes the SH themselves facilitated RMC participation. In PL2, participation of young RMC and their relationship with SH and LA in small groups seemed to be rather fluid. The SH facilitated the interaction by asking the RMC opinion on different issues (*what do you think, do you think this would be the solution, would you feel identified this way?*), thus promoting equal positioning. **C5**. During PL3, one SH asked a RMC for information, empowering the RMC narrative. **C4**. One SH facilitated RMC participation, by asking a RMC if his impression that there are many local language courses available for them is correct, thus supporting the RMC expression of experience and opinion.

In some cases, the RMC actively exercised their agency. **C5**. In PL3, one RMC interrupted one SH because he disagreed with her and shared his point of view. Specifically, the RMC emphasised that *‘social policy should meet human needs and improve human welfare’*. When the facilitator referred to the mix of different cultural aspects and talked about what happened in PL1 and PL2 for those who did not participate in the meetings, one RMC interrupted her and commented on her statements, thus exercising agency by making his voice heard. **C4**. One RMC was very active during the World Café, hosting one table as active leader of the micro-experiment. In general, the exchanges between SH and RMC were balanced. In another group, one RMC proposed a “question/comment box”, which was approved by the other participants. At another table, one RMC was very active and self-confident, expressing his opinion, reformulating, discussing with another RMC. **C6**. In PL3, the RMC exercised agency in small group workshops; one RMC moderated a workshop, asked everyone to introduce themselves, gave the timing of the activities. In this group, there was a general exchange about young RMC and SH competences.

Overall, the reports relate RMC active participation to sharing of experiences and emotions, stimulated by the facilitators and by some SH. However, the RMC active participation was also hindered by SH and LA upgrading their epistemic authority. When the RMC had a relevant role (e.g. table hosts; moderators), they actively participated and exercised agency.

## **6.5 Summary**

This chapter has shown that frequently in PL-meetings there was a clear difference in terms of quantitative participation between the SH/LA on the one hand and the RMC on the other. The SH most frequent and longer turns of talk, showing their upgrading of epistemic authority, was associated with the SH more frequent opportunities to talk in public situations and with their more general knowledge of issues and problems. However, the facilitators indirectly supported the SH conversational dominance by using the same facilitative strategies with both SH and RMC. Thus, the ability to facilitate interactions had a side negative effect. Despite this, the

RMC had the opportunity to participate actively and exercise agency. They showed a strong motivation in expressing their views and proposals. Moreover, particularly in C1 but probably also in other cities (according to the reports), there was also collaboration between SH and RMC. Both the increasing mutual knowledge among the participants and the increasing attention of facilitators impacted positively on this collaboration.

## **7. Personal expressions and decision-making**

### **7.1 The primacy of personal expressions**

As was clear in Chapter 5, an important aspect of the PLs concerns the preference of RMCs for narratives of personal experiences and personal cultural trajectories. This preference created some challenges for the integration between these personal narratives and (1) the metanarrative of democratic participation as a tool to reach the objectives of the PLs, which were predefined by the cities when planning the project proposal, and (2) the provision of proposals and recommendations. The interference between personal stories and the PLs objectives was very frequent in PL1, but it was also evident in PL2 and PL3, where discussions on proposals and recommendations were expected.

Respondents to the interviews and focus groups described **narratives as personal experiences, sharing opinions and expressing emotions** and shared all these narratives, mostly in the plenary sessions. Respondents confirmed that especially **icebreaking plenaries produced personal experiences**, often facilitated by turn-taking techniques and/or coordinated by facilitators. In all cities all categories of respondents reported that they felt supported to share personal stories during the plenaries.

**In the videorecording it was clear that in C1** the narratives started during the rather long phase of **icebreaking**. The young RMCs participated actively by presenting themselves through interesting short stories, showing aspects of their personal experiences and ambitions: for instance, the ways of finding solutions in difficult moments of life; the strength of principles and cultural roots in difficult times and relations; the importance of reflecting to improve life experience and hybridization through social relations. However, these narratives were not followed by the promotion of further details or interlacements; the facilitators simply thanked the participants for their contributions. After the icebreaking activities, the personal stories were discontinued as a result.

Based on this finding one may conclude that icebreakers are certainly useful to start the facilitation of exchanges and narratives, but that they are not at all sufficient to establish inclusive dialogic collaboration.

In C1, during PL1 at the end of the icebreaking phase, for instance, F1f commented on three narratives, apparently selected without any specific reason. Then, the facilitators proposed to each participant to write down a word or a sentence, associated with each theme proposed by the local administration on a sheet and elaborate on these verbally. This strategy enhanced longer narratives, associated with the chosen words. In the following phases of PL1, migrants' personal expressions were systematically solicited by the facilitators (see Chapter 5), through questions like "did you know or did you experience such an environment?", or "you too X did you know or did you experience this type of environment?",

o again a combination of “did it happen to you to see this in your experience?” and “do you know someone, do you have acquaintances or friends who had an experience similar to yours?”. Moreover, during the workshops and the final plenaries, above all in PL1, but also in PL2 and PL3, several RMC narrated their personal experiences spontaneously. The SH also produced some narratives of personal experiences, which however concerned their professional activities and frequently showed the aim of generalising comments or observations about the RMC condition. In PL1, the SH also provided vicarious narrative, replacing RMC narratives and showing the SH knowledge of RMC problems and experiences. The respondents to the interviews and focus groups confirmed that these participants sometimes produced **vicarious narratives about the RMC creating unbalanced epistemic authority**. However, overall, a young RMC referred to the interlacement of narratives very positively, as a mosaic:

“The word is ‘mosaic’, in the sense of bringing together different knowledge, different cultures and different cultural backgrounds of knowledge, but above all trying to find a common idea. When you go to see the mosaic, the result is beautiful, so we all came together, everyone with our own experience and background of life and work, we came together to find a solution, to create a mosaic of colours that when you see it you say wow!” (F-G young migrant, C1).

**In C2** the narratives of SH/LA personal experiences frequently fragmented the conversation, particularly during the plenary in PL1 and during the workshops in PL1 and PL2. These narratives were prevalently vicarious, above all concerning the experience of participants’ children as exemplification of the challenges of the education system. Sometimes, these narratives also concerned other children in specific classrooms.

Interlacements between RMC narratives on the one hand, and SH/LA narratives on the other were limited to the dialogic collaboration between RMCs and SHs above all in small group workshops (see section 6.3). However, during the interview the facilitator in **C2** reported that different perspectives sometimes did build on each other and interlace. She gave the example of a part of a plenary discussion about head scarves where participants built upon each other’s stories, guided the conversation themselves and needed little facilitation.

Respondents to the interviews and focus groups did not explicitly mention sharing personal narratives that much in small group workshops, despite the fact they expressed feelings of connection and safety during those exchanges. Perhaps a focus on the deliberative and collaborative component made them experience these exchanges differently from the personal exchanges in the icebreaking plenaries and the informal moments like lunches and coffee breaks, where the production of personal narratives occurred the most.

Certainly, in **all cities**, PL2 and PL3 were more oriented to decision-making. This limited, but did not completely prevent, the narratives of personal experiences. Particularly in **C1**, the RMC narratives of personal experiences emerged during the first introductory plenary in PL3, even if the aim was discussing the experiments and finalising the recommendations. This clearly indicates the RMC need to narrate personal experiences.

In the interviews and focus groups, respondents defined **decision-making as debating, selecting, confronting different opinions and having impact**. Decision-making was mostly mentioned when the selection of priorities and micro-experiments were discussed. Although the foundations for decision-making were created in small-group discussions, the final

decisions in most PL-meetings were made in the final plenary sessions. The participants recognised that decision-making became more stringent along the way.

## 7.2 Decision making in final plenaries

In PLs, the plenaries at the end of PL-meetings have the function of collecting ideas from small groups and providing final proposals or recommendations (in PL3). According to respondents to interviews and focus groups, the results of small group workshops were reported in plenaries by **spokespersons**, who sometimes reinforced and perhaps upgraded their epistemic authority. When this role was taken up by less experienced SH, this created feelings of uncertainty, as was the case in **C6**.

“No, I certainly wasn't annoyed. I just felt uncomfortable that we realised at some point in the group that we should have divided up the roles at the beginning as suggested, because then of course there was the question of who would present the results in front of the politicians and the public. We got lost for a moment. [...]. I found it hard to bear that we couldn't come to a conclusion and were discussing things without a red thread. And then I took the initiative and structured the results. I had an idea for the presentation but I didn't really want to present it. However, the group was very supportive and wanted me to present as well” (SH, C6).

**In C1-3, the final plenary sessions were used to find consensus:** decision-making capacities seemed to grow over time and were influenced by participants' growing experience, facilitation and organisational matters. **In C4-C6 decisions were made by majority voting.** Some examples:

**C1.** During the final plenary of PL3, SH were grouped with RMC. The decisions they came up with did not have many epistemic authority problems. However, the last plenary reopened a space where brainstorming and the sharing of personal narratives occurred.

**C2.** Final plenaries were used to seek consensus about priorities and selection of micro-experiments. In PL1 and PL2, priority lists were made, but the turnover of RMC and the large number of participants from other categories favoured the decisions of more formal representatives, especially when it came to the implementation phase where only one of the RMC remained active. The final plenary in PL3 was not organised due to a very limited number of participants. The recommendations were shared with all the participants virtually.

**C3.** Decision-making was based on a long process of reaching consensus with different check-ins and many targeted discussions. The plenaries were the place where final decisions were being made. This strategy of reaching consensus over and over again was appreciated by all categories of respondents, but it was also described as a challenging process. One SH of a youth association described difficult conflicting experiences. Mixing up the group participants seemed to advance decision-making.

**C4.** The respondents perceived that the time available for reflection was very short to have an in-depth discussion about complex subjects and claimed this impacted the decision-making potential.

**C5.** Multiple SH stated decision-making was difficult in the plenary sessions of PL1 and PL2. Either decisions were not made and/or decisions were made by experts or LA. The goals of the PL were not always clear to all participants and time was limited. RMC did not contribute to decision-making fully, due to their fluctuating presence and the language barriers. However., the facilitator declared that the RMC were mainly contributing to decision-making in a consultative capacity. We do not have data from the RMC after the second PL-meeting.

**C6.** Decision-making was complicated due to the lack of time or budget. The PL-meetings were mainly operationalised in small groups and decision-making was supported using paper ballots. It seems that, when micro-experiments were developed in a World Café style, levels of participation rose accordingly.

From a cross-city analysis, we can deduce, from the analysis of the interviews and focus group discussions, that all respondents were positive about the decision-making potential of the PL-meetings, mainly in final plenaries or by a longer type of consensus seeking in which pre-structured group formation and world-café techniques were helpful. However, the respondents also raised doubts about the full inclusiveness of these processes. Since the RMC had a large turn-over, they may have been less consistently represented and may have been overshadowed at times by more formal and experienced SH. When RMC followed the whole PL-cycle, they increasingly exercised agency, which also manifested itself in the capacity of collaboratively making decisions and implementing pilot activities.

The video-recording in C1 and C2 shows the **challenge** of reporting and summarising the results of workshop discussions during the final plenaries in all PL-meetings. In **C2** and **C1 (PL3)**, the facilitators positioned as spokespersons. However, there was no specific methodology to organise the summary of the reports during the final plenaries; this determined loss of some important information that was produced during the workshops.

**In C1** at the beginning of the **final plenary in PL1**, the facilitators started to read the notes written during the workshops, but they stopped reading and invited participants to a free discussion, without focusing on specific themes and without selecting the participants, thus without giving any indication about the way of connecting what was written with what should be said. The outcome was rather chaotic, the task of reflecting on the proposals got lost and the discussion did not move towards concrete proposals. Near the end of the plenary, a stakeholder supported by F1f took the floor to invite more specific themes and to reach some conclusions. However, F2f suggested that the objective of PL1 was to know the most important problems from the participants' point of view. F1f solicited the last contributions, and a public officer suggested starting from the results of PL1 to propose concrete actions for PL2, also providing a list of the relevant aspects emerging from the discussion, which was however incomplete. Thus, the final plenary was a conversation without a clear focus.

This final discussion may explain some disappointment for the policy outcomes of PL1, expressed through the questionnaire at the end of the meeting (see **Chapter 8**).

Based on the analysis of the recordings we can say that the **final plenary in PL2** was organised better. The workshops were based on written guidelines that allowed the collection of several details proposals of micro-experiments. The facilitators could count on both the expanded oral presentations and the written texts on which the oral presentations were based, and the lack of summary did not have the same negative impact as in PL1. The results of the four workshops were reported by spokespersons: one RMC, two SH, and one RMC and one SH in collaboration. The first three reports developed the contents of the introductory plenary, but the last one did not reflect the views expressed during this plenary about the proposals of a communication campaign. Some suggestions about the needs of better communication were provided during the plenary, but the spokespersons supported the proposal to collect the needs systematically through a survey, before starting with any possible initiative. The facilitator expressed perplexity about the possibility of organising an experiment based on this proposal. In fact, this micro-experiment was not implemented. At the end of PL2, all participants were invited to

collaborate to the construction of the micro-experiments, but the role of the participants was not clearly identified.

In **C2** some ideas elaborated in PL1 got lost in PL2 since the notes taken during the workshops were not completely supported by participants' memory and participants frequently got lost in conversation. The final plenaries of PL1 and PL2 were not preceded by the facilitators' reflection on the outcomes of the workshop and, as happened in C1, the discussion was only based on the reports of the spokespersons. The facilitator actively participated in enhancing the proposals trying to promote their transformation in concrete micro-experiments. She was able to coordinate the discussion effectively, but several contents got lost, as based on participants' memory rather than on organised materials, and no conclusion was drawn. As in C1, the facilitator delayed the conclusions to a future time. Sometimes the conversation shifted to a brainstorming among SH, despite the facilitator's efforts. In **Extract 20** (C2, PL2) this is exemplified by F1f who aims to understand the micro-experiment proposed during a workshop in which a project officer (POf), a school care coordinator (S9f) and a social worker (S7f) participated. F1f provides questions (turns 1, 13), minimal responses (turns 3, 7), an interrogative formulation to develop the gist of previous rather general contributions (turn 5), an appreciation (turn 9), finally delaying the elaboration of the experiment (turn 17).

1. F1f: Ok. And what exactly does the experiment entail? Putting, uh putting together a diverse school team?
2. POf: The idea was: if for a micro experiment, there are no diverse, or more diverse teachers ((laughs)) can be recruited, seen as this is the reality ((laughs))
3. F1f: Uhuh
4. POf: Then the idea was can one make the school more diverse? Who comes into the school? Maybe that idea is then that a teacher's room can look much more diverse if it is also open to others? This could be parents or it could mean bringing in other expertise and then focusing very much on the type of diversity that is missing in the school.
5. F1f: So, bringing diversity into the teacher's room, which is no longer a teacher's room but a room for the school team?
6. S9f: Yes, that was one idea. But, we were also thinking about exchange projects or or ((looks at teammate SG to check interpretation)) internships from other contexts.
7. F1f: Ok, yes, that
8. S9f: It was not very concrete yet.
9. F1f: That is a good idea as well, but those are three different areas of expertise.
10. S9f Yes
11. F4f: and job shadowing, we also mentioned.
12. S7f: but within one school team.
13. F1f: So what does that mean in terms of the experiment?
14. POf: External expertise!
15. S7f: Or looking for a diverse school team.
16. POf: ((nods))
17. F1f: So later you will elaborate on that.

In C1 the **final plenary of PL3** aimed to share the recommendations elaborated on in small group workshops, including some proposals that were not implemented. However, the facilitators (all acting as spokespersons) of the workshops only reported the results about which there was no consent during the world café. Thus, the complete list of final recommendations was not discussed. This decision did not give the chance to summarise the recommendations. The oral reports were supported by billboards including several post-it notes, designed by the participants in the workshops. Some recommendations were discussed during the plenary, but their final definition and sharing were delayed to the future.



In **C2**, there was no final plenary in PL3, therefore there was no discussion of the recommendations.

In both cities, there were clear difficulties in bringing the contents of workshops into the final plenaries through spokespersons' reports. It seems clear that the organisation of written text can help the provision of good reports, while simple oral reports and brainstorming are not productive. In general, it was difficult for the facilitators to draw conclusions about proposals and recommendations during the final plenaries, leading to delay them to a future moment.

### 7.3 Summary

The experience of PL-meetings shows the primary importance of narratives of personal experiences and expertise, particularly among the migrants, as is also confirmed by the grid for **C3-C6**. Thus, the challenge for facilitators and organisers of PLs is how to manage the relation between narratives of personal experiences and decision-making about proposals and recommendations. Apparently, respondents from all cities to interviews and focus groups were optimistic about decision-making in PLs, despite their recognition of problems about the use of spokespersons to report the outcomes of small group workshops. However, the recordings in **C1** and **C2** show that the final plenaries in PL2 and PL3 did not reach final proposals of recommendations, which were elaborated after the end of the PL-meeting, on the initiative of organisers from the public administration.

## 8. Participants' assessment of the Policy Labs

This chapter is based on the primary collection of data from questionnaires (especially in 8.1) and interviews/focus groups (especially in 8.2). Some data from videorecording are also briefly recalled.

### 8.1 Participants' general assessment

**The questionnaire shows that all participants claimed to have felt very well during the PLs (95.7%).** They also declared very few relevant problems (6.7%). Feeling well meant feeling respected (94.7), appreciated (88%), understood (87.7%), and considered important (81.9%). On the contrary, it means never feeling assessed in negative way (80%). **The general evaluation of PLs was positive for 95.2% of participants,** while there was no negative assessment.

If **problems** were reported, they regarded the non-migrants more frequently (8%). It is however interesting that in PL3, only 53.8% of **S-G migrants** declared no problems at all. Moreover, while getting very bored or feeling very annoyed was very rare (respectively 4.3% and 3.7%), F-G migrants claimed to never have gotten bored (72.4%) and never have felt annoyed (75.2%) less frequently than other participants. These data and other data presented in section 5.1 show that F-G and S-G migrants report some more problems, which are probably linked to the upgrading of epistemic authority from some SH and LA, and to the challenges of facilitating equality. However, the **videorecording** in **C1** and **C2** show that these problems were not generalised.

Participants assessed decision-making in PLs, both quantitatively and qualitatively. In the questionnaire, decision-making was not assessed very positively. After the first PL, **only 52.8% of the participants clearly perceived participating in relevant decisions, although only 3.2% did not perceive any participation in these decisions.** Perception increased a bit from PL1 to PL2 (56.3%), then decreased again in PL3 (53.4%) despite of the fact that PL3 provided final recommendations. Participation in relevant decision was perceived by few S-G migrants (only 37.5%), but F-G migrants perceived it much more than non-migrants (61.9% vs. 52.1%). The progress was very different between F-G and S-G migrants: in PL3, the former seemed a bit disappointed (55.6%) while the latter reported a strong increase (53.8%).

Only 57.6% of participants identified relevant decisions as **the core** of PLs, against 89.1% identifying dialogue and 82.4% claiming support of personal expressions (see section 5.1). Relevant decisions were particularly and reasonably associated to **PL2 and PL3**, without differences (63.7/63.8%). However, this data does not show a generalised idea of PLs as a setting for decision-making. Overall non-migrants are the most critical about the importance of decision-making in PLs (51.6%), against 67.6% of F-G migrants who consider decision making as important in PLs, despite the problems shown above. The negative assessment of non-migrants regarding the importance of decision making mainly regards PL1 (only 36.6%), which was the meeting in which decisions are not yet so relevant in the planning of PLs, but their perception is still less positive than other participants in the other PL-meetings. Particularly, in PL3, the importance of decision-making among F-G and S-G migrants increases to about 70%.

The implementation of new policies is observed by 59.7% of participants, increasing from PL1 (45.9%) to PL2 (66.9%) to PL3 (69%). This increase is important, but a higher increase from PL2 to PL3, where recommendations were crucial, could be expected. Moreover, it seems clear that across cities PL1 was not successful in convincing the participants that they needed time to reach decisions. The data from the videorecording in **C1** and **C2** clearly shows this problem. Another data shows migrants' disappointment. In PL3, while the perception of non-migrants about implementation of new policies increases a lot (75%), the perception of S-G and above all F-G migrants decreases if compared to PL2 (respectively from 69.6% to 61.5% and from 79.4% to 55.6%). The decrease of the number of F-G participants from 27 to 15 (in C1 the participants in the first introductory plenary could not fill the questionnaire) probably influenced this decrease.

There are some discrepancies between the questionnaires on the one hand and the interviews/focus groups on the other. From a cross-city analysis of the interviews and focus group discussion we can deduce that all respondents were positive about the possibility to produce narratives and make decisions during the PL-meetings. The latter mainly in final plenaries or by a longer type of consensus seeking, in which pre-structured group formations and world-café techniques were helpful. However, all types of respondents also raise doubts here and there about the full inclusiveness of these processes. Since mainly the representatives from the migrant community had a large turn-over, they may have been less consistently represented and despite all the efforts that were made their perspective may have been overshadowed at times by more formal and experienced stakeholders. When migrant

representatives stayed on and followed the whole PL-cycle, they increasingly exercised agency, which also manifested itself in the capacity of collaboratively making decisions and implementing pilot activities.

Generally, as was evidenced throughout the report, respondents mentioned the following actions and organisational elements to be **supportive to decision-making**: facilitation; a clear structure, with a clear organisation of intended goals in plenaries and small-group discussions; clear roles in small-group compositions; visualisation and brainstorm techniques; time and the acquisition of debating and listening skills over the course of the PL-cycle. Conversely, the following elements **created barriers to making decisions**: a large turnover of participants, especially with migrant background; upgraded epistemic authority of some participants and unbalanced distribution of epistemic authority in the policy lab members; unclear and inequitable roles; a lack of facilitation; a lack of time.

## 8.2 Participants' qualitative views on micro-experiments

**In interviews and focus groups, several topics regarding decision-making collected through the questionnaires were not addressed.** The analysis of respondents' assessment of the outcomes of the MUST-a-Lab PL-meetings concerns: (1) the selection of micro-experiments that were developed because of the selected challenges cities had chosen and (2) the ensuing results and recommendations. For the analysis of (1), responses from all respondents were used; for (2), responses stem from the last two interviews, after the last PL-meeting, with the facilitators, SH and/or RMC.

### 8.2.1 Selection of micro-experiments

Most respondents across cities stated overall satisfaction with the selection process of the micro-experiments. However, all respondents also mentioned several hurdles regarding **the selection and the further development of micro-experiments**. For instance, in **C4**, one SH underlined her happiness about working with **multiple SH and collectively building something from the ground up**. In **C2**, One LA initially saw the micro-experiments as opportunities to create innovative piloting actions and said that after seeing the first concrete plans for the micro-experiments, she found them more innovative than she had anticipated. In **C5**, another LA stated that both RMC and non-migrants had a voice in the sessions that listed priorities for experiments.

"I think that participants [RMC] felt empowered and dynamic, they had a 'voice' and they spoke up about themselves and their problems and I'm talking about stakeholders and migrants, too, I don't separate them, because I think we are here to support both parties. As for the results, I really think it was a positive experience" (LA, C5).

In **C3**, young RMC respondents stated that they felt good about the selection precisely because of the shared responsibility and the **lack of hierarchical barriers** between them and the LA. They however claimed it was not always easy to choose ideas and projects: a position they shared with all other categories of respondents. In several cities, participants voiced difficulties in deciding and distinguishing between the first set of priorities. A basic concern was the relevance of the topics and the role participants assumed in the deliberations. **Relevance** was sometimes defined as building on already existing projects and sometimes envisioned as

creating innovative actions. In **C4**, one RMC that worked as a LA highlighted the importance of continuing along the same paths of other projects. In **C5**, respondents mentioned that **not all participants could truly weigh on decision-making**. According to the facilitator, decision-making was mainly perceived as the task of LA and both RMC and SH did not seem to want to take up that role. In section 5.1, we have seen that the questionnaire shows how **F-G migrants participated with great interest and involvement, but many of them perceived problems in sharing their contributions, particularly in the phase of recommendations**.

To make a final selection of micro-experiments, two main criteria came up in the cross-city analysis: **feasibility** and **common ground**. Concerning feasibility all categories of respondents mentioned the available budget and concretisation of micro-experiments, but they did not perceive these elements to be present completely. Other respondents stated that the micro-experiments lacked a bit of an innovative factor and claimed that time and budget constraints might have directed participants towards making more feasible choices. In **C2**, the S-G migrant citizen claimed that during the final phase of the preparations, the decision-making process changed because of this implementation.

“I think decision-making changed over time. In the beginning, before the topics were chosen, we really choose democratically. Then the experiments were conceived and then the decision-making became very much the responsibility of the person who was then, say, the spearhead of the micro-experiment. Then the decision-making was left to that person or group” (S-G migrant citizen, C2).

Not all participants wanted to be a part of the implementation. In **C6**, one SH explained that the extra efforts that were expected in the execution of the micro-experiments were not tailored to the day-to-day challenges of his job and NGO-organisation. The facilitator explained that participants were surprised with the extra effort the execution of the micro-experiments demanded because it was not clear to them at the beginning of the project. In **C6**, **C5**, and partly in **C4**, the participants were only marginally involved with the implementation phase. In **C1**, **C2** and **C3**, all categories of participants were involved in the implementation phase. Nevertheless, in **C1**, according to one SH, the strong involvement of SH perhaps resulted in slightly less involvement of RMC in the micro-experiments. The F-G young RMC who also worked for a sports association showed disappointment because sports were not included in the micro-experiments, but he was involved in an experiment about language teaching. In **C2**, the S-G RMC actively contributed to the experiment and liked that phase of the project. Her only suggestion concerned more previous clarity about the possibilities and expected results such as the available time and budget. One F-G migrant parent claimed that it was a pity that she was not involved in the micro-experiments and claimed she did not understand how the implementation would take shape. Although she found a way to make clear she was interested, she did not take part in the end and did not turn up for PL3. The child that was interviewed initially had been very keen on implementing her ideas herself. She even claimed to have given priority to a feasible idea she thought she could put into practice and co-create with the other pupil-participant of the PL. However, the children did not get to steer a micro-experiment themselves in the end. The children did not take part in PL3 and were not interviewed after the second PL-meeting, so we do not know how they perceived this evolution.

### 8.2.2 Participants' views on outcomes of micro-experiments

The questionnaire shows that the micro-experiments were appreciated by the large majority of participants in PL3 (from 79.3% to 72.4% depending on the micro-experiment). Moreover, 86.2% of the respondents declared that they contributed to the micro-experiments. Probably the change in participation in PL3 (30% less migrants and 15% more non-migrants; overall 65% of non-migrants) increased the number of those who contributed to the micro-experiments, as the qualitative data in 8.2.1 may confirm. Finally, overall satisfaction for micro-experiments was very high (89.7%)

We have partial qualitative data about the outcomes of the PL-meetings, because the second round of interviews (with SH and/or RMC and the facilitators) took place while the micro-experiments were still being carried out. Most respondents confirmed the **high satisfaction with the results of the micro-experiments**. Most facilitators claimed that the experiments were relevant, but they also said it would still be preferable to engage more participants and especially RMC in their implementation, foreseeing more time to engage with RMC about the role they could take up in the experiments. Some SH agreed with this view. In **C4**, for example, a SH noted that perhaps the micro-experiments did not reach the most vulnerable target groups. In **C1** and **C3**, the RMC emerged as the protagonists and (co)organisers of the experiments. In **C5**, there was little capacity from participants to practically manage experiments, thus the project team had to manage and develop the micro-experiments. Other SH stated that the micro-experiments had a limited feasibility. Some claimed they would have welcomed more feedback and further **analysis to evaluate the entire experimentation phase**. Nevertheless, they also expressed their enthusiasm for the method and their hope for sustainability of the project:

"We realise that not everything will be implemented, but if nothing is done, the whole project will lose its credibility. It's important that there is time for feedback and analysis. The stakeholders around the table are waiting for concrete results. [...] It would be great if this could be replicated. There are still a lot of gaps, and everyone is still working in their own way. I hope that the momentum generated by this project can be sustained, also in the form of tools for this type of governance" (SH, C4).

Finally, some respondents claimed that the impact of the project should have been more far-reaching and that this would only be achieved by being more innovative, adjusting and refining the micro-experiments along the way. These respondents claimed it was an asset that local synergies emerged throughout the micro-experiments, but that there is still a lot of work to be done to help migrants more effectively. Several respondents concluded that the work was not finished at the end of the PL-meetings and that a continuation was required.

## 9. Follow-up of PL recommendations

Overall, 26 recommendations were produced by the Policy Labs in the six cities, requiring a political follow-up. The number of recommendations ranges from three to six per city. Obviously, a higher number of recommendations implies a stronger effort in producing policies to implement them. Recommendations concerned the following types of action: (1) production of more or less complex materiality, including (a) maps and guides (C1, C2, C4), (b) training and courses (C1, C2, C3, C4, C5) and (c) centres (House of Hospitality in C4, Centre for

Creative Learning of Children in C5); (2) organisation of migrants' active participation in social contexts (a Lab group in C3, sport and volunteering in C1, activities for children and families in C6) and education contexts (activities in schools in C2); (3) plans concerning jobs and housing for migrants (C1, C4); (4) dissemination of knowledge and awareness through workshops and roundtables (C1, C3, C6). Follow-up policies of these recommendations presented different levels of application. Against this variety of recommendations and required policies, it is possible to observe some common threads in the follow-up phase in the cities and in decision-making at local level.

The procedures of transferring recommendations into policies were primarily based on meetings (58 documents produced in the cities concerned meetings). These procedures were basically of two types. The first, more simple procedure, was the direct construction of policies by the staff of MUST-a-Lab, in collaboration with other staff in the local administration. This was possible when decisions concerned the production of materials, such as maps, guides or training. The second, more complex and long procedure was the organisation of meetings with different department of the local administration, other administrations and a variety of stakeholders. In several cases, these meetings led to final positive results, in other cases the procedure was still in progress at the time of delivery of this report, in a few cases the meetings produced positive intentions, rather than outcomes. Several collaborations with other European projects were also explored to support the implementation of the recommendations, but sometimes this strategy led to undefined delays in their application.

Against this background, the action plan based on the recommendations was officially approved by two city councils (C1 and C2), although this does not necessarily mean that the action plan could be completed. In C5, the formal approval concerned one single recommendation, however important (Centre for Creative Learning of Children). In the other three cities, long series of meeting among departments of the local administration were organised, but there is no evidence of formal approval of action plan or actions.

The ways of implementing policies in relation to the recommendations is illustrated in the following points.

1. Overall, the final goal of all the produced recommendations was enhancing participation of people with migrant backgrounds. However, only in some cases policies explicitly concerned promotion and support of migrants' active participation in the social context of the city. Support of this participation was the core policy in C3, leading to create a permanent lab, involved in all the participatory initiatives supported by the local administration. Some recommendations were implemented through specific action, in particular involvement of young migrants in sport and volunteering in C1. Other actions are still in progress when this report is delivered, particularly participatory activities in school in C2, and participatory activities for children and families in C6.
2. The ambitious policy of creating centres for migrants was successful when approved by the local administration (C5). In the other case (C4), it was decided to try to raise funds through a new European project, which is a longer and more risky strategy.

3. Several policies concerned the problem of communication and information addressed to migrants. Maps and guides addressed to migrants were easily implemented. The actions related to communication also involved activities on social media or informative meetings in all cities.
4. Policies concerning migrants' jobs or housing were implemented through organization of training, construction of knowledge/awareness and networking to enhance new opportunities. Policies aiming to implement new jobs and housing were much more difficult, as they require a strong connection not only with the Departments of the Municipality, but also with several actors involved in the labour and housing market.
5. Policies concerning training and courses were implemented with specific focus on information and diversity in schools, languages and interpreting, digitalization and citizenship, themes of interest for young people with migrant background. Some training was addressed to civil servants and volunteers interacting with migrants. These policies were easily implemented, particularly when local stakeholders were involved. Implementation seemed more difficult when other institutions were involved for the bureaucratic complexity.

This review of policies shows that the transformation of recommendations into policies was easier when recommendations were not too ambitious, although sometimes a strong involvement of local administrations could also lead to some, more ambitious results.

## **10. Conclusions on effectiveness of the Policy Labs**

The semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions showed some interesting results about the participants' positive perceptions of PL's.

1. The topic of the local policy challenge and the possibility to have impact on policy development.
2. The way recommendations can contribute to local policy about migrants' integration, as an experience that is challenging, but instills hope and make participants feel optimistic about the possibilities of deliberative democratic exchanges.
3. The preparation phase of the project, preparing the participants for the PL-meetings.
4. The informal moments: (1) getting to know the other participants on a more personal level and hearing their personal stories helped respondents to gain trust and open themselves up to others; (2) providing the opportunity to exchange personal stories without judgement, starting from equal positions, creating connection, togetherness and safety.
5. The wish and need to carry the PL-cycle further than the foreseen number of sessions, leading to more experiments and to more exchanges and deepening the relational bond between participants.
6. The icebreaking activities and check-ins of the initial plenaries as spaces where personal narratives are shared and turn-taking is structured, in this sense linked to informal lunches, coffee breaks and other pauses.
7. The plenaries as spaces where participants report back on the brainstorming sessions, summarise ideas and decide about the selection of micro-experiments and recommendations, uniting all participants and making collective goals visible
8. The small-group workshops allowing collaboration among the participants and more targeted discussions.
9. The facilitators as motors of a participatory and collaborative PL-dynamic, safe-guarding

- equitable roles, turn-taking and decision-making.
10. The facilitators' appreciation of the transnational training and feeling supported by working in teams and by local and transnational networks involving other facilitators and knowledge partners.

There were also a few critical remarks, concerning:

1. The insufficient preparation phase and training sessions.
2. The need for more clarity concerning (1) the timeline and the budget foreseen for practical activities and (2) the expected personal time investment in those activities.
3. The need for more time for informal encounters and dialogue during formal meetings.
4. The difficult combination of the role of project manager/policy officer with the role of facilitator.

The analysis of processes in PL-meetings mainly focused on **C1** and **C2**, with some indications about **C3-C6**. This analysis shows differences and similarities among the PLs in **C1** and **C2** and, for what it is possible to understand from the grids and reports, in **C3-C6**. In **all cities**, the sequence of PL-meetings was the same. Particularly, micro-experiments were defined in PL2 and were reported in PL3, where the recommendations for future policies were also discussed. In all cities, the contents of the small group workshops were reported by spokespersons in plenary sessions. The **most important organisational differences** among the PLs concerned: (1) the distribution of number and age of RMC; (2) the distribution of plenaries and small group workshops; (3) the number of (trained) facilitators; (4) the use of facilitation in small group workshops. These differences had an impact on the way of facilitating dialogue and participants' exercise of agency.

**In C1 and C2, the analysis of facilitation** of the PL-meetings showed the following results (1-5 effective and 6-7 ineffective):

1. Invitations to talk, particularly to present and add/expand were frequent. At least in C1 and C2, less attention was paid to invitations to ask or comment on other contributions, and thus to interlace narratives, although this attention positively increased in PL3 in C1.
2. Both focused and open questions were used appropriately, although a few questions, aiming to reach a conclusion, conveyed the facilitators' epistemic authority.
3. Minimal responses and repetitions of words or short sentences were frequent, showing active listening and claims of receipt, stressing interest, surprise or affect (acknowledgments). They were more frequently used in C1 than in C2 and (according to the grid) in the other cities, with the exception of small group workshops in PL3 in C2.
4. Formulations of the gist of participants' contributions were very frequent, particularly in C1. Formulations were prevalently used to make participants' talk explicit and clear and less frequently to develop previous talk.
5. Appreciations and thanks were frequent and provided affective support to participants' actions, stressing that they were doing well, though in C2 appreciations of children's contributions were sometimes replaced by assessments of the facilitator.
6. Comments and suggestions, frequent above all in C2 with migrant children. Comments were used in an ambivalent way, to enhance reflections and as claims of epistemic authority.
7. Some interruptions and (a few) conflicts were not managed and left to self-organisation both in C1 and C2. In some situations, the SH took the floor when the RMC were expected to



participate, and the facilitators did not manage well these situations. The data from C3-C6 show more conflicts and conflict management, but these data could not be checked directly.

The analysis also shows other controversial aspects of facilitation and participant's agency:

1. It was much easier to support young RMC agency in C1 (and probably young or adult RMC agency in other cities), than migrant children's agency in C2.
2. When the workshops were not facilitated, exercise of agency was left to the personal initiatives of SH and RMC and some RMC were left behind. In C1, PL2, guided self-organisation worked much better, and the workshops were more balanced. It seems that there was also an informal learning process in working together, but the facilitators also supported the workshop discussion with more structured instructions. In C1, PL3, the workshops were all facilitated, overall with good results, but with some occasional directive facilitation. In C2, all workshops were facilitated, but overall facilitation was less effective than in plenaries: on the one hand facilitation did not always stop free brainstorming, on the other hand, the children were frequently "directed" by the facilitator, though they were also frequently active.
3. In C1 and particularly in C2, during the plenaries (in C2 also during the small group workshops), the SH and the LA proffered very long turns, showing higher epistemic authority in reflecting and proposing, though the RMC were active participants in conversations (more massively in C1). In the first introductory plenary in C1, and in PL3, the facilitators paid more attention to give the floor to the RMC and the collaboration between RMC and SH improved. In both C1 and C2, it seemed difficult to balance the participants' personal expressions and the necessity of reaching proposals/recommendations. This was confirmed by respondents in interviews and focus groups, observing although they attached great importance to the presence of RMC, participants with more policy and debating experience such as LA and several groups of SH took up too much space and sometimes produced vicarious narratives about RMC, Particularly, in the initial PL-meetings pre-existing skills and networks created instances of unbalanced epistemic authority, sometimes overshadowing the voices of RMC. In PL2 the combination of lack of experience and the focus on proposals reinforced that risk. During the plenaries, RMC who did not speak the local language fluently and children had more difficulties to take the floor. Technical jargon and experience with debating in groups probably contributed to these imbalances. Some unbalanced relations and turn-taking also occurred in small group workshops, especially if they were not facilitated.
4. **Participant categories with less experience in policy and debating, such as the MRC,** seemed to gain trust in the PL-method and collaboration with other participants as participating in PL-meetings involved learning about participatory possibilities. As all categories of participants gained experience and with the help of facilitation, risks of unbalanced exercise of agency were mitigated as time went by.
5. Some RMC dropped out or missed a session due to work-related or personal reasons. Following the analysis of the questionnaires, we can assume that some of them dropped out because they did not feel involved or represented, but this is not clear in the analysis of the interviews and focus group discussions. The turn-over of participants forced the facilitators to replay descriptions and explanations.

The analysis also showed several aspects about the production of narratives:

1. All participants contributed to produce narratives, as tellers and, less frequently, as co-tellers. In C1, co-telling involving SH and RMC was more frequent during the first

- introductory plenary in PL3 and in some small group workshops in PL2 and PL3. In C2, co-telling was frequent between a S-G migrant citizen and SH/LA.
2. The produced narratives received comments by other participants very frequently, so that response narratives were frequent. Thus, interlaced narratives were also produced in the interaction. However, this interlacement was frequent among RMC on the one hand and among SH on the other. It was much less frequent between SH and MRC. Important exceptions were the interlacement between a S-G migrant citizen and the SH in C2 and the first introductory plenary in PL3 in C1.
  3. The RMC narratives were above all first-person narratives concerning personal experiences. Vicarious narratives were frequent in C1, based on SH expertise of migrants' problems and in C2 regarding participants' children. In C1, MRC narratives were solicited by the facilitators, above all during the introductory plenary in PL1 and in PL3.
  4. Narratives of RMC personal cultural trajectories were very frequent in C1 in PL1 and to same extent in PL3. Narratives showing general considerations (metanarratives) were frequent both in C2 and in C1 in PL1 (in larger quantity in C2) from the SH and the LA. In PL3, given the necessity of discussing the micro-experiments and providing recommendations, metanarratives were more compelling, but in C1 they were frequently mixed with personal narratives.
  5. Narratives of RMC personal cultural trajectories showed personal experiences and views. Sometimes, they also showed cultural identity (We-identity). In C2, the S-G migrant children and the S-G migrant citizen frequently stressed differences in cultural identity, while SH frequently stressed shared community identity. In C1, the SH stressed above all their membership of associations/organisations. In C2, migrant children's production of We-Identity was discouraged by the facilitator, while the SH production of We-identity (belonging to the community) was not discouraged.
  6. The *mélange* of different cultural narratives (hybridity) was rarely stressed. However, hybridity was evident during the workshops in PL2 and PL3 in C1, through the collaborative work between SH and MRC, and in the first introductory plenary of PL3. It was also evident through the interlacement of narratives of the S-G migrant citizen, the SH, and the LA in C2, despite the divergent narratives of diversity. Finally, hybridity was stressed in the reports about C3-C6.

Against the background of these considerations, this report suggests some recommendations about the effective organisation and facilitation of Policy Labs, defining objectives for effective facilitation in Policy Labs, especially including migrant participants (and others disadvantaged or marginalised participants).

1. To think about the possibility of longer PL-cycles to include more participatory dynamics and more interlaced narratives.
2. To value informal moments, which can improve bonds between participants, contribute to decision-making, inspire the co-construction and interlacement of narratives.
3. To use and balance different facilitative actions (1-5 in the list above), and to avoid non-facilitative actions (6-7 in the list).
4. To apply facilitation in contextualised and conscious way, that is:
  - 4.1 to pay great attention to enhance and support MRC participants in providing views and proposals (exercising agency).

- 4.2 to prevent SH interruptions or replacement of MRC narratives and discourage the SH/LA tendency to upgrade their own epistemic authority.
- 4.3 to balance the different target groups when PLs involve migrant children and young people, also providing a balanced number of MRC in PL's.
- 4.4 to consider (migrant) children as fully competent agents, avoiding the misunderstanding that support of children in the interaction with adults requires an epistemology of childhood as a phase of development of knowledge.
- 5. To be aware that both lack of facilitation and directive facilitation can downgrade MRC epistemic authority and especially exclude MRC with less language or expressive abilities or showing more hesitation in contributing to the conversation.
- 6. To pay attention to the composition of small-group workshops with a representative sample of participants in each group as beneficial to the clarity of the interactions.
- 7. To introduce effective facilitation in the small group workshops or at least clear techniques and instructions.
- 8. To accurately connect the small group workshops and the plenary sessions:
  - 8.1 to find an effective way of bringing the workshop outcomes into the plenaries (for instance, facilitators can provide guidelines to write proposals during the workshops and organise these written proposals before the plenary discussion).
  - 8.2 to coordinate workshops and final plenary discussions avoiding their transformation in brainstorming.
- 9. To encourage self-organisation of dialogic collaboration between SH and MRC, and interlacements of RMC and SH narratives, by providing minimal facilitation and paying attention to self-organisation as an evolutionary achievement.
- 10. To facilitate the systematic integration of personal expressions (which are very appreciated by RMC) and proposals/decisions, especially in PL1, where it seems more productive to facilitate RMC narratives of personal experiences than RMC proposals.
- 11. To facilitate the production of hybrid integration by promoting the interlacement of RMC and SH personal cultural narratives, that is to manage and transform possible expressions of We-identity, but without contrasting their personal expression.
- 12. To be ready to manage possible conflicts in PL-meetings, without leaving them to self-organisation, because self-organisation of conflicts can both discourage communication and encourage competition.
- 13. To organise a balanced collaboration between facilitators and a clear differentiation of tasks between facilitators and between facilitators and LA, clarifying the role of LA.
- 14. To employ only trained facilitators and to implement/improve the facilitators' training about all objectives included in this list.

An important consideration is that PL-meetings require *time* for exploratory conversations and mutual knowledge, dialogic collaboration and learning to work together. Icebreakers, which are very appreciated by participants, are certainly useful to start, but they are not sufficient to establish dialogic collaboration. Facilitation should resist to any shortcut to reach proposals and recommendations. Dialogic collaboration requires time and patience and careful facilitation, based on the awareness of different personal cultural trajectories and levels and types of knowledge and expertise. Failures in stopping SH and LA long conversations, in

interlacing personal views and experiences and in summarising shared proposals during the PL-meetings is not due to an excess of personal expressions, but to lack of dialogic collaboration in this expression, that is lack of dialogic interlacement of personal narratives. As some literature explains (Chapter 2), rational decisions are not the essence of mini-publics as PLs, because PLs work well if they are primarily “friendly and collaborative spaces of discussion” (Bherer et al., 2016: 226).

A final issue concerns the transformation of PL recommendations into an effective political follow-up. The political support that is required for the implementation of PLs is not necessarily fully confirmed through the political engagement in applying PL recommendations. To avoid any complaint concerning the political implementation of recommendations, it is important to create a synergy between the PL and the local government. Thus, facilitation of transformation of recommendations into political follow up is also necessary. Here are some final suggestions about the way in which this facilitation could be provided.

1. The first suggestion concerns the connection between facilitation of agency in providing recommendations and facilitation of effective political support of their implementation. It is important to be ambitious but also realistic in facilitating the formulation of recommendations in PLs, to avoid difficulties for the follow-up policies. A way is facilitating the systematic involvement of the political decision level during the phase of formulation of recommendations.
2. The continuity in the employment of staff inside the local administration is crucial to facilitate the application of the PL recommendations. A facilitative staff can reduce the time required to reach some results, for instance regarding training, provision of materials for migrants’ orientation and information. A facilitative staff can also support the realisation of more ambitious projects.
3. The formal political approval of an action plan based on PL recommendations is extremely important. This approval does not necessarily guarantee the realisation of effective policies, but it guarantees the formal support that is necessary to ensure continuity of the facilitative staff working on the implementation of actions regarding the recommendations.
4. The number and density of interlocutory meetings with external actors can be an obstacle for the follow-up, because it can deviate from promotion of practical results. First, meetings require strong organisational efforts and synchronisation of different times, which can delay policies. Second, meetings can generate new meetings so that the time is consumed by meeting. Maybe several meetings could be replaced by the staff proposal of protocols of collaboration on specific actions, preliminarily tested by the interlocutors to check its feasibility, so that specific meetings are just the conclusion of the process, rather than its beginning.
5. The stabilisation of relatively long-term political actions is crucial. For instance, the constitution of permanent groups of young migrants, permanent centres dedicated to migrants and permanent training programmes can give continuity and stability to the policies because they create opportunities of migrants’ long-term access to policies and active participation in their implementation, establishing a cultural programme for a facilitative political system.

Policy Labs are not concluded with the realisation of the Policy Lab cycle of meetings. They are concluded with the effective political follow-up of recommendations. Thus, facilitation is also concluded at the end of this the follow-up, when actions have been stabilised.

## References

- Annå, A. (2006). Playing with fire? Swedish mobilization for participatory democracy. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13(4), 587-606.
- Bächtiger, A., Steenbergen, M.R. & Tschentscher, A. (2008). Developing deliberative democracy: A research report and a research agenda. BIDS - University of Bern.
- Baraldi, C. (2022). *Facilitating children's agency in interactions. Challenges for the education system*. Chams: Palgrave.
- Baraldi, C., Joslyn, E., & Farini, F. (Eds.) (2021). *Promoting children's rights in European schools: Intercultural dialogue and facilitative pedagogy*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Baraldi, C., & Iervese, V. (2017). Narratives of memories and dialogue in multicultural classrooms. *Narrative Inquiry*, 27(2), 398-417.
- Barber, B. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bartels, K. (2014). Communicative capacity: the added value of public encounters for participatory democracy. *American Review of Public Administration*, 44(6), 656-674.
- Bherer, L., Dufour, P. & Montambeault, F. (2016). The participatory democracy turn: an introduction. *Journal of Civil Society*, 12(3), 225-230.
- Carson, L. & Elstub, S. (2019). Comparing participatory and deliberative democracy. In *new DEMOCRACY Research and Development Note*, <http://www.newdemocracy.com.au>
- Chambers, S. (2003). Deliberative democratic theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 6(1), 307-326.
- Chwalisz, C. (2019). A new wave of deliberative democracy. In *Carnegie Europe*, <https://carnegieeurope.eu/>
- Cohen, J. (2007). Deliberative democracy. In S. W. Rosenberg (Ed.), *Deliberation, participation and democracy. Can the people govern?* (pp. 219-236). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Curato, N., Dryzek, S.A.E, Hendriks, C. & Niemeyer, S. (2017). Twelve key findings in deliberative democracy research. In *Dedalus*, 146(3), 28-38.
- Dacombe, D. & Parvin, P. (2021). Participatory democracy in an age of inequality. *Representation*, 57(2), 145-157.
- Davidson, S. & Elstub, S. (2014). Deliberative and participatory democracy in the UK. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 16, 367-385.
- Dillard K.N. (2013). Envisioning the role of facilitation in public deliberation. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 41(3), 217-235.
- Drury, S.A. M., Elstub, S., Escobar, O. & Roberts, J.J. (2021). Deliberative quality and expertise: Uses of evidence in citizens' juries on wind farms. *Journal of Deliberative Democracy*, 7(2), 31-44.
- Eliasoph, N. (2016). The mantra of empowerment talk: an essay. *Journal of Civil Society*, 12(3), 247-265.
- Elstub, S. (2018). Deliberative and participatory democracy. In A. Bächtiger, J. S. Dryzek, Mansbridge, J & M. Warren (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Deliberative Democracy* (pp. 187-202), Oxford: Oxford Handbooks.
- Elstub, S., Ercan, S. & Mendonça, R.F. (2016). Editorial introduction: The fourth generation of deliberative democracy. *Critical Policy Studies*, 10(2), 139-151.
- Escobar, O. Facilitators: The micropolitics of public participation in deliberation. In S. Elstub & O. Escobar (Eds.), *Handbook of Democratic Innovation and Governance* (pp. 178-195). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Flinders, M. & Dommert, K. (2013). Gap analysis: Participatory democracy, public expectations and community assemblies in Sheffield. *Local Government Studies*, 39(4), 488-513.
- Gergen, K., McNamee, S. & Barrett, F. (2001). Toward a vocabulary of transformative dialogue. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 24, 697-707.

- Gherghina, S., Mokre, M. & Mişcoiu, S. (2021). Deliberative democracy, under-represented groups and inclusiveness in Europe. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 34(5), 633-637.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Green, J., Kingzette, J. & Neblo, M. (2019). Deliberative democracy and political decision making. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia for Politics*.
- Gutmann, A. & Thompson, D.F. (2004). *Why deliberative democracy?*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hannon, M. (2020). Empathetic understanding and deliberative democracy. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 101(3), 591-611.
- Hartz-Karp, J. (2005). A case study in deliberative democracy: Dialogue with the city. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, (1)1, 1-15.
- Hartz-Karp, J., & Briand, M.K. (2009). Institutionalizing deliberative democracy. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 9(2), 125-141.
- Heritage, J. & Raymond, G. (2005). The terms of agreement: indexing epistemic authority and subordination in talk-in-interaction. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 68(1), 15-38.
- Holliday, A. & Amadasi, S. (2020). *Making Sense of the Intercultural. Finding DeCentred Threads*. London: Routledge.
- Kadlec, A. & Friedman, W. (2007). Deliberative democracy and the problem of power. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 3(1), 1-26.
- Karpowitz, C.F., Raphael, C., & Hammond, A.S. (2009). Deliberative democracy and inequality: Two cheers forenclave deliberation among the disempowered. *Politics and Society*, 37, 576-615.
- Knobloch, K.R., & Gastil, J. (2021). How deliberative experiences shape subjective outcomes: A study of fifteen minipublics from 2010–2018. *Journal of Deliberative Democracy*, 18(1), 1–16.
- Landmore, H. (2017). Beyond the fact of disagreement? The epistemic turn in deliberative democracy. *Social Epistemology*, 31(3), 277-295.
- Kuhar, M., Krmeli, M., & Petric, G. (2019). The impact of facilitation on the quality of deliberation and attitude change. *Small Group Research*, 50(5), 623-553.
- Legacy, C., Curtis, C. & Neuman, M. (2014). Adapting the deliberative democracy ‘template’ for planning practice. *The Town Planning Review*, 85(3), 319-340.
- Michels, A. & De Graaf, L. (2010). Examining citizen participation: Local participatory policy making and democracy. *Local Government Studies*, 36(4), 477-491.
- Min, J.B. & Wong, J.K. (2018). Epistemic approaches to deliberative democracy. *Philosophy Compass*, 13(6), 1-13.
- Moore, A. (2012). Following from the front: Theorizing deliberative facilitation. *Critical Policy Studies*, 6(2), 146-162.
- Morrell, M. E., Johnson, G. F. & Black, L. W. (2022). Mini-public replication: Emotions and deliberation in the citizens’ initiative Review Redux. *Journal of Deliberative Democracy*, 18(2), 1–13.
- Niessen, C. & Reuchamps, M. (2019). *Designing a permanent deliberative citizens' assembly: The Ostbelgien Modell in Belgium*. Centre for Deliberative Democracy and Global Governance.
- Norricks, N. (2007). Conversational storytelling. In D. Herman (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative* (p.127-141). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- OECD (2021). *Eight ways to institutionalise deliberative democracy*.
- Pateman C. (1970). *Participation and democratic theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pateman, C. (2012). Participatory democracy revisited. *Perspectives on Politics*, 10(1), 7-19.
- Pimbert, M. & Wakeford, T. (2001). Overview – deliberative democracy and citizen empowerment. In IIED, *PLANotes 40: Deliberative Democracy and Citizen Empowerment* (pp. 23-28).
- Post, R. (2011). Participatory democracy and free speech. *Virginia Law Review*, 97(3), 477-490.
- Premat, C. (2009). The implementation of participatory democracy in French communes. *French Politics* 7(1), 1-18.
- Richards, R.C. Jr. (2018). Deliberative mini-publics as a partial antidote to authoritarian information strategies. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 14(2), 1-32.
- Rountree, J., Park, C.H., & Richards, R.C. (2024). The Washington Climate Assembly: Note-taking as

deliberative guidance in an online citizens' assembly. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 52(3), 338-358.

Somers, M.R. (1994). The narrative constitution of identity: A relational and network approach. *Theory and Society*, 23(5), 605-649.

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

von Schneidemesser, D., Oppold, D., & Stasiak, D. (2023). Diversity in Facilitation: Mapping Differences in Deliberative Designs. *Journal of Deliberative Democracy*, 19(1), pp. 1–13.

Wagenaar, H. (2011). *Meaning in action, Interpretation and dialogue in policy analysis*. Armonk: Sharpe.

Wierbizcka, A. (2006). The concept of 'dialogue' in cross-linguistic and cross-cultural perspective. *Discourse Studies*, 8(5), 675-703.

Williamson, A. & Barrat, J. (2022). Mapping deliberative democracy in Council of Europe member States, *CDDG*.

Youngs, R. (2019). Can citizen participation really revive European democracy? A new wave of deliberatedemocracy. *Carnegie Europe*, <https://carnegieeurope.eu/>