Digital Parents:
Raising Children in an Onlife Age

Digital Parents: Raising Children in an Onlife Age

Desk Research Report

Co-funded by the European Union

Project name: "Digital Parents: Raising Children in a Onlife Age" **Agreement number:** 2025-1-IT03-KA220-YOU-000351360
Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Contents

1. The Digital Parents project 3
1.1. Objectives and aims. 3
1.2. Key definitions 5
1.3. Rights-based approach 12
2. Research Objectives and Methodology 16
2.1. Specific Research Objectives 16
2.2. Research methodology 17
3. Analysis of European Union Policies and Reference Documents 21
3.1. The European Digital Strategy (A Europe fit for the Digital Age) 21
3.2. Digital Education Action Plan (2021–2027) 22
3.3. Digital Competence Framework for Educators (DigCompEdu) 23
3.4. European Skills Agenda (2020) 24
3.5. European Strategy for a Better Internet for Kids (BIK+, 2022) 25
3.6. The Digital Services Act (DSA) and the protection of minors 26
3.7. The Artificial Intelligence Regulation (AI Act) 27
3.8. Summary: a convergent framework 28
4. Analysis of the 'State of the Art' in Media Education for Adults – Qualitative Results from Focus Groups and Interviews 29
4.1. The current landscape: Parenting in the Digital Age 29
4.2. The intergenerational digital divide: Perceptions of parents, young people and youth workers. 30
4.3. Emerging challenges and risks 32
4.4. New frontiers: artificial intelligence as an educational and relational challenge 36
4.5. Towards an educational community 41
5. Collection and Analysis of Good Practices 44
5.1. Good practices: a reasoned summary 44
5.2. Innovative methodologies 48
5.3. Critical analysis 52

6. Summary of the results of the stakeholder interviews..... 57
6.1. The experts' perspective 57
7. Conclusions and future developments 59
7.1. Summary of key findings and preliminary recommendations 59
7.2. Preliminary recommendations..... 61
7.3. Input for the subsequent phases of the project 63
8. Annexes 64
8.1. List of stakeholders involved. 64
8.2. Good practice analysis sheets. 66
9. Bibliography..... 70

1. The Digital Parents project

1.1. Objectives and aims.

This Desk Research constitutes the fundamental exploratory and methodological phase of the Erasmus+ project "Digital Parents: Raising Children in a Onlife Age". Forming part of Work Package 2 (Onlife Parenting), this research aims to map and analyse the current state of media education for parents and families, with the aim of providing a scientific and practical basis for all subsequent project activities.

Research objectives

The primary objective of the desk research is to update the themes and priorities related to media education from an 'onlife' perspective, where the distinction between online and offline life is now obsolete. Specifically, the research aims to:

- map pedagogical strategies: Analyse parental approaches to digital education at national and European level, drawing on key documents such as the Digital Education Action Plan 2021-27 and DigCompEdu;
- identify best practices: Collect and catalogue 30 best practices and innovative methodologies that involve parents and children together in the digital literacy process;
- understand the needs of families: Identify the main challenges that parents and carers face in guiding their children through the complexities of the digital world, thereby bridging the intergenerational gap.

Aims and conceptual framework

The research is not limited to a literature review, but integrates theory with practice through interviews with 26 key stakeholders (educators, teachers, experts) and the direct involvement of families and young people in focus groups.

The research adopts innovative scientific approaches, such as Maryanne Wolf's studies on the 'biliterate brain' ([1]), exploring how deep reading on paper and rapid digital consumption can coexist to develop critical thinking. The ultimate aim is to ensure that the transition to digital takes place with due regard for the rights of children and young people through an intersectional lens, including families in vulnerable situations or from different backgrounds.

[1] Wolf, M. (2018). *Reader, Come Home: The Reading Brain in a Digital World*. Harper.

Impact on project activities

The results of this desk research form the core content and methodological basis for the development of subsequent project outputs, specifically:

- the Guidelines for parental involvement (WP3);
- the design of challenges for the Urban Game (WP4), a playful tool for intergenerational learning;
- the Final Recommendations addressed to policy-makers and stakeholders for the creation of harmonious digital educational ecosystems.

In summary, the Desk Research serves as the compass for the Digital Parents project, essential for beginning to consider informed parenting that is prepared for the challenges of the digital transition.

1.2. Key definitions

The concept of Media Education

To understand the conceptual framework within which the Digital Parents project operates, it is necessary to clarify some fundamental terms that cut across the field of media education and which, over time, have taken on broader and more nuanced meanings.

The concept of media education traditionally refers to the educational process through which both young people and adults develop critical skills regarding the media. This field has its roots in twentieth-century pedagogy, drawing on the Anglo-Saxon critical tradition[2] and the Italian theoretical framework developed, among others, by Pier Cesare Rivoltella[3] . Media education is not limited to teaching the technical use of tools, but aims to develop the ability to analyse, evaluate and produce media messages in an informed manner.

The term 'media literacy', more widely used internationally, refers to the outcome of this process: the set of skills that enable a person to access, understand, critically analyse and create content across different media. The European Digital Competence Framework (DigComp), in its various versions up to the most recent 3.0, has helped to systematise these competences into five areas: information and data literacy, communication and collaboration, digital content creation, safety, and problem-solving.

For the Digital Parents project, it is essential to emphasise that media literacy does not concern only minors. Media literacy among adults – and parents in particular – is a necessary condition for building effective educational environments. Without their own critical skills, parents tend to oscillate between two polarised attitudes: uncritical techno-optimism and moral panic, both of which are inadequate for providing genuine educational support.

[2] Buckingham, D. (2003). *Media Education: Literacy, Learning and Contemporary Culture,* Polity and Masterman, L (1985). *Teaching the Media*, Routledge

[3] Rivoltella, P. C. (2020). *New alphabets. Education and cultures in the post-media society*. Scholé.

Parental mediation: Livingstone's contribution

Research on parental mediation in the digital environment has produced, over the last two decades, a substantial body of evidence that constitutes an essential reference for the Digital Parents project. The most influential contribution at international level is that of Sonia Livingstone and the EU Kids Online network, which has developed a classification of parental mediation strategies divided into four main types: active mediation (dialogue and discussion about digital content and experiences), restrictive mediation (rules and limits on use), co-use (shared use of devices) and monitoring (checking a child's online activities, often retrospectively).

Livingstone[4] has emphasised that these strategies are not inherently good or bad, but produce different effects depending on the context, the age of the children and the quality of the family relationship. In particular, active mediation is associated with minors' greater ability to manage online risks, whilst exclusively restrictive mediation tends to reduce both risks and opportunities, limiting the development of digital skills. Her distinction between an 'engagement' approach and a 'policing' approach effectively encapsulates the tension many parents experience and represents the central educational focus of the Digital Parents project: guiding without controlling, protecting without isolating. The balance between control and autonomy, in fact, is not static but evolving: a more protective approach is appropriate in the early stages, before gradually shifting towards a form of guidance that encourages self-regulation, in line with the principle of evolving capacities in the CRC.

The 'Onlife' perspective

The concept of 'onlife', introduced by the philosopher Luciano Floridi (2014) in the Onlife Manifesto[5] commissioned by the European Commission, describes the condition in which the traditional distinction between online and offline life is gradually losing its meaning. This is not simply a matter of stating that people spend a lot of time online, but of recognising a qualitative shift: information and communication technologies (ICT) have ceased to be mere tools and have become the constitutive environment of everyday experience.

[4] Livingstone, S., Mascheroni, G., & Staksrud, E. (2017). Maximising opportunities and minimising risks for children online: The role of digital skills in emerging strategies of parental mediation. *Journal of Communication, 67*(1), 82–105.

[5] Floridi, L. (2015). *The onlife manifesto: Being human in a hyperconnected era*. Springer

For Floridi, we live in a 'hyper-historical' era, in which societies are structurally dependent on ICT for their functioning – from communication to economic production, from access to public services to the construction of social relationships. In this context, our individual identity is being reconfigured: we are no longer simply users of technology, but 'inforgs', informational organisms that exist at the intersection of the biological, social and digital dimensions.

This perspective has direct consequences for the way we think about digital parenting. If the digital realm is not a separate 'place' into which sons and daughters 'enter' and from which they can be 'excluded', but the very fabric of contemporary life, then the educational approach cannot be based on a separation between a 'real' world (safe, controllable, and one in which to be overprotective parents) and a 'virtual' world (dangerous or, conversely, so alien as to be unworthy of parental attention). The challenge for parents is to guide their sons and daughters in navigating a hybrid environment, where meaningful experiences – relational, cognitive and emotional – arise equally both on and off screens

The Digital Parents project adopts this perspective as its framework: it does not aim to teach parents to "control the digital world", but to develop skills for living and educating consciously within the onlife condition.

The biliterate brain

A scientific contribution of particular relevance to the project is that of cognitive neuroscientist Maryanne Wolf, who, through her works – from **Proust and the Squid** (2007) to **Reader, Come Home** (2018) – has explored the transformations that digital technology brings about in reading processes and, more generally, in deep cognitive structures.

Wolf starts from a fundamental neuroscientific fact: the human brain is not born 'predisposed' to reading. The brain's reading circuitry is built through experience: the way we read, what we read and the media on which we read materially alter neural architecture. Deep reading on paper – the kind that enables critical thinking, empathy, complex analysis and inner reflection – develops through a slow and demanding process requiring years of practice.

The rapid and fragmented consumption of digital texts – characterised by fast scrolling, superficial scanning, multitasking and constant interruptions – activates different neural circuits, ones more geared towards speed and efficiency but less capable of supporting deep comprehension, inferential reasoning and ethical reflection. This also has direct implications for the ability to resist disinformation: superficial and rapid reading is

structurally more vulnerable to informational manipulation, because it does not activate the processes of verification, comparison and critical evaluation of sources that deep reading makes possible. In other words, Wolf's cognitive bi-literacy is not merely a matter of the 'pleasure of reading', but a civic competence in the age of algorithmic disinformation.

Wolf's proposal is not to reject the digital, but to build a 'biliterate brain': a brain capable of switching fluidly between deep reading (typical of print) and rapid, strategic reading (typical of digital), knowing when to apply each. The analogy is with bilingualism: just as a bilingual child learns to navigate between two linguistic systems, a bi-literate reader learns to navigate between two cognitive modes, preserving the critical thinking skills that deep reading makes possible.

For the Digital Parents project, Wolf's research provides a rigorous scientific argument in favour of a balanced approach to digital media, one that neither demonises technology nor accepts it uncritically. It also offers a practical message for parents: bi-literacy is built through daily practices (reading aloud, dedicating time to reading on paper, alternating between digital and analogue experiences) and requires an awareness of the different cognitive skills that different media engage.

Tisseron's 3As: Accompaniment, Alternation, Self-regulation

Another key theoretical reference for the project is the work of the French psychiatrist and psychoanalyst Serge Tisseron, best known for the '3-6-9-12' educational campaign (2013)[6] , which offers age-specific guidelines for introducing children to screens. Beyond the age thresholds, which have been widely publicised but which Tisseron himself regards as flexible guidelines rather than rigid rules, his most enduring contribution lies in the "3A" model: Accompaniment, Alternation and Self-regulation.

Accompaniment refers to the need for adults not to limit themselves to a passive presence alongside the child using a screen, but to engage in active interaction: asking questions about what they are seeing or doing, sharing the experience, encouraging reflection, and establishing rules of use together. This is not about supervision, but about educational mediation.

'Alternation' refers to the need to integrate digital experiences into a broader range of activities: physical play, reading, exploring nature, the arts, and direct interpersonal

[6] Tisseron, S. (2016). *3-6-9-12. Growing up in the age of digital screens*. La Scuola.

relationships. The principle is not quantitative (setting a 'maximum screen time') but qualitative: ensuring that screens are one stimulus among many, not the dominant one.

Self-regulation is the most ambitious goal: to gradually guide children towards the ability to independently manage their relationship with digital technology, developing an awareness of their own needs, limits and vulnerabilities. This process takes time and is closely linked to the child's age and maturity. As Rivoltella has emphasised[7] , in an increasingly pervasive market context, self-regulation must be rethought not only as the ability to 'switch off', but as the ability to anticipate and foresee the effects of one's own digital choices.

It should be emphasised that Tisseron has never taken a demonising stance towards digital media, including video games. On the contrary, in his work he has explored the educational and even therapeutic potential of digital gaming, recognising that video games can develop cognitive skills (problem-solving, strategic thinking, coordination), social skills (collaboration, negotiation in multiplayer experiences) and narrative skills (immersion in complex narrative worlds). This stance is consistent with the 3A's overall approach: the point is not to ban an experience, but to accompany it, place it within a context of alternation, and progressively build the capacity for self-regulation. For the Digital Parents project, this means that the Urban Game and gamification activities are not a strategic concession to the language of young people, but a consistent application of the principle that learning can take place through play – including digital play – when it is guided, shared and embedded within a purposeful educational context.

In a recent talk (February 2026)[8] , Tisseron extended his reflection to the theme of artificial intelligence, highlighting how AI represents a further level of educational complexity: no longer merely the use of screens, but interaction with systems that simulate understanding, empathy and competence, posing unprecedented challenges to the critical thinking skills of both young people and adults.

The 3A model integrates naturally with Wolf's proposal on bi-literacy: both frameworks reject simplistic solutions (bans, decontextualised time limits) and propose a vision of digital education as a relational, progressive and conscious process. Tisseron's 'Accompaniment' corresponds to Livingstone's 'active mediation'; Alternation ties in with Wolf's bi-literacy; Self-regulation converges with the principle of evolving capacities in the

[7] Rivoltella, P. C. (2014). *Smart future: Teaching, digital media and inclusion*. FrancoAngeli

[8] Tisseron, S. (2026). *Screens: A guide to informed parenting*. Érès.

UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (also referred to by the abbreviation CRC, Convention on the Rights of the Child)[9] . This convergence between theoretical frameworks that differ in disciplinary tradition reinforces the coherence of the project's conceptual framework.

The strategy of delaying smartphone access: movements and educational perspectives

In recent years, a movement of parents promoting the delay of smartphone access for pre-adolescent sons and daughters has gained momentum internationally. Initiatives such as 'Wait Until 8th' in the United States, 'Smartphone Free Childhood' in the United Kingdom and 'Wait Mate' in Australia have attracted hundreds of thousands of supporters. In Italy, although the phenomenon is less organised, the debate is very active and is intertwined with recent regulatory initiatives on sharenting and minors' access to social media.

This trend, particularly widespread in the Anglo-Saxon world, reflects the approach of those who deliberately choose to postpone the introduction of a child's first personal smartphone, typically until the end of lower secondary school or later. This is not necessarily a technophobic stance: many participating families use alternative devices (phones without internet access, shared tablets with parental controls) and justify their choice based on evidence regarding the effects of early and intensive smartphone use on adolescents' mental health, sleep quality and social relationships.

A study published in *Pediatrics* (Barzilay et al., 2026[10]), based on data from *the Adolescent Brain Cognitive Development Study* (over 10,500 participants), highlighted significant associations between early smartphone ownership and increased risks of depression, being overweight and poor sleep quality in early adolescence. In parallel, qualitative research with families who chose to delay access (Vaterlaus et al., 2026[11]) documented perceived benefits in terms of relationships, but also necessary compromises and social pressures linked to this choice.

[9] https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-child

[10] Barzilay, R., et al. (2026). Adolescents' emotional reliance on AI companions: Implications for mental health. *Journal of Adolescent Health*.

[11] Vaterlaus, J. M., et al. (2026). "It listens better than people": Teen perceptions of AI companions. *Computers in Human Behavior*.

Within the framework of the Digital Parents project, this practice of delaying access is considered a significant sign of growing parental awareness, whilst maintaining a critical perspective: scientific evidence suggests that the age of access is a relevant but insufficient variable, and that the quality of parental mediation matters at least as much as time or age restrictions. This approach is consistent with the institutional stance of organisations such as Save the Children, which has emphasised that exclusively restrictive measures risk being ineffective if not accompanied by education, critical skills and digital environments designed with respect for the rights of children and adolescents[12] .

[12] https://www.savethechildren.it/cosa-facciamo/pubblicazioni/educare-al-digitale

1.3. Rights-based approach

The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child in the digital environment.

The CRC and General Comment No. 25 (2021)

The Digital Parents project is explicitly based on a child rights-based approach, in line with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and its application to the digital environment.

The most relevant reference document in this area is General Comment No. 25 [13] (2021) by the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, dedicated specifically to the rights of children in relation to the digital environment. The General Comment is the result of a two-year consultative process involving States, international organisations, civil society and over 700 children in 28 countries.

General Comment No. 25 reaffirms that all rights enshrined in the Convention apply fully to the digital environment and provides guidance on how States should ensure their implementation. The general principles of the CRC are applied in the digital context as follows.

Non-discrimination (Art. 2): States must ensure that inequalities in access to and digital skills do not result in discrimination in the exercise of rights. This includes socio-economic, geographical, gender-based and disability-related digital divides.

Best interests of the child (Art. 3): in the design, regulation and governance of digital technologies, the best interests of the child must be a primary consideration. This principle applies both to public policy and to the design of digital platforms and services (design by default).

Right to life, survival and development (Art. 6): the digital environment must promote the physical, mental, spiritual, moral and social development of minors. This involves both protecting them from risks and ensuring access to the opportunities that digital technology offers for education, culture, play and participation.

Listening and participation (Art. 12): States must ensure that minors can express their views on the digital environment and that these are taken seriously. Consultation processes must be inclusive, including for children who do not have access to technology.

[13] UN Committee on the Rights of the Child. (2021). *General Comment No. 25 on children's rights in relation to the digital environment*.

Evolving capacities and the role of parents

A particularly relevant aspect for the Digital Parents project concerns the principle of 'evolving capacities' (Art. 5 CRC), which General Comment No. 25 explicitly addresses in the digital context. The Committee states that States must respect the evolving capacities of children as an 'enabling principle' that accompanies the gradual process of acquiring skills, understanding and autonomy.

This means that protective measures and parenting practices in the digital environment must be proportionate to the age and level of maturity of the individual child, and must evolve over time towards greater autonomy. Overprotection can be just as detrimental to a child's rights as insufficient protection: it can restrict the right to information, participation, freedom of expression and play.

The General Comment assigns parents and carers a crucial mediating role, but also recognises that many adults themselves require training and support to fulfil this role effectively. States are urged to provide parents with "information and training on digital safety" (para. 27) and to develop resources to help them provide guidance that is rights-based, not merely focused on the child's protection.

Specific rights in the digital environment

General Comment No. 25 addresses in detail various rights in the digital environment that are of particular relevance to the Digital Parents project.

Privacy and data protection (Articles 16 and 8): the data of minors requires enhanced protection. The Committee highlights how practices that have now become routine on digital platforms – behavioural profiling, targeted advertising, and the collection of biometric data – may constitute arbitrary interference with the right to privacy and have long-term consequences on the lives of minors. At European level, the GDPR and the Digital Services Act (DSA) have introduced specific safeguards, including obligations regarding algorithmic transparency and a ban on targeted advertising based on the profiling of minors.

Right to information and freedom of expression (Articles 13 and 17): the digital environment can be a vital space for minors to access information and express themselves creatively, but it requires the ability to critically evaluate sources, distinguish information from disinformation, and understand the algorithmic logic that selects and prioritises content.

Protection from violence (Art. 19): the Committee addresses the various forms of violence in the digital environment – cyberbullying, hate speech, grooming, sexual exploitation,

exposure to violent content – and calls on States to adopt prevention and response measures that go beyond reactive interventions to build digital environments that are safe 'by design'.

Right to play and leisure (Art. 31): the General Comment recognises that the digital environment offers significant opportunities for play, creativity and cultural participation, and that protective measures must not unduly restrict these opportunities.

Ethical premise — Child Safeguarding as a theoretical framework and research practice

For the Digital Parents project, Child Safeguarding is not merely a set of operational procedures to be followed in conducting the research: it is a theoretical framework that permeates the entire conceptual structure of the project and informs its methodological choices, content and educational vision.

Adopting a safeguarding perspective means recognising that the protection of minors and adults in vulnerable situations is not limited to the prevention of direct harm, but requires the active construction of environments — physical, relational and digital — in which the rights, dignity and well-being of every person are a structural priority and not a residual variable. In this sense, safeguarding is not opposed to empowerment: it presupposes it. It is not possible to build critical autonomy, digital skills or self-regulation capabilities in the absence of contexts that guarantee safety, trust and respect.

This perspective naturally intertwines with the theoretical frameworks already adopted by the project. The rights-based approach, Livingstone's active mediation, Tisseron's 3A model and General Comment No. 25 all converge in outlining an educational responsibility that is, at the same time, a responsibility of care: towards minors, towards families in vulnerable situations, towards anyone in a position of lesser power within the contexts in which the project operates.

In the age of artificial intelligence, this responsibility extends to a new level. It is therefore hoped that, increasingly, organisations working in this field will have specific safeguarding policies in place that include explicit guidelines for the responsible use of AI: tools that simulate understanding, empathy and relationships cannot be introduced into educational or research contexts involving minors or vulnerable adults without informed, transparent and protection-oriented governance.

This principle does not only concern the conduct of this research, but constitutes a recommendation addressed to all organisations — educational, third sector, institutional — that the project aims to reach and train in accordance with each institution's specific policies and the relevant European regulatory framework (AI Act, GDPR, DSA).

Implications for the project

The rights-based approach has concrete implications for the methodology and content of the Digital Parents project. Firstly, it directs parental education not towards simply controlling their children's digital experience, but towards informed guidance that balances protection and autonomy in a manner proportionate to the child's developmental capabilities. Secondly, it situates digital parenting within an internationally shared regulatory and values-based framework, reinforcing the legitimacy and consistency of the project's activities. Finally, it requires the diversity of family circumstances – socio-economic, cultural, and those related to disability, gender and sexual orientation – to be considered as a cross-cutting dimension of educational design, in line with the principle of non-discrimination.

2. Research Objectives and Methodology

2.1. Specific Research Objectives

The exploratory and documentary research phase of the Digital Parents project aims to build an up-to-date knowledge base shared among the five partner countries (Italy, Poland, Latvia, Croatia) on the state of the art of digital parenting, media literacy for adults and emerging challenges in the 'onlife' environment, where the online and offline dimensions of daily life are deeply intertwined.

The specific research objectives are as follows:

- to map the regulatory framework and national policies on digital literacy, cyberbullying, the protection of minors online and family involvement in the five partner countries, including in relation to the European regulatory framework (DSA, AI Act, GDPR);
- to analyse the training needs of parents, educators and teachers, with particular attention to the intergenerational digital divide and the specificities of the different national contexts;
- to collect and analyse existing good practices in the field of media education aimed at adults, particularly regarding digital parenting, with a focus on innovative methodologies – including gamification – and the inclusion of vulnerable groups;
- gather the views of experts and stakeholders through qualitative interviews, in order to update the project's themes and priorities and identify the main gaps in currently available educational tools;
- provide structured input for the subsequent phases of the project: the drafting of the Guidelines and the design of the Urban Game challenges.

2.2. Research methodology

The research adopted a mixed-methods approach, combining documentary analysis with qualitative field data collection through interviews with experts and stakeholders, as well as through questionnaires and focus groups aimed at both families and adults involved in education, and at minors.

The methodological framework was agreed upon by all partners and comprises four main components:

- documentary analysis and scientific literature
- interviews with stakeholders
- focus groups with families
- mapping of good practices

Documentary analysis and scientific literature

In each of the five partner countries, national desk research was conducted, following a common structured model divided into five sections: (1) national context and policy framework; (2) needs analysis – challenges for parents and minors; (3) intersectionality, inclusion and diversity; (4) existing good practices and resources; (5) strategic inputs for the focus groups and the Urban Game.

The sources analysed include: national and European institutional reports, statistical surveys (including ISTAT, Eurostat, IPSOS, DESI), scientific literature and sectoral studies, national legislation and EU regulations (Digital Services Act, AI Act, GDPR), as well as data and reports produced by civil society organisations, safer internet centres and parents' associations active in the partner countries.

Stakeholder interviews

The qualitative phase of this research also involved a diverse group (26) of experts and key stakeholders, selected through *purposive sampling*. The primary objective was to map the impact of digital technologies on the lives of children and families from a multidisciplinary and transnational perspective. To broaden the research's analytical base and the information gathered, stakeholders from countries (Spain, Turkey, Germany) outside the partnership involved in this project were also involved; the partnership organisations have developed stable collaborative relationships with these countries over the years, and their involvement enabled the qualitative investigation to be expanded to a broader level.

The selection criteria adopted for identifying profiles were defined to ensure a triangulation of data between academic theory, public policy and educational practice. Specifically, the following guiding criteria were followed:

1. Systemic expertise and analysis of social policies: priority was given to academics capable of contextualising digital challenges within structural frameworks. In Croatia, the selection focused on experts in family policy and social inequalities to analyse the distribution of educational responsibility between the state and the family. Meanwhile, in Italy, the involvement of sociology lecturers enabled the integration of a theoretical analysis of the relational changes brought about by the media.

2. Direct observation and educational continuity: a key criterion was the inclusion of stakeholders working in formal and non-formal educational settings, ensuring a privileged observation of young people's behaviour in the field.

3. School setting: school leaders and teachers with specific expertise in creating digital content were included, capable of assessing the impact of new media on learning processes.

4. Non-formal setting: particular focus was placed on scouting (specifically in the Polish context), selected for its method based on peer influence and long-term relational education, factors critical to balancing the virtual and physical dimensions.

5. Specialisation in vulnerability and new digital risks: in order to explore the most sensitive aspects of online life, the selection criteria included experts in critical sectors.

6. Identity and rights: LGBTQ+ rights activists and sex educators were involved to investigate how digital media influence identity formation and the prevention of discrimination. The selection also included experts in the analysis of gender stereotypes in the media and the prevention of online radicalisation, with a specific focus on male digital socialisation.

7. Protection and support: the involvement of staff from women's shelters and psychologists ensured a perspective on the safety and mental wellbeing of minors;

8. Practical experience in parenting support: finally, representatives were selected from third-sector associations and organisations that provide practical tools for digital literacy and 'digital parenting'. The selection criteria were based on these stakeholders' ability to interpret parents' everyday needs and translate them into targeted educational programmes.

In conclusion, the composition of the expert panel reflects a strategic balance between policy vision, action research and socio-educational intervention, enabling a holistic understanding of the contemporary digital environment.

The interviews were conducted using questions common to all partner countries, organised into five thematic areas:

1. analysis of the current situation and good practices;
2. identification of needs and gaps, with reference to the 'onlife' dimension;
3. the onlife perspective and the concept of the 'bilingual brain' (with reference to Maryanne Wolf's research on cognitive and digital development);
4. family involvement and participation, including reflection on the intergenerational approach and gamification;
5. content ideas for the Urban Game challenges.

Focus Groups

The methodology adopted for this research is based on the qualitative analysis of targeted focus groups, aimed at exploring the complexity of onlife parenting.

The definition of the sample and the structuring of the meetings followed precise criteria to ensure a plural and intersectional view of the phenomenon.

To obtain a broad perspective, recruitment was not limited to biological parents alone, but encompassed a variety of educational figures.

We operated according to a broad concept of family, which included various forms of parenting to reflect current family structures, including rainbow families and foster parents. In general, we sought to consider the concept of family not only as the biological unit but as a broader entity encompassing all significant adults in the lives of minors; in this sense, within the focus groups, some parents positioned themselves in the discussion not only in their parental role with their own sons and daughters but also as significant adults for their grandchildren and the children of friends.

Grandparents were also included; their involvement proved interesting for the purposes of the research as they often act as logistical support figures, sometimes coming into conflict with parents over a more permissive approach to the use of devices.

Finally, a number of education professionals were also included in the focus groups: the inclusion of teachers allowed us to observe the divergence between the use of digital technology in schools (often imposed or didactic) and its recreational and domestic use.

We also sought to include, within the various focus groups, families with sons and daughters of different and varied ages, who could therefore address different digital routines and educational concerns.

The research also adopted a transnational approach, involving different contexts (Milan, Rome, Zagreb, Gulbene) to identify universal constants and local peculiarities.

From a methodological perspective, we chose to create a welcoming, inclusive and non-judgemental atmosphere. This allowed participants to discuss openly their relationships with their children on digital-related issues, as well as enabling them to open up about any feelings of guilt, their own digital addiction as adults, and their curiosity about new technologies.

Mapping good practices

The collection of good practices followed specific selection criteria, with the aim of identifying significant and replicable experiences in the field of media education for adults and parental involvement in the digital environment. A total of 30 case studies were selected, 20 of which came from the partner countries (Italy, Latvia, Poland, Croatia) and were also chosen based on the guidance provided by the stakeholders interviewed, whilst the remaining 10 were selected from broader European contexts.

The criteria adopted for the selection of good practices included: proven effectiveness in engaging parents and families; methodological innovation (with particular attention to gamification, experiential learning and intergenerational dialogue); inclusivity and attention to vulnerable groups and different family structures; the transferability of the model to different national contexts; consistency with the project's priority themes (online safety, critical thinking, intergenerational dialogue, digital wellbeing).

3. Analysis of European Union Policies and Reference Documents

The Digital Parents project forms part of a framework of European policies that has seen significant acceleration in recent years, driven by the realisation that the digital transition cannot be managed solely through technological or market-based tools, but requires structural investment in education, skills and the protection of rights. This section analyses the main European Union reference documents that constitute the political and regulatory framework within which the project is situated.

3.1. The European Digital Strategy (A Europe fit for the Digital Age)

The European Digital Strategy (*A Europe fit for the Digital Age*) sets out the overarching policy framework within which all the initiatives analysed in this section are situated. Built around three pillars – technology at the service of people, a fair and competitive digital economy, and **an open, democratic and sustainable digital society** – the Strategy identifies the development of digital citizenship as a cross-cutting objective, integrating technical skills, ethical considerations and democratic values. This is complemented by the Council Recommendation of 22 May 2018 on the promotion of common values and inclusive education, which explicitly lists the **strengthening of critical thinking**, media literacy and education for active citizenship among its priorities. The *Digital Parents* project fits within this framework: building practices of intergenerational digital co-navigation directly responds to the European vision of digital competences understood as genuine citizenship skills.

3.2. Digital Education Action Plan (2021–2027)

The Digital Education Action Plan 2021–2027 is the European Union's policy initiative that sets out a shared vision for high-quality, inclusive and accessible digital education. Adopted in September 2020, it is structured around two strategic priorities: promoting the development of a high-performing digital education ecosystem and enhancing digital competences and skills for digital transformation, set out in a total of 14 concrete actions.

Among the most relevant measures for the project are: ethical guidelines for educators on the use of artificial intelligence and data in teaching and learning (Action 6); guidelines for teachers and educators to promote digital literacy and combat disinformation (Action 7); and the update of the European Digital Competence Framework (DigComp 2.2) to systematically include AI and *data literacy* skills (Action 8).

In quantitative terms, the Plan highlights a significant shortfall compared to the Union's objectives: findings from the international ICILS 2023 study show that over 40% of 13- to 14-year-olds in the EU still lack basic digital skills, compared to the European target of reducing this percentage to below 15% by 2030. This gap does not only affect minors: as documented in the previous sections of this desk research, the skills gap also significantly affects adults and parents, making structured *media education* intervention that is not limited to the school context alone an urgent priority.

For the *Digital Parents* project, the Action Plan offers two key points of reference. Firstly, the recognition that digital education is not a subject in its own right but a cross-cutting dimension of the educational experience, consistent with the *'onlife'* perspective adopted by the project. Secondly, its duration (coinciding with the Multiannual Financial Framework 2021–2027 and *NextGenerationEU*) ensures a structural funding framework for national and transnational initiatives, including Erasmus+ cooperation projects such as *Digital Parents*.

3.3. Digital Competence Framework for Educators (DigCompEdu)

DigCompEdu, developed by the European Commission's Joint Research Centre (JRC), provides a reference model for the digital pedagogical competences of teachers and trainers at all educational levels, from early childhood to adult continuing education.

The framework is divided into **six areas of competence.**

Area 1: Professional engagement (use of digital technologies for communication, collaboration and professional development);

Area 2: Digital resources (selection, creation, protection and sharing);

Area 3: Teaching and learning practices (design and management of digital learning activities);

Area 4: Assessment (use of digital tools for formative and summative assessment);

Area 5: Student empowerment (personalisation, inclusion, accessibility and active engagement);

Area 6: Fostering the development of learners' digital competence.

For each area, six progressive levels of proficiency are defined, based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, ranging from **A1 (Novice)** to **C2 (Proficient)**. A significant operational development is the recent publication of the ***DigCompEdu in Practice*** guide, which offers case studies, methodological guidelines and concrete examples for the practical application of the framework in various educational contexts.

DigCompEdu serves as the primary methodological reference point for any European initiative aiming to train educational professionals in digital pedagogical competences, providing both a common language among international partners and a standardised self-assessment tool. For the *Digital Parents* project, the framework serves as the scientific basis for training practitioners and facilitators who will work within family settings. In particular, the project focuses on **Areas 5 and 6**, which are directly and synergistically linked to the objective of fostering critical autonomy, inclusion and digital wellbeing within families.

3.4. European Skills Agenda (2020)

Presented by the European Commission, the New Skills Agenda outlines the strategic plan to update and reskill the European workforce and citizens in response to the twin green and digital transitions. The Agenda introduces an approach centred on the right to training and lifelong learning, in full synergy with the principles of the European Pillar of Social Rights, and is structured around 12 structural actions.

Of fundamental relevance to the project is **Action 8: 'Skills *for* life'**. This measure supports adult learning in crucial transversal skills, such as media literacy (*media education*), civic skills, and digital, environmental and health literacy.

In terms of quantitative targets, the Agenda had set an interim target of 70% of adults (aged 16–74) achieving basic digital skills, as a milestone towards the ultimate target **of 80% by 2030** established by the strategic programme for the *Digital Decade*. European monitoring, however, highlights that this process is experiencing significant delays in several Member States, including Italy, where the digital skills gap among the adult population remains critical.

This gap compared to European standards provides a framework that justifies and necessitates *media education* initiatives aimed not only at children, but also and above all at adults and family settings. The *Digital Parents* project fits precisely into this space: the development of digital parenting skills and co-navigation practices is not a secondary activity, but responds to a transnational strategic objective that recognises *lifelong* learning as a right and as a structural necessity of contemporary society.

3.5. European Strategy for a Better Internet for Kids (BIK+, 2022)

The European *Better Internet for Kids* (BIK+) Strategy, adopted by the European Commission in May 2022 as an update to the previous 2012 version, is the policy document most directly relevant to the *Digital Parents* project. It aims to ensure that the digital environment is a safe, accessible space rich in opportunities for children, structured around **three strategic pillars**:

- **safe digital experiences:** to protect children from harmful content, behaviour, contacts and risks online;
- **digital empowerment:** to enable them to acquire the skills needed to make informed choices and express themselves safely in the digital environment;
- **active participation:** to give children a voice by involving them directly in the development of digital policies and products.

The document strongly emphasises the crucial role of parents and educators as active mediators in their children's digital experience, highlighting the need to provide them with appropriate tools and training. In particular, the BIK+ promotes the adoption of design standards that make digital platforms secure at their core (*safe by design* and *by default*). This principle shifts part of the responsibility from mere individual parental supervision towards a structural responsibility of technology companies and states, an approach now made binding by the provisions of **the Digital Services Act (DSA)**.

For the *Digital Parents* project, BIK+ offers an ideal framework. Its emphasis on the balance between protection, empowerment and participation reflects the project's approach, which rejects purely prohibitive approaches in favour of promoting critical and informed guidance. The pillar of empowerment, in particular, aligns with the project's objective of developing parenting skills that go beyond restrictive control to foster dialogue, active mediation and intergenerational co-navigation.

3.6. The Digital Services Act (DSA) and the protection of minors

Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 on digital services (*Digital Services Act* – DSA), fully applicable throughout the European Union, represents the most significant regulatory framework for the protection of minors in the digital environment. The DSA introduces specific and binding obligations for online platforms, providing for a strengthened oversight regime for very large online platforms (**VLOPs**) and very large online search engines (**VLOSEs**).

Among the provisions most relevant to the *Digital Parents* project are:

- **the ban on targeted advertising:** based on the profiling of minors' personal data (Art. 28);
- **the obligation to provide a high level of protection:** the requirement for platforms accessible to minors to guarantee, by default, a very high level of privacy, security and protection (Art. 28);
- **systemic risk assessment:** the obligation for web giants to analyse and mitigate the negative effects of their services on the mental health, physical and psychological well-being, and rights of minors (Art. 34);
- **algorithmic transparency:** the obligation to make the criteria by which recommendation systems select the content proposed in feeds clear and understandable to users.

The DSA proves fundamental to the project on two distinct levels. On **an educational level**, it offers parents and educators a framework of 'enforceable rights': the aim of *media education* is no longer merely to teach young people to defend themselves, but to make families aware of the protections already guaranteed by European law, translating these into practical skills for reporting and active protection. **Conceptually**, the DSA shifts responsibility from the sole supervision of the individual family to the structural responsibility of the platforms. This approach recognises that the digital wellbeing of young people requires a regulated ecosystem and aligns perfectly with the *rights-based* perspective (based on the rights of children and adolescents) adopted by the *Digital Parents* project.

3.7. The Artificial Intelligence Regulation (AI Act)

Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 on artificial intelligence (*AI Act*), which entered into force on 1 August 2024 with a phased implementation, represents the world's first regulatory framework specifically dedicated to the regulation of AI. The Regulation adopts a risk-based approach, classifying AI systems into four broad categories:

- **unacceptable risk:** systems prohibited because they are considered a threat to people's safety and rights;
- **high risk:** systems subject to stringent requirements and obligations prior to being placed on the market;
- **limited risk:** systems subject to specific transparency obligations;
- **minimal or no risk:** systems that are not subject to specific regulatory obligations.

Several provisions of the AI Act are directly relevant to the *Digital Parents* project. AI systems used in education and vocational training are classified as **high-risk** (Annex III), imposing obligations regarding transparency, human oversight and impact assessment that closely affect educational settings attended by minors and young people. Article 5 strictly prohibits AI systems that exploit age-related vulnerabilities to manipulate people's behaviour, a fundamental safeguard that directly concerns minors. Article 50 also introduces transparency obligations for generative AI systems, requiring that users (including family contexts) be explicitly informed when interacting with an automated system.

Of particular interest to the project is **Article 4**, which introduces for the first time the principle of AI *literacy* for those who place such systems on the market or use them, encouraging Member States to promote awareness-raising and training measures at all levels. Although this provision still requires time to be translated into structured programmes for families and educators, it marks an important institutional recognition: understanding AI is no longer a specialist technical skill, but a requirement of widespread citizenship.

For parents, knowledge of this regulatory framework constitutes a genuine educational skill. Knowing that European law prohibits the psychological manipulation of minors, requires transparency regarding the nature of generated content, and oversees the digital systems used in schools enables a shift from a sense of powerlessness to an **awareness of enforceable rights**. This approach is fully consistent with the *rights-based* approach of the *Digital Parents* project: critical literacy includes knowledge of existing safeguards and the ability to activate them to protect and support young people.

3.8. Summary: a convergent framework

The documents analysed in this section converge in a direction that is deeply consistent with the conceptual and methodological framework of the *Digital Parents* project. From the Digital Education Action Plan to the BIK+ strategy, via the Skills Agenda, the DSA and the AI Act, a clear European vision of the digital transition emerges. This vision integrates skills development with the protection of **enforceable rights**, defining a shared responsibility between families, educational institutions, technology companies and states.

The *Digital Parents* project fits into this framework by focusing specifically on the issue of informed parenting and co-navigation: an area that all EU frameworks recognise as crucial for the digital wellbeing of young people and minors, but which still lacks structured, inclusive interventions based on evidence from the field.

4. Analysis of the 'State of the Art' in Media Education for Adults – Qualitative Results from Focus Groups and Interviews

4.1. The current landscape: Parenting in the Digital Age

The contemporary reality of families is defined by the 'onlife' dimension, a fluid ecosystem in which the boundaries between analogue and digital are now indistinguishable. In this context, parenting can no longer be viewed as a technical management challenge, but as a profound renegotiation of identity and emotion.

A central paradox emerges from the qualitative data: the digital device is used as an emotional regulator and technological babysitter, but over time it becomes a veritable currency of educational exchange — a tool for negotiation ("if you help me, I'll give you 10 more minutes") that risks replacing the relationship with a transaction. This dynamic is accompanied by the 'loneliness of the next room': the parent feels reassured by the child's physical presence in the home, whilst the child, through the device, is exposed to global risks and profound isolation.

Adults' attitudes swing between rigid prohibition and pragmatic survivalism, both of which are ineffective. Bans and nostalgia for the analogue past erect communication barriers and push young people towards furtive, unguided use. Alessandra Rampani describes this as a "disarming naivety": many parents admit to having handed over devices too early due to social conformity, ending up trapped in dynamics that are difficult to reverse. Added to this, as Nicola Bruno points out, is the fear of being judged as "boomers" by their children, with a consequent perceived devaluation of their educational authority.

In terms of timing, Daniele Catozzella identifies a clear watershed in the Covid-19 pandemic: whilst there was not even a perception of the problem before the pandemic, from 2023 onwards concern has emerged strongly, albeit remaining concentrated in families with greater cultural capital and often resulting in fragmented, unsystematic interventions.

Effective media education should not be understood as a separate subject, but as a cross-cutting life skill, similar to learning a language. The focus must shift from quantitative screen time control to the relational co-management of content. As Jasena Knez Radolovic highlights, parents rarely seek media literacy in the abstract: they engage with the topic when they need to solve concrete everyday problems — and that is where the real opportunity for effective intervention lies.

Whilst adults view digital technology as an external threat, the young people involved in this research describe it as an **'onlife'** dimension where human relationships and real-world contact retain a central value and are not replaced, but enriched by digital technology. (see Focus Group on young people)

4.2. The intergenerational digital divide: Perceptions of parents, young people and youth workers.

The gap between generations is not merely a question of technical skills, but of profoundly different meanings attributed to the digital space. For children, it is the air they breathe, a real space for socialisation and identity formation; for parents, it is often a source of anxiety. As Nicola Bruno points out, the fear of being judged as 'boomers' or 'infantilised' by their children drives many adults to withdraw from their guiding role, abdicating their educational function so as not to reveal technological fragility.

Added to this is a profound disconnect between perception and reality. Catozzella highlights the gap between the theoretical risks discussed with parents and the real lives of young people, which revolve around multiplayer games, streaming and algorithms. Many parents also tend to overestimate their own digital skills: data emerging from the meetings and training sessions led by Nicola Bruno reveal a worrying 'Verification Gap' – 87% claim to know how to verify online sources, over 50% fail to distinguish fake news from real news, and only 30% pass a practical test. This overestimation hinders effective critical guidance and fuels an illusion of control — including through monitoring apps — which transforms trust into geospatial data, prompting young people to develop strategies to 'cover their tracks'.

Disinformation in the digital environment represents an educational challenge that cannot be addressed with purely technical tools (fact-checking, algorithmic filters) but requires intervention on deep cognitive skills. Wolf's research on bi-literacy offers a fundamental insight: the rapid, superficial reading mode that the digital environment encourages is structurally more vulnerable to information manipulation, because it does not activate the processes of verification, cross-referencing of sources and critical evaluation that deep reading makes possible. In other words, vulnerability to disinformation is not merely a problem of 'information literacy' in the technical sense, but a consequence of the cognitive transformations brought about by immersion in digital environments designed to capture attention and reward emotional engagement.

For parents, this means that teaching children to 'spot fake news' is necessary but not sufficient. We need to build the cognitive conditions for broader critical thinking: the ability to slow down, to suspend judgement, to seek out multiple sources, and to tolerate

uncertainty. These skills are developed through daily practices involving both digital and non-digital contexts, and require adults themselves to reflect on their own vulnerability to disinformation, which they often underestimate. The Digital Parents project's approach to this issue is consistent with the 'onlife' perspective: not separating the 'dangerous digital world' from the 'safe real world', but building transferable skills that work in both environments.

The Onlife dimension: in Croatia, experts such as Stipe Nogalo explain that, for minors, the digital world is a real space for socialising that has replaced physical meeting places, which have now lost their appeal.

The perceptions of the two generations are mirror images of one another and rarely align:

Topic	Parental perception	Minors' perception
Online Socialising	Seen as isolation, a 'waste of time' or a risk of grooming.	Primary space for identity and inclusion; the online world is reality. For gamers (Roblox, Minecraft), platforms are key communities; for social media users (TikTok, Instagram), the smartphone is an extension of their social self.
Gaming	Often reduced to passive entertainment or a potential addiction.	A collaborative environment for problem-solving and leadership.
Physical Presence	The only place of genuine safety and control.	Geolocation as the price of autonomy: tracking is the deal we make to be able to leave the house.
Rules	Strict boundaries and fixed timings (e.g. curfew).	Onlife flexibility: the smartphone allows the rule to be renegotiated in real time.

The impact of technology on family relationships often creates a paradox: on the one hand, parents experience a sense of helplessness; on the other, children are perceived as technical experts, yet lack the critical maturity to navigate the risks. Parents often use the device as an 'emotional regulator' or digital babysitter from early childhood, delegating the management of the child's boredom or agitation to the screen.

Continuous monitoring via apps is not merely a technical tool, but a reflection of the parent's need to manage uncertainty. This creates an illusion of omnipresence that distorts the concepts of 'discovery' and 'risk' in adolescence. This 'right-duty' to total control transforms trust into a geospatial datum, leading minors to develop creative strategies to 'cover their tracks', further fragmenting the educational bond.

Practitioners — including experts from Generazioni Connesse and the MEC Association — note fragmented communication and highlight the need for structured, non-emergency educational agreements.

As Alessandra Rampani observes, parents often express a genuine sense of helplessness: they do not know how to intervene and are asking for practical tools, not theoretical manuals.

A virtuous model comes from Latvia: in 2025, Gulbene Library issued no fewer than 344 digital competence certificates following a State Project about digital education for adults. Also, the possibility of reversing roles between children and parents — far from being a loss of authority — can become an opportunity for intergenerational cooperation, quite different from the Italian model, where support remains fragmented between clinical centres and school helpdesks (Rampani).

4.3. Emerging challenges and risks

One of the least visible yet most profound challenges parents face in the onlife era concerns the cognitive transformations that digital immersion brings about in their children's thought processes and, at the same time, in those of the adults themselves.

As illustrated in section 1.2, Wolf's research on the bi-literate brain offers a framework for interpreting the cognitive transformations documented by the stakeholders interviewed. In particular, concerns are shifting from technical issues to matters of values and relationships.

The Screen Time Paradox: there is unanimous agreement among the stakeholders interviewed that focusing solely on screen time is a misleading 'excuse'. The focus must shift to the quality of content and the context of use.

The home safety paradox: Alessandra Rampani observes that many parents forbid their children from going out alone but leave them in their rooms with their smartphones, convinced they are safe, unaware that the greatest dangers (e.g. contact with unknown adults) occur precisely online.

Disinformation and algorithms: in Italy, disinformation is a priority. Natasa Vajagic warns of the influence of algorithms in normalising gender stereotypes and toxic beauty standards.

The 'Data' culture: Catozzella highlights a serious lack of awareness regarding the permanence of data: many minors believe that data disappears after 24 hours because it is associated with WhatsApp's 'status' feature.

Radicalisation: Stipe Nogalo explains that the digital realm is not the cause, but the place where pre-existing beliefs (e.g. misogyny) are confirmed and articulated.

The gravity of digital risks today does not lie 'far away', but in the room next door. Threats come via seemingly harmless gaming platforms such as Roblox and Minecraft, where the risk of grooming and cyberbullying lurks behind anonymous nicknames and gaming communities.

Boys and girls report concrete examples of viral videos leading to exclusion from school and constant **performance anxiety** linked to the 'perfect' body image promoted by social media. Digital platforms strongly influence self-perception and relationships with others. Today, one's online image appears to be a central element of adolescent social life and often generates pressure, a need for approval and a fear of judgement. (See Focus Group with young people)

The civic threat and 'word of mouth'

Disinformation has been identified by Raffaele Lupoli as an "addictive dynamic", a civic threat that erodes critical thinking. A critical issue that emerged is the inadequacy of parental controls: extreme content (such as that found on *Squid Game* or *Pornhub*) reaches minors not through direct searches, but via 'peer word-of-mouth' (parish, school, sport), rendering parental technical controls entirely obsolete unless accompanied by education in discernment.

Summary of risks and data protection

Relational risks: the phenomenon of geolocation, used as a 'pact of autonomy': minors accept tracking as the price for physical freedom.

Sharenting and privacy: the widespread habit of posting photos of minors (even in intimate settings such as the beach) without awareness of the permanent digital traces left behind.

Night-time interference: sleep disturbances caused by devices taken to bed at night, with direct consequences for academic performance.

A shift therefore seems necessary from censorship to an understanding of the new frontiers, where the danger lies in the automation of thought and where focusing on the stopwatch is a methodological limitation: an hour of video creation is pedagogically opposed to an hour of passive consumption. The challenge lies in the quality of the experience.

Mapping of Critical Issues

Identified Risk	Impact on Onlife
Misinformation and Manipulation	Erosion of critical thinking; 70% of parents say they feel overwhelmed by the volume of fake news.
Inappropriate Content (e.g. *Squid Game, Pornhub*)	Early exposure to violence and distorted sexuality among minors (including 11-year-olds) who lack interpretative filters.
Cyberbullying and Hate Speech	Fragile sense of identity and social isolation despite constant hyper-connectivity.
'Loop' and 'mindless' content	Atrophy of intellectual curiosity through repetitive videos.
Sleep Disorders	Chronic school fatigue due to falling asleep whilst watching video content (YouTube/TikTok).
Borderline social interaction	Minors who, despite being "physically together", do not communicate, being completely absorbed by their individual devices.

Exposure to repetitive content lacking in cognitive stimulation (video loops) accustoms people, regardless of age, to immediate and superficial gratification, making it more difficult to commit to structured forms of learning.

4.4. New frontiers: artificial intelligence as an educational and relational challenge

Among the emerging challenges that this desk research must address with care, the use of generative artificial intelligence by minors—most frequently by pre-teens and teenagers as an emotional and confidential confidant—is probably the most significant.

The most recent data converge in outlining a phenomenon that is already structural. At European level, the EU Kids Online 2026 report [14] ' (Staksrud, Mascheroni et al.), based on a survey involving over 25,000 minors (aged 9–16) across 17 European countries, including 2,170 in Italy, documents that around seven in ten European minors have used some form of generative AI. In Italy, the figure rises to 89%: AI is now part of minors' everyday digital lives.

Particularly significant is the Italian figure on the use of AI for personal matters (24%) and for health and fitness advice (20%). The report also highlights widespread mistrust among minors themselves, who fear that the use of AI may reduce their ability to think independently. As Mascheroni, deputy coordinator of the network and head of the Italian team, points out, gender and age gaps are also emerging, replicating inequalities already observed in internet use.

At national level, the survey conducted on Safer Internet Day 2026 by Generazioni Connesse (with contributions from Skuola.net, the University of Florence and Sapienza) confirms this picture: 26% of secondary school pupils say they use artificial intelligence systems to talk and confide in, especially during times of emotional difficulty. The Save the Children survey finds that 92.5% of adolescents use AI tools, and that for 41.8% of them, AI represents a resource to turn to when they feel lonely or anxious. The 'Cuori e Algoritmi' report by Fondazione Carolina (February 2026) explored this aspect in depth, defining it as the 'emotional use of artificial intelligence'. Internationally, research by Common Sense Media involving 1,060 teenagers (aged 13–17) found that 72% had used an emotionally supportive chatbot at least once, 52% do so regularly, and 33% prefer to confide in AI about serious issues rather than in real friends.

This phenomenon raises issues that go far beyond online safety in the traditional sense. Conversational AI does not merely present risks related to privacy or exposure to inappropriate content: it profoundly intersects with the relational and emotional development dimensions. Chatbots offer certain features that make them attractive as conversation partners – constant availability, non-judgemental nature, immediate

[14] https://eucpn.org/document/eu-kids-online-final-report

responses, apparent empathy – but these very features make them problematic from an educational perspective. The absence of conflict, frustration, authentic reciprocity and physicality means that interaction with AI does not develop the relational skills that are cultivated through human relationships: dealing with rejection, negotiation, tolerance of ambiguity, and the ability to read non-verbal cues.

Serge Tisseron, in his recent talk in February 2026, emphasised how artificial intelligence adds a further layer of educational complexity beyond the simple management of screens: AI makes mistakes, and everyone – adult or minor – bears a responsibility for how they guide and use it. The sycophancy of chatbots (the tendency to please the interlocutor, avoiding disagreement) is particularly insidious with adolescents, because it reinforces a worldview in which meaningful relationships are those devoid of friction – exactly the opposite of what growing up requires.

For parents, the challenge is twofold: on the one hand, understanding a phenomenon that in most cases they do not know and do not experience first-hand; on the other, developing the ability to talk to their children about an experience that for many teenagers is already an integral part of their emotional daily life. The guiding question posed in the Italian national desk research ("What would you do if you discovered that your child was using AI to confide secrets they don't tell you?") touches precisely on this crux.

The interviews and focus groups reveal that Artificial Intelligence is viewed with ambivalence: on the one hand, it is already a silent presence in the home (Alexa, Google Home), but it is feared for its impact on schoolwork.

Although it is perceived as an advantage for the speed of research, parents' fear is that of "a decline in reasoning skills" that turns minors into individuals incapable of independent thought (the "goats" mentioned in the Milan focus group).

Added to this is the risk that AI might become an 'empathetic confidant'; thanks to increasingly human-like interfaces, teenagers might prefer conversing with an algorithm rather than an adult, seeking 'reliable' and non-judgemental answers. In Poland, there is also discussion about the need to balance analogue and digital reading to preserve the ability to concentrate and read deeply.

The educational challenge unfolds on three fronts: preventing AI from becoming a shortcut that bypasses critical analysis; transforming schoolwork from production to the critical review of machine-generated outputs; and safeguarding the relational space that the algorithm risks occupying in place of the adult.

In addition to AI, there is concern about the so-called 'loop' of low-value content (unboxing, 'Brain Rot'), which creates an addiction to repetitive stimuli, stripping digital time of any creative value.

Young people are already using artificial intelligence to simplify their studies, create content on TikTok and, surprisingly, sometimes as **a sounding board for emotional outbursts**. They have also expressed fears that they cannot fully control the impact these technologies are having on society, on the way we learn and on human relationships. More generally, they feel that digital technology and AI are profoundly changing the way people develop tastes, identities and relationships. (see Focus Group on young people).

Tools and intervention strategies

The most effective strategy is that of co-learning, in which the parent is not the technical expert but a companion in discovery. Among the practical tools:

- **Digital Agreements and the 'Parenting Licence'**, promoted by the MEC Association, which formalise family negotiations. A practical example is the 'Time Cake': a visual exercise in which parents and children draw together how to divide the day between online activities, leisure, sport and offline time;
- **Urban Games**, inspired by the model in the Rione Sanità district of Naples: physical activities in the neighbourhood (QR codes, hashtags, cooperative challenges) to debunk fake news or transform discriminatory language into messages of citizenship;
- **Intergenerational workshops**, in which young people act as facilitators to reduce parents' performance anxiety.

To be effective with adults, gamification must be meaningful, brief (max 30–40 minutes) and focused on cooperative problem-solving, not competition.

The relationship between video games and education is a topic that requires careful consideration in the context of desk research, because parental common sense tends to oscillate between two equally problematic extremes: demonisation (video games as a source of addiction and isolation) and underestimation (video games as neutral entertainment that does not merit educational attention).

Scientific research paints a more nuanced picture. As previously noted, Tisseron has explored the cognitive and relational potential of digital gaming, emphasising that the decisive factor is not the medium itself but the context in which it is used: a video game played together, discussed, and placed within a range of different experiences has profoundly different effects from the same game played in isolation and without limits. Research on gamification in education has documented how game mechanics (progressive challenges, immediate feedback, storytelling, collaboration) can be effective tools for learning and engagement, provided they are designed with pedagogical intent. This has direct implications for the Digital Parents project on two levels. In terms of communication with parents, it is important to provide tools to distinguish between different types of digital play experiences and to assess their quality, moving beyond both indiscriminate alarm and indifference. In terms of project methodology, the adoption of the Urban Game as an intergenerational educational tool is consistent with the evidence that play – including digital play – can be a powerful vehicle for learning when it is accompanied, shared and embedded in a context of critical reflection.

Integrating theoretical frameworks: from the 3As to bi-literacy in the age of AI

The theoretical frameworks presented in section 1.2 (Floridi, Wolf, Tisseron, Livingstone) converge on a vision of digital education for parents that can be summarised in the following operational principles, which are also useful as a guide for the subsequent phases of the project (Guidelines and Urban Game). Digital is an environment, not a tool: Floridi's onlife perspective requires us to move beyond the rhetoric of 'screen time' as the sole metric, and instead focus on the quality of experiences and the ability to navigate a hybrid environment consciously.

Cognition is built through the diversity of experiences: Wolf's proposal on bi-literacy and Tisseron's on Alternance converge in emphasising the importance of a rich and varied repertoire of cognitive, sensory and relational experiences.

Support is relational, not technical: Tisseron (Accompaniment), Livingstone (active mediation), General Comment No. 25 of the CRC (evolutionary capacities) and Wolf's research all converge in indicating that effective parental mediation is not based on the adult's technical competence, but on the quality of the educational relationship and the ability to engage in dialogue.

Autonomy is the goal, not the threat: Tisseron's self-regulation and the CRC's principle of evolving capacities converge in defining the educational goal not as 'protecting from risks' but as progressively building the skills to manage risks autonomously.

AI changes the parameters: the relational and confidential nature of adolescents' use of AI, documented by EU Kids Online, Generazioni Connesse and Fondazione Carolina, necessitates an update to existing educational frameworks, incorporating reflection on the quality of relationships (human vs. simulated), algorithmic sycophancy and awareness of simulated empathy.

4.5. Towards an educational community

The aim is not disconnection, but the transformation of the digital realm from a place of conflict into a space for connection. This requires a collective response: digital agreements between families and institutions, certification programmes for parents and validated methodologies that move beyond the logic of emergency.

Comparison between Countries and Best Practices

Country	Distinctive Approach and Best Practices	Key References
Italy	**Community Digital Pacts:** agreements between families, schools and institutions (Gui) to delay smartphone use and create support networks, reducing social pressure.	Marco Gui, IC Cagliero, Associazione 303
Italy	**Educational Contract:** use of blogs (*educaredigitale.it*), board games and rule generators to manage the introduction of devices into the family.	Daniele Catozzella
Croatia	**Focus on Life and Gender:** in-depth analysis of the impact of algorithms on masculinity and identity; active fatherhood programmes.	Natasa Vajagic, Stipe Nogalo, Alisa Aliti Vlasic
Latvia	**Libraries as Learning Hubs:** successful intergenerational projects such as 'Grandparents – Grandchildren', where young people teach digital skills to older people.	Gulbene Library, Gulbene School
Spain	**Cibermentores:** a service-learning methodology in which students themselves train their peers and parents.	Raquel Fernandez Alvarez
Turkey	**Ministerial collaboration:** practical toolkits, seminars in schools and community centres based on real-life case studies (fact-checking).	Ergün Aksoy
Poland	**Digital Wellbeing and Neuroscience:** focus on cognitive balance; school practices such as the use of 'bins' for phones during lessons.	Katarzyna Bednarska, Maÿgorzata Radojiyïÿ

Successful methodologies: all stakeholders agree that traditional lectures do not work. Practical workshops, short formats (micro-learning), a playful approach (gamification) and peer-to-peer discussions where parenting challenges are normalised prove to be effective.

The voices of young people

Key points emerge from focus group sessions with young people held in Italy and Latvia:

The perception of the 'Onlife' dimension

Young people do not view the digital world as a separate realm. Although they spend a lot of time online (mainly on TikTok, Snapchat and Instagram), they state that the most important experiences remain those lived in person. However, they admit that what happens online profoundly influences their mood, especially in relation to shocking news (such as war) or negative comments from people they know.

Time management and 'doomscrolling'

There is a strong awareness of their own addiction. Many young people describe the mechanism of 'doomscrolling' (endlessly scrolling through videos) and the sense of frustration or 'regret' over wasted time. Some go so far as to delete apps (such as TikTok) as a form of self-protection, whilst others admit to using their phones late into the night, negatively affecting their sleep.

A critical relationship with parental rules

Young people perceive adults' rules as inconsistent or unclear. They point out sarcastically that it is often the parents themselves who are 'absorbed' by their devices at mealtimes or during their free time. This leads young people to develop strategies to get round the restrictions (e.g. finding out their parents' passwords to extend their screen time).

Privacy, Security and Trust

The loss of privacy is the risk that causes the most concern. In the event of serious problems (e.g. blackmail or bullying), boys and girls tend to turn first to their friends and only rarely to their parents, for fear of being judged or that adults will 'worry too much' without really understanding the situation. There is also a persistent myth about data expiry (e.g. believing that everything disappears after 24 hours, as on WhatsApp).

AI as a tool and confidant

Artificial Intelligence is used daily to 'do homework for them' or to explain complex concepts in a simple way. However, a use of AI as emotional support is emerging: some young people turn to it for advice on how to handle arguments with friends, whilst acknowledging with unease that they cannot fully trust a machine.

Advice from children to parents

In summary, young people are asking adults not for more control, but for a listening ear and understanding. They suggest that parents:

- make it clear that they can be a safe haven in the event of online problems, promising to understand rather than punish;
- not give them a smartphone too early (ideally not before Year 3 or the age of 13 for social media);
- set an example by reducing phone use in the presence of their children.

5. Collection and Analysis of Good Practices

The case studies and best practices presented in this chapter are the direct result of field research: the selection of 30 best practices (both national and European) stems from reports, methodological guidelines and concrete experiences that emerged during qualitative interviews with stakeholders and focus groups with parents.

In this way, each practice analysed addresses a specific need or a critical issue raised by participants during the research.

5.1. Good practices: a reasoned summary

Relational and Dialogic Practices (Focus: Communication)

Talking circles: facilitating meetings between parents to share vulnerabilities and educational strategies. *Implementation:* Create self-help groups facilitated by a moderator to normalise difficulties and reduce isolation (Source: Aliti Vlasic).

Non-judgemental intergenerational dialogue: taking time to listen to children's digital experiences. *Implementation:* Asking the child to show content that moves them, maintaining a stance of curiosity rather than judgement.

Family psychological mediation: use specialist counselling to manage conflicts arising from addiction. *Practical steps:* Contact integration centers to restore face-to-face communication disrupted by device abuse (Source: Bednarska).

Co-management of the experience: navigating minors' digital spaces together. *Practical steps:* Set up accounts together and discuss privacy settings as an act of care, not spying. (Also watch films and TV series, choose games ...)

Active and authentic listening: Validate the emotions experienced online by boys and girls. *Practical steps:* Do not downplay an argument that took place on WhatsApp; treat it with the same respect as a conflict that occurred at school.

Deconstructing gender stereotypes: critically analysing models of social 'perfection'. *Practical steps:* Examine influencers' profiles together to identify photo editing and toxic narratives of motherhood (Source: Vajagic).

Role reversal (Reverse Mentoring): let children teach technical skills to adults. *Practical application:* Ask young people to explain how a new app works, valuing their technical expertise (Source: Gulbene Ed.).

Analysis of Onlife Identity: reflect on the continuity between the physical self and the digital self. *Practical application:* Discuss as a family how an offensive online comment carries the same weight as a public verbal insult.

Technical and Contractual Tools (Focus: Regulation)

Educational Contract: draw up a written agreement between parents and children. *Practical application:* define rights (weekend use) and responsibilities (no smartphones at the table) in a document signed by both parties (Source: educaredigitale.it).

Online rule generator: use interactive tools to create household rules. *How it works:* visit the generatore di regole on *educaredigitale.it* to receive a personalised form based on the minor's age.

Domowe Zasady Ekranowe (House Rules): establish 'tech-free' zones and times. *Procedure:* identify physical areas of the home (e.g. the bedroom) where devices are prohibited at night (Source: sexed.pl).

Active Parental Control: use technical filters as an educational 'bridge'. *How to do it:* install monitoring software, explaining to your child its temporary protective function, aimed at future independence.

Dinner Zone: collective switching off of devices during meals. *Practical steps:* use a shared container ('parking station') where the whole family places their phones before eating.

Shared password management: educate on personal data security. *Implementation:* create strong passwords together and explain the importance of never sharing them with third parties, not even friends.

Limiting constant connectivity: reduce tasks requiring round-the-clock internet access. *Practical steps:* schools should schedule online activities for the weekend, allowing for parental supervision (Source: Gui).

Anonymous accounts and pseudonyms: protecting the visual identity of minors. *Practical steps:* encourage the use of avatars or neutral images instead of real photos for gaming and social media profiles (Source: Radojičić).

Educational and Recreational Practices (Focus: Skills)

Collaborative gaming (Minecraft): use the game for shared problem-solving. *Practical approach:* take part in a gaming session to understand your child's dynamics of collaboration and creativity (Source: Catozzella).

TikTok Mapping: analyse how algorithmic feeds work. *Practical steps:* look together at which videos are suggested and discuss the criteria the algorithm uses to grab attention (Source: Vajagic).

Algorithm training: teaching how to 'clean up' one's feed. *Practical steps:* show the child how to click 'not interested' or block toxic content to retrain the algorithm to show valuable content.

Fact-checking (Fake News): practical fact-checking exercises. *Practical approach:* take a viral news story and search together for three different sources to confirm or refute its veracity.

Digital Storytelling: creating positive, creative content. *Practical application:* working together to create short videos or memes that showcase a family passion, transforming the child from a consumer into a creator.

Urban Exploration (Pokémon GO): integrating technology and physical activity. *Practical activity:* using augmented reality apps to discover city monuments or parks, whilst maintaining a connection with the physical space (Source: Mickiewicz-Florczak).

Safety quizzes: fun family competitions on digital risks. *Practical approach:* organise small family competitions on how to recognise a phishing attempt or a suspicious link.

Bilingual Reading **Routine:** alternating reading media. *Implementation:* dedicating 20 minutes to reading on paper to train deep concentration and 10 minutes to digital research for quick summaries.

Community and Institutional Practices (Focus: Social Network)

Community Digital Pacts: agreements between groups of parents. *Implementation:* sign class pacts to collectively delay smartphone use, countering social pressure (Source: Gui).

Parent Networks**:** support networks for educational resilience. *Practical steps:* create WhatsApp groups for parents dedicated exclusively to mutual support in 'digital detox' choices.

Scouting and Outdoor Activities: radical experiences of disconnection. *Action:* encourage participation in nature camps where devices are restricted to rediscover offline socialising (Source: Salski).

School-Family Joint Responsibility Agreement: incorporate digital guidelines into official documents. *Action:* ask the school to include a ban on smartphones and limits on online homework in the School Education Plan (POF).

Paediatric Collaboration (Digital Guardians): involvement of GPs. *Implementation:* ask your paediatrician for advice on digital health (vision, sleep, posture) from the very first months of your child's life.

Visual awareness campaigns: posters highlighting the impact of digital distraction. *Implementation:* promote campaigns showing how excessive smartphone use by parents fragments their attention towards their children (Source: Jurek).

5.2. Innovative methodologies

Gamification and playful learning as engagement tools (introduction to the Urban Game approach).

Why play — connecting to the project's theoretical framework

The theoretical frameworks outlined in Chapter 1 of this desk research converge on a vision of digital parenting that is relational, progressive and experiential. Tisseron's three As — Accompaniment, Alternation, Self-regulation — reject both prohibition and passive acceptance in favour of guided, shared experience. Livingstone's active mediation points to the quality of the adult-child relationship, not the adult's technical expertise, as the decisive factor. Wolf's bi-literacy argues that deep cognitive skills are built through a diverse repertoire of experiences, not through information alone. And General Comment No. 25 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child frames the educational objective not as protection from risk, but as the progressive building of the child's own capacity to manage risk.

Playful learning is not at odds with any of these frameworks — it is their natural methodological expression. Play is by definition a shared, exploratory, low-stakes environment in which participants can take risks, make mistakes and reflect without the pressure of judgement. These are precisely the conditions under which Tisseron's Accompaniment becomes possible, Livingstone's active mediation becomes concrete, and Wolf's alternation between cognitive modes can be practised rather than preached.

Tisseron himself, in his work exploring the educational potential of digital gaming, is explicit on this point: the distinguishing factor is not the medium but the context. A game played together, reflected upon and embedded in a diverse repertoire of experiences has profoundly different effects from the same game played in isolation and without limits. The Urban Game is designed precisely around this principle.

Urban games, as a playful experience, are the tool with the potential to tackle disengagement issues. In the Urban Games community, we often say it is a pity that adults stop playing at some point – even though we all have a need to play throughout our lives, not just in childhood. Urban Games – with their sports/competition, role-play and exploratory elements – have often succeeded in engaging adults in play.

Playful learning and Urban Games as a methodology

Playful learning / game-based learning — learning that takes place through play and games, where the game itself serves as the vehicle for educational content. Urban Games fit squarely into this category, although they do not always include purely educational content.

An Urban Game is not a digital game played outdoors, nor a standard treasure hunt. It is a structured participatory experience that uses the city — its streets, buildings, institutions, histories and communities — as a learning environment. Participants move through physical space, encounter real situations and people, solve challenges that require both online and offline navigation, and reflect on what they have experienced. The game is inherently social: it requires collaboration, negotiation and communication between participants. It is inherently onlife: it does not treat the digital world as a screen to be managed, but as part of the fabric of everyday urban life. Digital devices are widely used in urban games, but a physical presence, the real world and offline interactions are always at the heart of the experience.

This methodology directly addresses several of the good practices identified in Chapter 5 of this report. The 'Digital Orienteering and Urban Games' good practice (using Actionbound to create educational treasure hunts integrating online and offline elements) and the 'Pavedieni Experience' (an educational team game for families that uses printed and digital resources to solve mysteries) both reflect the same underlying logic; moreover, Urban Games (or Field Games) are also one of the main methodologies used in scouting (as stated by Antoni Salski). The Urban Game in Digital Parents builds on this existing European evidence and adds an explicit intergenerational and media literacy dimension.

Gamification: what it means and what it is not

The term 'gamification' is frequently misunderstood, and it is worth being precise. Gamification does not mean turning everything into a game, nor does it mean adding points and badges to existing content. For the purposes of this project, gamification refers to the deliberate use of game mechanics — challenges, narrative framing, progressive difficulty, immediate feedback, collaborative reward structures — to increase engagement and sustain motivation throughout a learning experience.

The desk research findings support several specific choices regarding which mechanics to prioritise for a parent and family audience. The stakeholder interviews make it clear that competition is counterproductive: parents who feel they are failing in front of others disengage. Collaborative mechanics, in which families work together towards a shared goal, are far more effective. Similarly, challenges must be achievable: early tasks should

build confidence rather than expose gaps. Progressive difficulty — introducing complexity gradually — is especially important given the anxiety many parents feel about the subject.

Design principles for the Urban Game and challenge system

Drawing on both the desk research findings and Topografie's practice, the following principles should guide the design of T4.1 (challenge system) and T4.3 (Urban Game Manual):

Onlife design. Challenges must deliberately blur the online/offline boundary, reflecting Floridi's framework that underpins this project. A challenge that asks a family to find a physical location in their city connected to a viral online story, or to co-create a short video about a neighbourhood that they then discuss in terms of what they would and would not share publicly, is more effective than any exercise that treats digital life as a separate domain to be managed.

Safe failure. Game design must normalise not knowing. This is especially important when parents are less digitally confident than their children — which the data show is more common than parents admit. The game should be structured so that the parent's lack of technical expertise is not a disadvantage but a starting point for genuine intergenerational dialogue. Instructions, facilitation language and scoring should all reflect this.

The debrief is the learning moment. Research on game-based learning consistently shows that the reflective conversation after the game — not the game itself — is where the deepest learning occurs. This is especially true for sensitive topics such as data privacy, cyberbullying, AI companions and algorithmic manipulation of content, all of which emerge as priority themes in this desk research. The Urban Game Manual must allocate significant time to the debrief phase and provide facilitators with structured questions for each challenge theme.

Intergenerational parity. The Urban Game should be designed so that children and parents bring different but equally valuable knowledge to the experience. Children often know the platforms; parents often know the neighbourhood. A challenge that requires both kinds of knowledge fosters genuine collaboration rather than reproducing the dynamic — documented throughout this report — in which one generation lectures the other.

Low-tech fallback. The game and challenges should incorporate both digital and offline design – firstly to offer offline activities as an alternative to online ones, and secondly to

simply serve as a fallback for participants who may lack access to technology or the necessary skills.

Connecting to the wider project

This section feeds into both WP3 and WP4. The Guidelines document (T3.1) will include, as specified in the project application, a dedicated section on gamification as a tool for parent engagement: the evidence base for that section is compiled here. The challenge system (T4.1) and Urban Game Manual (T4.3) implement the design principles set out above, grounded in both the theoretical frameworks of Chapter 1 and the qualitative findings of Chapters 4 and 5.

The Urban Game approach developed by Topografie also ties in with a broader strand of good practice identified in this report: the use of community spaces — the library, the neighbourhood, the school playground — as venues for media education. The Gulbene Library model, the Rione Sanità Urban Game cited in section 4.5, and the Digital Orienteering examples all point in the same direction. Media education for parents works best when it meets families in the spaces they already inhabit and trust, rather than asking them to enter a new institutional setting. The city is that space. The Urban Game is the methodology that makes it a learning environment.

5.3. Critical analysis

What works and what are the main obstacles to engaging vulnerable families/Effective methodologies for family engagement

The mapping of good practices and the results of the interviews enable us to identify both the factors that make media education interventions with families effective and the specific barriers that hinder the involvement of those in the most vulnerable circumstances.

What works

A number of cross-cutting principles emerge from the experiences analysed. Effective interventions share certain common characteristics: they are short and flexible in format (micro-learning, short video clips, 30-40 minute sessions rather than long courses), a feature embodied by the practice of micro-learning via WhatsApp/Telegram, which reaches parents through the tool they already use daily, and confirmed as a successful format in Generazioni Connesse's Immersive Practical Workshops, which immerse parents in the platforms so they can understand them from the inside; they start from concrete, everyday problems, not theoretical content (as Knez Radolovic observes, parents engage with media education when they need to solve a real-life problem), a founding principle of the Educational Contract promoted by educaredigitale.it, which offers parents a personalised rule generator based on their children's age and the family's specific circumstances; they adopt a co-learning approach in which the adult is not required to be an expert but is involved as a companion in discovery, as demonstrated by collaborative gaming (Minecraft) and TikTok Mapping, in which parents and children explore the algorithmic logic of the platforms together, moving from control to shared understanding; value the knowledge of young people through reverse mentoring, as in the Gulbene Library model where young people train parents and grandparents, but also in the Spanish Cibermanagers programme by PantallasAmigas, in which students themselves raise awareness among their own families, a strategy that Catozzella recognises as capable of transforming young people's 'technological advantage' from a source of intergenerational conflict into an educational resource; create spaces for peer discussion where parenting difficulties are normalised, reducing feelings of guilt and isolation—a role fulfilled by 'Talking Circles' facilitated by a mediator and 'Parent Networks', practices that research identifies as particularly effective in the Italian context, where informal peer support compensates for the fragmentation of institutional services noted by Rampani.

As Rampani points out, parents often express a genuine sense of helplessness: they do not ask for theoretical manuals, but for practical tools and spaces where they can feel

less alone. This observation is confirmed by Gui, who highlights how Community Digital Pacts work precisely because they transform an individual educational choice into a collective commitment, reducing the social pressure and isolation of the individual parent. Bruno also emphasises that the 'Verification Gap' — the gap between perceived and actual digital skills — is not bridged by imparting theoretical information, but through practical experiences in which adults experience the dynamics of the platforms first-hand. The short, workshop-based format is therefore not merely a practical choice, but an epistemological condition: competence is built through experience, not through reading. Croatian stakeholders, and in particular Vlasic from Roda – Parents in Action, document how this evidence holds true even in cultural contexts very different from Italy's, reinforcing the transnational scope of these principles.

These principles are not specific to vulnerable families: they are the very conditions that make any media education intervention with adults effective. The difference lies in the barriers to access.

The obstacles

Families in situations of socio-economic or cultural vulnerability, or isolation, face specific obstacles that media education programmes rarely address in a structured way.

Time is the first barrier: families in precarious employment situations do not have the time required to participate in training courses, especially if these involve travel or fixed timetables. As Radolovic observes, parents from the most vulnerable families only engage with the issue in emergency situations, not due to a lack of interest but because of priorities and daily pressures. Trust in institutions is the second: the most vulnerable families are often those with a more distant or distrustful relationship with schools and services, and tend to engage only in emergency situations. Rampani describes the phenomenon as a "disarming naivety": many families do not recognise themselves in the typical user profile of media education initiatives and do not feel addressed by institutional messages; Vlasic emphasises that this distance is particularly marked in families with a low level of education or a history of exclusion from educational services. Language and cultural references act as a further barrier for families with a migrant background, for whom standard educational materials may prove inaccessible or culturally alien — a barrier that Aksoy systematically addresses in her work by developing practical toolkits based on real-life cases rooted in the everyday contexts of the families involved. The material digital divide – unstable connections, shared devices, a lack of suitable domestic spaces – limits participation in initiatives that require technological access which not all families have; the technology lending schemes for schools and libraries identified in the mapping of European best practices represent a concrete

response, but these remain isolated initiatives. Finally, the perception of need: when daily priorities are tied to subsistence, housing or work, media education is not perceived as urgent. As Catozzella notes, even before Covid-19, there was a lack of awareness of the problem even among families with greater cultural capital; for families in vulnerable circumstances, this disconnect tends to be structural rather than merely circumstantial.

Strategies

The most promising examples emerging from the research suggest some strategies for overcoming these barriers.

Go where families already are: incorporate media education sessions into settings that families visit for other reasons — the paediatric clinic (the 'Digital Guardians' model, which involves GPs from the first months of a child's life), community centres, school events not specifically dedicated to digital topics, places of worship. This reduces the barriers of travel and initial motivation. The Gulbene Library model, which issued as many as 344 digital competence certificates in 2025 by integrating training into the library's regular activities, is a prime example of this principle: families are not summoned to discuss a specific topic, but digital competence is built within an existing context of trust, as highlighted by Jefimova, head of the Gulbene Library. Catozzella and Rampani confirm that the same logic applies in Italian youth centres and parish spaces, where digital topics can be introduced within activities that families already attend for other reasons. The Giovanni Cagliero Comprehensive School in Rome offers a further variation: the post-emergency 'Circles of Conversation' initiated by the school following critical incidents transform a moment of crisis into a learning opportunity, reaching even families who would not have participated in a preventative programme.

Using informal, low-threshold channels: the educational snippets via WhatsApp or Telegram, cited as best practice, are effective precisely because they do not require advanced digital skills, travel or a significant time commitment. They reach parents via the tool they already use daily. This strategy is consistent with the views of Italian stakeholders: Rampani, Bruno and Catozzella agree that parents with lower cultural capital need interventions that meet them in their daily lives, not programmes that require further mobilisation of resources. The Custodi Digitali project applies this logic particularly effectively, incorporating short messages promoting digital health into paediatricians' routine communications — an approach that reaches families who would never have actively sought out a media education programme. Polish stakeholders, in particular Katarzyna Bednarska and Anna Jurek of the SPUNK Foundation, report that similar formats also work effectively in school settings, where short podcasts or videos sent to parents' class groups significantly lower the barrier to accessing digital education topics.

Building horizontal networks among parents: Community Digital Pacts and 'parent consortia' act as tools for inclusion because support comes from peers, not institutions, thereby lowering the threshold of mistrust. Marco Gui has documented how these pacts — born out of collaboration between the University of Milan-Bicocca and the MEC Association — have been successful precisely in communities where social pressure to conform was strongest: the pact transforms an individual choice into a collective decision, neutralising that pressure and creating a context of mutual support that also encompasses the most vulnerable families, who on their own would not have had the strength or legitimacy to make the same choice. Support groups facilitated by professionals, as in the practice documented by Alisa Aliti Vlasic of Roda – Parents in Action, add a layer of shared processing that normalises difficulties and reduces the sense of isolation. The Latvian experience of the Gulbene Library with the 'Grandparents-Grandchildren' programme also shows that horizontal networks can span generations, building educational alliances that extend far beyond the immediate family unit.

Involving cultural mediators and bridge-builders: for families with a migrant background, cultural and linguistic mediation is not an add-on but a prerequisite. Aksoy and the Croatian stakeholders highlight that practical toolkits and seminars based on real-life cases work much better when led by individuals who share the cultural context of the target families. The practice of non-judgemental intergenerational dialogue, which values the narration of lived experiences as a point of entry, lends itself particularly well to an intercultural approach. Catozzella notes that Save the Children Italy has developed programmes specifically tailored for families with a migrant background, in which reflection on digital issues is interwoven with that on cultural transmission and identity, transforming a potential barrier into a narrative resource. In Poland, Ida Mickiewicz-Florczak of Fabryka Równości notes that intercultural mediation is particularly relevant when addressing sensitive issues such as online gender stereotypes, where families' underlying cultural values may come into conflict with the content of the educational intervention.

Design for accessibility, not for the target audience: the most effective strategy is not to create 'special' programmes for vulnerable families — which risk stigmatising them — but to design all tools with a structural focus on accessibility: flexible timetables, multilingual or visual materials, short formats, low entry barriers, and free access. This principle is embodied by the MEC Association's Digital Parenting Licence and the European Pix Parents programme, which offer modular courses adaptable to different starting levels without requiring any technical prerequisites. As Franceschini from the Sara di Pietrantonio Anti-Violence Centre points out, families in vulnerable situations often need not specialised materials but learning environments where they feel safe and unjudged —

precisely the same condition which, as all the research shows, makes media education effective for any type of family. The Polish Domowe Zasady Ekranowe and Power of Zero's First Device Family Toolkit are further examples of tools designed to be universally accessible, reaching vulnerable families not through a targeting approach but through the inherent simplicity of the format. Stakeholders across all partner countries agree on one point: universal access is not merely an ethical choice, but the methodologically soundest strategy for ensuring the reach and impact of the intervention.

6. Summary of the results of the stakeholder interviews

6.1. The experts' perspective

From interviews with key stakeholders, it emerges that teachers and educators are on the front line but often lack the tools needed to manage the complexity of the 'onlife' dimension of young people's lives. The training needs identified by experts concern not only technical skills, but above all a shift in pedagogical and relational paradigms.

Bridging the gap in technical and pedagogical skills

Stakeholders agree that there is a structural shortfall in the training of educational staff:

- lack of specific skills: many educators do not possess the skills needed to use digital tools effectively and, above all, to integrate them correctly into daily educational practice. Often, the training received is limited to technical aspects, neglecting digital ethics and online citizenship;
- transversal skills and source verification: teachers express a strong need to acquire tools for fact-checking and verifying the authenticity of images and news. This is considered an essential teaching skill for guiding pupils in school research and group work;
- systematisation of digital skills: Daniele Catozzella emphasises that schools should play a role in systematising the skills that pupils already develop informally (e.g. problem-solving in games such as Minecraft), transforming them into structured learning.

The need for new teaching and organisational strategies

Training must respond to the need to rethink the way we 'do school' in a connected world:

- adjustment of workloads: Marco Gui highlights the need for teachers to limit online homework that requires a constant internet connection in the afternoons, to avoid forcing families to rush their children's digital independence or to hand over passwords without supervision;
- managing distraction and concentration: teachers observe a significant decline in the ability to concentrate due to the excessive use of short-form video formats (TikTok, Reels) which 'quickly stimulate the mind' but make in-depth reading difficult. Educators need training on how to balance analogue and digital reading (the concept of the 'biliterate brain');

- adult role modelling: there is a need to reflect on the behaviour of adults themselves. Some teachers report feeling 'guilty' about using their smartphones in the corridors when this is prohibited for pupils, suggesting the need for self-regulatory guidelines that also involve school staff.

Training in mediation with families

A crucial training need concerns educators' ability to act as a bridge between school and family:

- involving parents: educators need resources to involve parents in classroom activities on topics such as data and artificial intelligence, extending the educational debate beyond the school walls;
- shift from control to shared responsibility: experts suggest that teachers should be trained to promote 'Digital Agreements', transforming the management of technology from a confrontational/prohibitive approach to one of educational partnership and negotiation.
- support for 'distant' parents: a complex challenge for educators is finding informal ways to engage with those families who are less involved or in disadvantaged situations, who would most need support with digital mediation.

Methodological approaches and barriers

Stakeholders clearly indicate which training formats are considered most useful:

- no to lectures: purely theoretical and didactic training is perceived as ineffective. Practical workshops are needed where adults can 'physically enter' young people's digital environments (e.g. TikTok or gaming platforms) to understand their inner workings;
- intergenerational collaboration: experts propose 'reverse mentoring' models, where young people themselves train teachers and parents on web languages and trends, bridging the gap and demystifying technology;
- logistical obstacles: a lack of time and the extreme fatigue of school staff represent significant barriers to participation in long or complex training programmes. For this reason, flexible tools such as micro-learning (short video clips/podcasts) are required.

7. Conclusions and future developments

7.1. Summary of key findings and preliminary recommendations

Towards a new intergenerational media education

This desk research has explored the state of the art in digital parenting and media education for adults through document analysis, interviews with 26 stakeholders in five partner countries, and focus groups with families, minors and young people. The results converge into five key messages that run across all the contributions gathered.

First: the 'onlife' condition as a paradigm.

The distinction between online and offline life has lost its meaning in the daily lives of families. As highlighted both by the theoretical framework (Floridi) and by the testimonies gathered in the focus groups, the digital realm is not a separate space into which minors 'enter', but the constitutive environment of contemporary experience. This implies that educational approaches based on the separation between a 'safe' real world and a 'dangerous' virtual world are structurally inadequate. Parents interviewed in all partner countries, albeit with different nuances, share this perception: the digital world is already everywhere, in the bedroom as well as in the school playground, and the challenge is not to keep it out but to learn to inhabit it together.

Second: from surveillance to support.

The research documents a clear consensus, both among experts and among the most informed parents, that educational strategies based exclusively on control (monitoring, time restrictions, technical filters) produce limited and sometimes counterproductive effects. Qualitative data show that minors respond to strict bans by developing evasive strategies (secondary accounts, browsing in unsupervised settings, sharing devices with peers), whilst parents who adopt active mediation (discussing content, sharing experiences, negotiating rules) observe better results both in their children's ability to manage risks and in the quality of family relationships. This is consistent with Livingstone's research on parental mediation and with Tisseron's 3A model. The operational distinction between engagement and policing emerges as the central educational issue: accompanying without monitoring, protecting without isolating.

Third: bi-literacy as a citizenship skill.

Wolf's research on the bi-literate brain, incorporated into the desk research both as a theoretical framework and as a key to interpreting the field data, highlights that the cognitive challenge posed by digital technology does not concern only minors. The

erosion of deep reading skills also affects adults and has direct implications for the ability to resist disinformation, to exercise critical thinking and to engage in complex reasoning processes. For parents, this means that bi-literacy is not a goal to be imposed on children from the outside, but a shared educational challenge, requiring an awareness of one's own cognitive transformations and a willingness to develop daily practices that alternate between digital and analogue.

Fourth: artificial intelligence as a relational challenge.

The data collected documents a phenomenon that is already structural and rapidly expanding: the use of generative artificial intelligence by minors as an emotional and confidential confidant. Data from EU Kids Online 2026 (89% usage in Italy), Generazioni Connesse (26% using AI to confide in), Fondazione Carolina and Common Sense Media converge to paint a picture in which AI is no longer merely a technical tool but a companion to whom adolescents attribute a significant supportive role. The main risk lies not in the use itself, but in the substitution dynamic: when interaction with AI does not complement but progressively replaces engagement with human interlocutors (parents, peers, educators), the adolescent loses opportunities to practise the relational skills that only a relationship with another person – in all its unpredictability and effort – allows to develop. This poses unprecedented educational challenges that go beyond traditional online safety: the sycophancy of chatbots (the tendency to please the interlocutor), simulated empathy, the absence of authentic reciprocity and constructive conflict risk offering an impoverished relational model precisely at the stage of development when relational skills are formed. For parents, who in most cases do not know or experience this phenomenon first-hand, the challenge is twofold: to understand and to engage in dialogue.

Fifth: the need for an educational community.

The research strongly suggests that digital parenting cannot be treated as the sole responsibility of the family. Stakeholders across all partner countries agree on the need for structured educational partnerships between families, schools, local services and institutions. Community Digital Pacts, experiences of intergenerational peer education (such as the model of the Gulbene Library in Latvia), and co-learning pathways between parents and children represent promising models that the project can promote and develop. The approach is not one of emergency response (intervening when the problem arises) but of structural prevention and the building of widespread skills.

7.2. Preliminary recommendations

Based on the results of the desk research, the following preliminary recommendations are formulated, differentiated by area of intervention. These recommendations are intended to guide both the project's subsequent activities (Guidelines and Urban Game) and the broader debate on digital parenting at European level.

For parents and families

Adopt age-appropriate mediation strategies: in early and middle childhood, direct co-navigation (exploring content together, sharing the on-screen experience, establishing rules of use) is the most effective form of support. In pre-adolescence, mediation gradually shifts from shared presence to dialogue about content and experiences; it is no longer 'let's browse together' but 'tell me what you've seen, what do you think?'. In adolescence, active mediation takes the form of critical discussion and relational openness: the parent neither controls nor co-navigates, but maintains an open space for dialogue in which the adolescent knows they can bring up doubts, problems or difficult experiences without fear of a punitive reaction. The aim is for this support to gradually transform into self-regulation, in line with the principle of evolving capacities in the CRC and Tisseron's 3A model.

Investing in family bi-literacy: establishing daily practices that alternate between digital and analogue experiences (reading aloud, physical play, exploration, conversation) not as a punishment or deprivation, but as an enrichment of the cognitive and relational repertoire of the whole family.

Recognising AI as a presence already in children's lives: opening a dialogue on the use of chatbots not with an attitude of alarm or prohibition, but with curiosity and a willingness to listen, starting from an understanding of what children are seeking in these interactions and what they may not find in existing human relationships.

Participate in educational networks and agreements: mindful digital parenting is also built through dialogue with other parents and educational institutions. Community Digital Agreements and co-learning experiences provide a context for normalising challenges and sharing strategies.

For educators and educational institutions

Integrate media education as a cross-curricular skill, not as an additional subject: media and digital education is not limited to an hour of 'digital citizenship' but cuts across all subjects and all educational relationships, including the personal example set by adults.

Train in mediation with families: educators need specific skills to involve parents in the digital education process, moving beyond the logic of emergency communication (calling parents in when there is a problem) in favour of structural and preventive cooperation.

Adopting active and participatory methodologies: lectures and theoretical textbooks prove ineffective with both parents and minors. Practical workshops, gamification, micro-learning and reverse mentoring (where minors train adults) are the methodologies that research identifies as most effective.

Rethink homework and educational activities from an 'onlife' perspective: schools should consider the impact of their organisational choices (online homework, use of platforms, digital communications) on families' digital balance, avoiding the imposition of premature digital autonomy.

For policy-makers and institutional stakeholders

Translate the guidance in Article 4 of the AI Regulation into concrete programmes: the Regulation recognises AI literacy as a widespread necessity and encourages Member States to promote it at all levels, including training and education. This guidance remains largely unimplemented. The findings of this desk research (which document an already structural use of AI by minors, often with emotional significance unknown to adults) reinforce the urgency of training initiatives dedicated to parents and educators. The Digital Parents project offers a model of what this translation might mean in practice.

Adopting an intersectional approach to media education for families: data collected across the five partner countries confirm that socio-economic, geographical, gender and disability-related inequalities significantly influence both access to digital resources and the quality of parental mediation. Families in vulnerable situations are those most in need of support and with the least access to available educational tools. Digital literacy policies that do not take these differences into account risk widening inequalities rather than reducing them. The Digital Parents project integrates this dimension into its research methodology, the criteria for selecting good practices and the design of tools, and the results can help guide national policies that are more attentive to inclusion.

7.3. Input for the subsequent phases of the project

The results of the desk research directly inform the two main subsequent activities of the Digital Parents project: the drafting of the Guidelines for parental involvement (WP3) and the design of the Urban Game (WP4).

For the Guidelines (WP3), the desk research provides the theoretical basis (onlife perspective, 3A model, bi-literacy, rights-based approach) and the empirical basis (results of interviews, focus groups and the mapping of good practices) upon which to build operational recommendations tailored to national context, children's age group and family type. In particular, the Guidelines must translate the five key messages emerging from the research into practical and accessible guidance, avoiding both technical jargon and excessive simplification.

For the Urban Game (WP4), the desk research provides both thematic content (the priority themes to be addressed in the challenges: disinformation, AI, privacy, digital identity, online relationships) and methodological guidance (the characteristics that make gamification effective with adults: brevity, meaningfulness, cooperation, problem-solving orientation). The good practices mapped in Section 5, and in particular the experiences of digital orienteering, educational treasure hunts and collaborative gaming, offer concrete models from which to start designing the challenges.

The challenge for the next phases of the project is to translate the richness and complexity of the desk research findings into tools that are both scientifically sound and operationally accessible. The aim is not to produce yet another handbook for parents, but to build educational experiences that put into practice the principles emerging from the research: co-navigation, intergenerational dialogue, digital and literacy skills as a daily practice, critical awareness of AI, and the building of learning communities.

8. Annexes

8.1. List of stakeholders involved.

Surname	First name	Role	Organisation	Country
Aksoy	Ergün	Director	Information and Study Centre, Riga Technical University	Turkey
Bednarska	Katarzyna	Professor of Applied Linguistics	University of Łódź	Poland
Bruno	Nicola	Founder and Media Expert	DataNinja	Italy
Catozzella	Daniele	Media Education Manager	Save the Children Italy	Italy
Dobrotic	Ivana	Department of Social Policy	Faculty of Law, Zagreb	Croatia
Fernandez Alvarez	Raquel	Teacher	IES Antonio Machado Madrid	Spain
Franceschini	Chiara	Head	CAV Sara di Pietrantonio	Italy
Fucile	Anna	Director	IC Giovanni Cagliero - Rome	Italy
Gui	Marco	Professor of Sociology	University of Milan-Bicocca	Italy
Jefimova	Sabīne	Head	Gulbene District Library	Latvia
Jurek	Anna	Founder and Youth Educator	SPUNK Foundation	Poland
Lupoli	Raffaele	Editor-in-chief	Economiacircolare.com	Italy
Mickiewicz-Florczak	Ida	Chair of the Board	Fabryka Równości	Poland
Minervino	Francesco	Member	Time Bank	Italy

Nogalo	Stipe	Project Coordinator	Status M NGO	Croatia
Pluša	Aija	Special Needs Teacher	Gulbene Education Department	Latvia
Radojičić	Małgorzata	Teacher Content creator	Primary School No. 83 in Łódź TuCzytam YouTube channel	Poland
Radolovic	Jasena Knez	Coordinator of Parenting Projects	Roda - Parents in Action NGO	Croatia
Rampani	Alessandra	Psychologist	Spazio Pensiero	Italy
Rutinowski	Torsten	Head	Service for International Youth Work, City of Bochum	Germany
Salski	Antoni	Instructor	Polish Scouting Association	Poland
Silauniece	Liena	Headteacher	Gulbene District Secondary School	Latvia
Stībele	Valērija	Head	Gulbene District Youth Centre Bāze	Latvia
Vagule	Aiga	Deputy Head	Gulbene Education Department	Latvia
Vajagic	Natasa		No SH/T network – Network against Sexism, Homophobia and Transphobia in the media	Croatia
Vlasic	Alisa Aliti	Project Manager and expert on digital parenting	Coglobal and Roda - Parents in Action NGO	Croatia

8.2. Good practice analysis sheets.

Below are 20 examples of good practice that emerged from discussions with the stakeholders interviewed and the network of associations involved in the project in the countries concerned.

Community Digital Pacts: Collective agreements between parents to establish shared rules on digital progression, developed through collaboration between the University of Milan-Bicocca and the MEC Association.

Link: pattidigitali.it

Family Digital Agreement: A tool for negotiation between parents and children to define 'tech-free' times and spaces, promoted at European level.

Link: klicksafe.de/familiemedienvertrag (also available via educaredigitale.it)

'Grandparents - Grandchildren' Project: A Latvian intergenerational mentoring initiative where young people teach digital skills to their grandparents.

Link: drossinternets.lv (reference portal for online safety in Latvia)

Cibermanagers (or Cibermentores) Programme: Developed by PantallasAmigas, it uses *Service-Learning* to train students to raise awareness among their families.

Link: cibermanagers.com

Immersive Practical Workshops (TikTok and Gaming): Sessions where parents explore the platforms to understand how they work from the inside, as proposed in the **Generazioni Connesse** courses.

Link: generazioniconnesse.it

Digital Orienteering and Urban Games: Use of the **Actionbound** app to create educational treasure hunts that integrate online and offline elements.

Link: actionbound.com

Pavedieni Experience: An educational team game for families trialled by Gulbene Library that uses printed and digital resources to solve mysteries.

Link: gulbenesbiblioteka.lv

Open Parents Project: A toolkit offering cooperative play experiences (e.g. mystery-solving) to do at home with children to help parents overcome 'digital performance' anxiety.

Link: openbox.is (parent platform of the Open Box project)

Domowe Zasady Ekranowe (Home Screen Rules): A Polish portal (FDDS Foundation) offering visual guides to establishing transparent digital rules at home.

Link: domowezasadyekranowe.fdds.pl

Digital Driving Licence (Internet-ABC / Surfing Licence): A German initiative for children and parents to obtain a 'licence' for responsible internet use.

Link: internet-abc.de

Digital Guardians Project: An alliance between doctors and parents to promote digital health from early childhood through advice from paediatricians.

Link: custodidigitali.it

Logout Now - Digital Detox Village: An experience of disconnecting in nature that offers craft workshops as an attractive alternative to online life.

Link: logoutnow.it

Think and Click Programme (Razmisli pa klikni): A Croatian initiative by the RODA association to integrate media literacy with child development.

Link: roda.hr

My Father's Legacy (Ostavština mog oca): A method for reflecting on educational heritage and male identity, adapted to facilitate dialogue between fathers and sons on digital content.

Link: status-m.hr (the organisation that manages the method in Croatia)

Micro-learning via WhatsApp/Telegram: Sending short video clips or podcasts (2–3 minutes) to parents' class groups, a strategy recommended to reach parents who are less involved.

Post-Emergency Discussion Circles: A support method implemented by schools (such as the IC Giovanni Cagliero) following critical incidents to transform the crisis into a shared learning experience.

Link: icgcagliero.edu.it

Digital Week and Media Literacy Week: National themed weeks offering free practical workshops in libraries and schools.

Link: eprasmes.lv (Digital Week Latvia) / medijpratiba.lv

ZHR Scouting (Digital Detox): Scouting activities as a structured form of 'detox' and offline growth promoted by scout associations in Poland.

Link: zhr.pl

EPALE / Many Parents Project: European resources for family psychological mediation related to digital addictions.

Link: epale.ec.europa.eu

Digital Parenting Licence (MEC Association): A training course leading to a certificate for families engaged in digital citizenship.

Link: associazionemec.it

Below are a further 10 best practices analysed at European level on this topic, useful for complementing what has already been discussed.

Pix Parents (France): A digital skills training and certification platform designed specifically to help parents support their children. It includes modules on cyberbullying, parental controls and screen time management.

Link: pix.fr/actualites/pix-parents

Digi-Nauts (Council of Europe): A series of videos on digital citizenship aimed at young children, parents and educators. Each episode is accompanied by practical activities to reinforce the key messages.

Link: coe.int/en/web/digital-citizenship-education/digi-nauts

Ora de Net (Romania): An initiative by the Romanian Safer Internet Centre that promotes the creative and safe use of the internet through educational resources and the direct involvement of young people to empower families.

Link: oradenet.ro

Utržené Sluchátko (Czech Republic): A child-friendly podcast featuring peer-to-peer discussions on online safety, facilitating family dialogue on complex topics.

Link: linkabezpeci.cz/pribehy/podcast-utrzene-sluchatko

First Device Family Toolkit (Power of Zero): A practical toolkit designed for families preparing to give their children their first digital device, with a focus on kindness and respect online from early childhood.

Link: powerofzero.org/resources

Trend Micro Cyber Academy: An interactive platform offering lessons and resources to teach children (and their parents) about cybersecurity and online privacy protection in a fun way.

Link: trendmicro.com/internet-safety

Je protège mon enfant (France): A French government portal that brings together resources and practical tools to help parents manage screen time and ensure children's safety.

Link: jeprotegemonenfant.gouv.fr

Project MeLi - Media Literacy for Parents: An Erasmus+ project that has developed a multilingual guide (including Italian) for parents, focusing on developing critical thinking regarding media messages.

Link: meli4parents.eu

Tech lending programmes: A recommended practice for schools and libraries involving the loan of tablets or laptops to families for educational use, thereby reducing the digital divide and promoting the co-managed use of devices.

Link: better-internet-for-kids.europa.eu

Workshop "Creating the media device of the future" (MyAppEduc): A workshop activity in which parents and children imagine and design the devices of the future together, discussing how technology has changed over time and what real-world problems it could solve.

Link: myappeduc.eu

9. Bibliography

Books and academic articles

- Buckingham, D. (2003). *Media Education: Literacy, Learning and Contemporary Culture,* Polity.

- Floridi, L. (2014). *The fourth revolution: How the infosphere is reshaping human reality*. Oxford University Press.

- Floridi, L. (2015). *The onlife manifesto: Being human in a hyperconnected era*. Springer.

- Livingstone, S., Mascheroni, G., & Staksrud, E. (2017). Maximising opportunities and minimising risks for children online: The role of digital skills in emerging strategies of parental mediation. *Journal of Communication, 67*(1), 82–105.

- Masterman, L (1985). *Teaching the Media*, Routledge

- Rivoltella, P. C. (2014). *Smart future: Teaching, digital media and inclusion*. FrancoAngeli.

- Rivoltella, P. C. (2020). *New alphabets. Education and cultures in the post-media society*. Scholé.

- Tisseron, S. (2016). *3-6-9-12. Growing up in the age of digital screens*. La Scuola.

- Tisseron, S. (2026). *Screens: A guide to informed parenting*. Érès.

- Wolf, M. (2007). *Proust and the squid: The story and science of the reading brain*. Harper.

- Wolf, M. (2018). *Reader, Come Home: The Reading Brain in a Digital World*. Harper.

Reports and grey literature

- Common Sense Media. (2025). *Talk, trust, and trade-offs: How and why teens use AI companions*.

- Fondazione Carolina. (2026). *Adolescents and chatbots: Artificial relationships and educational risks*.

- Fondazione Carolina. (2026). *Hearts and algorithms: Artificial intelligence and emotional development*.

- UNICEF. (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*.

- UN Committee on the Rights of the Child. (2021). *General Comment No. 25 on children's rights in relation to the digital environment*.

Recent studies

- Barzilay, R., et al. (2026). Adolescents' emotional reliance on AI companions: Implications for mental health. *Journal of Adolescent Health*.

- Vaterlaus, J. M., et al. (2026). "It listens better than people": Teen perceptions of AI companions. *Computers in Human Behavior*.

European frameworks

- *DigComp 2.2: The digital competence framework for citizens*. European Commission. (2022).

- *DigComp 3.0: The digital competence framework for citizens (5th ed.)*. Joint Research Centre. European Commission. (2025).

Bibliography

educaredigitale.it – Educational contracts and rule generators.

drossinternets.lv – 'Save Internet' portal for online safety.

https://www.commonsensemedia.org/– Reviews and family media plans.

https://sexed.pl/– Integrated emotional and digital education.

https://domowezasadyekranowe.fdds.pl/ - Polish guide to household rules.

https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-child

Project name: "Digital Parents: Raising Children in a Onlife Age"

Agreement number: 2025-1-IT03-KA220-YOU-000351360

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA).

Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.