Rights, Respect and Responsibility in Hampshire County

RRR and Resilience Report

Katherine Covell, PhD & R. Brian Howe, PhD

Children's Rights Centre

Cape Breton University

September, 2011

Background

It has been our privilege to assess the implementation and effects of the *Hampshire Rights Respect and Responsibility Initiative* (RRR) since its early inception in 2002 and official launch in 2004. Building on our work in Nova Scotia, and guided by the vision and commitment of John Clarke and Ian Massey of the Hampshire Children's Services, RRR is now widely seen as a world leader in programs of children's human rights education.

Historically, human rights education in schools has been contextualized within human rights instruments such as the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights – an instrument impelled by the atrocities of the Second World War -- that are largely of relevance to adults (Tibbits, 2002). Pupils, often at the secondary school level, learn the importance of the right to be free of torture or persecution, the right to freedom of speech, the right to the basic necessities for human dignity, and concurrently the need for social justice (Brabeck & Rogers, 2000). And, with notable exceptions (e.g., Amnesty, UK), human rights education has tended to focus on historic rights violations such as the Holocaust and other genocides with little generalization to contemporary concerns (Gaudelli & Fernekes, 2004). The importance of such teachings cannot be overestimated. However, what has been missing – and remains missing in many education jurisdictions -- is the teaching of human rights that are of direct relevance to children in the present and that are aimed at elementary level. Children are much more likely to be receptive to learning about rights and social justice is more likely evoked, if children have already learned that they themselves have rights, if they have experienced the value of having those rights respected, and, of course, if they are engaged in school. Children's rights education in which children are recognized as contemporaneous citizens and taught about their own rights from the earliest years does just that

Children's rights education describes an approach to schooling that has at its core the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. It has the following four additional characteristics. First, its pedagogy, consistent with article 12 of the Convention, is democratic and systematic opportunities for participation in all aspects of school life are provided to the children. Second,

it aims, consistent with article 2, to promote success and engagement in all children regardless of their personal, family, or neighbourhood characteristics. Third, to attain consistency with articles 29 and 42, it ensures that the curricula are age and culture appropriate, are engaging to students, include human rights and children's rights, and address the development of the whole child (physical and social as well as cognitive). Fourth, to be in the child's best interests (article 3), school policies and practices are rights-based, inclusive, and evidence-based. In practice, children's rights education is a whole school approach comprising teaching children about their rights in a developmentally appropriate and supportive environment that respects those rights. Rights are incorporated into each subject taught, making lessons of immediate relevance to the student, and allowing for self-interest while promoting empathy and the motivation to respect the rights of others (Howe & Covell, 2005). School governance, including the articulation of rights-based behavior codes and classroom pedagogy, is democratic with children being provided opportunities for meaningful participation. Positive peer interaction is encouraged through the use of small group role-play and cooperative learning. When fully implemented, Hampshire's RRR exemplifies children's rights education.

Previous Evaluations of RRR

Our initial formal assessment of the RRR took place between 2005 and 2008 with 18 schools (5 infant, 5 primary, and 8 junior schools) representing a variety of geographic and socioeconomic contexts. Each of these schools was eager to implement the RRR. However not all were fully successful. This allowed the identification of factors that facilitated the extensive school reform that was necessitated by the RRR. Of primary importance was the extent to which the school head teacher showed leadership, commitment, and planning (Covell, Howe, & McNeil, 2010). In turn, successful leadership in implementing the RRR was related to an understanding that RRR must be at the core of the school culture providing an overarching framework into which all school functioning, teaching practices, and other related school programs and policies fit. The differential levels of success in implementing RRR allowed us to identify its effects on pupils and teachers by providing appropriate comparison groups. Schools that fully implemented RRR – referred to below as RRR schools – experienced many positive outcomes which are summarized

below (Covell, 2010; Covell & Howe, 1999; 2001; 2005; 2008; Covell, Howe, & MacNeil, 2008; Covell, McNeil & Howe, 2009; Howe & Covell, 2009; 2010).

Understanding of Rights and Responsibilities. Children, even the youngest infants, who were in RRR schools understood the nature of rights and their inextricable link with responsibilities. It is perhaps important to stress here that the emphasis should be on teaching children about their rights, not their responsibilities. Nonetheless, the connecting of rights and responsibilities is very positive in that when children learn about their own rights, they learn the importance of all children's rights being respected. They come to spontaneously appreciate that they must accept responsibility for upholding the rights of other children (for full discussion on this issue see Howe & Covell, 2010a).

Unlike older children who were able to talk about rights using abstract concepts such as equality and justice, children aged 4 to 7 years were concrete in their descriptions. But they reflected understanding. For example '(rights) *allows children to have a good life and not be hurt*." And in describing the meaning of responsibility, only children in RRR schools talked about their responsibilities in terms of people. For example: "*The most important responsibility is to make sure everyone has their rights*." Children in the less rights-consistent schools talked about responsibility toward objects – for example, looking after toys, or being careful with books.

Achievement. Teachers and head teachers in RRR schools reported improved learning styles among the children. They commented in particular on increased levels of self-regulation, confidence, effort, and motivation. Teachers provided many examples of children's increased use of critical thinking, persuasive argument, decision-making, and collaborative learning. The changes were described by one as a change from passive thinking to active questioning. These changes were reflected in marked and steady increases in children's achievement scores on the standardized assessment tests (SATs) since the implementation of the RRR.

School Engagement. Engagement was defined broadly to include its cognitive, behavioral, and affective dimensions: children's academic effort, enjoyment in school, positive behaviors, participation, peer and teacher relationships, and perception of overall school climate. Engagement was assessed both with teacher reports of students' levels of engagement, and with student self-report among those aged 9 to12 years. Both reported increased levels of engagement. To confirm these findings, we undertook a larger scale study using the self-report measure with almost 1300 students across the district. The findings from this study showed that compared with their peers, those in the RRR schools perceived a more respectful and fair and safe school climate, had more positive relationships at school, and participated more in learning and school committees and activities. In addition, more positive comments were made about their school. An interesting difference emerged in the type of comments children added to their surveys. Positive comments from the children in RRR schools focused on the school climate and the good relationships among peers, teachers, and administrators. Positive comments from children in the comparison schools centered on the physical resources of their school, for example, their sports equipment.

Behaviors. Teachers in RRR schools reported significant improvements in behaviors. Pupils were reported to be more cooperative with each other, more inclusive and more sensitive to the needs of children with learning difficulties, and more respectful in general. Incidents of bullying and other inappropriate behaviors decreased over time. It was noted that when the children had disagreements, they often used rights discourse to settle them. In consequence, most schools demonstrated a decrease in exclusions.

Participation. Perhaps the most important change seen in RRR schools was in the amount of participation allowed by teachers and in the increased participation by pupils. From the perspective of the school administrators, the most significant changes in teachers were in their use of democratic teaching, positive classroom management, and in less confrontational dealings with their students. Teachers were listening to children and taking their views into account. And the children's respect for their teachers increased as they knew that they were

being heard. As a result of increased participation and engagement, teachers in RRR schools reported significant reductions in job-related burnout over time.

One intriguing finding in our data was that the positive effects of RRR were more pronounced in the schools in very disadvantaged neighborhoods. In such schools, absences and behavioral incidents decreased markedly; and test scores, motivation, and self-regulation in learning and behavior increased significantly. RRR it seems is of disproportionate benefit to disadvantaged students. In one school, for example, between 2002 and 2008, the number of exclusions dropped from 101 days (2002-2003) to 31 days (2005-2006) to 2 in 2007-2008. Over the same time period, test scores were steadily rising. Students' aggregate SATs scores increased from 133 in 2002-2003, to 231 in 2005-2006, and to 243 in 2007-2008. We decided to systematically test the extent to which RRR affected disadvantaged pupils by comparing those attending a very disadvantaged RRR school, Woodview School[1], with two other schools – one which was similarly disadvantaged but had not adopted the RRR (Riverview School) and one which was well-resourced school, in a socioeconomically advantaged neighborhood, and had adopted the RRR (Hillside).

We found that compared with their peers at Riverview and Hillside, the disadvantaged children at Woodview reported significantly higher levels of engagement in school (Covell, Howe & Polegato, 2011). This meant that compared with the children at both other schools, they perceived their teachers to be more supportive and they rated their school climate as more positive and respectful. It meant also that their level of participation, academic motivation, and effort was higher than the children in the other two schools, and that the relationships among students and staff were more positive. We also made comparisons between the two disadvantaged schools. Here we found that compared with Riverview students, Woodview students reported more positive self-concepts, fewer social problems such as bullying and fighting at school, more optimism about their futures, more commitment to stay in school longer. Moreover, the SATs scores between the advantaged Hillside students and the

[1] Pseudonyms are used for all schools to preserve anonymity of research participants.

disadvantaged students at Woodview were almost indistinguishable. The percentage of students who achieved expected or better scores in math, science, reading, and writing was respectively Woodview: 83, 88, 84, and 50; Hillside: 82, 92, 94 and 49; and Riverview: 43, 50, 46 and 29. In summary, the students from Woodview showed a socio-demographic profile that largely paralleled those from Riverview, and an achievement profile that paralleled those from Hillside.

Educational Resilience

The findings led us to question whether the effects of the RRR are robust enough to promote educational resilience. Educational resilience describes the likelihood of success in school among students who are at risk of failure because of personal and social circumstances (Martin & Marsh, 2006; Peck et al, 2008). Difficulties at home, including socioeconomic adversity and ineffective parenting, are strongly linked with problems at school (Call & Mortimer, 2001; Crosnoe & Elder, 2004; DeBruyn, 2005; Dubow et al, 2009; Schoon et al, 2004). In turn problems at school often are associated with behavioral maladjustment or depression (Chun & Mobley, 2010; Frojd et al, 2008). Challenging family or school circumstances are particularly predictive of problem behaviors when they are in evidence prior to age 12 (Zimmer-Gembeck & Helfand, 2008). Schools can build resilience by what Masten and her colleagues (2001; 2008; 2009) refer to as "ordinary magic" – essentially, the promotion of problem-solving and self-control skills, the provision of a supportive school climate, and evidenced-based interventions that reduce bullying and discrimination – with optimal success when efforts are made early. Student participation in school may be particularly important. Students who are highly involved in school show increased attendance and fewer problem behaviors (Barber et al, 2001; Eccles & Barber, 1999; Martin & Marsh, 2006). And participation provides opportunities for the child to develop the skills that Masten and others (e.g., Masten et al, 2008; Peck et al, 2008; Zucker, et al, 2008) have identified as fundamental to resilience: self-control and the promotion of problem-solving through exercising developmentally appropriate autonomy and exploring educational opportunities. In a supportive school climate, participation enhances commitment to learning, problem solving and achievement, academic aspirations, engagement in school, self-esteem, and optimism for the future (Covell, 2010; Covell & Howe, 2008; Finn & Rock,

1997; Fredricks & Eccles, 2006, 2008; Jennings, 2003; Martin & Marsh, 2006; Pancer et al, 2007; Peck et al, 2008). Participation is especially effective when students are also involved in school governance (Howe & Covell, 2005; Pancer et al, 2002).

The components of the RRR at Woodview are consistent with the factors that promote educational resilience – the ordinary magic. What we were interested in assessing, then, was whether the changes in motivation and achievement that were observed at Woodview, would endure across the normally difficult transition to secondary school and promote educational resilience. Without the RRR, the adverse living circumstances of the Woodview pupils would predict a very difficult transition, a decrease in achievement, low aspirations, and school failure (Schoon et al, 2004; Woolley & Bowen, 2007).

The most significant transition in schooling occurs between childhood and early adolescence (11 to 13 years). Adjustment difficulties at this time are common among most children, but they are particularly pronounced among students from disadvantaged backgrounds (Cauley & Javanovich, 2006; Humphrey & Ainscow, 2006; Plunkett et al, 2008; Reyes et al, 2000), and especially those who are disengaged from school (Crosnoe & Elder, 2004). During the first few years of secondary schooling, a substantial number of disadvantaged students show declines in school engagement and achievement, and increases in problem behaviors such as substance abuse, criminal offending, early pregnancy, and early school leaving (Roeser et al, 2008; Stone et al, 2008). If the effects of RRR are short lived, a band-aid rather than an inoculation, with the challenges that accompany the transition to secondary school, these at-risk disadvantaged pupils would be expected to revert to the more common pattern of underachievement, disengagement, and behavior problems. If robust, then we would expect the pupils from Woodview to continue to show patterns of engagement that are comparable to their more advantaged peers from Hillside.

Current Research

The current research was designed to assess the capacity of the RRR at the primary or junior school level to promote educational resilience during the first two years of secondary school among disadvantaged pupils. We have assessed two cohorts of pupils from each of Woodview, Hillside, and Riverview as they have transitioned to one of three secondary level schools.

We first note that there have been two methodological difficulties that make difficult the interpretation of the findings, which nonetheless have been promising. The first difficulty concerns the variations in the secondary schools which the pupils from Woodview, Hillside and Riverview attend. The differences among the three schools are particularly apparent in the percentage of students qualifying for free school meals (FSM) – the most common marker of poverty. Halycon has 5.4 % FSM, Waverly has 10 % FSM, and Schaller has 16% FSM. Pupils from Woodview for the most part are attending Schaller Secondary School. This school, in addition to having a relatively high rate of poverty among its students, is under-resourced, in great need of renovation, under pressure to improve outcomes, and appears to be somewhat preoccupied with security. It has not implemented the RRR. The most disadvantaged of the junior school pupils, then, predominantly are at the most disadvantaged of secondary schools. Students from Hillside and Riverview largely are attending Waverly and Halcyon Schools. In sharp contrast to Schaller, these two schools are relatively advantaged and each has implemented the RRR. Waverly is the only one of the three secondary schools to have reasonable representation from each of the three elementary level schools; however the predominance of pupils from Hillside indicate that a within school comparison would not be reliable. The second difficulty is the high rate of attrition (51%) that was experienced with the first cohort who was assessed in 2010 (Year 6 in 2009, and Year 7 in 2010). We had no way of knowing if the children had gone to secondary schools other than the target three or simply did not wish to participate further in the research. A related problem with the high attrition rates of 2010 were that resultant numbers preclude within cohort analyses this year. Nonetheless, early indications from those data were that the Woodview pupils had maintained their high levels of school engagement and enthusiasm through the difficult transition period of Year 7.

Methodology

During the month of June, 2011, using on-line surveys and small mixed-sex focus group discussions, we assessed the progress of the Year 7 and 8 pupils at Waverly, Halcyon and Schaller Schools whose Year 6 had been spent at either Riverview, Woodview, or Hillside School. A total of 139 pupils completed the surveys, of whom 76 were female and 63 were male. Eighty-four pupils were in Year 8 (45 female and 39 male), and 55 (31 female and 24 male) were in Year 7. Schools attended in Year 6 and at this time are presented in Table 1 in Appendix 2. The surveys included the following measures: level of school engagement (subscales: participation, rights-respecting climate, academic orientation, interpersonal harmony), career aspirations, risk behaviours, time spent in physical and sedentary activities, parental involvement in school, self-esteem, social problems at school, optimism, and experiences with bullying. Surveys took 10 to 20 minutes to complete. A copy of the survey is found in Appendix 1. Seventeen separate focus groups were held with a total of 130 pupils, 76 of whom were female, and 54 were male. Focus groups varied in length from 20 minutes to 50 minutes, most being around 30 minutes. We also held key-informant individual interviews with either head teachers or teachers in charge of RRR. These varied from 15 minutes to one hour. Focus and interview questions are in the Appendix.

Results

1. Survey Data

Prior to describing differences obtained in the survey, we reiterate that each of the three target junior schools is disproportionately represented at each of the secondary level schools (see Table 1). This makes difficult disentangling possible effects of the junior school attended and the current school attended. Pupils at Schaller are predominantly from Woodview, so any differences might be attributed to having come from Woodview, or to being at Schaller.

Multivariate analyses on the measures using either the current school or the Year 6 school as the fixed factor (independent variable) yielded no differences. We are, therefore, limiting the

data presented to analyses using the current school as the fixed factor. Interpretation of data, however, is compromised by the correlation between school attended in Year 6 and Year 7 or Year 8. Descriptive statistics are found in the Appendix 2, Tables 1-8. Differences were found on the following measures. Statistics are presented in Appendix 3.

Engagement. Comparisons of the four subscales of engagement by current school attended showed that there were no significant differences in reported rights-respecting climate, academic orientation, or interpersonal harmony, although it is noteworthy that pupils at Schaller had a higher average score than the other schools on each of these subscales. There was, however, a significant difference in reported levels of participation. Pupils in Schaller School reported significantly more participation than those at Halcyon, and at Waverly. Sex differences were obtained with females reporting greater interpersonal harmony than males.

Parental Involvement. Pupils at Halycon reported significantly higher levels of parental involvement than did those at both Waverly and Schaller. There were no significant sex differences.

Self-esteem. Pupils at Halycon reported significantly higher levels of self-esteem than did those at Waverly. Pupils at Schaller were not significantly different from pupils in either of the other two schools. There were no significant sex differences.

Optimism. As with self-esteem, pupils at Halycon reported significantly higher levels of optimism about their future than did those from Waverly whereas those from Schaller were not significantly different from either. Males reported significantly more optimism about their futures than did females.

Activity. Pupils at Halycon reported significantly more hours spent in physical activity than those at Schaller who, in turn reported significantly more hours spent in physical activity than pupils at Waverly. The same pattern of activity was reported also for school based physical education

indicating that the differences among the pupils in their amounts of physical activity may be a direct result of time spent in school physical education classes. There were also sex differences in reported levels of activities. Females reported spending significantly more hours each day watching television than males, and males reported more physical activity than females. Males also reported more attendance at school physical education classes than did females.

2. Focus Group Data

Pupils. We conducted content analyses on the focus group discussions identifying emergent common themes both by current school and school in Year 6. The responses described here are limited to those which were commonly expressed. Idiosyncratic responses or discussions of personal issues are omitted.

The first question asked pupils to describe what they like about their current school. Answers varied more with the current school attended than with school in Year 6. Pupils attending Halcyon identified the physical and psychological environment (friendly atmosphere, space, and facilities) and the activities. Pupils attending Waverly talked about their classes and the teachers. They particularly liked that their teachers "*try to make it fun, you're not just writing stuff down;* that "*the work gets challenging slowly so you are comfortable*," and that having teachers with particular specialties allowed for more interesting and complex learning. Pupils at Schaller liked having a variety of teachers, house competitions and space. Comparing answers on the basis of which school the children attended in Year 6, the key difference was that pupils from Woodview who were attending Waverly, identified that they liked that the school was rights-respecting.

The second question asked the pupils to describe what they did not like about their current school. Answers here were consistent within groups regardless of their school in Year 6. And there were similarities across schools. At all three secondary schools the pupils identified the school uniform as very uncomfortable, and they expressed their concerns about bullying by older children. Pupils at both Halcyon and Waverly complained of overcrowding and "*getting crushed in stairs*." Pupils at Waverly also complained of a lack of soap in the toilets. Pupils at

Schaller expressed significant dissatisfaction with both the overall school conditions and the teaching staff. They described toilets and classrooms that were in very poor condition, and furniture and equipment that were in great need of repair. The library was closed. Teachers were described as disrespectful, distrusting, punitive, unfair and boring. "*We just sit while she shouts at us and puts things on the board*" one pupil explained as they discussed their lack of voice or opportunities for self-regulated learning. General attitudes were perhaps reflected in the following pupil comments: "*We have to knock on doors to get through and if you knock quietly they don't come, then you knock loud and they yell at you*;" "*There are too many cameras, we are always walking on edge because they are watching us*;" and "*They don't teach us anything, they just annoy us."*

When asked what they remembered most about their Year 6 school, answers were fairly consistent within groups who had attended the same elementary level school. Pupils from Woodview focused on the correlates of RRR. They described excellent peer relationships, for example, "*we all got along well*." They talked about their teachers as "*amazing*", and "*kinder and softer*." And they described the overall environment of respect, one in which there was neither shouting nor bullying, but caring, helpfulness and friendliness. It was particularly interesting that the children expressed their understanding of the link between RRR and the school climate. One child explaining why Woodview had such a good climate said it was because "*at (Woodview), RRR was followed by everyone*." Pupils from Hillside also remembered RRR but had very different memories. They described the RRR as a topic for "boring assemblies", where they were constantly reminded that "*we are a R and R and R school so you should respect each other*." The use of RRR primarily as a behavior control strategy was further exemplified in comments such as "*Most teachers just kept going on about RRR*" and "*at (Hillside) they (the teachers) never listened.*" Positive memories described the school's physical environment, especially the clean toilets. Pupils from Riverview varied in their memories as a function of whether they currently were in Year 7 or Year 8 (Yr 7s had a new head teacher who introduced RRR). Those in Year 7 primarily commented on the smallness of the school; the adjective "horrible" was the most frequently used by pupils in Year 8 regardless of whether

they were referring to the schools physical or psychological environment or staff. The punitiveness and disrespect they remembered is clear in the following example one child provided, "*Hot lunches were cold, and if someone bumped into you and you dropped your lunch there was no more*."

The fourth question, following from the third, asked pupils if there was anything from their elementary school that they wished was at the current school. Again the answers generally were consistent within, and different between, groups from the same Year 6 school. There were, however, two exceptions. Across groups and schools, all children wished they had their friends from elementary school at their current school. Second, among those who were currently attending Schaller, all wished for the toilets from their previous school. Pupils from Woodview wished for the rights-respecting environment and for the teachers there. "*Teachers were kinder and more understanding and they would take the time to listen to you*;" and as one so cogently stated we miss "*the happiness of the teachers."* Pupils from Hillside mentioned the school trips, uniforms and rewards system as what they wished for, Pupils from Riverview, in addition to their friends and the toilets, wished for the sports.

The remaining questions asked pupils to describe what their thoughts on what makes a good teacher, class and school. Recurrent themes across groups in response to each of these questions described issues of social justice, mutual respect, good education, a safe and clean physical environment, and teacher personal characteristics.

Responses categorized under social justice were primarily describing teacher behaviors. Teachers should be non-judgmental, kind, fair, treat everyone equitably, avoid activities with costs, punish only those who misbehave, and respond quickly and effectively to bullying. Some children from Woodview and from Hillside also noted the importance of teachers respecting their rights. On from Woodview, for example, described a good teacher as on who will "*respect you and your rights*." Common among discussion also was that teachers should listen to their pupils and allow them participation.

Similarly the need for mutual respect was focused on behaviors. Pupils wanted clear limitations and boundaries in the classroom and other pupils to behave rather than be disruptive. But they also wanted teachers and administrators to treat them with respect and to listen to them. Being treated with respect was variously defined (by school attended) as meaning no cameras, no shouting, no belittling or being spiteful, maintaining privacy (when a pupil discloses a problem), and understanding that some pupils have limited or differing capacity for work. Teachers, one pupil said, should "*Be fair to everyone in the class and take into account their different learning styles.*" Shouting was the most commonly reported teacher behavior that pupils believed should change. As one said "*Instead of shouting, come and see why you are angry and understand*."

With regard to education, pupils stressed the need for teachers to keep control of classes and pay less attention to misbehaving children, to make lessons interesting and fun, explain things clearly, and to appreciate that some children need extra help, or sometimes forget things. *"Don't*", as one child said, "*just put stuff on the board and say get on with it – explain it in a way we'd understand using examples that we'd know about*." Overwhelmingly, also, the pupils identified participatory and self-regulated learning, group work, and project based learning as far more engaging and likely to result in real learning than rote or other forms of more passive learning. *"It's easier to connect with people and get more work done when working in groups*," explained one pupil. "*Group work is better,"* said a pupil at a different school, *"people get along better, you hear a variety of opinions and get to know people better."* (Such comments, we note, are entirely consistent with the education research literature). A few pupils also talked about the value of work that was challenging but within their capacity.

The need for a safe and clean physical environment was stressed. Particular attention was paid to the need for clean and sufficient toilets with soap available, and for sufficient space in hallways and stairwells to prevent being squashed. Comfortable and affordable uniforms were also identified as important. In addition, many pupils thought sufficient space, colorful classes and an attractive exterior, perhaps with flowers, would make the school more welcoming.

Pupils, across, groups, described the ideal teacher as one who kind, patient and really enjoys teaching. "*Someone who wants to be there, not ones who are paid just to put up with kids or are just doing it for the money.*" And they seemed to have no difficulty identifying such teachers: "(we*) can tell by their body language if they don't want to be there*." They also wanted teachers who had a sense of humour and were happy, able to interact on a more casual friendship basis where appropriate, but with effective behaviour management skills. Interestingly, the pupils seemed to be acutely aware of displaced anger or frustration as exemplified in the following comments: "*Some are really grumpy all the time and take out their feelings on the kids." "Maybe some have a problem at home and don't want to teach and take* it *out on the children." "Some are in a mood when they get to school and take it out on the children and are less patient*.

Adult Key Informants

We held individual interviews with eight key informants. Two of these were from the target secondary schools (we were unable to hold an interview at Schaller); neither was a head teacher but each was in charge of RRR. The remaining six interviewees were head teachers, one was from an infant school, three were from junior or primary schools, one from a secondary school, and one from a special school. The amount of experience each had with RRR varied extensively. Regardless of level of experience with RRR, which school or position within the school, many common themes emerged in the content analyses of informants' responses to the interview questions. These are described here.

When describing their general reflections on RRR, three key themes emerged. One was pragmatic; that the RRR fit well with the school's, or the individual's, ethos and existing approach to education. A second focused on the utility of RRR in providing a common values framework for the school – a means of integrating school policies, practices, and providing a

common discourse. The third was affective; that RRR had been revitalizing or inspirational, providing as one said "*a new sense of direction and passion*."

Four themes emerged in descriptions of the effects of RRR. All were very positive and interestingly one individual astutely noted that the effect was that of "*an evolution rather than a revolution*." One theme was that of an improved school climate. Relationships were said to have improved and the school climate to have become characterized by mutual caring, respect, and support. A second theme concerned improved pupil behavior. Pupils were said to have gained confidence, and to show improved behavior and academic performance. Two of the informants also noted that their school's OFSTED rating had increased as a result of the effects of RRR. A third commonality of response here was in noting that the school had taken on a more global orientation with more staff and pupils more aware of citizenship issues nationally and internationally. Finally, teachers were said to be less stressed and generally happier, and new teachers easier to attract than in the past.

The challenges that had been experienced fell into three categories. One described difficulties of full implementation and concerns about tokenism, or complacency after a certificate was received. As one interviewee said "*We want to live it without doing it for the badge*." A second emergent theme was the difficulty of not being able to gain full support for RRR across the school. Difficulties had been encountered with lunch time staff, new teaching staff, and existing staff who demonstrated a reluctance to accept RRR. The third, and perhaps related, difficulty that was described concerned teachers who perceived RRR to be a useful tool for behaviour management and in consequence limited their involvement with it to attempts to coerce the children to behave.

The answers about future directions were diverse with the exception of one commonality. Increased linkages with schools locally and internationally appeared to be the one common aspiration. Three individuals did comment on the need to stay focused on explicitly teaching rights as well as living them, again expressing concern that RRR may become assumed rather

than pursued, especially among schools who had received the UNICEF level 2 award. "*It is a journey that never stops*", one noted. Individual aspirations included the use of media as an advocacy tool for RRR, the development of resources and activities to facilitate teaching RRR, and a focus on pupil leadership to enable children to become critical thinkers who use rights to guide their decision making.

Summary of Findings

The primary question guiding this research was whether the effects of RRR are robust enough to promote educational resilience among disadvantaged pupils. Our findings suggest that this may well be the case.

First, we note that as would be predicted by their backgrounds, students at Halycon Secondary School reported the highest level of parental involvement, which is a key predictor of engagement in school and achievement to potential, and is strongly linked with family socioeconomic status (Cooper et al, 2010; Jeynes, 2007; Sheldon, 2002; Tazouti et al, 2010). In addition, pupils at Halcyon reported higher levels of self-esteem and optimism than did those from Waverly, more physical activity than students in either of the other two schools and the lowest levels of risk behaviours. In essence, students at Halcyon reported the most physically and psychologically healthy status. Such findings are to be expected given the relative advantage these pupils experience in their families, their elementary schools, and their secondary schools. This is consistent with a wealth of research on the linkage between socioeconomic status and education.

Second, and of major importance, we note that there were few differences between the Halycon and Schaller pupils. Students currently attending Schaller (predominantly from Woodview with its high level of implementation of RRR) were scathingly critical of their present school. Nonetheless, they reported significantly higher levels of participation in school and perhaps surprisingly similar levels of academic orientation and interpersonal harmony, on the

engagement scale compared with pupils from both other schools. Moreover they showed no significant differences from their more advantaged peers at Halcyon on levels of self-esteem or optimism for the future.

Given their extensive criticism of Schaller, we also ran comparisons of pupils from Woodview who were currently attending Waverly with pupils from Woodview attending Schaller. We expected that those at Waverly – who had expressed more satisfaction with their school in the focus group discussions – might report higher levels of engagement in school. This was not the case. Again, there were no differences, but perhaps this was an artifact of the small sample sizes.

Essentially, the differences reported between pupils at Schaller and the other schools were ones related to socioeconomic status. As noted above, pupils at Schaller reported significantly less parental involvement. If we look at the tables of descriptive statistics, it also looks like pupils at Schaller report the least use of bicycle helmets (perhaps because parents have been unable to purchase them) and relatively little involvement in physical activity (partly a function of lack of resources at school, and again likely insufficient family funds available). Moreover, reasons for being bullied are notably different among the three schools. Pupils at Halcyon and Waverly are most likely to report being bullied on the basis of looks. Pupils from Schaller report the most common reason for bullying to be family circumstances – plausibly, again a function of their disadvantaged circumstances. (It should be noted here that small and zero cell sizes precluded the use of statistical analyses so we do not know if these apparent differences are real.)

Overall, these data suggest that the RRR which the students experienced at Woodview has, at the very least, contributed to promoting educational resilience among them. If the RRR was not robust, then the Schaller children would have engaged in more high risk behaviours, had more social problems at school, and decreased levels of school engagement, compared to the pupils at Halcyon.

Although it is possible that the findings are somehow artifactual, the pattern overall suggests not. A question remains as to the differences in the expressed opinions of the Schaller pupils in their focus groups and in their survey responses. While describing the school as boring and punitive in focus group discussions, they report being engaged and even report a higher level of participation than pupils at both Halycon and Waverly in their survey responses. More commonly, focus group discussions confirm quantitative findings and provide valuable insights into survey responses (e.g., Ellis et al, 2009). It could be that the peer pressure in the focus group discussions led to the criticisms of the school. However, although overall the pupils were highly critical, not all were in full agreement on all issues as would be expected if peer pressure was impelling conformity of responses. It is also possible that the criticisms of Schaller came from the degree of difference between it and Woodview. Recall that Woodview, and in particular its teachers and atmosphere, were remembered with a great deal of affection. Their experiences at Woodview, then, may have heightened their awareness of the deficits of Schaller. One further explanation is that although the pupils at Schaller were intensely critical of their school, their experiences with RRR had evoked a level of intrinsic motivation and aspiration for success that overcame their dislike of the particular school. Future research will be necessary to disentangle these findings, and also, of course, to assess the sustainability of school engagement among these pupils.

In summary, the findings point to the importance of RRR in building educational resilience for socially disadvantaged children. By building educational resilience, the RRR in turn increases the odds that these children will experience educational success.

Conclusions and Recommendations

We emphasize that these findings must be interpreted with caution. The uneven distribution of pupils among the secondary schools and the relatively small sample sizes are problematic. In addition, a further obstacle to interpretation results from changes that occurred in school leadership and the provision of RRR at Riverview and Woodview Schools during the time of the research. These changes indicate that the current Year 7s from these schools may have had different experiences with RRR than the current Year 8s. Despite these methodological

considerations, however, we are fairly confident in believing that RRR at the primary or junior school level, when fully and appropriately implemented, can and does promote educational resilience among disadvantaged children. We cannot predict whether the educational resilience is strong enough to be sustained throughout secondary school; that would require continued assessments with the two cohorts of pupils. But we do know that resilience can most effectively be built by reducing the effects of challenging family circumstances in elementary level schooling (Zimmer-Gembeck & Helfand, 2008). And we do know that building resilience is of utmost importance in the early years of secondary school.

As discussed previously, disadvantaged children are of particular risk of having difficulty with the transition to secondary level schooling. The importance of this transition in determining longer term educational and psychosocial outcomes is emphasized by evidence of stability in educational adjustment status between mid-adolescence and adulthood (Schoon et al, 2004). For the most part, efforts to ease the transition have focused on providing short-term programs that introduce the students to their new school in the months prior to transition (e.g., Cauley & Javanovich, 2006; Humphrey & Ainscow, 2006; Wassell, 2007). However, as Humphrey and Ainscow (2006) note, these programs tend to be resource heavy. It is not clear that they are feasible for general use, and there is little evidence of their long term effect. They may simply be too little, too late. However, as evidenced in the RRR, building educational resilience in disadvantaged children throughout elementary school may be more effective for long term successful adaptation and success. Fully implemented RRR, then, should be a goal for all schools.

RRR at the infant, primary, and junior schools has many benefits as previously described. This research suggests it also can build resilience in disadvantaged children. We therefore recommend using the findings of the overall research to encourage the full implementation of RRR in all such schools. The experiences of the adults interviewed for this study may be particularly helpful in assisting others. In addition, RRR should also be fully implemented at the secondary level to reinforce and sustain those benefits. Although the children at Schaller did

not score lower on the measure of engagement or higher on the experience of social problems at school, it seems unlikely that even the most resilient children could maintain their engagement in school when the school and their teachers are perceived to be boring, disrespectful, and punitive.

Our findings also confirm the importance of listening to pupils. Perhaps because of their positive experiences at the elementary level, the pupils were very aware of what makes a good teacher and what makes a good school. Their descriptions of appropriate pedagogy, disciplinary practices, and environment are consistent both with the existing literature and with the rights of the child (Howe & Covell, 2005; Lundy, 2007; Lumby, 2011). We recommend, then, that the voices of the children summarized here be heeded and used for school improvement. Listening to children's perspectives on what is important to them in school, and acting on their recommendations, has the potential to vastly improve their engagement in school and in consequence, their academic achievement (e.g., Ferguson et al, 2011; Hopkins, 2008). As Jacky Lumby found in her study, we also found that there were many pupils who saw their teachers as sources of pressure and dislike and many who saw their lessons as "an imposed endurance of a mysterious ritual without meaning or purpose" (2011, p.257). This is neither necessary nor desirable. Specifically we recommend that pupils and teachers engage in open and respectful dialogue about their perceptions of how learning and management could be improved. An excellent example of the benefits of so doing is provided in the work of Caroline Koh and her colleagues (2009). Like many of the pupils in our sample here, Koh reports that pupils recognized the benefits of and wanted more group work, but their teachers were reluctant to allow. The teachers had questioned the pupils' motivation and competence. After discussion, the teachers and pupils were able to reconcile their differences, group work was allowed, and the pupils carried it out effectively. It seems likely similar dialogue could also reduce the amount of teacher shouting and create a climate in which discipline respects the dignity of each child.

Our final recommendation concerns the need for administrators to pay more attention to the particular difficulties for children from disadvantaged backgrounds. Article 2 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child is quite clear in stating that no child should be discriminated against. This includes on the basis of the child's family circumstances. Article 28 is clear in stating that children have the right to education on the basis of equal opportunity. This means that disadvantaged children should have the same opportunities as others. Yet we find the pupils in these secondary schools expressing their concern about costs of meals and costs of trips. Children are being excluded from participating fully in school life when their family is unable or unwilling to pay for excursions, and children are feeling discomfort for themselves and their friends when they cannot afford a drink or snack. In addition, the data suggest that the more disadvantaged children are not having equal access to physical education or to participation in sports. Under article 29 of the Convention, schools are to be concerned with the development of the whole child – that includes the child's physical self.

These recommendations would be taken care of if all schools fully implemented the RRR. The continued increase in the number of schools interested in implementing the RRR over the past few years suggests that sustaining rights-consistent schooling may be more of a challenge than implementing it. The head teacher and area specialists who we interviewed identified three obstacles to sustainability that are consistent with our observations and past research: complacency, misuse, and tokenism.

Complacency is a threat to sustainability when RRR is understood to be a completed initiative – a "*done that got the certificate*" perception. It needs to be emphasized that RRR is a way of school functioning that of necessity includes ongoing explicit teaching of children's rights as well as rights staying the guiding principle of all school practices. Although the RRR may seem fully embedded, unless it remains explicit and at the top of all school agendas, it may erode.

Misuse – primarily reflected in the use of RRR to coerce children in behaving – teaches children that rights are yet another weapon in adults' arsenal of annoying admonitions. Hillside provides

the exemplar of this problem. The initial implementation of RRR taught children their Convention rights and efforts were made to respect those rights across the time. However, over time, RRR has devolved into what the children described to us in this research as something the teachers "*kept going on about*" to control their behavior.

Tokenism is equally a threat to sustaining RRR because children – especially adolescents – are quick to detect hypocrisy and understandably are repelled by it. This is most often evidenced in the paying of lip service to participation. Meaningful participation – as obligated by the Convention – requires a fundamental change in the power balance between teacher and pupil, and between administrator and pupil. This has not always been easy to sustain. Because of these challenges we recommend that schools monitor their progress and their focus on RRR through the use of a self-evaluation tool that is completed annually.

We end this report as we did the research with the thoughts of pupils at a secondary school about RRR. Although not part of the formal research described here, this school was the most rights- consistent of all we visited. We talked with a mixed-sex and mixed-age group of 12 pupils from Year 7 to Year 10 (12 – 15 years) seven of whom were boys. We asked them to tell us why schools should have RRR. Because, they said:

"*It makes you feel safe and there's always someone to talk to if there's serious stuff."*
"The atmosphere is healthy." "It makes a more inviting school."
"It makes a difference in how kids talk with each other and a much better atmosphere because people feel more accepted." "You respect people who are different to you."
"There's a special connection between the teacher and every student."
"It'll never fully stop bullying because that's what kids do, but there's more awareness and we can talk about it."
"RRR sets a good principle and example and helps with what you want to do and not do and helps you learn right from wrong in an advanced way – you don't get that at home."
"It opens your eyes to the wider issues around the world, not just where you live."

We can think of no better reasons.

References

Barber, B.L., Eccles, J.S., & Stone, M. (2001). Whatever happened to the jock, the brain, and the princess? Young adult pathways linked to adolescent activity involvement and social identity. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 16,* 5, 429-455

Brabeck, M.M., & Rogers, L. (2000). Human rights as a moral issue: Lessons for moral educators from human rights work. *Journal of Moral Education, 29* (2), 167-183.

Call, K.T., & Mortimer, J.T. (2001). *Arenas of Comfort in Adolescence: A Study of Adjustment in Context*. Mahwah, N.J: Erlbaum

Cauley, K.M., & Javanovich, D. (2006). Developing an effective transition program for students entering middle school or high school. *The Clearing House*, *80*, 1, 15-25

Chun, H., & Mobley, M. (2010). Gender and grade level comparisons in the structure of problem behaviors among adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence, 33,* (1), 197-207

Cooper, C.E., Crosnoe, R., Suizzo, M.A., & Pituch, K. (2010). Poverty, race, and parental involvement during the transition to elementary school. *Journal of Family Issues, 31* (7), 859-883

Covell, K. (2010). School engagement and rights-respecting schools. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *40* (1), 39-51.

Covell, K. & Howe, R.B. (2008). *Rights, Respect and Responsibility: Final Report on the Hampshire County Rights Education Initiative.* Available at: http://www.cbu.crc Retrieved: July 1, 2008

Covell, K., & Howe, R.B. (2005). Rights, respect and responsibility: Report on the Hampshire County Initiative. Available at: http://www.cbu.crc Retrieved: July 21, 2008

Covell, K. & Howe, R.B. (2001) Moral education through the 3 Rs: rights, respect and responsibility. *Journal of Moral Education, 30* (1), 31-42.

Covell, K., & Howe, R.B. (1999). The impact of children's rights education: A Canadian Study. *International Journal of Children's Rights, 7,* 171-183

Covell, K., Howe, R.B. & McNeil, J.K, (2010) Implementing Children's Human Rights Education in Schools. *Improving Schools, 13* (2), 1-16

Covell, K., Howe, R.B. & MacNeil, J.K. (2008). If there's a dead rat, don't leave it. Young children's understanding of their citizenship rights and responsibilities. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 38*, 30, 321-339

Covell, K., Howe, R.B. & Polegato, J.L. (2011). Children's human rights education as a counter to social disadvantage: A case study from England. *Educational Research: Special Issue Intercultural, Citizenship and Human Rights Education.* 53 (2), 193-206.

Covell, K., McNeil, J.K, & Howe, R.B. (2009). Reducing teacher burnout by increasing student engagement. *School Psychology International 30 (3),* 282-290

Crosnoe, R., Elder, G.H. Jr. (2004). Family dynamics, supportive relationships, and educational resilience during adolescence. *Journal of Family Issues*, *25*, 5, 571-602

De Bruyn, E.H. (2005). Role strain, engagement and academic achievement in early adolescence. *Educational Studies, 31*, 1, 15-27

Dubow, E.F., Boxer, P., & Huesmann, L.R. (2009). Long-term effects of parents' education on children's educational and occupational success. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 55* (3), 224-249

Eccles, J.S. & Barber, B.L. (1999). Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching band: What kind of extracurricular involvement matters? *Journal of Adolescent Research, 14*, 10-43

Ellis, L.A., Marsh, H.W., & Craven, R.G. (2009). Addressing the challenges faced by early adolescents: A mixed-method evaluation of the benefits of peer support. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 44*, 54-75

Ferguson, D.L., Hanreddy, A., & Draxon, S. (2011), Giving students a voice as a strategy for improving teacher practice. *London Review of Education*, *9* (1), 55-70

Finn, J.D. & Rock, D.A. (1997). Academic success among students at risk for school failure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*,2, 221-234

Fredricks, J., & Eccles, J. (2008). Participation in extracurricular activities in the middle school years: are there developmental benefits for African American and European American Youth? *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, *37*: 9, 1029-1043.

Fredricks, J., & Eccles, J. (2006). Is extracurricular participation associated with beneficial outcomes? Concurrent and longitudinal relations. *Developmental Psychology*, *42*: 4, 698-713

Frojd, S.A., Nissinen, E.S., Pelkonen, M.U.I. et al. (2008). Depression and school performance in middle adolescent boys and girls. *Journal of Adolescence, 31*, 485-498

Gaudelli, W., & Fernekes, W.R. (2004). Teaching about global human rights for global citizenship. *The Social Studies*, 16-26

Hopkins, E.E. (2008). Classroom conditions to secure enjoyment and achievement: the pupils' voice. Listening to the voice of *Everychild matters. Education, 36*, 3-13

Howe, R. B. & Covell, K., (2010). Toward education in the best *interests of the child*. *Education and Law Journal, 20 (1), 17-33*

Howe, R. B. & Covell, K., (2010a). Miseducating children about their rights. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 5* (2), 91-102

Howe, R. B., & Covell, K., (2009) Engaging Children in Citizenship Education: A Children's Rights Perspective, *Journal of Educational Thought 43* (1) 21-44

Howe, R.B., & Covell K. (2005). *Empowering Children: Children's Rights Education as a Pathway to Citizenship.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Humphrey**,** N., Ainscow**,** M. (2006) Transition club: Facilitating learning, participation and psychological adjustment during the transition to secondary school. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *XX1*, 3, 319-331

Jennings, G. (2003). An exploration of meaningful participation and caring relationships as contexts for school engagement. *The California School Psychologist, 8*, 43-52

Jeynes, W. H. (2007). The relationship between parental involvement and urban secondary school student academic achievement. A meta-analysis. *Urban Education, 42* (1), 82-110

Koh, C., Wang, C.K., Tan, D.S., Liu, W.C., & Ee, J. (2009). Bridging the gaps between students' perceptions of group project work and their teachers' expectations. *The Journal of Educational Research, 102* (5), 333-348.

Lundy, L. (2007). Voice is not enough: Conceptualizing article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. *British Education Research Journal, 33 (6),* 927-942

Lumby, J. (2011). Enjoyment and learning; policy and secondary school learners' experience in England. *British Educational Research Journal, 37* (2), 247-264

Martin, A.J., & Marsh, H.W. (2006). Academic resilience and its psychological and educational correlates: a construct validity approach. *Psychology in the Schools, 43*, 3, 267-281

Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist, 56,* 227-238.

Masten, A.S., Herbers, J.E., Cutuli, J., Lafavor, T. (2008). Promoting competence and resilience in the school context. *Professional School Counselling*, 12 (2), 76-84.

Masten. A. S., & Motti-Stefanidi, F. (2009). Understanding and promoting resilience in children: Promotive and protective processes in schools. In T. B. Gutkin & C. R. Reynolds (Eds.), *The handbook of school psychology* (4th ed.) (pp. 721-738). New York: Wiley.

Pancer, S.M., Pratt, M., Hunsberger, B., & Alisar, S. (2007). Community and political involvement in adolescence: What distinguishes the activists from the uninvolved. *Journal of Community Psychology, 35*, 6, 741-759

Peck, S.C., Roeser, R.W., Zarrett, N., & Eccles, J.S. (2008). Exploring the roles of extracurricular activity quantity and quality in the educational resilience of vulnerable adolescents: Variable and pattern centered approaches. *Journal of Social Issues, 64*, 1, 135-155

Plunkett, S.W., Henry, C.S., Houltberg, B.J., Sands, T., & Abarca-Mortensen, S. (2008). Academic support by significant others and educational resilience in Mexican-origin ninth grade students from intact families. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *28* 3, 333-355

Reyes, O., Gillock, K.L., Kobus, K., & Sanchez, B. (2000). A longitudinal examination of the transition to senior high school for adolescents from urban, low-income status, and predominantly minority backgrounds. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 28*, 519-544

Roeser, R.W., Galloway, M., Casey-Cannon, S., Watson, C., Keller, L., & Tan, E.

(2008). Identity representations in patterns of school achievement and well being among early adolescent girls. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *28*, 1, 115-152

Schoon, I, Parsons, S., & Sacker, A. (2004). Socioeconomic adversity, educational resilience, and subsequent levels of adult adaptation. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *19*, 4, 383-404

Sheldon, S.B. (2002). Parents' social networks and beliefs as predictors of parent involvement. *Elementary School Journal, 102*, 301-316

Stone, M. R., Barber, B.L., & Eccles, J.S. (2008). We knew them when. Sixth grade characteristics that predict adolescent high school social identities. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *28*, 2, 304-328

Tazouti, Y., Malarde, A., & Michea, A. (2010). Parental beliefs concerning development and education, family educational practices and children's intellectual and academic performances. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 25*, 19-35.

Tibbits, F. (2002). Understanding what we do: Emerging models for human rights education. *International Review of Education*. Special Issue on Education and Human Rights, *48*, (3-4), 159-171.

Woolley, M.E., & Bowen, G.L. (2007). In the context of risk: Supportive adults and the school engagement of middle school students. *Family Relations, 56*, 92-104

Wassell, C. (2007). Transition: A universal issue. *Pastoral Care in Education. 25*, 1, 49-53

Zimmer-Gembeck, M.J., & Helfand, M. (2008). Ten years of longitudinal research on adolescent sexual behavior; Developmental correlates of sexual intercourse and the importance of age, gender and ethnic background. *Developmental Review*, 153-224

Zucker, R.A., Donovan, J.E., Masten, A.S. et al (2008). Early developmental processes and the continuity of risk for underage drinking and problem drinking. *Pediatrics, 121 (Suppl. 4)* 5252-5272

APPENDIX 1: MEASURES

Survey Used

How I Feel About School

1. Some children have a mum or dad who likes to know about their children's schoolwork, but some parents are too busy. Which is most true for you?

How much does your mum or dad:

	Not at all	A little	A bit	Quite a lot	A lot
Help with your homework					
Come to school events					
Ask how you are doing at school					
Make sure you get to school on time					
Encourage you to do well at school					
Get upset if you don't do well					

2. Some children like school and like to work hard, and some children don't like school very much. What about you? Please tell us what you think by answering these questions as well as you can.

At my school, we:

	Not true	Not very true	Sort of true	Very true
Listen to our teacher all the time				
Work well as a team				
Bother each other				
We mostly do				

group work				
We decide what to work on together				
Look after books and other things in our classroom				
We help each other even if we are not friends				
We always get our work finished				
We care about each other				
We tease or bully each other				
We work together to solve problems				
We listen to each other				
We decide the rules together				
All the adults respect our rights				
The rules are fair				
I really like my school				
I feel safe and cared for at school				

3. When I am at school:

	Not true	Not very true	Sort of true	Very true
I try hard to do good work				
I get good marks				
I find my school work boring				
I get my work done				
I enjoy learning				

new things even if they are hard				

4. At my school, my teacher:

	Not true	Not very true	Sort of true	Very true
Is easy to talk to about things that bother me				
Treats me fairly				
Is very nice				
Cares about me				
Encourages me to do my best				

5. If you belong to any school clubs, teams, committees or councils, over the past year please tell us which.

6. If you belong to any community clubs, teams, committees or councils, over the past year please tell us which.

7. Thinking back over this school year, how often have you had trouble:

	Never	Just a few times	About once a week	Almost every day	Every day
Paying attention in school					
Getting your homework done					
Getting along with your teachers					
Getting along with the other pupils					

8. And how often have you:

	Never	Just a few times	About once a week	Almost every day	Every day
Been bullied at school					
Bullied someone else at school					
Got into a fight at school					
Bunked or skived off school					

9. Thinking about your future, at what age would you like to leave school?

10. Thinking about your future after school, what kind of job/career do you hope to have?

11. Thinking about your future:

	Extremely unimportant	Quite unimportant	Somewhat unimportant	Somewhat important	Important	Very important	Extremely important
How important is it that you complete school and go to college or university?							

12. Thinking about your future plans:

	Extremely unlikely	Quite unlikey	Somewhat unlikely	Somewhat likely	Likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
How likely do you think it is that you will go to college or university?							

13. Thinking about your future:

	Extremely unimportant	Quite unimportant	Somewhat unimportant	Somewhat important	Important	Very important	Extremely important
How important is it to you to be able to do this job/career?							

14. Thinking about your future after school:

	Extremely unlikely	Quite unlikely	Somewhat unlikely	Somewhat likely	Likely	Very likely	Extremely likely
How likely do you think it is that you will do this job/career?							

15. Thinking about this school year, please rate each of the following:

	Never or rarely	Sometimes	A lot of the time	Most or all of the time
You felt hopeful about the future				
You felt just as good as other people				
You were happy				
You enjoyed life				

16. Please rate how much you agree with the following:

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Not sure	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
You have a lot to be proud of					
You like yourself just the way you are					
You have a lot of good qualities					
You feel like you are doing everything just about right					
You feel loved and wanted					
You feel socially accepted					
You feel physically fit					

17. Are you: Male _____ or Female _____

18. Your Birth date:

19. Name of Your School:

20. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your school?

Focus Questions

1. What do you like about this school?
2. What don't you like about this school?
3. Think back to your elementary school – what do you remember about it?
4. Was there anything about your elementary school that you wish were here?
5. What do you think makes a school a place where pupils want to go?
6. What do you think is most important?
7. What makes a good teacher?
8. How could your teachers do better?
9. What makes an interesting class?
10. How could your classes be better?

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about what you think a good school should be?

Key Informant Interview Questions

1. Reflecting on your experiences with RRR to date, what can you tell us?
2. How do you think RRR has changed your school – if at all?
3. What have been the biggest challenges with RRR?
4. What do you see to be the future of RRR in your school?

APPENDIX 2: Descriptive Statistics

Table 1. School attended in Year 6 and at time of research in 2011

CURRENT SCHOOL (YEAR 7 + YEAR 8)	SCHOOL IN YEAR 6 : 1 HILLSIDE	SCHOOL IN YEAR 6: 2 RIVERVIEW	SCHOOL IN YEAR 6: 3 WOODVIEW	TOTAL 2011
HALCYON	6 females 16 males 22	2 females 1 male 3	5 females 2 males 7	32
SCHALLER	0 females 1 male 1	5 females 1 male 6	14 females 8 males 22	29
WAVERLY	25 females 20 males 45	9 females 5 males 14	10 females 9 males 19	78

Table 2: Percent of pupils reporting experiences with bullying, 2011.

TYPE	HALCYON IN SCHOOL		HALCYON OUTSIDE		WAVERLY IN SCHOOL		WAVERLY OUTSIDE		SCHALLER IN SCHOOL		SCHALLER OUTSIDE	
	Yr 7s	Yr 8s	Yr 7s	Yr 8s	Yr 7s	Yr 8s	Yr7s	Yr 8s	Yr 7s	Yr 8s	Yr 7s	Yr 8s
Verbal	15	30	8	5	24	33	12	20	27	17	18	17
physical	8	10	8	5	12	16	12	13	05	17	0	8
Cyber	8	10	0	5	08	13	0	8	05	0	9	8
Indirect	0	0	0	0	08	5	4	2	0	0	0	0
property	8	10	0	0	08	5	0	5	0	0	0	0
REASON												
race/religion	0	10	0	0	8	5	0	2	0	0	0	0
special needs	0	5	0	0	0	5	4	6	0	0	0	0
looks/health	8	20	8	10	16	23	4	14	14	8	9	8
sexual orientation	0	0	8	0	0	5	4	3	0	0	0	8
home circumstances	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	2	0	25	0	25
Gender	8	0	8	0	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	3

Table 3: Percent of pupils who report engaging in entertainment and physical activities 2011

ACTIVITY	HALCYON	WAVERLY	SCHALLER
2-5 hours per day TV	58	59	46
2-5 hours per day videogames	52	43	38
1-3 sports teams over past year	79	65	45
3 + days per week physical activity	70	54	20

Table 4: Percent of pupils reporting engaging in risk behaviours

BEHAVIOUR	HALCYON	WAVERLY	SCHALLER
Never wear a helmet while riding a bike	21	29	44
Never wear a helmet while rollerblading	15	26	32
Never wear a seatbelt in a car	00	05	03
Ridden in a car with someone who had been drinking	03	15	03
Carried a weapon to school	03	14	09
Got into a fight	34	49	24
Needed medical treatment as a result of a fight	09	13	03
Tried cigarettes	09	21	16
Tried alcohol	29	56	42
Used marijuana	00	05	00
Used steroids	00	02	03
Sniffed glue to get high	13	18	00

Table 5: Percent of pupils reporting career choice

CAREER CHOICE	HALCYON	WAVERLY	SCHALLER
Professional	33	32	21
Trades	37	35	52
Arts	06	21	17
Athletics	23	12	10

Table 6: Percent of pupils reporting participating in school or community organizations

NUMBER OF ORGANIZATIONS PARTICIPATING IN	HALCYON		WAVERLY		SCHALLER	
	1 or 2	3-5	1 or 2	3-5	1 or 2	3-5
In the school	77	18	72	21	58	21
In the community	86	10	80	20	69	0

Table 7. Average scores on parental involvement, optimism, esteem and social problems at school.

SCALE	HALCYON	WAVERLY	SCHALLER	MAXIMUM SCORE
Parental involvement	22.91	20.70	19.60	30
Optimism about the future	12.91	11.21	11.59	16
Self-esteem	29.46	26.40	28.08	35
School problems	15.01	16.51	17.90	40

Table 8. Average scores on engagement subscales

ENGAGEMENT SUBSCALE	HALCYON	WAVERLY	SCHALLER	MAXIMUM OBTAINABLE
Rights-respecting climate	27.55	26.30	28.90	36
Interpersonal harmony	26.37	25.17	27.22	36
Academic orientation	17.97	17.80	18.50	24
Participation	6.86	7.38	8.55	12

Appendix 3: Statistics[2]

For each of these analyses, current school was used as the fixed factor.

Engagement

A multivariate analysis revealed a significant difference,. *Pillai's*= .140, F (8, 290) = 2.73, p< .01, n^2=.070. A significant difference was found for participation F (2,150) = 6.54, p < .01, n^2=.082. Pupils from Schaller (mean= 8.55, sd. 340) reported significantly more participation than pupils at Halcyon (mean+ 6.862, s.d. = .357), and significantly more participation than those at Waverly (mean= 7.38, s.d. = .204).

Parental Involvement

Significant findings were found for parental involvement. An LSD post hoc test revealed differences between Halcyon and the remaining two schools. Pupils at Halcyon (mean= 22.91, s.d. = .760) reported more parental involvement than pupils at Schaller (mean = 19.60, s.d. = .749) and Waverly (mean = 20.7, s.d. = .458).

Self –Esteem

The pupils reported significantly different levels of self-esteem. The univariate analysis revealed a significant difference F (2, 158) = 3.15, p<.05, n^2= .039. An LSD post hoc test showed that pupils at Halcyon School (mean= 29. 46, s.d. = 1.09) rated higher on the scale for self-esteem than pupils at Waverly (mean= 26.40, s.d. = .655).

Optimism

Significant differences were found for optimism, F (2, 158) = 4.09, p < .05, n^2= .050. An LSD post hoc test revealed the significant differences occurred between pupils at Halcyon and Waverly. Pupils at Halcyon (mean = 12.91, s.d. = .510) reported significantly more optimism than those at Waverly (mean= 11.21, s.d. = .307).

Physical activity, Days in Gyms, Hours watching t.v and hours playing video games

Reported days of physical activity was found to be significant at the multivariate level, *Pillai's* = .446, F (10, 266) = 7.62, p < .001, n^2= .223. At the univariate level days of physical activity was found to be significant. An LSD post hoc test revealed significant difference between Halcyon and Schaller and Schaller with Waverly. Halcyon pupils (mean= 3.67, s.d. = .459) reported more days of physical activity than pupils at Schaller (mean= 1.26, s.d. = .484). Pupils at Schaller reported more days of physical activity than pupils at Waverly (mean = 2.98, s.d. = .278). Days of Physical Education was also found to be significant. For

[2] Statistics are reported only where analyses revealed significant differences.

days of physical education, pupils at Halcyon (mean = 2.5, s.d. = .142) report more days of physEd than those at Schaller (mean = 1.52, s.d. = .150) and Waverly (mean= 1.15, s.d. = .086). While pupils at Schaller also report significantly more physEd days than those at Waverly.

For each of the following analysis, sex was used as the fixed factor.

Engagement (RRC, AO, IH and PT)

Univariate analysis reveals a significant difference for sex on Interpersonal Harmony (IH), with females (mean= 26. 68, s.d. = .494) reporting more IH than males (mean= 25.14, s.d. = .522).

Optimism

Significant differences were found for reports of optimism at the univariate level for sex of pupil. Males (mean = 12.36, s.d. = .342) reported more optimism than females (mean = 11.12, s.d. = .321).

Physical activity, Days in Gyms, Hours watching t.v and hours playing video games

A multivariate analysis revealed significant differences for sex, *Pillai's* = .099, F (5, 120) = 2.62, $p < .05$, $n^2 = .099$. At the univariate level significant differences were found for days of physical activity, and hours spent watching television. and days in PhysEd. Males (mean 3.55, s.d. = .540) report more physical activity than females (mean= 1.673, s.d. = .650). Females (mean=4.34, s.d. = .453) report watching television more often than males (mean= 3.18, s.d. = .377) and males (mean= 1.95, s.d. = .205) report attending physEd significantly more than females (mean=1.262, s.d. = .246).