YOUNG VOICES UNHEARD:

CHILDREN'S VIEWS FROM SCOTLAND AND GREECE ON EDUCATION





Evanthia Synodi

Young Voices Unheard: Children's Views from Scotland and Greece on Education

Authored by

Evanthia Synodi

Department of Preschool Education
University of Crete
Gallos Campus
Rethymno, 74100,
Greece

Young Voices Unheard: Children's Views from Scotland and Greece on Education

Author: Evanthia Synodi

ISBN (Online): 978-981-5124-66-8

ISBN (Print): 978-981-5124-67-5

ISBN (Paperback): 978-981-5124-68-2

© 2023, Bentham Books imprint.

Published by Bentham Science Publishers Pte. Ltd. Singapore. All Rights Reserved.

First published in 2023.

BENTHAM SCIENCE PUBLISHERS LTD.

End User License Agreement (for non-institutional, personal use)

This is an agreement between you and Bentham Science Publishers Ltd. Please read this License Agreement carefully before using the ebook/echapter/ejournal ("Work"). Your use of the Work constitutes your agreement to the terms and conditions set forth in this License Agreement. If you do not agree to these terms and conditions then you should not use the Work.

Bentham Science Publishers agrees to grant you a non-exclusive, non-transferable limited license to use the Work subject to and in accordance with the following terms and conditions. This License Agreement is for non-library, personal use only. For a library / institutional / multi user license in respect of the Work, please contact: permission@benthamscience.net.

Usage Rules:

- 1. All rights reserved: The Work is the subject of copyright and Bentham Science Publishers either owns the Work (and the copyright in it) or is licensed to distribute the Work. You shall not copy, reproduce, modify, remove, delete, augment, add to, publish, transmit, sell, resell, create derivative works from, or in any way exploit the Work or make the Work available for others to do any of the same, in any form or by any means, in whole or in part, in each case without the prior written permission of Bentham Science Publishers, unless stated otherwise in this License Agreement.
- 2. You may download a copy of the Work on one occasion to one personal computer (including tablet, laptop, desktop, or other such devices). You may make one back-up copy of the Work to avoid losing it.
- 3. The unauthorised use or distribution of copyrighted or other proprietary content is illegal and could subject you to liability for substantial money damages. You will be liable for any damage resulting from your misuse of the Work or any violation of this License Agreement, including any infringement by you of copyrights or proprietary rights.

Disclaimer:

Bentham Science Publishers does not guarantee that the information in the Work is error-free, or warrant that it will meet your requirements or that access to the Work will be uninterrupted or error-free. The Work is provided "as is" without warranty of any kind, either express or implied or statutory, including, without limitation, implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose. The entire risk as to the results and performance of the Work is assumed by you. No responsibility is assumed by Bentham Science Publishers, its staff, editors and/or authors for any injury and/or damage to persons or property as a matter of products liability, negligence or otherwise, or from any use or operation of any methods, products instruction, advertisements or ideas contained in the Work.

Limitation of Liability:

In no event will Bentham Science Publishers, its staff, editors and/or authors, be liable for any damages, including, without limitation, special, incidental and/or consequential damages and/or damages for lost data and/or profits arising out of (whether directly or indirectly) the use or inability to use the Work. The entire liability of Bentham Science Publishers shall be limited to the amount actually paid by you for the Work.

General:

- 1. Any dispute or claim arising out of or in connection with this License Agreement or the Work (including non-contractual disputes or claims) will be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of Singapore. Each party agrees that the courts of the state of Singapore shall have exclusive jurisdiction to settle any dispute or claim arising out of or in connection with this License Agreement or the Work (including non-contractual disputes or claims).
- 2. Your rights under this License Agreement will automatically terminate without notice and without the

- need for a court order if at any point you breach any terms of this License Agreement. In no event will any delay or failure by Bentham Science Publishers in enforcing your compliance with this License Agreement constitute a waiver of any of its rights.
- 3. You acknowledge that you have read this License Agreement, and agree to be bound by its terms and conditions. To the extent that any other terms and conditions presented on any website of Bentham Science Publishers conflict with, or are inconsistent with, the terms and conditions set out in this License Agreement, you acknowledge that the terms and conditions set out in this License Agreement shall prevail.

Bentham Science Publishers Pte. Ltd.

80 Robinson Road #02-00 Singapore 068898 Singapore Email: subscriptions@benthamscience.net



CONTENTS

PREFACE	i
THEORETICAL PART	
CHAPTER 1 THE CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD	1
INTRODUCTION	
Explanatory Documents	
General Comment No 7 (2005): Implementing Child Rights in Early Childhood	
General Comment No. 1 (2001), Article 29 (1): The Aims of Education	
General Comment No. 12 (2009): The right of the Child to be Heard	
General Comment No. 14 (2013) on the Right of the Child to have his or her Best	
Interests taken as a Primary Consideration (art.3, para. 1)	8
Interpretations of Children's Rights	. 8
CHAPTER 2 MODELS OF SCHOOLING AND CHILDREN'S RIGHTS	12
INTRODUCTION	
The Authoritarian School	
The School Based on Traditional Developmental Psychology	
The Rights Based School	
NOTES	
EMPIRICAL RESEARCH PART	
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	17
INTRODUCTION	
Background to the Conceptualization of this Research	
Comparative Study	
Oualitative Research	
Method	
Research Tools	
The First Focus Group Session	
Second Focus Group Session	
Research Questions	
Sample and Participants	
Research Ethics	
Official Permission for Research	
Contact with Research Gatekeepers	
Anonymity	34
Research Process	35
Power Issues	. 35
Ensuring the Trustworthiness of the Research	36
NOTES	40
CHAPTER 4 CHILDREN'S VIEWS ABOUT AN AUTHORITARIAN SCHOOL	
INTRODUCTION	42
The Physical Environment of a School	
Scotland	
Greece	
Comparison of Children's Perspectives on the Physical Environment	
The Social Environment of A School	
Scotland	
Greece	63

Comparison of Children's Perspectives on the Social Environm	ent 71
NOTES	
CHAPTER 5 CHILDREN'S VIEWS ABOUT A SCHOOL BASED O	N DEVELOPMENTAL
PSYCHOLOGY	
INTRODUCTION	74
The Physical Environment of A School	
Scotland	
Greece	81
Comparison of Children's Perspectives on the Physical Environ	ment 89
Social Environment of A School	
Scotland	90
Greece	97
Comparison of Children's Perspectives on the Social Environm	
NOTES	99
CHAPTER 6 CHILDREN'S VIEWS ABOUT A RIGHTS-BASED SO	CHOOL 101
INTRODUCTION	
The Physical Environment of the School	
Scotland	
Greece	
Comparison of Children's Views on the Physical Environ	
The Social Environment Of A School	
Scotland	
Greece	
Comparison Of Children's Views On The Social Environ	
NOTES	
CHAPTER 7 THE PERFECT SCHOOL FOR WILSON	
INTRODUCTION	
Scotland	
Valley School MX1	
Valley School MX2	
Hill School AU	
Hill School DP	
Comparison of Data within Scotland	-
Greece	
Elm School AU	
Elm School RB	
Elm School MX1	
Oak School AU	
Oak School DP	
Oak School RB	
Pine School AU	
Pine School MX	
Comparison of Data Within Greece	
Comparison of Data From Scotland And Greece	
NOTES	
CHAPTER 8 CONCLUSIONS	
INTRODUCTION	
Methodology of Research	
Main Findings of the First Focus Group Sessions	

The Physical Environment of a School and Children's Rights	176
The Social Environment Of a School and Children's Rights	178
Main Findings of the Second Focus Group Sessions	180
The Perfect School for Wilson	180
Findings and the Convention on the Rights of the Child	181
Findings and the Conceptualizations of Schooling	183
Children's Rights, School and Play	
Implications of the Study	188
Further Research on the Topic	188
NOTES	189
REFERENCES	190
SUBJECT INDEX	200

PREFACE

This book is dedicated to some young children's views on a variety of aspects of school provision and school practices that have been in place or advocated for young children. I related these provisions to children's rights in terms of whether they indicate respect to or violation of children's rights. Then, children's views and preferences on school provisions and practices are discussed in connection with the children's rights as defined in the Convention on the Rights of a Child (United Nations [UN], 1989). This way it was ascertained which educational provisions and practices young children prioritized and consequently which rights they favored or not.

What is it about?

I undertook this study because I wanted to record the views of children aged five to six years in Greece and Scotland on three different types of school provision and practice arranged for young children over the years. The three different models of schooling selected for children to discuss were analyzed in order to show which of the children's rights pertaining to their education they reflected and which they violated. The first model of schooling is the teacher-centered school, which shows no respect for children's rights except perhaps partly their right to education (article 28.1 of the Convention). This is how I shall refer to the Convention on the rights of the child (United Nations, 1989) henceforth). The next school model is based on traditional developmental psychology and it allows adults the scope and potential to respect some of the children's rights, such as play (article 31), but neglects or ignores others, such as freedom of conscience or religion (articles 14 & 30). The last model of school is the rights-based school, which fully respects all children's rights pertaining to their attending school.

The special contribution of such a study is that it reveals some young children's voices in multiple ways. First, young children were given the opportunity to discuss specific education practices, which have been implemented over time in early year's classes. This way I was able to produce data on the same topics but from children living in two different countries, national cultures and education provision. These children also had the opportunity to describe their ideal school for a child of their age, in the form of suggestions for establishing a school for Wilson, who did not want to go to school. In this case too, the children who offered their ideas came from Scotland and Greece and from different cultures and schooling. Subsequently, this data, e.g. children's suggestions, thoughts, and ideas, is related to their rights so as to show which ones the participants themselves prioritized. The differences in priorities were explained based on children's experience of schooling and their national cultures.

Why Children's Rights?

Greece ratified the Convention on the rights of the child in 1992, whereas the UK, part of which is Scotland, in 1991. As a result, legislation pertaining to children in both countries is to conform to what is foreseen by the Convention. Some of the rights children have, according to the Convention, are not so easy to inform changes in the existing legislation due to the varieties of cultural perspectives of citizens in both countries on childhood, children, and their rights. For example, both countries have a mandatory curriculum, which means that some of its aspects, such as the goals of learning that children must achieve, cannot be negotiated or omitted to suit children's interests or choices in accordance with article 12 of the Convention.

This phenomenon is recorded in many countries, since their cultures are in juxtaposition with some of the children's rights in the Convention, especially those of child participation (Frost, 2011, as cited in Jones & Walker, 2011, p. 53; Kanyal & Gibbs, 2014; UN General Comment 7, 2005; Welsh, 2008, as cited in Jones & Walker, 2011). Many adults, regardless of their background, hold different perspectives on childhood and the immaturity that characterizes young human beings from the perspective on which the Convention is based (e.g. Cunningham, 2005, 2006). Therefore, some adults think that children lack maturity, abilities, and reason in absolute terms, so they treat them with less respect and dismiss them and their views (Archard, 2004; Cunningham, 2005). However, according to the Convention, adults, including teachers and parents, have the responsibility of giving children direction and guidance in relation to exercising their rights (article 5 of the Convention). This means that adults must help children find the place they are entitled in society, rather than allow the dominant culture in any society to give children a predetermined position, which may not always correspond to all children's potential.

Why Young Children?

Children need to be given a voice, to be able to have a say in the provision adults make for their education. This is something I believe in and is in accordance with article 12 of the Convention. Article 12 defines children's right to express their 'views freely in all matters affecting the child, the views of the child being given due weight in accordance with the age and maturity of the child'.

As Allison James (2007, p. 262) explains, however, 'giving voice to children is not simply or only about letting children speak: it is about exploring the unique contribution to our understanding of and theorizing about the social world [part of which is school] that children's perspectives can provide'. This is even more true for younger children for whom the provision and protection rights tend to be favored by adults over their participation rights. Young children are considered immature by many people and thus their opinions are not valued or sought (Archard, 2004). This has led the United Nations to issue General Comment No. 7 (2005) on early childhood to clarify that all children regardless of their age have all the rights foreseen by the Convention.

Why these countries?

Greece and Scotland have certain features, which enable a meaningful comparison (Clarkson, 2009). These countries offer different educational provisions to children aged five to six years both in terms of the type of school (preschool education in Greece and primary education in Scotland) and of financial aid to schools (Scotland devotes a larger part of its budget to education than Greece¹ does). The dominant cultural perceptions of children's and people's rights are also different, if not opposite, in these two countries. Children in Scotland are taught to be independent of the beginning of their lives, whereas in Greece, the children's environment in family and school is overprotective and collectivist (e.g. Farlane, 2018).

On the other hand, both countries have populations mainly Christian, White and European, which means that they share some common ideas about childhood and young children's education. Therefore, there exists a fruitful balance of similarities and differences between Scotland and Greece to justify their selection for a study in Comparative Early Childhood Education.

How was the research conducted?

Apart from this study being comparative in nature, it is also qualitative with data produced through focus group sessions with young children. The novelty of this research, on top of it is a comparative one, is that its participants are young children aged 5 to 6 years and that its method of data production is focus group; a not so usual way of researching on children (Gibson, 2007).

What is the value of this study?

As an educator I think five to six year old children in schools can be offered more opportunities to learn (a) what their rights are according to the Convention, which both Scotland and Greece have ratified, and (b) how to act as right holders. In accordance with articles 5 and 29 of the Convention, people who are responsible for children, which includes teachers, have the responsibility to teach them about their rights and facilitate them in exercising them.

With this study adults involved in young children's education gain insight into the matter of how children feel about certain practices and provisions. Such insight can be considered when defining and determining good practices in schools for five-year-old children in Greece and Scotland in general. This insight is also valuable when considering how teachers can better cater to article 5 of the Convention, especially at the initial teacher education level. Furthermore, in an age of education leadership, regardless of whether it refers to headteachers / principals or teachers themselves (Leithwood, 1992; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008; Smylie & Eckert, 2018), such studies can contribute to the improvement of young children's education and to a school life respectful of children's rights.

What is the structure of this book?

In the first chapter of this book, the Convention is presented. Particular consideration is given to the rights that apply to children's education in school together with the relevant to children's education General Comments (General Comment 7, 2005; General Comment 1, 2001; General Comment 12, 2009 and General Comment 14, 2013) issued by the United Nations. These documents are selected because they are what Scotland and Greece committed to abide by in relation to the educational provision for their young children.

The second chapter is about the models of education that are known and have been partly or full implemented in the Western world. The models are embodied in the authoritarian school, the school based on traditional developmental psychology and the rights-based school. These models of schooling for young children are related to the rights foreseen by the Convention for the children in order to determine which rights they respect and facilitate and which they violate. Aspects of these models were discussed by the children who participated in this study. The next chapter is dedicated to the methodology of the research undertaken. 56 children from Scotland and Greece participated in two focus group sessions in groups of 4. In the first session, children discussed three models of education that have been advocated for them. I chose some of the features of each of the three conceptualizations of school and made them features of three plans for the best school ever, which children discussed. In a second session with each group, children were read the beginning of the book *Whiffy Wilson: The wolf who wouldn't go to school* and asked to describe the features of a school that would make Wilson want to attend. Both of these sessions were followed by children drawing aspects of what they discussed.

In the empirical part of the study, the data are analyzed in four chapters. In the first chapter of the second one, the data about the plan for a school based on traditional developmental psychology. In the third chapter, children's views on the plan for a rights-based school are analyzed whereas in the fourth chapter, the data about a perfect school for Wilson. The analysis of the data from both focus group sessions showed that children prioritized children's right to play, safety, consultation and education. In the final chapter of this study, the conclusions of the study are presented together with recommendations for further research.

Note:

Even though Greece has double the population of Scotland for the year 2022, for example, Greece allocated 4.943.012£ (5.841.100 €) to education and Scotland 4.207.700£ according to their official budget sites. (Hellenic Republic, 2021 and Scottish Government, 2021).

Evanthia Synodi
Department of Preschool Education
University of Crete
Gallos Campus
Rethymno, 74100,
Greece

THEORETICAL PART

In this part of the study, its theoretical underpinnings are analyzed in two chapters. In the first chapter, the rights of children entitled according to international legislation are analyzed as well as how their implementation changes the power balance in the relationship between adults and children. In the second chapter, three conceptualizations of education for children are examined in relation to whether they respect, promote and facilitate the implementation of children's rights. These three models of schooling are the teacher-centered, the traditional developmental psychology based and the rights-based, which children discussed in the empirical part of this study.

CHAPTER 1

The Convention on the Rights of the Child

Abstract: In this chapter, children's rights as defined by the Convention on the rights of the child are analyzed, since the Convention has been ratified by Scotland and Greece. According to the Convention, children have protection, provision, and participation rights. Some of the General Comments issued by the United Nations on children's rights are discussed as they are related to young children's education. It is evident that participation rights are more difficult to implement, as they imply more power for the children and acknowledgement of their competency.

Keywords: Convention on the rights of the child, General Comments, Greece, Participation rights, Protection rights, Provision rights, Scotland.

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the rights of children according to the Convention and other relevant documents by the United Nations are presented and analyzed. However, before discussing the literature on children's rights, the definition of rights must be clarified. A right 'is something you should always be able to do, to have, to know, to say or to be protected from', according to Jones (2011a, p. 4). However, one must not forget that rights come with responsibilities, which are 'something you should do for other people, for society or for the environment' (Jones, 2011a, p. 4).

The Convention on the Rights of the Child (United Nations [UN], 1989) foresees rights for all children that must be respected and implemented by every country, which has ratified the Convention. These rights have been grouped in various ways. The International Save the Children Alliance (2007), for example, discusses children's rights in terms of the four general principles of the Convention:

- 1. Article 2 and children's right not to be discriminated.
- 2. Article 3 and children's right to their best interest being the primary concern in all actions concerning children.
- 3. Article 6 and children's right to live and develop.

4. Article 12 and children's right to participation in all matters affecting them and their right to be heard (International Save the Children Alliance, 2007).

Jones and Welch (2018) categorize the rights defined in the Convention into liberty rights and welfare rights of children. Liberty rights are based on the notion that people have the right to live and act freely, to be free and to look out for their interests. In such a case, the state intervenes only 'with the will of the people' (Jones & Welch, 2018, p. 42). Each individual is considered to be autonomous and responsible for themselves, their family and their property. However, not all people have the same start in life or equal capacities, therefore, they cannot make a good life for themselves and their families. This means that there must be some provision in place so as to help everybody 'make the best use of their liberty rights' (Jones & Welch, 2018, p. 44). This provision is made available by the state in the form of welfare rights, such as healthcare and education (Jones & Welch, 2018).

Others, such as Te One (2011) and Alderson (2008), group the rights of the Convention into three categories. According to them, the Convention includes rights of protection, provision and participation for all children and clarifies that all types of rights should be implemented in combination and not in isolation (UN, 1989, Preamble; General Comment 7, 2005, article 3; Te One, 2011).

The protection rights children are entitled to are the right of children to be protected from any kind of discrimination (article 2), children's right to have adults act in the children's best interest (article 3), the right to be protected from any kind of abuse (articles 19, 33 and 34), to be protected from exploitation (articles 32, 35, and 36), to be protected from injustice (article 40) and from war dangers (article 38) (Alderson, 2008; Archard, 2004; Te One, 2011).

The rights regarding the quality of family life children are entitled (articles 5, 18 and 27), children's right to health, safety and education (articles 24, 26 and 28), children's right to provision for their general development in education (article 29), for their physical and special care (articles 6 and 23) and for play, spare time, fun and children's culture (article 31) are considered to be provision rights for children (Alderson, 2008; Archard, 2004; Te One, 2011).

The participation rights that children are entitled to are children's right to their identity (articles 7, 8 and 30), their right to be consulted, and their views considered in accordance with their age and maturity when decisions about their lives are made (article 12), their right to access information (article 17), children's right to freedom of speech, expression and thought (articles 13 and 14) and their right to a private life (article 16) (Alderson, 2008; Archard, 2004; Te One, 2011).

Even though all rights apply to all children at all times and are interconnected, some of the articles of the Convention are clearly related to education and how schools should operate. These articles are:

- 1. Article 2, which states that children are not to be discriminated against for any reason. The grounds for discrimination forbidden by the Convention are children's or their parent's / guardian's 'race, color, sex, language, religion, political opinion, national, ethnic, or social origin, property, disability, birth or other status'.
- 2. Article 3, which states that in all actions concerning children (some of which are related to their education) the best interests of the child should be a primary consideration.
- 3. Article 5, which defines that people legally responsible for a child, who include their teachers, need to provide them with guidance and direction in the exercise of their rights.
- 4. Article 13 and children's right to freedom of expression. This includes schools where children seek, receive and impart information and ideas in ways they choose, except if they are against the law or violate other people's respective rights.
- 5. Article 14, which states that the child's right to freedom of 'thought, conscience and religion' shall be respected, except if it is against the law or violates other people's respective rights. This kind of respect is expected, therefore, by schools and teachers.
- 6. Article 23, which refers to the right to an effective access to education and to providing education for the mentally or physically disabled children. Such education should ensure their dignity, self-reliance and their active participation in society, part of which is a school.
- 7. Article 24, which refers to children's right to education on health issues, hygiene and prevention of accidents.
- 8. Article 28, which refers to all children's right to education. Primary education must be compulsory for all, whereas all types of secondary education must be developed and available to all children free of charge. Measures must be taken to minimize the number of children dropping out of school as well as to provide education 'on the basis of equal opportunities' (article 28.1). School discipline is linked to respecting children's dignity and all of their rights included in the Convention.

Models of Schooling and Children's Rights

Abstract: In this chapter, children's rights as defined in the Convention on the rights of the child are related to three models of schooling well known in the Western world. These theoretical models are the traditional, authoritarian school, the school based on traditional developmental psychology and the rights-based school. Aspects of these three models, therefore, may coexist in early years settings in Scotland and Greece and thus facilitate or hinder children from enjoying their rights.

Keywords: Authoritarian school, Convention on the rights of the child, Participation rights, Protection rights, Provision rights, Rights-based school, Traditional-developmental-psychology-based school.

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, three major conceptualizations of children education are analyzed in order to highlight if and how they afford children their rights as defined by the Convention. The models of schools investigated are the authoritarian, the one based on traditional developmental psychology and the rights-based one. The purpose of such an examination is twofold. First, it sheds light onto solidified school practices, which may hinder the implementation of some of the children's rights. Secondly, aspects of these models of schooling formed part of the empirical research carried out.

The Authoritarian School

In the traditional, authoritarian school, everything that takes place is teacher led (Johnny, 2005). Everything is decided by the adult (Ciccelli, 1983; Mascolo, 2009). The teacher remains in control of the knowledge to be acquired (what is to be learned) by the learners (Wood, 2010) and the learner remains a passive recipient of what the teacher offers and a passive listener, only responding to instructions by the teacher (Johnson & van Wyk, 2016; Kok-Aun, 2014; MacNaughton, 2020; Mascolo, 2009).

Learning in such a school has a theoretical focus, as experience is outcast. It is based on the premise that peers learn in the same way (MacNaughton, 2020), hence the whole class instruction (Kok-Aun, 2014). Learning as acquisition is the metaphor describing education in such a school (Wood, 2010). Therefore, the most common methods of teaching employed are recitation, copying (Ciccelli, 1983; Decker & Decker, 1992, as cited in MacNaughton, 2020; Lowe, 2007), telling, lecturing and direct instruction (Burts, Hart, Charlesworth, Fleege, Mosley, & Thomasson, 1992; Burman, 2008; Johnson & van Wyk, 2016; Kalantzis, Cope, & Harvey 2003; Leininger, 1979; Mascolo, 2009). The curriculum is 'mechanistic – behaviorist' according to Alexander's categorization (1988, as cited in Pugh, 1996, p. 90). There is time and space for the 3 R' s¹ (Lowe, 2007), habit formation, testing and pupil obedience to their teacher and punishment if they do not do as they are told (Ciccelli, 1983; Leininger, 1979; MacNaughton, 2020). This latter aspect of child - teacher relationship is not based on children's rights to physical protection and to the protection of their dignity (articles 19 and 28.2). Space is not abundant in the classroom and time is allocated to activities in a clear cut way (Decker & Decker, 1992, as cited in MacNaughton, 2020; Kok-Aun, 2014; Mascolo, 2009).

In the classroom, the teacher's table is in the front of the rows of desks for pupils and there are sets of textbooks (Kok-Aun, 2014; Walkerdine, 1998). There is no room or time for children to play. Whether children are seen as empty vessels to be filled in schools (Bruce, 1997; Locke, 1689, as cited in Archard, 2004; Kok-Aun, 2014) or as born evil (Archard, 2004; Lowe, 2007) and/or as sinner children (Blenking & Kelly, 1992) and 'in need of redemption' (Lowe, 2007, p. 5), by uprooting this evil from them, 'children need to be schooled to particular ends' (Lowe, 2007, p. 5). Children were considered 'prone to the badness, which only a rigid disciplinary upbringing could correct' (Archard, 2004, p. 46). Parents are supposed to 'break the child's will' (Archard, 2004, p. 46) and their sinfulness and replace it with Christian morality. This duty was extended to schools. A sense of discipline and readiness to accept the rhythms and timing of the working day form part of the aims of the traditional school (Brown, 2014; Hartley, 1993; Lowe, 2007). To achieve these aims, a teacher-led school develops 'subservient conformity, hierarchical acceptance and motivation by external rewards' (Ross, 2008, p. 115, as cited in Brown, 2014, p. 7) in children (MacNaughton, 2020).

In Europe, the mission of a teacher-led school has been moral and sociopolitical (Burman, 2008; Lowe, 2007); to inculcate good habits, and teach 'skills suited to one's gender and station in life' and reading the Bible (Hunt, 1985, as cited in Burman, 2008). The perception of such education for children remains one based on a perception of children as deficient and on the model of passive child (Bruce, 1997; Burman, 2008).

Childhood and thus the education of the children in such a school is a stage of preparation for adulthood. In such a case, respect, protection and implementation of children participation rights, such as their right to be consulted and listened to and to participate in decision making about issues that affect their lives (article 12 UN 1989) are not included. There is provision for the children's right to education (article 28) but not for play (article 31). There is also no protection of human decency and dignity (article 28.2) and of physical safety for the children (article 19). All the above have nothing in common with acknowledging children as rights holders. This approach to children's education is also partly on a par with the protection position (Te One, 2011), which prioritizes children's right to have adults act in their best interest (article 3) but not with the provision thesis (Te One, 2011) because it does not provide for children's right to play (article 31).

The School Based on Traditional Developmental Psychology

The school based on traditional developmental psychology is also governed by a concern for children preparation for adult life (Archard, 2004) as the authoritarian school is. Their difference is in the way of achieving it. Child development is perceived as taking place in stages which determine the level and kind of learning children can achieve (Bruce, 1997; MacNaughton, 2020) and these stages are considered universal (Bruce, 1997; Burman, 2008). Such a school pays attention to the particular features of every stage of the development of the child, rather than train them in the skills they will need as adults (Bruce, 1997). Care and education cannot be compartmentalized and the same applies to learning and development (Hurst, 1991). Holism must characterize adults' perception of children and their education and development (Bruce, 1997).

In this school, there is only the voice of one child who represents each stage of development. Development in areas or in ways other than those discussed by traditional developmental psychology is not accepted as worthwhile (MacNaughton, 2020; Potts, 2007). Falling behind in the development as defined by traditional developmental psychology (Woodhead, 1999) is considered a delay (Bruce, 1997; Curtis, 1998) in unfolding the biological programing of humans, not withstanding cultural and family conditions at least (Potts, 2007; Walkerdine, 1993). Child behavior perceived as diverging from that of the expected stage of development is in need of intervention (Burman, 2008). Family and culture are examined in relation to what can be done to achieve the development corresponding to the learner's age (Popkewitz & Bloch, 2001).

The curriculum in such a school is 'open' and 'negotiable', so as to help children reach their full potential (Alexander, 1988, as cited in Pugh, 1996, p. 90). The activities offered in such a school are either teacher led or child led and a balance

EMPIRICAL RESEARCH PART

This part of the study is dedicated to describing the methodology of conducting this empirical research and the data from the focus group sessions with children aged 5 to 6 years from Scotland and Greece. In the methodology chapter, it is explained that this is a comparative research with a qualitative approach to producing data. Focus groups sessions with five year old children were conducted. The reasons for selecting the specific countries and children are explained as well as the process of the research. At the end of the chapter, the ethical considerations of the research and the measures taken to ensure its trustworthiness are analyzed.

The methodology chapter is followed by four chapters of data analysis; three chapters devoted to the first focus group sessions and one chapter devoted to the second sessions. During the first sessions, children discussed three types of schools; a traditional, authoritarian school, a school based on traditional developmental psychology and a rights-based school in terms of their physical environment and social environment. In our second sessions, the children were read a part of the book called *Whiffy Wilson, the wolf who wouldn't go to school* and then made suggestions as to what school would make Wilson want to attend it.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Abstract: This chapter is dedicated to the empirical research undertaken in order to discover, first, children's perceptions on aspects of provision and practices, preselected by me, which have characterized theories and policies about classes for five to six year old children. A second purpose of carrying out this study is to discover what aspects of a school for children of their age these children consider essential. All data is discussed in terms of respect or violation of children's rights in order to highlight the connection of children's views with children's rights. It is a comparative research conducted in a qualitative manner using focus groups. The sample is five to six year old children who attended school in Scotland and Greece and participated in two focus group sessions. Approval for this research with children was granted by the appropriate authorities both in Scotland and Greece. Permission to conduct the research with children was requested by their teachers, their parents, and the children themselves. Finally, the measures taken to ensure that this research research is conducted in accordance with research ethics and issues on its trustworthiness are discussed.

Keywords: Comparative education, Early childhood education, Focus groups, Primary school, Qualitative research, Research trustworthiness, Rights based school, Research ethics, School based on traditional developmental psychology, Teacher-directed school.

INTRODUCTION

The reason for this study, for its purpose and its design, is based on my working as an educator and not a child sociologist. As such a person, I have seen, observed and spoken to teachers, both in Greece and some parts of Europe, of young children about working with them. Their ways of working and being with children seemed to me that sometimes did not indicate acknowledgement of children as right holders. At times, some teachers' behavior did not show any awareness of them violating some of the children's rights or even that children had rights at school. Whether they believed they should treat children like that or were forced to is beyond the aims of this study. However, I wanted to find out how children felt about the different school practices and provisions, which respected or violated some of their rights.

Therefore, this study is dedicated to children in Scotland and Greece expressing their views on aspects of school practice in schools for children aged five to six years. I did not intend to conduct emancipatory research (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2018) or share the topic and design of the research with children (Thomas, 2021). I only wanted to give children a chance to express how they felt about specific behaviors and practices which take place or are likely to take place in classes for five years olds, so that I can relate these ideas to children's rights.

More specifically, the purpose of this study is to explore five-year-old children's views on aspects of behavior and rules, learning and play and the physical environment in schools so that I can relate these views to their rights. The aspects of school practice and school provision selected for this study reflect the implementation or not of various provision, protection and participation rights that children are entitled to in schools. Therefore, this research aims to examine (a) how children feel about specific (selected by me) aspects of school practice and provision for five to six year old children, and (b) what specific aspects of an education for children of their age children themselves consider important in order to determine what children's rights these views reflect.

Background to the Conceptualization of this Research

Two pieces of research related to young children's perceptions of school guided me in selecting the particular aspects of schooling to be studied. They are a research by Sheridan and Pramling-Samuelsson (2001) and a research by Einarsdottir (2005).

According to Sheridan and Pramling-Samuelsson (2001), when young children in Sweden were asked to define what it means to decide, the children referred to (a) what they want to do, mostly during play and free activity time, (b) what is allowed and what is not and (c) the exercise of power and control. Children seemed to categorize decisions at school into decisions made by teachers, decisions made by groups of children and decisions made by each child individually. As for who decides what happens at school, children claimed that the teacher decides about almost everything, such as the conditions in the school, everyday routines, rules, norms and values as well as handling little daily incidents. According to almost all of the participating children, they do not decide where and when they play. Many times they felt that their teachers' decisions had priority over what they wanted to do. Children believed that the only decisions allowed to them were relevant to what they would play, what their own free activities would be and what to do with their belongings. Children also said that they co-decided things with their teachers only when they are going to do an activity together, such as a circle time activity. As a group of peers, children

decided, all together, what to do and mainly what to play but children knew that some of them decided more often than others.

Einarsdottir (2005) found that children in Iceland considered that the teacher's role included disciplining and controlling children on top of teaching. Teachers handled children's disputes and ensured that children followed the rules. Children also said that they did not like participating in group activities over which they did not have any control and during which they had to follow their teachers' instructions. When asked what they could decide and what not, children in Iceland, in the same way as children in Sweden, said that they were allowed to decide about their play and their free activities. At the same time, however, they understood that their choices of play and games were not unlimited and that they would need to wait at times because of the large number of children waiting in a queue to play in a specific area. Children also mentioned that they could not decide about the general operation of the school, the routine, the rules, their diet as well as the activities and their content, which were organised by adults, just like in Sweden. The list of the issues children felt they were not allowed to decide is as follows:

What classroom we are in

When we go outdoors

When we play with the computer

What the playschool teachers do

What we have for lunch

What we draw in philosophy-time

Where you sit

When to leave choice time

When to leave rest time

Where to be at rest time

To ruin things if the playschool teacher leaves

To sneak out

Children's Views about an Authoritarian School

Abstract: In this chapter, the data produced in the first focus group session with children in Scotland and Greece are analyzed. The children who participated in this session were read the plan for a teacher-directed school for young children, which does not provide for most of the children's rights relevant to their education. Children in both countries mainly talked about the physical environment of the school in the plan, which they found poor and hindering play (article 31). In terms of the social environment of the authoritarian school, children wanted to be consulted (article 12) but this tendency was stronger in Scotland and only children from Greece talked about the need for children to be safe at school (article 19). The significance of article 5 on adults helping children with exercising their rights was raised.

Keywords: Children's participation, Right to education, Right to play, Right to protection from physical harm, Teacher-directed school.

INTRODUCTION

Children in both countries were given the following plan for a school intended to be the best school ever.

In this school, the teacher will make all the decisions for the children. She will set the classroom rules for the children without asking them and she will punish them when they do not follow them. The teacher will prepare lessons for the children and all of them will do the same thing at the same time. All the children will sit quietly and listen to their teacher. When there is a break, the teacher will let the children play for a while. Then she will stop them and start her lesson again. Around the school there will be a high wire netting. The yard will be small, covered in cement and have a few trees. Inside the school we will put rows of desks, a blackboard, a clock on the wall and a large desk for the teacher.

Since they did not agree that it was a plan for a perfect school, they were asked for suggestions to improve it. The first thing children from both groups in Scotland and from two of the three groups from Greece mentioned referred to the physical environment, even though it is described last in the plan. Only the children in one group in Greece did not let me tell them the whole plan and then discuss it. They

commented on the first element of the plan as I was reading, so I accepted a discussion on one element of the plan after another.

The Physical Environment of a School

Scotland

There were two groups of children, one from Valley primary school and one from Hill primary school in Scotland who discussed an authoritarian school for children of their age. The first thing children in both groups in Scotland mentioned as improvement of the plan of a perfect school for five year olds was about play. Contact with nature at school was also important to these groups. Only girls participated in the focus groups of both schools.

Valley School

More time for play and more space for play in the yard as well as contact with flora (e.g. sunflowers) were important to the plan of the best school, together with an element of academic school structure, such as a bell.

ES: So, I was wondering, can you help the queen and the king make the best school ever? Do you think this plan is the best or have you got any other ideas?

We can have a longer play time.

We could have a bigger playground.

And not covered in cement.

ES: Not covered in cement. What would you like on the floor on the yard?

Hmm ... Probably a few flowers.

ES: Flowers! Grass? Trees?

We could put some more ... we could put trees on the grass.

ES: Alright. Anything else to make this school they want to build better?

Maybe have a bell so that they know when it is break time and stuff?

ES: A bell.

We can have a sunflower.

ES: A sunflower. Plant sunflowers?

Cause the sunflowers in our garden are dying.

ES: Alright. Anything else?

Nope.

These children answers indicate the importance of article 31, that is, children right to rest, leisure and play, and of article 28.1. about children's s rights to education. Children would add a bell to the plan so that children know when teaching ends and children can have a break. A bell in a primary school is a feature of a school found in primary schools in both countries. However, children aged five to six are in kindergartens in Greece and a tambourine is used to signal the change from a teacher directed activity to child directed activity and vise versa. These children did not reject the idea of learning in school and indicated how important it was for children to know what activities follow; to know the daily routine. Children suggestions for a bell show that children may not know how to tell time or how to estimate the duration of activities and that they were not involved in, or perhaps not even informed of, how long each activity takes in class. Article 29(e), which refers to children being taught to respect the natural environment at school, seems to have a strong basis of being implemented successfully, as these children were interested in flora ¹.

Hill School

Children in the group from Hill School also commented on the physical environment of the best school ever in terms of play resources (seesaw, climbing frame, *etc.*), space for play and contact with flora (flower garden). However, their emphasis on play equipment was stronger compared to that from the Valley School, because they described more resources for play. They also made provisions to ensure the potential to rest (big bed) and eat (lunch boxes) in the classroom exists in the physical environment of a perfect school.

ES: So, can you help her [the queen] make the best school ever? Do you have any ideas?

Make a shoot for them?

ES: What do you mean, a shoot?

Children's Views About A School based on Developmental Psychology

Abstract: The data from the session in which children discussed the plan for a school based on developmental psychology are presented here. Children in both countries referred to aspects of provision and practice relating to children's right to education, play and participation. However, only children in Scotland talked about whether children should wear a uniform at school or not, raising the question of discrimination (article 2) and freedom of expression (article 13). Similarly, only children in Greece mentioned their fear for lack of protection from a hedge (article 19) around the schoolyard. When it comes to the social environment of the school, children in Scotland appreciated article 12 and children's right to be consulted and their views to be taken seriously according to their age and maturity a lot more than children in Greece.

Keywords: Developmental psychology, Non-discrimination, Right to play, Right to education, Right to participation, Right to safety.

INTRODUCTION

Children in both countries were read the following plan for the new school, which they were asked to improve.

In this school, the teacher and the children will decide together on many issues but not everything. The teacher will set some rules but she will also make some with the children. The teacher will prepare activities that she thinks children like. She will sometimes play with them in the corners and in the yard as if she were a little child herself. She will let children play a lot but she will want lessons, too. Around the school building, there will be a hedge. The yard will be large and some of it will be covered with grass and some of it with tartan. The yard will also have trees, a sand pit, a play house, monkey bars and a slide. Inside the school, there will be large rooms and a lot of stuff for the children such as toys, books, dolls, pastels, small tables and chairs and a clock. There will be no rows of desks or a big desk for the teacher.

The Physical Environment of A School

Scotland

The groups of children who discussed a plan based on developmental psychology came from Valley primary school (a boy and two girls) and from Hill primary school (two boys and two girls) in Scotland. Children in both groups made comments on aspects of play for the improvement of the plan for a school for children of their age.

Valley School

Children from Valley School would add resources and equipment relevant to play, mostly sports, such as an obstacle course and a pool, to this plan for a school for young children. A garden with flowers, however, was their first suggestion. The inclusion of nature and the expansion of the size of the schoolyard to allow for movement and children being able to use their bodies were essential improvements to the yard.

Add flowers on it?

ES: You would add flowers. Ok. In the garden you mean?

Yeah.

Yeah.

Add obstacle courses¹?

I like that idea.

ES: Ok. Any other ideas?

Trampoline.

A slide.

A swing.

ES: A slide? Oh, yes, I said it was going to have a slide, but I didn't say it was going to have a swing. Okay.

A swimming pool.

ES: Anything else?

Climbing frame.

ES: Climbing frame! Okay. Anything else?

A go cart.

A bike.

A two-wheel bike.

A two-wheel scooter.

We have loads of ideas.

Children did not mention any improvements for the indoors. It is as if the indoors was a place forbidden to them to question its perfection, perhaps because the plan was made by the queen and king's helpers. It is as if the school yard was the only place that interested them or that they had ideas about its improvement. This is on a par with Einarsdottir's (2005) findings. In her study children drew and photographed the outdoors as their most liked space. Perhaps the omission of the indoors in the discussion indicates a connection with Howard's (2010) and Wood's (2010) work on children distinguishing between play as the child's domain and work and learning as the teacher's domain and work. So, in classrooms, children learn / work and their teacher decides about their learning, whereas in the outdoors they play, which is their business. Article 31 on the children's right to play was prioritized. The implementation of article 29(e) regarding children learning respect for nature seems to be facilitated as children added flowers to the plan.

Hill School

Children in this group discussed the physical environment of the plan in relation to play, children's safety, their attire and their relaxation. They were concerned about fires at school and would add sprinklers and alarms and other ways of ensuring safety from fire in the school.

ES: So, do you think this school is fine? Would you suggest something else?

I think we should have like an art table.

CHAPTER 6

Children's Views About A Rights-based School

Abstract: Children discussed the plan for a school respecting and implementing all of their rights and their views are analyzed here. They added more resources to their physical environment which were relevant to their right to play mainly and this tendency was stronger in Greece as compared to Scotland. In terms of suggestions for a school for young children, these were influenced by the provision of education children received in their countries respectively. As for the social environment, children in both countries showed an appreciation of article 12 and wanted to participate in decision-making, even though they did not know which decisions or how. This need raised the importance of article 5 and the importance of adults helping children exercise their rights.

Keywords: Indulgence, Individualism, Right to play, Right to education, Right to safety, Rights-based school.

INTRODUCTION

Only children from Valley School in Scotland were read the following plan for a rights-based school and were asked to discuss it because there were not enough participants from Hill School. However, there were three groups, one from each of the participating schools in Greece.

In this school the children and the teachers will decide together about all the school problems. They will decide what they will do with children and teachers who do not treat others well or if they go visit a museum. In this school the children and the teachers will decide all of the rules together. The teacher will ask the children what they want to do and learn and that is what they will do. Children will play everywhere in the school; in the corners, in the gym, in the yard and in the forest with their teachers and with other children. Their teachers will never interrupt their play to start other activities. They will not put wire or bushes around the yard. The school yard will have grass but also tartan. There will also be trees, a sand pit, a play house, a jungle gym, a seesaw, a climber and a slide. The school will have large and tiny rooms. They will put a lot of stuff inside for the children such as toys, books, teddy bears, crayons, tricycles, dough, furniture,

big and small, cement, plaster, wood, thermometers, tubes, scissors, spatulas, knives and saws.

The Physical Environment of the School

Scotland

There was only one group of children from Valley School in the sample from Scotland who discussed the plan for a rights-based school. They were concerned with learning resources and practices and barely talked about the play.

Valley School

When asked the first general question about how to make the rights-based school described to them perfect, children included very few play resources i.e. balls and obstacle courses. Tartan was linked to an obstacle course and was not perceived as a safe floor for play outdoors, as it was intended by the plan. They focused on children learning, on teaching, which was broadly defined in one sentence in the plan¹, and on time spent on the play. They believed that children in this school should spend more time learning rather than playing, even though the plan did not say how much time children would spend on work / learning and play / child led activities in school. Children referred to the part school plays in developing children physical skills, social skills, and life attitudes. More particularly, they talked about learning more mathematics, doing more writing and worksheets, learning about money and paying bills, becoming able not to spill food and drinks, doing gymnastics, not hurting others and not giving up when they fail. These children seemed to have identified the materials and equipment of the plan as play-related, even though, traditionally, real thermometers, knives, saws and tubes, for instance, are not allowed to be used as play resources in schools.

We could put some more things in the playground and stuff, you know, so, many balls and we could have some other things into the obstacle course?

They need to do more learning.

ES: More learning. Ok, Like what?

Like, how to count up.

ES: Anything else they should be learning?

How to count down.

ES: Count up and down. Ok.

Maybe we could learn more things to do with maths.

Maybe not play so much?

ES: Alright. Not play so much. Why do you think they shouldn't play that much?

Because they won't know anything when somebody asks them a question.

ES: Alright. They will not know anything if somebody asks them questions. And is that more important than playing?

Christine nods yes.

ES: You think so? Ok.

They might want to learn not to kick the ball in their face because somebody might get hurt and fall over.

ES: Anything else to make it the best school ever? Any other ideas that these children may have forgotten?

Maybe we could ... we could maybe learn the time properly?

Maybe they should learn about money a bit more, cause they may not know what money is.

ES: Ok. Learning about money. Yes.

Em ... they may have to learn how to pay.

And get food and drink not spilled.

ES: Oh, they need to learn to pay what?

Pay and buy and see if they have enough money to buy food and drinks.

They could have some worksheets and blue folders?

ES: Worksheets and blue folders. So, what exactly do you do with the blue folders? I don't know.

You put your...you put your work in it.

ES: Alright. In the folder. Is that what you wanted to say?

CHAPTER 7

The Perfect School for Wilson

Abstract: In the second focus group session of this research, each group of children read the beginning of a book called *Whiffy Wilson, the wolf who wouldn't go to school*. In this chapter, children's perceptions of the perfect school for Wilson are presented. Children in both countries suggested a school where play time would be allowed a lot more than in their schools. Sugar-based foods were more popular in Scotland than in Greece, which disagrees with children's right to healthy nutrition (article 24). Children in all groups from Scotland discussed learning in terms of the education they were being offered, and they wanted help for Wilson or no lessons at all nor a teacher for him. On the contrary, most of the groups in Greece did not talk about learning in school. Friendships were important to children in Greece only, even though all children in both countries discussed classroom rules that would enable positive relations with other children.

Keywords: Indulgence, Individualism, Power distance, Right to education, Right to participation, Right to play, Right to safety.

INTRODUCTION

In this section, the data from the second focus group sessions with children are analyzed. In our second session, the children were read the following part of the book called *Whiffy Wilson, the wolf who wouldn't go to school* (Hart, 2014).

There was a wolf called Wilson who couldn't count to ten. He wouldn't learn to write his name. He never used a pen. He didn't know his A B Cs. He couldn't paint or cook. He wouldn't learn his two-plus-twos. He never read a book.

'Time for school!' his father cried, 'you pesky little pup!'.

'But school is BORING!' Wilson whined, and he turned the telly up.

One morning, Wilson went next door to ask his friend to play. But Dotty smiled, 'I can't because I'm off to school today.'

'Well, I'm not going', Wilson grumped. 'Who wants to read and write? I'd rather play and watch TV and stay up late at night.'

'Oh, you're so silly', Dotty smiled. 'Come to school with me! There's nothing to be scared of - school's lots of fun, you'll see!'

'WHO SAYS I'M SCARED?' growled Wilson. 'A wolf is brave and strong. It's just ... the teacher might be cross if I get the answers wrong.'

Children were then asked to suggest what school would make Wilson want to attend it. The data about a school for Wilson are presented first for each country in terms of physical and social environment and then the data from Scotland and Greece are compared.

Scotland

In Scotland, there were two groups from Valley School who discussed the story of Wilson. For their second focus group session, it was not possible to group children from Valley School with the criterion of having discussed the same plan in their first session. A girl in group MX1 was not present in the first session as well as a boy in MX2. Both groups were comprised of five children. In Hill School, on the other hand, the groups remained the same as in their first session.

Valley School MX1

Children from Valley School who participated in this session had suggestions only for the social environment of the perfect school for Wilson. Resources, time and space for play were not mentioned at all in their descriptions.

Social Environment

This group emphasized other children's behavior, *i.e.* Wilson's classmates' behavior, as a motive for him to go to school. They said that other children should be 'nice' to him and play and share stuff with Wilson. They discussed the teacher's behavior, too. The teacher should be nice to him, like his classmates should, and encourage them to be nice to Wilson. She (the teacher) should give him his school equipment and teach him both the basics and not to neglect his diet.

School for Wilson

ES: What sort of school, do you think, can make Wilson to want to go to school?

If people were nice to one another and share with them.

ES: Okay. What else?

Maybe if they could give him a school bag and a water bottle and a pencil case and things that you need for school.

ES: Okay. So, a school where they give you all the stuff you need for learning like school bags and things and where people are nice. Anything else?

Maybe we could make him feel to go to school.

ES: How?

To play nicely.

ES: Play nicely! Nelly, any ideas?

Maybe a wolf school?

ES: A wolf school! And what would the wolf school be like?

Nobody answers.

ES: Would it be wrong if he went to school with Dotty?

Again nobody answers.

ES: you think he would be more comfortable with other wolves?

Yeah [he would be].

ES: You think he would be more comfortable with other wolves?

She nods yes.

CHAPTER 8

Conclusions

Abstract: In this chapter, the topic of this study is described, together with its importance for the education of young children. The methodological approach to this research is also examined as well as its main findings. It attempts to give voice to children from Greece and Scotland aged 5 to 6 years about the education of children their age. Children's views underlined the significance of their right to play (article 31) and their right to participate in decision-making (article 12). At the end of the chapter, the implications of this study are considered together with further topics of investigation relevant to children's rights in school. It is concluded that more initiatives need to be taken regarding the implementation of article 5 of the Convention, which pertains to the adults' role in helping children exercise their rights.

Keywords: Children's rights, Children's right to play, Comparative Education, Education, Focus groups, Participation, Qualitative research, Safety, Young children.

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this book was to give voice to children, aged 5 to 6 years, regarding the education of children their age and then relate these voices to children's rights as defined in the Convention of the Rights of the Child (1989). More specifically, the purpose of this study was to explore five-year-old children's views on aspects of behavior and rules, learning and play, and the physical environment of a school and to relate these views to the implementation or not of various provision, protection and participation rights (Te One, 2011) that children are entitled to and pertain to school. In this study, the term voice was used as Jones and Welch (2018) defined it rather than as related to children agency and participation determined by childhood studies (Lee 1998). I employed the term *voice* because many children are still 'silenced, not listened to or have adults speak for them' (Jones & Welch, 2018, p. 118) when decisions affecting them are made.

The topic of giving children an opportunity to voice their ideas on the education of young children was considered significant, because there is a tendency for many people to ignore or underestimate children's views due to their young age rather than their inability to form opinions and think rationally. That definitely

deprives children of their right to be consulted and their opinions to be listened to and be seriously considered when decisions are made affecting children's lives (article 12 of the Convention). Another reason this research is significant is its comparative nature, since there are not many studies comparing the opinions of children from different countries on aspects of different schooling.

Methodology of Research

As for the methodological approach to this empirical research, it was comparative and qualitative. Children views on aspects of schooling were produced in two countries, Scotland and Greece. The significance of comparison is that it leads to a deeper understanding of education phenomena and the impact of societal factors (e.g. economy, governance, politics, culture) on them (Calogiannaki, 2011; Clarkson, 2009; Georgeson et al., 2013; Kazamias, 2009; Lubeck, 1995; Phillips & Schweisfurth, 2011).

The education for children aged five years in Scotland and Greece was selected for various reasons so as to enable the research to be viable, productive, worthwhile and manageable (Clarkson, 2009). Scotland and Greece were chosen because of their difference in economic affluence and what it entails for their education systems. Scotland was selected because it is considered a rich country, whereas Greece is struggling to survive. The difference in affluence means that there is less financial aid to education in Greece as compared to Scotland, which entails less choices for children and limited scope for participation in decision-making for the children as well as the teachers.

Scotland and Greece were also selected because of three particular differences in their national cultures (Hofstede, 2021a). The three cultural dimensions between Greece and the United Kingdom [part of which is Scotland], as defined and measured by Hofstede that were relevant to the topic of children's education and their rights are (a) power distance (Hofstede, 2019a), (b) indulgence (Hofstede, 2019b) and (c) individualism (Hofstede, 2021b). The score on power distance is higher for Greece (Hofstede, 2019a); it is almost double compared with that of the UK (60 versus 35). On the contrary, in terms of individualism, UK scores 91 as compared to 35 for Greece, almost three times higher than Greece. As for indulgence, the UK scores higher (Hofstede, 2019b) than Greece (69 versus 50) but the difference between the countries is not as sharp as with the aforementioned dimensions.

These differences may have manifested in the form of children expecting or even receiving more adult directed education from their teachers in Greece and thus children's scope for consultation or participation in school being narrower as compared to that of Scotland. However, each person has their own culture, that is,

their own way to 'relate to other people, to think, to behave and their own worldview' (Rodriguez, 1999, as cited in Samovar *et al.*, 2013, p. 35). This means that not all the dimensions of one's national culture are accepted by people and this applies to teachers as well as pupils (Keesing, 1974). Therefore, depending on their national culture, the culture of the school children attend, their teacher's culture, and their own culture, children may have had different perceptions of the best school provision for them.

Simultaneously, Greece and Scotland had similarities which justified their selection for comparison. They are both located in Europe, were both part of the European Union when the empirical research in Scotland took place and are countries with mainly a Christian population and past (Report on International Religious Freedom: United Kingdom, 2017; Report on International Religious Freedom: Greece, 2017). Therefore, over the centuries, people in Scotland and Greece have known aspects of similar cultures, philosophies and ideas about educating young children.

Child-centeredness in education is considered a means of facilitating the implementation of young children's rights (General Comment 7 2005, articles 14, 17, 23, 28, and 34) and it exists in some form in the official education provision of both countries. Five year old children in Scotland attend primary school for the first time, but Scotland has at least two decades of child-centered primary education starting in 1965 (Darling, 2004) more than Greece. Their peers in Greece attend kindergartens, therefore, more time for play is allowed to them as compared to children in Scotland.

The final reason for choosing Scotland and Greece was practical. Since data were to be produced using an oral method of investigation, focus groups, and I am a native Greek speaker fluent in English, these two countries were within my options. Such a choice also enabled me to ensure linguistic equivalence, which should characterize every comparative study (Broadfoot, Osborn, with Gilly, & Bûcher, 1993).

The data for this comparison was chosen to be produced qualitatively. Each child participated in two focus group sessions (Flick, 2007; Gibson, 2007; Kitzinger, 1994; Large & Beheshti, 2001). In the first one, they discussed one of three plans for a school for children of their age. These plans were for a teacher-directed school, for a school based on developmental psychology and for a rights-based school. These three models of school reflect different degrees of respect towards children's rights, with the teacher directed model showing respect to a minimum number of rights and a rights-based model showing respect to all rights. Children were asked to suggest improvements for the plan they were read, so that they

REFERENCES

Alderson, P. (2008). Young children's rights: Exploring beliefs, principles and practice. Jessica Kingsley.

Aman, R. (2018). Decolonising Intercultural Education: Colonial differences, the geopolitics of knowledge and inter-epistemic dialogue. Routledge.

Archard, D. (2004). Children: Rights and childhood. (5th ed) Routledge.

Archard, D., & Skivenes, M. (2009). Balancing a child's best interests and a child's views. *Int. J. Child. Rights*, 17(1), 1-21.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/157181808X358276]

Arnstein, S.R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *J. Am. Inst. Plann.*, 35(4), 216-224. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225]

Berrell, M. (2020). *National culture and the social relations of anywhere working*. https://www.igi-global.com/chapter/national-culture-and-the-social-relations-of-anywhere-working/263827

Blenkin, G.V., & Kelly, A.V. (1997). Principles into practice in early childhood education. Paul Chapman.

Burts, D.C., Charlesworth, R., Fleege, P.O., Hart, C.H., Mosley, J., & Thomasson, R.H. (1992). Observed activities and stress behaviors of children in developmentally appropriate and inappropriate kindergarten classrooms. *Early Child. Res. Q.*, 7(2), 297-318. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0885-2006(92)90010-V]

Bordova, E., & Leong, D.J. (2011). Revisiting Vygotskian perspectives on play and pedagogy. In S. Rogers (Ed.), *Rethinking play and pedagogy in early childhood education: Concepts, contexts and cultures* (pp. 60-72). Routledge.

Bouzakis, S. (1993). Sigritiki Pedagogiki III / Συγκριτική Παιδαγωγική III [Comparative education III]. Gutenberg.

Bowe, R., Ball, S.J., & Gold, A. (1992). Reforming education and changing schools: Case studies in policy sociology. Routledge.

Breathnach, H., Danby, S., & O'Gorman, L. (2017). 'Are you working or playing?' Investigating young children's perspectives of classroom activities. *Int. J. Early Years Educ.*, 25(4), 439-454. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09669760.2017.1316241]

Broadfoot, P., Osborn, M., with Gilly, M., & Bûcher, A. (1993). Perceptions of teaching: Primary school teachers in England and France. Cassell.

Brown, M. A. (2014). What is childhood? In: M. A. Brown & J. White (Eds.), *Exploring childhood in a comparative context: An introductory guide for students* (pp. 5-15). Routledge.

Bruce, T. (1997). Early childhood education (2nd ed.). Hodder and Stoughton.

Burman, E. (2008). Deconstructing developmental psychology (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Calogiannaki, P. (2011). Sigritiki pedagogiki: Epistimologika ke methodologika zitimata / Συγκριτική Παιδαγωγική: Επιστημολογικά και μεθοδολογικά ζητήματα [Comparative Education: Epistemological and

Evanthia Synodi All rights reserved-© 2023 Bentham Science Publishers

References

methodological issues]. Ion.

Calogiannaki, P. (2015). *Peri Sigritikis Pedagogikis / Περί συγκριτικής παιδαγωγικής* [About Comparative Education]. Gutenber.

Cicchelli, T. (1983). Forms and functions of instruction patterns: Direct and nondirect. *Instr. Sci.*, 12(4), 343-353.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00154125]

Clarkson, J. (2009). What is comparative education? In W. Bignold & L. Gayton (Eds.), *Global issues and comparative education* (pp. 4-17). Sag.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). Research methods in education (8th ed.). Routledge.

Collins (n.d.). Equal. In Collins Online Dictionary https://www.collins dictionary.com/dictionary/english/equal

Colucci, E. (2007). "Focus groups can be fun": The use of activity-oriented questions in focus group discussions. *Qual. Health Res.*, 17(10), 1422-1433. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1049732307308129] [PMID: 18000081]

Corsaro, W.A., & Molinari, L. (2000). Priming events and Italian children's transition from preschool to elementary school: Representations and actions. *Soc. Psychol. Q., 63*(1), 16-33. [http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2695878]

Cornwall, A. (2008). Unpacking participation models, meanings and practices. *Community Development Journal*, 43(3), 269-283.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsn010]

Covell, K., & Howe, R.B. (2001). Moral Education through the 3 Rs: Rights, respect and responsibility. *J. Moral Educ.*, 30(1), 29-41.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03057240120033794]

Covell, K., Howe, R.B., & McNeil, J.K. (2010). Implementing children's human rights education in schools. *Improving Schools*, 13(2), 117-132. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1365480210378942]

Cunningham, H. (2005). Children and childhood in western society since 1500. Pearson Education Limited.

Cunningham, H. (2006). The invention of childhood. BBC Books.

Curtis, A. (1998). A curriculum for the pre-school child: Learning to learn (2nd ed). Routledge Falmer.

Darling, J. (2004). Scottish primary education: Philosophy and practice. In T. G. K. Bryce & W. H. Humes (Eds.), *Scottish education: Post evolution* (2nd ed., pp. 27-36). Edinburgh; University Press.

Devine, D. (1999). Children: Rights and status in education - A socio-historical analysis. Irish Educational Studies, 18(1), 14-28.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0332331990180105]

Einarsdottir, J. (2005). We can decide what to play! Children's perception of quality in an Icelandic playschool. *Early Educ. Dev.*, 16(4), 469-488. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15566935eed1604 7]

Eldén, S. (2013). Inviting the messy: Drawing methods and 'children's voices'. Childhood, 20(1), 66-81.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0907568212447243]

Farlane, A. (2018). China, Japan, Europe and the Anglo-sphere: A comparative analysis. Cam Rivers Publishing.

Filias, V. (1989). Kinoniologikes prosegisis / Κοινωνιολογικές προσεγγίσεις [Sociological approaches]. Sihroni Epoh.

Fisher, J.A. (2009). 'We used to play in Foundation, it was more funner': investigating feelings about transition from Foundation Stage to Year 1. *Early Years J. Int. Res. Dev.*, 29(2), 131-145. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09575140802672576]

Flewitt, R. (2005). Conducting research with young children: Some ethical considerations. *Early Child Dev. Care, 175*(6), 553-565. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03004430500131338]

Flick, U. (2007). The sage qualitative research kit. Designing qualitative research. Sage.

Francis, M., & Lorenzo, R. (2002). Seven realms of children's participation. J. Environ. Psychol., 22(1-2), 157-169

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jevp.2001.0248]

Freeman, E.B., & Hatch, J.A. (1989). What schools expect young children to know and do: An analysis of kindergarten report cards. *Elem. Sch. J.*, 89(5), 595-605. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/461594]

Georgeson, J., Payler, J., & Cambell-Barr, V. (2013). The importance of international perspectives. In: J. Georgeson & J. Payler (Eds.), *International perspectives of early childhood education and care* (pp. 3-8). Open University Press.

Gibson, F. (2007). Conducting focus groups with children and young people: Strategies for success. *J. Res. Nurs.*, 12(5), 473-483. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1744987107079791]

Gizeli, V. D. (1987). Deka mathimata stin kinoniologia / Δέκα μαθήματα στην κοινωνιολογία [Ten lessons in Sociology]. Epikerotit.

Goecke, N. (1976). What do they mean by 'Back to Basics'? *Music Educators J.*, 63(3), 30-33. [http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3395094]

Gotowos, A. (1983). Piotiki erevna stis epistimes tis agogis / Ποιοτική έρευνα στις επιστήμες της αγωγής [Qualitative research in education sciences]. Dodoni.

Gray, P. (2013). Free to learn. Why unleashing the instinct to play will make our children happier, more self-reliant, and better students for life. Basic Books.

Green, A. (1990). Education and state formation. The rise of education systems in England, France and the USA. Palgrave.

Grieshaber, S., & McArdle, F. (2010). The trouble with play. McGraw Hill.

Gripton, C., & Vincent, K. (2020). Using small world toys for research: a method for gaining insight into children's lived experiences of school. *Int. J. Res. Method Educ.*, 44(3), 225-240. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2020.1753692]

Gundarina, O. (2020). Interviews with creative techniques: research with Russian-speaking migrant pupils. *Int. J. Res. Method Educ.*, 44(4), 414-432. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2020.1804543]

Hall, E.L., & Kofkin Rudkin, J. (2011). Seen and heard: Children's rights in early childhood education. Teachers College Press.

Hart, C. (2014). Whiffy Wilson: The wolf who wouldn't go to school. Orchard Books.

Hartley, D. (1993). Understanding the nursery school. Cassell.

Hatch, A. J. (1995). (Ed). Qualitative research in early childhood settings. Praeger Publisher.

Hedegaard, M. (2008). A cultural-historical theory of children's development. In M. Hedegaard & M. Fleer (Eds.), *Studying children: A cultural-historical approach* (pp. 10-29). OU.

Hellenic Republic (2021). Kratikos proipologismos / Κρατικός προϋπολογισμός [State Budget]. (2021). https://www.minfin.gr/documents/20182/14940417/%CE%9A%CE%A1%CE%91%CE%A4%CE%99%CE%9A%CE%9F%CE%A3+%CE%A0%CE%A1%CE%9F%CE%A5%CE%A0%CE%9F%CE%9B%CE%9F%CE%93%CE%99%CE%A3%CE%9C%CE%9F%CE%A3+2021.pdf/90427c6f-d2a2-421e-9-87-6e5d5685b9fe.

Hofstede, G. (2019a, February 3). *National culture*. https://www.hofstede-insights.com/models/nationa-culture/

Hofstede, G. (2019b, February 3). *Compare countries*. https://www.hofstede-insights.com/product/compar-countries/

Hofstede, G. (2021a, January 5). National culture. https://hi.hofstede-insights.com/national-culture

Hofstede, G. (2021b, January 5). *Country comparison*. https://www.hofstede-insights.com/countr-comparison/greece,the-uk/

Howard, J. (2010). Making the most of play in the early years: The importance of children's perceptions. In: P. Broadhead J. Howard & E. Wood (Eds.), *Play and learning in the early years* (pp. 145-160). Sage.

Howe, R.B., & Covell, K. (2005). Miseducating children about their rights. *Educ. Citizsh. Soc. Justice*, 5(2), 91-102.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1746197910370724]

Hughes, P. (2001). Paradigms, methods and knowledge. In: G. MacNaughton S. A. Rolfe & I. Siraj-Blatchford (Eds.), *Doing early childhood research: International perspectives on theory and practice* (pp. 31-55). Allen and Unwi.

Hurst, V. (1991). Planning for early learning: Education in the first five years. Paul Chapman.

International Save the Children Alliance. (2007). Getting it right for children: A practitioners' guide to child rights programming. Save the Children UK.

James, A. (2007). Giving voice to children's voices: Practices and problems, pitfalls and potentials. *Am. Anthropol.*, 109(2), 261-272. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/aa.2007.109.2.261]

Jans, M. (2004). Children as citizens: Towards a contemporary notion of child participation. Childhood,

11(1), 27-44.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0907568204040182]

Johnny, L. (2005). UN Convention on the rights of the child: A rationale for implementing participatory rights in schools. *Can. J. Educ. Adm. Policy*, 40(May), 1-20. http://iej.cjb.net

Johnson, L., & van Wyk, M. (2016). Approaches to teaching EMS: The teacher-centred approach. In: M. van Wyk & K. dos Reis (Eds.), *Teaching Economics and Management Sciences in the Senior Phase* (pp. 103-120). Oxford University Press.

Jones, P. (2011a). What are children's rights? Contemporary developments and debates. In: P. Jones & G. Walker (Eds.), *Children's rights in practice* (pp. 2-16). Sage. [http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781473914711.n1]

Jones, P. (2011b). Participation and provision across disciplines: Child rights for, and by, children. In: P. Jones & G. Walker (Eds.), *Children's rights in practice* (pp. 43-56). Sage. [http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781473914711.n4]

Jones, P., & Welsh, S. (2018). *Rethinking children's rights: Attitudes in contemporary society*. (2nd ed). Bloomsbury. [http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350001282]

Kaime, T. (2011). The convention on the rights of the child: A cultural legitimacy critique. Europa Law Publishing.

Kalantzis, M., Cope, B., & Harvey, A. (2003). Assessing multiliteracies and the new basics. *Asess. Educ.*, 10(1), 15-26.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09695940301692]

Kanyal, M. (2014). Childhood and children's participation: A social – cultural perspective. In: M. Kanyal (Ed.), *Children's rights 0-8: Promoting participation in education and care* (pp. 26-41). Routledge. [http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781315815107]

Kanyal, M., & Gibbs, J. (2014). Participation: Why and how? In: M. Kanyal (Ed.), *Children's rights 0-8: Promoting participation in education and care* (pp. 45-62). Routledge. [http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781315815107]

Katz, C. (1986). Children and the environment: Work, play and learning in rural Sudan. *Child. Environ. Q.*, 3(4), 43-51.

Kay-Flowers, S. (2009). Education and social care: friends or foes? In: W. Bignold & I. Gayton (Eds.), *Global Issues and Comparative Education* (pp. 94-108). Sage..

Kazamias, A. M. (2009). Forgotten men, forgotten themes: The historical-philosophical-cultural and liberal humanist motif in Comparative Education. In: R. Cowen & A. M. Kazamias (Eds.), *International Handbook of Comparative Education* (pp. 37-58). Springer. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6403-6 4]

Keating, I., Fabian, H., Jordan, P., Mavers, D., & Roberts, J. (2000). "Well, I've not done any work today. I don't know why I came to school". Perceptions of play in reception class. *Educ. Stud., 26*(4), 437-454. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03055690020003638]

Keesing, R.M. (1974). Theories of Culture. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.*, *3*, 73-97. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.03.100174.000445]119

Kitzinger, J. (1994). The methodology of Focus Groups: the importance of interaction between research participants. *Sociol. Health Illn.*, 16(1), 103-121. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.ep11347023]

Kitzinger, J. (1995). Qualitative Research: Introducing focus groups. *BMJ*, 311(7000), 299-302. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.311.7000.299] [PMID: 7633241]

Kok-Aun, T. (2014). Teacher-centred teaching is alive and well. *Teaching and Learning*, 15(1), 12-17. http://hdl.handle.net/10497/440

Lancy, D.F. (2012). Unmasking children's agency. *AnthropoChildren*, 2(October), 1-20. Corpus ID: 170186959.

Large, A., & Beheshti, J. (2001). Focus groups with children: Do they work? Can. J. Inf. Lib. Sci., 26(2), 86-89.

Lee, N. (1998). Towards an immature sociology. *Sociol. Rev.*, 46(3), 458-482. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-954X.00127]

Leininger, E.V. (1979). Back to basics: Underlying concepts and controversy. *Elem. Sch. J.*, 79(3), 167-173. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/461147]

Leithwood, K. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. Educ. Leadersh., 49(5), 8-12.

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *Sch. Leadersh. Manage.*, 28(1), 27-42. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13632430701800060]

Li, L. (2022). Developing a pedagogy of play: toddlers' conceptual learning in a PlayWorld. *Early Years J. Int. Res. Dev.*, 42(3), 278-292. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09575146.2020.1739002]

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. *Lincoln and Guba's evaluative criteria*. http://www.qualres. org/HomeLinc-3684.html. (1985).

Lowe, R. (2007). *The death of progressive education, how teachers lost control of the classroom.* Routledge. [http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203945957]

Lubeck, S. (1995). Policy issues in the development of child care and early education systems: The need for cross national comparison. In A. J. Hatch (Ed.), *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Settings* (pp. 79-98). Praeger.

Lundy, L. (2007). 'Voice' is not enough: Conceptualizing article 12 of the United Nations convention on the rights of the child. *Br. Educ. Res. J.*, 33(6), 927-942. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01411920701657033]

Lundy, L., & McEvoy, L. (2012). Children's rights and research processes: Assisting children to (in)formed views. *Childhood*, 19(1), 129-144. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0907568211409078]

Lynch, K. (2014). New Managerialism: The Impact on education. *Concept, 5*(3), 1-11. [http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.4342.3128]

MacNaughton, G. (2020). Shaping early childhood: Perceptions about learning, curriculum and the

education context [Shaping early childhood: Learners, curriculum and contexts]. (Y. Scarveli, Trans.). Pedio. (Original work published 2003).

MacNaughton, G., Hughes, P., & Smith, K. (2007). Young children's rights and public policy: Practices and possibilities for citizenship in the Early Years. *Child. Soc.*, 21(6), 458-469. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1099-0860.2007.00096.x]

Mandell, N. (1991). The least-adult role in studying children. In: F.C., Waksler, (Ed.), *Studying the Social Worlds of Children: Sociological Readings* (pp. 38-59). Falmer.

Marfo, K., & Biersteker, L. (2011). Exploring culture, play, and early childhood education practice in African contexts. In: S. Rogers (Ed.), *Rethinking play and pedagogy in early childhood education: Concepts, contexts and cultures* (pp. 73-85). Routledg.

Mascolo, M.E. (2009). Beyond student - centered and teacher - centered pedagogy: Teaching and learning as guided participation. *Pedagogy and the Human Sciences*, 1(1), 3-27.

Merriam, S.B. (1995). What can you tell from an N of 1? Issues of validity and reliability in qualitative research. *PAACE J. Lifelong Learn.*, 4, 51-60.

Morgan, M.T., & Robinson, N. (1976). The 'back to basics' movement in education. *Can. J. Educ., 1*(2), 1-11. [http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1494485]

Noble, H., & Smith, J. (2015). Issues of validity and reliability in qualitative research. *Evid. Based Nurs.*, 18(2), 34-35.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/eb-2015-102054] [PMID: 25653237]

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (1998). Children's rights and citizenship: Some implications for the management of schools. *Int. J. Child. Rights, 6*(3), 313-333. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/15718189820494085]

Percy-Smith, B. (2009). Beyond the UNCRC: Realising children's participation in practice. In: Children's Rights Conference: Easier said than done: 20 years of children's rights between law and practice, 11-12th June 2009, Institute of Child Health, University College London. (unpublished).

Percy-Smith, B. (2010). Councils, consultations and community: Rethinking the spaces for children and young people's participation1. *Child. Geogr.*, *8*(2), 107-122. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14733281003691368]

Phillips, D., & Schweisfurth, M. (2011). Comparative and International Education: An introduction to theory, method, and practice. *Continuum*.

Popkewitz, T. S., & Bloch, M. N. (2001). Administering freedom: A history of the present - Rescuing the parent to rescue the child for society. In K. Hultqvist & G. Dahlberg (Eds.), *Governing the child in the new millennium* (pp. 85-118). Routledge.

Potts, P. (2007). The place of experience in comparative education research. In: M. Bray B. Adamson & M. Mason (Eds.), *Comparative Education research: Approaches and methods* (pp. 63-81). Springer. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6189-9 3]

Pugh, G. (1996). Contemporary issues in the early years: Working collaboratively for children. (2nd ed). Paul Chapman.

Quennerstedt, A., Quennerstedt, M. (2014). Researching children's rights in education: Sociology of

childhood encountering educational theory. *Br. J. Sociol. Educ.*, *35*(1), 115-132. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2013.783962]

Robinson, N. (1999). The use of focus group methodology — with selected examples from sexual health research. J. Adv. Nurs., 29(4), 905-913.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.1999.00966.x] [PMID: 10215982]

Robson, C. (2007). How to do a research project: A guide for undergraduate students. Blackwell.

Ross, E.V. (1980). Back to basics: Underlying concepts and controversy. Elem. Sch. J., 79(3), 167-173.

Samovar, L.A., Porter, R.E., McDaniel, E.R., & Roy, C.S. (2013). *Communication between cultures*. (8th ed.). Wadsworth Cengate Learning.

Sandelowski, M. (1993). Rigor or rigor mortis: The problem of rigor in qualitative research revisited. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 16(2), 1-8.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00012272-199312000-00002] [PMID: 8311428]

Scott, W.R. (2008). Lords of the dance: Professionals as institutional agents. *Organ. Stud.*, 29(2), 219-238. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0170840607088151]

Scottish Government. (2021). Scottish Budget 2021 to 2022. https://www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-budget-2021-22/pages/9/

Sevón, E. (2015). Who's got the power? Young children's power and agency in the child-parent relationship. *International Journal of Child, Youth and Family Studies, 6*(4.1), 622-645. [http://dx.doi.org/10.18357/ijcyfs.641201515049]

Shenton, A.K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Educ. Inf.*, 22(2), 63-75.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.3233/EFI-2004-22201]

Sheridan, S., & Pramling-Samuelsson, I. (2001). Children's conceptions of participation and influence in preschool: A perspective on pedagogical quality. *Contemp. Issues Early Child.*, 2(2), 169-194. [http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/ciec.2001.2.2.4]

Singer, E. (1996). Prisoners of the method breaking open the child-centred pedagogy in day care centres. *Int. J. Early Years Educ.*, 4(2), 28-40.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0966976960040203]

Sirkko, R., Kyrönlampi, T., & Puroila, A.M. (2019). Children's agency: Opportunities and constraints. *Int. J. Early Child.*, *51*(3), 283-300. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13158-019-00252-5]

Smith, A., Duncan, J., & Marshall, K. (2005). Children's perspectives on their learning: Exploring methods. *Early Child Dev. Care, 175*(6), 473-487. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03004430500131270]

Smith, P.K. (2010). Children and Play. Wiley-Blackwell.

Smylie, M.A., & Eckert, J. (2018). Beyond superheroes and advocacy: The pathway of teacher leadership development. *Educ. Manage. Adm. Leadersh.*, 46(4), 556-577. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1741143217694893]

Socolova, M. A., Kouzmina, E. H., & Rodionof, M. L. (1990). Comparative Education [СРАВНИТЕЛЬНАЯ

ПЕДАГОГИКА]. (A. Koutsoukalis, C. Kenourgios, & Y. Labrakis, Trans.). Sihroni Epohi. (Original work published 1978).

Stoecklin, D. (2013). Theories of action in the field of child participation: In search of explicit frameworks. Childhood, 20(4), 443-457.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0907568212466901]

Stolp, S. (1994). Leadership for school culture. *ERIC Digest*, 91, 1-7. Accessed January 31, 2020. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED370198.pdf.

Straus, A.L., & Corbin, J.M. (1998). Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and procedures for developing Grounded Theory. Sage.

Te One, S. (2011). Defining rights: Children's rights in theory and in practice. *He Kupu, The Word, 2*(4), 41-57.

Te One, S., & Dalli, C. (2013). The status of children's rights in Early Childhood Education policy 2009. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 19, 52-77.

Tesar, M. (2016). An overview of Childhood Studies. In: M.A. Peters (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Educational Philosophy and Theory* (A-F, pp. 261-267). Springer. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-532-7_261-1]

Thomas, N. P. (2021). Child-led research, children's rights and Childhood Studies: A defence. *Childhood*, 1-14.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0907568221996743]

Troman, G. (1996). The Rise of the New Professionals? The restructuring of primary teachers' work and professionalism. *Br. J. Sociol. Educ.*, *17*(4), 473-487. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0142569960170404]

UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC). (2001). General Comment No. 1: Article 29(1): The aims of Education. https://www.refworld.org/docid/4538834d2.html.

UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC). (2005). *General Comment No. 7: Implementing Child Rights in Early Childhood, CRC/C/GC/7/Rev.1*. https://www.refworld.org/docid/460bc5a62.html.

UN Committee on the Rights of the Children (CRC). (2009). *General Comment No. 12 The right of the child to be heard.* https://www.refworld.org/ docid/4ae562c52.html.

UN Committee on the Rights of the Children (CRC). (2013). General Comment No. 14 on the right of the child to have his or her best interests taken as a primary consideration (art. 3, para. 1). https://www.refworld.org/docid/51a84b5e4.html.

UN Committee on the Rights of the Children (CRC). (2013). General Comment No. 17 (2013) on the right of the child to rest, leisure, play, recreational activities, cultural life and the arts (art. 31)*. https://www.refworld.org/docid/51ef9bcc4.html.

UN General Assembly. (1989). Convention on the rights of the child. https://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b38f0.html.

U.S Department of State. (2017). International Religious Freedom Reports: on International Religious Freedom: Greece. https://www.state.gov/reports/2017-report-on-international-religious-freedom/greece/

U.S Department of State. (2017). International Religious Freedom Report : United Kingdom.

References

https://www.state.gov/reports/2017-report-on-international-religious-freedom/united-kingdom/

Vasquez, V.M. (2004). *Negotiating critical literacies with young children*. Routledge. [http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781410611109]

Verma, G.K., & Mallick, K. (2004). Researching Education: Perspectives and techniques. Falmer.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1966). Play and its role in the mental development of the child. *Voprosy psikhologii*, 12(6), 62-76.

Walkerdine, V. (1993). Beyond Developmentalism? *Theory Psychol.*, *3*(4), 451-469. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0959354393034004]

Walkerdine, V. (1998). Developmental psychology and the child-centred pedagogy: The insertion of Piaget in early education. In: W. Hollway J. Henriques C. Venn C. Urwin & V. Walkerdine (Eds.), *Changing the subject: Psychology, social regulation and subjectivity* (pp. 153-202). Routledge. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0959354393034004]

Warner, L., & Lynch, S.A. (2004). Preschool classroom management. Gryphon House Inc..

Warren Little, J. (1993). Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform. *Educ. Eval. Policy Anal.*, 15(2), 129-151.

Warshak, R.A. (2003). Payoffs and pitfalls of listening to children. *Fam. Relat.*, *52*(4), 373-384. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3700318 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2003.00373.x]

Wilson, V. (1997). Focus Groups: a useful qualitative method for educational research? *Br. Educ. Res. J.*, 23(2), 209-224.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0141192970230207]

Wood, E. (2010). Developing integrated pedagogical approaches to play and learning. In P. Broadhead J. Howard & E. Wood (Eds.), *Play and Learning in the Early Years* (pp. 9-26). Sage.

Wood, E., & Attfield, J. (1996). Play, learning and the early childhood curriculum. Paul Chapman.

Woodhead, M. (1999). Reconstructing Developmental Psychology - Some first steps. *Childen & Society*, 13, 3-19.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1099-0860.1999.tb00097.x]

SUBJECT INDEX

A	Books, reading 115, 184
	Bouncy castles 55
Abuse 2, 9, 29, 30, 142, 151	Boxing sack 155
physical 142, 151	Bullying, avoiding 78
sexual 29, 30	C
Abusive teacher 54	C
Access information 2, 49	
Activities 55, 111, 113, 185, 150	Care, animal 166
physical 55	Castle, bouncing 47
recreational 185	Change school cultures 23
teacher-directed 150	Chenille stem 72
teacher-led 111	Child 14, 17, 28, 51, 54, 86, 93, 111, 150, 184,
time 113	188
Adult(s) 2, 14, 15, 185	apologise 51
gaze playgrounds 185	behavior 14
life 14	development 14
act 2, 14, 15	initiated activities 28, 54, 86, 111, 150, 184,
Agency, children's 6, 24, 39	188
Agents 6, 16	relationships 93
social 6	sociologist 17
Alarms, smoke 77	Children 4, 8, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 33, 51,
Animal's welfare 162	56, 63, 86, 89, 94, 98, 102, 11, 113, 142,
Anonymity 34, 35, 100, 171	143, 146, 150, 152, 169, 173, 176, 179,
children's 34	185, 186, 188
Attire, children's 90, 181	agency 173
	activities 15
В	complaining 169
	developing 102
Behavioristic technique 81	developmental stage 185
Behavior(s) 17, 18, 20, 21, 26, 28, 37, 40, 49,	dignity 51, 56, 98, 179
56, 58, 60, 89, 122, 136, 138, 139, 151,	education 12
166, 184	harming 94, 113
children's 89, 122	health 188
communicative 40	individualism and independence 15
issues 184	issues 19
teacher's 122	learning 14, 16, 102, 152
unacceptable 151	naughty 89
Bicycle 83, 136, 137, 148	participation rights 14
giant 136	preparation 14, 111
Board 16, 87, 156, 159, 189	prioritize 33, 176
diving 159	protecting 146
games 16, 87, 156, 189	punishes 70, 183
541100 10, 01, 100, 107	

Evanthia Synodi All rights reserved-© 2023 Bentham Science Publishers

Discrimination, racial 7

Disobedience 51, 93 children's 51	G
Disobeyed rules 51 Duties, teacher's 118	Gray's definition 186 Gymnastics 102, 104
E	Н
Early childhood education 8, 17, 185 Echo article, children misbehavior 51 Education 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 21,	Hill school 66, 93, 99 in Scotland 66 rules 93, 99 Homework 92, 185 Hopscotch area 110 Horses 83, 84, 153, 162, 163 little 163 real 162 House 30, 31, 45, 50, 74, 80, 83, 101, 108, 110, 129, 162 big green 80 little 110 I Ice 132, 165 cubes 165 lollies 132 Ice cream 81, 133 fat 133 giant 81 International humanitarian law 7 L
F	Language 3, 4, 7, 21, 25, 29, 37, 114, 187 official 25 Learner's age 14
Food 95, 96, 102, 103, 125, 126, 128, 130, 131, 133, 134, 139, 146, 147, 150, 161, 163, 165, 167, 168, 169, 170, 180, 181 healthy 130, 139, 181 spill 102 sugary 180 unhealthy 125, 126, 133, 134, 139, 146, 147, 161 Football playground 149 Free activity time 18 Freedom, children's 167 Fun fair 163, 172	Learning 5, 6, 13, 15, 25, 76, 102, 105, 111, 114, 121, 132, 134, 138, 147, 154, 170, 180, 182, 183, 184 academic 114, 138 devalue 154 difficulties 25 equipment 183 indoors 147 materials 184 Linguistic minorities 4

Subject Index

M

Mobile phones 39

Moray house school 34 Mother tongues 30, 38 Motivation, intrinsic 187 Multiplicity 37 Museum 31, 101 Musical instruments 158

N

Natural environment 4, 7, 40, 44, 49, 54, 59, 63, 81, 84, 169 Nutrition, healthy 121, 134, 170, 180

$\mathbf{0}$

Obstacle 75, 99, 102, 162, 163 courses 75, 99, 102 jumping 162 Outdoors, ground 110

P

Palm trees 81, 82 Parental permissions 34 Pastry shop 109, 110 area 109 label 110 Pencil case 123, 125 Playing 96, 97, 98, 182 arrangements 96 football 97, 98 indoors 182 Playschool teacher 19, 181, 182 Political opinion 3 Primary education 3, 24, 92, 175 child-centered 24, 175 Puppies, younger 143 Puzzles 52, 53, 87, 108, 150, 152

R

Raspberries, people blowing 137 Research, conduct emancipatory 18

Resources 28, 44, 49, 55, 86, 102, 111, 124, 131, 138, 149, 150, 152, 158, 176, 177, 183, 185 entertainment 158 material 185 Right to education 42, 44, 74, 101, 121, 127 Role, teacher's 19, 49, 94, 147, 170 Rooms 30, 74, 84, 134 giant 134 large 30, 74, 84 Rules 56, 57, 58, 68, 59, 60, 63, 66, 68, 98, 99, 70, 71, 93, 97, 112, 113, 120, 149, 151, 157, 166, 168, 169, 170, 171, 179, 180, 182 bad 59, 60 behavior 58, 149 break 99 class 60 crazy 171 lax 180 linked 98 safety 98 silly 182 strict 169, 180

S

```
School 4, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 25, 28, 29, 30,
     31, 33, 36, 63, 65, 66, 71, 78, 79, 81, 90,
     91, 99, 101, 112, 113, 115, 118, 128,
     142, 161, 166, 175, 176, 178, 180, 183,
     184
 children 23, 118, 175
 cultures 22, 23
 layout 142, 161
 library 72
 life 4, 91, 166
 matters 25, 91, 115, 183, 184
 nursery 36, 128
 paint 65
 play-based 180
 plans 33, 66, 176, 178
 policies 23, 113
 practices 17, 18, 28
 problems 31, 101
 provision 18, 21, 33, 176
 right-based 30
 royal 78, 79, 81
 rules 63, 71, 81, 112, 180, 183
 sessions 99
```

shortcomings 65 spacious 28 teach children 22 teacher-centered 29, 81, 90 Scolding 50, 51, 152, 161 teacher's 50 Skills 102, 109 children's motor 109 physical 102 social 102 Social 6, 15 actors, young 6 order 15 Society, multi-ethnic 24	Toys 52, 53, 54, 55, 61, 64, 67, 83, 85, 105, 109, 126, 129, 140, 145, 147, 149, 150, 158, 159, 162 big inflatable 83 bombs 109 cars 162 fish 158 fruit 55 guns 109 kitchen 53, 149, 162 knives 105 motorcycles 85 pastry shop 110 lots of 125, 129, 134, 149
Space, physical 49	shop 162
Stereotypes 146 T	spiderman 153 spiders 84 sweets 110 tools 55
Tables, glittery 47	trucks 84, 85
Teacher(s) 23, 28, 31, 56, 58, 60, 63, 64, 70, 71, 93, 94, 96, 98, 99, 115, 118, 120, 124, 130, 131, 135, 137, 139, 141, 142, 143, 146, 151, 152, 154, 157, 160, 168,	weapons 109 Traditional developmental psychology 12, 14, 17, 28, 38, 147, 185
170, 179 funny 139 good 141, 142, 154	V Voice, children's 24, 25
head 93, 94 ideal 137, 141, 160 lady 143	W
nice 124, 130, 135 perfect 70, 152, 160, 168, 170 primary 131 silly 135	Watch 32, 48, 122, 125, 155 children's programs 155 TV 32, 48, 122, 125 Water 39, 77, 80, 113, 123, 125, 130, 133,
strict 71, 137, 157, 168, 170 wolf 143 Time 13, 19, 24, 28, 29, 31, 36, 43, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61, 70, 81, 94, 113, 114, 131, 132,	137, 158, 159, 162 bottles 113, 123, 125 clean 39 drink 159
137, 161, 163, 177 break 43 disco 131, 137 free 163 golden 132	fights 80, 133, 137 fountain 130 pistols 80, 133 spray 77
spending 36 tea 161 Toilets indoors 137	
Tolerance 4, 7, 124, 149, 167 Tools 27, 72, 87, 107, 156 magic 27	