

THE UNIVERSITY OF HULL

The language of the human rights of children: a critical discourse analysis.

Being a Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the University of Hull

by

Allison Anne Dunhill

MA, Education, Inclusion & Special Needs, Open University.

April 2019

Abstract

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child is an international treaty addressing the human rights of children. The Convention can be seen as the language of the human rights of children. Children are becoming more engaged and participating in the actual implementation of the Convention. This is a welcome move, but at the same time, we need to ensure the understanding and use of the language of the human rights of children is effectively and accurately available to them.

This study examines the use of the Convention, the language of the human rights of children, by schools in England who have achieved the Rights Respecting Schools Award (RRSA). This is done by applying Norman Fairclough's three phases of Critical Discourse Analysis. Schools who are working towards the RRSA are required to embed the Convention into the school ethos and teaching and learning approaches.

Based on the analysis of the language of the human rights of children incorporated into the RRSA and presented on school websites, this study identified two key findings. First, there is a lack of understanding of the human rights of children, and this is clear from the misunderstandings or recontextualisation of the language of the Convention. Second, there is a lack of evidence regarding the reality of what is in the 'best interest of the child' (Article, 3) and the views of the child being taken into consideration and being given due weight (Article 12), when developing reciprocally respectful adult and child relationships in schools. This study has identified that more needs to be done to reduce or stop the recontextualisation of the Convention and the language of the human rights of children as this is distorting the discourse.

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank my supervisors Dr Max Hope and Dr Josef Ploner who made my experience of the EdD, and specifically the thesis, a most enjoyable one. I appreciated your continual guidance and support which allowed me to shape my ideas and thoughts into this study. Your ‘tough’ questions and wonderful sense of humour were a great combination, and you always made me feel that I could complete the EdD. Thank you also to Dr Michael Farrelly who first gave me the confidence and reassurance that I could use CDA in my study and I have never looked back. Thank you to all the EdD students and staff, it was great to work and learn with you all.

I would also like to thank the children that I have had the privilege to research with and the many rights defenders across the world who I am lucky to be connected with and who continually remind me of what the human rights of children is all about. Also, I would like to thank the small number of educational/ social science researchers who (discreetly) acknowledge themselves as critical discourse analysts.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends who lifted me at times when chocolate stains covered my papers. Richard, thank you for the many debates and discussions we had. I have always been able to rely on you, and you kept me going in the direction I needed to go. Lucy and Fraser thank you for listening to me discuss my research and for gently distracting me when I needed a break. My life over the last five years wouldn't have been as much fun if it wasn't for friends like Alicia, Archie, John, Kiki, Lisa, Hermione, Karen, Sue, Gail, Di, Vanessa, Amanda and Vicki.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
<i>Introduction.....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Motivation behind this Study.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Methodology.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>The Research Questions.....</i>	<i>7</i>
Primary Research Question	8
Research Sub-questions	8
<i>The Research Sources.....</i>	<i>9</i>
The Convention	9
The RRSA	13
School Websites.....	14
<i>Limitations of the Study</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Organisation of the Study.....</i>	<i>16</i>
Literature on Human Rights and the Human Rights of Children: Chapter 2.	17
Methodology: Chapter 3.	18
Interpretative Phase: The History of the Language of the Human Rights of Children. Chapter 4.	18
Descriptive Phase: Findings: Chapter 5.	19
Explanation Phase: Discussion: Chapter 6.....	19
Conclusion: Chapter 7.....	20
Chapter 2. Literature on Human Rights and the Human Rights of Children	21
<i>Introduction.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>The Foundations of Human Rights.....</i>	<i>21</i>
The Modern Concept of Human Rights	28
Criticisms of Human Rights	29
Defining Contemporary Human Rights.....	32
<i>The Human Rights of Children</i>	<i>33</i>
The Child as a Rights Holder and an Object of Rights	34
Realising the Human Rights of Children.....	38
Realising the Human Rights of Children through the RRSA.....	42
<i>Summary</i>	<i>45</i>

Chapter 3. Methodology	47
<i>Introduction.....</i>	47
The Four Articles in this Study.....	48
<i>The Scope of the Study</i>	50
Research Question.....	51
Research Sub-questions	51
<i>A Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) Approach.....</i>	52
CDA as a Theory and a Method	55
Elements of Fairclough’s CDA applied in this Study.....	57
Further Context of the Theoretical and Analytical Framework of CDA	58
CDA and Power.....	62
<i>Sources and Data Collection</i>	64
Interpretative Phase	65
Descriptive Phase	66
Explanation Phase	67
Data Sources.....	68
<i>Ethical Considerations.....</i>	70
<i>Positionality</i>	71
<i>Summary</i>	77
Chapter 4. Interpretative Phase: The History of the Language of the Human Rights of Children.....	79
<i>Introduction.....</i>	79
The Genesis and Language of the 1924 Declaration of the Rights of the Child	82
The Genesis and Language of the 1959 Declaration of the Rights of the Child	86
The 1989 United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.....	91
<i>The Development of the Four Articles included in this Study.....</i>	96
The Drafting Process.....	108
<i>Contemporary Critiques of the Language of the 1989 Convention</i>	110
<i>Summary</i>	111
Chapter 5 Descriptive Phase: Findings	115
<i>Introduction.....</i>	115
<i>The Structure of Analysis.....</i>	116
<i>Rights Respecting School Award (RRSA) Level 2.....</i>	118
RRSA Standard A	119
RRSA Standard B	121
RRSA Standard C	124
RRSA Standard D	127

<i>Common Wordings used Throughout the RRSA Standards</i>	129
<i>Review of the School Websites</i>	131
School One.....	132
School Two.....	133
School Three	135
School Four	137
School Five.....	139
School Six	141
<i>Summary</i>	142
Chapter 6. Explanation Phase: Discussion	146
<i>Introduction</i>	146
<i>Summary of Data from Interpretative Phase and Descriptive Phase</i>	147
<i>Power Dimensions</i>	150
<i>The Discourse of Rights</i>	155
The Realisation of These Rights	156
<i>The Impact on Practice</i>	162
<i>Summary</i>	167
Chapter 7. Conclusion	170
<i>Introduction</i>	170
<i>Summary of the Study</i>	170
<i>Contribution to Knowledge</i>	172
Recontextualising the Language of the Human Rights of Children	173
Contribution Beyond Existing Research	174
Language Matters	175
Rights Respecting and the Convention	176
Power Dimensions	176
Applying CDA	177
<i>Limitations of the Study</i>	178
<i>Reflecting on my Positionality</i>	180
<i>Recommendations for Further Research</i>	181
<i>Summary</i>	184
References	187

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction

This thesis examines the language of the human rights of children. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) (hereby referred to as Convention), is acknowledged in this study as the language of the human rights of children as its contents have been globally agreed, therefore accepted by almost every country in the world (United Nations, 1989). The United States is the only country in the world that has not fully agreed to the Convention.

Throughout history, children have “been afforded none or very few rights” as they “have been little more than property” (Freeman, 2009:377). By using the term ‘the human rights of children,’ I aimed to draw attention to children as human beings. According to Freeman (2011:23) “many of today’s critics of children’s rights are passionate defenders of the rights of others”. Using the term ‘children’s rights’ can act as a way to marginalise "child rights from human rights" (Cantwell, 2011:35). Therefore, by positioning the Convention as the human rights of children, and drawing attention to the language, I am placing ‘children's rights’ within the paradigm of human rights.

My examination of the language of the human rights of children begins with the development and drafting of the Convention and then analyses how this language is incorporated into the UNICEF UK Rights Respecting Schools Award (RRSA) and onto school websites, where the school has achieved level 2 of the RRSA. The RRSA is a UNICEF UK school award that supports schools to embed the Convention into the ethos of the school (UNICEF UK, 2015a). The Convention can be seen as a guiding framework for all those who have a responsibility for

children and when incorporated into practice, including teaching and learning in schools, can support the realisation of the human rights of children. The Convention was "adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession" in November 1989 (UNESCO, 1989). The Convention was drafted over ten years and was built upon the foundations of two previous international children's rights agreements.

The RRSA is presented as "a whole school approach to embedding the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child at the centre of the school ethos and teaching and learning approaches" by UNICEF UK (2015a). The number of schools in the UK achieving this Award is growing each year. Currently, there are over 5000 schools in the UK which are either working towards or have achieved an RRSA (UNICEF UK, 2019). This thesis examined the incorporation of Articles 2, 3, 6 and 12, in the Convention, through analysing the language presented in the UNICEF UK Rights Respecting School Award level 2 and the language presented on six school websites that had completed this award.

The school can be seen as a social space where language forms social realities and practices on a daily basis through all forms of interactions. Within the 'social space' of a school, the language of the human rights of children presented on the websites can also be seen to indicate power and the invested interests of those in power. All maintained schools in England, which have a website, must include a representation of the school ethos on that platform (DfE, 2017). The RRSA requires the Award to be embedded into the school ethos. Therefore, all maintained schools in England with a school website, which have achieved the RRSA, must include their school ethos, which will include the embedding of the RRSA, on this platform. However, there is no monitoring of a school once the

RRSA is achieved. Schools retain the Award for a term of three years. This is significant, as schools have the opportunity and power to communicate on their websites what they believe is favourable to them strategically. It is essential to understand how schools represent their rights ethos and themselves on such platforms as school websites.

This study examines the use of rights language, and how schools construct their position and their understanding of the human rights of children on their websites. The way that schools represent themselves as 'Rights Respecting' and promote their 'rights' ethos online has significance for all stakeholders and individuals associated with the school, such as children, parents, carers, staff, other schools, professionals and researchers. If schools misrepresent the human rights of children on their website, stakeholders may read and not question this information. Therefore, they accept the misinformation and apply that understanding of the human rights of children to their practice and knowledge. Consequentially, children will not be accurately informed of their rights and adults will not accurately uphold the human rights of children as stated in the Convention.

The language of the human rights of children was examined using Fairclough's (2015) version of critical discourse analysis (CDA). This form of CDA "combines critique of discourse and explanation of how it figures within and contributes to the existing social reality, as a basis for action to change that existing reality in particular respects" (Fairclough, 2015:6). This version of CDA, informed by a critical realist ontology, was selected as both a conceptual and methodological framework for the study of the language of the human rights of children. The discourse of the human rights of children, presented through language was

critiqued, and the Convention, the RRSA Standards and six school websites were examined for language similarities, differences, inconsistencies and gaps.

Motivation behind this Study

I have a wide range of experience in working and researching with children and young people including participating in and researching the RRSA. My interest in the RRSA began in early 2015 when I met a headteacher at an education event, and she informed me that her school was working towards level 2 of the RRSA. I had been aware of the RRSA, and from the reports I read on this, I was impressed by the published outcomes. I asked if I could research how the school was working towards the Award and after discussing this with the School Governors and staff and children, it was agreed. Although the data I found from the study in 2015 came across as very positively regarding the RRSA, I discovered that I wanted to 'dig' deeper into the RRSA and find out how it was encouraging schools to embed the Convention in their ethos and practices and how much of the Convention was included in the RRSA. I decided to look for alternative ways to research this. There was research on the RRSA that included the views of the children, staff and parents and this was carried out through observations, interviews and questionnaires.

I was introduced to CDA during my level 8 studies. This thesis forms part of a Doctorate of Education (EdD). During taught sessions, I was introduced to a range of methodologies. Some I was aware of but had never applied in previous research, for example, social constructivism. Others, I was less aware of, for example, CDA. I studied this methodology further and had the opportunity to

apply it during a small project not related to this study. I then decided that CDA was the most effective approach to research the language of the Convention, how it was incorporated in the RRSA and how schools presented this language on their websites.

Methodology

According to Jäger and Maier (2009:35), “all types of knowledge can be subjected to analysis including...knowledge transmitted by...schools”. In this study, I analysed the knowledge that schools transmitted on their websites that represented the language of the human rights of children. The language of the human rights of children was analysed using Fairclough’s (2015) version of critical discourse analysis (CDA). Fairclough’s (2015) version of CDA has three phases. These are the Interpretative Phase, the Descriptive Phase and the Explanation Phase. Fairclough (2015) provides an extensive range of elements to carry out CDA. However, a researcher is expected to select the most relevant elements of CDA to carry out their study (Fairclough, 2015). Elements of the three phases of Fairclough’s framework requires unique types of analysis. Since this three-phase framework is central to reading this thesis, I will now outline the core elements.

For the Interpretative Phase, I analysed the development of the language of the human rights of children to provide the background information and recognise the context by identifying keywords. This allowed me to research the debates that took place regarding the word choices for the Articles. As this study seeks to examine the extent to which the language of the Convention has been

incorporated into the RRSA level 2 and then represented on six school websites that have achieved this award, the four Articles of the Convention were the main focus of the Interpretive Phase.

The Descriptive Phase identifies the language included in the RRSA and on the school websites, in relation to the four Articles of the Convention. My analysis focused on the selection and sequencing of wordings, (Fairclough, 1992, 1995, 2001) which denotes the hierarchical order of the text. My analysis also identified intertextuality and recontextualisation through analysing the word choices of the creators of the RRSA and the school websites (Fairclough, 2015).

The purpose of the Explanation Phase was to analyse at the societal level. My focus here was on the language of the human rights of children as presented in the Convention. From the information presented on the school websites, I analysed the impact that intertextuality and recontextualisation may have had on the children and staff. This was done by analysing how this language of the human rights of children had been incorporated into the RRSA and presented on the school websites.

This conceptual and methodological framework enabled me to analyse the material and address my research questions critically. Using CDA in this study allowed me to examine and critique the language of the human rights of children within the RRSA and on the school websites, and recommend changes. According to Fairclough (2015:5) by applying CDA to analyse the language of the human rights of children, I could “ultimately change the existing social reality in which such discourse is related in particular ways to other social elements such as power relations ... and policies”.

This thesis is written in the first person. I made many attempts to write it in the third person. However, I did not want to disassociate myself from the process. Applying CDA and writing in the first person has enabled me to present my thought processes, experiences, and critical reflections throughout this thesis. According to Fairclough (2015) to carry out a CDA, my understandings of the reality of the discourse and other elements of social practice must be evident. To achieve this, I chose to write this thesis in the first person.

This study is unique, as there has not been a study on how schools which have achieved the RRSA have incorporated a rights-based ethos that includes the language of the human rights of children, and how schools have embodied and communicated their understanding of the human rights of children on their websites to the wider public. Language is powerful and can shape the human experience through influencing the way in which human beings understand, uphold and practice the human rights of children. In the age of the internet, social and mass media the use of language is often un-reflected and taken lightly and therefore requires critical examination, particularly when it comes to fundamental issues such as the human rights of children.

The Research Questions

The aim of my research was to provide a comprehensive critical analysis of the language of the human rights of children. The research questions consist of one primary question and three sub-questions.

Primary Research Question

To what extent is the Convention, the language of the human rights of children, incorporated into the UNICEF UK Rights Respecting School Award (RRSA) and how it is then presented on school websites?

This question will be answered in parts throughout all of the chapters and in full in Chapter 6, Explanation Phase.

Research Sub-questions

1. What is the language of the human rights of children?

This sub-question will be answered in Chapter 4, Interpretive Phase, from an analysis of the background information of the text.

2. How does the UNICEF UK Rights Respecting Schools Award level 2, incorporate the language of the human rights of children, as stated in the Convention?

This sub-question will be answered in Chapter 4, Interpretive Phase, which provides an analysis of the language and includes a critique of the use of the language of the human rights of children within the RRSA. Also, Chapter 5, Descriptive Phase, which identifies the language included in the RRSA in relation to the four Articles from the Convention.

3. How do schools which have achieved the Rights Respecting Schools Award present the language of the human rights of children on their websites?

This final sub-question will also be answered in chapters 5 and 6. Chapter 5 Descriptive Phase, provides an analysis of the language and includes a critique of the use of the language of the human rights of children within the RRSA and begins to recognise the interconnectedness of each source, identifying intertextuality and recontextualisation. Chapter 6, Explanation Phase, provides analysis at the societal level and the possible impacts of intertextuality and recontextualisation of this language through the RRSA.

The Research Sources

Overall, this study included eight sources, the Convention, Articles 2, 3, 6 and 12; the RRSA level 2 Standards, and six school websites.

The Convention

The Convention was included in this study as it is the crucial document that contains the language of the human rights of children. The Convention comprises of fifty-four Articles, all of which are substantive rights. Four Articles from the Convention formed the focus of this research. These four Articles are known as the 'General Principles', which support and guide the interpretation of all the other Articles, and are described as the "general requirements for all rights" (United Nations, 1989). They are:

- Article 2 (Non-discrimination)

1. States Parties shall respect and ensure the rights set forth in the present Convention to each child within their jurisdiction without discrimination of any kind, irrespective of the child's or his or her parent's or legal guardian's race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, property, disability, birth or other status.

2. States Parties shall take all appropriate measures to ensure that the child is protected against all forms of discrimination or punishment on the basis of the status, activities, expressed opinions, or beliefs of the child's parents, legal guardians, or family members.

- Article 3 (Best interests of the child)

1. In all actions concerning children, whether undertaken by public or private social welfare institutions, courts of law, administrative authorities or legislative bodies, the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration.

2. States Parties undertake to the child such protection and care as is necessary for his or her well-being, taking into account the rights and duties of his or her parents, legal guardians, or other individuals legally responsible for him or her, and, to this end, shall take all appropriate legislative and administrative measures.

3. States Parties shall ensure that the institutions, services and facilities responsible for the care or protection of children shall conform with the standards established by competent authorities, particularly in the areas

of safety, health, in the number and suitability of their staff, as well as competent supervision.

- Article 6 (Right to life, survival and development)

1. States Parties recognize that every child has the inherent right to life.
2. States Parties shall ensure to the maximum extent possible the survival and development of the child.

- Article 12 (Respect for the views of the child)

1. States Parties shall assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those 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.
2. For this purpose, the child shall in particular be provided the opportunity to be heard in any judicial and administrative proceedings affecting the child, either directly, or through a representative or an appropriate body, in a manner consistent with the procedural rules of national law (United Nations, 1989).

It must be noted that throughout the thesis, all Articles are identified as 2, 3, 6 and 12. However, this study specifically focused on all of Article 2 (Non-discrimination) as all points in this article are focused on non-discrimination; Article 3.1 (the best interest of the child) and 3.2 (well-being); all of Article 6 (life, survival and development) and Article 12.1 (The views of the child). These elements were selected as being most relevant for schools to incorporate into their ethos and learning and teaching. Keywords were then identified from these

Articles. These were: *Convention; rights; discrimination; best interest; development; well-being* and *views of the child*. Also, derivatives of these words were added along with *voice* and *participation* which were found to be commonly associated with Article 12 (Respect for the views of the child) in the literature review. In addition, UNCRC and CRC were included, which are other titles for the Convention. These words were identified as being the key elements of the Articles. Not all keywords identified in the Interpretation Phase were included in the next phases. Reasons for this are explained further in Chapter three, Methodology.

Due to the large number of original documents that are referred to in this thesis, regarding the drafting of the Convention, for ease of referencing, many of the reports that document the drafting including the preparation, negotiation and discussions of the Convention, were referenced from *The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. A Guide to the "Travaux Préparatoires"* by Sharron Detrick (1992). This book contains many of the "documents issued by the United Nations concerning the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child (Detrick, 1992:1) paraphrased or summarised citations are references from here. All direct quotes are referenced to the *Travaux Préparatoires* database at the University of Virginia, School of Law. This is a unique, searchable, comprehensive database of the preparatory works from the drafting and negotiation of the Convention, such as minutes, drafts and reports (University of Virginia, n.d.). The "Travaux Préparatoires", is the most commonly used name for such a compendium of documents. In this thesis, only direct quotes have been referenced to the original documents stored on this platform.

The RRSA

From 2004, schools in the UK started to work towards gaining the RRSA. According to UNICEF UK (2009), the Convention “lies at the heart of the Rights Respecting Schools Award” and is a mechanism for incorporating the human rights of children into the ethos and values of a school. UNICEF UK (2009) states that the framework fully includes the Convention. The criteria in the Standards require schools to integrate the values and beliefs of the Convention into the learning and teaching, and overall ethos with the aim of ensuring children reach their full potential (UNICEF UK, 2015a). The focus of this study was the 2017 Rights Respecting Schools Award Level 2, which consisted of four standards, A, B, C, and D. These were analysed to identify the language incorporated within these standards in relation to Articles, 2, 3, 6 and 12 of the Convention. It must be noted that the RRSA was reviewed in late 2017 and an updated version of the Award is now in place. The new Award consists of three stages, as did the version in this study and schools go through a similar process to achieve the Award. However, the language of the new Standards has not been included in this study. The RRSA criteria required the Convention to be embedded within the ethos of a school. For this study, the school had to have achieved the RRSA at least six months before May 2017, the date the schools were selected, and information from their websites was collected. The six-month window was to give a reasonable amount of time for a school to update their website after achieving the Award. Therefore, due to the timeline of this thesis, it was not possible to include the new RRSA Standards.

School Websites

Schools which have achieved the RRSA Award present themselves as a Rights Respecting School, upholding the rights of the child and teaching children about their rights. However, the information on how schools are promoting themselves as 'rights respecting' is not monitored or assessed once they have received the Award. The schools are not required to be reviewed for three years after gaining the Award. Therefore, schools can present themselves as 'rights respecting schools' for three years with no further monitoring regarding how accurate and aligned their practices are to the human rights of children. This includes the information they present on their websites.

As a consequence, children, parents and staff will be developing their understanding of the human rights of children through the language used in the school and on the website. The website must include the school ethos and how the school has embedded the Convention into its teaching and learning (UNICEF UK, 2015a). The website can be seen as an indicator of practice in the school and will reflect the language of the human rights of children that are used in the school. Fayoyin (2011) states that platforms such as school websites are often used by children to develop an understanding of their human rights. Therefore, it is essential to understand what language has been incorporated from the Convention to the RRSA and what language the schools then select to present their understanding of the human rights of children.

This study aimed to identify what language from the Convention was included in the RRSA and was then presented on school websites that had achieved the Award. The schools chosen for this study were selected from the list of schools which had achieved the Award on the UNICEF UK RRSA website in May 2017.

The six schools comprised of two primary schools, two secondary schools and two special schools. All the schools in the study are maintained schools (State funded) and the special schools cater to the needs of children and young people with moderate to severe learning difficulties. These types of schools were chosen to represent the types of schools that have achieved the RRSA. To meet the criteria for this study, each school had to be a 'maintained' (State funded) school, based in England. This was to ensure they incorporated the school ethos on the school website, as the Department of Education requires all maintained schools in England to do this (DfE, 2015). This requirement endorses the use of websites as a credible source of information regarding the ethos of the school.

Limitations of the Study

It must be acknowledged that although this study adds to the discourse of the human rights of children, generalisability was not the principal aim. The sample size is small, however, analysing six school websites has allowed for a careful and close study of the language of the human rights of children on these platforms. This study is significantly different as previous studies on the RRSA have focussed on visiting the schools and speaking to staff and children. I took a different approach and did not visit the schools or talk to any staff or children in this study. This different approach allowed me to focus solely on the way in which the schools presented their understanding of the human rights of children on a public domain, the school websites.

This study focused on the language of the human rights of children and how that language was incorporated into the 2017 RRSA Standards and how it was then

presented on the school websites. However, this study includes the version of the RRSA that is no longer being offered by UNICEF UK. The schools in this study will be assessed against a new version of the Standards, when and if they reapply to gain the Award. This study does provide valuable insights into how the language of the Convention can be recontextualised into a School Award and how schools present this discourse. Previous research has suggested that schools use the RRSA as a way in which to enhance their behaviour management programmes (Osler and Starkey, 2010; Trivers and Starkey, 2012; Struthers, 2014).

Since 2001, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) has published interpretations of the Articles in the Convention in the form of 'General Comments' (OHCHR, 2018). These included a wide range of topics regarding the human rights of children, such as General comment No. 14 (Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2013) on the right of the child to have his or her best interests taken as a primary consideration (art. 3, para. 1) (Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2013). I did not analyse the language of the 'General Comments' relating to the four Articles in this study as there were no references or links to any 'general comments' within the RRSA documentation or Standards. However, these statements are used as reference points in this study.

Organisation of the Study

This thesis comprises of seven chapters. Three of the chapter titles reflect Fairclough's (2015) CDA phases. These are Chapter 4, Interpretative Phase, which analyses the history of the language of the human rights of children.

Chapter 5, Descriptive Phase, which includes the 'findings' from an analysis of the RRSA and the school websites. Chapter 6, Explanation Phase, which is a critical analysis of the 'findings' under the headings of the three themes identified from the previous two chapters. These are Power Dimensions; the Discourse of Rights and the Impact on Practice. I decided to use the 'phases' as the titles of the chapters as they provide a better description of what is included in each chapter.

Due to a large number of acronyms included in this thesis, the first time each abbreviation is used in each chapter, it is written out in full.

This initial chapter provides an introduction to the thesis. I will now provide an outline of each subsequent chapter.

Literature on Human Rights and the Human Rights of Children: Chapter 2.

This chapter presents a critical review of the philosophy and discourse of human rights and the human rights of children to carry out a critical discourse analyse on the language of the human rights of children. This chapter does not include every development in the formation of human rights as an international agenda but provides an analysis of key reference points, from the Magna Carta in 1215 to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. This chapter is about the philosophy and the basic concept of human rights. This will include a short historical context and the exclusionary nature of developments of human rights, but the focus of this chapter is human rights from the 20th century, as much of the current notions and debates on human rights and the human rights of children from that era are most relevant to this research.

Methodology: Chapter 3.

This chapter presents the development and application of a conceptual and methodological framework for the study on the language of the human rights of children using critical discourse analyse (CDA), informed by a critical realist ontology, and aligns with the approach to CDA developed by Fairclough and others. The discourse of the human rights of children, presented through language was critiqued, and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (Convention); the UNICEF UK Rights Respecting School Award (RRSA) criteria and six school websites were examined for language similarities, differences, inconsistencies and gaps. This chapter also includes an analysis of my positionality, including the relevance of a reflexive research diary that I maintained throughout this study.

Interpretative Phase: The History of the Language of the Human Rights of Children. Chapter 4.

The Interpretive phase is the first phase I have applied from Fairclough's (2015) CDA framework in which I present an analysis of the process of the development and drafting of the Convention. The Convention is an accepted framework on the human rights of children, as it incorporates internationally developed and agreed on language that reflects the meaning of children's rights (Detrick, 1992; Verhellen, 1994; Freeman, 1996). Due to its international genesis and significance, the framework and its language are where debates should begin on the human rights of children. This chapter outlines the development of the language of the human rights of children in international instruments and is

presented as the Interpretive Phase, from the analytical phases based on Fairclough's (2015) CDA framework.

Descriptive Phase: Findings: Chapter 5.

This chapter identifies the language included in the RRSA and on the school websites, in relation to the four Articles from the Convention. This second phase of Fairclough's (2015) CDA framework focused on the selection of wordings, construction of sentences, and sequencing of information (Fairclough, 1992, 1995, 2001) and identified intertextuality and recontextualisation. Intertextuality is the way in which another text shapes a text through the same words or the words being represented (Fairclough, 2003). Recontextualisation is the point in which different texts interrelate and create a different context (Fairclough, 2015).

Explanation Phase: Discussion: Chapter 6.

This is phase three within the framework offered by Fairclough's CDA framework, where I have analysed at the societal level. The analysis at the societal level focuses on the language of the human rights of children as presented in the Convention and is where I had to consider what the possible impacts could be from the presentation of this language through the RRSA and the school websites. This format allowed me to analyse the material and address my research questions critically. The chapter begins with a synopsis of the data presented from the Interpretative Phase and Descriptive Phase chapters.

Conclusion: Chapter 7.

This final chapter of my thesis summarises the study I carried out to answer the research question - *To what extent is the Convention, the language of the human rights of children, incorporated into the UNICEF UK Rights Respecting School Award (RRSA) and how it is then presented on school websites?* This chapter identifies the strengths of this study, including what new knowledge has emerged from it and provides a range of recommendations.

Chapter 2. Literature on Human Rights and the Human Rights of Children

Introduction

The aim of this study was to analyse the language of the human rights of children critically. This chapter provides a critical evaluation of the literature of the philosophy and discourse of human rights and the human rights of children, which led to the formation of the research question in this study. The primary research question is - *To what extent is the Convention, the language of the human rights of children, incorporated into the UNICEF UK Rights Respecting School Award (RRSA) and how it is then presented on school websites?*

This chapter does not include every development of human rights but provides an analysis of key reference points, from the *Magna Carta* in 1215 to the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* in 1948. This chapter is about the philosophy and the basic concept of human rights. This will include a short historical context, but the focus of this chapter is on human rights from the 20th century, as much of the current notions and debates on human rights and the human rights of children emerge during this era and are thus most relevant.

The Foundations of Human Rights

According to Orend (2002:24) “A human right is a high-priority entitlement”. This term creates “the concept of a human rights-holder” (Orend, 2002:37), therefore all human beings have these rights by the very fact that everyone is a human being. However, the realisation, application and even understanding of human rights is subject to contextual processes. According to Ishay (2004:2), human

rights are “the result of a cumulative historical process”. Human rights have a history of moral, legal and political debate which has been historically disputed in different ways (De Gaay Fortman, 2011). Ishay (2004) states that historically, human rights have made significant advances, but intervals of retractions have followed these. One could argue that the history of human rights has been a disorganised and messy development of understandings. The following sections of this chapter will outline some of these developments including the practical impact of philosophy, and the political and social context.

The development of human rights has been connected to a range of philosophical and political advancements; the corpus of education; and religious and cultural expansions (Nickel, 1987; Ishay 2004; Clapham, 2007; Finnis, 2011). ‘Natural rights’ can be identified within Greek and Roman documents as early as 500 AD and were acknowledged as ‘natural laws’ and defined as “principles and standards of behaviour” (Clapham, 2007:5). However, Clapham (2007:5), goes on to state that much of the early development of ‘natural rights’ were concepts of “decent behaviour” and not rights. Contrariwise, Ishay (2004) claims that historical religious and cultural ‘humanistic elements’ positively contributed to the development of human rights. However, Freeman (1994:497) maintains that “human rights theory began with John Locke’s claim that we have certain ‘natural rights’...”. However, Archard (2014), states that Locke did not believe that children had the same rights as adults. This early recognition of human rights as a concept of ‘natural rights’ is defined as the theory of ‘good’ within a human being and how morally they will ‘do good, not evil’ to their fellow human beings (Clapham, 2007; Hunt, 2007; Finnis, 2011). However, the understanding that ‘natural rights’ are for everyone, has been disputed over the centuries (Clapham, 2007). ‘Natural rights’ are a human beings’ right to life, liberty, free speech and

freedom of conscience, which are different to 'legal rights' which are human-made laws that relate to security and protection (Tierney, 1997). 'Natural rights' are seen as inalienable and universal (Archard, 2014).

Another understanding of human rights comes as 'legal rights', which are the freedoms and choices given to people, within a nation, by their Government and if they are in place, they cannot be denied (Ishay, 2004). However, Clapham (2007:22) states that a "recurring challenge" in understanding 'legal rights' is to ensure a focus is kept on human rights when discussing these rights.

Within the Anglophone world, the earliest agreement or document that transforms the concept of 'natural rights' to rights and human rights is the Magna Carta in 1215 (Nickel, 1987; Ishay, 2004; Clapham, 2007; Hunt, 2007). However, this was seen as a political agreement only for 'freemen', which at that time were a select group of privileged men (Clapham, 2007). The next significant recognition of human rights began in the late seventeenth century. *The English Bill of Rights* in 1689, was an English law that affirmed the 'rights and liberties of the people' (Parliament of England, 1689). The word to define those invested by this Bill is 'people' and the words 'men' or 'women' are not included. According to Clapham (2007), these rights were recognised for all men and women and is supported by Waldron (2002:68) who argues that Locke used the word 'man' in a "gender-neutral sense of man" within his publications. The philosophy of John Locke has resonance within the *Bill of Rights* (Ishay, 2004) and includes the 'natural rights' of 'life, liberty and estate' (Locke, 2010) ('Estate' is defined as property in many publications).

Some activists published papers to counteract what can be seen as a male-dominated human rights agenda. In 1697, Mary Ashell wrote *Serious Proposal to the Ladies*, and argued for equal educational opportunities stating, “If all men are born free, how is it that all women are born slaves?” (Ashell, 1697: n.p.). However, the publications and moral debates regarding human rights were dominated by men.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s *The Social Contract* (Rousseau, 1762a), developed the idea of ‘good citizenship’ and the benefits of a ‘civil society’ through a ‘social contract’ between a government and its citizens. However, the only inclusion of women is where he identifies how their fertility levels are higher in some areas. He also published *Emile: or On Education*, in the same year which is primarily about childhood and raising a morally ‘good’ child (Rousseau, 1762b). It should be noted that this was the first time that children and their education were brought to the centre of attention when it comes to citizenship and the recognition of civic rights and responsibilities. However, he argued that there should be limited education for girls as they should be raised to be good wives and mothers (Rousseau, 1762b). Wollstonecraft disagreed with Rousseau and argued for better education, social equality and the right to participate in politics for women (Wollstonecraft, 1792). Ishay (2004:20) acknowledged that Rousseau “contributed to render women more artificial, weak characters, than they would otherwise have been”, but argued that Rousseau and Locke’s work was influenced by a ‘common good’, that can be identified as a ‘human goodness’ and thus a human right for everyone. However, Rousseau (1762b) believed that ‘man’ was naturally good and innocent which indicates his belief in women was far less enlightened.

In 1792, Mary Wollstonecraft published *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* which stated that "The neglected education of my fellow-creatures is the grand source of the misery I deplore" (Wollstonecraft, 1792:1). She conserved the argument for rights for women and to allow women "to judge for themselves respecting their own happiness" (Wollstonecraft, 1792: viii). However, much of Rousseau's *The Social Contract* (Rousseau, 1762a) identifies the 'personal interests' of individuals within society and how this can dominate the 'common interest'. This points to an early tension between the personal and common interests of individuals and shows human rights have to be understood in practice as individual rights in society.

Boersema (2011:5) states that the human rights philosophies of Locke and Rousseau were 'natural rights' and describes them as "liberties that all living beings have and that clash when different interests clash". This is an interesting concept as Rousseau and Locke did not support the same rights for women and men. From this interpretation, this could indicate that both philosophers could have believed that there was a clash between the rights or interests of women and men. However, the rights of children are largely absent from the work of these enlightenment philosophers. Although, both Locke and Rousseau frequently included the benefits of educating children in their work, this was more aligned with 'human goodness' and they made no referral to the human rights of children.

Just after the start of the American Revolutionary War (also identified as the American War of Independence), the United States Continental Congress drew up the *Declaration of Independence* in 1776. This Declaration stated that "all men are created equal ... with certain unalienable Rights that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness" (United States Continental Congress,

1776). The same year, Thomas Paine wrote *Common Sense*, which was a pamphlet that called for equal rights for 'mankind', and stated this could only happen if men are responsible for the creation of the laws that rule them (Paine, 1776). Researchers indicate that there are many similarities between the Declaration and *Common Sense* (Ishay, 2004; Clapham, 2007; Archard, 2014).

In France, *The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen* in 1789, was the beginning of the eradication of the French Monarchy and brought about the formation of the French Republic (Jellinek and Farrand, 2009). The Declaration declares that all citizens have the rights of "liberty, property, security and resistance to oppression" (Fremont-Barnes, 2007:191). Although the word 'citizen' (*citoyen*) was used within the Declaration, the focus and explanations are on the realisation of rights of man (*l'homme*) (Schröder, 1989). To counteract this Declaration, Olympe de Gouges, a French activist, who campaigned for women's rights and abolishing slavery, wrote and distributed a pamphlet entitled *The Declaration of the Rights of Woman* in 1791, and included equal rights for men (Schröder, 1989). She initially called for a statement to be included in *The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen* that required a social contract between men and women to be created, in relation to property and inheritance (Clapham, 2007). De Gouges asked Queen Marie Antoinette to support this, but the Queen did not, and De Gouges was found guilty of treason against the people of France and went to the guillotine in 1793, the same year as the Queen (Schröder, 1989; Fremont-Barnes, 2007). The *Bill of Rights of the United States Constitution* in 1791, describes the basic rights of the citizens of the United States (Armitage, 2007). Similar to the *English Bill of Rights* in 1689, the word 'people' is used, and the words 'men' or 'women' are not included.

1791 Rights of Man, which defended the French Revolution and built upon the work of Locke and Rousseau, provides examples of how Locke was a strong advocate for social justice and had great empathy for others who were suffering and protecting 'natural rights' (Clapham, 2007). In the *Rights of Man*, Paine (1791) argued for natural and civil rights and called for education for all children. However, according to Coole (1993) and Hunt Botting (2014), Paine argued for the rights of men and not women. *Common Sense* does not include the word 'women' and only refers to men and 'mankind'.

Kant contributed the aspect of 'obligation' to respect human dignity and aligned this to human rights (Clapham, 2007). According to Ishay (2004), Kant's philosophy was extensively influenced by Rousseau. Both Rousseau and Kant supported "a right to life" and defended "capital punishment" (Ishay, 2004:88). However, the work of Kant on 'moral principles' and respecting human dignity is seen as aligned with the development of human rights (Clapham, 2007; Boersema, 2011). Clapham (2007) states that over the centuries, declarations were created to provide a set of principles to protect human rights. However, the rights outlined in many of the declarations identified here were only relevant to specific groups of people and by far, written by and for men. Therefore, the history of human rights shows an exclusionary nature of developments of women and children and much of this exclusionary practice was carried out by enlightened philosophers. This, in turn, has heavily influenced the understandings and practical impact of human rights in modern times.

The Modern Concept of Human Rights

Much published material on the modern concept of human rights refers back to the *American Declaration of Independence* in 1776 and the *French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen* in 1789 (Ishay, 2004; Freeman 2004). Clapham (2007:10) states that,

Declarations were inspired by a liberal conception of society and a belief in natural law, human reason and universal order. Rights were believed (by men) to be the exclusive property of those possessing the capacity to exercise rational choice (a group that excluded women).

Today, the understanding of human rights is largely dominated by national or international legal documents (Clapham, 2007). This began in the post-Second World War period where new forms of international organisations developed and aimed at formulating a global understanding of human rights. The cataclysmic experiences of two consecutive world wars of the early 20th century had an enormous effect on the development of international and universal human rights. A critical text is the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948. The Declaration led to the *European Convention on Human Rights* in 1954 (Council of Europe, 2010) and the *International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* in 1966 (UN General Assembly, 1966) which further promoted human rights. In addition, international treaties that work against male dominance. These included the *Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination* (United Nations, 1965) and the *Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women* (United Nations, 1979).

Criticisms of Human Rights

Many researchers provide a definition and description of human rights within their work. However, Boersema (2011:11) states that “Rights can be difficult to define” and he suggests that this is due to it emulating “both privilege and liberty” (Boersema, 2011:200). Freeman (2004) states that there is too much of a gap between the documentation of rights, such as declarations and conventions and current human rights violations. Milne (1986) goes further and argues that declarations, covenants and conventions only present the idea of human rights and do not critically examine human rights. He states that the ideal standard to be a ‘liberal-democratic industrial society’, and the 1948 Declaration was about all nations emulating such a society (Milne, 1986). This traditional western model of society raised objections and continues to generate complaints due to the modern conception of human rights being “predominately European in origin” (Ishay 2004:5). Sen suggests that the history of rights was and still is, “intellectual scepticism” regarding human rights (Sen, 2004:316). He identifies what he called a ‘cultural critique’, which is the contentious confusion between human rights and legislated legal rights when comparing cultures (Sen, 2004). Milne (1986:4) supports this as he argues “no human being can be socially and culturally neutral” and questions the cultural relativism of international human rights.

The subject of cultural relativism is an often-assumed stance when others are criticising human rights. Freeman (1994:492) states “the doctrine of human rights ... rests upon a certain concept of the ‘human being’” and is linked with morality through ‘social stratification’, which is the social boundaries within societies. Theorists have tried to identify a cross-cultural accord. However, Donnelly (1989) attempts to reject cultural relativism, as he believes all human beings have similar

universal morals. Freeman (1994) disagrees using the example of 'freedom of expression' as a morality that is not upheld across cultures. However, he does agree that there are instances of universal morals, "for example, murder and rape" (Freeman, 1994:493). Freeman states that much of the differing interpretations and understandings of human rights come from a "conflict between moral universalism and cultural relativism" (Freeman, 1994:495).

Jeremy Bentham, an English philosopher and reformer, stated that human rights were "nonsense upon stilts" (Bentham, 1843). A trained lawyer and proponent of utilitarianism, he believed the only rights were 'legal rights', and human rights did not exist. MacIntyre (2007) believes there are no human rights as he argues that they are not found in every society. Husak (1984) supports this argument and states that human beings do not share the same morals and values. MacIntyre (2007:67) states that "Such a set of rules only come into existence at particular historical periods and in particular social circumstances". He sees human rights as having equity for all human beings and as this is not the case, he states that "belief in [human rights] is at one with belief in witches and unicorns" (MacIntyre, 2007:69). Freeman (2004) states that MacIntyre is mistaken in his interpretation as he [MacIntyre] sees rights as 'things'. He goes on to argue that, "Rights are not things" but "claims and entitlements" (Freeman, 2002:6). However, many contemporary rights thinkers endure to advocate the existence of rights, and argue that rights are key to building a society where human beings are free to flourish as autonomous individuals and at the same time, equally participate in their societies' decision-making processes (Nickel, 1987; Freeman, 1997; Ishay, 2004; Boersema, 2011). Clapham (2007:12) agrees and argues that "Contemporary human rights laws allow for some limitations that are necessary for a democratic society".

Nickel (1987:6) affirms that human rights are a “minimum standard” and are specific legal norms that require primacy. He goes on to argue for human rights, explaining that they are not ‘natural rights’ as they are universal claims or entitlements and they aim to address the current problems and injustices that ‘rights holders’ are facing now and the “national leaders and electorates” are assigned with responsibility as duty bearers (Nickel, 1987:9). However, Milne (1986:2) argues that the *Declaration of Human Rights* (1948) was aimed at not just creating a ‘minimum standard’ but an “ideal standard which every human community should try and reach”.

The concept of a ‘rights holder’ is explained by Boersema (2011:6) who states that "rights holders have rights that relate an individual ... to everyone else", they are "a mode of regulating behaviour". He goes on to explain that this term determinates and regulates what people do and do not get to do" (Boersema, 2011:4). Wolgast (1987) and Boersema agree (2011) claiming that human beings are always contextualised in relation to another human being, and this is why human rights regulate behaviour. However, Freeman (2004) argues that human rights are not composable, no one can invoke one person’s human rights to violate the human rights of another. He states this is mainly due to ‘rights inflation’ when the concept of human rights is extended to satisfy social desires (Freeman, 2002).

There are criticisms of human rights from a broader perspective than that of moral philosophers. Milan Kundera, a writer, provides his critique of human rights in his book *Immortality*,

The world has become man's right and everything in it has become a right:
the desire for love the right to love, the desire for rest the right to rest, the

desire for friendship the right to friendship, the desire to exceed the speed limit the right to exceed the speed limit, the desire for happiness the right to happiness (Kundera, 1988:136).

Kundera (1988) claims that the language of human rights is commonly associated with entitlements and disagreements, such as 'whose right is it?' He goes on to argue that human rights are claims made by those who feel hard done by and who require a sense of justice when their human right has been denied (Kundera, 1988). This is an example of differing interpretations and understandings of human rights and reinforces the need for further discussions and debates to get through the messy complexity.

Defining Contemporary Human Rights

According to Milne (1986:1) "If the adjective 'human' is taken seriously, then human rights are by virtue for all humans". Therefore, every human being has basic rights and freedoms that are based on the realisation of equality and moral values. They are not about wants, desires, or what a person believes they deserve. Freeman (1994:514) states that "human rights should be flexible enough to allow space for the human creativity it seeks to defend and to address the changing conditions of the world that may threaten its values". Human rights can provide the needs of every human being, and the state rulers or electorate should morally offer the security and means for this to happen (Nickel, 1987). Therefore, contemporary human rights are wider than 'natural rights' as they require positive international action and not just advocacy (Nickel, 1987).

Freeman (1994:507) states that the idea of human rights is positioned within the notion that “human lives can and should have value”. These values can be found in the *Declaration of Human Rights* (UN General Assembly, 1948) and summarise contemporary human rights. People are “born free and equal in dignity and rights” and have “equal, inalienable rights” (UN General Assembly, 1948).

The Human Rights of Children

The development of the human rights of children through the 1924 and 1959 Declarations and the 1989 Convention, which is described by Verhellen (2006) as a move from “an important moral code to a legally binding instrument” (Verhellen, 2006:145), is outlined in Chapter 5, Description Phase. The focus here is on the philosophy underpinning the human rights of children, beginning with an analysis of children as legitimate and autonomous rights holders and ending with the current research on the discourse of the human rights of children. The human rights of children is a modern concept. According to Freeman (2011), historically, adults ensured that children were dependent beings by controlling and regulating everything they did. As previously stated, the human rights of children are mostly absent from the historical context of human rights.

The Convention “was drafted under the auspices of a human rights body – the then UN Commission on Human Rights” (Cantwell, 2011:40) and was “created within the human rights context” (Cantwell, 2011:37). According to Beazley et al. (2009:369), the Convention “adds protection rights, special provision rights and caveats to the human rights of children”. Freeman (2011) points out that there is

a constant need to reiterate and repeat that the Convention represents the human rights of children. The Convention is “a human rights instrument” (Invernizzi and Williams, 2011:4), and “embraces an understanding of the child as an independent human being with rights” (Miljeteig-Olsen, 1990:149).

Within this thesis, I position the Convention as containing the language of the human rights of children and not the language of children’s rights. By using the phrase ‘the human rights of children’, my aim is to draw attention to children as human beings. According to Freeman (2011:23) “many of today’s critics of children’s rights are passionate defenders of the rights of others”. Using the term ‘children’s rights’ can act as a way to marginalise “child rights from human rights” (Cantwell, 2011:35). Therefore, by positioning the Convention as the human rights of children, and drawing attention to the language, I am positioning ‘children’s rights’ within the paradigm of human rights. The main reason for this is to draw attention to how language contributes to “the emancipation of those who are dominated and oppressed in our society” (Fairclough, 2015:229).

The Child as a Rights Holder and an Object of Rights

The human rights of children are “universal rights held by children that non-children do not have” (Boersema, 2011:350-351). Children have “the right to have rights” (Liebel, 2012:10). The Convention established the child as a rights-holder and active participant in the realisation of their rights and removed the perceptions of a child having the responsibility as a rights-holder (Grugel and Piper, 2007). The human rights of children are not conditional or dependent on the child’s age or stage of development (United Nations, 1989). However, during

early childhood, children have distinct helplessness and are reliant on others for protection and sustenance (Boersema, (2011). Van Bueren (1998) argues that limited autonomy due to the age of the child, should not deny them their rights. Bentley (2005) claims that universal children's rights are problematic as they have non-derogable rights, which cannot be taken away, such as a right to food and protection, but so do all human beings. On the other hand, children have derogable rights due to their age, which is rights that can be suspended by states/governments due to national emergencies, such as an education, which Bentley sees as universally challenging (Bentley, 2005).

The Convention creates "more respect for children" (Verhellen, 2006:147). Verhellen (2006) outlines two dominant discussions about the human rights of children. One is that children are "human beings with rights" and calls these "material rights", the other is the recognition of children's "legal capacity", which he defines as "formal rights" (Verhellen, 2006:39). He claims that a law is required to uphold and further develop a constructive approach to provide children with the respect they are entitled to as human beings (Verhellen, 2006). Hanson and Nieuwenhuys (2013:10) argue that there is a detachment and sometimes contradictions between the normative image of the human rights of children and the social and cultural practices of childhood.

Coady (2005) believes there are two different positions on the human rights of children, the 'protectionist' and 'liberationist' view. The 'protectionist' believes children need protection and they are not capable of looking after themselves. Therefore, the parents and the state have a duty and certain rights and power to make decisions for children (Coady, 2005). This is similar to what Phillips (2016:42) describes as the "caretaker", the adult who "denies children self-

determination". The 'liberationist' view, on the contrary, perceives children as autonomous 'moral agents' with rights comparable with their abilities and equivalent to adults. 'Liberationists' identify children as an 'oppressed group' by adults and the education system (Farson, 1974; Coady, 2005; Holt; 2013). Both these positions assert the most important concern is the best interest of the child. Guggenheim (2007:7) agrees with the two positions and states that the majority of adults agree with the 'protectionist' view, but opposes the opposite of this which he calls the "modern children's rights movement". Boersema (2011) and Archard (2014) agree that children are innocent, defenceless and reliant on adults. Guggenheim (2007) insists that children do not need to be 'liberated', as adults are not oppressing them. He believes that the "current emphasis on children's rights reduces the pressure on adults to do right by children" (Guggenheim, 2007: 226).

There is a range of opinions that can be seen as between the 'protectionist' and 'liberationist' view. Bennett Woodhouse (1994:331) believes that children "have the capacity for growth toward autonomy and deserve the right to be treated in a manner consistent with this capacity". Gillet-Swan and Coppock (2016) maintain that children need to be acknowledged as capable, autonomous beings and should be recognised as rights holders. However, l'Anson (2016:20) contends that the explanations and descriptions of the autonomy of children since the Convention is problematic as it refers to "a kind of autonomous western individualism" and is continually criticised.

One concern for many researchers in this field is the identification of childhood as either a social construction or a biological one. The notion of a universal childhood has been discredited by many (James and Prout, 1990; Burman, 1994;

Nieuwenhuys, 1998; Christensen and James, 2000; Reynaert et al., 2009). Bentley (2005:107) claims that as “childhood is not universally understood” therefore ‘universal children’s rights’ do not exist. The Convention, requires “all States Parties to take action to ensure the realisation of all rights in the Convention for all children in their jurisdiction” (Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2003). Therefore, all State Parties are expected to implement as per their own society.

Reynaert et al. (2009) state that much of the research on the human rights of children has been around three specific themes. One theme is ‘child participation’, which is recognised by Gillet-Swan and Coppock (2016) as a ‘prolific’ area of study. This theme is directly linked with Article 12 of the Convention “Respect for the views of the child” (United Nations, 1989). The second theme identified in the human rights of children literature is the concern regarding parental rights and the challenges and contradictions between the human rights of children and parental rights. The final theme is what Reynaert et al. (2009:526) describe as, “the global children’s rights industry”. They describe this theme as focusing on the monitoring and processing of the human rights of children and describe this as ‘technicalization’ (Reynaert et al., 2009:528) and argue that the human rights of children are becoming “a technical debate on the most effective and efficient way to implement children’s rights”. This unease also appears in earlier literature identifying concerns with such matters. Fernando (2001:12) argued that literature on the human rights of children was developing a “technocratic discourse” that no longer focused on the denotation of the human rights of children.

Reynaert et al. (2009:528) associated 'technicalization' to the 'decontextualization' of the human rights of children. They explain that 'decontextualization' does not consider and incorporate the lived experiences of the child and the context both historically and currently in which they live. Veerman and Levine (2000), suggest that the discussion on the human rights of children should be progressed from the 'Geneva scene', and the Convention, to the actual context in which these rights have to be recognised and understood. Therefore, the Convention should be the foundation of the context in which researchers consider children's lived experiences of human rights.

Realising the Human Rights of Children

To enable children to realise their rights, they must be informed of and understand them. However, according to Evans (2005), the language of the Convention is written in 'legal mode'. Not only are such legal terms problematic to understand, but the language of rights is also a new concept to children (Liebel, 2012). l'Anson (2016) identifies the 'translation' of the human rights of children by the different professionals and organisations which work with children as being awkward and challenging due to the elisions made and the tensions that this topic can create.

Hanson and Nieuwenhuys (2013) propose the notion that 'living rights' are the lived experiences in which children develop an understanding and experience their rights. "Children do not simply discover their rights after exposure to metropolitan rights discourses, but become aware of their rights as they struggle with their families and communities to give meaning to their daily existence" (Hanson and Nieuwenhuys, 2013:4). If children experience rights, they can then

begin to develop an understanding of their rights (Hanson and Nieuwenhuys, 2013).

According to Liebel (2012:12), it is not enough to inform children of their rights, if children are to recognise, realise and claim their rights, they “must perceive these rights as their own”. Woodiwiss (2006:34) supports this and goes on to argue that the human rights of children “must be present within the social routines of everyday life” if they are to be realised. However, Liebel, (2012:14) goes further and states that children should not only be rights-holders but should be able to “contribute to the modification or expansion to the rights available to them”. This would provide children with an understanding of their rights and encourage them to be active rights-holders, and through the realisation of rights, the rights could be more appropriate to their lives. Ishay (2004:4) maintains that advancement has been made in human rights through “each generation [building] on the hopes and achievements of its predecessors”. However, l’Anson (2016) comments on the lack of children’s involvement in the drafting of the Convention and suggests that future considerations of the human rights of children must include a process to include children. This is supported by Hanson and Nieuwenhuys, (2013:5) who argue that “Children should be party to the shaping and implementation of these rights”.

Liebel (2012) states that the Convention contains codified rights, rights in the language and code of law that makes the language of rights ambiguous and vague with no tangible meaning. An example is ‘the best interest of the child’ as explained in Chapters 4 and 5. Liebel (2012) suggests that this vagueness in the meaning allows those who are interpreting rights language, to create their specific interpretations. Ladd (2017:156) argues that “the language of rights is not

appropriate in talking about children” and is only used when there is a problem. Archard (2014:107) states that the Convention represents the “legal rights of children”. I’Anson (2016) uses the term 'translation' to explain the need to describe the human rights of children from legal language, and that there are issues of how this is understood by not only children but also to those professionals who work with children. It is wholly impractical to expect a global instrument to be written in the language for children. The Convention was never written for children. It is up to a State to implement and scale the Convention through society, where the translation and further understanding is to occur. Education could be an effective way to provide the ‘translation’ that I’Anson is suggesting. However, it would then be the responsibility of the adults in the school to ‘translate’ this language accurately. Initiatives such as the RRSA can be seen as a vehicle to ‘translate’ the human rights of children and support adults to build the Convention into pedagogies. However, the RRSA must accurately represent the Convention, and the adults would have to have a clear understanding of what the human rights of children are and how to ‘translate’ these accurately, or they would ‘translate’ from their own perceptions and understandings.

Thelander (2016:72) agrees that the content of the Convention is difficult to understand and identifies how teachers can “rattle article after article”, but had a “rather narrow perspective of children's human rights” (Thelander, 2016:73). I’Anson (2016) identifies as problematic, the words ‘voice’ and ‘participation’, which are presented in the research literature on children's rights, to describe and clarify Article 12 (Respect for the views of the child) of the Convention, a child's right to express their views and be heard (I’Anson, 2016). He goes on to argue that reducing the Articles to ‘tropes’ such as these has ‘decontextualised’ children's rights (I’Anson, 2016:20). But this does raise an issue of what is the

best way to ensure children and adults, including teachers who are incorporating the Convention into their learning and teaching, make the language of rights explicit and clear, providing obvious meaning that is both understood by all children and adults.

According to Thelander (2016) teachers have a contracted perception of the human rights of children. This could be due to the exclusion of the Convention and human rights education within teacher training programmes (Bemis, 2013; Jerome et al., 2015). Verhellen (2006:147) argues that there is a lack of awareness of the Convention as “legally binding, comprehensive and universally ratified” and this lack of awareness is linked to a lack of philosophical recognition of the human rights of children. Covell et al. (2017:306) agree and identify teachers as one of those groups which argue “against children’s rights” due to fear of “losing power over children”. The ‘power’ that Covell et al. (2017) identify here could be linked to how Foucault (1976) describes power in a 1976 lecture, as a commodity. He asserts that power is not given to a leader by followers, but instead the leader exercises that power over followers. However, Robinson (2014b: 6-7) believes this is not the case and explains that,

we are witnessing a slackening of the more rigid hierarchical power relations which at one time dominated staff-pupil relationships and a move towards adults and school staff engaging in more deliberate dialogue about school-related issues.

According to Flutter (2007) schools now give children a ‘voice’ on issues relating to their experiences of learning. Nevertheless, this may not be the experience from a child’s perspective as Davey et al. (2010:12) state that children are “very aware of the imbalance of power in the adult–child, teacher-pupil relationship”.

Realising the Human Rights of Children through the RRSA

There is a range of programmes, projects and initiatives that have been developed to further the realisation of the human rights of children in schools. One such programme that claims this and forms part of the scope of this study is the UNICEF UK Rights Respecting School Award (RRSA). From 2004, schools in the UK began to work towards the Rights Respecting School Award (RRSA), what Sebba and Robinson (2010) described as a framework of values. According to UNICEF UK (2009), the Convention “lies at the heart of the Rights Respecting Schools Award” (RRSA) and is a mechanism for incorporating the human rights of children into the ethos and values of a school. UNICEF UK (2009) explains that the RRSA incorporates the Convention by requiring schools to integrate these values and beliefs into the school’s learning and teaching and overall ethos. Jones (2017) raises the question of why schools need to gain an award to incorporate the human rights of children into their ethos and practice. He suggests that,

either teacher training is lacking in areas that consider children's rights, that schools are not designed or intended to promote children's rights or that an ideology of children as non-persons is pervasive within schools and the wider culture (Jones, 2017: 79).

It is interesting to note the description of this Award. UNICEF UK (2015a), describes it as an ‘RRSA programme’, while Lundy et al. (2017) describe it as an ‘education rights project’. Trivers and Starkey (2012) initially introduce the RRSA as a Human Rights Education (HRE) programme. However, they go on to explain why it does not meet the criteria for an HRE programme, as defined in various international HRE documentation. This is, “due to the lack of political content and

analysis, coupled with token participation which fails to provide children with their rights under the Convention” (Trivers and Starkey, 2012:138-139). According to Osler (2016:4), an HRE programme highlights the knowledge and practice of human rights, by modelling, “education about, through and for human rights”. Therefore, as the RRSA has not been described as an HRE programme, I have not discussed the Award as an HRE programme in this study.

According to UNICEF UK (2017), over 4000 schools in the UK were aiming to achieve this Award. Currently the number is reported to be over 5000 (UNICEF UK, 2019). To achieve the Award a school collates evidence to meet the four Standards within levels one and two of the Award, and it is externally assessed by UNICEF UK (UNICEF UK, 2009). This evidence must include examples of a whole school approach where children, teachers and parents have been actively involved in creating evidence to achieve the Award (UNICEF UK, 2009). According to Lundy et al. (2017:374) “There is no established definition of what constitutes a whole-school approach”, but the Rights Respecting School Award is, “an innovative and inspiring education rights project”. The Award is valid for three years, and if the school wishes to continue using the ‘Rights Respecting School’ title, they have to be successfully reassessed. Each level of the Award has registration, training, support and assessment costs which are met by the school (UNICEF UK, 2009).

Research by Sebba and Robinson (2010) identified that children from schools which had achieved the RRSA presented not only an understanding of their rights but an understanding of the rights of others. Schools that have been involved in RRSA research by Sebba and Robinson (2010) and Dunhill (2016) reported that the number of incidents of bullying has reduced and they accredited this to the

RRSA. Covell (2010) researched the levels of school engagement across eighteen schools in the UK, including schools that had achieved the RRSA. All schools in these studies were either mainstream primary or secondary schools. Neither Sebba and Robinson (2010) or Covell's (2010) research included special schools.

Covell (2010) found that children in schools that have achieved the RRSA reported that the children were more engaged in the learning process. However, Jones (2017:78) argues that "there is still no indication that the RRSA includes children and young people in discussions about what constitutes 'suitable education'". Robinson (2014a) agrees and states that "certain aspects of school organisation, policies and practices are not open to being challenged by [children]". She also identified significant concerns regarding the RRSA in schools as the decision's children were involved in were not central to the functioning of a school, and were fairly superficial (Robinson, 2014a). In addition, she found that the children involved in the RRSA, such as Ambassadors, were children who appeared to agree with the staff at the school, and never questioned the processes, and said what the staff wanted to hear (Robinson, 2014a).

Trivers and Starkey (2012:138) raised concerns that the RRSA was being implemented in some schools as a behaviour management programme, where "children equate human rights to good behaviour and obeying rules". Previously, Osler and Starkey (2010) had raised concerns regarding the connections between what children were experiencing, between learning about human rights and conforming to school rules. This is an interesting element that is discussed further in Chapter 6, Explanation Phase, in regards to the realisation of rights through the Award.

Summary

Several philosophical perspectives have been discussed and a body of research has been presented that recognises the long journey from what can be described as 'the human rights of man', to the current position of not only recognising the human rights of children, but signifying that knowing about and understanding these rights can have a real significance to how they 'translated' and are practically implemented. According to Verhellen, (2006:87) the examinations and deliberations around the Convention and the human rights of children are still in its early stages and that the Convention is "only the beginnings of a solution [that gives] new impetus to the debate". However, children have rights and as Freeman (2011:22) states, "those who have [rights] can exercise agency... and there is now clear evidence that even the youngest amongst us can do this".

By reviewing studies of human rights and the human rights of children I have identified research gaps in the literature. First, there is a broad range of research that recognises that the language of the Convention requires 'translation', as identified earlier in this chapter, not only for children but also for adults. The reasons for this have been identified in this chapter. However, research on how the language can be 'translated' through such programmes as the RRSA and then 'retranslated' on school websites does not exist. Secondly, existing research regarding the RRSA has provided feedback from school staff, children and parents. However, such an approach lacks attention to the language of the human rights of children that are then incorporated into the school ethos after gaining the Award. This study includes special schools, which have not been included in previous research on the RRSA.

Due to ongoing disorganised and in many contexts, exclusionary nature of developments of the human rights of children, the RRSA needs to work on getting through the messy complexity to support schools to embed the Convention accurately into a school ethos. As previously stated, there are requirements for maintained schools in England to present their ethos on their school website (DfE, 2017). The way that schools represent themselves as 'Rights Respecting' and promote their 'rights' ethos online has significance for all stakeholders associated with the school, including children, parents, carers and staff. If the school misinforms the stakeholders and the general public by misrepresenting the human rights of children on their website, then children will not be accurately informed of their rights and adults will not effectively uphold the human rights of children as stated in the Convention. Therefore, the information that schools present on their websites must be accurate.

The next chapter is Methodology. This chapter presents the conceptual and methodological framework for the study of the language of the human rights of children using critical discourse analysis (CDA).

Chapter 3. Methodology

Introduction

This chapter presents the development and application of a conceptual and methodological framework for the study of the language of the human rights of children using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). My methodology was informed by a critical realist ontology and aligns with the approach to CDA developed by Fairclough and others. The discourse of the human rights of children, presented through language was critiqued, and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (Convention); the UNICEF UK Rights Respecting School Award (RRSA) criteria and six school websites were examined for language similarities, differences, inconsistencies and gaps.

The Convention comprises of fifty-four Articles and are all aimed at States and Governments to implement. Four Articles from the Convention formed the focus of this research. These Articles are known as the 'General Principles', which support and guide the interpretation of all the other Articles, and are described as the "general requirements for all rights" (United Nations, 1989).

Using elements of Fairclough's (2015) three phase framework of CDA; interpretation; description and explanation, I carried out an analysis of the language of the Convention, the RRSA, and six school websites in England, where the schools have achieved the level 2 RRSA (2 x primary, 2 x secondary, 2 x special schools).

In this study, the term 'text' refers to "visual language", this includes the words on websites and as well as written language in documents (Fairclough, 2015:60).

Throughout this thesis, the content of the Convention, RRSA and school websites are referred to as text.

The Convention is an internationally agreed universal language of the human rights of children (UNICEF, 1989). I carried out a CDA approach on the language of the RRSA and on six school websites, where the schools had achieved level 2 RRSA, and interpreted, described and explained how the language of the Convention, is being represented through these sources. According to Liebel (2012), analysing contexts, such as interpreting, describing, and explaining the language of the RRSA and school websites, can give new or 'broader' meanings and 'implications' to the existing reality of the language of the human rights of children.

This chapter begins with the scope of this study, including the research questions and how I have addressed them. I then explain the philosophical conventions that apply to this study, followed by an outline of CDA approaches and clarification of Fairclough's (2015) three phases of CDA as a theory and a method. This is followed by a description of the research design; selection of the sources and how the data from the sources were selected and collected. I also include an explanation of the ethical considerations of this study. Finally, as reflexivity is a key element of CDA, this chapter also includes a discussion on my positionality.

The Four Articles in this Study

Article 2 (Non-discrimination)

1. States Parties shall respect and ensure the rights set forth in the present Convention to each child within their jurisdiction without discrimination of any

kind, irrespective of the child's or his or her parent's or legal guardian's race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, property, disability, birth or other status.

2. States Parties shall take all appropriate measures to ensure that the child is protected against all forms of discrimination or punishment on the basis of the status, activities, expressed opinions, or beliefs of the child's parents, legal guardians, or family members.

Article 3 (Best interests of the child)

1. In all actions concerning children, whether undertaken by public or private social welfare institutions, courts of law, administrative authorities or legislative bodies, the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration.

2. States Parties undertake to the child such protection and care as is necessary for his or her well-being, taking into account the rights and duties of his or her parents, legal guardians, or other individuals legally responsible for him or her, and, to this end, shall take all appropriate legislative and administrative measures.

3. States Parties shall ensure that the institutions, services and facilities responsible for the care or protection of children shall conform with the standards established by competent authorities, particularly in the areas of safety, health, in the number and suitability of their staff, as well as competent supervision.

Article 6 (Right to life, survival and development)

1. States Parties recognize that every child has the inherent right to life.
2. States Parties shall ensure to the maximum extent possible the survival and development of the child.

Article 12 (Respect for the views of the child)

1. States Parties shall assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those 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.
2. For this purpose, the child shall in particular be provided the opportunity to be heard in any judicial and administrative proceedings affecting the child, either directly, or through a representative or an appropriate body, in a manner consistent with the procedural rules of national law (United Nations, 1989).

The Scope of the Study

The aim of this study was to identify the extent to which the Convention, the language of the human rights of children, was incorporated into the UNICEF Rights Respecting School Award (RRSA) (2015-2017) level 2 and how it was then presented on the websites of six schools that have achieved this award, through applying a CDA approach. I aimed to contribute to the debate on the

discourse of the human rights of children by addressing the following research question and sub-questions.

Research Question

To what extent is the Convention, the language of the human rights of children, incorporated into the UNICEF UK Rights Respecting School Award (RRSA) and how it is then presented on school websites?

Research Sub-questions

1. What is the language of the human rights of children?

A historical review of UN documentation included in the Travaux and an analysis of previous research was carried out. This process formed part of the Interpretative Phase of Fairclough's framework of CDA. This sub-question will be answered in Chapter 4, Interpretive Phase, from an analysis of the background information of the text.

2. How does the UNICEF UK Rights Respecting Schools Award level 2, incorporate the language of the human rights of children, as stated in the Convention?

An analysis was carried out to identify the extent to which the language of the four Articles of the Convention was incorporated into the RRSA Standards. This sub-question will be answered in chapters 5 and 6. Chapter 5, Descriptive Phase, provides an analysis of the language and includes a critique of the use of the

language of the human rights of children within the RRSA and begins to recognise the interconnectedness of each source, identifying intertextuality and recontextualisation. Chapter 6, Explanation Phase, provides analysis at the societal level. The analysis at the societal level focuses on the language of the human rights of children as presented in the Convention, and the possible impacts of intertextuality and recontextualisation of this language through the RRSA.

3. How do schools which have achieved the Rights Respecting Schools Award present the language of the human rights of children on their websites?

An analysis was carried out to identify the extent to which the language of the four Articles of the Convention and the RRSA was presented on the school websites. This sub-question will be answered in chapters 5 and 6. Chapter 5 Descriptive Phase, provides an analysis of the language and includes a critique of the language of the human rights of children presented on the school websites. Chapter 6, Explanation Phase, provides analysis at the societal level. The analysis at the societal level focuses on the language of the human rights of children as presented in the Convention, and the possible impacts of intertextuality and recontextualisation of this language as presented on the websites.

A Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) Approach

CDA developed from within the field of 'critical linguistics', by researchers at the University of East Anglia in the 1970s (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997). According to Wodak (1995:204), CDA "analyses the opaque as well as transparent

structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language". Fairclough and Wodak (1997) state that CDA incorporates a range of approaches to the social analysis of discourse and according to Fairclough (2015), CDA involves an interpretation of text, an evaluation and a critique of contradictions within a text. In this study, I applied elements of Fairclough's (2015) three-phase framework of CDA. Fairclough's approach to CDA is characterised by critical realism (Fairclough, 2015).

Critical realism in social science is associated with the work of Roy Bhasker and Rom Harré (Sayer, 2000; Denzin and Lincoln, 2013). According to Archer et al. (2016), current critical realists incorporate the works of a range of researchers including Archer (1982), Gorski (2008) and Little (2016). However, Fairclough's (2015) approach to CDA was influenced by the work of Roy Bhasker and was the influence on my approach in this study.

During the late 1970s and 1980s, critical realism emerged from a post-positivist 'crisis' between natural science and social sciences (Archer et al., 2016). Sayer (2000) states that critical realism offers an alternative to positivism and interpretivism. "Critical realism proposes a way of combining a modified naturalism with a recognition of the necessity of interpretative understanding of meaning in social life" (Sayer, 2000:2-3). Kerr (2003) explains that realism diverges from positivism in two ways. Realism,

...must include an attempt at interpreting causal links from observable outcomes... [and as] ... agents are themselves active in interpreting their structural context, and that the meanings which they attach to any given situation are likely to differ, part of the quest for explanation must be the incorporation of the notion of hermeneutics; i.e. an understanding of the

differential meanings which agents infer upon their actions (Kerr, 2003:122-123).

Critical realists share some aspects of ontology with positivism, such as particular methods and look for causality with the explanation; and interpretivism, by assuming an interpretive position to understand a situation; they also have to explain the situation within society (Sayer, 2000). CDA, like positivism, looks for causality. However, it differs from positivism in that, “explanation depends rather on identifying causal mechanisms and how they work, and discovering if they have been activated and under what conditions” (Sayer, 2000:14).

Using a CDA approach directs the researcher to not only look at the text to interpret, describe and explain the meaning, but also to consider the historical conditions in which the text was created, and to analyse how discourse and social meaning are linked (Blommaert, 2005). While developing their understanding of the structures of language that is created from the researcher's lived experiences (Macdonald et al., 2002).

Elements of CDA are also taken from the work of thinkers in the early 1900s from the Frankfurt School, such as Horkheimer (1895-1973) and Adorno (1903-1969) (Rasmussen, 1996). From the 1970s, Habermas' work at the Frankfurt School, in particular, challenged the traditional critical theories of that time by continually challenging oppression and inequality and realising the goal of human emancipation in the future (Habermas, 1985). However, Kompredis (2006:25), a student of Habermas, stated that Habermas' theory had “...remodelled critical theory in the image of liberal theories of justice”, and through this has weakened the position of critical theory through reducing the emancipatory discourse of the theory. However, Habermas (1985:337) argued that when individuals

communicate, they assume that the understandings each other has, are seen as similar and straightforward by the other, he used the term “taken-for-granted background assumptions”. This can be interpreted as enhancing emancipatory discourse as he continued to call for communication to take place around the understandings of human emancipation, to learn from the vicissitudes of modernity.

CDA brings together the critique of language (discourse) and sets out to explain how and where it relates within social reality, with an aim to change that existing reality "for the better" (Fairclough, 2015:6). According to Fairclough (2015), CDA can identify ‘taken for granted assumptions’ in language and through an emancipatory discourse can empower the individual, which is a critical element in critical theory and CDA. In this study, I acknowledge that my understanding of text will not be the same as another's. My level and focus of critique will be different from another researcher due to my lived experiences. Using CDA has supported me to identify any ‘taken for granted’ assumptions that I made. For example, I do not assume that individuals will have the same ‘taken for granted’ background assumptions that supported their understanding when they developed the school websites. Due to this, I assumed at the start of this study that all the school websites would be different.

CDA as a Theory and a Method

Fairclough (2015) developed his version of CDA over the past twenty-five years and states that it is both a theory and a method. His work is well-respected, and he has been influential in developing CDA not only as a theory and a method but as both (Phillips and Hardy, 2002; Luke, 2002; Weiss and Wodak, 2003; Wodak, 2004). Fairclough and Wodak (1997) argue that CDA is not and never should be

a single methodology or theory, but a multifarious approach. Fairclough, (2001:21) explains that CDA is more than “just analysing text or analysing process of production” and interpretation. It is both a theory and a method as it goes on to analyse the relationship or link between the texts, the process and the social conditions in which they sit (Fairclough, 2001). Weiss and Wodak (2003:7) support this position and state that CDA is a “theoretical synthesis of conceptual tools”. This can also be aligned with Bourdieu’s argument that a theory is a “thinking tool” (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992:160). Such ‘tools’ allow the researcher to consider “What conceptual tools are relevant for this or that problem and for this or that context?” (Weiss and Wodak, 2003:7). Luke states that,

CDA involves a principled and transparent shunting back and forth between the microanalysis of texts using varied tools of linguistics, semiotics, and literary analysis and the macro-analysis of social formations, institutions, and power relations that these texts index and construct (Luke, 2002:100).

Therefore, when using a framework of CDA, a researcher cannot carry out the interpretation, description and explanation without referring to theory. Luke (2002:101) goes on to state that,

...a linguistic and text analytic metalanguage, no matter how comprehensive, cannot ‘do’ CDA in and of itself. It requires the overlay of a social theoretic discourse for explaining and explicating the social; contexts, concomitants, contingencies and consequences of any given text or discourse.

In addition, Pennycook (2001) argues that any form of text analysis cannot identify the impact of a text on an individual or society without a context. Therefore, by using Fairclough's three phases of CDA, I was able to analyse, interpret and explain the language of the human rights of children by moving "between text and context" (Luke, 2002:100).

Elements of Fairclough's CDA applied in this Study

Using elements of Fairclough's (2015) three phase framework of CDA, I drew upon what Fairclough (2015: 57) explains as my "members' resource", to "explicate what [I] am doing" (Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999:176) and "try to reflect on [my] interpretations" (Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999:204). "Members resource" is unique insider knowledge of the language that epitomises the researchers lived experiences (Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999) and according to Fairclough (2015:51), "...language as social practice [is] determined by social structures".

The aim of this study was to critique the changes in the discourse of the human rights of the child from the Convention, to the RRSA and on the school websites by interpreting, describing and explaining the text. When reading a text, an individual will interpret meaning from the language, starting from their perspective and their lived experiences (Reynolds, 2004). Therefore, I acknowledge that this interpretation of meaning is from my positionality and my experienced reality (Parkes, 2012). However, I have been very conscious of my experienced reality and paid attention to my positionality to ensure rigour during this study.

Using CDA to interpret, describe and explain the language of the human rights of children, provides an effective way to focus on how power is constructed within texts (Fairclough, 1995). Language included in text is a source of power (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997; Fairclough, 2014) and none more so than that the power provided by the Convention, the language of the human rights of children (Human Rights Watch, 2014; United Nations, 2014).

Further Context of the Theoretical and Analytical Framework of CDA

A research approach can be seen as an accepted, ever-changing, or general standpoint, that is constructed from the epistemological and ontological considerations of an assumed research community (Lincoln and Guba, 2000; Donmoyer, 2006; Trifonas, 2009; Humphrey, 2013). Therefore, duplication and generalisation are doubtful due to the research being accepted as time and context bound (Denzin and Lincoln, 2013). In social and educational research, the meaning is not discovered in a single reality but constructed from a multidimensional reality (Gray, 2004). These multidimensional realities are different for each person, and each person reacts to them in their way (Robson, 2002). In social and educational contexts due to the ever-changing and evolving world (Whitty, 2006), some studies on the human rights of children may not be seen as useful in future contexts (Liebel, 2012). However, children are legitimate and autonomous rights holders and have “the right to have rights” (Liebel, 2012:10). Therefore, this study has currency, as the discourse of the human rights of children is a current ‘social struggle’ (Fairclough, 2015). By identifying ‘power relationships’, the ‘social struggle’ can be seen as ensuring that all children are made aware of, and adults uphold, the human rights of children.

CDA can be a misleading term in regards to the word 'critical'. In this case, it does not mean negative (Wodak and Meyer, 2009). Habermas (1981) describes the 'critical' in critical research as having an 'emancipatory knowledge interest' that is dedicated to progressive social policy. Fairclough (2015:41) argues that CDA contributes to "critical social analysis" and is a useful way to critique "existing social reality" (Fairclough, 2015:48). Therefore, using CDA to interpret, describe and explain the language of the human rights of children, an existing but complex social reality, can be seen as contributing to the development of the human rights of children.

Du Gay (1996:43) explains that discourse is,

... a group of statements which provide a language for talking about a topic and a way of producing a particular kind of knowledge about a topic. Thus the term refers both to the production of knowledge through language and representations and the way that knowledge is institutionalised, shaping social practices and setting new methods into play.

Foucault was one of the first to define the 'discourse' as a way to express and interpret an object through a set of linguistic classifications that associate knowledge and power within disciplines (Potter, 1996; Bryman, 2012). CDA regards language as something that 'shapes and is shaped' by all social practices (Fairclough, 1995). Therefore, the language that is presented in text, the meanings and how it is used, can be systematically analysed (Luke, 1997). The objective of using CDA is to exhibit transparently, the way in which language as power is situated in social practices (Wetherell et al., 2001).

CDA identifies how discourses are socially constructed and conditioned (Blommaert, 2005; Fairclough, 2015). This includes how individuals form their meaning-making from language (Macdonald et al., 2002). Consequently, when reading a text, an individual will interpret meaning from the text from their perspectives and their lived experiences (Reynolds, 2004).

Critical Discourse Analysis studies real and often extended, instances of social interaction which take (partially) linguistic form. The critical approach is distinctive in its view of (a) the relationship between language and society, and (b) the relationship between analysis and the practices analysed (Wodak 1995:173).

Therefore, by using a critical realism informed CDA approach to interpret, describe and explain text, one can expose hidden meanings behind the text, uncover the unchallenged and undisputed metaphors and identify the power structures within the text that may not be determined using other approaches to CDA.

This study draws on language within text. The meanings from text are often referred to using other words, which in turn, refer to yet other words. For example, within the Convention, Article 12 (Respect for the views of the child). The Article states:

1. States Parties shall assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those 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.

2. For this purpose, the child shall in particular be provided the opportunity to be heard in any judicial and administrative proceedings affecting the child, either directly, or through a representative or an appropriate body, in a manner consistent with the procedural rules of national law (United Nations, 1989).

The term "...given due weight" (United Nations, 1989) is not defined in the Convention. In some situations, this could be a tokenistic activity where the information obtained was dismissed straight away, to an activity that supported adults to understand what children want or need and a joint decision being made by both adults and children. Therefore, 'given due weight' could also mean 'listened to', 'did an activity', 'collected views on paper', 'actively engaged and collectively agreed on a decision'. This is what van Leeuwen (2008) refers to in CDA as the representation of social action. It gives a way of interpreting and describing formulations such as 'given due weight' which in this example is an abstraction from what adults will do in this situation. This can be seen as an example of the "distinction between 'having' rights and being able to exercise them" (Freeman, 2009:387). Therefore, CDA is a useful approach to interpreting, describing and explaining the language of the human rights of children.

Fairclough (2015) argues that language is variable, and it depends on the social identity of people within the interactions they participate in. These, he believes, have specific social purposes within social settings. He uses the term discourse and defines it as a, "socially constructed" use of language (Fairclough, 2015:4). From this description, text and language can be identified as socially constructed to create a person's reality. Therefore, "People [speak, listen, read and write] in ways which are determined socially and have social effects" (Fairclough, 2015:4).

Seeing language as a discourse gives the researcher an opportunity not only to analyse the production and interpretation of texts but to analyse “the relationship between text, process and their social conditions” (Fairclough, 2015:58). Discourse can also be seen as how language is stated (Wetherell et al., 2001). This language can express power; language can even contest, allocate and provide a conduit for power within social structures (Fairclough, 2003).

The lived experiences or “social conditions”, the term Fairclough (2015:57), offers, can be seen as a discourse. This discourse has been reproduced or transformed by a person’s social position. The lived experiences of an individual can “shape the members’ resource’ (Fairclough, 2015:58), from which forms the construction and interpretation of the meaning. For example, my normative view is that all children must be informed of their rights and all adults, especially those in a position of responsibility, including those working in schools, are obligated to uphold the human rights of children and ensure children are educated about their rights. My positionality will be explored later in this chapter.

CDA and Power

Wodak and Meyer (2009) explain that CDA can be identified as a ‘research programme’, with the aim to study the ideologies and power relations involved in discourse. Applying CDA, allows the researcher to focus systematically on specific linguistic items within text to produce meaning that can then be related to social reality (Hardy et al., 2004; Seale, 2004). According to Phillips and Hardy (2002:2), CDA provides the researcher with a framework to examine “an interrelated set of texts and the practices of their production, dissemination, and

reception” and challenge taken-for-granted “truths” or “realities”. A significant standpoint of CDA is identifying the concept of power. This concept recognises the connection between language and power. Wodak (2004:188), states that,

...it is very rare that a text is the work of any one person. In texts discursive differences are negotiated; they are governed by differences in power, which is in part encoded in and determined by discourse and by genre. Therefore, texts are often sites of struggle in that they show traces of differing discourses and ideologies contending and struggling for dominance.

According to van Dijk (1995:17), CDA is a ‘special approach to the study of text’, from which researchers can “...discover patterns of elite dominance or manipulation ‘in’ texts” (van Dijk, 1995:19). Therefore, language forms and is informed by social and educational practices. Using CDA to interpret, describe and explain the language within the Convention, and how it was incorporated into the RRSA and on the school websites provided me with an effective way to focus on how power is constructed within the texts (Fairclough, 1995, 2003).

Arguably, all language is power-laden. By including this combination of resources, I was able to determine the changing demands and contradictions of the language of the human rights of children (Fairclough, 2015). Language can be identified as a mode of power and social control (Habermas, 1985), and power dimensions are codified and authorised by means of language (Wodak, 2001). Word choice is also important. For example, identifying what words were removed from drafts and agreed in the final version of the four Articles of the Convention and which State parties were involved in this decision. According to Wingersky et al. (2009:120),

Word choice often determines whether or not you get your message across. Making poor word choices and not writing appropriately for the audience can distract the reader so much that the message you intended to convey is missed.

Also, Bondi (2007) states that the choice of words presents the author's standpoint and where the words are placed in the sentence is just as important as the position of those words. Therefore, by applying a CDA approach, I was able to interpret, describe and explain unavoidable multiplicity and variability of meanings that can be understood by different readers of a text who are all meaning-making from their lived experiences. I also applied this approach to identify and acknowledge the power-laden language that was incorporated in the RRSA and on the school websites and how the language was changed (Grbich, 2013), from that in the Convention. This allowed me to produce meaning from these changes that I then related to social reality (Hardy et al., 2004; Seale, 2004).

Sources and Data Collection

The CDA approach I applied to interpret, describe and explain the language of the human rights of children within the Convention, the RRSA and on the school websites, allowed me to analyse critically the current accepted values and ideals that are created by rights language and identify intertextuality and recontextualisation of the language of the human rights of children.

Before I discuss the data sources, I will explain the three phases in more detail from Fairclough's (1993, 1995, 2001) CDA framework and describe how these

were applied in this study. The Interpretative Phase; the Descriptive Phase and the Explanation Phase. The three phases of Fairclough's framework required the application of three unique types of analysis. These unique phases consist of three approaches to data analysis.

Interpretative Phase

The Interpretative Phase analyses the creation of the text, how it was produced, what its purpose was (Fairclough, 2015). In this study, the Interpretive Phase analysed the Convention, which in this study encompasses the language of the human rights of children. The Interpretative Phase is an analysis of the background information of a text. As the aim of this study was to analyse the extent to which the language of the Convention had been incorporated into the RRSA and then represented on the school websites that have achieved this award, the four Articles of the Convention, commonly referred to as the 'General Principles', were the main focus of the Interpretive Phase. The development and the drafting of the Convention and the 1989 final published version were analysed. This provided me with the historical context in which the Convention was created, and how the language of the human rights of children was developed. This phase included an analysis of a range of United Nations historical documents that led to the creation of the Convention. This consists of the UN Human Rights Treaties, held within the Travaux Préparatoires database at the University of Virginia, School of Law. This is a unique, searchable, comprehensive database of the preparatory works from the drafting and negotiation of the Convention, such as minutes, drafts and reports (University of Virginia, n.d.).

In this phase, the researcher interprets the text from “what is in the text and what is ‘in’ the interpreter” (Fairclough, 2015:155). What is ‘in the text’ relates to analysing each word, its position in the text, what comes before it or after it, its position in a sentence (Fairclough, 2015). In this study, the words analysed were those of the four Articles. These were; *Convention; rights; discrimination; best interest; development; well-being and views of the child*. Also, derivatives of these words were included along with *voice and participation* which were found to be commonly associated with Article 12 and UNCRC and CRC, which are other titles for the Convention. The additional words were added to widen the search for language that identified with the Convention and allowed for the identification of recontextualisation. These words are from or associated with the four Convention Articles and form the key concepts of the ‘General Principles’ of the Convention. These words were then searched for in the Descriptive phase to identify to what extent the language of the human rights of children had been incorporated into the RRSA and onto the school websites.

What is ‘in the interpreter’ is what Fairclough (2015) calls the ‘Members Resource’ and is the knowledge, the background information that the interpreter of the text has at the time of reading the text. ‘Members Resource’ is further explained later in this chapter. The Interpretative Phase of the research is presented in Chapter 4.

Descriptive Phase

The Descriptive Phase identified the formal features of the text. In this study, the formal features identified was the language of the human rights of children as

acknowledged in the Interpretative Phase, and that was evident in the RRSA and on the school websites. The objective of this phase was to describe the properties of representations of the language of the four Articles of the Convention in the RRSA and on the school websites. The ordering of the words was also an essential element to consider in this phase, as this demonstrates importance. Particular elements were taken in a specific way due to where they were placed in the text (Brown and Yale, 1983). This phase identified the intertextuality, the interconnectedness of each source. Furthermore, I was able to locate recontextualisation, where the language was changed in the RRSA and on the school websites, to present a different context from that in which it was initially presented in the Convention. The Descriptive Phase of the research is presented in Chapter 5.

Explanation Phase

The Explanation Phase analyses the “relationship between interaction and social context” of the language from the Interpretive Phase and the Descriptive Phase (Fairclough, 2015:36). The societal analysis focused on the language of the human rights of children as presented in the Convention, and what could the possible impacts be from the presentation of this language through the RRSA and on the school websites. The analysis identified the intertextuality between the three sources. Additionally, the recontextualisation of the language of the Convention was analysed to identify how this language had been changed in the RRSA and on the school websites, and what was the societal impact of such changes. According to Fairclough (2015:172) this phase, “is a matter of seeing a discourse as part of processes of social struggle”, and also identifying any “power

relationships”. In this study the social struggle can be seen as ensuring that all children and adults are made aware of the human rights of children, and analysing how these rights are being promoted in the RRSA and on the school websites using the language of the Convention, what I refer to as the globally accepted language of the human rights of children. The ‘power relationships’ can be identified in this study through the language used to describe or present the positions of the staff and the children at the schools. This phase identified emergent themes from the Interpretive and Descriptive phases of the analysis. These were identified as having the highest possible impacts from the presentation of this language through the RRSA and on the school websites. The Explanation Phase of the research is presented in Chapter 6.

Data Sources

In this study, the Convention and the RRSA were vital components; therefore, their incorporation was paramount. The version of the RRSA from May 2017, was analysed as part of this study. This was developed initially from the Convention in 2004. Screenshots on May 24th 2017 captured the school websites. It is important to acknowledge that the RRSA was reviewed in July 2017 and the school websites may change over time and this is why the specific version and dates will only be included in this study. On 24th May 2017, the UNICEF UK RRSA website listed over 300 schools that had completed the level 2 Award. This was the highest level of RRSA that could be achieved. The list of schools included mostly primary schools, but also included secondary and special schools. The schools selected for this study had all achieved the RRSA level 2 before November 2016. That was to ensure the school had time to update their websites

after completing the Award. I wanted to include a representative sample of the range of schools which had completed the RRSA. Therefore, using the UNICEF UK RRSA level 2 list, I applied stratified random sampling to ensure the six schools included two primary, two secondary and two special schools (Bryman, 2012). I only included maintained schools as they are required to include a representation of the school ethos on their website (DfE, 2017). Also, the three types of schools were included to represent the range of schools that had completed the RRSA. Previous research on the RRSA included primary and secondary schools. Although special schools had achieved the RRSA award, they were not included in any of the previous research studies. Therefore, I used stratified random sampling to ensure my sample included these three types of schools.

The websites were searched for the words: *Convention; UNCRC; CRC rights; discrimination; best interest; development; well-being; views of the child; voice; participation* and derivatives of these words. These are the keywords that were identified from the four Articles that are the 'General Principles' of the Convention. The word *discrimination* is the key term in Article 2; *best interest* is the key term in Article 3; *development and well-being* are the key terms in Article 6 and *views of the child* is the key term in Article 12. In addition to this term, I also included the words *voice* and *participation* when searching for links to Article 12 as these words are commonly associated with this Article.

Once these words were found the relevant pages were printed. This was followed by a manual analysis using coloured highlighters to analyse the text, which was then aggregated electronically. Due to the small amount of text that included

these words, there was minimal aggregation, and it told me very little. Therefore, I then wrote a narrative on each school from my analysis.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations were paramount throughout this research. Due to there being no human participants within the planned research project there was only a short University ethical approval process to go through. There are no ethical issues regarding the inclusion of the school websites as they are in the public domain. However, the schools were coded and are not identified within this study. To ensure the schools cannot be identified from the quotations included in this thesis, I searched two major search engines, to try and determine the schools from the quotes. If a school was identifiable from these searches, by that I mean it came up on the first page of the search results, then the direct quote was modified. The modification was in the form of deleting certain words in the quote that made the school identifiable. Although some schools may have changed their websites since May 2017, others may not have, and I wanted to ensure anonymity for every school in this study. This was time-consuming, but from this process, I found that many schools appeared to copy the wording on their websites. For example, the quotations I had seen on one school website were the same ones on at least another five school websites.

Due to my personal moral and ethical stance, an ethical approach to analysing the language of the human rights of children was continually reflected upon. I kept a reflexive research diary throughout the process to provide a vehicle for self-reflexivity and to identify, interpret, acknowledge and present not only the

limitations of the research but was purposeful in providing indicators of rigour. Maintaining a diary throughout this study has allowed me to reflect on all aspects of the process including the problems I came across during the study. For example, structuring the thesis; understanding the three phases; considering how to ensure I present this thesis to promote trustworthiness, and developing the threads from the findings.

Positionality

Positionality is the practice of positioning the researcher in relation to the research focus and the knowledge and experiences the researcher brings with them (Haraway, 1991). This presents to the reader the influences that the researcher has drawn upon to carry out the research and how they have interpreted the findings. Positionality was first identified within geographical sciences (Sack, 1974) and was further developed as a theoretical framework by feminist researchers (Haraway, 1991). The framework attracted additional 'layers' that were to consider where the researcher 'stands' in relation to the participants and the settings (England, 1994).

Positionality consists of and is constructed from reflexivity, self-reflexivity and researcher subjectivity (Pillow, 2010). Reflexivity is an ongoing process of constant analysis of the research method, self – reflexivity can be defined as a process of continuing self- analysis by the researcher on themselves (Callaway, 1992). Self-analysis can then be seen as an iterative approach by the researcher to reflect upon previous and ongoing lived experiences. This can support the construction of knowledge within the research (Pillow, 2010) and provide more

'valid' research (Ball, 1990). Researcher subjectivity is the emotion, experience and professional and personal knowledge a researcher brings to the process (Letherby, 2013). This could be identified from the researcher's biography and requires constant, "critical interrogation" (Letherby 2013:80).

To maintain my positionality and reflexivity in practical terms when doing this study, I kept a research diary. I wrote my personal reflections in the diary almost every time I read, wrote or thought about the research in this study. This allowed me to consider not only what I was reading, writing and thinking, but also why. I reflected on why I was reading a research paper; why I was writing a paragraph using a particular language or making a particular emphasis, or why I thought in a particular way about, for example, my data. I also read the diary several times when I was finalising the chapters of this thesis. This process identified the personal emotions, the biases, I brought to the study and provided me with a vehicle to continually critically interrogate myself (Letherby, 2013).

There is a wide range of varying and contrasting theoretical frameworks that all require the researcher to ensure procedures are in place to achieve rigour and in CDA this is presented as trustworthiness (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Guba, 1990; Hammersley, 2007). Positionality and reflexivity rely on rigour and trustworthiness. However, CDA has many critics. One of the most critical is Widdowson (1995:149) who argues that "CDA is subordinating analysis to interpretation, of finding in the text what they set out to find". This is suggesting that when a researcher applies CDA, they are biased. However, Miles and Huberman (1994) argue that bias is inevitable for all social researchers.

Widdowson (1995:136) states that CDA, "is not the systematic application of a theoretical model, but a rather less rigorous operation". However, many

supporters of CDA state that the systematic approach that is being called for in CDA is a standardised approach with mechanical methods (Bucholtz, 2001; Grant and Hardy, 2003; Wodak, 2004; Fairclough, 2001, 2003; Gee, 2005; Wodak and Meyer, 2009). If CDA was standardised, this would eliminate the level of reflexivity and thus reduce the trustworthiness (Billig, 2002). Wodak (2001:9) agrees and states that the trustworthiness of CDA comes from "having a focus on self-reflection".

Researchers construct a position from their past experiences and knowledge and should acknowledge these (Scheurich,1994). It is important to state that I collected the data to analyse and I was the only person interpreting the data (Guba and Lincoln, 2005); therefore my 'member resource' must be recognised (Fairclough, 2001; Gee, 2005). Also, the "position of the researcher needs to be acknowledged, to help the research audience understand the choices made" (Sharp and Richardson, 2001:203).

CDA allows me to not only acknowledge my 'Members Resource' in regards to what I bring to the interpretation but also allows me to draw on 'cues' that I have due to my knowledge and experience (Fairclough, 2015). I brought my 'Members Resource', to this study, through my knowledge of the Convention, the RRSA and how schools' approach the Award. The 'cues' I drew upon were from my knowledge and experience and through CDA I was able to "engage in the discourse processes [that I was] investigating" (Fairclough, 2015:175) by continually reflecting on my analysis and being self-conscious of this.

Many of my reflective diary entries were about applying CDA in this study. Although I found my reflections difficult, to begin with, once I started to reread my diary before researching, I was able to use the entries in the diary to evaluate my

thoughts and how I was thinking. In turn, this process reinforced the notion of emancipatory discourse and strengthened my resolve to identify 'taken for granted assumptions' in the language (Fairclough, 2015). For example, after identifying the word 'responsibility' and how it was presented on the majority of the school websites, I continually analysed the "rootedness of this discourse" (Fairclough, 2015:176). This led me to documents I had not planned to refer to in this study, such as the DfE (2014) booklet entitled *Promoting fundamental British values as part of SMSC¹ in schools*.

Throughout this study, I have reflected on my 'Members Resource' to acknowledge and reflect on how I am analysing the information. Due to my normative view, and applying CDA, I maintained an awareness of the possibility that I may look through a deficit lens, and point out the weaknesses and faults within the RRSA and on the school websites. However, the criticality in CDA "proceeds from normative critique of discourse to explanatory critique of aspects of the existing social reality" (Fairclough, 2015:19). The Explanation Phase of Fairclough's (2015) framework is unique and is not part of any other forms of CDA. Therefore, in this study, the Explanation Phase of CDA will include the deficits and shortcomings in relation to the language of the human rights of children in the RRSA and on the school websites.

My lived experiences have created my position and generated a range of biases from which I acknowledge when approaching research. According to Hastrup (1992), I am positioned within my research by my gender, age, race/ethnicity and my sexual identity alongside my biography. I represent a 'Western' or even a

¹ SMSC stands for - spiritual, moral, social and cultural development. All schools in England must demonstrate they are including this in their curriculum.

'Eurocentric' perspective. As identified in Chapter 2, this perspective permeates the discourse of human rights and the human rights of children. From these positions, I have developed specific insights within the field of the human rights of children. Recognising my biases and identifying my positionality offers me the opportunity to provide transparency while contributing my viewpoints within my research (St. Louis and Barton, 2002).

Identifying my positionality has required a, "... self-conscious awareness of the process of self-scrutiny" (Chiseri-Strarer, 1996:130). By being self-reflexive about my personal history and how it will influence my research I believe I have been able to present clarity regarding this study. My positionality shaped the decisions I made during this study. My positionality is that of a white, adult female, a mother of two children, who researches. Identifying myself as a researcher who focuses on researching with and on children and young people provides me with an identity (England, 1994), that places me within a context in which I research.

Using Boud's critical self-reflection process to, "...recapture the experience, think about it, mull it over and evaluate it" (Boud et al., 1996:19). I reflected upon my personal lived experiences and of working with children and where my interest in the human rights of children began. Acknowledging children as rights holders is something that I believe I have done most of my life although I have not always referred to my actions and beliefs in these terms. I grew up thinking that every child was entitled to education; to have enough food to eat; a family that cared for them; have their views heard and be safe. In my childhood, I believe I experienced all of these. I cannot remember any time in my childhood where I felt marginalised and believe I had opportunities at school to select and enjoy topics and activities that I was interested in. It was not until I grew older and became a

parent that I started to notice the inequality of children in society. I believe this had an impact on me as a person and set in motion my desire to support and promote the human rights of children.

To reflect on my experiences and beliefs during this research, I applied Gibbs' (1998) cyclical model of reflection alongside Argyris' (1982) Ladder of Inference, from which my approach was unorganised, messy and subjective when it needed to be, allowing me to reflect on my positionality critically. My positionality has 'fixed positions', my age, the colour of my skin, where I grew up, how I grew up. It also has 'subjective positions' which originate from lived experiences during my childhood, my adulthood, my work experiences, my family life and my health (Goodall, 2000). All of which will have influenced my political and moral values in some way and has led me to believe that teaching children about their rights and upholding the human rights of children are particularly important to me.

My experiences of working and researching with children, the philosophy of the Convention and my current work as a consultant, has propelled me into a pedagogical praxis in which I am practising and engaging and it is that which is continuously enforcing my positionality to support children to be aware of their human rights and to develop an understanding of human rights through rights education (Freire, 1986). I believe that language forms and is formed by social and educational practices and these practices have shaped and reshaped my reality. My social and educational experiences have shaped and reshaped my lived experiences. My positionality has been developed and created by these unique experiences. Therefore, my positionality is unique to me.

Bias is a natural characteristic of human beings, and by reflecting on my positionality throughout this study, I was able to maintain an awareness of my

biases and provide trustworthiness. Positionality is frequently used in the context of social science research, the researcher's self-exploration of the research process is a subjective viewpoint (England, 1994). Positionality calls for a narrative that can demonstrate the researcher's stance within the social and political context of a study (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Summary

This chapter explains the development and application of a conceptual and methodological framework for the study of the language of the human rights of children using elements of Fairclough's (2015) three phase CDA framework. By using a CDA approach, I was able to identify the extent to which the Convention, the language of the human rights of children, was incorporated into the UNICEF UK RRSA (2015-2017) level 2 and how it was then presented on six school websites that have achieved this award. Also, this approach has allowed me to contribute to the debate on the discourse of the human rights of children. By using elements of Fairclough's (2015) three phases of CDA, I have critiqued the language of the human rights of children as defined in the Convention. I have analysed the intertextuality and recontextualisation of the language from the human rights of children to the RRSA and onto the school websites.

As explained by Fairclough (2015:6),

When we do CDA, the point is not just to analyse and criticise discourse ... it is to analyse and criticise and ultimately change the existing social reality in which such discourse is related.

By analysing how meanings of the human rights of children are constructed and transmitted through the Convention, the RRSA and onto school websites, I was able to identify and critique the language of the human rights of children, therefore critiquing the discourse of the human rights of the child.

The next chapter, the Interpretative Phase, identifies the language included in the RRSA and on the school websites, in relation to the four Articles from the Convention. The analysis focuses on the selection and sequencing of wordings, (Fairclough, 1992, 1995, 2001) and will identify intertextuality and recontextualisation through analysing the word choices of the creators of the RRSA and the school websites (Fairclough, 2015).

Chapter 4. Interpretative Phase: The History of the Language of the Human

Rights of Children

Introduction

This chapter will outline the development on the language of the human rights of children in international instruments and is presented as the Interpretative Phase, from the analytical phases based on Fairclough's (2015) Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework. In doing so, I will answer research sub-question,

1. What is the language of the human rights of children?

Elements of the three phases of Fairclough's framework requires unique types of analysis. The Interpretative Phase is an analysis of the background information of the text. As this study seeks to analyse the extent to which the language of the Convention has been incorporated into the UNICEF UK Rights Respecting School Award level 2 and then represented on six school websites that have achieved this award, the four Articles of the Convention were the main focus of the Interpretative Phase.

The previous chapter on the History of Human Rights and the Human Rights of Children, focused on the theoretical aspects. This chapter focuses on the language of the human rights of children and the development of the language that formed the 1989 Convention. Due to the various drafts of the Convention being discussed in this chapter, I will refer to each draft and the final version with the relevant dates. For example, the 1978 Draft Convention and the 1989 Convention. This phase of Fairclough's (2015:155) CDA framework is concerned with the "processes of text production".

The history of the language of the human rights of children can be seen to become of interest to adult policymakers from the start of the 20th century when children became the subject of rights. The League of Nations developed a Committee for the protection of children in 1919. This Committee later adopted the Geneva Declaration in 1924 which was inspired by the work of Janusz Korczak, who is considered to be the father of children's rights. This Declaration was the first international treaty on children's rights,

In 1915, Alexander Neill, a Scottish teacher founded Summerhill, the first democratic or 'free' school in the UK (Neill, 1975). Neill went on to publish a semi-autobiography in which he encouraged and supported children's rights in UK schools (Neill, 1975). These included the right to play, to protection and to manage their own learning (Neill, 1975). In 1919, *Save the Children* was established to provide food to children facing starvation in Europe after the First World War (Save the Children, 2017). In that same year, the League of Nations was launched with the aim of developing and maintaining world peace, (Northedge, 1986). In 1920, the *International Save the Children Union* (Union International de Secours à L'Enfant) was established in Geneva (Beigbeder, 1991). Both the British *Save the Children* and the Swedish *Rädda Barnen* were principal members of this international organisation (Beigbeder, 1991).

The first internationally recognised agreement on the rights of the child, the Declaration of the Rights of the Child was adopted by the League of Nations in 1924, followed by a further Declaration in 1959. This was then in place until 1989, when the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (hereafter known as the Convention) was established. A Convention is an official, legally binding agreement between the Member States, and different to a declaration which is

not legally binding (Concepcion, 2000). Then acknowledges that a Member State has accepted "...the obligations contained in the United Nations Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able to carry out these obligations" (United Nations, n.d.b). A Member State signs a Convention to indicate it will adhere to the treaty. This is the step before ratification, when a state confirms that their government is now legally bound to comply with the treaty through its own judicial requirements (UNICEF, n.d.). The legal obligations in the Convention apply to the States, and the principles, ideas and practices are directed at the actual lived experiences of the child (Burchill and Dunhill, 2014).

There are specific exclusions and discriminations that only children are faced with, but they have a right to full protection from these (Freeman, 1996). For example, most countries do not prosecute parents if they smack their children although they would prosecute that adult if they were to smack another adult. The status of children in contemporary society makes them more vulnerable to sexual abuse and other forms of violence and exploitation (Humanium, 2017). Children are not anyone's property, not their parents or the state (United Nations, n.d.a). They belong to their own future and freedom (UNICEF, 2015; Humanium, 2017).

In this chapter, the key focus of the Convention is the general history of how the language was developed and internationally agreed, with a specific emphasis on the four Articles that are the focus of this study. The four Articles included in this study are known as the "General Principles," as they support and guide the interpretation of all the other Articles, and are explained as the "general requirements for all rights" (UNICEF, 2014). The Articles are:

- Article 2: Non-discrimination

- Article 3: Best interests of the child.
- Article 6: Right to life, survival and development.
- Article 12: Respect for the views of the child

(United Nations, 1989).

This study does not discuss or debate the definition of a 'child' but accepts the meaning as stated in Article 1 of the 1989 Convention. The 1989 Convention states that a child means every human being below the age of 18 years unless, under the law pertinent to the child, adulthood is reached earlier (United Nations, 1989).

The Genesis and Language of the 1924 Declaration of the Rights of the Child

Historically, there was very little special protection for children. In the Middle-Ages, children were considered as 'small adults' (Aries, 1973). The recognition of children as 'human beings' with rights of their own, began to emerge from the 'Child Rights Movement' in the early 1900s when Eglantyne Jebb, a British teacher and co-founder of the *Save the Children Fund* (Save the Children, 2017), drafted the five points of the *Declaration of the Rights of the Child* in 1923 (Mulley, 2009). This was commonly known as *The Children's Charter* (Kanyal, 2014). *The League of Nations*, the predecessor to the United Nations, was established in 1919, with the main aim, "to promote international cooperation and to achieve peace and security" (United Nations, n.d.a). The *League of Nations* adopted the *Declaration of the Rights of the Child* in 1924 (Save the Children, 2017). The final version of this Declaration also contained five points. These were,

1. The child must be given the means requisite for its normal development, both materially and spiritually;
2. The child that is hungry must be fed; the child that is sick must be nursed; the child that is backward must be helped; the delinquent child must be reclaimed, and the orphan and the waif must be sheltered and succoured;
3. The child must be the first to receive relief in times of distress;
4. The child must be put in a position to earn a livelihood, and must be protected against every form of exploitation;
5. The child must be brought up in the consciousness that its talents must be devoted to the service of fellow men

(League of Nations, 1924)

Although the *Declaration of the Rights of the Child* includes the word 'rights', the word is not included in the five points (Verhellen, 2006). This early focus on 'children's rights' actually focuses on the "adults' obligations to children" (Verhellen, 2006:65), as children were seen as vulnerable and in need of protection (Kanyal, 2014). Point five of the Declaration, "The child must be brought up in the consciousness that its talents must be devoted to the service of fellow men" (League of Nations, 1924), suggests an "investment in children" (Freeman, 1996:1), and identifies the need for "socialisation" of children at that time.

A few years before writing the *1924 Declaration of the Rights of the Child*, Eglantyne Jebb and her sister Dorothy Buxton launched the *Save the Children*

Fund in 1919 (Kanyal, 2014). This organisation initially fundraised for destitute and starving children in Europe after the First World War (Save the Children, 2017). The emphasis at that time was on the physical needs of children, due to their level of vulnerability and the organisation pressed for protection and social welfare for all children (Foley et al., 2001; Hagglund and Thelander, 2011). Consequently, the objectives and ambitions of the *Save the Children Fund* clearly informed the five points of the 1924 *Declaration of the Rights of the Child*.

After being adopted by the *League of Nations* in 1924, the *Declaration of the Rights of the Child* was formally known as the *Geneva Declaration* (Verhellen, 2006). In 1934, at the *Assembly of the League of Nations*, the *Geneva Declaration* was “reconfirmed” by all the Member States, promising to “enact its principles in their own legislation” (Verhellen, 2006:65). However, during the Second World War, children experienced brutal and horrifying atrocities (Miller, 2016; Save the Children, 2017). The *Geneva Declaration* provided no protection to children during the Second World War, and many continued to suffer in the aftermath.

“After failing to prevent the Second World War” (United Nations, n.d.a), the *League of Nations* was replaced with the *United Nations*. Member States then suggested that the *Geneva Declaration* of 1924 should be adopted by the *United Nations* and therefore this Declaration was “reconfirmed” (Verhellen, 2006:65) for the second time. The efforts to bolster this international legislation was in part due to the preparation work for the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, which was announced by the *United Nations General Assembly* in 1948 (Freeman, 1996; Verhellen, 2006; United Nations, n.d.a).

In December 1946, the *United Nations* founded UNICEF, a relief organisation to provide emergency food, clothing, and health care to children and families after the Second World War (UNICEF, 2015). It was originally known as *The United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund*. In 1950, the words 'emergency' and 'international' were removed, and it became *The United Nations Children's Fund* (Black, 1986). It was then given a broader remit, to provide for the longstanding and continuing needs of children all over the world (Verhellen, 2006). However, it maintained its original acronym UNICEF (UNICEF, 2015) and became a permanent organisation within the *United Nations* in 1953.

UNICEF is a distinctive organisation within the United Nations. It is an 'autonomous body', as it is responsible for its own budget, of which it receives funding from voluntary contributions and is independent of the United Nations (Verhellen, 2006). UNICEF has a mandate that only includes a particular group of individuals, children (Black, 1986). However, as children are most likely to be affected by poverty, conflict, war, famine, drought and health emergencies, UNICEF is expected to work in cooperation with other United Nations organisations and non-government organisations (NGOs) (UNICEF, 2015). An example of this can be seen in the work UNICEF does with other humanitarian aid organisations in developing countries to provide suitable education to "to address the needs of the whole child" (UNICEF, 2015). However, there is no evidence of UNICEF's involvement in any of the early drafting working groups. According to Cantwell (2011:38-39), "UNICEF's view was that its development in health, nutrition and education had the secondary effect of contributing to the realisation of certain rights, but that its role was not to promote or protect rights". Detrick (1992:21), states that UNICEF had a "total lack of initial interest in the

exercise” of drafting the 1989 Convention but did participate fully towards the end of the process.

The Genesis and Language of the 1959 Declaration of the Rights of the Child

In 1959, the United Nations reviewed ebb’s drafting of the *Declaration of the Rights of the Child* (Verhellen, 2006; United Nations, n.d.a). At this time there was a renewed interest in human rights at the UN and attitudes started to change concerning children's rights (Freeman, 1996). In November 1959, the Declaration of the Rights of the Child was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly and comprised of ten principles (Freeman, 1996; United Nations, n.d.a).

Principle 1 -The child shall enjoy all the rights set forth in this Declaration. Every child, without any exception whatsoever, shall be entitled to these rights, without distinction or discrimination on account of race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status, whether of himself or of his family.

Principle 2 -The child shall enjoy special protection, and shall be given opportunities and facilities, by law and by other means, to enable him to develop physically, mentally, morally, spiritually and socially in a healthy and normal manner and in conditions of freedom and dignity. In the enactment of laws for this purpose, the best interests of the child shall be the paramount consideration.

Principle 3- The child shall be entitled from his birth to a name and a nationality.

Principle 4 - The child shall enjoy the benefits of social security. He shall be entitled to grow and develop in health; to this end, special care and protection shall be provided both to him and to his mother, including adequate pre-natal and post-natal care. The child shall have the right to adequate nutrition, housing, recreation and medical services.

Principle 5 -The child who is physically, mentally or socially handicapped shall be given the special treatment, education and care required by his particular condition.

Principle 6 -The child, for the full and harmonious development of his personality, needs love and understanding. He shall, wherever possible, grow up in the care and under the responsibility of his parents, and, in any case, in an atmosphere of affection and of moral and material security; a child of tender years shall not, save in exceptional circumstances, be separated from his mother. Society and the public authorities shall have the duty to extend particular care to children without a family and to those without adequate means of support. Payment of State and other assistance towards the maintenance of children of large families is desirable.

Principle 7- The child is entitled to receive education, which shall be free and compulsory, at least in the elementary stages. He shall be given an education which will promote his general culture and enable him, on a basis of equal opportunity, to develop his abilities, his individual judgement, and his sense of moral and social responsibility, and to become a useful member of society. The best interests of the child shall be the guiding principle of those responsible for his education and

guidance; that responsibility lies in the first place with his parents. The child shall have full opportunity for play and recreation, which should be directed to the same purposes as education; society and the public authorities shall endeavour to promote the enjoyment of this right.

Principle 8 -The child shall in all circumstances be among the first to receive protection and relief.

Principle 9 -The child shall be protected against all forms of neglect, cruelty and exploitation. He shall not be the subject of traffic, in any form. The child shall not be admitted to employment before an appropriate minimum age; he shall in no case be caused or permitted to engage in any occupation or employment which would prejudice his health or education, or interfere with his physical, mental or moral development.

Principle 10 -The child shall be protected from practices which may foster racial, religious and any other form of discrimination. He shall be brought up in a spirit of understanding, tolerance, friendship among peoples, peace and universal brotherhood, and in full consciousness that his energy and talents should be devoted to the service of his fellow men.

(United Nations, 1959)

These ten 'Principles', as they were known, not only emphasised the physical needs of a child but provided values and ideologies, which adults were to consider from the perspective of, 'the best interest of the child' (United Nations, n.d.a; Verhellen, 2006). However, there is no explanation of how this term should be understood or applied in practice.

During the discussions regarding the content of this Declaration, Poland, along with other Member States, called for a Convention rather than a Declaration (Verhellen, 2006). A Declaration is a 'statement of principles' and does not hold the Member States answerable for their actions towards the human rights of children, but a Convention requires the Member States to uphold these rights under international law (Concepcion, 2000).

Although it was just a 'statement of principles', the preamble of the 1959 *Declaration of the Rights of the Child*, propositions the Member States to recognise children's rights, and "calls upon parents, upon men and women as individuals, and upon voluntary organizations, local authorities" (United Nations, 1959) to recognise and endeavour to uphold these rights. However, the ten Principles highlight the belief at the time that the child was highly vulnerable, as did the five points that made up the 1924 Declaration. The child was still portrayed as "in need of protection" (Wells, 2015:28-29) and having "special circumstances" (Wells, 2015:15). The child was not seen as a human being with self-determination or having any autonomy, but in need of protection and so remained within society at that time as "an object of concern" (Freeman, 1996:3) and thus an object of rights. This Declaration did not recognise the child as a subject of rights or an "active agent" (Cantwell, 2011:38) that could exercise their rights. Cantwell (2011: 38) states that these children's rights "did not fall within the scope of human rights". The best indicator to see how society viewed children at that time, can be drawn from Mr Juvigny's statement, who was the French delegate to the Commission on Human Rights in 1959. He stated,

...the child was not in a position to exercise his own rights. Adults exercised them for the child ... A child had special legal status resulting from his inability to exercise his rights (Quoted in Freeman, 1997:49).

The gap between these decades where children's rights were given an international stage is significant (Ruck et al., 1998). Thirty-five years on from the first *Declaration of the Rights of the Child in 1924*, the scope of this Declaration is wider. Verhellen (2006:67) identifies a significant change in the language identifying children. He argues there is a shift from the child seen as a "legal object to a legal subject". However, he also states that the 1959 Declaration does not recognise that the child should have self-determination or autonomy (Verhellen, 2006). The child was still seen as needing "special safeguards and care" (United Nations, n.d.a). Nonetheless, the term 'in the best interests of the child', can be seen as protecting the rights of the child.

There were specific concerns for children and the 1959 *Declaration of the Rights of the Child*, began to focus on the physical and intellectual needs of children (Knutsson, 1997). The preamble and Principles include the words 'rights', in terms of being 'entitled to rights' and to 'recognise these rights' (United Nations, 1959). It also refers to a child "not being admitted to employment before an appropriate age" (United Nations, 1959). This removes the child's right "to earn a livelihood" (League of Nations, 1924) as stated in the 1924 Geneva Declaration. However, it did not state what an 'appropriate age' is.

Although the Principles provided values to pursue; it did not provide the means to make these rights available to all children (Freeman, 1996; Verhellen, 2006). For example, Principle 7 required the Member States to provide "free and compulsory education, at least in the elementary stages". (United Nations, 1959).

Not all Member States could provide this, and many developing countries had no means to provide such requirements. However, seventy-eight members of the United Nations General Assembly agreed to adopt the Declaration. Only Cambodia and South Africa did not agree (Freeman, 1996).

The 1989 United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child

The 1989 Convention was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights on 20th November 1989 (OHCHR, 2007). This was signed by every State and was seen as a significant moment in the history of childhood and the human rights of children (Freeman, 1996; Kellett, 2010; Lundy, 2012). The 1989 Convention took thirty years to evolve and become international law. This timeframe was seen as too long by Freeman (1996). However, the 1989 Convention has the potential to “harness political and public commitment to improving the lives of children” (Save the Children, 2017:13).

A first draft of the 1989 Convention was first proposed by the Polish Government in 1978. Poland was planning to host the International Year of the Child in 1979 and decided to not only use the opportunity to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the *Declaration of Children’s Rights*, but also to present the notion of creating a *Convention on the Rights of the Child*, to replace the Declaration (Verhellen, 2006). Due to the large number of Polish children who had been killed, persecuted or experimented upon during the Second World War, the Polish Government were continuing to campaign to replace the Declaration with a Convention (Trolley, 1989; Cantwell, 1992). Many other Member States joined the campaign to draft a Convention after the International Labour Office (ILO)

began to share information regarding the appalling conditions of child workers around the world at that time. It reported that in 1975 there were “nearly 55 million children under 15 years old were working throughout the world” (ILO, 1999).

The first draft of the proposed Convention was initially rejected by the United Nations as it was very similar to the 1959 Declaration (Verhellen, 2006; Wells, 2015). Following the responses from the other Member States, various NGOs and the Polish Government’s continual argument for a Convention, the United Nation Secretary General commissioned a working party to draft a Convention (Verhellen, 2006). A second version, in 1978 “provided the first indicators of the emergence of children as rights-bearing individuals” (Cohen, 2006:189). It proposed to give the child, “who is capable of forming his own views the right to express his opinions in matters concerning his own person” (Cohen, 2006:189). The proposed Convention was redefining children as ‘rights holders’ (Verhellen, 2006; Wells, 2015) and was seen as a “Magna Carta for children” (Fottrell, 2000:1). This concept is now presented as Article 12(1) of the 1989 Convention,

States Parties shall assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those 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 (United Nations, 1989).

The 1978 Draft Convention contained nineteen Articles (OHCHR, 2007). There was also a Revised Polish Draft of the Convention proposed to the United Nation Secretary General in October 1979 (OHCHR, 2007). This version contained twenty-eight Articles. A Convention was beginning to develop, and through the involvement and support of the many States and NGOs, the Articles were developing more substance.

The drafting of the 1989 Convention took over ten years to complete (UNICEF, 2015) and was written by an 'open working group', which means participation was open to all United Nation Member States and NGOs on a voluntary basis (LeBlanc, 1995). Reports available from the *Travaux Préparatoires* contain the participants who attended each working group meeting, and the contributions they made. While attendees are listed in the reports, there is no indication of their level of engagement during the sessions. However, a high attendance rate at the sessions does indicate a strong interest in the 1989 Convention (LeBlanc, 1995). However, attendance may not indicate an interest in the positive development of the rights of the child but could be to direct or steer the drafting, as this was to be done only by the total agreement of all present (Wells, 2015). Therefore, if any member of a state attending the session disagreed with any proposed wording or changes to the text, it was not adopted.

The development of the 1989 *Convention on the Rights of the Child* was reported on at eleven sessions of the *Commission of Human Rights*, between 1978 and 1989 (University of Virginia, n.d.). In addition, there is evidence of just under two thousand working group meetings that included discussions and drafting decisions made on the 1989 *Convention on the Rights of the Child* (University of Virginia, n.d.). These reports are archived and publicly available at the University of Virginia, School of Law (University of Virginia, n.d.). The *Travaux Préparatoires* (a specific term in international diplomacy given to United Nations preparatory information), are published, accessible documents and reports of United Nations Human Rights Treaties. Although there has been much analysis of the Articles within these documents, there has not been a detailed analysis of the language of rights and the recontextualisation of the language during the drafting process. This thesis aims to address the development of four Articles, through to the

promotion of the human rights of children presented on school websites which have completed the RRSA.

The final version of the Convention was agreed in 1989, and came into force in September 1990 (OHCHR, 2017). This international treaty sets out the fundamental rights of all children and was signed by every country in the world (OHCHR, 2007; UNICEF, 2015). Only the United States has not ratified it (OHCHR, 2017).

A United Nations Convention is first signed by the Member States, which means the State “expresses the willingness of the signatory state to continue the treaty-making process ... and creates an obligation to refrain, in good faith, from acts that would defeat the object and the purpose of the treaty” (United Nations, 2018b). When a Convention is ratified by a State, it is demonstrating “its consent to be bound to a treaty” (United Nations, 2018b).

The 1989 Convention is seen as, “... the most comprehensive, widely known and accepted articulation of school children’s rights across the world” (Lundy, 2012: 395). The 1989 Convention is made up of 54 Articles that are set out as legal obligations. At the same time, many see international human rights treaties as an ‘aspirational’ set of values and beliefs (Freeman, 1996; Verhellen, 2006; Kellett, 2010; Wells, 2015) The Convention contains:

- General Rights – the right to life, freedom of expression, not tortured, to information and privacy;
- Rights requiring protective measures – protect children from economic and sexual exploitation, prevent drug abuse, prevent neglect and abuse;

- Rights concerning the civil status of children – having a nationality, an identity, remain with parents;
- Rights concerning development and welfare – reasonable standard of living. To health, basic services, social security, to education, to leisure;
- Rights concerning children in special circumstances – or in especially difficult circumstances

(United Nations, 1989).

Ensuring all Member States, that have ratified the Convention and are upholding the rights of the child, are monitored by the United Nations mechanisms. The Articles are monitored and reviewed by international committees and processes but are only enforceable in domestic law if a country has incorporated the treaty into the domestic legal system (Verhellen, 2006). This monitoring process was agreed at the *Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action* in 1993, “to ensure constructive monitoring’, and ‘make children’s rights a reality” (United Nations, 1993).

The 1989 Convention provides guidelines to governments regarding what they should adhere to and how they should recognise and improve the lived experiences of children (Burchill and Dunhill, 2014). However, due to the language and statements within the Articles being interpreted differently by governments and organisations around the world, this indicates that the language is unclear (Gerber, 2008). Therefore, consistency is needed in the understanding and presentation of the language of the 1989 Convention, and further discussions leading from the same starting point could reduce the ambiguity.

The Development of the Four Articles included in this Study

The development of the four Articles included in this study will now be explained. Many Articles in the 1989 Convention were originally either partially or entirely included in the 1978 Draft Convention proposed by the Polish Government. The four Articles in this study are presented below, from the 1978 Draft Convention to the agreed versions in 1989. The words underlined from the 1989 Convention are those that I have identified as the keywords of the Articles and formed part of the bank of words used in the next phase of analysis in this study.

Article 2 (Non-discrimination). The 1989 Convention states,

1. States Parties shall respect and ensure the rights set forth in the present Convention to each child within their jurisdiction without discrimination of any kind, irrespective of the child's or his or her parent's or legal guardian's race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, property, disability, birth or other status.

2. States Parties shall take all appropriate measures to ensure that the child is protected against all forms of discrimination or punishment on the basis of the status, activities, expressed opinions, or beliefs of the child's parents, legal guardians, or family members

(United Nations, 1989).

Article 2 of the 1989 Convention aligns to Articles within the 1978 Draft Convention. These are specifically aligned with the words 'right(s)' and 'discrimination'. These words were included in the 1978 Draft Convention in the form of:

Article I

Every child, without any exception whatsoever, shall be entitled to the rights set forth in this Convention, without any distinction or discrimination on account of race, colour, sex, language, religion, political and other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or status, whether of himself or of his family.

Article IV

The child shall enjoy the benefits of social security. He shall be entitled to grow and develop in health; to this end, special care and protection shall be provided both to him and to his mother, including adequate prenatal and post-natal care. The child shall have the right to adequate nutrition, housing, recreation and medical services.

Article VII

1. The child is entitled to receive education, which shall be free and compulsory, at least in the elementary stages. He shall be given an education which will promote his general culture and enable him, on a basis of equal opportunity, to develop his abilities, his individual judgements and his sense of moral and social responsibility, and to become a useful member of society.

2. The best interests of the child shall be the guiding principle of those responsible for his education and guidance; that responsibility lies in the first place with his parents.

3. The child shall have full opportunity for play and recreation, which should be directed to the same purposes as education; society and the public authorities shall endeavour to promote the enjoyment of this right.

Article X

The child shall be protected from practices which may foster racial, religious or any other form of discrimination. He shall be brought up in a spirit of understanding, tolerance, friendship among peoples, peace, and universal brotherhood, and in full consciousness that his energy and talents should be devoted to the service of his fellow men

(OHCHR, 2007).

Article 2 (Non-discrimination) of the 1989 Convention also is aligned with Articles within the 1979 Revised Draft Convention. These are specifically linked with the words 'right(s)' and 'discrimination'. These words were included in the 1979 Revised Draft Convention in the form of:

Article 5

The States Parties to the present Convention recognize the right of alien children staying in their territories to enjoy the rights provided for in this Convention.

Article 19.1

The child shall be protected against all forms of discrimination, social exploitation and degradation of his dignity. He shall not be the subject of traffic and exploitation in any form.

(OHCHR, 2007).

Much of the discussions and debates while drafting Article 2 (Non-discrimination), concentrated on the 'jurisdiction' of this Article, and working party members wanted to include specific examples of 'discrimination' (University of Virginia, n.d.). However, it was agreed that the wording in this Article should be aligned with the 1989 Convention on the *Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation's Convention against Discrimination in Education* (UNESCO, 1981).

LeBlanc (1995:14) states that this Article has been strengthened with the words "ensure within their retrospective jurisdiction" as the wording in the 1978 and 1979 drafts, did not include such a level of responsibility. However, Horn et al. (2017:223) affirm this Article, and the entire Convention is deficient of language that "explicitly include[es] LGBTQ-GNC² persons", and this, "allows states to limit the affordances of rights to these young people".

Article 3 (Best interests of the child). The 1989 Convention states,

1. In all actions concerning children, whether undertaken by public or private social welfare institutions, courts of law, administrative authorities or legislative bodies, the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration.

² LGBTQ-GNC stands for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender and Gender Non-Conforming

2. States Parties undertake to the child such protection and care as is necessary for his or her well-being, taking into account the rights and duties of his or her parents, legal guardians, or other individuals legally responsible for him or her, and, to this end, shall take all appropriate legislative and administrative measures.

3. States Parties shall ensure that the institutions, services and facilities responsible for the care or protection of children shall conform with the standards established by competent authorities, particularly in the areas of safety, health, in the number and suitability of their staff, as well as competent supervision.

(United Nations, 1989)

Article 3 of the 1989 Convention is aligned with Articles within the 1978 Draft Convention by the Polish Government. Article 3 (Best interests of the child) of the 1989 Convention, can be clearly aligned with Articles II and VII in the 1978 Draft Convention. These are specifically linked with the words 'best interest of the child'. The Articles in the 1978 Draft Convention state:

Article II

The child shall enjoy special protection and shall be given opportunities and facilities, by law and by other means, to enable him to develop physically, mentally, morally, spiritually and socially in a healthy and normal manner and in conditions of freedom and dignity. In the enactment of laws for this purpose, the best interests of the child shall be the paramount consideration.

Article VII

2. The best interests of the child shall be the guiding principle of those responsible for his education and guidance; that responsibility lies in the first place with his parents.

(OHCHR, 2007).

Article 3 (Best interests of the child) of the 1989 Convention also is aligned with Articles within the 1979 Revised Draft Convention. These are specifically linked with the words 'best interest of the child'. These words were included in the 1979 Draft Revised Convention in the form of:

Article 3.

1. In all actions concerning children, whether undertaken by their parents, guardians, social or State institutions, and in particular by courts of law and administrative authorities, the best interest of the child shall be the paramount consideration

(OHCHR, 2007).

The term 'best interest of the child' can be seen as a key element to all other Articles. The term itself is not defined, but Detrick (1992) states this Article is a 'General Principle' and indicates the approach that should be taken when considering this term. Archard (2014:113) states that, "The language of best interests in maximising", and that the 1989 Convention means more than "do good", it designates the adult to "do the best by the child". However, he goes on to describe this Article as "a maximising principle ... that seems unfeasibly demanding" (Archard, 2014:113).

Article 6 (Right to life, survival and development). The 1989 Convention states,

1. States Parties recognize that every child has the inherent right to life.
2. States Parties shall ensure to the maximum extent possible the survival and development of the child (United Nations, 1989).

Article 6 of the 1989 Convention is aligned with Articles within the 1978 Draft Convention by the Polish Government. These are specifically linked with the words 'develop(ment)' where it relates to survival, and 'right to life'. The word 'right' was found, 'to life' was not. However, the word 'right' was linked to means of staying alive e.g., nutrition and medical services. These words were included in the 1978 Draft Convention in the form of:

Article II

The child shall enjoy special protection and shall be given opportunities and facilities, by law and by other means, to enable him to develop physically, mentally, morally, spiritually and socially in a healthy and normal manner and in conditions of freedom and dignity. In the enactment of laws for this purpose, the best interests of the child shall be the paramount consideration.

Article IV

The child shall enjoy the benefits of social security. He shall be entitled to grow and develop in health; to this end, special care and protection shall be provided both to him and to his mother, including adequate prenatal and post-natal care. The child shall have the

right to adequate nutrition, housing, recreation and medical services.

Article IX

2. The child shall not be admitted to employment before an appropriate minimum age; he shall in no case be caused or permitted to engage in any occupation or employment which would prejudice his health or education, or interfere with his physical, mental or moral development

(OHCHR, 2007).

Article 6 (Right to life, survival and development), of the 1989 Convention is aligned with Articles within the 1979 Revised Draft Convention. These are specifically linked with the words 'develop(ment)' where it relates to survival, and 'right to life'. The word 'right' was found, 'to life' was not. However, the word 'right' was linked to means of staying alive e.g., nutrition and medical services. These words were included in the 1979 Revised Draft Convention in the form of:

Article 1

According to the present Convention a child is every human being from the moment of his birth to the age of 18 years unless, under the law of his State, he has attained his age of majority earlier.

Article 13

1. It is recognized that the child shall be entitled to benefit from the highest attainable standard of health care for his physical, mental

and moral development, and also, in the case of need, from medical and rehabilitation facilities.

2. The States Parties to the present Convention shall pursue full implementation of this right, and, in particular, shall: (a) take measures to lower the mortality index of babies, (b) provide a generally accessible system of health protection, (c) develop the system of health protection so that medical assistance and care shall be open to all children, (d) extend particular care to expectant mothers for a reasonable period of time before and after confinement.

Article 15

1. The States Parties to the present Convention recognize the right of every child to a standard of living adequate for his healthy and normal physical, mental and moral development in every phase of the child's development.

2. The parents shall, within their financial possibilities and powers, secure conditions of living necessary for a normal growth of the child.

3. The States Parties to the present Convention shall take appropriate measures to implement this right, particularly with regard to nutrition, clothing and housing, and shall extend the necessary material assistance to parents and other persons bringing up children, with special attention paid to incomplete families and children lacking parental care.

Article 17

1. The States Parties to the present Convention recognize that the bringing up and education of the child should promote the full development of his personality, his respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Discussions reported upon in the drafting of Article 6 (Right to life, survival and development), identify the main concerns for representatives on the working parties were around the recognised identification of a human life, in relation to abortion and the death penalty (University of Virginia, n.d.). The 1979 Revised Polish Draft, included a statement that identified that a life began at birth, however others including Malta and the Holy See, proposed that a life begins at conception (UNCHR, 1989). Both proposals were rejected, and it was agreed that individual state laws would determine this (University of Virginia, n.d.).

In addition, proposals to changes in the wording were aimed at ensuring that Member States did everything they could to sustain life, such as providing immunisations, to stop children dying from avoidable diseases. Articles II and IV from the 1978 Draft Convention are closely aligned with the final version of Article 6 (Right to life, survival and development). The word 'grow' was discussed at the working group meetings and was replaced with 'survival' (University of Virginia, n.d.). Other discussions focused on the words from the 1978 Draft Convention, including 'special protection', 'other means' and 'healthy and normal manner.' These were described as 'unclear' by members of the working group. Others proposed that the word 'dignity' is included (University of Virginia, n.d.). The final agreed version of Article 6 (Right to life, survival and development) is short and describes the child as having the right to not only survival but to life. The

differences in language between the 1924, 1959 Declarations and the 1989 Convention demonstrates a move from 'child welfare' to 'child well-being' (Ben-Arieh and Tarnish, 2017). According to Lundy (2014), there are very few mentions of the term 'child well-being' in the 1989 Convention. However, she goes on to state that there is growing use of the term by policymakers and researchers when referring to the human rights of children (Lundy, 2014).

Article 12 (Respect for the views of the child). The 1989 Convention states,

1. States Parties shall assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those 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.

2. For this purpose, the child shall in particular be provided the opportunity to be heard in any judicial and administrative proceedings affecting the child, either directly, or through a representative or an appropriate body, in a manner consistent with the procedural rules of national law (United Nations, 1989).

Article 12 is not aligned with any Articles within the 1978 Draft Convention. However, Article I in the 1978 Draft Convention, does include the word 'opinion' but refers to, no matter what the child's opinion is, they still have these rights. It does not state that the child's opinion should be listened to or given due weight, as stated in the 1989 Convention.

Article 12 is aligned with Article 7 of the 1979 Revised Draft Convention. The word 'views' in regards to enabling the child to 'form' and 'express' their 'views' was first included here.

Article 7

The States Parties to the present Convention shall enable the child who is capable of forming his own views the right to express his opinion in matters concerning his own person, and in particular, marriage, choice of occupation, medical treatment, education and recreation

(OHCHR, 2007).

The focus within the meetings of the working group for Article 12 (Respect for the views of the child) was on how much should be included and explained in this Article (University of Virginia, n.d.). The discussion notes indicate a list of issues that this Article should include was starting to grow. The Polish representatives proposed that Article 12 include “the child’s right to express their views freely on such matters as marriage, choice of occupation, medical treatment, education and recreation” (UNESCO, 1981:13). The United States proposed that children’s political and social beliefs should be included (UNESCO, 1981). Cohen (2006) suggests that a list of items was rejected as it could restrict the right to express something that was included. LeBlanc (1995:160) states the final version of this Article is “open-ended, but [is] nonetheless qualified” to allow a child to freely express their views. However, Archard (2014:119) states that this Article is “limited and essentially unclear” due to the lack of explanation what to listen to and what “due weight” to give to each child. According to Lundy (2007:930), Article 12 “is often mentioned under the banner of “the voice of the child”. Freeman (1996:3) argues that this Article “assure[s] to the child, capable of forming his or her own views, the right to express these views freely in all matters affecting” [them]. Lundy (2007) provides a meaningful and effective ‘model’ of

participation “space, voice, audience and influence” which expands the concept of Article 12 (Respect for the views of the child) and provides a practical framework to operationalise the ‘views’ while considering the ‘due weight’ to be given to each child.

The Drafting Process

Much of the debates recorded in the *Travaux Préparatoires* regarding the drafting of the 1989 Articles, show the diplomatic wrangling and bartering that occurs in the creation of international human rights treaties. For example, the United States representatives proposed the word ‘lawfully’ should be included in Article 2 (Non-discrimination). The proposal stated:

States Parties shall respect and ensure the rights set forth in the present Convention to each child “lawfully” within their jurisdiction without discrimination of any kind, irrespective of the child’s or his or her parent’s or legal guardian’s race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, property, disability, birth or other status (UNESCO, 1981).

The United States wanted to apply this right only to “all children lawfully in its territory” (UNESCO, 1981) and thus no child could be in their ‘territory’ illegally. This was due to Poland proposing the second draft in 1979 that included an Article on the rights of “alien children staying in their territories” (UNESCO, 1981). Representatives at this working group supported this Article from Poland’s second draft. After further discussions the United States withdrew the proposed word, ‘lawfully’ and it was agreed that the second draft Article was removed

(UNESCO, 1981). This makes the final version of the Article open to interpretation.

Freeman (2009) identified the tensions between the different the Member States during the debates regarding the 1989 Convention. These include Article 14 on freedom of thought, conscience and religion, adoption, rights of the unborn child, and traditional practices such as Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) and the need to respect the parents in such matters. Much of these were defended by the state representatives as traditional approaches to childhood (Kanyal, 2014). Freeman (1996) argues that the Member States ratified the 1989 Convention without giving serious thought to their own laws and practices and to what extent ratifying this entailed.

The 1989 Convention gives 'voice' to children as a human right, which made Article 12 (Respect for the views of the child) in particular, "one of the most controversial provisions of the [Convention] during the drafting process" (Lundy, 2007: 928). Such controversy developed an agreed language which established a unified aim to uphold and progress the human rights of children. However, children did not participate in drafting the 1989 Convention (Freeman, 1997; Liebel, 2012; Kanyal, 2014). The words that form the final agreed Articles can then only be seen as negotiated and comprised by adults representing children. This does not indicate that they have been written to best describe the 'rights' they represent.

An important requirement of every government that has ratified the 1989 Convention, is the obligation to provide children with the knowledge and awareness about their rights and to uphold them (UNICEF, 2009). It would appear from the many examples of negotiated words and terms, the working groups

achieved the United Nations requirement to ensure it did not contradict itself or any other international treaty (Detrick, 1992). The priority was to achieve agreement from all the Member States to ensure that the international treaty was drafted. Then compromising and negotiating the words and terms can be seen as an accepted practice when developing an international agreement.

Contemporary Critiques of the Language of the 1989 Convention

There are a number of critiques of not only the language presented in the 1989 Convention, but also the Articles identified as the 'General Principles'. Hanson and Lundy (2017:300) argue that Articles 2, 3, 6 and 12 are not "general nor principles" as together they do not "play an intersecting role in the context of all Convention Articles". They go on to recommend that the title of 'General Principles' is not meaningful in this context and that Article 5, should replace Article 6, which would then provide what they call a set of 'cross-cutting standards' (Hanson and Lundy (2017:301). Archard and Skivenes (2009:2) state that no right within the 1989 Convention has "priority over others". However, they contend that in the UK, "there has been a tendency to view a child's rights and a child's interests or welfare as discrete matters" (Archard and Skivenes, 2009:2). This concern is in relation to the language of Article 3 (Best interests of the child) and Article 12 (Respect for the views of the child). Archard and Skivenes (2009:2) state that the wording in these Articles present "two different kinds of commitments" and therefore,

seem to pull in different directions: promotion of a child's welfare is essentially paternalist since it asks us to do what we, but not necessarily

the child, think is best for the child; whereas, listening to the child's own views asks us to consider doing what the child, but not necessarily we, thinks is best for the child (Archard and Skivenes (2009:2).

Overall, the 1989 Convention is seen as a "convenient benchmark" (Freeman 2009:388), that "for the first time ... made children the subjects of their own rights" (Liebel, 2012:125). Although Liebel (2012) states that "[a]lmost no child or adult who advocates for children would disagree with [the Convention]". He goes on to explain that the 1989 Convention "does not provide answers to each and every question arising out of the lives of children" (Liebel, 2012:126). However, there are examples in which the 1989 Convention, the language of the human rights of children, has been used by parents "to effect change ... in relation to certain groups of children such as those with disabilities" (Lundy, 2012:407).

This thesis examines the incorporation of Articles 2, 3, 6 and 12, as signed and ratified, in the 1989 Convention, through analysing the language of rights that has been incorporated (or not), to the UNICEF UK RRSA level 2 and what language is then presented on six school websites that have completed this Award.

Summary

At the beginning of the twentieth century, children were seen as the object of rights, vulnerable and in need of protection. However, this focus and language changed halfway through the century and children began to be seen as individuals with their own rights. The language of the human rights of children, as presented in the 1989 Convention, presented the child as a rights holder and the subject of their own rights.

It should be noted that the word 'responsibility', in relation to the child developing responsibility, did not appear until the 1959 Declaration. Although this is not one of the Articles included in this study, it should be pointed out that the 1989 Convention Article 29 (Goals of education) states, "the education of the child shall be directed to... (d) The preparation of the child for responsible life in a free society" (UNESCO, 1989). Studies by Struthers (2014:34) identified that teachers in Scotland, who were teaching human rights, "link[ed] the idea of rights to behaviour management, emphasising child responsibility rather than rights". This practice was previously identified by Trivers and Starkey (2012:146) and they described it as "responsibility respecting".

The 1989 Convention does include elements of the child as an object of rights. For example, there are many Articles that refer to protection and seeing children as objects can be a necessary reality but should have the proviso that action will be taken in the 'best interest of the child'. One example of concerns regarding the language within the 1989 Convention, is around the term 'best interest of the child'. This was not defined and can be subject to different interpretations. In recognition of the concerns in interpreting and acting 'in the best interest of the child', the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) published a set of guidelines on how to "apply the 'best interests' principle in practice" (OHCHR, 2008:9). However, as identified in the many 1989 Convention working group reports, different Member States will interpret the language of the Articles and guidelines differently. Studies in the United States by Kruk (2010) have recognised that parents going through a divorce, present different portrayals of the "best interest of [their] child". This can then be judged differently by some judiciary and he argues that understandings of the 'best interest of the child' are

made from “idiosyncratic biases and subjective value-based judgments, including gender bias” (Kruk, 2010:378).

It must be pointed out that in just less than a hundred years, there have been three internationally recognised documents that aimed to protect children. The 1924 and 1959 Declarations, were specifically drafted due to the atrocities of the First and Second World Wars. However, the 1989 Convention, originally proposed in the form of a 1978 Draft Convention by the Government of Poland, and supported by many other Member States, is a more focused initiative on children's ‘voice’ and in their ‘best interest’.

The focus of the human rights of children has changed from viewing children “as an investment for the future” (Freeman, 1996:1) to the 1989 Convention being recognised as, “the most important advocacy tool for children’s rights globally” (Gillett-Swan and Coppock, 2016:7). Therefore, the 1989 Convention should be seen as the framework and act as a basis in which all references to the language of the human rights of children, should be accurately and clearly made.

This chapter has presented the history of the language of the human rights of children using the Interpretive Phase, from the analytical phases based on Fairclough’s (2015) CDA framework. However, as stated in Chapter 3. Methodology, I acknowledge that by applying Fairclough’s phases of CDA, and the selected elements for this study, I have interpreted ‘cues’ from my ‘members resource’ to complete this interpretive procedure.

The next chapter will present the present the findings from the Descriptive Phase of Fairclough’s CDA framework and introduce the findings from the examination of the text from the RRSA and the school websites. The findings were examined

using elements of Fairclough's CDA framework which identified the selection and sequencing of wording, intertextuality and recontextualisation. It describes the way in which the language of the human rights of children, as stated in the 1989 Convention, is incorporated into the RRSA Standards and the school websites. In the next phase, the words that were underlined in this chapter, were used to research the extent of the language of the 1989 Convention that was incorporated in the RRSA and on to the school websites were: *Convention; rights; discrimination; best interest; development; well-being and views of the child*. In addition, the words identified in the literature review as commonly used terms associated with the 1989 Convention and the four Articles; voice; participation; UNCRC; CRC and derivatives of all these words, were also included. The analysis focuses on the textual data and includes the selection and sequencing of words between the 1989 Convention, the RRSA level 2 Standards and the school websites.

Chapter 5 Descriptive Phase: Findings

Introduction

This chapter identifies the language included in the Rights Respecting Schools Award (RSA) and on the school websites, in relation to the four Articles from the Convention. The analysis focuses on the selection and sequencing of wordings (Fairclough, 1992; 1995; 2001) and will identify intertextuality and recontextualisation through analysing the word choices of the creators of the RRSA and the school websites (Fairclough, 2015). 'Word choice' can identify the standpoint and opinion of the writer or organisation presenting the text (Fairclough, 2001). However, this can also be done unintentionally through a lack of understanding of the topic and by including poor word choices that are not appropriate for the audience (Wingersky et al., 2009).

The purpose of this study was to analyse the extent to which the language of the Convention was incorporated into the UNICEF UK RRSA level 2 and how it is then presented on the school websites that have achieved this award. Examining the school websites allows for an analysis of how schools use rights language online, with particular reference to the definitions and representations they present, regarding the language of the human rights of children. This chapter will present the findings from the Descriptive Phase of Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework and introduces the findings from the examination of the text from the RRSA and the school websites. The findings were examined using elements from the framework offered by Fairclough's CDA three phases, which identified the selection and sequencing of wording, intertextuality and recontextualisation.

The presentation of these findings is organised, in relation to the four Articles from the Convention, in accordance with:

- The four Standards at level 2 of the RRSA from 2017
- The six school websites:
 - School 1. - Primary School achieved RRSA level 2
 - School 2. - Primary School achieved RRSA level 2
 - School 3. – Secondary School achieved RRSA level 2
 - School 4. – Secondary School achieved RRSA level 2
 - School 5. – Special School for ages 5-18 years achieved RRSA level 2
 - School 6. – Special School for ages 11-19 years achieved RRSA level 2

(All schools had achieved level 2 in 2016 and at least six months before the website pages were downloaded).

The Structure of Analysis

Before I present the data, it is helpful to review the analytical phase based on elements of Fairclough's (2015) CDA framework. Elements of the three phases of Fairclough's framework requires unique types of analysis. The Interpretative Phase is an analysis of the background information of the text. As this study seeks to analyse the extent to which the language of the Convention has been incorporated into the UNICEF UK RRSA level 2 and then presented on six school websites that have achieved this award, the four Articles of the Convention were

the main focus of the Interpretive Phase. This analysis was presented in Chapter 4. Interpretative Phase.

This chapter will present the Descriptive Phase and identifies the language included in the RRSA and on the school websites, in relation to the four Articles from the Convention. The objective of this phase is to describe the properties of representations of the four Articles of the Convention in textual form within the RRSA and on the school websites. During this phase, I identified intertextuality and began to recognise the interconnectedness of each source. Also, during this phase I identified recontextualisation, this is where the context from the four Articles of the Convention has been incorporated differently or not included in the RRSA and then presented on the school websites.

To initially identify the language included in the RRSA and on the school websites, in relation to the language identified from the four Articles from the Convention, I searched the RRSA Standards and school websites for the following words: *Convention; rights; discrimination; best interest; development; well-being* and *views of the child*. Also, derivatives of these words were included along with *voice* and *participation* which were found to be commonly associated with Article 12 and UNCRC and CRC, which are other titles for the Convention. The additional words were added to widen the search for language that identified with the Convention and allowed for the identification of recontextualisation. These words are from the four Articles of the Convention and form the key concepts of the 'General Principles' of the Convention. After identifying these words in the RRSA Standards and on the school websites, I printed the relevant pages and highlighted the words. I then carried out a manual analysis using coloured highlighters on the printed pages, and from this, I wrote a narrative about

each RRSA Standard and school website. I then read and reread each Standard and website looking for further vocabulary that could be aligned with the language of the four Convention Articles. From this, I was able to identify the language incorporated in the RRSA and presented on the school websites, in relation to the four Articles from the Convention, and the intertextuality and recontextualisation.

Rights Respecting School Award (RRSA) Level 2

The 2015-2017 Rights Respecting Schools Award Level 2, consisted of four Standards, A, B, C, and D. These will be outlined below, identifying the language presented within these standards in relation to Articles, 2, 3, 6 and 12 of the Convention. According to UNICEF UK (2009), the RRSA is an award based on the principles of equality, dignity, respect, non-discrimination and participation drawn directly from the Convention.

In the subsequent analysis, attention was given to the language that was directly copied or are commonly used words associated with the four Articles to the RRSA Standards, the language that refers to the Convention, the wording and sequencing of information. Each RRSA Standard was comprised of a statement that outlined the aim, a set of Requirements and an equal set of Expected Outcomes, the latter two being evidence-based.

RRSA Standard A

The aim of Standard A states that,

Rights -respecting values underpin leadership and management. The best interests of the child are a top priority in all actions. Leaders are committed to placing the values and principles of the Convention at the heart of all policies and practice (UNICEF UK, 2015a).

Five criteria are set out as Requirements and Expected Outcomes, that must be met to achieve RRSA Standard A (A1-A5). The language included in the aim of this Standard, not only refers to the whole Convention in the form of, 'the values and principles of the Convention' but includes a direct use of the language from the Convention Article 3, 'best interest of the child' (UNICEF UK, 2015a). There are further direct uses of the word 'Convention' in Standard A. The RRSA A2 expected outcome states, "Policies have been reviewed to refer explicitly to the Convention" and RRSA A3 Requirements states, "The school has an inclusive and participatory ethos based on the Convention" (UNICEF UK, 2015a). RRSA A4 Requirements state, "The Convention underpins the school's actions to share good practice with other schools and communities" (UNICEF UK, 2015a). RRSA A5 Requirements include practices that must be, "guided by the values and principles of the Convention", and the Expected Outcomes state the practice must be "linked to the Convention" (UNICEF UK, 2015a).

When analysing the language of RRSA Standard A, I found no direct use of the wording from Article 2 (Non-discrimination). However, RRSA Standard A's aim states, "...the values and principles of the Convention at the heart of all policies and practice" (UNICEF UK, 2015a) and Article 2 is a 'General Principle' (United

Nations, 1989). Therefore, by including this statement in the aim, the RRSA Standard A, includes an indirect reference to Convention Article 2.

As mentioned above, 'the best interest of the child' was included in the aim of RRSA Standard A and is taken directly from Convention Article 3. This was the only reference to the wording in the RRSA Standards. However, as previously stated the RRSA Standard A's aim states, "... the values and principles of the Convention at the heart of all policies and practice" (UNICEF UK, 2015a). All the Articles in this study are 'General Principles' of the Convention (United Nations, 1989). Therefore, by including this statement in the aim, RRSA Standard A can be seen as referring to the four Articles of the Convention. It should be noted that there was no wording within the Requirements and Expected Outcomes of RRSA Standard A that included the language from Convention Articles 3, 6 and 12. However, other words that are commonly affiliated with Convention Articles 3 and 6 are included.

The words, 'life,' survival' and 'development', the focus of Convention Article 6, are not included in RRSA Standard A. Both the Requirements and Expected Outcomes in RRSA Standard A1 include the word 'well-being'. To meet this RRSA Standard, A1 requirement, a school must achieve a high, "impact on the well-being, achievement and progress of young people" (UNICEF UK, 2015a), (I will return to the wording of 'young people' later in this chapter). Also, RRSA Standard A1 Expected Outcomes required a school to provide,

...evidence of how becoming rights respecting has contributed to improving well-being, achievement, including attainment, reduced exclusions and improved attendance (UNICEF UK, 2015a).

It is interesting to point out here that the word 'well-being' in both examples was used alongside 'achievement' and in the latter example, 'attainment' refers to "attainment, reduced exclusions and improved attendance" (UNICEF UK, 2015a). Also, RRSA Standard A refers to the impact of "Rights Respecting values" on 'well-being' (UNICEF UK, 2015a). This is an example of recontextualisation, which is the point in which different texts interrelate and create a different concept (Fairclough, 2015). Here the RRSA Standards have incorporated the Convention, the language of the human rights of children together with language which refers to 'achievement' and 'attainment' terms commonly used within schools in England.

The words, 'respect for the views of the child', the focus of Convention Article 12, are not included in RRSA Standard A. As stated in Chapter 4. Interpretative Phase, the term 'voice' is commonly used when referring to Article 12, is also not included. However, as previously stated the RRSA Standard A's aim, "... the values and principles of the Convention are at the heart of all policies and practice" (UNICEF UK, 2015a), and Convention Article 12 is a 'General Principle' (United Nations, 1989). Therefore, by including this statement in the aim, RRSA Standard A includes a reference to Article 12.

RRSA Standard B

The aim of RRSA Standard B states that,

The whole school community learns about the Convention. The Convention is made known to children and adults, who use this shared

understanding to work for global justice and sustainable living (UNICEF UK, 2015a).

It should be noted that this statement is aligned to Article 42 (Knowledge of Rights) of the Convention (United Nations, 1989).

Four criteria are set out as Requirements and Expected Outcomes that must be met to achieve RRSA Standard B (B6-B9). The wording from Convention Articles 2, 3 and 12 are not included in this RRSA Standard. However, the RRSA Standard B aim and all four criteria (B6-B9), refer to the 'Convention'. Much of the wording in this RRSA Standard includes the terms children/pupils/young people. However, RRSA B6 requirement, states, "Young people and staff are ambassadors for rights when talking to others", but the Expected Outcomes include the wording, "Pupils and staff have acted as ambassadors for rights" (UNICEF UK, 2015a). I will discuss the use of the terms 'children', 'pupils' and 'young people' later in this chapter.

RRSA Standard B, B9 requirement states that "The Convention is embedded in teaching and learning about global citizenship and sustainable development" (UNICEF UK, 2015a), which implies that the Convention was only required to be included in lessons on 'global citizenship and sustainable development' to achieve the Award. Although 'Citizenship' is a compulsory subject at Key stage 3 and 4 in England, the Department of Education (DfE, 2018), which is responsible for education in England, does not explicitly included 'global citizenship and sustainable development' in any area of the national curriculum. However, a school curriculum is broader than the national curriculum and schools can approach the defined subjects in which they could include "global citizenship and

sustainable development”, or add them as areas of study due to staff expertise (DfE, 2018).

It must be noted that the RRSA B9 Expected Outcome, states, “Nearly all pupils interviewed are able to talk about how they have learnt to link rights with global citizenship and sustainable development across the curriculum” (UNICEF UK, 2015a). This raises the question of how embedded the Convention has to be in the teaching and learning, as not all ‘interviewed’ ‘pupils’ have to talk about it. As stated in the Introduction Chapter, the school selects the interviewees not the UNICEF UK Award assessor (UNICEF UK, 2015b).

Although RRSA Standard B does not include wording from the Convention Articles, it could be construed that the “Convention being made known to children and adults” (UNICEF UK, 2015a), was in ‘the best interest of the child’ and can be considered as corresponding to Convention Article 3 (Best interests of the child). But it does raise the question, how embedded does the Convention have to be to achieve the RRSA level 2 Award?

There was, however, a direct reference to Convention Article 6 (Right to life, survival and development). RRSA B8 Requirement states,

Nearly all curriculum areas provide rich opportunities for high quality learning about the Convention and wider personal development and well-being (UNICEF UK, 2015a).

This raises another question of whether some curriculum areas offer lesser “quality learning about the Convention and wider personal development and well-being” (UNICEF UK, 2015a). For as previously identified to meet the criterion for RRSA B9 expected outcome, most of the interviewed pupils should be “able to

talk about how they have learnt to link rights with global citizenship and sustainable development across the curriculum” (UNICEF UK, 2015a).

RRSA Standard C

The aim of Standard C states that,

The school has a rights-respecting ethos. Young people and adults collaborate to develop and maintain a rights-respecting school community in all areas and in all aspects of life based on the Convention (UNICEF UK, 2015a).

Six criteria are set out as Requirements and Expected Outcomes that must be met to achieve RRSA Standard C (C10-C15). It is interesting to note that the wording ‘young people’ was included in the aim and four of the Requirements within this RRSA Standard but the word ‘children’ was not included. The word ‘pupil’ replaces ‘young people’ in all the RRSA Standard C Expected Outcomes. The wording ‘young people’ suggests an age requirement for the RRSA Standard to be realised. Therefore, it can be concluded that the pupil has to be a ‘young person’ for the Standard to be relevant.

There are no direct references to the wording from Convention Articles 2, 3, 6 and 12 in this RRSA Standard. However, RRSA Standard C aim and C10 expected outcome does refer to the Convention. RRSA C10 expected outcome states,

Charters or agreements based upon the Convention are in nearly all classrooms visited and in public areas. Staff and pupils interviewed can

explain how the charters or agreements are developed and how they use them (UNICEF UK, 2015a).

It should be pointed out that although the wording in RRSA Standard B6 and B9 Expected Outcomes stated “nearly all”, in RRSA Standard C10 the expected outcome states, “Staff and pupils ...” (UNICEF UK, 2015a), with no measure included. It could be suggested here that with no measure such as ‘nearly all’ stated in RRSA Standard B, that this would mean ‘all’. However, the word ‘all’ was used several times in other areas of the RRSA Standards. For example, in RRSA Standard C10 Expected Outcomes, “Relationships are identified by all interviewees as mutually respectful” (UNICEF UK, 2015a). Therefore, this indicates a lack of consistency in the language within the RRSA Standards and to the extent of the evidence required to achieve each Standard.

Although RRSA Standard C does not include direct references to the four Articles of the Conventions, it could be construed that the requirements to meet C10 Requirement, “... a whole-school ethos based on mutual respect for rights”, and to meet RRSA C11 requirement, “Rights-respecting language and attitudes are established throughout the whole school” (UNICEF UK, 2015a), was in ‘the best interest of the child’ and can be considered as corresponding to Convention Article 3 (Best interests of the child).

However, RRSA C11 expected outcome states that not ‘all’ but,

Nearly all classroom practitioners and support staff interviewed use rights-respecting language and attitudes. Relationships are identified by all interviewees as mutually respectful. Improvement in relationships is

recognised by all staff, including for example lunchtime supervisors (UNICEF UK, 2015a).

Therefore, if not all staff have to, 'use rights-respecting language and attitudes', this inconsistency is not in the 'best interest of the child'. It is worth noting that the word 'use' was included here and not 'use and have' 'rights respecting language and attitudes'. This implies that the staff only have to 'use' 'rights respecting language and attitudes' at the interview. This was supported as the criteria only require 'staff' to recognise an 'Improvement in relationships', not all interviewees, indicating that children or parents are not asked about this. Therefore, supporting the suggestion that staff only have to 'use' 'rights respecting language and attitudes' at the interview, as the children and parents are not asked about this as part of the assessment process to gain the Award.

RRSA Standard C contains one more indirect link to Convention Article 6 (Right to life, survival and development) regarding learning development. RRSA C12 expected outcome states,

Nearly all pupils interviewed are confident in expressing their opinions about their learning and, when necessary, asking for help. They identify that they are increasingly involved in the evaluation of their own learning and in understanding their targets for improvement and how to achieve them (UNICEF UK, 2015a).

However, it is interesting to point out the use of the words referring to the 'pupils', such as, 'opinions', 'increasingly involved in the evaluation of their own learning' and 'understanding their targets' within this criterion. Although this does indirectly refer to Convention Article 12, 'respect the views of the child', it does emphasise

achieving targets, and these targets may be more important to the school than to the 'pupil'. This does not indicate a strong understanding or upholding of Convention Article 12, in which the adults should respect the views of the child, who has the right to "express those views freely in all matters ..." (United Nations, 1989). This RRSA Standard expected outcome indicates that 'pupils' can express "their opinions [only] about their learning..." (UNICEF, 2015a).

There were four examples in the RRSA Standard C Requirements 12, 13, 14 and 15, where the wording used refers to 'young people'. As stated in the previous RRSA Standards, this suggests an age requirement for rights to be relevant and thus realised. This age differentiation is not defined in the RRSA.

RRSA Standard D

The aim of Standard D states that,

Children are empowered to become active citizens and learners. Every child has the right to say what they think in all matters affecting them and to have their views taken seriously. Young people develop their confidence through their experience of an inclusive rights-respecting school community, play an active role in their own learning and speak and act for the rights of all to be respected locally and globally (UNICEF UK, 2015a).

Three criteria are set out as Requirements and Expected Outcomes that must be met to achieve RRSA Standard D (D16-D18). The aim refers to 'Every child', which is a close reference to the wording from Convention Article 2 (Non-discrimination), 'each child'. The term 'every child' is also used within several

other Convention Articles, including Article 6 (Right to life, survival and development). It should be noted that the wording 'every child' was included in the 1978 Draft Convention (OHCHR, 2007). This was the only example of the term 'every child' being included in the RRSA. This is an example of intertextuality, where wording from another text, sometimes a historical version of a text, has been included as an aspect of another (Fairclough, 2015). In this case, the wording from the 1978 Draft Convention has been included and not the wording from the 1989 Convention.

Throughout all the RRSA Standards Expected Outcomes, the most common term used, when referring to children or young people was 'pupils'. In RRSA Standard D, all Expected Outcomes required that "Nearly all pupils interviewed ..." and not 'all pupils'. As stated previously, the school decides who will be interviewed by the RRSA UNICEF UK Assessor. Therefore, from the range of pupils, it would be in the best interest of the school to choose the pupils that they believe will be able to provide the assessor with evidence to meet the Award criteria. I would assume that those chosen would be selected as, in the school's eyes, for their ability to provide evidence to meet the criteria. Therefore, from the small number of chosen interviewees, if some are not able to meet the criteria, then I would question if the numbers of 'nearly all pupils interviewed' provides evidence that a school has embedded the Convention and is a Rights Respecting School. For example, RRSA Standard D16 requirement states "Nearly all children and young people have a strong voice ..." (UNICEF UK, 2015a). Moreover, in RRSA Standard D17 expected outcome, "Nearly all pupils interviewed report that the school provides a range of opportunities to access information, which equips them to make informed decisions" (UNICEF UK, 2015a). The 'nearly all' equates to only what was evidenced and those interviewed on the day of the assessment, not 'nearly

all' children, young people or pupils in the school. 'Nearly all' is not explained or clarified in the RRSA.

This could be confusing and discriminatory as RRSA Standard D17 requirement states "Young people are empowered to access information that enables them to make informed decisions about their learning, health and well-being" (UNICEF UK, 2015a). This can also be seen as suggesting only young people should be empowered to access information, not children. Again, this suggests an age requirement and may not be seen as relevant to all those involved in the process of gaining this Award, including children and staff.

The wording from Convention Articles 3 and 6 are not included in this RRSA Standard. However, the aim of RRSA Standard D and Requirements for D16 and D17, include the words, 'have a strong voice', 'are listened to' and 'their views are respected' when referring to children. All these words are closely linked with Convention Article 12 (Respect for the views of the child).

Common Wordings used Throughout the RRSA Standards

In addition to words aligned with the four Convention Articles identified above, other words are clearly related to the Convention. As identified earlier, the word 'Convention' was included across three of the RRSA Standards. In addition to this, the words 'rights' and 'rights respecting' are included in all RRSA Standards. This wording was of course within the title of the Award, and thus I would expect these to be included in some form within the RRSA Standards. It is interesting to note that the words 'rights- respecting' appeared to substitute for 'rights' or 'Convention' in the criteria in the RRSA Standards. An example of this was in

RRSA Standard SA1. The expected outcome states that a school must, “provide evidence of how becoming rights respecting has contributed to improved well-being and achievement” (UNICEF UK, 2015a). Another example was from the RRSA Standard A2 expected outcome, “Becoming rights respecting is clearly referenced in the school’s development plan” (UNICEF UK, 2015a). This is an example of recontextualisation, which is the point in which different texts interrelate and create a different concept (Fairclough, 2015). Here the RRSA Standards have incorporated the Convention, the language of the human rights of children together with RRSA language. It should be noted that the term ‘rights respecting’ is not included in the Convention. This then can be seen as promoting the RRSA and requiring that schools refer to it for guidance on the human rights of children and not the Convention. Therefore, it raises the question, is the RRSA about the ‘Award’ rather than ‘rights’ or the Convention.

The final wordings I include in this section pertains to the words used when referring to children. In regard to the Convention, a child refers to “any human being below the age of eighteen years” (United Nations, 1989). As previously identified, there was a range of words included in the RRSA that referred to children. These were:

- Standard A – ‘child’, only included in the aim
- Standard B – ‘young people’, ‘pupils’, and ‘children’,
- Standard C- ‘pupils’ and ‘young people’
- Standard D- ‘child’, ‘children’, ‘young people’ and ‘pupils’

The RRSA Standards mainly refer to 'children' and 'young people' in the aims and Requirements and 'pupils' in the Expected Outcomes. However, as mentioned previously this could be confusing as RRSA Standard D17 Requirement states that, "Young people are empowered to access information that enables them to make informed decisions about their learning, health and well-being" (UNICEF UK, 2015a), and refers to 'pupils' in the expected outcome. Again, this suggests an age requirement for the rights referred to in the RRSA Standards to be realised, but it also could identify the status of children and young people in a school. The wording 'young people', could also confuse staff in primary schools, who could assume that only those that they deem as 'young people' can have the rights referred to in that Standard, and not those who are deemed as not yet 'young people'.

Review of the School Websites

The websites examined in this study are from six maintained (State funded) schools from three different categories. There are two primary schools from England (Schools 1 and 2); two secondary schools from England (Schools 3 and 4) and two special schools from England (Schools 5 and 6). Schools 5 had an intake age range of 5-18 years, and School 6 had an intake age range of 11-19 years.

All schools had achieved the RRSA level 2 and gained the Award at least six months before the information was captured from their websites in May 2017. This was to give the schools a reasonable amount of time to update their websites after gaining the Award. However, the criteria of the Award had to be met before

the Award was achieved. Therefore, all schools in this study should have met all the criteria of the Award. This includes such criteria as RRSA Standard A2 expected outcome, “Policies have been reviewed to refer explicitly to the Convention” (UNICEF UK, 2015a).

The school websites were first searched using the words, ‘rights’; ‘rights respecting schools’ (RRSA); *Convention*; *UNCRC*; *CRC*; *discrimination*; *best interest*; *development*; *well-being*; *views of the child*; *voice*; *participation* and derivatives of these words. All areas of each website, including linked documents that included these words, were then critically analysed. The content of each school website, in relation to the language of the human rights of children, is described below.

School One

This primary school in England stated that they had achieved the RRSA level 2 on their website homepage, with the wording, “...we are a Rights Respecting School”. They then explained what being a Rights Respecting School meant to them, “... we teach children about their rights according to the Rights of the Child (CRC)” and that the RRSA, “is a highly valued award”. The school ethos includes the wording, “the children are taught to have respect for school property, themselves and each other”. It should be noted that the order of this statement is interesting and raises the question whether respect for staff and parents is not accounted for? The order of words (sequencing) in a list such as this does indicate importance, implying the first being the most important. Therefore, the children are being taught to, “have respect for school property”, before, having

respect for, “themselves and others”, does not reflect the ethos within the four Articles of the Convention or link to the wording in the RRSA. The school presents the following recurring message that refers to all staff and children at the school, “It is our responsibility to ensure we respect everyone’s rights”. This appears on several school documents and was on three of the web pages. It should be noted that the word ‘responsibility’ when referring to giving children a, ‘responsibility’ or making them ‘responsible’ for something, was not included in the RRSA, or the four Articles included in this study or in the Convention.

There were twelve school policies available on the website in May 2017. None of the policies included any reference to ‘rights’ or the ‘Convention’, although RRSA Standard A2 Expected Outcome stated, “Policies have been reviewed to refer explicitly to the Convention” (UNICEF UK, 2015a).

School Two

The second primary school in England included in this study did not include any information or direct link to the RRSA or the Convention, on their website homepage. After searching the web pages and linked documents, a section was found titled, “UNICEF Rights Respecting Schools”. On the first page of this section, a statement from the headteacher includes the wording, “we are extremely proud to achieve this prestigious Award”. This section of the website contains information on how school Ambassadors are visiting other schools to “offer advice” to achieve the RRSA. This was a criterion for RRSA Standard A,

share good practice with other schools ... school is an ambassador for the RRSA ... school’s leadership can show how the school has shared good

practice in becoming rights respecting with other schools (UNICEF UK, 2015a).

There was also a leaflet on *Being a Rights Respecting School level 2*, on the website and this included the wording, “we teach our children about their own rights as well as those around them”. However, it does not identify who the school is referring to by ‘around them’. Does it relate to all children, children and staff, all human beings? The leaflet also explains that there are two Rights Ambassadors in every class and they are, “chosen as positive role models and as spokespeople for their class ... [and] selected by the school staff”. The website did not include the process of how school staff select the Ambassadors. However, this could be seen as not in the best interests of the children; not supporting the development of all children or respecting the views of the children, as adults are deciding who are the ‘positive role models’ and who should be ‘spokespeople’ for each class. A practice that does not show mutual respect between the staff and the children. The process of adults deciding for children does not indicate, “the values and principles of the Convention [are] at the heart of all policies and practice” (UNICEF UK, 2015a), as stated in the aim of RRSA Standard A.

This section of the website also includes a list of ‘rights’ that are titled, “The most relevant rights concerning our children”. There are seven Articles from the Convention included here, Articles 7, 12, 23, 24, 28, 29 and 32. Only Article 12 is a ‘General Principle’ of the Convention. There are four ‘General Principles’ in the Convention and they represent the fundamental necessities for any and all rights to be realised. It is not clear from the website if the meaning here was that these selected rights are the rights that the children were more concerned about, or the children had selected or that the school had selected them as the ‘most relevant’.

The latter raises concerns that this statement does not support 'the best interest of the child' but is presenting a discourse of 'it is for your own good', a phrase that is commonly used when adults decide on something for children.

There were three school policies available on the school website in May 2017. Only one policy included a reference to, 'rights', which was, "... as a Level 2 Rights Respecting School, we ...". This wording was followed by a list of rules that the children must follow. Therefore, there was no explicit reference to the Convention.

School Three

This is a secondary school in England, which stated it was a 'Rights Respecting School' on the website homepage. A link under that heading labelled "Rights Respecting Information", provided a wide range of information regarding the RRSA and UNICEF UK. The RRSA information contains an explanation of being a Rights Respecting School and had links to, "other useful rights websites". For example, a link to the Convention and all the Articles on the United Nations website. There was another link to the School Charter titled "Respect". The Charter included two statements with links to Convention Articles. These were, "Respect ourselves, our school and others (Article 29)", and, "Everyone is equal and their voice valued (Article 12)". Also, there was a "Pupil Responsibilities" section that included the bullet point, "to know their rights and responsibilities". The Charter ends with the statement, "Pupils at the school are developing rights, responsibilities and respect for all". It is interesting to note that the RRSA does not refer to the 'responsibilities' of the child within its Standards and the

Convention only mentions responsibilities in relation to the child, within Article 29 (The aims of education), “The preparation of the child for responsible life in a free society” (UNESCO, 1989).

There were sixteen policies available on the school website in May 2017. All policies started with the wording, “As a Rights Respecting School...” and included wording and references to Articles from the Convention or other articulations of the Articles but did not refer to the Convention explicitly. For example, one policy stated that “the best interest of the child shall be a primary consideration (Article 3)” which is a direct quote from the 1989 Convention. However, another policy stated, “when adults or organisations make decisions which affect children, they must always think first about what would be best for the child (Article 3)”. This included a quote from a UNICEF Fact Sheet (UNICEF, n.d.) which, is a summary of the Convention. Within another policy, the school stated that “All children will be protected against discrimination (Article 2)” and goes on to include how the school will, “uphold the rights of all the children (UNCRC)”. Also, the school refers to Articles from the Convention but uses wording from a ‘Fact Sheet’ on the Articles of the Convention created by UNICEF UK (n.d.a). For example, in one policy, the school stated that it,

Requires all pupils to exercise self-discipline, self-respect, respect for others, the environment and local community and personal responsibility in line with Article 29 of UNCRC, Education must encourage the child’s respect for human rights as well as respect for others.

This direct quote embedded in the wording above, from the school website, was from the wording created by UNICEF UK (n.d.a) in the ‘child-friendly’ version of the Articles of the Convention. However, it should be noted that the Revised

Polish Draft (1979) included the wording “The child will be protected against all forms of discrimination” (OHCHR, 2007). Therefore, the school uses the language of not only the 1989 Convention but the 1979 Revised Polish Draft and two other articulations that are both shortened from the original 1989 Convention. Although the direct quotes are from four different sources, they are only referenced by the Article, e.g. Article 3. The only direct link on the school webpages to the Articles was through the link to the 1989 Convention. Therefore, if anyone, including a child, young person or parent, went to this website for further information regarding an Article, they may be confused as the wording in the quotes presented by the school, may be different to the wording of the Article in the 1989 Convention that they had been directed to.

School Four

This is also a secondary school in England, which has a statement on the home page of the website stating, “Welcome, this is a Rights Respecting School.... Article 29 states, ‘You have the right to an education which develops your personality, respect for other’s rights and the environment’”. This is a direct quote from the Children and Young People’s Commissioner for Scotland website. It should be noted that the Revised Polish Draft (1979) included the wording “... education of the child should promote the full development of his personality”.

There was a link that takes the reader to a poster titled, *Child Rights: The School Ethos*. The ethos includes wording such as, “rights respecting attitudes and language”, in relation to adults and pupils. There was also a section on “Pupils and Adults Responsibilities”. This included a statement that everyone at the

school “respects each other”. The pupil’s responsibilities included, “pupils have the responsibility to be prepared and punctual for all lessons”, and “pupils have the responsibility to dress for excellence”. Also, included “pupils have the responsibility to listen to and act on the advice of staff”. The only responsibility that was for staff was to “encourage pupils to take responsibility for their actions”.

There were three policies available on the website in May 2017. Although the Convention was never referred to explicitly, these included direct wording from a range of Articles in the Convention but were all referenced to Article 29. One policy included the statement, “every young person has the right to be protected against all forms of discrimination at the school (Article 29)”. However, this wording was from Article 2 of the Convention. Another included, “the best interests of the young people are a primary concern for us (Article 29)” which includes wording from Article 3 (Best interests of the child) of the Convention. The final policy included the statement, “young people have the right to express their views in any decision-making process about them ... (Article 29)”. This wording was from Article 12 (Respect for the views of the child) of the Convention. All three policies contained some direct wording from the Convention. However, the inclusion of ‘Article 29’ after each statement indicated a lack of knowledge of the Convention and/ or that Article 29 was the Article that the school wishes to promote or prioritise.

There was also a link to a web page on the *Rights Respecting Committee*, and there was a statement on how the “pupils are learning about rights and modelling these rights”. Here, the Committee also outlined their future plans to, “review the School Charter” and “our cluster primary schools in the area”. It should be noted

that a criterion for the RRSA was to, “Share good practice with other schools” (UNICEF UK, 2015a).

School Five

This is a special school in England for children and young people aged between five and eighteen years. “We are a Rights Respecting School” was on the school website home page. The school’s aim, also presented on the home page, states, “We help all our pupils to achieve, and we celebrate every achievement. Our curriculum topics are linked with specific Articles within the UNCRC”. This can be seen as a tenuous link to Article 6 (Right to life, survival and development) in regards to achievement and learning development. A further link from that statement leads to a range of information on ‘rights’. Here, a link takes the reader to a page titled, *What is a Rights Respecting School?* The Convention was described as, “a particular set of rights for all children due to their vulnerability and need for protection”, which links to Convention Articles 2 and 3. It also states, “There are 42 “Articles” in the Convention”, and these are then summed up under the headings, “Right to a childhood”, “Right to an education”, “Right to be healthy and “Right to be treated fairly”. None of the Articles are identified in this information. As previously stated, there are 54 Articles in the Convention. However, Articles 43-54 are recognised as explanations for Governments and States on how to implement the Convention (United Nations, 1989).

The explanations in this section did include further wording from the Convention. For example, “All children have the same rights without discrimination and should be protected from all forms of punishment”. This statement contained wording

from Convention Article 2. A further statement, “an education that develops their personality, talents and abilities to the full” can be linked with Article 6 (Right to life, survival and development) (United Nations, 1989). However, there was no link to Convention Article 12, no references to ‘participation’, or the ‘views’ / ‘voice’ of the children or young people. The statement also includes, “All children have a right to a childhood and should be free from adult responsibility”.

There were thirty-nine policies available on the website in May 2017. All policies started with the statement,

The aims of the [title of policy] are directly linked to the school aim, which in turn links to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC).

All policies on the website referred to at least two Convention Articles. However, the wording in the policies did not always refer to the Article being referenced. For example, one policy included the wording, “All children will be supported to develop good relationships and have a sense of belonging to the school community (Article 7)”. This statement is incorrectly referenced to Article 7, as Convention Article 7 states,

The child shall be registered immediately after birth ... have the right from birth to a name ... to acquire a nationality ... to know and care for by his or her parents (United Nations, 1989).

The wording, ‘school community’ was included in three of the RRSA Standard aims. Another example states, “The School curriculum will encourage all pupils to develop their self-esteem and self-motivation (Article 36)”. However, Convention Article 36 is about protecting “the child against all forms of

exploitation” (United Nations, 1989) and the wording ‘self-esteem and self-motivation’ was not included in the RRSA.

There are examples of statements that do not align to a specific Article but to the Convention, such as, “To ensure all children and young people’s right to protection from harmful treatment as defined in ‘The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child’”. Also, other statements included a reference to an Article, but the school has included the wording ‘young people’ into the wording of the Article. For example, “Children and young people have the right to be protected from being hurt and mistreated, physically or mentally (Article 19)”, and, “When adults make decisions, they should think about how their decisions will affect children and young people. (Article 3)”. As previously mentioned, the RRSA includes many references to young people.

School Six

This is also a special school in England for children and young people aged between eleven to nineteen years. The school website homepage included the wording, “Welcome to [name of school], a UNICEF Rights Respecting School with a Rights Respecting ethos”. The ethos “Enjoy and Achieve” was presented below this statement. Further references to ‘rights’ were available through the ‘Curriculum’ link which was located within a column of tabs on the left of the screen. The following statement is from the ‘Curriculum’ section of the website.

Our curriculum empowers our pupils to recognise their own rights and the rights of others and advocate for themselves and their peers according to their ability.

The school then outlined the curriculum areas. Two curriculum areas explicitly referred to 'rights'. One included the following wording, "This curriculum area also explores [an addition subject] as well as rights and responsibilities" and included the topic, "I have Rights". However, this topic was only on the upper school timetable for one term. The second curriculum area included the wording, "Student voice and active participation is encouraged and supported". Although no Articles were identified in this section of the website, the latter wording can be linked with Convention Article 12(Respect for the views of the child).

There were twenty-three policies available on the website in May 2017. Fifteen policies contained the statement,

[name of school] is a Rights Respecting School (level 2) and we are committed to promoting all aspects of the United Nations Charter on the Rights of the Child.

Although the school was meeting the criterion in the RRSA, Standard A2 Expected Outcomes, which states, "Policies have been reviewed to refer explicitly to the Convention" (UNICEF UK, 2015a), they have used the word 'Charter' instead of 'Convention'. All other references to 'rights' within the policies included the wording, "... as a Rights Respecting School ...". There were no references to specific Articles in any of the policies.

Summary

This chapter has identified the language included in the Rights Respecting Schools Award (RSA) and on the school websites. It described the way in which

the language of the human rights of children, as stated in the Convention, is incorporated into the RRSA Standards and the school websites. The analysis focused on the textual data and included the selection and sequencing of words between the Convention, the RRSA level 2 Standards and the school websites. It also identified examples of intertextuality and recontextualisation. The chapter also answers two of the research sub-questions:

2. How does the UNICEF UK Rights Respecting Schools Award level 2, incorporate the language of the human rights of children, as stated in the Convention?

3. How do schools which have achieved the Rights Respecting Schools Award present the language of the human rights of children on their websites?

Although every school in this study held the RRSA level 2 Award, none of the schools met the criteria in May 2017. However, each school did promote and present some form of the language of the human rights of children. Some were better than others. There was a range of differences, including how each school presented their achievement of the Award and how they aligned the RRSA with the Convention. In some cases, there was no or very little mention of Convention Articles, and when they were included, there were errors made when referring to specific Articles of the Convention. There was much reference to ‘responsibilities’ in regards to ‘rights’ which indicated a lack of understanding about the human rights of children.

It should be noted that School 5, a special school for children aged five to eighteen, presented the greatest extent of the language of the human rights of

children. School 5 did not link 'rights' to 'responsibilities', and they incorporated the Convention and Articles in all their policies (although they did misrepresent the numbers of the Articles). As formerly identified, previous research on the RRSA did not include specials schools. Therefore, in this study, it is interesting to note a special school was found to have accurately presented the greatest extent of the language of the human rights of children.

The preliminary interpretation of the Descriptive Phase identified the following themes:

- Power Dimensions
- The Discourse of Rights
- The Impact on Practice

Chapter 6. Explanation Phase: Discussion, will focus on the themes identified above. It will identify the relationship between the incorporation of the language of the Convention into the RRSA and how this language is then presented on the school websites. This chapter will also identify if and how any changes to the language changes the social context. This chapter will analyse the similarities and differences between the Convention, the RRSA and the school websites when referring to the Articles. These will now be analysed as phase three, 'Explanation', of the framework offered by Fairclough's CDA three phases, which analyses at the societal level. The analysis at the societal level focuses on the contexts of social and historical discourses embedded in text. This phase will identify and explore the interpretations of these discourses and the possible implications of such interpretations. By applying this phase, I will raise awareness

of the issues regarding social contexts of the language of the human rights of children (Fairclough, 2015).

Chapter 6. Explanation Phase: Discussion

Introduction

This chapter begins with a synopsis of the data presented from the Interpretative Phase and Descriptive Phase chapters. I then move on to critically analyse these findings under the headings of the three emergent themes: **Power Dimensions; The Discourse of Rights** and **The Impact on Practice**, and will present existing literature with my analysis. Phase three, the Explanation Phase within the framework offered by Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) three phases, analyses at the societal level. The analysis at the societal level focuses on the language of the human rights of children as presented in the Convention. This phase will also identify possible impacts on the social context and practice of the individual schools, from the presentation of this language through the RRSA and on the school websites. This format allows me to analyse the material and address my research questions critically.

According to Fairclough (2015: 172) this phase, "is a matter of seeing a discourse as part of processes of social struggle", and also identifying any 'power relationships'. In this study the social struggle can be seen as ensuring that all children and adults are made aware of the human rights of children, and these rights are being promoted in the UNICEF UK Rights Respecting School Award (RRSA) and the school websites using the language of the Convention, what I refer to as the globally accepted language of the human rights of children. The 'power relationships' can be identified in this study through the language used to describe or present the positions of the staff and the children at the schools.

This phase will be organised from the emergent themes drawn from the Interpretive and Descriptive phases of this study. I will explain the relationship, and the properties of representations of the Convention in textual form within the RRSA and on the school websites and will analyse intertextuality, to recognise the interconnectedness of each source. Intertextuality is the way in which another text shapes a text through the same vocabulary or the representation of the vocabulary (Fairclough, 2003). This chapter will also analyse the recontextualisation of the language. 'Recontextualisation' is when words have been taken 'out of their original context' (Fairclough, 2015: 38). Through examining the language from the RRSA and the school websites, in comparison to the language from the Convention, I will raise awareness of any changes to the social context (Fairclough, 1992; 1995; 2001) and identify the impact it can have on the human rights of children.

By the end of this chapter, I will respond to the primary research question:

To what extent is the Convention, the language of the human rights of children, incorporated into the UNICEF UK Rights Respecting School Award (RRSA) and how it is then presented on school websites?

Summary of Data from Interpretative Phase and Descriptive Phase

The Convention includes elements of the child as an object of rights, however, the majority of the language in the Convention, presented the child as a rights holder and the subject of their rights. There are concerns about undefined terms that are subject to different interpretations of the language of the Articles, such as the 'best interest of the child'. However, the Convention should be seen as the

framework and act as the basis in which all references to the human rights of children, should be made accurately.

The RRSA is presented as “a whole school approach to embedding the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child at the centre of the school ethos and teaching and learning approaches” by UNICEF UK (2015a). However, it does not include references or corresponds to all the ‘General Principles’ - Articles 2, 3, 6 and 12. The ‘General Principles’ support and guide the interpretation of all the other Articles, and are described as the “general requirements for all rights” (United Nations, 1989). The Award had a strong focus on ‘rights- respecting’, and this was a Requirement of the Award, which was linked to specific practices within schools, such as having a ‘rights respecting’ ethos. Many references in the RRSA Standards were made to ‘values and principles’. Although the ‘principles’ can be read as the ‘General Principles’ this is not a clear reference and much of the language explaining the ‘principles’ was not from the Convention. In addition, it is not clear what the RRSA ‘values’ are, as there are no explicit examples or references.

There was further confusing and inconsistent use of language throughout the RRSA. The use of the terms ‘children’, ‘young people’ and ‘pupil’ are not consistent and could cause confusion, create discrimination or support a power relationship between the child and the adult, which does not place, “the values and principles of the Convention at the heart of all policies and practice” (UNICEF UK, 2015a) in a school.

It is not clear how embedded the RRSA level 2 has to be for a school to achieve this level of Award, as from the analysis of information on the websites, none of the schools in this study met all the Requirements in the Standards. Also, there

was an ambiguous quantum regarding how many 'pupils' were being considered in the assessment to achieve the Award. For example, only those pupils being interviewed were asked if they 'feel safe at school'. To achieve this criterion, 'nearly all pupils interviewed' must state this. It could be argued that 'nearly all' of the interviewed 'pupils' is not a high enough quota of 'pupils' to achieve the criteria and gain an award for 'embedding rights across the school'.

The school websites made many references to 'responsibilities' and aligned them to 'rights'. UNICEF UK (2011:6) published a *Rights Respecting Toolkit* that identified the misunderstandings by staff in schools of rights and responsibilities and stated that "we have come to see this as a risk". UNICEF UK (n.d.b) state that the concept of "children's rights ... linked with responsibilities" is a "myth and misconception". This indicates that the staff who had created this information for the school websites had a lack of understanding not only about the human rights of children but also the RRSA.

This thesis examined the incorporation of Articles 2, 3, 6 and 12, as signed and ratified in the Convention, through analysing the language of rights presented in the UNICEF UK RRSA Award level 2 and the language shown on the school websites that have completed this Award. This Explanation Phase chapter is the third and final phase within the framework offered by Fairclough's version of CDA.

This phase will be organised from the emergent themes, 'Power Dimensions'; the 'Discourse of Rights' and the 'Impact on Practice'. These were drawn from the Interpretive and Descriptive phases of the analysis and presents the significance of the texts and the findings while considering what has been acknowledged in previous chapters regarding the language of the human rights of children.

Power Dimensions

“With great power there must also come – great responsibility!” (Lee, 1962: 12).

According to Fairclough (2015:26) “Power is not in itself bad ... the power of people to do things is generally a social good”. However, he explains that it is important to “distinguish between the power to do things and power over other people” (Fairclough, 2015:26). It is also important to identify the impact that these different dimensions of power can have. Language can be identified as a mode of power and social control (Habermas, 1985), and power dimensions are codified and authorised by means of language (Wodak, 2001). The power dimensions identified in this study can be seen within the language used to describe or identify someone, such as a child, young person, pupil and staff and the adult-pupil relationships presented within the RRSA and on the school websites.

A school is a “social space” with characteristic structures, where discourse is acted out by participants who are in “recognised social” positions, such as ‘teacher’ and ‘pupil’ (Fairclough, 2015:68). And, “it is only by occupying these positions that one becomes a teacher or pupil”, each with specific purposes such as ‘learning’, ‘teaching’ and ‘behaviour management’ (Fairclough, 2015:68). In this situation, the knowledge that teachers have and the discourse they use is “firmly connected to power relations (Jäger and Maier, 2009:35). Fairclough (2015:69) describes this as “a closed circle: [where] discourse types determine discourse practice, which reproduces discourse types”. Throughout the RRSA the use of the terms, ‘children’, ‘young people’ and ‘pupil’ were found to be inconsistently used. The terms ‘children’ and ‘young people’ were mostly found

in the Aims and Requirements of the RRSA Standards. However, the term 'pupils' was only found in the Expected Outcomes of the RRSA Standards. This indicates that the term 'pupil' is deliberately used by the RRSA to signpost to all those involved in the Award that the Expected Outcomes are to be achieved through the "recognised social positions" (UNICEF UK, 2015a), which implies that 'pupils' will take on their role as the learner and accept "the inherent power difference in the adult-child relationship" in schools (Davey et al., 2010:42). Therefore 'pupils' will be less likely to question or present their views on the RRSA or the adults managing the process. This supports previous research by Robinson on Rights Respecting Schools, who found that "power structures within schools serve to silence pupils' voices" (Robinson, 2014b:14).

Within the 'social space' of the school, the language of the human rights of children presented on the websites can also be seen to indicate power and the invested interests of those in power. The order in which words were presented on the school websites indicates the priorities of the person(s) writing the statements (Brown and Yale, 1983; Fairclough, 2015). For example, on School 1 website, the sequence of points in the school ethos, children are taught to have respect for "school property" followed by "themselves and each other". It could also be argued that "respect of school property" almost has a disciplining discursive dimension, rather than one implying or encouraging rights in a proactive manner. Through the discursive act of sequencing, positioning "school property" first, seems to prioritise this over the children's respect for "themselves and each other". This could mean a lack of understanding of and training on the human rights of children. Robinson (2014b:19) states that this concept may be difficult for some teachers due to "holding a position of power and authority relative to pupils [will have been] a significant part of their teacher identity for

many years”. Including the term ‘pupils’ and sequencing the ‘school property’ first can be seen as a recontextualisation of language. Where “texts are taken out of their original context” (Fairclough, 2015:38). Fragments of the language from the Convention are included here, but further words have been added, and the sequence in which they have been presented does not represent the context of the Convention and thus does not demonstrate advocacy for the human rights of children.

Further examples of power dimensions are evident in the RRSA Standard C criteria, where staff only have to ‘use’ rights respecting language and attitudes at the interview and only staff are asked if they recognise an ‘Improvement in relationships’ and ‘attitudes’ due to the Award. To meet this criterion, the children, young people and pupils are not asked at the interviews if the staff are using rights respecting language and attitudes in the school or asked if, in their experience, had there been ‘improvement in relationships’ with staff. This does not align practice to an Award that required the Convention to be embedded within the ethos of a school and in relation to Convention Articles 3 (Best interests) and 12 (Respect for the views of the child). This could be due to the ambiguous or vague language used within these Articles allowing those who are interpreting the Convention and RRSA, to create their specific interpretations (Liebel, 2012; l’Anson, 2016). The vague language indicates a lack of intertextuality from the Convention to the RRSA. A lack of intertextuality attests that there is a lack of “common ground” between these texts (Fairclough, 2015:164). The lack of respect for the views of the children regarding staff using rights respecting language and attitudes and allowing the children to comment on the relationships with staff align to Robinson’s (2014b:20) comment on children’s

voices in Rights Respecting Schools, “where the only voices listened to concur exactly with what the school wants to hear”.

On the website for School 2, the role of Ambassadors was explained. However, it was interesting to note that the Ambassadors were “selected by the school staff”. There is no further information regarding how the selection takes place and if the children have any input into the selection process. However, this indicates that the final decision is made by the school staff. This aligns to Robinson’s (2014b: 19) research on Rights Respecting Schools where she states that “the voices listened to represent no more than a minority” in the schools which had achieved the Award, and in this case, the school may be selecting these minority ‘voices’.

The term ‘young people’ was presented in the RRSA Standards throughout the Aims and Requirements and was only presented in one Expected Outcome. This was concerning a requirement to have displays done by children and young people around the school. It is interesting to note that the terms ‘children’ and ‘young people’ were not presented together in all RRSA Standard Aims or Requirements. The RRSA documentation defines a child from the Convention Article 1, as under the age of eighteen (United Nations, 1989). However, in the RRSA the term ‘young people’ was not defined. This is not surprising as UNICEF UK is part of the United Nations, and throughout United Nations documents the term ‘young people’ is often presented alongside the term ‘youth’. The United Nations has not adopted a single definition and age range for ‘youth’. Throughout the United Nations documents, there are various age ranges presented when stating ‘youth’, including, 15-24 years, 18-29 years and 15-35 years. A recent Youth Strategy document included a footnote on the first page acknowledging

that “there is no universally agreed international definition of youth” (United Nations, 2018:4a). The UN Secretariat defined youth in the Youth Strategy as persons “between the ages of 15 and 24 years” (United Nations, 2018:4a). However, UNESCO adopts a definition of ‘youth’ from where ever it is based at the time. For example, when working in Africa, UNESCO refers to ‘youth’ as, “every person between the ages of 15 and 35 years” (UNESCO, 2017). This indicates that the terms ‘youth’ and ‘young people’ are often used flexibly.

Therefore, as the term ‘young people’ presented in the RRSA Standards is not defined, it will be up to the individual or organisation, in this case, each school, to define the definition and age range. This will in any situation exclude young children. If the staff in schools research the United Nations documentation looking for a definition of ‘young people’, the lowest age they will find is 15 years. Therefore, when embedding the Convention into the school ethos, through acting on the RRSA Recommendations and Expected Outcome, staff and pupils can assume certain ages are excluded when ‘young people’ are referred to and limit the autonomy of those not deemed to be ‘young people’. This demonstrates a lack of intertextuality as the language of the human rights of children, the Convention, is not incorporated into the Award. The human rights of children are not conditional or dependent on the child’s age or stage of development (United Nations, 1989). Any limited autonomy that adults believe exists due to the age of the child should not deny them their rights (Van Bueren, 1998). This can be seen as a power dimension within the adult-child relationships, and as it is presented in the RRSA, it can support an increase in the power dimensions within schools which have achieved the Award.

From the power dimensions discussed above, how can teachers and pupils adapt their positions to incorporate the discourse practice of upholding rights in such a power relationship situation? It will require a change of behaviour in regards to the social structure and social order of the school. Due to the language presented in the RRSA, the criteria can be seen to increase further the power dimensions and cause confusion, creating discrimination or exclusion due to age, which does not place, “the values and principles of the Convention at the heart of all policies and practice” (UNICEF UK, 2015a).

The Discourse of Rights

Fairclough (2015) defines discourse in relation to people constructing reality from the written words, they already have. The “human rights community ... has a certain way of speaking” (Orend, 2002:15). Jäger and Maier (2009:34) explain that “knowledge refers to ... all kinds of meanings that people use to interpret and shape their environment”. They describe this as a “flow of knowledge” (Jäger and Maier, 2009:35). Therefore, knowledge regarding the human rights of children will depend on how individuals have interpreted the Convention and how much is accurately understood and implemented effectively in a specific environment.

Lundy and Martínez Sainz (2018:15) state that “discourse around children’s rights is often a rosy one, focused on positive images of protecting children from harm, enabling their development and empowering them [however] in reality ... they are sources of conflict and tension”.

The discourse regarding the human rights of children is developing fast. This indicates the achievement of the Convention and how the concept of children as

rights holders is being embedded in society. However, this study has identified more needs to be done to reduce or stop the recontextualisation of the Convention and the language of the human rights of children as this is distorting the discourse. This study has identified many characteristics of the discourse of the human rights of children that indicates misunderstandings and recontextualisation and this can have a counter-productive effect on the realisation of these rights.

The Realisation of These Rights

Some misunderstandings or discursive practices of recontextualisation were identified on the school websites in regard to presenting the Convention and the Articles. On the website of School 2, it was determined that “the most relevant rights concerning [the] children” were 7, 12, 23, 24, 28, 29 and 32, yet there was no further information explaining why these were ‘the most relevant’. These could have been the Articles that the school were focusing on at that time or the ones the children have selected to learn more about. However, the language of the Convention is taken out of context here by stating these were ‘the most relevant rights’, suggests that the other rights were not as relevant. The Convention requires “the realisation of all rights ... for all children” (Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2003) and no right has “priority over others” (Archard and Skivenes, 2009:2). When children and adults are developing an understanding of rights and children are experiencing having their rights realised, this language can create misunderstandings and can have a negative impact for the actual realisation of the human rights of the child.

Three school websites contained errors in regards to Convention Articles. For example, School 4, presented the wording from Articles 2, 3 and 12. However, they stated these were all Article 29. This can be seen as an error. Nevertheless, Article 29 which indicates the goals of education, could be deliberately included here to reinforce the importance of education. This is another example where misunderstandings regarding the human rights of children can occur from reading the information on the school website. It misinforms and misdirects the reader. Misinformation occurs by not presenting the relevant Article to its correct content and misleads those who will look for Article 29 when looking for further information on 'discrimination', best interests' or 'views'. It is important to ensure that accurate language and information is presented to those who are developing an understanding of the human rights of children. Adults presenting this language must have a "more critical awareness of language as [it has] a powerful influence on people's attitudes and behaviours" (Sanders, 2017:519). With such misunderstandings, the discourse of rights will have a negative impact on rights holders.

The RRSA specified, through the Standards, that the Convention was the framework which the Award was developed from. The RRSA Standards included a reference to the Convention nineteen times. However, the inclusion of the reference to the Convention did not contain specific references to all the 'General Principles', Articles 2, 3, 6 and 12. References were made to 'values and principles. The 'principles' could be read as the 'General Principles', but it is not clear what the 'values' are as there are no explicit examples or references. The Award had a strong focus on 'rights- respecting' and linked specific practices or requirements within schools to having a 'rights respecting' ethos. This term appeared to substitute for the words 'rights' or 'Convention'. RRSA Standard A4

requirement stated that “The Convention underpins the school's actions to share good practice with other schools and communities” (UNICEF UK, 2015a). It goes on to require the school to be an “ambassador for the RRSA” (UNICEF UK, 2015a). It is interesting to note that the schools are not expected to be an ‘ambassador’ for ‘rights’ or the Convention. RRSA Standard A4 Expected Outcome reinforces the promotion of the RRSA by requiring the school to “... show how the school has shared good practice in becoming rights respecting with other schools and the local community” (UNICEF UK, 2015a). This can be seen as promoting the RRSA and requiring that schools refer to it for guidance on the human rights of children and not the Convention.

Previous research has identified that teachers relate ‘rights respecting’ to “behaviour management in the classroom” (Struthers, 2014:65). If teachers are developing a ‘rights respecting’ discourse rather than a rights discourse, by referring to the term ‘rights respecting’ rather than the human rights of children or the Convention, then this raises further concerns. My concerns are similar to Trivers and Starkey’s (2012:138) concerns that the RRSA is being implemented in some schools as a behaviour management programme, where “children equate human rights to good behaviour and obeying rules”. Previously, Osler and Starkey (2010) had also raised concerns regarding the connection children were experiencing between learning about human rights and conforming to school rules.

It should be noted that the term ‘rights respecting’ is not included in the Convention. The RRSA Standards contains many references to this term. As mentioned above, it is not clear what the ‘values’ are referring to in the RRSA Standards. However, there are other references to ‘values’ within the UNICEF

UK (2016) *RRSA Impact Report*. This report stated, “RRSA is often cited by schools and inspectors as a valuable way to teach positive British values”. (UNICEF UK 2016:5). Advice for schools is available from the DfE (2014) in the form of a booklet entitled “Promoting fundamental British values as part of SMSC in schools”. This booklet contains no reference to the human rights of children. It does, however, state that schools should “encourage students to accept responsibility for their behaviour” to “enable students to distinguish right from wrong” (DfE 2014:5). The use of the term ‘rights respecting’, the lack of information on ‘values’ and the comments from schools regarding how the RRSA has supported the teaching of ‘British Values’ is concerning. The government’s advice on teaching ‘British Values’ indicates that the human rights of children are not a ‘British value’. This supports the previous finding that the RRSA is being used as a behaviour management programme rather than an Award that embeds the Convention into a school ethos and practice. However, this also indicates that schools are themselves caught up in uneven discursive power relations, with regards to national policy on ‘responsibilities’, requirements and ideological criteria surrounding the notion of ‘values’.

All school websites included a statement regarding them as being a Rights Respecting School. School 1 went so far as to state that this was a ‘highly valued’ Award. School 2, equally prized their ‘prestigious’ Award. These findings raise the questions, is the RRSA seen as a badge of honour or a mechanism to uphold the human rights of children and teach children and adults about the Convention? In addition, do schools aim to achieve the Award to embed the human rights of children in the ethos and practice of the school or do they want an Award that supports their behaviour management practices? Do schools see the RRSA as a

badge of honour rather than a genuine way to promote and uphold the human rights of children in educational settings?

There are many references on the school websites regarding rights and responsibilities which demonstrate recontextualisation due to the schools constructing new meaning regarding the human rights of children. School 3 and 6 included a 'Pupil Responsibilities' section. School 4 listed pupil's responsibilities that included the statement that staff had a responsibility to "encourage pupils to take responsibility for their actions". School 5 was the only school to state that children are "free from adult responsibility". The RRSA does not refer to the 'responsibilities' of the child within the Standards. In addition, UNICEF UK (n.d.b), clearly state in supporting RRSA documentation that "There is a common misunderstanding that children's rights are linked with responsibilities. But this is not correct". They go on to explain that "there are no conditions attached to rights. Rights can never be a reward for the fulfilment of a responsibility". However, it is interesting to note that within UNICEF UK's (2016) *Impact Report*, they include comments from nine schools which have achieved the Award, that contain the word 'responsibilities' when explaining their experience of gaining the RRSA. For example, "The school's promotion of rights and responsibilities means that pupils understand and respect everyone's entitlement to learn" (UNICEF UK, 2016).

The Convention only mentions 'responsibilities' in relation to the child, within Article 29 (the aims of education), "The preparation of the child for responsible life in a free society" (UNESCO, 1989). The word 'responsibility', in relation to the child developing responsibility, did not appear until the 1959 Declaration. The Convention established the child as a rights-holder and active participant in the realisation of their rights and removed the perceptions of a child having the

responsibility as a rights-holder (Grugel and Piper, 2007). Studies by Struthers (2014:34) identified that teachers in Scotland, who were teaching human rights, “link[ed] the idea of rights to behaviour management, emphasising child responsibility rather than rights”. This practice was previously identified by Trivers and Starkey (2012:146), and they described it as “responsibility respecting”. This could be a deliberate practice by teachers, to teach ‘responsibilities’ within schools, and for this to have a positive impact on the behaviour of children while they attend the school (Damon and Gregory, 1997).

This discourse promotes not only a power relationship between the adult and the child but can be seen as a controlling and manipulating discourse and “is a misapplication of the concept of human rights” (Waldron and Oberman: 2016:745).

There was a range of differences between the school websites, including how each school presented their achievement of the Award and how they aligned the RRSA with the Convention. In some cases, there was no or minimal mention of Convention or Articles, and when they were included, there were inaccuracies. There was much reference to ‘responsibilities’ in regards to ‘rights’ which, as discussed earlier indicates a lack of understanding about the human rights of children but is also recontextualising these rights. It is clear from this study that although there seems to be some knowledge and learning about the human rights of children and the discourse, the RRSA is not achieving its aim of embedding the Convention, as a human rights framework into the school curriculum, learning and teaching, and creating a ‘rights respecting’ school. In other words, “human rights talk [is] being used to engender conformity rather than emancipation” (Lundy et al., 2017:375).

The Impact on Practice

All aspects explained in the first two threads can be seen as affecting practice. However, this thread will focus on embedding the human rights of children into the school ethos and practice. It is not clear how embedded the RRSA has to be for a school to achieve this level of Award as none of the schools met all the criteria during this study. The RRSA Standards states that “Becoming rights respecting is referenced in the school's development plan (SDP). Policies have been reviewed to refer explicitly to the Convention” (UNICEF UK, 2015a). From analysing the school websites, none of the schools met this criterion for the RRSA level 2 Award in May 2017. It has to be acknowledged that embedding the Convention into school practices can be seen as an ambitious agenda and questions have been raised regarding how can the human rights of children sit alongside and support existing school policies and practices of “discipline and control” (Phillips, 2016:42). In schools “the standardisation of curricular content and rules [l]imit scope for children to make decisions and express opinions” (Phillips, 2016:41).

Two major concerns have emerged from this study regarding the practice of upholding the human rights of children in Rights Respecting Schools. Firstly, a lack of understanding of the human rights of children is clear from the misunderstandings or recontextualisation of the language of the Convention. This can be aligned with ‘translation’ of the Convention, which has been identified as problematic, not only in the RRSA Standards but on the school websites. Secondly, a lack of evidence regarding the reality of what is in the ‘best interest of the child’ (Article, 3) and the views of the child being taken into consideration

and being given due weight (Article 12), when developing reciprocally respectful adult and child relationships in schools. These concerns will now be discussed.

It has been identified that the Convention and human rights education is lacking within teacher training programmes and there is strong evidence that many teachers have only a slight knowledge of the human rights of children (Bemis, 2013; Jerome et al., 2015; Thelander, 2016). Therefore, if teachers lack training and knowledge on the human rights of children how can they embed the Convention into their learning and teaching practices? There is a requirement for teacher training on the Convention to develop understanding and support and encourage teachers to implement a rights-based ethos (Lundy, 2007; Howe and Covell, 2010). However, as Covell et al. (2017) identified, there can be an unwillingness of teachers to accept and support a whole school approach that is required to ensure that an Award such as the RRSA is fully embedded within the school ethos. It is interesting to point out that the word 'well-being' in RRSA Standard A, was used alongside 'achievement' and in the latter example, 'attainment' (UNICEF UK, 2015a). Also, RRSA Standard A refers to the impact of 'Rights Respecting values' on 'well-being' (UNICEF UK, 2015a). As previously identified in this chapter, the UNICEF UK (2016) RRSA Impact Report, identified that "schools and [Ofsted] inspectors" believe the RRSA is "a valuable way to teach positive British values". (UNICEF UK, 2016:5). However, the only reference to 'well-being' in the British values document states that "an appreciation [of] living under the rule of law protects individual citizens and is essential for [children's] well-being and safety" (DfE, 2014: 5), and does not contain any references to the human rights of children.

This is an example of recontextualisation, which is the point in which different texts interrelate and create a different concept (Fairclough, 2015). Here the RRSA Standards have incorporated the Convention, the language of the human rights of children together with language which refers to ‘targets’, ‘achievement’ and ‘attainment’ terms commonly used within schools in England. The child’s ‘targets’ and ‘achievement’ may not necessarily be what is important to the child. This also raises the concern, can the embedding of the Convention be accommodated into school policies and practices. Jones (2017:79) states that “an ideology of children as non-persons is pervasive within schools”. Therefore, implementing a rights-based ethos may take more than the inclusion of the human rights of children in teacher training programmes.

The second concern regards the relationships between adults and children in the schools. There is a lack of evidence regarding the importance of reciprocally respectful adult and child relationships, for all children, in the RRSA and the practice in schools as presented on the websites. The RRSA Standards use the measure ‘nearly all’ in many of the Expected Outcomes. There is no indication of what ‘nearly all’ means. One such example,

Nearly all classroom practitioners and support staff interviewed use rights-respecting language and attitudes. Relationships are identified by all interviewees as mutually respectful. Improvement in relationships is recognised by all staff, including for example lunchtime supervisors (UNICEF UK, 2015a).

Therefore, not all staff have to “use rights-respecting language and attitudes’ when being interviewed as part of the assessment for this Award. And staff only have to ‘use’ ‘rights respecting language and attitudes’ at the interview as the

criteria only requires 'staff' to recognise an 'Improvement in relationships', not all interviewees, indicating that children are not asked about this. This suggests that the views of children, regarding mutually respectful relationships in schools, are not required and therefore, not respected. This positions the child in the relationship as "relatively powerless when compared to the adults in schools" (Robinson, 2014b). There is also an ambiguous quantum regarding other RRSA criteria. For example, how many 'pupils' "feel safe at school" (UNICEF UK, 2015a). The Expected Outcomes requires 'nearly all' to state this during the interviews. As stated previously, the school decides who will be interviewed by the RRSA UNICEF UK Assessor. Therefore, from the range of pupils, it would be in the best interest of the school to choose the pupils that they believe will be able to ensure the criteria of the Award was met. I would assume that those chosen would be selected as, in the school's eyes, for their ability to provide evidence to meet the criteria for the school to gain the Award. Therefore, from the small number of chosen interviewees, if some are not able to meet the criteria, then I would question if the numbers of 'nearly all pupils interviewed' provides evidence that a school has embedded the Convention and is a Rights Respecting School. Lundy (2007:932) argues that there is a need for a "discourse on pupil voice and this to be firmly located within the framework of children's rights". My analysis of the RRSA supports this argument. If an Award, developed by UNICEF UK that aims to embed the human rights of children into a school ethos and practice, does not advocate for 'pupil's voice' then a specific discourse is needed.

There were also examples of practice regarding the adult-child relationship that were portrayed on the school websites that raised concerns. On the website for School 2, was a brief explanation of what Rights Ambassadors were and how they were selected. There are two Rights Ambassadors in every class, and they

are 'selected by the school staff'. These positions are presented as being of importance to the school, and according to schools which have achieved the Award, children are keen to take on these roles (UNICEF UK, 2016). If this role is important to children, should children not decide for themselves who should have this role? After all, the Ambassador will be representing them. The role could be seen as a 'central issue' for the school as in their RRSA research, Sebba and Robinson (2010:40), found that "[d]ecisions influenced by pupils mainly focused on important but not central issues". Therefore, that may be why the children cannot decide on who should be the Ambassadors. The main concern here is, as Robinson (2014b) explains, "who possess the schools' cultural capital and agree with what the adults in the school want to hear are acknowledged more often". This indicates that there is not a mutually respectful adult – child relationship at the school. To make this a more respectful relationship and uphold the human rights of children, the school staff need to re-examine the process of selecting Ambassadors to ensure the views and voice of the children are actively listened to and purposely considered. In addition, "[t]he practice of actively involving pupils in decision making should not be portrayed as an option which is in the gift of adults but a legal imperative which is the right of the child" (Lundy, 2007:932). After further reflections on the RRSA research carried out by Sebba and Robinson (2010), Robinson (2014a) stated that the "reality of mutually respectful adult-pupils relationships may, therefore, not be as prevalent as first assumed" in Rights Respecting Schools.

Summary

The language of the human rights of children, the Convention, is not easily translated to programmes such as the RRSA and onto school websites. However, this does not mean that the language should not be accurately presented in such instances. The Convention provides discourse, and although the human rights of children exist within a wider context than that identified within the Convention, all references regarding the human rights of children should build from the Convention. The RRSA incorporated the term 'Convention' but does not include clear and accurate language reflecting the 'General Principles'. Schools did not "place the values and principles of the Convention at the heart of the policies and practices" (UNICEF UK, 2015) or meet the Requirements of the RRSA as they did not explicitly reference the Convention within their policies. Promoting the RRSA and not the Convention can result in schools referring to the RRSA for guidance on the human rights of children. The process where the Convention has been "translated" into practice is "either ignored or regarded as unproblematic" (l'Anson 2016:18-19). However, "[o]nce a translation has been achieved it often becomes invisible" (l'Anson 2016:19). Due to the lack of accurate 'translation' of the language on the human rights of children; the inclusion of language that reinforces power dimensions in schools and a focus on 'rights respecting' which, as presented in this study, has been identified as being used as a behaviour management programme, the RRSA is not an appropriate reference point for practice to uphold the human rights of children.

In this study, the aim was to identify to what extent the language of the Convention is incorporated into the UNICEF Rights Respecting School Award (RRSA) (2015-2017) level 2 and how it is then presented on the school websites that have

achieved this award. Although there are examples of intertextuality, overall, I found that the language of the RRSA and on the majority of school webpages expressed a discourse that was inaccurately presented and recontextualised, and there was insufficient language incorporated from the Convention. As discussed above, much of the language analysed in this study was aligned with the education requirements of the schools.

I agree with Robinson (2014a) that “it is a moral prerequisite that children should be respected, and the establishment of a rights-respecting school ethos is a positive move in working towards this”. Indeed, a basic awareness about the human rights of children, even with errors, is better than to have no knowledge at all. However, from carrying out a CDA on the language of the RRSA and six school websites, where the schools had achieved RRSA Level 2, I conclude that there was not sufficient incorporation of the language of the human rights of children presented in the RRSA Standards in May 2017. This may, in turn, have misrepresented the language of the human rights of children to schools. Therefore, this suggests that the RRSA does not provide schools with an effective framework to embed the Convention into the ethos of a school and a lack of monitoring once it has been awarded has exacerbated the matter. Therefore, the RRSA is not a programme that supports schools to effectively and accurately embed the Convention throughout practice and ethos. It is not enough to use the term ‘rights respecting’ I believe this has diluted the context and ethos of the Convention.

For any programme that aims to embed the human rights of children into the ethos and practice of schools, it must ensure “children ... perceive these rights as their own, i.e. they must be able to establish a relationship between their rights

and their lives” (Liebel, 2012:12). Woodiwiss (2006:37) states that “for rights to work for more than law itself is required ... to be effective, the legal enforcement of human rights must mobilise the supportive elements and/or processes present within the social routines of everyday life” (Woodiwiss, 2006:34). This has implications for a school as a “social space” with characteristic structures, where discourse is acted out by participants who are in “recognised social” positions, such as ‘teacher’ and ‘pupil’ (Fairclough, 2015:68).

The RRSA provides a basic understanding of the human rights of children, but mainly this is concerning the lives of the children while at school. By including terms such as ‘pupils’ within the Expected Outcomes; linking well-being to attainment and target setting; not asking children about their views about child-adult relationships. These can be seen as supporting, if not encouraging, power dimensions within a school. In addition, setting age restrictions for certain elements of the criteria by using the term ‘young people’ and excludes children, who are not deemed by adults as young people.

Chapter 7. Conclusion

Introduction

This final chapter of my thesis summarises the study I carried out to answer the research question - *To what extent is the Convention, the language of the human rights of children, incorporated into the UNICEF UK Rights Respecting School Award (RRSA) and how it is then presented on school websites?*

The chapter identifies the strengths of this study and what new knowledge has emerged. It also recognises the limitations of the study and provides a range of recommendations for further research.

Summary of the Study

To answer my research question, I carried out a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), on the language of the human rights of children. CDA was applied as a theoretical and methodological approach to examine how the language of the Convention was incorporated and presented in the Rights Respecting Schools Award (RRSA) and on the school websites. Using Fairclough's (2015) three phases of CDA, allowed me to study the language of the human rights of children, and not only interpret and describe the use of the language, but explain the use of language at the societal level. Three major themes emerged from this study; **Power Dimensions; the Discourse of Rights** and the **Impact on Practice**.

I have identified the limited incorporation and misrepresentation of the language of the Convention in the RRSA and on the school websites. This study provides a deeper understanding of how the divergent use of the language of the human rights of children is being articulated which in turn indicated that the RRSA is being applied to enhance power relations. The Convention recognises all children as rights holders, with a 'voice'. This study not only identifies the discourse of the RRSA which not only has limited language from the Convention but includes language that reinforces the power relationships in schools. The RRSA also excludes children from providing their experiences of being in a Rights Respecting school as certain Expected Outcomes excludes the 'voices' of the children.

This study has identified many examples on the school websites, of rights being linked with responsibilities. Rights should not be used as a reward for the fulfilment of responsibility; they are unconditional. Children should be encouraged to show rights respecting behaviours, but they are not duty bearers. Although the RRSA do not indicate any links between rights and responsibilities, the Award Standards does not counteract this by stating this is wrong and goes against the concept of the human rights of children. UNICEF UK (n.d.b) published a document that states that the concept of "children's rights ... linked with responsibilities" is a "myth and misconception". UNICEF UK (2011) published a *Rights Respecting Toolkit* that identified the misunderstandings by staff in schools of rights and responsibilities and stated that "we have come to see this as a risk". They recommended that emphasis was put on 'respect' for rights and that there should be no mention of responsibilities alongside rights.

Using CDA has identified not only what message is being presented through language from what is there, but it also suggests what is not there. The use of such language on the school websites indicates either a lack of understanding of the responsibilities of duty bearers to uphold the rights of children, such as school staff or it suggests that the RRSA is being misused to manage and control the behaviour of children.

Contribution to Knowledge

This study has examined the language of the human rights of children from the Convention, to the RRSA and onto six English school websites, where the schools had achieved the level 2 RRSA. I have identified examples of intertextuality, where the language of the Convention was incorporated into the RRSA and onto the school websites. However, most of the language on the school websites, identified in this study, does not present the language of the Convention.

Much of the language is undergoing a process of recontextualisation, which reinforces the power relations within a school and can be seen as supporting a behaviour management programme. Although, not all examples of the recontextualisation can be seen as directly influenced by the RRSA. For example, the practice of aligning rights with responsibilities is not evident in the RRSA. As Shier (2018:762) states, “children’s rights ... [have] become increasingly confused”. An alignment between rights and responsibilities is a way in which schools can “manipulate children as part of their classroom management strategy” (Shier, 2018:776). “A focus on teaching responsibilities rather than

rights has important implications for children's understanding of the nature of rights" (Howe and Covell, 2010:99). It may be that staff are confused and do not understand the ethos of the human rights of children. However, it can also be a fear of losing what they consider as authority or power in the classroom (Alderson, 1999; Torney-Purta et al., 1999). This is a concern and may be the reason why the language of the human rights of children has been recontextualised on the school websites.

In comparison to previous research on the Convention and the RRSA, this study contributes a range of knowledge regarding the human rights of children. These are explained below.

Recontextualising the Language of the Human Rights of Children

This study has contributed to the knowledge regarding how the language of the human rights of children is 'translated' by organisations and individuals. Previous research has suggested that schools use the RRSA as a way in which to enhance their behaviour management programmes. As identified in Chapter 2, the Convention explicitly states what the responsibilities are of adults such as teachers to uphold the human rights of children. Due to my normative view of the human rights of children, I am concerned about the low levels of accuracy regarding the language of the Convention presented on the majority of the school websites in this study. From these findings, I have concerns regarding how the schools have embedded the Convention into their learning and teaching and how the staff are upholding the human rights of children. Findings from this study

indicate a separation or dissonance between the language of the Convention, the language of the RRSA and the language presented on school websites.

Although it can be challenging due to the elisions made and the tensions that this topic can create, it is important to provide knowledge of the human rights of children accurately. Adults are responsible for informing children of their rights and upholding these rights, and this includes providing accurate information on school websites. This study has identified that schools interpret and present the language of the human rights of children differently. All schools in this study presented the language of the human rights of children differently on their websites, and in most cases, the recontextualised text can be interpreted as enhancing the schools' behaviour management programmes. The 2017 Standards included elements of the recontextualisation of the Convention and UNICEF UK published reports that contained information regarding rights and responsibilities that could be seen as confusing (UNICEF UK, n.d.b). The order of language and the links between rights and responsibilities presented on the school websites may be unintentional or due to a lack of understanding. Therefore, UNICEF UK must try to ensure there is no confusion regarding this and reinforce their message that "there are no conditions attached to rights. Rights can never be a reward for the fulfilment of a responsibility" (UNICEF UK, 2016).

Contribution Beyond Existing Research

Previous research has included interviews and questionnaires with adults and children. These researches have not included an analysis of the RRSA Standards

or focused on school websites. In addition, previous research on the RRSA has not included special schools in England. In this study, six school websites were analysed. Two of these schools were special schools and from the analyse of the language of the human rights of children presented on the school websites, one of the special schools was found to provide the most accurate presentation of this language.

This study is original and unique as I have applied CDA for the first time to the language of the human rights of children in the RRSA and on school websites. This study is different as it analyses the language of school ethos as presented on a public domain, a website. The findings in this study add to the current research on how schools present the RRSA as enhancing their behaviour management programmes. From the analysis of the RRSA Standards and the websites, this study provides the extent to which the language of the human rights of children is being recontextualised and examples of words that are leading to misrepresentation and changing the discourse of the human rights of children.

Language Matters

This study is unique as it has identified examples of how schools are communicating the language of the human rights of children on their websites. As identified in this thesis the Convention, the language of the human rights of children, took over ten years to develop and much of this time was spent negotiating specific words in the Articles. The language in the Convention has been agreed and ratified by nearly every country in the world. This language needs to be presented accurately within the RRSA. UNICEF UK must make it

clear to schools that “there are no conditions attached to rights” (UNICEF UK, 2016). This would not only support and further develop a more accurate understanding of the human rights of children, but could lead to less recontextualised language presented on school websites. Language informs reality and, in this study, I provide examples of how changes to some words, adjusts the context and thus demonstrates how easy it is to abuse language.

Rights Respecting and the Convention

This study has identified that staff in schools which have achieved the highest level of the RRSA, level 2, do not present the Convention, the human rights of children accurately on the school websites. The RRSA requires schools to promote the Award, not the Convention. The term ‘rights respecting’ is not included in the Convention. This term can be seen as promoting the RRSA and requiring that schools refer to it for guidance on the human rights of children and not the Convention. Therefore, by using this term schools can be seen to endorse and promote the Award rather than ‘rights’ or the Convention.

Power Dimensions

This study has identified examples of words in the RRSA that reinforces power dimensions in schools, for example, the use of the word ‘pupil’. In addition, the analysis identified gaps in the RRSA, words from the Convention that should be included. For example, the exclusion of children’s and young people’s ‘voice’. As the Standards only requires ‘staff’ to recognise an “Improvement in relationships”

(UNICEF, 2015), this reinforces the power dimensions in a school. The findings from this study contribute to the knowledge of the RRSA, an Award that aims to embed the Convention into the ethos of participating schools, with content that is empowering the staff and disempowering the children. This adds to previous research and provides examples and explanations of the societal impact from this practice.

These examples identify either a lack of understanding or oversight by UNICEF UK, the writers of the RRSA, of the ethos of the Convention and in particular Article 12 (Respect for the views of the child). The analysis indicates the possibility that schools are merely doing this to gain an award with little intention of embedding the ethos and practice of the Convention throughout their practices. This could be described as 'window dressing', as identified in this study, all six schools state they are a Rights Respecting School, on their websites. Most had this statement on their home page, some including terms such as a 'highly valued' or 'prestigious' Award.

Applying CDA

This study provides a strong case for using CDA to examine the language of the human rights of children, to gain further understanding of how it can be recontextualised within the paradigms of schools. The data included in this study was publicly available, and one of my objectives was to identify the recontextualisation of the language of the human rights of children in the RRSA and on the school websites, as postulated by CDA. In some cases, the erroneous presentation of information, where schools inaccurately present Articles on their

websites, could be considered as misdirection as it provides children, parents and staff with inaccurate information. If similar errors and misdirection are being presented to children and staff in schools, then this will only reinforce the erroneous information and hinder or reduce the child's experiences of being a rights holder. If schools continue to reapply to gain the RRSA, every three years, then the inaccurate information can be represented and reinforced for that timeframe. However, as this study has identified, gaining the Award is not a guarantee that the schools have an accurate understanding and knowledge of the human rights of children. Schools must provide correct information on the human rights of children and the language they use to do this must accurately communicate this.

This study contributes to the development of the discourse of the human rights of children, e.g. the work of Freeman (1996, 2009), Lundy (2012, 2017), Kellett (2010), Liebel (2012), Hanson (2013), Archard (2014) and Gillett-Swan (2016). It also expands the on the growing research on the embedding of a rights-based framework within schools, e.g. the work of Gerber (2008), Lundy (2007; 2015), Osler (2010, 2017), Sebba (2010), Robinson (2010, 2014a), Howe (2010), Covell (2010, 2017), Jerome et al. (2015), Orr (2015), Struthers (2014), Trivers (2012), Starkey (2010, 2012). Therefore, the analysis from this study can instigate and reinforce discussions on the human rights of children.

Limitations of the Study

It must be acknowledged that the findings presented in this thesis are limited to four Articles from the Convention. Additionally, these findings present my

interpretation of the language of the human rights of children in the RRSA and on the school websites and does not include any perceptions or observations of participants. As previously outlined in Chapter 3, Methodology, my own positionality has informed this study.

It must be noted that the RRSA was reviewed in late 2017 and an updated version of the Award is now in place. The new Award consists of three stages, as did the version in this study and schools go through a similar process to achieve the Award. However, the language of the new Standards has not been included in this study. This study aimed to identify what language from the Convention was included in the RRSA and was then presented on school websites that had achieved the Award. The schools chosen for this study were selected applying stratified random sampling and using the list of schools which had achieved the Award on the UNICEF UK RRSA website. The sample comprised of two primary schools, two secondary schools and two special schools. These types of schools were chosen to represent the types of schools that have achieved the RRSA, and special schools were included as previous research did not include such schools. Each school had to be based in England to ensure they incorporated the school ethos on the school website, as required by the Department of Education. This allowed me to consider the website as a credible source of information regarding the ethos of the school. The RRSA criteria also required the Convention to be embedded within the ethos of a school; thus this must then be presented on a school website. Also, the school had to have achieved the RRSA at least six months before May 2017. This was to give a reasonable amount of time for a school to update their website after achieving the Award. Therefore, this study would not have been possible to carry out if the new RRSA Standards had been included.

As previously identified, only four Articles are included in this study. However, they are known as the 'General Principles', and support and guide the interpretation of all the other Articles, and are described as the "general requirements for all rights" (United Nations, 1989). In addition, this study specifically focused on all of Article 2 (non-discrimination) as all points in this article are focused on non-discrimination; Article 3.1 (the best interest of the child) and 3.2 (well-being); all of Article 6 (life, survival and development) and Article 12.1 (the views of the child). These elements were selected as being most relevant for schools to incorporate into their ethos and learning and teaching.

As I have pointed out, this study does include some limitations. However, these limitations present opportunities for further study. These will be included in the following section.

Reflecting on my Positionality

As discussed previously, it is important to acknowledge my positionality in this study, and throughout the thesis, I have demonstrated reflexivity. This is my analysis and interpretation, as a researcher, I am part of, and influenced by, society, and from this, I am a 'meaning-maker' (Fairclough, 2015). My 'meaning-making' has been a focus of my self-reflection, which provides a level of trustworthiness in this study (Wodak, 2001). From this reflective process, I have identified what could potentially become colonised discourse constructed from the language of the human rights of children and recontextualised for use in schools.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study analysed school websites that had achieved the RRSA level 2 at least six months before the data was retrieved from the website. This study was limited to what was available on six school websites in England. With this initial study, further research can be carried out to expand the number of schools in England, which have achieved the RRSA level 2. From the analysis of information on the websites, none of the schools in this study met the Requirements in the Standards. It would be interesting to identify how many schools meet the criteria of the RRSA after six months of achieving the Award. The requirement to achieve the Award stated that all policies must explicitly refer to the Convention (UNICEF UK, 2015), none of the school websites, achieved this, as not all the policies explicitly referred to the Convention.

This study included the 2017 version of the RRSA. As previously stated, UNICEF UK has updated the RRSA, including the Requirements and Expected Outcomes in the four Standards. Schools in the UK started working towards the new Standards in July 2017. I want to apply CDA to the new RRSA Standards and then carry out a comparison of the findings from this study with the findings from the new Standards. By identifying the changes made between the two versions of the RRSA, it would indicate to what extent UNICEF UK is continuing to 'translate' the Convention.

It would also be interesting to adapt this study and consider what a school website would look like if the children themselves created it. They are the experts of their experiences at school. Would they 'translate' or recontextualise the language of the human rights of children and what would the societal impact be and who (children or adults) would it impact the most?

This study has identified a low level of intertextuality between the Convention, acknowledged as the language of the human rights of children, and the RRSA, and on the school websites. I would recommend that all programmes or awards that aim to support an understanding of the Convention for children and staff explicitly incorporate the language of the Convention. The RRSA should include as a minimum, to label itself as the 'General Principles'. As acknowledged previously, the language can be complex and for many people, especially children, is a new discourse. There is an opportunity to study the new RRSA Standards and compare the finding from this analysis of the Standards to the latest version. Also, this study found a lack of knowledge and understanding regarding the human rights of children whether it is a lack of knowledge where errors have been made in presenting the language of the human rights of children on school websites, or a lack of understanding which has developed a fear of teaching children about their rights. Both issues require support and training. Further research could be carried out to identify the content of teacher education programmes, identifying the incorporation of the Convention, how this is taught, if and how developing an understanding of the Convention is encouraged and does this impact on practice. This could be a future study for research and practice.

The RRSA is attractive to schools, as from the numbers of schools gaining the Award and the way in which they acknowledge their achievement. Much of the marketing of the Award by UNICEF UK, will influence the practice of embedding the Convention into the ethos of the school. As identified in this study, the RRSA has been portrayed as a programme that improves the behaviour of children, increases retention and attainment, and reduces bullying. This can be seen as embedding the human rights of children to support and strengthen a school

paradigm, one in which that does want to share power between the adult and the child but can be seen as trying to do so through tokenism. Research has been carried out with staff and children in Rights Respecting Schools, and the initial findings were presented as positive (Covell, 2010; Sebba & Robinson, 2010; Dunhill; 2016). However, further research has identified superficial and tokenistic practices (Robinson, 2014a, 2014b).

Further longitudinal research could be carried out to identify the journey of a Rights Respecting School and how the ethos is embedded and maintained over time. Also, CDA research would provide a different perspective on the findings provided by participants such as children and adults. CDA would focus on the language presented by participants and how and if this language changes over time.

Finally, this study has identified the language of the human rights of children on six school websites that have achieved the RRSA level 2. It would be interesting to carry out a similar study that includes schools that have not achieved the Award. As identified in this study, the majority of the schools are aligning rights to responsibilities. It would be interesting to identify the use of language, the power dimensions and how those schools reinforce their behaviour expectations or requirements and if they use the term responsibilities.

From my own perspective, I will aim to share these findings with UNICEF UK and will be reflecting on how to carry out some of the proposed further research suggestions above.

Summary

The language used in reference to the human rights of children must be consistent, clearly linked with the original internationally accepted and agreed language that is evident in the Convention. The Convention must be the starting point when presenting the human rights of children, and all further developments of this language must not be exclusionary. Advances should be enhanced to ensure children and adults develop an understanding of not only what rights children have but how children must experience these rights. The inclusion of children in advancing the language of the human rights of children, such as 'translating', is critical. For as this study has identified, the language of the human rights of children can and is being recontextualised by adults in positions of power. This process is leading to the misrepresentation of the human rights of children.

This study has identified the extent to which the language of the Convention was incorporated into the RRSA and then presented on the websites of six schools that had achieved the RRSA level 2. The study has identified that more needs to be done to reduce or stop the recontextualisation of the Convention and the language of the human rights of children as this is distorting the discourse. In analysing the relationship or link between the texts, the process and the social conditions in which they sit (Fairclough, 2001), this study has identified limited intertextuality between the Convention and the RRSA. This could have led to the errors or misrepresentation of the language on the school websites. However, carrying out a CDA allowed me not only to identify the discourse of the human rights of children but also examples of the "power behind the discourse"

(Fairclough, 2015:3) and how the discourse can be recontextualised through school paradigms, using an award or programme.

Fairclough (2015:41) argues that CDA contributes to “critical social analysis” and is a useful way to critique “existing social reality” (Fairclough, 2015:48). Therefore, using CDA in this study to interpret, describe and explain the language of the human rights of children, an existing but complex social reality, has contributed to the development of the human rights of children. I have described the incorporation of the language of the Convention, interpreted the incorporation as intertextuality or recontextualisation and explained how these have impacted on the discourse of the human rights of children and why this seems to happen. In addition, examining the websites for the use of the language of the human rights of children, was helpful from an alternative perspective of research that is not often used outside linguistics (Fairclough, 2015). Using Fairclough’s (1993, 1995, 2001), elements from the analytical phases based on Fairclough’s CDA framework has facilitated my research by exploring the relationships between the ‘text [the language of the human rights of children] and social structures [schools]’ (Fairclough, 2001:117).

Applying CDA has allowed me to systematically focus on specific linguistic items within text to produce meaning that can then be related to social reality (Hardy et al., 2004; Seale, 2004). By applying CDA to the language of the human rights of children presented on the school websites, and focusing on the selection and sequencing of language (Fairclough, 1992, 1995, 2001), I identified the intertextuality and recontextualisation through analysing the word choices of the creators of the school websites (Fairclough, 2015). This allowed me to identify covert representations within the language.

This study has provided insight, developed principles and extended the knowledge base of the language of the human rights of children. However, to have an impact and change social reality for the better, the research needs to be translated into practice. It is hoped that this study will raise the consciousness of how the language of the human rights of children can be manipulated or miscommunicated and how this recontextualisation of the language can empower some (teachers) and disempower others (children) in schools. Through applying CDA, I have analysed and criticised the discourse of the human rights of children in the RRSA and on the school websites. I not only did this to make recommendations for practice but, in due course to change the social reality of how and in what context, children are being taught about their human rights. Also, to empower teachers in schools not to fear rights but to be confident and knowledgeable to embed the Convention into their learning and teaching thoroughly and to ultimately uphold and realise the rights of every child in schools.

References

- Alderson, P. (1999) Human rights and democracy in schools – do they mean more than 'Picking up litter and not killing whales?'. *The International Journal of Children's Rights*, 7, 185-205.
- Archer, M. (1982) Morphogenesis versus structuration: on combining structure and action. *British Journal of Sociology*, 33(4), 455-483.
- Archer, M., Decoteau, C., Gorski, P., Little, D., Porpora, D., Rutzou, T., Smith, C., Steinmetz, G. & Vandenberghe, F. (2016) *What is critical realism? Perspectives Newsletter*. Available online: <http://www.asatheory.org/current-newsletter-online/what-is-critical-realism> [Accessed 280517].
- Archard, D. (2015) *Children: rights and childhood*, 3rd edition. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Archard, D. & Skivenes, M. (2009) Balancing a child's best interests and a child's views. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, 17, 1–21. Available online: <http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/content/journals/10.1163/157181808x358276> [Accessed 061018].
- Argyris, C. (1982) *Reasoning, learning and action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Aries, P. (1960) *Centuries of childhood*. Translated from French by Robert Baldrick, 1973. New York: Random House.
- Armitage, D. (2007) *The Declaration of Independence: a global history*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Ashell, M. (1697) *A serious proposal to the ladies, for the advancement of their true and greatest interest: in two parts*. London: Kings Head. Available online: <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A26092.0001.001?rgn=main;view=fulltext> [Accessed 221017].
- Ball, S. J. (1990) Self-doubt and soft data: social and technical trajectories in ethnographic fieldwork. In Hammersley, M. (ed) *Educational research: current issues*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Beazley H., Bessell, S., Ennew, J. & Waterson R. (2009) The right to be properly researched: research with children in a messy, real world. *Children's Geographies*, 7(4), 365-378. Available online: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14733280903234428?needAccess=true> [Accessed 150318].
- Beigbeder, Y. (1991) *The role and status of international humanitarian volunteers and organizations*. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Bemis (2013) *A review of human rights education in schools in Scotland*. Available online: <http://bemis.org.uk/documents/BEMIS%20HRE%20in%20Schools%20Report.pdf> [Accessed 021117].
- Ben-Arieh, A. & Tarnish, N. (2017) Children's rights and wellbeing. In Ruck, M. D., Peterson-Badali, M. & Freeman, M (eds) *Handbook of children's rights. Global and multidisciplinary perspectives*. Abingdon: Routledge, 68-79.
- Bennett Woodhouse, B. (1994) Out of children's needs, children's rights: the child's voice in defining the family. *Brigham Young University Journal of Public Law*, 8(2), 4. Available online:

<http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1159&context=jpl>
[Accessed 311017].

Bentham, J. (1843) Anarchical fallacies. In Bowring, J. (ed) *The Works of Jeremy Bentham* 1843. New York: Russell and Russell, 489-534.

Bentley, K. (2005) Can there be any universal children's rights?'. *International Journal of Human Rights*, 9(1), 107-123.

Billig, M. (2002) Critical discourse and analysis. In Weiss, G. & Wodak, R. (eds) *CDA and interdisciplinarity*. London: MacMillan.

Black, M. (1986) *The children and the nations: the story of UNICEF*. New York: UNICEF.

Blommaert, J. (2005) *Discourse: a critical introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boersema, D. (2011) *Philosophy of human rights: theory and practice*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Bondi, M. (2007) Key-words and emotions: a case study of the Bloody Sunday Inquiry. In Fairclough, N., Cortese, G. & Ardizzone, P. (eds) *Discourse and contemporary social change*. New York: Peter Lang, 407-432.

Boud, D., Keough, R. & Walker, D. (1996) Promoting reflecting in learning. In Edwards, R., Hanson, A. & Raggart, P. *Boundaries of adult learning*. London: Open University Press.

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992) *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: UCP.

Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983) *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bryman, A. (2012) *Social research methods*, 4th edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bucholtz, M. (2001) Reflexivity and critique in discourse analysis. *Critique of Anthropology*, 21(2), 165-183.

Burchill, R. & Dunhill, A. (2014) Is Wales leading the way in recognising the importance of human rights in the delivery of children's services? In Thomas, M. (ed) *A child's world. Contemporary issues in education*. Aberystwyth: CAA, 21-38.

Burman, E. (1994) *Deconstructing developmental psychology*. London: Routledge.

Callaway, H. (1992) Ethnography and experience: gender implications in fieldwork and texts. In Okely, J. & Callaway, H. (eds) *Anthropology and autobiography*. New York: Routledge, 29-49.

Cantwell, N. (1992) *The origins, development and significance of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Cantwell, N. (2011) Are children's rights still human? In Invernizzi, A. & Williams, J. (eds) *The human rights of children: from visions to implementation*. Farnham Surrey: Ashgate, 37-59.

Chiseri-Strater, E. (1996) Turning in upon ourselves: positionality, subjectivity and reflexivity in case study and ethnographic research. In Mortensen, P. & Kirsch, G. E. (eds) *Ethics and responsibility in qualitative studies of literacy*. Urbana Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 115-133.

- Chouliaraki L. & Fairclough N. (1999) *Discourse in late modernity. Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: EUP.
- Christensen, P. & James, A. (eds) (2000) *Research with Children: perspectives and practices*. London: Falmer Press.
- Clapham, A. (2007) *Human rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coady, M. (2005) The continuing importance of thinking that children have rights. *Australian Journal of Professional and Applied Ethics*, 7, 47-57.
- Cohen, C.P. (2006) The role of the United States in the drafting of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. *Emory International Law Review*, 20(185), 185-192.
- Committee on the Rights of the Child (2003) *General Comment No. 5. General measures of implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child*. (27 November 2003. UN Doc. CRC/GC/2003/5).
- Committee on the Rights of the Child (2013) General Comment No. 14. The right of the child to have his or her best interests taken as a primary consideration. (29 May 2013. UN Doc. CRC/C/GC/14) Available online: https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CR%2fC%2fGC%2f14&Lang=en [Accessed: 150918].
- Concepcion, N. P. (2000) The Convention on the Rights of the Child after ten years: success or failure? *Human Rights Brief*, 7(2), 1-2. Available online: <https://www.wcl.american.edu/hrbrief/v7i2/child10years.htm> [Accessed 300817].
- Coole, D. (1993) *Women in political theory from ancient misogyny to contemporary feminism*. 2nd edition. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester- Wheatsheaf.
- Council of Europe. (2010) *European Convention on Human Rights*. Available online: http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Convention_ENG.pdf [Accessed 291017].
- Covell, K. (2010) School Engagement and Rights Respecting Schools. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 40(1), 39-51.
- Covell, C., Howe, B. R. & McGillivray, A. (2017) Children's education rights in school. In Ruck, M. D., Peterson-Badali, M. & Freeman, M. (eds) *Handbook of children's rights. Global and multidisciplinary perspectives*. Abingdon: Routledge, 296 -311.
- Damon., W. & Gregory. A. (1997) The Youth Charter: towards the formation of adolescent moral identity, *Journal of Moral Education*, 26(2), 117-130. Available online: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/0305724970260201?needAccess=true&instName=University+of+Hull> [Accessed: 120918].
- Davey, C., Burke, T. & Shaw, C. (2010) *Children's participation in decision-making. A children's views report*. London: NCB. Available online: https://www.childrenscommissioner.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Childrens_participation_in_decision-making_-_A_childrens_views_report.pdf [Accessed 170918].
- Denzin, N. (2009) The elephant in the living room: or extending the conversation about the politics of evidence. *Qualitative Research*, 9(2), 139–160.
- Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (2000) Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (eds) *Handbook of qualitative research* 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- De Gaay Fortman, B. (2011) *A political economy of human rights: rights, realities and realization*. London: Routledge.

- DfE (2014) *Promoting fundamental British values as part of SMSC in schools*. London: Crown Copyright.
- DfE (2017) *What maintained schools must publish online*. London: Crown Copyright. Available online: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/what-maintained-schools-must-publish-online#values-and-ethos> [Accessed 290617].
- DfE (2018) *Statutory guidance. National curriculum in England: framework for key stages 1 to 4*. Available online: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-framework-for-key-stages-1-to-4/the-national-curriculum-in-england-framework-for-key-stages-1-to-4> [Accessed 051118].
- Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (2000) Introduction: the discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. Denzin. & Y. Lincoln (eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (2013) *The landscape of qualitative research*. 4th edition. London: Sage.
- Detrick, S. (ed) (1992) *The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Donmoyer, R. (2006) Take my paradigm...please! The legacy of Kuhn's construct in educational research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(1), 11-34.
- Donnelly, J. (1989) *Universal human rights in theory and practice*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Du Gay, P. (1996) *Consumption and identity at work*. London: Sage.
- Dunhill, A. (2016) Does teaching children about human rights, encourage them to practice, protect and promote the rights of others? *Education 3-13*, 46(1), 16-26.
- England, K. V. L. (1994) Getting personal: Reflexivity, positionality, and feminist research. *The Professional Geographer*, 46(1), 80-89.
- Evans, T. (2005) International human rights law as power/knowledge. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 27(3), 1046-1068.
- Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995) *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997) Critical discourse analysis. In van Dijk, T. A. (ed) *Discourse studies. A multidisciplinary introduction, Vol. 2. Discourse as social interaction*. London: Sage, 258-284.
- Fairclough, N. (2001) The discourse of New Labour: critical discourse analysis. In Weatherall, M., Taylor, D. & Yates, S. (eds) *Discourse as data. A guide for analysis*. London: Sage, 229-266.
- Fairclough, N. (2003) *Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2015) *Language and power*, 3rd edition. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Farson, R. (1974) *Birthrights*. New York: Macmillan.
- Fayoyin, A. (2011) Prompting children's rights through the new media. *Journal of Communication*, 2(2), 57-65.
- Fernando, J. (2001) Children's rights: beyond the impasse. *The Annals of the American Academy*, 575(1), 8-24. Available online:

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/000271620157500101> [Accessed 140518].

Finnis, J. (2011) *Natural law and natural rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Flick, U. (2009) *An introduction to qualitative research*, 4th edition. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Flutter, J. (2007) Teacher development and pupil voice. *Curriculum Journal*. 18, 343-354. Available online: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249016393_Teacher_Development_and_Pupil_Voice [Accessed 171018].

Foley, P., Roche, J. & Tucker W. (eds) (2001) *Children in society*. Basingstoke: Palgrave/Open University.

Fottrell, D. (ed) (2000) *Revisiting children's rights: 10 years of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.

Foucault, M. (1976) Two Lectures. Translated from French by C, Gordon., L, Marshall., J, Mepham., & K, Soper, 1980. In Gordon, C, (ed) *Power/knowledge: selected writings and other interviews 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon Books, 78-108.

Freeman, M. (1994) The philosophical foundations of human rights. *Human Rights Quarterly*. 16, 491-514.

Freeman, M. (1996) *Children's rights*. Ashgate: Dartmouth.

Freeman, M. (1997) *The moral status of children. Essays on the rights of the child*. The Hague, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Freeman, M. (2002) *Human rights: an interdisciplinary approach*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Freeman, M. (2009) Children's rights as human rights: reading the UNCRC. In Qvortrup, J., Corsaro, W. A. & Honig, M. (eds) *The Palgrave handbook of childhood*. London: Palgrave, 377-393.

Freeman, M. (2011) The value and values of children's rights. In Invernizzi, A. & Williams, J. (eds) *The human rights of children: from visions to implementation*. Farnham Surrey: Ashgate, 21-36.

Freire, P. (1986) *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Fremont-Barnes, G. (ed) (2007) *Encyclopaedia of the age of political revolutions and new ideologies, 1760-1815*. Westport, United States: Greenwood Press.

Gee, J. P. (2005) *An introduction to discourse analysis: theory and method*. New York: Routledge.

Gerber, P. (2008) *From convention to classroom: the long road to human rights education. Measuring States' compliance with international law obligations. Mandating human rights education*. Saarbrücken, Germany: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller Aktiengesellschaft.

Gibbs, G. (1998) *Learning by doing: a guide to teaching and learning methods*. London: FEU.

Gillett-Swan, J. & Coppock, V. (2016) *Children's rights, educational research and the UNCRC*. Oxford: Symposium.

Goodall, H.L. (2000) *Writing the new ethnography*. New York: Alta Mira Press.

- Gorski, P. (2008) The ECPRES model: a critical realist approach to causal mechanisms in the social sciences. In Wittrock, B. & Hedström, P. (eds) *The frontiers of sociology*. Leiden: Brill, 147-194.
- Grant, D. & Hardy, C. (2003) Introduction: struggles with organizational discourse. *Organization Studies*, 25(1), 5–13.
- Gray, D.E. (2004) *Doing research in the real world*. London: Sage.
- Grbich, C. (2013) *Qualitative data analysis*, 2nd edition. London: Sage.
- Grugel, J., & Piper, N. (2007) *Critical perspectives on global governance: rights and regulation in governing regimes*. London: Routledge.
- Guba, E. G. (ed) (1990) *The paradigm dialog*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005) Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (eds) *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 191-215.
- Guggenheim, M. (2007) *What's wrong with children's rights?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1981) *Reason and the rationalization of society, volume 1 of the theory of communicative action*. Translated from German by T. McCarthy, 1984. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1985) *The philosophical discourse of modernity*. Translated from German by F.G. Lawrence, 1987. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hagglund, S. & Thelander, N. (2011) Children's rights at 21: policy, theory, practice. *Education Inquiry*, 2(3), 365-372.
- Hammersley, M. (2007) The issue of quality in qualitative research. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 30(3), 287–305.
- Hanson, K. & Lundy, L. (2017) Does exactly what it says on the tin? *International Journal of Children's Rights*, 25, 285-306.
- Hanson, K. & Nieuwenhuys, O. (eds) (2013) *Reconceptualising children's rights in international development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haraway, D.J. (1991) *Simians, cyborgs and women: the reinvention of nature*. London: Free Association Books.
- Hardy, C., Grant, D., Keenoy, T., Oswick, C. & Phillips, N. (eds) (2004) *Organization Studies, Special Issue on Organizational Discourse*, 25(1).
- Hastrup, K. (1992) Writing ethnography: state of the art. In Okely, J., & Callaway, H. (eds) *Anthropology and autobiography*. London: Routledge.
- Hodge & Kress G. (1988) *Social semiotics*. London: Routledge.
- Holt, J. (2013) *Escape from childhood: the needs and rights of children*, 2nd edition. Medford, MA: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.
- Horn, S. S., Peter. C. & Russell. S. T. (2017) The right to be who you are. In Ruck, M. D., Peterson-Badali, M., & Freeman, M. (eds) *Handbook of children's rights. Global and multidisciplinary perspectives*. Abingdon: Routledge, 221-238.
- Howe, B., & Covell. K. (2010) Miseducating children about their rights. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 5(2), 91–102. Available online: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1746197910370724> [Accessed 150718].

- Human Rights Watch (2014) *25th anniversary of the Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Available online: <https://www.hrw.org/news/2014/11/17/25th-anniversary-convention-rights-child> [Accessed 301116].
- Humphrey, C. (2013) A paradigmatic map of professional education research. *Social Work Education*, 32(1) 3-16.
- Humanium (2017) *Together for children's rights*. Available online: <http://www.humanium.org/en/childrens-rights-history/> [Accessed 040518].
- Hunt, L. (2007) *Inventing human rights, a history*. New York: Norton.
- Hunt Botting, E. (2014) Thomas Paine among early feminists. In Shapiro, I., & Callvert, E. *Selected writings of Thomas Paine*. Connecticut: Yale University Press, 630-654.
- Husak, D. (1984) Why there are no human rights. *Social Theory*, 10(2), 125-141. Available online: https://www.pdcnet.org/pdc/bvdb.nsf/purchase?openform&fp=soctheorpract&id=soctheorpract_1984_0010_0002_0125_0142 [Accessed 161017].
- l'Anson, J. (2016) UNCRC at 25: a critical assessment of achievements and trajectories with reference to educational research. In Gillett-Swan, J., & Coppock, V. (eds) *Children's rights, educational research and the UNCRC*. Oxford: Symposium, 17-37.
- International Labour Office (1999) *Children at work*. (CONDI/T/1979/12/E (Rev.)). Available online: http://staging.ilo.org/public/libdoc/ilo/1979/79B09_979_engl.pdf [Accessed 250817].
- Invernizzi., A. & Williams, J. (eds) (2011) *The human rights of children: from visions to implementation*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate.
- Ishay, M. (2004) *The history of human rights: from ancient times to the globalization era*. California: University of California Press.
- James, A. & Prout, A. (1990) *Constructing and reconstructing childhood*. London: Falmer Press.
- Jäger, C. & Maier, F. (2009) Theoretical and methodological aspects of Foucauldian critical discourse analysis and dispositive analysis. In Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (eds) *Methods for critical discourse analysis*, 2nd edition. London: Sage, 34-61.
- Jellinek, G. & Farrand, M. (2009) *The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of Citizens: a contribution to modern constitutional history*. New York: World Library Classics.
- Jerome, L., Emerson, L., Lundy, L. & Orr, K. (2015) *Teaching and learning about child rights: a study of implementation in 26 countries*. Queens University Belfast and UNICEF: Belfast and Geneva. Available online: www.unicef.org/crc/files/CHILD_RIGHTS_EDUCATION_STUDY_final.pdf [Accessed 140417].
- Jones, T. (2017) Unsatisfactory progress: Article 12 and pupil participation in English schools. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, 25, 68-84.
- Kanyal, M. (ed) (2014) *Children's rights 0-8. Promoting participation in education and care*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Kellett, M. (2010) *Rethinking children and research: attitudes in contemporary society*. London: Continuum.
- Kerr, P. (2003) Keeping it real! Evolution in political science: a reply to Kay and Curry. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 5(1), 118-128.

- Knutsson, K. E. (1997) *Children: noble causes or worthy citizens?* New York: UNICEF.
- Kompridis, N. (2006) *Critique and disclosure: critical theory between past and future.* Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Kruk, E. (2010) Parental and social institutional responsibilities to children's needs in the divorce transition. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 18(2), 159-178.
- Kundera, M. (1988) *Immortality.* Translated from Czech by P Kussi, 1991. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Ladd, R. (2017) Philosophical perspectives. In Ruck, M. D., Peterson-Badali, M. & Freeman, M. (eds) *Handbook of children's rights. Global and multidisciplinary perspectives.* Abingdon: Routledge, 149-162.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated learning. Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.
- League of Nations (1924) *Declaration of the Rights of the Child.* Available online: <http://www.un-documents.net/gdrc1924.htm> [Accessed 160717].
- LeBlanc, L. J. (1995) *The Convention on the Rights of the Child. United Nations law-making on human rights.* Lincoln, USA; University Nebraska Press.
- Lee, S. (1962) *Spider-Man! Amazing fantasy.* Marvel Comics, 15 August. New York: Marvel.
- Letherby, G. (2013) Theorised subjectivity. In Letherby, G., Scott, J., & Williams, M. (eds) *Objectivity and subjectivity in social research.* London: Sage, 79-102.
- Liebel, M. (2012) *Children's rights from below.* Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (2000) Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (eds) *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 163-188.
- Little, D. (2016) *New directions in the philosophy of social science.* London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Luke, A. (1997) Theory and practice in critical science discourse. In Saha, L. (ed) *International encyclopaedia of the sociology of education.* New York: Pergamon, 50-56. Available online: <http://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/ed270/Luke/SAHA6.html> [Accessed 14/11/16].
- Luke, A. (2002) Beyond science and ideology critique: developments in critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 96-110.
- Lundy, L. (2007) 'Voice' is not enough: conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. *British Educational Research Journal*, 33 (6), 927-942. Available online: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01411920701657033> [Accessed 040518].
- Lundy, L. (2012) Children's rights and education policy in Europe: the implementation of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. *Oxford Review of Education*, 38(4), 393-411.
- Lundy L. (2014) United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and child well-being. In, Ben-Arieh, A., Casas F., Frønes I. & Korbin J. (eds) *Handbook of Child Well-Being.* Dordrecht: Springer, 2439-2462.
- Lundy, L. & Martínez Sainz, G. (2018) The role of law and legal knowledge for a transformative human rights education: addressing violations of children's rights in

- formal education. *Human Rights Education Review*, 01-24. Available online: <https://journals.hioa.no/index.php/human/article/view/2560> [Accessed 221018].
- Macdonald, D., Kirk, D., Metzler, M., Nigles, L.M., Schempp, P. & Wright, J. (2002) It's all very well, in theory: theoretical perspectives and their applications in contemporary pedagogical research. *QUEST*, 54, 133–156.
- MacIntyre, A. (2007) *After virtue. A study in moral theory*, 3rd edition. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Merriam, S. B., Johnson-Bailey, J., Lee, M., Kee, Y., Ntseane, Y. & Muhamad, M. (2001) Power and positionality: negotiating insider/outsider status within and across cultures. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 20(5),405-416.
- Miles, M. M. & Huberman, A.M. (1994) *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Miljeteig-Olssen, P. (1990) Advocacy of children's rights: The Convention as more than a legal document. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 12, 148-155.
- Miller, E. (2016) Making sense of the brutality of the Holocaust: critical themes and new perspectives. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 151 (1), 88-106. Available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00223980.2016.1217191> [Accessed: 270917].
- Milne, A. J. M. (1986) *Human rights and human diversity*. Basingstoke: MacMillan Press.
- Mulley, C. (2009) *The woman who saved the children: a biography of Eglantyne Jebb, founder of Save the Children*. London: Oneworld Publications.
- Neill, A., S. (1975) *A Dominie's Log (1916)*. New York: Hart.
- Nickel, J. (1987) *Making sense of human rights: philosophical reflections on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. California: University of California Press.
- Nieuwenhuys, O. (1998) Global childhood and the politics of contempt, alternatives. *Global, Local, Political*, 23, 267-290.
- Northedge, F. S. (1986) *The League of Nations: Its life and times, 1920–1946*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- OHCHR (2007) *Legislative history of the Convention on the rights of the child. Volume I*. Geneva: United Nations.
- OHCHR (2008) *Guidelines on determining the best interests of the child*. Geneva, Switzerland: OHCHR.
- OHCHR (2017) *Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Available online: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CRC.aspx> [Accessed 030917].
- OHCHR (2018) *Human Rights Treaty Bodies - General Comments*. Available online: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/hrbodies/pages/tbgeneralcomments.aspx> [Accessed 121118].
- Orend, B. (2002) *Human rights. Concept and content*. Ormskirk: Broadway Press.
- Osler, A. & Starkey, H. (2010) *Teacher education and human rights*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.
- Osler, A. (2016) *Human rights and schooling. An ethical framework for teaching for social justice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Paine, T. (1776) *Common sense*. Available online: https://www.learner.org/workshops/primarysources/revolution/docs/Common_Sense.pdf [Accessed 201017].
- Paine, T. (1791) *The rights of man*. Available online: https://www.ucc.ie/archive/hdsp/Paine_Rights_of_Man.pdf [Accessed 201017].
- Parkes, R.J. (2012) *What is Poststructuralism?* [eBook]. Academic Bytes. [Accessed 180917].
- Parliament of England. (1689) *English Bill of Rights*. Available online: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/WillandMarSess2/1/2/introduction> [Accessed 161017].
- Pennycook, A. (2001) *Critical applied linguistics: a critical introduction*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Phillips, L. G. (2016) Educating children and young people on the UNCRC: actions, avoidance and awakenings. In, Gillett-Swan, J. & Coppock, V. *Children's Rights Educational Research and the UNCRC*. Oxford: Symposium Books, 39-60.
- Phillips, N. & Hardy, C. (2002) *Discourse analysis: investigating processes of social construction. Qualitative Research Methods Series 50*. London: Sage.
- Pillow, W. (2010) Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(2), 175-196.
- Potter, J. (1996) Discourse analysis and constructionist approaches: theoretical background. In Richardson, J. (ed) *Handbook of qualitative research methods for psychology and the social sciences*. Leicester: British Psychological Society, 125-140.
- Rasmussen, D.M. (ed) (1996) *The handbook of critical theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Reynaert, D., Bouverne-de-Bie, M. & Vandeveld, S. (2009) A review of children's rights literature since the adoption of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. *Childhood*, 16(4), 518-534.
- Reynolds, J.M. (2004) Pragmatic humanism in Foucault's later work. *University of Alberta Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue Canadienne de Science Politique*, 37(4), December/décembre, 951-977. Available online: <http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayFulltext?type=1&fid=328111&jid=CJP&volumeId=37&issueId=04&aid=328110&bodyId=&membershipNumber=&societyETOCSession> [Accessed 261116].
- Robinson, C. (2014a) Children, their voices and their experiences of school: what does the evidence tell us? CPRT research Survey 2. Cambridge Primary Review Trust. Available online: <https://cprtrust.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/FINAL-VERSION-Carol-Robinson-Children-their-Voices-and-their-Experiences-of-School.pdf> [Accessed 140618].
- Robinson, C. (2014b) Developing mutually respectful adult-child relationships in schools: is this a reality experienced equally by all pupils? *Research Intelligence*, 18-19. Available online: <https://research.brighton.ac.uk/en/publications/developing-mutually-respectful-adult-child-relationships-in-school> [Accessed 141118].
- Robson, C. (2002) *Real world research*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rousseau, J. J. (1762a) *The social contract*. Translated from French by H.J. Tozer, 1895. Available online: https://www.ucc.ie/archive/hdsp/Rousseau_contrat-social.pdf [Accessed 231017].

Rousseau, J. J. (1762b) *Emile, or education*. Translated from French by B Foxley, 1911. Available online: <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/rousseau-emile-or-education> [Accessed 231017].

Ruck, M., Abramovitch, R. & Keating, D. (1998) Children's and adolescents' understanding of rights: balancing nurturance and self-determination. *Child Development*, vol. 69, No. 2, April, 404-417. Available online: www.jstor.org/stable/1132174 [Accessed 091117].

Sack, R.D. (1974) Chorology and special analysis'. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 64(3), 439-452.

Sanders, B. J. (2017) Words matter: textual abuse of childhood in the English-speaking world, and the role of language in the continuing denial of children's rights. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, 25, 519-536. Available online: <http://booksandjournals.brillonline.com/content/journals/10.1163/15718182-02502010?showFullText=pdf> [Accessed 131118].

Save the Children (2017) *History: timeline*. Available online: <http://www.savethechildren.org/site/c.8rKLIXMGIpI4E/b.6229507/k.C571/History.htm> [Accessed 170817].

Sayer, A. (2000) *Realism and social science*. London: Sage.

Scheurich, J. J. (1994) Social relativism: a postmodernist epistemology for educational administration. In Maxcy, S. J. (ed) *Postmodern school leadership: meeting the crisis in educational administration*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 17-46.

Schröder, H. (1989) The Declaration of Human and Civil Rights for Women (Paris, 1791) by Olympe de Gouges', *History of European Ideas*, 11:1-6, 263-271. Available online: [http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1016/0191-6599\(89\)90215-5](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1016/0191-6599(89)90215-5) [Accessed 161017].

Seale, C. (2004) *Social research methods: a reader*. London: Routledge.

Sebba, J. & Robinson, C. (2010) *Evaluation of UNICEF UK's Rights Respecting Schools Award*. Available online: http://www.unicef.org.uk/Documents/Education-Documents/RRSA_Evaluation_Report.pdf [Accessed 230315].

Sen, A. (2004) Elements of a theory of human rights. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 32(4), 315-356. Available online: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/3557992.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A9964fe9c6d21bea1617d4aa3ceddbbaa> [Accessed 291017].

Sharp, L. & Richardson, T. (2001) Reflections on Foucauldian discourse analysis in planning and environmental policy research. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 3, 193-209.

Shier, H. (2018) Towards a new improved pedagogy of "children's rights and responsibilities". *International Journal of Children's Rights*, 26 (4), 761-780. Available online: https://brill.com/view/journals/chil/26/4/article-p761_761.xml?rskey=TvPEFk&result=2 [Accessed 291118].

St. Louis, K. & Barton, A. C. (2002) Tales from the science education crypt: a critical reflection of positionality, subjectivity, and reflexivity in research. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research Sozialforschung*, 3(3), 19. Available online: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/832> [Accessed 061017].

Struthers, A. (2014) Human rights education: education about, through and for human rights', *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 19(1), 53-73.

- Thelander, N. (2016) Human rights education: teaching children's human rights – a matter of why, what and how. In Gillett-Swan, J. & Coppock, V. (eds) *Children's rights, educational research and the UNCRC*. Oxford: Symposium, 61-79.
- Tierney, B. (1997) *The idea of natural rights*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Trifonas, P. P. (2009) Deconstructing research: paradigms lost. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 32(3), 297-308.
- Trivers, H. & Starkey, H. (2012) The politics of critical citizenship education: human rights for conformity or emancipation? In Mitchell, R. C. & Moore, S. A. (eds) *Politics, participation and power relations: transdisciplinary approaches to critical citizenship in the classroom and community*. Rotterdam: Sense, 137-152.
- Trolley, H. (1989) *The UN Commission on Human Rights*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- UNESCO (1981) *Question of a Convention on the Rights of the Child: report of the working group on a draft Convention on the Rights of the Child*. (17 February 1981. UN Doc. E/CN.4/L.1575).
- UNESCO (1989) *Question of a Convention on the Rights of the Child: Report of the Working Group on a Draft Convention on the Rights of the Child*. (2 March 1989. UN Doc. E/CN.4/1989/48).
- UNESCO (2017) *What do we mean by 'youth'?* Available online: <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/youth/youth-definition/> [Accessed 201118].
- UN General Assembly (1948) *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Available online: <http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/> [Accessed 221017].
- UN General Assembly (1966) *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. Available online: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CCPR.aspx> [Accessed: 291017].
- UNICEF (1989) The UN Convention on the rights of the child. Available online: www.unicef.org/why/why_rights.html [Accessed 011217].
- UNICEF UK (2011) Child rights education toolkit: rooting child rights in early childhood education, primary and secondary schools. Available online: https://www.unicef.org/crc/files/UNICEF_CRE_Toolkit_FINAL_web_version170414.pdf [Accessed 110717].
- UNICEF (2014) *Rights under the Convention on the rights of the child*. Available online: https://www.unicef.org/crc/index_30177.html [Accessed 300817]
- UNICEF (2015) *UNICEF, our history: past, present and future*. Available online: https://www.unicef.org/about/who/index_history.html [Accessed 300817]
- UNICEF (n.d.) *Fact sheet: a summary of the rights under the Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Available online: https://www.unicef.org/crc/files/Rights_overview.pdf [Accessed 190718].
- UNICEF UK (2009) *UNICEF UK Rights Respecting School Award: a quick guide*. Available online: <http://www.unicef.org.uk/rrsa> [Accessed 170216].
- UNICEF UK (2015a) *Rights Respecting Schools Award (RRSA)* Available online: https://www.unicef.org.uk/rights-respecting-schools/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2014/12/RRSA_Level2_expected_outcomes.pdf [Accessed 150517].

UNICEF UK (2015b) *Rights Respecting Schools Award (RRSA) Good Practice, developing a strong RRSA profile and its impact*. Available online: https://www.unicef.org.uk/rights-respecting-schools/about-the-award/impact-on-schools/rrsa-good-practice-review/?utm_source=shorturl&utm_medium=shorturl&utm_campaign=shorturl&utm_content=shorturl-rrsa-good-practice [Accessed 150517].

UNICEF UK (2016) *Impact report. Rights Respecting Schools Award 2016*. Available online: <https://www.unicef.org.uk/rights-respecting-schools/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2016/08/Impact-Report.pdf> [Accessed 120118].

UNICEF UK (2017) *UNICEF UK Rights Respecting Schools Award*. Available online: <https://www.unicef.org.uk/rights-respecting-schools/> [Accessed 050517].

UNICEF UK (n.d.a) *Our rights. CRC summary*. PDF. Available online: https://www.unicef.org.uk/rights-respecting-schools/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2016/10/Our-rights_CRC-summary.pdf [Accessed 110818].

UNICEF UK. (n.d.b) *Myths and misconceptions about the Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Available online: <https://www.unicef.org.uk/rights-respecting-schools/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/10/Myths-and-Misconceptions.pdf> [Accessed 121118].

United Nations (1959) *Declaration of the Rights of the Child*. Available online: [http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Education/Training/Compilation/Pages/1DeclarationoftheRightsoftheChild\(1959\).aspx](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Education/Training/Compilation/Pages/1DeclarationoftheRightsoftheChild(1959).aspx) [Accessed 120517].

United Nations (1965) *International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination*. (21 December 1965, UN Treaty Series Vol 660, page 195). Available online: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/cerd.aspx> [Accessed 051118].

United Nations (1979) *Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women*. UN Doc. A/34/46. Available online: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/cedaw.aspx> [Accessed 051118].

United Nations (1989) *The Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Available online: https://treaties.un.org/doc/Treaties/1990/09/19900902%2003-14%20AM/Ch_IV_11p.pdf [Accessed 130417]

United Nations (1993) *Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action*. (25 June 1993, UN Doc. A/CONF. 157/24). Available online: <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/FactSheet10rev.1en.pdf> [Accessed 030917].

United Nations (2014) *25 Years of the Convention on the Rights of the Child: is the world a better place for children?* New York: UNICEF. Available online: http://www.unicef.org/publications/files/CRC_at_25_Anniversary_Publication_compilation_5Nov2014.pdf [Accessed 031216].

United Nations (2018a) *Youth 2030. United Nations Youth Strategy*. Available online: https://www.un.org/ecosoc/sites/www.un.org.ecosoc/files/18-00080_un-youth-strategy_web.pdf [Accessed 140818].

United Nations (2018b) *What is the difference between signing, ratification and accession of UN treaties?* Available online: <http://ask.un.org/faq/14594> [Accessed 121218].

United Nations (n.d.a) *History of the United Nations*. Available from: <http://www.un.org/en/sections/history/history-united-nations/> [Accessed 210817].

- United Nations (n.d.b) *About UN membership*. Available online: <http://www.un.org/en/sections/member-states/about-un-membership/index.html> [Accessed 260917].
- United States Continental Congress (1776) *The United States Declaration of Independence*. Available online: <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript> [Accessed 161017].
- University of Virginia (n.d.) *UN human rights treaty. Travaux Préparatoires. Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Available online: <http://hr-travaux.law.virginia.edu/international-conventions/convention-rights-child-crc> [Accessed 3300917].
- Van Bueren, G. (1998) *The international law on the rights of the child*. London: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1995) Aims of critical discourse analysis. *Japanese Discourse*, 1, 17-27.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2008) *Discourse and practice. New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Veerman, P. & Levine, H. (2000) Implementing children's rights on a local level: narrowing the gap between Geneva and the grassroots. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, 8(4), 373–384.
- Verhellen, E. (2006) *Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Antwerp: Garant Publishers.
- Waldron, J. (2002) *God, Locke and equality: Christian foundations of Locke's political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Waldron, F. & Oberman, R. (2016) Responsible citizens? How children are conceptualised as rights holders in Irish primary schools. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 20(6), 744-760. Available online: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13642987.2016.1147434?needAccess=true> [Accessed 160918].
- Weiss, G. & Wodak, R. (eds) (2003) *Critical discourse analysis: theory and interdisciplinarity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wells, K. (2015) *Childhood in a global perspective*, 2nd edition. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Whitty, G. (2006) Educational research and education policy making: is conflict inevitable? *British Educational Research Journal*, 32(2), 159-176.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1995) Discourse analysis: a critical view. *Language and Literature*, 4(3), 157-172.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1998) The theory and practice of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Applied Linguistics*. 19(1), 136-151.
- Wingersky, J., Boerner, J. & Holguin-Balogh, D. (2009) *Writing paragraphs and essays: integrating reading, writing, and grammar skills*, 6th edition. Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage.
- Wodak, R. (1995) Critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis. In Verschuren, J., Ostman, J. & Blommaert, J. (eds) *Handbook of pragmatics- manual*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 204-210.
- Wodak, R. (2001). The discourse-historical approach. In Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (eds) *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage, 63–95.

- Wodak, R. (2002) Aspects of critical discourse analysis. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Linguistik*, 36, 5-31. Available online: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.121.1792&rep=rep1&type=pdf> [Accessed 121218].
- Wodak, R. (2004) Critical discourse analysis. In, Seale, C., Giampietro Gobo, G., Gubrium, J.F. & Silverman D. *Qualitative research practice*. London: Sage, 186-202.
- Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2009) *Methods for critical discourse analysis*, 2nd edition. London: Sage.
- Wolgast, E. (1987) Wrong Rights. *Hypatia* 2(1), 25-43. Available online: <https://philpapers.org/rec/WOLWR> [Accessed 171017].
- Wollstonecraft, M. (1792) *A vindication of the rights of woman*. London: Joseph Johnson. Available online: https://books.google.co.uk/books/about/A_Vindication_of_the_Rights_of_Woman.html?id=tlo-QAAMAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=kp_read_button&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Rousseau&f=false [Accessed 221017].
- Woodiwiss, A. (2006) The law cannot be enough: human rights and the limits of legalism. In Meckled-Garcia, S. & Cah, B. (eds) *The legalisation of human rights: multidisciplinary perspectives on human rights and human rights law*. London: Routledge, 32-48.