

THE CVS STUDY



Erasmus+ Project 2018-1-IT02-KA201-048371



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	3
PREFACE	4
THE CVS STUDY	7
1. Overview of the CVS Study.....	7
2. Teacher’s opinions of the training sessions	7
2.1 Session 1 of training	7
2.2. Session 2 of training	10
3. Changes in Teachers’ values, attitudes, knowledge, and skills	10
4. Changes in Children’s values, attitudes, knowledge, and skills	18
4.1 Participants	18
4.2 Materials	18
4.3 Procedure	19
4.4 Findings	20
4.5 Reach of the Curriculum.....	24
5. Parents’ Opinions	24
6. Evaluation of the App	25
7. Summary	25

The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The CVS Study was developed by:

Harriet Tenenbaum
Sonia Ingoglia
Nicolò Iannello
Cristiano Inguglia
Francesca Liga
Alida Lo Coco
Maria Grazia Lo Cricchio
Nora Wiium
Martyn Barrett

With the collaboration of:

Beathe-Kathrine Aasheim Moe
Rosanna Balistreri
Miriam Barrachina Peris
Silvia Blasco
Maria Magdalena Bordas
Veneta Chobova
Maria Asunta D'Aleo
Martina Di Marco
Mercè Garreta Papaceit
Borislava Ivancheva
Vasilka Kolovska
Anamaria Marina
George Marina
Cornelia Melcu
Maria Andrada Muntean
Kristine Myklebust
Pietro Sardina
Giovanna Sciortino
Anita Shepherd
Mihai Stoica
Henrik Skjerlie Daae



PREFACE

The **CVS Outputs** have been developed in the context of the Erasmus+ project *Children's Voices for a new Human Space (CVS)*¹, lasting from September 1 2018 to August 31 2021. They comprise: the CVS Training Course for Teachers, the CVS Curriculum for Children, the CVS App, and the CVS Study².

The CVS Outputs implement the Council of Europe (CoE) *Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture* (RFCDC; Barrett, 2020; Barrett et al., 2018a, 2018b, 2018c) – which provides materials that can be used to promote in young people the democratic and intercultural competences which citizens require in order to participate effectively in a culture of democracy – in the context of primary education³.

To achieve the overall aim of fostering the democratic and intercultural (DI) competences of children and teachers in the primary school context, four related intellectual outputs were developed and utilized in the CVS project: (a) a training course for teachers, (b) a curriculum for children, (c) an app for trainers and teachers, and (d) a scientific study.

The strengths on which the CVS Outputs are based comprise:

- a strong theoretical framework: they implement the CoE's RFCDC in the context of primary school education;
- the international and multidisciplinary nature of the development team: it includes the lead author of the RFCDC, Martyn Barrett, seven researchers, two trainers, fifteen primary school teachers, an urban planner, and two IT technicians, coming from six European countries;
- teachers' and children's involvement in the CVS Outputs revision;
- a powerful system of (teaching and learning) evaluation and (pupil) assessment based on the RFCDC;
- the integration of IT in the training, the curriculum and their evaluation and assessment system.

The **CVS Training Course for Teachers** comprises a series of activities brought together to empower teachers responsible for the teaching of the CVS Curriculum, by

¹ 2018-1-IT02-KA201-048371 , <https://www.cvs-project.eu/>

² <https://www.cvs-project.eu/intellectual-output/>

³ <https://www.coe.int/en/web/campaign-free-to-speak-safe-to-learn/reference-framework-of-competences-for-democratic-culture>

equipping them with DI competences. It is organized in two programmes, each lasting one week. Activities of the two-week training programme promote competences (for example, Openness to cultural otherness, Analytical and critical thinking skills, Empathy, Flexibility and adaptability) derived from the CoE's RFCDC. The University of Palermo has coordinated its development and implementation in collaboration with Associazione Identità, Sviluppo, Integrazione Onlus (ISI).

The **CVS Curriculum for Children** reflects a series of activities that allow 9- to 10-year-old pupils to actively exercise their DI competences at school and in their local communities through urban regeneration activities, making their voices heard about their needs, views and dreams regarding their closest "urban" spaces. It is based on the main idea that children belong to different groups and communities and they have to take on the responsibility of each of them; adults caring for pupils have to help them in doing this. Adults can help pupils to manage this responsibility adequately starting from closer contexts (for example, the school) to further contexts (for example, the town). Children are not the citizens of the future - they are already citizens, and their voices need to be heard by policy-makers. They need to be protagonists able to express their needs, views and dreams about urban spaces in dialogue with local administrations. In order to do that, the CVS Curriculum foresees the involvement of local policy-makers dealing with the urban sector with whom pupils can discuss their own proposals.

The Curriculum is a biennial course that is taught in two modules: (a) Module 1 "Our voices for our schools", (b) Module 2 "Our voices for our towns". Module 1 has been developed according to a project-based learning approach and Module 2 according to a service-based learning approach. Both modules are expressed in the five steps of Experience, Comparison, Analysis, Reflection and Action and are taught over an entire school year.

The CVS Curriculum also foresees a system of:

- teaching and learning evaluation, that is the observation and measurement of the effectiveness of a specific activity and the whole programme of study,
- assessment of children's degree of proficiency in democratic and intercultural competences.

The University of Palermo has coordinated its development and implementation in collaboration with ISI.

The **CVS App** is an IT tool put together for allowing the online methodological supervision of trainers and teachers during the implementation of the CVS Training and the CVS Curriculum, respectively.

Its two main functions are to provide:

- an electronic "how-to manual" for the use of the CVS Training Course and the CVS Curriculum,
- an evaluation and assessment tool for trainers and teachers as well as evaluation results for CVS researchers.

The CVS App works on desktop, laptop, tablet and mobile, and is accessible with login information via the CVS website: www.cvs-project.eu.

RODAX is responsible for the development and management of the CVS App.

The **CVS Study** embraces all research activities of the CVS project and has the general goal of testing the efficacy of the CVS Training Course, the CVS Curriculum, and the CVS App. Specifically, the study aims to investigate:

- teachers' DI competences before and after the Training Course,
- children's DI competences before and after being taught the CVS Curriculum,
- teachers' satisfaction with the CVS App,
- parents' knowledge, skills and attitudes toward DI education as well as scholastic communities' views about DI education.

The University of Surrey is the coordinator for the CVS research activities.

The CVS Outputs can be downloaded and consulted at the following link:
<https://www.cvs-project.eu/intellectual-output/>



THE CVS STUDY

1. Overview of the CVS Study

This report describes the CVS study, which used the techniques of focus group and questionnaire. There are five components to assessing the project. First, we assessed teachers' opinions of the training curriculum. Second, we investigated change in teachers' values, attitudes, knowledge, and skills from involvement in the delivering the curriculum. Third, we assessed change in children's values, attitudes, knowledge, and skills from participation in learning the curriculum. Fourth, we assessed parents' (of children in the intervention schools) own opinions and their opinions of the training programme. Finally, we assessed the app.

2. Teacher's opinions of the training sessions

2.1 Session 1 of training

Teachers were trained on the curriculum for two weeks, once in March 2019 and again in September 2019. We conducted two focus groups at the end of the first training in Mezdra, Bulgaria in March 2019 and in addition, we distributed a questionnaire after the second training in Bagheria in September 2019. The teachers were generally positive as reported by the focus group and questionnaires.

Harriet Tenenbaum and Nora Wiium held two focus group sessions with teachers in Mezdra, Bulgaria in Spring 2018 after the initial training sessions. Teachers were from Italy, Bulgaria, Spain, Romania, and Norway. The focus groups explored how teachers found their experience at the training course. Each focus group lasted about 45 minutes. One had 4 teachers and the other had 6 teachers.

The following questions were asked of teachers:

- 1) *What did you think of the training?*
- 2) *Which activities were useful? Why?*
- 3) *Which were not useful? Why? How would you change them?*
- 4) *Which activities do you believe addressed the competences?*
- 5) *Which activities would you like to see?*
- 6) *Do you have suggestions for activities in the future?*
- 7) *Was the length of the training appropriate? How would you change it?*
- 8) *What suggestions to you have for future training?*

Four main themes regarding their experience, especially whether they found it useful and why, were identified in the analysis. The first theme converged on the overall enjoyable experience that the participants reported. This theme was linked to the second theme, which highlighted that the teachers appreciated the activities' practical aspects. The third theme focused on the activities' multiple benefits for their schoolchildren, another aspect of why the teachers found the course useful. The fourth theme underlined how cultural differences enhanced the teachers' overall experience, despite posing both challenges and benefits to their training.

First, the main theme 'enjoyable experience' was created because teachers reported many positive comments towards both the activities they learned and the overall experience. For example, *"I think they have done a great job and I think they have found activities to practice on and to fit right in...I think that it is easy to adapt the activities so for me it has been very interesting and meaningful so I am looking forward to next time"* (Teacher B). This quote tells us that the participant found their time at the training worthwhile, as they note it was 'interesting and meaningful.' It also begins to give insight to the varying features that made the experience enjoyable, including the suitability and the adaptivity of the activities. Another aspect of enjoyability came from appreciation for the leaders of the training programme and their delivery of the activities. One teacher expressed, *"the way Nicolò and Maria do the classes they are dynamic classes and you are not made to be bored in their classes"* (Teacher A). This quote demonstrates that this participant felt that the course was entertaining, and appreciates it is so specifically because of the way the course leaders delivered it. Further praise was given, *"I think they did a great job of including the group and made us, you know they swap all the time and made us a group and they include everyone"* (Teacher A). This quote suggests that this teacher appreciated the inclusiveness and community-driven approach to the course; this could link to the final theme which discusses how some teachers found cultural barriers with other teachers to be a challenge but seemed to overcome it easily. Overall, it seems that part of the reason teachers expressed an enjoyable experience was due to the course's usefulness and effectiveness, for example the leaders' delivery, the inclusiveness, and adaptivity of the activities all enhanced their experience as well as the functionality of the activities learned. Some of these specific aspects are further explored in the next themes.

The second theme, 'appreciation of activities' practical aspects' links back to the enjoyability explained in the first theme. This theme explores the specific features of the activities that the teachers found useful. For example, in response to being asked for initial general feedback, Teacher A reported that the activities were *"easy to reuse in a classroom"* and Teacher B followed with *"yeah I think the same as well, easy to adapt the activities in the classrooms to different kinds of ages"*. These quotes demonstrate that the adaptability and practicality of the activities learned were prominent features of the training. Teachers found the training useful because they felt they could easily put the activities they learned into practice and comfortably make any necessary changes to suit their classes. In response to finding any activities not useful, Teacher A responded with *"...some of the ones I ended up thinking that this is odd to use in my classroom, I realised more that I can adjust them. Because they used to explain why we are doing this after we have done it"*. This quote gives more depth to the value of the activities' adaptability, because it suggests that even activities that do not seem useful can become suitable because they are easy to adjust to fit the individual teacher. This

meaning was also expressed by another teacher, *“Most of the role play that we played will be very useful in my everyday work with a little bit of adaption to the age for the children I am working with because not everything was appropriate for small children”* (Teacher D). Despite the activities not being catered specifically to certain age groups, their flexibility allowed teachers to change them in order to suit the children, reinforcing their usefulness.

Our third main theme, “appreciation of activities’ benefits for children” was identified because many teachers expressed their feedback in relation to different aspects of the child’s experience. For example, effects on children’s education were unsurprisingly mentioned, *“It will be a good thing to do in my English class because they will go round and use their listening skills and pronunciations”* (Teacher A). This teacher expresses that the activity is useful because it creates opportunity for his students to practice their language skills, suggesting that the usefulness of the course is not only based on the practical experience of the teacher themselves but also the educational experience of the children they teach. Another teacher expressed, *“I liked the activity with the mirror because it will improve the self-esteem of our children”* (Teacher C). This quote demonstrates that this teacher appreciates that the activity would have positive effects on children’s wellbeing. Another teacher conveyed the same message, *“... it is the kind of activity that helps the students that are always in a negative way of thinking and I think that we should apply this in our students because it can help”* (Teacher A). Together, teachers found the training course valuable when it considered the wellbeing of the child. Similarly, the child’s development was taken into consideration by another teacher, *“...because usually people don’t understand how others can consider ourselves. So it is a good way and it would be useful for children to make them part of a growing process”* (Teacher F). This teacher stresses that they found the activity useful because it would be beneficial for children’s development. Overall, it seems that many teachers expressed the meaning that they found activities useful because they seem valuable to the schoolchild’s education, wellbeing, and development.

The final main theme, ‘cultural differences enhancing experience’ highlights a slightly different aspect of the teachers’ enjoyment during the course. Rather than focusing on usefulness of the training, this theme was created because many teachers expressed the importance of cultural aspects during the training. For example, *“I have met a lot of people from different countries, different nationalities and different cultures. It is always good to know about other cultures and nationalities”* (Teacher A). This quote conveys that the participant values wide cultural knowledge, and this training has given them the opportunity to learn and experience this, hence their enhanced enjoyment. Another teacher expressed a similar message *“... the values of all people are just as valuable, every culture as much as everyone else”* (Teacher B). This appreciation for other cultures and emphasis on equality could underlie the positive attitude and cooperation this teacher had during the training course, which in turn may have eased and enhanced others’ experiences. Such appreciation may have helped teachers overcome language barrier difficulties mentioned by other teachers, for example, *“for me the first activity was hard because we came from our countries we were speaking in our languages and we didn’t know each other so it was a little bit difficult to...”* (Teacher F). In contrast to the ideas from the other themes, this teacher expresses that the activity was not as useful because the language barriers made the training less effective. However, another teacher said *“...there is a lot of new knowledge and a lot of activities in English that we are not used to, to*

...speak English everyday so that was a problem but I have enjoyed it” (Teacher A). It seems that despite the language barrier, this teacher enjoyed the challenge and it increased their learning experience as they discovered new things. Apart from just appreciating world knowledge, it seems that incorporating multiple cultures was also indirectly useful in relation to the activities. For example, *“the different experiences, for example in Spain we see different methods in the classroom. Different values and skills, it is very interesting together in the training”* (Teacher B). By communicating with the other teachers from different cultures, they learned and acquired new methods of teaching. Teacher A mentioned a similar idea, *“...although we have experienced that we have differences when we explained it was very much the same. And also when we find the positive ones it was like yes that is what we think as well so that was nice.”* The training gave them a chance to hear from culturally different views and incorporate them into the activities. Together, it seems that not only did the teachers appreciate learning about different cultures, the varying cultural views also made their activity training more interesting and helpful.

Overall, the themes picked out from the focus groups support the major idea that the teachers found the training both useful and enjoyable. Teachers particularly appreciate the practicality of the activities, and the positive outcomes of the activities for children’s wellbeing and education. The cultural differences between teachers also enhanced their overall experience due to their personal interest and being able to discuss varied viewpoints during the activities.

The findings of the focus group were shared with the trainers.

2.2. Session 2 of training

Teachers were asked to evaluate the training. Eleven teachers answered four closed-ended questions and five open-ended questions. For the most part, they were very positive. Two teachers agreed and nine strongly agreed that the training was useful. Four agreed that the second training increased their knowledge of the project and 7 strongly agreed. Teachers thought that the training was useful and a good use of time.

Teachers were provided space for open text comments. Teachers commented positively. For example, one teacher replied, *“I appreciate the increasing of my knowledge about CVS project, the opportunity to share ideas with the other core teachers and enjoy our time together in order to know better each other way of working or even other different education systems.”*

The responses were shared with the trainers.

3. Changes in Teachers’ values, attitudes, knowledge, and skills

To assess teachers’ values, attitudes, knowledge, and skills, we needed to develop and validate a questionnaire. Harriet Tenenbaum and Martyn Barrett developed the questionnaire by writing three items per competence from the RFCDC descriptors. Although there are 20 competences, the final competence, Knowledge and critical understanding of the world, was decomposed into its six subdomains for a total of 25 competences assessed (see Table 1). Respondents were asked to rate their agreement with each statement expressed by each descriptor on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Table 1. List of Competences

Valuing human dignity and human rights
Valuing cultural diversity
Valuing democracy, justice, fairness, equality and the rule of law
Openness to cultural otherness
Respect
Civic mindedness
Responsibility
Self-efficacy
Tolerance of ambiguity
Autonomous learning skills
Analytical and critical thinking skills
Skills of listening and observing
Empathy
Flexibility and adaptability
Linguistic, communicative and plurilingual skills
Cooperation skills
Conflict resolution skills
Knowledge and critical understanding of the self
Knowledge and critical understanding of language and communication
Knowledge and critical understanding of politics, law and human rights
Knowledge and critical understanding of culture, cultures, religions
Knowledge and critical understanding of media
Knowledge and critical understanding of history
Knowledge and critical understanding of economies
Knowledge and critical understanding of environment and sustainability

Before we could administer the questionnaire to teachers, we needed to make sure that the items for each descriptor were reliable using alphas. In the first test of the alpha of the scale, 175 undergraduate students at the University of Surrey completed the survey. This process resulted in the alphas as seen in Table 2 (see column first iteration).

When the alphas were too low (less than .70), we gave the same items to a sample of 76 college students. Two of the competences, autonomous learning skills ($\alpha = .74$) and flexibility and adaptability ($\alpha = .71$) had alphas above .70 in the new sample. However, the remaining eight scales did not achieve an alpha reliability of greater than .70. For these eight scales, we created new items to improve the reliabilities. In addition, it was judged that the face validity of one of the items in the responsibility scale could be enhanced. We then gave these items for these nine scales to 77 undergraduates at the University of Surrey. The new alphas are listed in Table 2 (see column for second iteration).

Table 2. The development of the scale

<i>Descriptor</i>	First Iteration (<i>n</i> = 125)			Second Iteration (<i>n</i> = 77)		
	Alpha	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Alpha	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Valuing human dignity and human rights	.68	4.59	0.51	.86	4.55	0.59
Valuing cultural diversity	.63	4.53	0.47	.69	4.43	0.52
Valuing democracy, justice, fairness, equality and the rule of law.	.59	4.41	0.53	.77	4.41	0.50
Openness to cultural otherness	.71	4.13	0.64			
Respect	.60	4.46	0.52	.82	4.47	0.48
Civic mindedness	.71	3.62	0.71			
Responsibility	.72	4.40	0.52	.82	4.47	0.48
Self-efficacy	.76	3.99	0.67			
Tolerance of ambiguity	.65	3.63	0.72	.78	4.11	0.53
Autonomous learning skills	.67	3.94	0.63			
Analytical and critical thinking skills	.73	4.15	0.52			
Skills of listening and observing	.70	4.43	0.54			
Empathy	.66	4.47	0.52	.71	4.45	0.42
Flexibility and adaptability	.65	4.17	0.48			
Linguistic, communicative and plurilingual skills	.58	3.91	0.63	.72	3.92	0.56
Cooperation skills	.73	4.25	0.54			
Conflict resolution skills	.73	4.10	0.55			
Knowledge and critical understanding of the self	.79	4.09	0.69			
Knowledge and critical understanding of language and communication	.75	4.14	0.63			
Knowledge and critical understanding of politics, law and human rights	.80	3.67	0.81			
Knowledge and critical understanding of culture, cultures, religions	.58	4.00	0.60	.77	4.02	0.55
Knowledge and critical understanding of media	.79	3.66	0.83			
Knowledge and critical understanding of history	.87	3.68	0.89			
Knowledge and critical understanding of economies	.91	2.97	1.04			
Knowledge and critical understanding of environment and sustainability	.85	4.02	0.70			

The intervention was delivered to the children between September 2019 to May 2021. The intervention activities were designed based on the RFCDC (Barrett, 2020; Barrett et al., 2018). A group of researchers and curriculum specialists met together to develop the activities.

A minimum of two core teachers and one contact teacher from each intervention school attended two separate one-week training events to learn about the curriculum. The two core teachers were the classroom teachers who taught the children the curriculum. In addition, there were monthly meetings across the schools. The curriculum may be found on <https://www.cvs-project.eu/intellectual-output/>. After the Covid pandemic had begun, additional RFCDC-related learning activities based on the Covid pandemic were developed by an expert group convened by the Council of Europe which consisted of two of the CVS teachers and one of the CVS trainers, plus a headteacher, another teacher trainer and the lead RFCDC expert (Martyn Barrett). Several of the activities developed by the group (for the full set of activities, see <https://www.coe.int/en/web/reference-framework-of-competences-for-democratic-culture/rfcdc-learning-activities-based-on-the-covid-19-pandemic>) were selected for use as part of the CVS curriculum. To give an example of an intervention lesson, children were introduced to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Children and discussed what children needed to survive. Children in control schools were a business-as-usual comparison who followed their typical curriculum.

All materials were translated by a native speaker and checked by two other native speakers for clarity (including one of the contact teachers). Before the start of the training, teachers in intervention and control schools completed the competences questionnaire described above twice, once in March 2019 and again in September 2020. At the conclusion of the intervention, teachers again completed the questionnaires (June 2021).

In March 2019, 28 teachers (18 intervention school; 10 control school) in Romania, 24 teachers (15 intervention, 9 control) in Italy, 16 teachers (10 intervention, 6 control) in Norway, 19 teachers (10 intervention, 9 control) in Bulgaria, and 29 teachers (15 intervention, 14 control) completed the questionnaires.

In September 2020, 75 teachers completed time 2 assessments. In total, 15 teachers (9 intervention school; 6 control school) in Romania, 11 teachers (6 intervention, 5 control) in Italy, 15 teachers (9 intervention, 6 control) in Norway, 15 teachers (9 intervention, 6 control) in Bulgaria, and 19 teachers (13 intervention, 6 control) completed the questionnaires.

In June 2021, 56 teachers completed time 3 assessments. In total, 9 teachers (7 intervention school; 2 control school) in Romania, 5 teachers (3 intervention, 2 control) in Italy, 14 teachers (8 intervention, 6 control) in Norway, 16 teachers (9 intervention, 7 control) in Bulgaria, and 12 teachers (7 intervention, 5 control) in Spain completed the questionnaires.

Across all three time points, 56 teachers completed all the questionnaires. Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations for the teachers who completed the measures at all three time points. We looked to see if there were any differences in these scores across time. We conducted 2 (School Type: Intervention, Control) x 2 (Time: March 2019, June 2021) mixed-design ANOVA models and found no statistically significant interaction differences. We also conducted 2 (School Type: Intervention, Control) x 2 (Time: September 2019, June 2021) mixed-design ANOVA models and found no statistically significant interaction differences.

We also looked at Time 1 and Time 2 to see if there were differences in teachers' rating across the countries. Again, using an alpha of .003, there were no differences at either Time 1 or Time 2. At Time 3, the only statistically significant difference was that Norwegian teachers reported less respect than did Spanish or Italian teachers, $F(4, 51) = 4.75, p = .002$. The means for Time 1 broken down by country are reported in Table 4.

Table 3. Teachers' Ratings across the Three Time points

Descriptor	Control						Intervention					
	Time 1		Time 2		Time 3		Time 1		Time 2		Time 3	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Valuing human dignity and human rights	4.65	0.44	4.63	0.46	4.65	0.43	4.65	0.43	4.70	0.44	4.69	0.47
Valuing cultural diversity	4.55	0.54	4.55	0.46	4.47	0.47	4.38	0.54	4.40	0.52	4.50	0.51
Valuing democracy, justice, fairness, equality and the rule of law	4.48	0.54	4.41	0.49	4.50	0.43	4.48	0.53	4.52	0.43	4.45	0.56
Openness to cultural otherness	4.22	0.55	4.07	0.63	4.11	0.61	4.15	0.58	4.18	0.52	4.25	0.73
Respect	4.45	0.50	4.50	0.63	4.47	0.59	4.44	0.46	4.44	0.48	4.47	0.73
Civic mindedness	4.10	0.61	3.93	0.61	4.18	0.51	4.05	0.62	4.10	0.52	4.25	0.57
Responsibility	4.70	0.44	4.43	0.55	4.42	0.53	4.66	0.48	4.55	0.48	4.68	0.44
Self-efficacy	4.16	0.55	4.07	0.60	4.18	0.51	4.24	0.49	4.23	0.47	4.32	0.52
Tolerance of ambiguity	4.50	0.48	4.46	0.46	4.27	0.59	4.30	0.48	4.36	0.42	4.36	0.57
Autonomous learning skills	3.94	0.61	4.07	0.58	4.03	0.63	4.03	0.45	4.07	0.45	3.96	0.65
Analytical and critical thinking skills	4.26	0.52	4.13	0.45	4.24	0.55	4.25	0.47	4.22	0.42	4.25	0.59
Skills of listening and observing	4.17	0.61	4.26	0.58	4.26	0.57	4.16	0.49	4.13	0.54	4.15	0.51
Empathy	4.18	0.49	4.13	0.45	4.23	0.50	4.04	0.50	4.06	0.43	4.15	0.58
Flexibility and adaptability	4.00	0.56	4.07	0.51	4.21	0.51	3.96	0.53	3.98	0.48	4.00	0.49
Linguistic, communicative and plurilingual skills	4.12	0.52	4.17	0.40	4.15	0.60	4.20	0.47	4.10	0.51	3.99	0.49
Cooperation skills	4.17	0.47	4.22	0.52	4.32	0.56	4.30	0.46	4.28	0.47	4.24	0.55
Conflict resolution skills	3.95	0.64	4.22	0.58	4.23	0.53	4.05	0.46	4.06	0.44	4.09	0.48
Knowledge and critical understanding of the self	4.09	0.58	4.09	0.55	4.18	0.51	4.14	0.45	4.22	0.44	4.32	0.52
Knowledge and critical understanding of language and communication	4.06	0.57	4.17	0.53	4.17	0.61	4.06	0.54	4.07	0.53	3.84	0.62
Knowledge and critical understanding of politics, law and human rights	3.94	0.62	3.88	0.62	3.97	0.66	3.95	0.68	3.83	0.75	3.86	0.51

<i>Descriptor</i>	Control						Intervention					
	Time 1		Time 2		Time 3		Time 1		Time 2		Time 3	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Knowledge and critical understanding of culture, cultures, religions	3.85	0.65	3.83	0.66	3.89	0.56	3.83	0.62	3.89	0.57	3.89	0.51
Knowledge and critical understanding of media	3.77	0.72	3.80	0.78	3.82	0.66	3.78	0.70	3.92	0.66	3.70	0.75
Knowledge and critical understanding of history	3.67	0.80	3.65	0.82	3.68	0.86	3.62	0.78	3.75	0.79	3.67	0.63
Knowledge and critical understanding of economies	3.38	0.96	3.54	0.80	3.38	0.77	3.34	0.74	3.55	0.82	3.42	0.68
Knowledge and critical understanding of environment and sustainability	3.82	0.61	3.87	0.70	3.91	0.78	3.81	0.64	3.88	0.64	3.80	0.65

Table 4. Teacher Means at Time 1 by Country

Descriptor	Bulgaria		Italy		Norway		Romania		Spain	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>								
Valuing human dignity and human rights	4.44	0.47	5.00	0.00	4.71	0.39	4.67	0.50	4.70	0.38
Valuing cultural diversity	4.10	0.47	4.87	0.30	4.69	0.44	4.10	0.54	4.56	0.57
Valuing democracy, justice, fairness, equality and the rule of law	4.33	0.52	4.73	0.37	4.40	0.63	4.56	0.55	4.61	0.45
Openness to cultural otherness	4.04	0.54	5.00	0.00	4.19	0.34	4.22	0.71	4.03	0.61
Respect	4.33	0.47	5.00	0.00	4.26	0.37	4.48	0.50	4.56	0.50
Civic mindedness	3.96	0.50	4.67	0.47	4.14	0.58	4.07	0.36	3.86	0.82
Responsibility	4.69	0.45	4.80	0.45	4.71	0.43	4.63	0.52	4.58	0.52
Self-efficacy	4.17	0.53	4.53	0.69	4.05	0.49	4.10	0.46	4.22	0.48
Tolerance of ambiguity	4.27	0.49	4.60	0.55	4.45	0.50	4.26	0.60	4.44	0.36
Autonomous learning skills	3.98	0.58	3.87	0.56	4.14	0.41	4.15	0.44	3.78	0.56
Analytical and critical thinking skills	4.08	0.45	4.53	0.73	4.19	0.45	4.44	0.53	4.28	0.40
Skills of listening and observing	4.08	0.60	4.47	0.87	4.07	0.54	4.17	0.36	4.25	0.35
Empathy	4.08	0.56	4.13	0.73	4.14	0.45	4.04	0.51	4.08	0.41
Flexibility and adaptability	3.75	0.41	4.60	0.60	4.17	0.45	4.00	0.29	3.76	0.67
Linguistic, communicative and plurilingual skills	4.04	0.44	4.33	0.78	4.14	0.36	4.33	0.55	4.17	0.52
Cooperation skills	4.33	0.44	4.40	0.68	4.12	0.43	4.26	0.55	4.22	0.41
Conflict resolution skills	3.84	0.52	4.13	0.80	4.12	0.36	4.22	0.67	3.89	0.46
Knowledge and critical understanding of the self	4.00	0.56	4.53	0.51	4.07	0.33	4.19	0.60	4.11	0.50
Knowledge and critical understanding of language and communication	4.04	0.58	4.13	0.77	4.00	0.64	4.07	0.47	4.11	0.41
Knowledge and critical understanding of politics, law and human rights	3.65	0.74	4.33	0.94	4.07	0.54	3.89	0.60	4.08	0.45
Knowledge and critical understanding of culture, cultures, religions	3.46	0.57	4.13	0.73	4.10	0.56	3.78	0.50	3.97	0.64

<i>Descriptor</i>	Bulgaria		Italy		Norway		Romania		Spain	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>								
Knowledge and critical understanding of media	3.42	0.70	3.93	0.72	4.00	0.59	3.75	0.73	3.94	0.69
Knowledge and critical understanding of history	3.42	0.55	4.20	0.77	3.95	0.63	3.48	0.71	3.44	1.09
Knowledge and critical understanding of economies	3.06	0.67	3.80	0.77	3.81	0.57	3.44	0.60	2.97	1.13
Knowledge and critical understanding of environment and sustainability	3.48	0.57	4.27	0.83	4.08	0.24	3.78	0.67	3.81	0.69

Summary: Teachers in both types of schools rated themselves highly on the descriptors. There was no increase from pretest to posttest in the competences in either type of school.

4. Changes in Children's values, attitudes, knowledge, and skills

4.1 Participants

Participants were 292 ($n = 145$ boys) children from Bulgaria, Italy, Norway, Romania, and Spain aged between 7 years; 4 months and 11 years; 6 months ($M = 9$ years; 6 months, $SD = 10.55$ months). Only children who completed the pre-test and post-test assessment are included. Intervention group children ($n = 172$) attended a school whose administration had agreed to take part in the project. The participants in the control group ($n = 120$) were recruited from different primary schools located in adjacent neighbourhoods to the intervention schools.

4.2 Materials

All materials were translated by a native speaker and checked by two other native speakers for clarity. The questionnaire included 10 competences. Unless noted, items were developed by Barrett and Tenenbaum based on the RFCDC Descriptors. Table 5 lists Cronbach alphas, means, and standard deviations for all of the values, attitudes, and skills.

Values

Rights Values. Children's valuing of rights was assessed with eight hypothetical vignettes adapted from previous research (Ruck et al., 2011). Half of the vignettes depicted situations where a child story character wished to exercise a self-determination right in conflict with the wishes of or practices of parental authority. The other half concerned situations in which the child story character wished to have a nurturance right fulfilled in conflict with the wishes or practices of parental authority. After the presentation of each vignette, children were asked whether the protagonist should be allowed to exercise the right in question on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much).

Valuing Cultural Diversity. Cultural diversity was measured with 8 items (e.g., We should play with people who have come from other countries who are now living in our country.). Answers ranged from 1 (not at all) to 4 (very much).

Attitudes

Attitudes to Openness. Openness was measured with 5 items (e.g., Do you think you would like to meet someone from another country?). The authors developed items based on Abbott and Cameron (2014) and supplemented by items created by the authors. Answers ranged from 1 (not at all) to 4 (very much).

Attitudes to Civic Mindedness. Civic mindedness was measured with 9 items (e.g., I have a responsibility to help keep my school clean). Items were based on White and Mistry (2016). Answers ranged from 1 (not at all) to 4 (very much).

Responsibility. Responsibility was measured with 6 items (e.g., If I hurt someone's feelings, I apologise.). Answers ranged from 1 (not at all) to 4 (very much).

Self-efficacy. Self-efficacy was measured with 6 items (e.g., I believe I can make things better in my school.). Answers ranged from 1 (not at all) to 4 (very much).

Tolerance of ambiguity. Tolerance of ambiguity was measured with 6 items (e.g., Surprise events upset me greatly). Items were based on Comer, Roy, Furr, Gotimer, Beidas, Dugas, and Kendall (2009). Answers ranged from 1 (not at all) to 4 (very much).

Skills

Empathy. Empathy was measured with 12 items (e.g., Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place.). Answers ranged from 1 (not at all) to 4 (very much). Items were developed by Davis (1983).

Knowledge

There were two aspects assessed about knowledge. The aspects included rights and understanding of democracy.

Rights Knowledge. To assess rights knowledge, children were asked whether all children had rights, to define a right, and if they could list a right (Willenberg et al., 2014). Answers to the questions asking the definition of a right and whether children had rights were coded based on the first author's reading of the transcript. The first author and another coder met to discuss answers. They then coded 40 transcripts (20.8%) of the dataset at each time point and obtained excellent inter-rater reliability (Bakeman & Quera, 2011) ($\kappa = .80$ for definition and $\kappa = .96$ for listing).

Knowledge of Democracy. Three multiple choice questions were adapted from Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, and Schulz (2001). Children received a score from 0 to 3 depending on how many they answered correctly. An example is:

Which of the following is likely to happen in a democratic country?

- a) People do not pay taxes
- b) Everyone has a job
- c) People can criticise the government
- d) Everyone thinks the same way

European Identity. We also measured European identity at post-test. There were four items, which children rated 1 (not at all) to 4 (very much) (e.g., How proud are you of being European?)

4.3 Procedure

Ethical approval was received from the University of Surrey Ethics Committee in 2019. This study was pre-registered on the OSF website. Parents provided written informed consent for their child's participation and children provided verbal assent. All participants were assigned an anonymous code.

The intervention was delivered to the children between September 2019 to May 2021. The intervention activities were designed based on the RFCDC (Barrett, 2020; Barrett et al., 2018) A group of researchers and curriculum specialists met together to develop the activities. A minimum of three teachers from each intervention school attended two separate one-week training events to learn about the curriculum, including a contact teacher and two teachers who implemented the curriculum. In addition, there were monthly meetings across the schools. The curriculum may be found on <https://www.cvs-project.eu/intellectual-output/>. After the Covid pandemic had begun, additional activities were introduced which could be delivered online. These were derived from the Council of Europe's set of RFCDC learning activities based on the Covid-19 pandemic. To give an example of an intervention lesson, children were introduced

to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and discussed what children needed to survive. Children in control schools were a business-as-usual comparison who followed their typical curriculum.

To measure the effectiveness of the intervention, participants in both the intervention and control groups were interviewed in June 2019 in groups of 3 to 4 children. Each child had a separate sheet to record their answers whilst a researcher read the questions aloud. Children were asked not to discuss their answers during the testing session. In May 2021, children were interviewed individually by a researcher over Teams. All researchers were fluent speakers of the language of schooling spoken by the children.

Participants were told that they were going to answer questions. Participants were reminded that there were no right or wrong answers and that their answers were private.

4.4 Findings

Values

We first examined endorsements of children's rights. Table 6 displays all means by country. To examine whether children changed in their endorsements of rights, we conducted a 2 (Time) x 2 (School Type: Intervention, Control) x 5 (Country) mixed-design ANOVA model. Time served as a repeated factor while school type and country served as between-participants factors. There was a main effect of Time, $F(1, 290) = 29.64, p < .0001, \eta^2 = .09$, which indicated that all children increased in their endorsement of rights from the pretest to the posttest. The effect for Time was qualified by a statistically significant Time X School type interaction effect, $F(1, 290) = 4.43, p = .04, \eta^2 = .02$. To tease this interaction apart, we conducted two follow-up repeated-measures ANOVAs separately by type of school using a protected alpha of .025 (.05 divided by 2). Using the protected alpha of .025, there was no increase in the control school from pretest to posttest, $F(1, 119) = 5.08, p = .03, \eta^2 = .04$. In contrast, children in the intervention schools increased from the pretest to the posttest, $F(1, 171) = 33.09, p < .0001, \eta^2 = .16$. There was also a statistically significant Time x School x Country interaction effect, $F(4, 282) = 2.74, p = .03, \eta^2 = .04$. To tease apart this interaction, we conducted 10 repeated measures ANOVAs separately by country and school type with a protected alpha of .01. The only statistically significant increases with the reduced alpha were in Italian children and Norwegian children in the intervention schools.

There were no differences in valuing cultural diversity.

Attitudes and Skills

There were no differences in any of the measures of attitudes and skills.

Knowledge

Who has rights? At the pretest, most children knew that children had rights. Indeed, 166 of 172 children in the intervention schools (109 out of 120 in the control schools) said children had rights at the start, whilst 164 in the intervention schools (118 in the control schools) said children had rights at post-test. The baseline numbers were too high to look for an effect of the intervention on these scores.

What is a right? Not all children responded to the questions about the definition of a right or listing of a right (see Table 7). Some children gave more than one codeable answer.

In the control schools, at pretest, 8 children (6.7%) did not provide an answer, 109 (90.8%) provided an answer, and 3 (2.5%) provided two answers. At posttest, 109 (90.8%) provided an answer and 11 (9.2%) provided two codeable answers.

In the intervention schools, at pretest, 6 children (3.5%) did not provide an answer, 160 (93%) provided one answer, and six (3.5%) provided two codeable answers. At posttest, 3 (1.8%) did not provide an answer, 155 (90.1%) provided one answer, and 14 (8.1%) provided two codeable answers.

We looked at whether there were increases in knowledge from pretest to posttest in the control and intervention groups separately. In the control group, using .006 as an alpha (.05 divided by 8 tests) for the McNemar's tests, the only contrast that was statistically significant was that there was an increase in listing of rights, $p = .002$. Thus, children in the control group did not increase in their understanding of rights from pretest to posttest.

The McNemar tests conducted on the intervention group indicated some growth in knowledge. There was a statistically significant increase in 'don't know' ($p < .001$) with 22 additional children in the intervention schools reporting this answer. There were, however, decreases in misconceptions ($p = .001$) and confusing rights with laws ($p < .001$). There were also increases in seeing rights as something given ($p < .001$) and privileges ($p = .004$), which are associated with reasoning about rights in older children. Combined across these two categories, 34 children in the intervention schools increased in their knowledge of rights.

Can you list a right that children have? In the control schools, 87 (72.5%) children provided a single example of a right, 28 (23.3%) gave two answers, three (2.5%) provided three examples, and two (1.7%) provided four examples at pretest. At posttest, 74 (61.7%) children provided a single example, 31 (25.8%) provided two examples, 11 (9.2%) provided three examples, two (1.7%) provided four examples, whilst 2 (1.7%) did not provide an answer at all.

In the intervention schools, 108 (62.8%) children provided a single example of a right, 40 (23.3%) gave two answers, 12 (7%) provided three examples, four (2.3%) provided four examples, one (.6%) provided five examples, five (2.9%) provided six examples whilst 2 (1.2%) did not provide a codeable answer at pretest. At posttest, 115 (66.9%) children provided a single example, 31 (18%) provided two examples, 13 (7.6%) provided three examples, three (1.7%) provided four examples, whilst 10 (5.8%) did not provide an answer at all. See Table 8 for examples.

Knowledge of Democracy. There was a Type of School x Time interaction effect, $F(1, 290) = 5.11$, $p = .02$, $p\eta^2 = .04$. Although children in the intervention schools increased in their understanding of democracy $F(1, 171) = 16.50$, $p < .001$, $p\eta^2 = .09$, the children in control schools increased more, $F(1, 119) = 47.73$, $p < .0001$, $p\eta^2 = .29$.

European Identity. We also measured European identity at post-test. There were four items, which children rated 1 (not at all) to 4 (very much) (e.g., How proud are you of being European?) There were no differences between children in the intervention compared to control schools in European identity, $F(1, 222) = 1.74$, $p = .19$, and no statistically significant Type of School x Country interaction effect, $F(3, 222) = .96$, $p = .41$. The means at the end of the intervention were 3.66 ($SD = 1.09$) for the intervention group and 3.64 ($SD = .99$) for the control group.

Table 5. Children's Scores on all Measures

Descriptor			Intervention				Control			
	Alpha	Alpha	Pretest		Posttest		Pretest		Posttest	
	(Pretest)	(Posttest)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Children's rights	.52	.50	3.33	0.61	3.59	0.55	3.53	0.57	3.66	0.52
Valuing cultural diversity	.88	.84	4.38	0.73	4.63	0.50	4.43	0.81	4.72	0.49
Openness to cultural otherness	.67	.53	4.25	0.67	4.38	0.50	4.18	0.62	4.38	0.49
Civic mindedness	.63	.76	4.45	0.51	4.48	0.48	4.51	0.43	4.51	0.41
Responsibility	.69	.57	4.34	0.64	4.38	0.50	4.45	0.49	4.62	0.50
Tolerance of ambiguity	.62	.66	4.07	0.65	4.05	0.60	4.09	0.55	4.05	0.56
Self-Efficacy	.41	.54	2.97	0.88	2.72	0.75	3.07	1.39	2.72	0.83
Perspective	.29	.51	3.55	0.57	3.66	0.54	3.50	0.91	3.59	0.55
Empathy	.70	.75	4.43	0.63	4.43	0.59	4.37	0.64	4.44	0.57
Knowledge of Democracy	NA	NA	1.30	0.93	1.66	1.01	1.28	0.96	1.96	0.96

Table 6. Means Endorsement of Children's Rights

	Intervention						Control					
	<i>n</i>	Pretest		Posttest		<i>F</i>	<i>n</i>	Pretest		Posttest		<i>F</i>
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Bulgaria	23	3.05	0.75	3.14	0.67	(1,22) = .30, $p = .60$, $p\eta^2 = .01$	17	3.16	0.53	3.26	0.49	(1,16) = .26, $p = .61$, $p\eta^2 = .02$
Italy	33	3.09	0.50	3.76	0.46	(1,32) = 34.55, $p = .0001$, $p\eta^2 = .52$	20	3.41	0.63	3.39	0.48	(1,19) = .01, $p = .91$, $p\eta^2 = .001$
Norway	28	3.73	0.47	3.97	0.30	(1,27) = 9.00, $p = .006$, $p\eta^2 = .25$	34	3.91	0.37	4.07	0.24	(1,33) = 5.58, $p = .02$, $p\eta^2 = .15$
Romania	48	3.09	0.53	3.32	0.51	(1,47) = 5.67, $p = .02$, $p\eta^2 = .11$	18	3.27	0.59	3.35	0.54	(1,17) = .21, $p = .65$, $p\eta^2 = .01$
Spain	40	3.56	0.57	3.77	0.38	(1,39) = 3.82, $p = .06$, $p\eta^2 = .09$	31	3.54	0.47	3.77	0.42	(1,30) = 4.81, $p = .04$, $p\eta^2 = .14$

Table 7. Number of Times Definitions of a Right were Offered

	Example	Intervention		Control	
		Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
Don't know	"I don't know"	2	24	9	10
Misconception	"A right is when you are not wrong"	16	2	7	2
Law	"It's a law"	29	2	19	0
To do	"It's something you have to do"	40	36	19	35
Given	"Something you are given"	11	33	9	15
Privilege/Entitlements	"Something you are entitled to"	2	14	4	3
List	"To play"	28	25	16	37
Other	"everyone has to decide"	53	48	47	28

Table 8. Number of Times Different Rights were Listed

	Intervention		Control	
	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
Food	26	18	24	23
Education	72	65	39	58
Play	76	42	35	27
Family	24	21	5	7
Health	18	17	6	15
Material	13	7	4	3
Other rights	45	56	46	43
No rights	1	2	1	1

Note. Answers are not mutually exclusive so children could list more than one right.

4.5 Reach of the Curriculum

In terms of reach, the training course has been downloaded 368 times and the curriculum has been downloaded 346 times.

5. Parents' Opinions

Parents's opinions were assessed at the dissemination events of the CVS project which took place in each school in Spring 2021. Parents were asked to complete an online questionnaire. They were asked to rate the importance of five values and skills that schools should teach given the level of demands on schools. They were asked how much they thought schools should teach human rights, the responsibilities of being a citizen within a democratic society, how to become an active democratic citizen, valuing cultural diversity, and how to

interact and communicate with people from other cultural backgrounds. They rated their opinions from 1 (very unimportant) to 5 (very important). They were also asked to rate the degree to which their children increased in these five areas in the past year from 0 (not at all) to 1 (a little) to 2 (a lot).

Eleven parents from Italy, 81 parents from Romania, and 13 parents from Spain answered the questions. At the end of the intervention, on average parents rated all these activities as between important and very important. More specifically, the teaching of human rights ($M = 4.51$, $SD = .77$), the responsibilities of being a citizen within a democratic society ($M = 4.43$, $SD = .82$), becoming an active citizen ($M = 4.27$, $SD = .67$), valuing cultural diversity ($M = 4.42$, $SD = .76$), and how to interact and communicate with people from other cultural backgrounds ($M = 4.47$, $SD = .71$) were all rated above 4 on a 5-point scale.

In terms of their assessment of their children's learning, parents believed that children learned between a little and a lot about each topic. More specifically, the teaching of human rights ($M = 1.34$, $SD = .60$), the responsibilities of being a citizen within a democratic society ($M = 1.30$, $SD = .60$), becoming an active citizen ($M = 1.23$, $SD = .61$), valuing cultural diversity ($M = 1.39$, $SD = .63$), and how to interact and communicate with people from other cultural backgrounds ($M = 1.40$, $SD = .61$) were all rated above the midpoint. Given the difficulties facing schools because of the Covid pandemic during the academic year from 2020-2021, this is a positive outcome. Parents believed that children learned these difficult topics during this year.

6. Evaluation of the App

The app has been visited 1.063 times. It does not need to be downloaded to be viewed. Six teachers who had been trained on the CVS curriculum rated the app from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). They generally agreed that the app was easy to find on the website ($M = 3.67$, $SD = 1.51$), that the app increased their knowledge of the CVS project ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 1.47$), that the app increased their knowledge of the RCFDC ($M = 3.67$, $SD = 1.37$), and that the app increased their ability to apply the RCFDC in teaching ($M = 3.67$, $SD = 1.37$).

7. Summary

In sum, this project evaluated the CVS curriculum with a focus on teachers, pupils, and parents. Teachers trained in the CVS curriculum enjoyed the training reported that it was effective. Teachers in the intervention condition did not increase in their intercultural competence compared to teachers in the control schools. In contrast, children increased in their valuing of children's rights, but not the other competences. The Covid-19 Pandemic may have prevented greater learning. However, parents reported their children learned a variety of competences. Finally, the CVS App has been downloaded many times.