Pupil Voice Groups: The Impact on Schools and Students

Eric Rubenstein
University of Georgia, erubenstein@uga.edu

James D. Scott
University of Georgia, jamesd.scott@uga.edu

Jason Peake
University of Georgia, jpeake@uga.edu

Pupil Voice Groups:
The Impact on Schools and Students

Eric D. Rubenstein
University of Georgia
erubenstein@uga.edu

James D. Scott
University of Georgia
jamesd.scott@uga.edu

Jason B. Peake
University of Georgia
jpeake@uga.edu

Abstract

Over 30 years ago, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child passed legislation allowing children under the age of 18 to express their concerns in circumstances and decisions that affect them. Because one impact on children under the age of 18 is the educational system, Scotland education has integrated opportunities for students to be involved in the educational process. Pupil voice groups are one of the techniques that have been implemented in Scotland and throughout Europe. These groups allow students to have a voice in their education that may impact development. Researchers sought to identify the impacts of pupil voice groups on student development, the surrounding community, and the school. Researchers identified primary school students from years P-3 to P-6 (7 to 12 years of age) involved in pupil voice groups. Data were collected through focus group interviews, in which themes surrounding benefits, drawbacks, and impacts on the school and community emerged. Results indicated that these groups improve the school and community, and students believe these opportunities allow them to share their opinions on their education. The researchers recommend that further research should examine the perceptions of previously interviewed students towards involvement in pupil voice groups, and the use of pupil voice groups outside of the United Kingdom.

Key words: students, pupil voice groups, education, primary education

Introduction and Literature Review

The premise of enabling and valuing students' voices about school is not a new concept to educators in the United Kingdom. Over 30 years ago, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) passed legislation to allow children under the age of 18 to express their concerns about circumstances and decisions that affect them. As such, one of the largest impacts on children under the age of 18 is the educational system. Because of this, schools in Scotland have integrated many ways for students to be involved in what they are learning. Pupil voice groups (PVGs) are one of the techniques that have been implemented not only in Scotland education curricula, but also in educational systems across the United Kingdom. The purpose of PVGs is to allow students to express their voice on decisions in the school system that may influence their development (Education Scotland, 2018, 2020).

While the concept of education seemingly holds a similar construct among different countries, there are many methods of teaching that vary across cultures and countries. The Scottish education system not only prides itself on their learning facilities, but also on their quality of teaching (Scotland.org, 2020). In Scotland, there is a national curriculum implemented from nursery school through secondary school (Scotland.org, 2020). This curriculum, Curriculum for Excellence, which was published in September 2019, centers the education around the learner (Education Scotland, 2020).

Within Scotland's curriculum, educators focus on understanding the learners, knowing the big ideas, having clear strategies for practical approaches, utilizing meaningful learning networks, and understanding the professional standards (Education Scotland, 2020). Scottish educators utilize PVGs as one way to understand their learners. These groups allow teachers to engage with students and often create positive relationships for learning (Marsh, 2012). Additionally, the intent of PVGs is to encourage teachers to work *with* students as opposed to working *on* students (Noyes, 2005).

Not only do PVGs allow teachers to engage with their students, they also benefit students in their own learning. Research indicates that pupils enjoy the opportunity to find independence outside of the normal learning objectives and want to be trusted to learn on their own (McIntyre et al., 2005). McIntyre et al. (2005) also state pupils believe that autonomous thinking is guided by the belief that a teacher is not there for the students' entire life, and there is the encouragement to complete tasks for themselves. Additionally, pupils understand that

their voice is effective, and they are not afraid to voice concerns and ideas to their teachers regarding the lessons (McIntyre et al., 2005).

Young people have a right to express their voice and have it heard and valued (Hulme et al., 2011; Scottish Executive, 2005). In providing youth with the opportunity to express their voice for what is being taught, PVGs have been specifically structured in schools to improve the quality of teaching and learning. Youth involved in PVGs were given the opportunity to participate in a variety of groups to improve their school and community, thus influencing their education and providing them with the capability to voice what they would like to learn in school. In order to examine the impact of PVGs on student development and educational experiences, student leaders from various PVGs in Dumfries, Scotland were asked to volunteer and then were selected by researchers for focus group interviews during a study abroad trip to the United Kingdom. In Dumfries, Scotland, PVGs meet once a month for an hour throughout the year to plan activities and work with teachers to share what experiences are needed around the school. During the time allotted at the primary school, researchers sought to understand how involvement in PVGs influenced student learning and impacted the school and community.

Theoretical Framework

This study draws heavily from both social cognitive theory and youth voice theory (YVT). Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory guided this study as Bandura postulates that learning occurs through bidirectional interactions of the environment, the learner (cognition), and behaviors. These interactions often occur internally while being impacted by external factors such as the environment or teacher. Additionally, the interactions between the learner, environment, and behavioral factors influence one's personal self-efficacy, which is a person's beliefs about their own capabilities to complete actions necessary to learn or perform a task (Bandura, 1986; Schunk, 2020). However, for the theory to be effective, Bandura (1986) states that the interactions do not need to occur simultaneously.

The components of social cognitive theory that were primarily focused on in this study were the interactions of the learner with the environment and certain behaviors. Within this study, the environment of the learner plays a key role in education as students participate in different educational groups and are given the opportunity to have a voice in their learning. When students were provided the opportunity to join any of the PVGs that were offered, personal factors may have predominated which group the student joined. In this case, students were choosing a group based on what they enjoyed, such as supporting the local wildlife, fundraising

for the school, or providing support to their friends. Thus, students were given the opportunity to have more of a voice in their learning and lead their peers in supporting the school and community. Additionally, because PVGs are student led, actions made by the group influence individual behaviors, so both the individuals and the group are influenced to perform at a higher level. Furthermore, with the assistance of teachers, students determine goals for the year which they believe can be completed, influencing the performance and behaviors of the students. A majority of the groups provide students the chance to improve their school or local community, and as they complete their goals, students develop personal self-efficacy and beliefs of completing tasks in school.

The interactions of the environment and the learner can occur in two directions: The learner can have an impact on their environment, and/or the environment can have an impact on the learner. Typically, if a student indicates that their actual ability to complete a task is significantly lower than that of other students in the classroom, the teacher may alter their teaching methods for the student overall (Schunk, 2012, 2020). This suggests that the learner impacts their environment due to the change in the teacher's methods. However, the environment can impact the learner if the teacher encourages success in the area in which the student is having issues (Schunk, 2012, 2020). Additionally, the environment can influence a student's cognition of a lesson as they attempt to understand what is being taught (Schunk, 2012, 2020).

Behavior and the learner also work in a reciprocal fashion in which the learner can impact their own behaviors and conversely the behaviors can impact their learning and cognition (Bandura, 1986; Schunk, 2012). Self-efficacy beliefs often influence one's behaviors, as the learner may change their choice of tasks, effort, and goal acquisition (Schunk, 2001, 2012; Schunk & Pajares, 2002). In contrast, an increase in these behaviors and the implementation of learning progress checks with the teacher, impact learner self-efficacy which informs the learner that they are successful in acquiring the desired knowledge or skills (Schunk, 2012, 2020).

In conjunction with social cognitive theory, youth voice theory (YVT) offers a more focused theoretical framework from which to view PVGs. YVT has gained momentum internationally since the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child ratified Articles 5 and 12 in 1989 (United Nations Convention of Rights of the Child, 1989). Broadly speaking, YVT proposes that considering youth input in shaping young people's lives leads to increased success in youth programming and outcomes (Fielding, 2001). The overarching goal of this framework is to increase youth engagement in identifying, engaging, and solving problems that are relevant to

youth (Pittman & Wright, 1991). Within the YVT theoretical framework, PVGs are squarely couched.

In an overarching view of pupil voice, the possibility exists that students can use their voice and be allowed or encouraged to offer their views and preferences (Whitty & Wisby, 2007). Moreover, pupil voice can be thought of as a way for students to take a more active role in their education and schooling by indicating to their teachers what experiences are wanted or needed (Whitty & Wisby, 2007). In this aspect of defining pupil voice, and in considering the potential of PVGs in schools, it was important to understand the level of participation by students in their education process, including the framework of Roger Hart's "ladder of participation" (Hart, 1992; Whitty & Wisby, 2007). This framework examines the degree of participation by youth in relation to adults throughout the process, from adult-led to youth-initiated and youth-directed at the highest level (Hart, 1992). In examining the higher levels of the continuum, the involvement of youth through PVGs has a greater chance of influencing what is learned and the experiences within the school (Whitty & Wisby, 2007). In these scenarios, the interactions within Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory were more prevalent, in that the learner's cognition, environment, and behaviors were potentially influencing decisions and experiences.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of pupil voice groups on students. The following specific research questions that guided this study:

1. What are student perceptions of the impacts PVGs have on primary school student development?
2. What are student perceptions of the impacts PVGs have on the surrounding community?
3. What are student perceptions of the impacts PVGs have on the school?

Methods

To determine the impacts of PVGs, students were interviewed utilizing a semi-structured interview guide, regarding involvement in the groups and their perceived importance of PVGs during a study abroad trip to Scotland. Interviews were conducted in five focus group sessions in which each group was comprised of eight to 12 students from the same grade level. Students were identified based on their involvement as PVG leaders and were then asked to participate in the study. This was done to ensure that various groups were represented, and older students were not talking over younger students. Focus group interviews ranged in length from 42 to 78

minutes to allow students the opportunity to share information that had the potential to inform the researchers about the true purpose of PVGs. Additionally, at the beginning of each focus group students were given the opportunity to choose a pseudonym or name to be used during the session. Researchers then assigned additional pseudonyms to participants during data analysis to ensure anonymity. The focus group interviews and research protocol were approved by the researcher's home institution's IRB board. To uphold all trustworthiness and rigor, all students were given pseudonyms, member checking and peer debriefing were utilized, and a journal was used to note all methodological decisions throughout the research. The researchers involved in this study were graduate students or faculty in agricultural education and have worked with a student abroad program that has traveled to this school each year for the past 5 years.

Population

The sample of this study consisted of primary school students from years P-3 to P-6, ages ranged from 7 to 12, and participants were grouped by year in school and classrooms they were in, leading to five distinct groups ($n = 37$; Table 1). All participants were students who were involved in various PVGs in the school, that students self-selected and were required to attend. As mentioned, the interview participants were volunteers who also served as the PVG leader and representative for their respective group. The PVGs represented by the students included the Transport, Wildlife, Enterprise, Kitchen, Playground Pals, National Days, ECO Resources, Sports Ambassadors, Rotary Kids, Community Friends, and PE groups. Each of the groups met once a month during school hours to plan projects and establish opportunities to assist around the school and within the local community. The PVGs were student-led, with support provided by the teacher when requested. The groups all serve a different purpose for the students and the community, and were each described by the students and teachers at the school:

- **Transport group** helps students with school transportation who live within the school catchment area and meet certain criteria
- **Wildlife group** seeks to increase habitat space surrounding the school for local wildlife.
- **Enterprise group** provides students with the opportunity to participate in various fundraising sales around the school.
- **Kitchen group** meets with cafeteria staff to help in planning meals that students will enjoy and find as nutritional.
- **Playground Pals** allows students to find support with other students around the school.

- **National Days** is a group that works with the building administration to find ways to celebrate different national holidays during the school year.
- **ECO Resources group** encourages students and teachers to recycle at school and at home.
- **Sports Ambassadors** were responsible for coming up with the rotating schedule for pupil groups to use the various sports equipment during recesses and suggesting new equipment to the administration.
- **Rotary Club** partners with the adults in the community Rotary Club to increase engagement and improve varied aspects of the community.
- **Community Friends** supports the community through food drives and managing a food closet for those in need.
- **PE group** meets to plan activities that will increase activity during the school weeks that the PE teacher is not present at their school.

Table 1. Demographics of Participants (*n* = 37)

Name	Year in school	Number of years involved in PVGs	Pupil voice group [a]
Isaac	P-3	1	Transport Group
Susan	P-3	1	Unknown
Faye	P-3	1	Unknown
Caitlin	P-3	1	Unknown
Hannah	P-3	1	Unknown
Maddox	P-3	1	Unknown
Nathan	P-3	1	Wildlife Group
John	P-3	1	Unknown
Ellie	P-4	2	Enterprise Group
Mary	P-4	2	Playground Pals
Ansley	P-4	2	Kitchen Group
Cameron	P-4	2	Enterprise Group
Sean	P-4	2	Enterprise Group
Drew	P-4	2	Unknown
Callan	P-4	2	Unknown

Table 1. (continued)

Name (pseudonym)	Year in school	Number of years involved in PVGs	Pupil voice group [a]
Ray	P-5	3	ECO Resources Group
Steven	P-5	3	Community Friends
Mac	P-5	3	Rotary Kids
Katherine	P-5	3	Sports Ambassadors
Jessica	P-5	3	Rotary Kids
Robert	P-5	3	Playground Pals
Scott	P-5	3	National Days
Julie	P-5	3	ECO Resources Group
Jamie	P-6	4	National Days
Brody	P-6	4	National Days
Braden	P-6	4	ECO Resources Group
Ewan	P-6	4	Unknown
Megan	P-6	4	Wildlife Group
Alex	P-6	4	Enterprise Group
Ian	P-6	4	Enterprise Group
Jackson	P-6	4	Sports Ambassadors
Tory	P-6	4	Rotary Kids
Maggie	P-6	4	Rotary Kids
Amber	P-6	4	Rotary Kids
Harold	P-6	4	PE Group
Peter	P-6	4	Community Friends
Erin	P-6	4	Enterprise Group

[a] Some participants' groups are unknown due to inaudible voice in recording.

Data Collection

Data were collected through focus group interviews during a study abroad trip to Scotland. Students were asked questions to clarify their perception of the purpose of PVGs and were not given the opportunity to share their personal opinion regarding their involvement in PVGs. This was done to ensure that students shared only their perception of the purpose of PVGs and did not respond to the researchers with biased remarks for a specific group. Students were primarily asked to share the purpose of their group and how their group impacted the school

and community, with the potential for the researchers to ask follow-up questions. Interviews were recorded and later transcribed by the researchers.

Data Analysis

Upon completion of transcription, researchers entered data into Weft QDA 1.0.1 to analyze the provided statements using the constant comparative method (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Categories were created based on recurrent themes that emerged from the data. Data were then reanalyzed for similar themes and categories were refined with more distinct themes. Finally, explanations were constructed about the PVG from data that emerged.

Results

Participants ($n = 37$) were divided into groups based on their year in school and responded to questions during a focus group interview with researchers. As mentioned, responses of the pupils during interviews were coded by researchers to determine different themes regarding student involvement in their respective PVGs. These varied themes included but were not limited to the purpose, benefits, drawbacks, and impacts on the school and community. Overall, respondents believed that PVGs improve the school system more than producing a negative impact. To best emphasize these themes, researchers selected a few key statements by the participants which featured the impact that involvement in PVGs had on their education, the school, and the local community.

Student Impact and Opportunities

Many students believe that PVGs impact their performance and provide them with opportunities to utilize their voices and opinions in the school. Common ideas emerged within this overarching theme, including (a) learning to speak for themselves and share opinions, (b) giving students a chance to do something different, (c) preparing for their lives, and (d) increasing their performance while enjoying their involvement in PVGs. While many students shared how PVGs had a positive impact on their performance in school and the opportunities they were given, many negatives also emerged.

One of the benefits for students involved in PVGs is that students learn to speak for themselves. This seemed to be a topic that many of the students shared strong beliefs in and believed that this was a large benefit to having the opportunity to participate in PVGs. Erin summed it up best in saying "The benefit is that it teaches children. The PVG teaches children to be who they are

and to speak out." Brody also stated that "Some of the pupil voice groups . . . make sure that people's ideas are listened to. So, say for example, last year I was in National Days and, there was a lot of ideas that we came up with because of the people in the pupil voice." Jamie followed up with Brody's ideas and discussed that, "I think it impacts on just like I said before, and when people are really quiet, they've been able to come out and share their ideas and . . . a lot of people are like quiet and shy and they like don't say anything, they're just sitting there. But then, . . . with the PVG, everyone's been able to have like a say of what they think should be done to this or what we should and should be done in the best and they've shared their ideas when they were really quiet and shy."

When discussing how PVGs give students a chance to do something different and impact their education, Braden shared that "There is a point in having them because . . . it gives you a chance to do other subjects instead of just in like science and math and things like that. [You] get to have a chance to do like charity funds and some stuff about the ecosystem and things like that." Ian shared some of the similar thoughts during the discussion and said, "Its there because instead of just doing maths and English and science all day every day and like you can come to school and expect something new then say to your parents when you go back home, and they ask you what you do about cold or asking you what you do, you don't just say the same thing. You will have something different to [say]." So not only do students have the opportunity to do something different in the classroom, they also share some excitement about the PVGs and the opportunity to share the ideas with their parents.

However, while students shared their perceptions of PVGs and the positive impacts, students also shared many negatives that affect their experience with PVGs and their education. Several students indicated that PVGs often cut back on their curricular learning time and normal class time, while also not meeting in PVGs frequently and forgetting about information they have been working on. Ewan shared their thoughts on the timing, saying "I think going, back to Ian's [comment], a month is quite long. And then how he said that if there was an idea you are bound to forget it in those 2 or 3 weeks that you've got to wait until and your next PVG is."

Improving the School

Similar to how students discussed how PVGs often improve the local community, there were several ideas that emerged in how PVGs improve the school. During the analysis of the interviews, researchers determined that students believed PVGs (a) improved the school grounds and playground, (b) made school more enjoyable, (c) improved the school as a whole,

and (d) aided in school achievement. When asked about the impact of PVGs and how PVGs improved the school, Tory summarized it well: "I think it's just made our school like overall better, more enjoyable place to be."

While the students were explaining how PVGs improve the school grounds and playground, several of the members of the Playground Pals group chimed in and stated their purpose, "which was help making the playground better for everybody to play on it." Additionally, Peter said that as a member of the Rotary Kids they assisted in brightening up the school grounds. He stated, "If it wasn't for the Rotary kids then there wouldn't be millions of [inaudible] planted on site. But it brightens up our school."

Following up with students on the other impacts on their school, a few of the respondents began discussing the ways that PVGs improved the school as a whole. Alex mentioned, "It helps the school because some of them need money first go and it helps us buy new equipment and school to pay bills." Not only do PVGs improve the school through contributions and new technology, Robert shared that PVGs also help teachers, which in turn help the school. He said, "It's a good part of our time because it's helping contribute to the school, which is then helping teachers, which is helping us, kind of."

Lastly, Katherine discussed the involvement of PVGs and how they aided in school achievement. She stated, "It makes our school achieve more. We recycle and we're like helping the community—if you're in the Rotary Kids—and we are getting better. So, it just helps—helps the school achieve more and that type of thing."

Improving the Local Community

As students began discussing some of the impacts of PVGs, several overarching ideas emerged within the theme of improving the community. Researchers established three ideas from the analysis in which students stated that PVGs (a) help the environment, (b) provide assistance to the community by helping others, and (c) encourage students to help with wildlife in the community. A majority of the respondents among each of the focus groups, including Julie, a student involved in the ECO Resources PVG, discussed that there are also benefits in helping the environment: "One of the benefits for me is that I get like a little feeling in the day that I've done good for the environment and . . . I've just helped more people."

Conscientious of the Environment

While discussing the PVGs and the activities that students participate in, students mentioned that they often do things to better the environment. This included ensuring they do their part in helping the environment by making signs about turning lights off and limiting water usage, as well as promoting recycling in the school and community. Julie, who saw benefits in her PVG with helping the environment, was a member of the recycling group and stated "I was happy to be enrolled in a pupil voice group that like helped recycling because it's a big part of the community and people should start doing it. I feel like we helped the school recycle more than it used to." Another student discussed how their PVG involvement impacted their water usage: "If you were in the water group last year, then you would know if you learn about, it then . . . at home you actually see the water and you help the environment." Many students indicated this was a true benefit to PVGs because they were finding ways to help the environment at school and at home.

Providing Assistance in the Community

Additionally, students described many of the ways they believed PVGs impacted the local community by assisting other people. Steven stated, "I think the purpose of . . . some PVG groups [is] to help the community," which was reiterated by other respondents in each focus group several times. Steven also indicated, "My favorite part from last year's PVG was that I got to help . . . elderly people and [people] with disabilities have more friends because some of them used to just sit in their home and talk to no one with no electronics . . . and then we just got a part to help them and just go on there to the outside world and talked to them." Furthermore, other students discussed that their groups helped to raise money for charities in the local community, such as the local animal charity.

Helping Local Wildlife

Finally, students who were involved in the wildlife PVGs expressed how their group helped local wildlife in the community. Megan and Tory both stated that the wildlife group was made to help and save animals; Megan described how the wildlife groups worked to save bumblebees.

Discussion of Pupil Voice Groups

In examining the data, the quotes highlighted within each theme best summarize the influence that PVGs had on student experiences at school and in the community. Each theme represents the many experiences shared regarding involvement in PVGs while students in primary school. The participants discussed many aspects of their involvement in PVGs, with much of the data

overlapping across each of the focus groups. For instance, students involved in the wildlife group and ECO resources group continually shared the projects that they worked on to improve the school grounds and protect the animals in the area. In addition to participants' sharing how their groups improved the school grounds, all participants continually shared how much they enjoyed their involvement in their groups.

Limitations

Limitations do exist. Only 37 students were interviewed out of a total student body of 263, and these students were selected by researchers from a group of volunteers, leading to potential biases. Thus, there is the probability that students do not share similar beliefs or experiences regarding their involvement in PVGs and information presented by participants, who were leaders of their groups, may be limited to few experiences. Moreover, student participation in PVGs—including the number and variety of PVGs students have been involved in and experience in PVGs—exists as a limitation to this study. Researchers noted another limitation of this study, in that the researcher serves as the data collection instrument and presents the data as interpreted from the participants. Additionally, due to the transcription software used, some of the information the participants presented to the researchers may have been misinterpreted, leading to difficulty in data analysis.

Conclusions

From the data, the researchers concluded that PVGs are perceived as having a positive impact on the learning of students in a multitude of ways. Primary school students believe that PVGs not only impact their school and community but also allow students to share their opinions and have a voice in their education. This was done through a myriad of ways as a community event, community service project, schoolyard improvement projects, and even connecting with local organizations to help assist with their community events. Each of these experiences allowed students the opportunity to apply their knowledge from classroom instruction into a real-world situation where they could see their knowledge come to life. Students saw this as an opportunity to learn something different, while many of the activities involved applying their knowledge in a new way.

Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory states that learning occurs in reciprocal interactions between the learner, the environment, and their behaviors. The environment may impact student learning and behaviors, and student behaviors may guide learning. Students who believed their involvement in PVGs had a positive impact on their learning indicated they were

excited to participate in activities. These students were guided by their behaviors to continue learning and developing. Additionally, students often found themselves excited to participate in PVGs and certain activities due to a change in environment. The change in environment influenced the behavior of the learner as they participated in the PVG.

Recommendations

Further examination of PVGs is recommended to determine how students and teachers perceive the short-term and long-term impacts of the groups. While PVGs are centered around the students, it is important to collect data from teachers, the community, and other sources on their perceptions.

Researchers developed recommendations for current practitioners in Scotland, which include the following:

1. Use PVGs as a means to build stronger community relationships that will increase student engagement in community clubs and organizations.
2. Engage all faculty in the school in the development and implementation of PVGs.

Finally, recommendations have been developed for practitioners and researchers in the United States:

1. Utilize PVGs as a leadership development tool in elementary education programs to increase student engagement in the school and local community.
2. Utilize PVGs as a way to increase student interest and investment in their education.
3. Examine the implementation of PVGs in formal and non-formal learning environments, to provide students the opportunity to control what they are learning.

In continuing to examine the influence PVGs have on student experiences, the school, and surrounding communities in the United Kingdom and the United States, researchers and practitioners have the ability to lead the way in preparing youth for their future endeavors. The recommendations for researchers and practitioners also allow the potential for updated curriculum and educational initiatives.

References

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.

Education Scotland. (2018). Learner participation in educational settings (3–18). National Improvement Hub. https://education.gov.scot/improvement/self-evaluation/learner-participation-in-educational-settings-3-18/

Education Scotland. (2020). *What is curriculum for excellence?*. https://education.gov.scot/education-scotland/scottish-education-system/policy-for-scottish-education/policy-drivers/cfe-building-from-the-statement-appendix-incl-btc1-5/what-is-curriculum-for-excellence

Fielding, M. (2001). Beyond the rhetoric of student voice: New departures or new constraints in the transformation of 21st century schooling?, *FORUM*, *43*(2), 100–112. https://doi.org/10.2304/forum.2001.43.2.1

Hart, R. A. (1992). Children's participation: From tokenism to citizenship. *Innocenti Essay*, No. 4. International Child Development Centre. https://www.unicef-irc.org/publications/100-childrens-participation-from-tokenism-to-citizenship.html

Hulme, M., McKinney, S., Hall, S., & Cross, B. (2011). Pupil participation in Scottish schools: How far have we come?. *Improving Schools*, *14*(2), 130–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480211406880/

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage Publications.

Marsh, H. (2012). Relationships for learning: Using pupil voice to define teacher–pupil relationships that enhance pupil engagement. *Management in Education*, *26*(3), 161–163. https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020612445702

Mcintyre, D., Pedder, D., & Rudduck, J. (2005). Pupil voice: Comfortable and uncomfortable learnings for teachers. *Research Papers in Education*, *20*(2), 149–168. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671520500077970

Noyes, A. (2005). Pupil voice: Purpose, power and the possibilities for democratic schooling. *British Educational Research Journal*, *31*(4), 533–540. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920500153614

Pittman, K., & Wright, M. (1991). *Bridging the gap: A rationale for enhancing the role of community organizations in promoting youth development*. Center for Youth development and Policy Research.

Schunk, D. H. (2001). Social cognitive theory and self-regulated learning. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 125–151). Erlbaum.

Schunk, D. H. (2012). *Learning theories: An educational perspective* (6th ed.). Pearson Education.

Schunk, D. H. (2020). *Learning theories: An educational perspective* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.

Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2002). The development of academic self-efficacy. In A. Wigfield & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of academic motivation* (pp. 15–31). Academic Press.

Scotland.org. (2020). *Scottish Education and school systems*. https://www.scotland.org/live-in-scotland/school-systems

Scottish Executive. (2005). *Protecting children and young people: Child protection committees*. Scottish Executive: Edinburgh.

United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, November 20, 1989. https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/crc.aspx

Whitty, G., and Wisby, E. (2007). Whose voice? An exploration of the current policy interest in pupil involvement in school decision-making. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, *17*(3), 303–319. https://doi.org/10.1080/09620210701543957