Teachers' Understanding and Practices of Meaningful Student Participation Based on the Lundy Model in a National Primary School in Bukit Mertajam, Penang

Nyanavalli A/P Rajoo[1] , Amelia Alias[2] , Nurfaradilla Mohamad Nasri[3]

Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Selangor, 43600, Malaysia (Malaysia) Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.101000229

Received: 19 October 2026; Accepted: 24 October 2026; Published: 01 November 2026

ABSTRACT

This study explores teachers' reported understanding and practices concerning meaningful student participation based on the Lundy Model at a national primary school in Bukit Mertajam, Penang. This qualitative case study is grounded in an interpretivist paradigm and involves eight teachers, coded GT-01 to GT-08. Data were collected solely through semi-structured interviews and analysed using Braun and Clarke's thematic analysis. The analysis focuses on three research questions: teachers' understanding of meaningful student participation; reported practices relating to Space, Voice, Audience and Influence; and implementation challenges. The findings indicate that participants described various practices intended to provide space for pupils, encourage them to express their views, and give attention to those views. However, participants identified Influence as the element most difficult to implement consistently, particularly because of time constraints, class size and curriculum demands. The findings also indicate that teachers adapt their strategies to pupils' readiness and classroom context. As interviews were the sole data source, the findings represent participants' reported experiences and practices and do not verify practice through direct observation or document analysis. The study recommends practical professional development that emphasises ways of considering and responding to pupils' views within the scope of learning objectives.

Keywords: Meaningful Student Participation, Lundy Model, Teacher Understanding, Teacher Practices, Qualitative Case Study

INTRODUCTION

Background

Twenty-first-century education requires pupils not only to achieve academically but also to think critically, make reasoned decisions, communicate effectively and act as active citizens. Accordingly, many education systems emphasise more democratic, inclusive and learner-centred approaches. In this context, meaningful student participation has emerged as an important element. It refers to pupils' active involvement in learning and in decisions that affect their educational experiences. It goes beyond physical attendance and emphasises opportunities to express views, be heard by those in authority, and influence decisions.

The importance of student participation is recognised internationally through the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC, 1989). Article 12 states that every child has the right to express their views freely in all matters affecting them and that these views should be given due weight in accordance with the child's age and maturity. In schools, however, implementation can be symbolic or tokenistic: pupils may be allowed to speak without their views necessarily being considered. To explain how Article 12 can be implemented more meaningfully in education, Lundy (2007) developed a conceptual model comprising four elements that should operate together:

- Space: a safe and inclusive environment in which pupils can express their views;
- Voice: opportunities and support for pupils to express their views;

- Audience: people who are prepared to listen seriously to pupils' views; and
- Influence: the extent to which pupils' views are considered and affect decisions.

Teachers are closest to pupils in everyday school life; therefore, their understanding and practices determine whether these four elements are realised in classrooms. In Malaysia, the aspirations of learner-centred learning, higher-order thinking skills (HOTS), communication and collaboration were emphasised in the Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013–2025 (Ministry of Education Malaysia, 2013). Implementation nevertheless faces challenges, including examination-oriented school culture, time constraints, teachers' workloads and teaching practices that remain teacher-centred (Noraini & Mislan, 2020). Local studies have more often focused on pupil engagement, academic achievement or the effectiveness of particular teaching strategies (e.g., Sapian et al., 2021), while studies examining teachers' understanding and practices through the Lundy Model in primary schools remain limited.

The study site, a national primary school in Bukit Mertajam, Penang, is an urban national primary school whose pupils come from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds and family educational experiences. This diversity makes it a relevant context for exploring how teachers understand and implement meaningful student participation.

Problem Statement

The problem addressed in this study has four aspects. First, primary school teachers are reported to interpret student participation narrowly, for example as answering questions actively or raising hands, without considering the dimensions of Space, Voice, Audience and Influence. Second, although learner-centred learning has long been promoted, teaching in primary schools remains largely teacher-centred. Third, teachers who intend to promote student participation face contextual challenges, including limited time, a crowded syllabus, established classroom cultures, examination-oriented practices and limited administrative support. Fourth, in-depth studies of teachers' experiences in urban national primary schools, particularly those informed by the Lundy Model, remain scarce.

Research Objectives and Questions

This study has three objectives: (RO1) to explore teachers' understanding of meaningful student participation based on the Lundy Model; (RO2) to explore teachers' practices in implementing Space, Voice, Audience and Influence; and (RO3) to identify the challenges teachers face. These objectives are addressed through three research questions:

- RQ1: How do teachers understand meaningful student participation based on the Lundy Model?
- RQ2: How do teachers implement Space, Voice, Audience and Influence in teaching and learning?
- RQ3: What challenges do teachers face when implementing meaningful student participation?

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Concept of Meaningful Student Participation

The concept of student participation has developed from an early interpretation focused on involvement in learning activities to a broader understanding of power-sharing between pupils and adults. Hart (1992) introduced the "Ladder of Children's Participation", comprising eight levels ranging from manipulation and tokenism to genuine shared power. This model became one of the foundations for the development of student voice and participation in education. Subsequent discussion emphasises that meaningful participation requires more than an opportunity to speak: pupils' views must be heard and have a tangible effect (Lundy, 2007; Robinson & Taylor, 2013).

Participation as a Children's Right and the Lundy Model

Student participation is not only a pedagogical approach but also a children's right under Article 12 of the UNCRC (United Nations, 1989). Lundy (2007) argues that Article 12 is often misinterpreted as merely a right to speak, although it also requires children to be heard and their views to receive due consideration. The Lundy Model translates this requirement into four interrelated elements. It has been widely used in educational contexts in the United Kingdom, Ireland and Australia, and has begun to be applied in Asia, including Singapore (Wong & Lim, 2021) and Malaysia (Hashim & Mohamad, 2022).

The Lundy Model was selected as the main framework for three reasons. First, it is grounded in an international legal provision, Article 12 of the UNCRC, which gives it a strong basis. Second, its four elements are concrete and can be explored in classroom contexts, making the model suitable for qualitative research. Third, the model has been used in a range of international educational settings.

Teachers' Understanding and Practices

Teachers' understanding is a prerequisite for effective student participation, although previous research indicates a gap between understanding and practice (Robinson & Taylor, 2013). Pedagogical practices that support participation include group discussion, open-ended questions, cooperative learning and involving pupils in decisions related to learning. Within the Lundy framework, teachers also act as facilitators who create safe environments, support different forms of expression, listen seriously and respond to pupils' views.

Implementation Challenges

Previous studies identify internal challenges, such as limited understanding, teachers' beliefs and workload, as well as external challenges, including large classes, varied pupil ability, school culture and curriculum pressure. Fielding (2011) identifies three categories of teacher beliefs that can obstruct participation: paternalistic beliefs, assumptions about children's maturity, and concerns about losing classroom control. Robinson and Taylor (2013) argue that as long as assessment systems are driven by summative examinations, examination culture will remain a major barrier. In Malaysia, Hashim and Mohamad (2022) report that Space is practised most frequently, whereas Influence is implemented least frequently, with curriculum pressure and time constraints identified as major challenges.

Malaysian Context and Research Gap

In Malaysia, the Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013–2025, the Revised Primary School Standard Curriculum (KSSR) 2017, higher-order thinking skills (HOTS) and Classroom-Based Assessment (PBD) provide policy foundations consistent with meaningful student participation. However, implementation continues to be shaped by examination culture and curriculum workload. The literature review identifies four gaps: (i) most studies using the Lundy Model have been conducted in Western countries, with few in Malaysia; (ii) teachers' perspectives as implementers have received limited attention; (iii) local studies tend to use broad surveys rather than in-depth approaches; and (iv) research in national primary schools remains limited.

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This study uses the Lundy Model (2007) as its main theoretical framework and Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) as a supporting theory. Self-Determination Theory explains that motivation and engagement increase when three basic psychological needs are met: autonomy, competence and relatedness. In this study, autonomy is associated with opportunities for pupils to make choices and express views, competence with pupils' confidence to participate, and relatedness with positive relationships among pupils, teachers and peers.

Conceptually, the Lundy Model serves as an analytical lens for examining how participants interpret meaningful student participation. Understanding refers to how teachers explain the concept, while practices

refer to the strategies they report using. Challenges such as limited time, class size and curriculum demands are analysed as themes emerging from the interviews, rather than as variables tested statistically.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Paradigm

This study adopts a qualitative approach and case study design (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016) because it focuses on participants' meanings, experiences and interpretations within a particular school context rather than hypothesis testing. The study is grounded in an interpretivist paradigm, which emphasises understanding social experiences through individuals' interpretations and the contexts in which those experiences occur.

Research Site and Participants

The study was conducted at a national primary school in Bukit Mertajam, Penang. Eight teachers were selected through purposive sampling based on the relevance of their experience to the research questions. They were coded GT-01 to GT-08 to protect their identities. They represented a range of subjects and school levels, with teaching experience ranging from 5 to 26 years (Table 1).

Table 1. Research Participant Profiles (N = 8)

Instrument, Data Collection and Analysis

The main instrument was a semi-structured interview protocol organised around the three research questions and the four elements of the Lundy Model. Follow-up questions were used to obtain clarification and more detailed examples. Participants were also asked to rate student participation practices in their classes on a scale from 1 to 10. With participants' consent, interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed and checked against the original recordings. Interviews with the eight teachers were the only source of empirical data; classroom observations and document analysis were not conducted.

Data were analysed using Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis, involving familiarisation with transcripts, initial coding, grouping codes, developing and reviewing themes, naming themes and writing the report. Verbatim quotations are used to demonstrate the data underpinning each interpretation.

Trustworthiness, Ethics and Researcher Positionality

The credibility of the findings was strengthened by checking transcripts against the original recordings, using verbatim quotations and practising researcher reflexivity. As interviews were the only data source, triangulation with observations or documents was not undertaken. Participants were informed about the study's purpose, recording procedures, confidentiality and their right to withdraw, and informed consent was obtained. The researcher is an educator with a professional relationship to the school context. This position was acknowledged as potentially influencing participants' responses and the interpretation of data; reflexivity was used to distinguish participants' statements from the researcher's interpretations.

FINDINGS

The findings are presented according to the three research questions. All findings represent experiences and practices reported by participants during interviews and were not verified through direct observation.

Teachers' Understanding of Meaningful Student Participation (RQ1)

Cross-case analysis identified six themes.

Theme 1: Active involvement rather than passive attendance. All eight participants distinguished between pupils who were "present" and those who were "engaged". GT-01 explained that meaningful participation

occurs when pupils "genuinely participate actively in the learning process", including having the courage to try even when an answer is wrong. GT-06 distinguished pupils who merely copy answers from those who analyse and discuss first. GT-08, the most experienced participant, emphasised pupils' ability to produce work independently, such as writing a poem without teacher assistance. The consistency of this theme suggests that the basic concept of active participation was widely understood, although most participants had never received formal training on the Lundy Model.

Theme 2: Space prioritises emotional safety over physical space. This theme appeared in all transcripts. GT-05 explained that space is "more about creating a safe, comfortable and inclusive environment so that pupils are not afraid to express their opinions", while GT-08 emphasised that space involves emotional support as well as physical space. Teachers adapted the concept to their subjects: GT-02 (Islamic Education) emphasised valuing pupils' effort rather than perfect answers, while GT-06 (Mathematics) viewed it as a psychological space that reduces the perception that mathematics is difficult. GT-08 also linked feelings of insecurity to adults belittling children's views.

Theme 3: Voice involves diverse forms of expression. All participants stressed that pupils' voices are not limited to spoken language. GT-03 mentioned expression through writing and activities; GT-06 referred to bar-model drawings, written calculation steps and digital tools; and GT-02 stated that younger pupils commonly express themselves through movement, storytelling, drawings and brief verbal responses. GT-08 emphasised equity and the need to encourage quieter pupils through questions directed specifically to them. This understanding extends beyond a narrow interpretation of voice as simply having an opportunity to speak.

Theme 4: Audience means listening as action. Participants distinguished hearing pupils from listening in a way that leads to action. GT-06 described serious listening as examining pupils' thinking to identify the source of errors, while GT-08 defined it as the ability to respond. GT-02 noted that younger pupils are highly sensitive to teachers' attention. Two participants from different backgrounds—GT-03 (Design and Technology, five years' experience) and GT-08 (English, 26 years' experience)—extended the idea of audience to include school administrators, peers, parents and other people, not only teachers.

Theme 5: Influence is conditional and the most complex element. Influence consistently emerged as the most difficult element to interpret and implement. Most participants understood it as conditional influence. GT-04 stated that pupils' views could influence decisions, "but not every suggestion can be accepted"; GT-05 stressed that teachers remain responsible for decisions based on learning objectives, safety and pupils' suitability. GT-08 explained that teachers need not accept pupils' suggestions "100%" but can make "some adaptations" and explain the reasons to pupils. Two participants teaching more structured subjects, GT-02 and GT-06, distinguished fixed content (religious rulings, mathematical formulae and facts) from methods and activities that could be reconsidered. GT-03 described Influence as the factor that determines whether participation is "truly meaningful or just for show".

Theme 6: Connection with children's rights. Six of the eight participants (GT-01, GT-02, GT-04, GT-05, GT-06 and GT-08) connected student participation with children's rights when asked directly. GT-08 stressed that participation is a pupil's right and "not merely a pedagogical approach". The other two participants (GT-03 and GT-07) did not explicitly connect participation with a rights-based framework and viewed it as good pedagogical practice.

Teachers' Practices in Implementing the Lundy Model (RQ2)

Six themes relating to reported practices were identified.

Theme 1: Establishing norms and organising the physical classroom. All participants reported explicit classroom norms to create a safe Space, such as prohibiting ridicule of incorrect answers (GT-02, GT-04, GT-05, GT-06 and GT-08), arranging seats in groups (GT-01, GT-03, GT-05, GT-06 and GT-08), and requiring pupils to listen without interrupting (GT-02 and GT-06). GT-08 used mixed-ability groups so that more proficient pupils could help peers who needed support, and stressed that teachers must not ridicule answers or embarrass pupils.

Theme 2: Cooperative strategies and open-ended questions. Think-pair-share, group discussions and open-ended questions were the most frequently mentioned strategies. GT-03 used think-pair-share, round-robin and gallery walks as daily routines. GT-05 added wait time after asking questions, while GT-06 used open-ended questions in Mathematics, for example asking pupils to provide two different ways to solve 12 divided by 5. GT-08 offered an important qualification: these strategies were "more suitable for classes with higher ability levels"; in lower-performing classes, the teacher provided more guidance and demonstrations. This indicates that approaches to Voice need to be adapted to pupils' readiness.

Theme 3: Supporting quieter pupils. All participants reported specific strategies to involve pupils who lacked confidence, including structured pair work and thinking time (GT-04), mini-whiteboards for written responses (GT-03 and GT-06), assigning a specific role to each group member (GT-06), and directing questions to quieter pupils (GT-08).

Theme 4: Non-verbal tools and channels. GT-03 used exit tickets, positive notes on the wall, a class suggestion box, Padlet and Kahoot. GT-02 used emotion cards, reward charts and visual cues suited to younger pupils. GT-08 described a long-term reflective journal practice called a "time capsule", in which pupils wrote their hopes for the year and revisited the journal at the end of the year.

Theme 5: Sharing pedagogical authority. This theme was reported by two participants. GT-03 involved pupils in determining assessment criteria for group presentations. GT-08 reported peer assessment (pupils exchanged books after a spelling test and checked their work together) and the "little teacher" practice, in which more capable pupils were given opportunities to teach peers at the front of the class. These were the clearest examples of sharing pedagogical power in this study.

Theme 6: Concrete responses to pupils' suggestions. All eight participants provided at least one example of a pupil suggestion leading to a change in teaching (Table 2). The consistent pattern was that teachers changed the delivery method or assessment, rather than the content or learning objectives.

Table 2. Examples of Reported Influence Practices by Participant

GT-08 also reported a "slow talk" practice: when a pupil's suggestion could not be implemented, the teacher explained why it was not possible at that time. This practice aligns with Lundy's (2007) argument that taking pupils' views into account also requires transparent feedback.

Implementation Challenges (RQ3)

Five challenge-related themes were identified.

Theme 1: Time constraints and syllabus pressure. All eight participants reported this challenge. GT-03 identified the crowded syllabus as a major obstacle; GT-08 explained that teaching and learning periods were sometimes only half an hour; and GT-06 linked the issue to pressure to ensure that all pupils achieved the minimum proficiency level.

Theme 2: Class size and differences in pupil ability. Seven of the eight participants reported this challenge. GT-05 stated that it was difficult to ensure equal opportunities for every pupil in a large class. GT-06 suggested that Mathematics classes should not exceed 25 pupils, while GT-08 noted that pupils of different abilities require different amounts of time to understand concepts.

Theme 3: Pupils' affective factors and out-of-school environment. GT-06 mentioned mathematics anxiety, GT-01 referred to pupils who lacked confidence and feared making mistakes, and GT-03 reported that some pupils used opportunities to speak to engage in off-topic conversations. GT-08 described parental involvement in lower-performing classes as "very disappointing" and explained that many pupils from B40 households used Malay exclusively at home, requiring teachers to be creative when promoting participation in English lessons.

Theme 4: Influence was consistently rated the weakest element. Of the six participants who provided scores or comparisons across the elements, all rated Influence as the weakest or most difficult element (Table 3).

Participants gave three reasons: the need to maintain the integrity of curriculum content (GT-02, GT-04, GT-05, GT-06 and GT-08); time constraints and examination schedules (GT-02, GT-06 and GT-08); and the epistemological limits of subjects with fixed facts or procedures (GT-02 and GT-06). Thus, the weakness of Influence was not attributed to teachers' unwillingness to listen to pupils, but to tension between pupil autonomy and curriculum responsibilities.

Table 3. Participants' Self-Ratings Across the Lundy Model Elements

An additional finding from GT-08 was that self-ratings differed between classes taught by the same teacher: scores of 7–8 for high-performing classes and 5 or below for lower-performing classes, because pupils in the latter "need more help and guidance from the teacher". This suggests that participation varies according to classroom context and pupil readiness, rather than being a fixed characteristic of an individual teacher.

Theme 5: Tension between learner-centred approaches and traditional methods. GT-08, who reported relatively developed participation practices and emphasised participation as a right, also stated that, if given the opportunity, the teacher would like to teach as in the past using "chalk and talk", believing that note-taking helps pupils learn "in the old way". At the same time, the teacher's own passive schooling experience had encouraged greater openness. This tension does not necessarily indicate inconsistency; it may reflect an experienced teacher weighing different forms of evidence.

DISCUSSION

Teachers' Understanding (RQ1)

The findings indicate that participants had a reasonably strong intuitive understanding of all four elements of the Lundy Model, although most had never received formal training in it. This differs from the initial expectation that teachers' understanding might be superficial. Two plausible explanations are: (i) informal exposure to learner-centred principles through programmes such as 21st-Century Learning (PAK21), HOTS and Classroom-Based Assessment (PBD), reported by nearly all participants, may have fostered intuitive understanding (Cook-Sather, 2020); and (ii) teachers' interpretation of Influence as conditional influence is consistent with Lundy's (2007) original explanation that Influence does not mean pupils have complete control over classroom decisions.

Two findings stand out. First, two participants extended Audience to include peers, parents and the community, suggesting that its implementation may require consideration of a broader ecosystem of listeners beyond teachers. Second, teachers in structured subjects distinguished fixed content from methods that could be reconsidered. This suggests that the reasonable scope of Influence may vary according to the nature of a discipline, a nuance not explicitly discussed in the original Lundy Model. Both findings are preliminary insights from eight participants in one school and warrant further investigation.

Teachers' Practices (RQ2)

The gap between understanding and practice appeared smaller than expected, particularly for Influence, because all participants could provide examples of teaching changes resulting from pupils' suggestions. This finding should be interpreted cautiously. The interview questions specifically requested concrete examples, so participants may have recalled uncommon experiences as evidence of practice. The findings are therefore better understood as evidence that teachers can implement Influence in concrete ways when circumstances permit, rather than as an indication that it occurs frequently in daily routines. This interpretation is supported by the RQ3 finding that Influence was still rated the weakest element. Previous research has also reported that Influence is the least frequently implemented element (Hashim & Mohamad, 2022).

The "little teacher" practice, peer assessment and "slow talk" reported by GT-08 were the most substantive implementations identified in this study. The "little teacher" practice goes beyond giving pupils an opportunity to speak by sharing some pedagogical authority, consistent with Cook-Sather's (2020) argument that authentic participation requires changes to classroom power structures. These practices should be understood as

participant reports rather than independently verified practices. The finding that think-pair-share may be less suitable for lower-performing classes without additional guidance also suggests that teacher training should offer strategies adapted to different classroom contexts rather than a uniform set of "best practices".

Implementation Challenges (RQ3)

The findings confirm time constraints and class size as major structural barriers, consistent with the literature review (Hashim & Mohamad, 2022). The most consistent finding was that Influence was rated the weakest element by all participants who provided element-level comparisons. Participants attributed this to curriculum integrity, examination schedules and the epistemological limits of certain subjects. In this study, the weakness of Influence did not appear to stem from paternalistic teacher attitudes as identified by Fielding (2011), but rather from tension between an examination-oriented system and the crowded KSSR syllabus. This interpretation is based on participants' explanations and was not tested through observation.

The difference in GT-08's scores between high- and lower-performing classes raises an equity concern. If lower-achieving pupils, who may most need opportunities to express their views and be heard, receive fewer opportunities to participate, implementation of the Lundy Model could reinforce existing gaps rather than reduce them. This finding comes from one participant only and should be treated as an early indication requiring more systematic investigation.

GT-08's tension between commitment to participation and a preference for "chalk and talk" should not be interpreted simply as rejection of learner-centred approaches, since the same participant reported some of the most developed participation practices. A more plausible interpretation is that teachers' acceptance of learner-centred approaches is selective and integrative. Professional development programmes should acknowledge this reality so that they are not perceived as dismissing teachers' professional experience.

Implications of the Study

Theoretical implications. This study proposes three considerations for further discussion of the Lundy Model: (i) the epistemological nature of a subject may shape the scope of Influence that teachers consider reasonable; (ii) Audience may be extended to an ecosystem of listeners that includes peers, parents and the community; and (iii) participation may be more appropriately conceptualised at class level rather than teacher level, because the same teacher may report different levels of participation in different classes.

Practical implications. Professional development should focus on Influence rather than Space or Voice, which were reported as relatively well established. Training should be practical and subject-specific, helping teachers distinguish aspects that can be reconsidered (methods, activities and assessment) from those that remain fixed (core facts and curriculum objectives). Practices such as "slow talk", sharing authority through "little teachers", and peer assessment can be shared as examples of meeting Influence without requiring teachers to accept every suggestion. Strategies should also be adapted to pupils' readiness.

Policy implications. At school level, existing Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), as reported by GT-06 and GT-08, could be used more purposefully to share Influence practices across subject panels. At national level, participants' suggestions concerning class size and syllabus flexibility support the need to review the KSSR curriculum workload. Particular attention should also be given to equity in participation so that learner-centred initiatives do not disproportionately benefit pupils who are already advantaged.

LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The main limitation is the use of interviews as the sole data source. The findings reflect the experiences and practices reported by eight teachers rather than direct observational evidence; therefore, correspondence between reported and actual practice could not be verified. The study was also limited to one school and eight participants, so the findings cannot be statistically generalised. Participants' responses may have been influenced by social desirability, and the researcher's professional relationship with the school context may

have affected responses and interpretation. Interviews were conducted in Malay, and some transcripts were generated using automated software, but were checked against the original audio recordings.

Future research is recommended to: (i) combine interviews with structured classroom observations and document analysis; (ii) include more than one school with different socioeconomic contexts; (iii) collect data at classroom level to examine participation gaps between high-performing and lower-performing classes; and (iv) systematically compare how the nature of different subjects shapes the scope of Influence.

CONCLUSION

This study explored teachers' understanding and practices concerning meaningful student participation based on the Lundy Model through interviews with eight teachers at a national primary school in Bukit Mertajam, Penang. Participants demonstrated a reasonably strong intuitive understanding of Space, Voice and Audience despite having no formal exposure to the model, and all could provide concrete examples of Influence in practice. However, their self-assessments consistently identified Influence as the weakest element, particularly because of tension between pupil autonomy and curriculum and assessment demands. An additional finding was that participation levels may differ between classes taught by the same teacher, raising questions about equity.

Based on participants' reports, the main gap in implementing meaningful student participation at the study site appears to lie in structural tension between learner-centred pedagogical aspirations and curriculum and assessment culture, rather than in a lack of teacher readiness or understanding. Strengthening meaningful student participation therefore requires support beyond teacher training, including adjustments to curriculum and assessment and support from school administrators, in line with the aspirations of the Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013–2025. As the study relied solely on interviews, these conclusions should be examined further through research incorporating observation and document analysis.

REFERENCES

1. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101.
2. Cook-Sather, A. (2020). Student voice across contexts: Fostering student agency in today's schools. Theory Into Practice, 59(2), 182–191. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1705091
3. Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
4. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. Plenum Press.
5. Fielding, M. (2011). Patterns of partnership: Student voice, intergenerational learning and democratic fellowship. In N. Mockler & J. Sachs (Eds.), Rethinking educational practice through reflexive inquiry (pp. 61–75). Springer.
6. Hart, R. A. (1992). Children's participation: From tokenism to citizenship (Innocenti Essays No. 4). UNICEF International Child Development Centre.
7. Hashim, A. T., & Mohamad, M. (2022). Teachers' understanding and practice of meaningful student participation in Malaysian primary schools. Asian Journal of University Education, 18(2), 112–128.
8. Ministry of Education Malaysia. (2013). Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013–2025 (Preschool to Post-Secondary Education). Ministry of Education Malaysia.
9. 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.
10. Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
11. Noraini, I., & Mislan, N. (2020). Implementation of learner-centred teaching practices among primary school teachers in Malaysia. Jurnal Pendidikan Malaysia, 45(1), 1–12.
12. Robinson, C., & Taylor, C. (2013). Student voice as a contested practice: Power and participation in two student voice projects. Improving Schools, 16(1), 32–46.

13. Sapian, M. A., Mahamod, Z., & Mahad, M. (2021). Student engagement in learning: Effects of teachers' teaching approaches on motivation and achievement. Jurnal Pendidikan Malaysia, 46(2), 45–58.
14. United Nations. (1989). Convention on the Rights of the Child. United Nations.
15. Wong, A. S., & Lim, C. P. (2021). Implementing student participation in Singapore primary schools: Teachers' perspectives. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 41(3), 417–431.

Table 1. Research Participant Profiles (N = 8)

Code	Specialisation / Subject	Teaching Experience	Year Level Taught
GT-01	Science and English	12 years	Year 1
GT-02	Islamic Education	Not stated	Level 1 (Years 1–3)
GT-03	Design and Technology	5 years	Level 2 (Years 4–6)
GT-04	English	10 years	Years 1–4
GT-05	English	10+ years	Year 2
GT-06	Mathematics	12 years	Level 2 (Years 4–6)
GT-07	English, Science, Music, Physical and Health Education, History	16 years	Years 1–5
GT-08	English	26 years	Years 1 and 5

Table 2. Examples of Reported Influence Practices by Participant

Code	Pupil Suggestion / Feedback	Teacher Response
GT-01	Conduct the activity as a game	Changed the activity to a picture-matching game
GT-02	Simulate table manners	Adjusted the teaching and learning activity and recorded it in the lesson reflection
GT-03	The project task was considered too difficult	Changed the assessment from an individual report to a group poster presentation
GT-04	Use pictures or games for the topic	Changed the learning setting and method
GT-05	Work in small groups	Accepted and implemented the suggestion
GT-06	Difficulty understanding cross-multiplication	Introduced visual methods and practical activities; changed the worksheet to station-based activities
GT-07	Set the task in a game format	Integrated game elements without neglecting the learning objectives
GT-08	Use a scrapbook for the "healthy food" project	Accepted and implemented the suggestion more formally

Table 3. Participants' Self-Ratings Across the Lundy Model Elements

Code	Overall Score	Highest-Rated Element	Lowest-Rated Element
GT-01	7/10	Not stated	Influence
GT-02	7/10	Space and Audience (8/10)	Influence (5/10)
GT-03	7–7.5/10	Space (8.5/10)	Influence (6/10)
GT-05	8/10	Voice (easiest)	Influence (most challenging)
GT-06	7.5/10	Space (8/10)	Influence (7/10)
GT-08	7–8 (high-performing class); 5 or below (lower-performing class)	Space (easiest)	Influence (most difficult)

Editorial note: Please verify all reference details, journal titles, DOI links and the target journal's submission requirements before submission.