

Pedagogical Innovations and Student Voices: A Longitudinal Examination of Engagement in Elementary Schools

Sharifah Ibrahim Alghamdi*

Abstract

From 2023 to 2024, this mixed-approaches longitudinal study follows students of varying ages to see how characteristics related to emotional and social development, curriculum flexibility, and innovative teaching methods affect their engagement and performance in the classroom. Educators and students are followed for one year in this study to see how educational approaches change and impact students' learning. For this study, researchers conducted a one-time survey of a sizable group of teachers and students to compile quantitative data on topics such as classroom climate, student engagement, technological resources, and the prevalence of creative pedagogy. Key aspects of child-centered learning and emotional and social development were identified through factor analysis, and patterns across time were studied through longitudinal analysis. Qualitative data was gathered through task-based classroom observations, teacher interviews, and student focus groups. Recurring themes concerning the efficacy of pedagogical approaches and the significance of social and emotional support in encouraging student engagement were uncovered via the use of thematic analysis. The study found that curricular flexibility and creative teaching methods significantly boosted students' involvement and academic performance. When paired with an environment that fosters kids' social and emotional development, this becomes much more evident. Combining quantitative and qualitative data is required to fully understand the interplay between these factors and how they affect learning results. Educators and policymakers can use the data to inform their pursuit of better teaching practices and the promotion of students' holistic development across age groups.

Keywords: Teaching methods, 21st Century learners, education technology, flexible curriculum, holistic education, student engagement

INTRODUCTION

According to UNESCO (2021), equality is experiencing a decline, considered by its inadequacies and susceptibility. In order to prepare students for the future's uncertainties, UNESCO stresses the critical relevance of education in fostering their ability to participate actively in democracy and as citizens. An examination of methods to effectively involve children has emerged, acknowledging their entitlement to both autonomy and expression (Morrow 2011) [1]. This signifies a significant change in the recognition that children possess distinct perspectives and attitudes that are independent from the adults in their lives (Matthews 2007) [2]. Individuals should possess the authority to demand respect and ensure that their opinions are acknowledged (Federle 1994) [3]. This reflects a fundamental shift in understanding that children have distinct viewpoints and attitudes from adults (Matthews, 2007). It emphasizes that individuals,

*Author for Correspondence

Sharifah Ibrahim Alghamdi
E-mail: simalghamdi@kau.edu.sa

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Early Childhood, King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

Received Date: September 04, 2024
Accepted Date: September 05, 2024
Published Date: September 30, 2024

Citation: Sharifah Ibrahim Alghamdi. Pedagogical Innovations and Student Voices: A Longitudinal Examination of Engagement in Elementary Schools. International Journal of Education Sciences. 2024; 1(2): 44–55p.

even youngsters, should be able to demand respect and have their perspectives heard (Federle, 1994). This study seeks to investigate and bridge the gap between global policies advocating for children's participation and present educational practices, which frequently fail to consider children's perspectives in decision-making processes. Children have historically been excluded from decisions about their identities and the quality of their lives (Federle, 1994). However, worldwide governments now acknowledge children as significant sources of information and experts in their own lives. They are consequently regarded as the most dependable advisors on topics affecting them. Despite this acknowledgement, educational decision-making procedures do not always consider children's opinions. According to James, Jenks, and Prout (1998), children are frequently removed from decision-making processes because they are deemed immature and incapable. This study is critical for reexamining old ideas of children's capacities and arguing for their proper participation in decision-making processes, so supporting more inclusive and equitable pedagogical approaches. According to Devine (2003) [4], schools generally focus on adults and pay little attention to the status of children inside the system. This is especially important in the early years sector, when youngsters are frequently regarded as the least likely to be involved in such issues. To address this issue, a study was done to incorporate the viewpoints of children in the reception classes (aged four to five years in their first year of formal learning) at an infant and primary school in the North of England (Devine, 2003). This study sought to better comprehend children's rights and standing within the educational system, emphasizing the need of recognizing the perspectives of young people who are frequently marginalized. The study's main findings revealed that children's perception of inclusion revolved around concepts of belonging and relationships, personal interests, and having control over the content, setting, or method of teaching activities. The study's second part examined how practitioners, such as teachers, nursery nurses, and teaching assistants, can react to children's opinions about their teaching methods. The report goes into greater detail about these findings. It was discovered that practitioners frequently have difficulties in effectively aligning their teaching approaches with the child's perspective, limiting their capacity to support learning based on the children's unique interests and preferences. The most recent assessment from Ofsted 2017 [5] demonstrates a noticeable change in focus, as eight out of fifteen recommendations highlight the need of employing formal teaching approaches that disregard individual needs. The language and tone of the Ofsted report, although not offering recommendations, but rather demanding action, may pose a problem for practitioners in making decisions while still being sensitive to the child's perspective. Therefore, the study presents the viewpoints of professionals regarding how to address children's perceived ideas of inclusiveness and examines the influence of national policies and regulatory bodies on their teaching methods. Furthermore, it urges professionals to actively involve themselves with the perspectives of young children and supports a moral standpoint about the position and importance of children, which acknowledges and advocates for their right to be recognized as individuals of worth and individuals with entitlements (Greene and Hill 2005 [6]. According to Corsaro and Everitt (2023), there has historically been a dearth of knowledge of how young children express their opinions [7]. They believe that, while evidence shows that children's decision-making abilities improve with more options, this growth frequently restricts their potential effect.

In a more recent study, MacNaughton, Hughes, and Smith (2007) point out that there is a lack of research involving young children and doubts about their ability to contribute meaningfully to policy-making [8]. This has resulted in a lack of empirical evidence supporting the idea that consulting young children is beneficial. Flutter and Rudduck (2004) [9] argue for developing inclusive environments for children, highlighting the necessity of gathering feedback from a varied spectrum of young people. They claim that this strategy assures that participation is not limited to those who are articulate or literate. This is especially relevant for young children and aligns with Kellett (2011) concept that children perceive things differently and have distinct priorities and worries [10]. Hence, it is crucial for adults, who have the authority to make decisions regarding children's life, to actively and easily involve themselves in listening to and considering their opinions. Nevertheless, in order to attentively consider children's opinions, it could be essential to make a decision when faced with conflicting viewpoints from many children. This challenges the notion that all children have a unified voice or culture

(Woodhead 2009) [11]. Nutbrown and Clough (2009) recognize that although it may provide challenges to address these varied perspectives, modifications in both practice and surroundings can enhance inclusivity and empower all attendees [12]. In the Early Childhood Education system, children are considered as naturally evolving individuals who actively participate in the learning process. The curriculum and theoretical frameworks are intended to elucidate the concepts of active learning by looking at diverse systems, activities, social capital, and human motivation. Examples of these frameworks are New Zealand's *Te Whāriki* and Australia's EYLF (Department of Education Employment and Workforce Relations, 2009).

Nevertheless, there appears to be a global trend towards incorporating developmentally appropriate practices (DAP) in early childhood education (ECE), notwithstanding the advice of early years academics. Moss, Dahlberg, and Pence (2006) [13] and Siraj Blatchford and Sylva (2004) [14] argue that it is important to have a balance between group work led by practitioners and play activities that children choose themselves but can still be educational. They also emphasize the need for a balance between adapting the curriculum to individual needs and promoting ongoing collaborative thinking. What is particularly troubling is the idea that an early childhood educator will excel at teaching in environments that implement Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP), so promoting the belief in teaching methods that are universally applicable and based on age-related stages. Furthermore, MacNaughton states that this method has been deeply ingrained in early childhood studies to the point where its familiarity gives the impression of being correct, superior, and morally sound. According to Taguchi (2010) [15], an onto-epistemological perspective suggests that there are no non-contextualized and universally applicable "best ways of learning." Consequently, practitioners must familiarize themselves with the intricacies, variations, and diversities of the environments in which all participants in the teaching and learning process are situated. As a result, the patterns of thought and action in these processes should be subject to critical analysis. Practitioners need to have a certain degree of pedagogical understanding in order to engage in such levels of reflexivity and analysis. However, they often struggle to express this understanding (Moyle, Adams, and Musgrove 2002) [16]. The lack of articulation in early childhood education (ECE) may be attributed to the absence of effective strategies that prioritize the nurturing and advancement of physical, social, and cognitive growth. In addition, the early years sector has made efforts to establish a distinct identity that is distinct from traditional school-based education. This may explain the restricted opportunities for professional development and discussion. Stephen (2010) [17] points out that there is a noticeable absence of direct mention of teaching methods in the education and training of early childhood education practitioners. However, research in the field of early education (Moss, Dahlberg, and Pence 2000; Dahlberg and Moss 2005) and the study of effective teaching methods are increasingly focusing on the concept of a 'listening pedagogy' (Rinaldi 2005) [18]. This educational approach acknowledges and values young children as proactive and influential participants in their own learning and growth (Dahlberg, Moss, and Pence 2006). Formosinho and Oliveira-Formosinho (2008) [19] propose a participatory pedagogy that fosters the development of democracy, identities, humanity, and knowledge. This is achieved by immersing children in pedagogical contexts where they actively contribute to the construction of their own learning. If practitioners actively listen to children and incorporate their thoughts in the organization and planning of the learning environment, children will have a sense of respect, value, inclusion, and acknowledgement, regardless of their unique characteristics and perhaps even because of them. Lenz Taguchi (2010) defines pedagogy as a method that effectively utilizes variations, diversities, and heightened intricacies in the process of learning and acquiring knowledge. She argues that pedagogical practice rooted in a philosophy of belonging and learning is distinct from one grounded in sociocultural models of learning, which are prevalent in the broader field of education and particularly in early childhood education (Roberts-Holmes, 2012) [20]. The sociocultural theories in the Early Years Foundation Stage (Department of Education 2017) [21] focus on how the social context can affect an individual's learning and development, rather than considering how the child's individuality and cultural beliefs influence their developmental environment (Rogoff 1998) [22]. Therefore, the process of learning is simplified and made uniform by a linear model of advancement, which overlooks the

child's feeling of being a part of the learning process. In England, the chief inspector of Ofsted, Amanda Spielman, responded to criticism of the Bold Beginnings report by acknowledging that although children should not spend hours sitting at desks, there is still a need for structured teaching of essential concepts in the reception class. In a structured and evaluation-focused education system, there is a risk that children's learning and education will be reduced to a list of necessary skills that determine their level of competence when they start school (Ang 2014) [23]. The concept of what should be taught is subject to critical discussion, as it is based on a particular legislative mandate. Genishi and Dyson (2009) highlight the noticeable discrepancy between the actual implementation of early year's education and the policies set by the government [24]. Their study uncovers the daily difficulties experienced by early year's educators who must navigate the pressures of academic evaluations and feel obligated to make concessions in their teaching methods to accommodate the requirements of a prescribed curriculum. This paper combines the study of pedagogic voice in sociology with a framework based on children's rights in order to address two specific research topics. How do children in varied primary school settings in Ireland experience being listened to and actively participating in decision-making processes relating to their learning? Furthermore, how do the interactions between children and instructors and their educational experiences in the classroom shape and change the expression of children's perspectives? We suggested utilizing a rights-based approach to children's pedagogic voice as a suitable framework for examining their involvement in decision-making and how this impacts their learning experiences. We utilize both quantitative and qualitative data from the longitudinal mixed-methods cohort study called Children's School Lives (CSL) project to examine the perspectives and encounters of children and teachers regarding- exert control over their own learning CSI is a nationally recognized organization.

POETS' PERSPECTIVE ON SOCIOLOGY

Arnot and Reay (2007) established the sociological idea of pedagogic voice, which investigates the power dynamics involved in the development of 'voices' and 'messages' in the classroom [25]. Rather than focusing on the voices required to reform teaching methods, this approach prioritizes investigating the voices shaped by existing methods. This viewpoint is useful for understanding when and how verbal expressiveness affects the learning process. The sociology of pedagogic voice is founded on Bernstein's concept of the "voice of pedagogy" (Bernstein, 2004) [26], which distinguishes between pedagogical regulations and how children interpret them. In this context, it is critical to understand the power dynamics that shape and constrain the messages sent via diverse modes of communication. Arnot and Reay (2007) further note that it delves into the ways in which interactions impact messages and their expression. Sociology has had an impact on many branches of study, including those that deal with visual expressions by children and interactive approaches with children. The pedagogic voice and its associated principles and conceptions have been the basis for these investigations. Some examples of this type of research are critical assessments of participatory approaches by Mayes, Finneran, and Black (2019) and Donegan et al. (2023) [27, 28]. Another example is the investigation of the potential of children's visual voices by Luttrell (2010) [29] and Samonova, Devine, and Luttrell (2022). In addition, it has impacted research on student engagement in school governance and decision-making (Bron and Veugelers 2014; Quinn and Owen 2016) [30, 31], as well as student perceptions of various teaching approaches (McGillicuddy and Devine 2020) [32]. In order to understand the dynamics of power in the classroom, this study looks at the sociology of pedagogic voice. It focuses on the narratives and pedagogical interactions between teachers and students to get insight into how these interactions shape and change both the teacher's voice and the message being conveyed.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Question

1. How can the utilization of cutting edge pedagogical techniques and adaptability in the curriculum enhance the involvement and scholastic achievement of students 6 to 11 years.
2. How can emotional and social development variables, such as specialized training for educators and the classroom environment, contribute to promoting student involvement in the age range from junior infants to 1st class (6–7 years old) and 2nd class (7–8 years old) to 5th class (10–11 years old)?

Research Objective

1. To investigate the impact of cutting-edge pedagogical practices and curricular adaptation on increasing student involvement and academic achievement among kids aged 6 to 11 during the year 2023–2024.
2. To investigate the influencing factors on improving student engagement and participation at various stages of development.

Research Design

The study will utilize a mixed-approaches approach, combining quantitative and qualitative data to give a thorough examination of the influence of new teaching methods on student engagement. The quantitative data will allow for a statistical examination of student engagement indicators, and the qualitative data will provide more in-depth insights into student experiences and perspectives. This method integration will allow for a more comprehensive understanding of how these new teaching styles influence both measured and subjective components of student involvement.

TARGET AUDIENCE

Individuals in the field of education who are interested in adopting progressive teaching approaches, enhancing educational results, gaining knowledge about contemporary educational strategies, and conducting research in the subject.

The sample size will be around four schools, carefully chosen to guarantee a broad representation of various geographical contexts, including urban, suburban, and rural areas. Each school will have 2–3 classes included in the study, providing a full overview of various educational environments and teaching approaches. The study will engage approximately 100 educators, including teachers, nursery nurses, and teaching assistants, to capture a diverse spectrum of professional viewpoints and practices. These educators will be observed and surveyed to learn how their teaching approaches and classroom conditions affect student engagement and learning results. Additionally, the sample will comprise roughly 40 children from various age groups, ranging from junior infants (ages 6–7) to fifth graders (ages 10–11). This selection seeks to cover a wide range of developmental phases, providing insights into how different age groups react to novel pedagogical strategies and adaptive curricula.

DATA COLLECTION METHODS AND TOOLS EMPLOYED

Surveys and Questionnaires

- *Teachers:* To gather data on the use of innovative teaching methods, the extent of professional development, access to technological tools, and perceptions of curriculum flexibility.
- *Students:* To measure levels of engagement, interest, and enthusiasm through validated engagement scales.
- *Parents:* To assess involvement and perceptions of the new pedagogical approaches.

From 2023 to 2024, yearly data on student participation and academic achievement were gathered. Descriptive statistics were used to assess characteristics such as the availability of technology resources, classroom atmosphere, student participation, and usage of innovative pedagogical approaches. To assess the data's eligibility for factor analysis, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sample adequacy were used. Kaiser (1974) describes the KMO measure as an index for evaluating the simplicity of factorial structures, whereas Bartlett (1950) proved the importance of these tests for establishing data appropriateness in factor analysis. Factor analysis with rotating component matrix tables revealed two dimensions: "Child-Centered Learning" and "Emotional and Social Development." In-depth semi-structured interviews and other qualitative data gathering methods were used in the study to augment these findings. These qualitative interviews allow for open-ended questions to drive the topic while also allowing for further exploration of participants' comments. The goal of these interviews is to fully elicit each person's unique experiences, thoughts, and points of view. Careful observation, also known as systematic qualitative observation, entails intently studying

behaviors, relationships, and settings in their natural setting, without interference. This method differs from quantitative observation in that it emphasizes on understanding the context and interpreting the importance of acts and interactions, rather than quantifying them. Furthermore, free-form surveys were used as a qualitative data gathering approach in this study. These questionnaires have open-ended questions that let respondents provide their own words to describe their ideas, emotions, and experiences as opposed to being restricted to predetermined answers. The responses are evaluated to uncover trends and themes, offering more information about dimensions such as ‘Child-Centered Learning’ and ‘Emotional and Social Development.’ It helps us comprehend people’s experiences more thoroughly. The role of specialized training and classroom conditions in influencing student involvement and emotional development was explored in interviews with instructors. Students’ experiences with innovative teaching methods, the availability of emotional support in the classroom, and their overall engagement were all topics covered in the focus groups that were held with them. Various teaching strategies’ effects on student involvement were illuminated by observational data gathered during classroom activities that centered on play and other forms of interactive work. Information that lacks a clear numerical value but is rich in description is known as qualitative data. Because it captures the diversity and richness of human experiences, it helps us grasp the topic at hand better. The role of specialized training and classroom conditions in influencing student involvement and emotional development was explored in interviews with instructors. Students’ experiences with new teaching methods, the availability of emotional support in the classroom, and their overall engagement were the primary foci of the focus groups. Classroom observation data that centered on play and other interactive activities was analyzed to provide useful information about how different teaching strategies affected student involvement.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Each year, four schools are selected to represent a varied range of urban, suburban, and rural locations. In both 2023 and 2024, 100 educators, including teachers, nursery nurses, and teaching assistants, will participate, providing a diverse spectrum of professional viewpoints and practices.

Group A comprises of 20 children who were observed as first-class students (ages 6–7) in 2023 and will move to second-class students (ages 7–8) in 2024. Group B consists of 20 children observed in 2023 as fourth-grade students (ages 9–10) who will advance to fifth-grade (ages 10–11) by 2024 as shown in Table 1.

This study’s sample size consists of four schools designed to reflect a variety of geographical contexts, including urban, suburban, and rural areas, ensuring a comprehensive overview of varied educational environments and teaching approaches. Each school has 2–3 courses, providing a diverse perspective on various educational settings. The study includes 100 educators, including teachers, nursery nurses, and teaching assistants, to capture a diverse range of professional perspectives and practices. Furthermore, the study includes many specialised activities: Every year, 100 educators are interviewed to gain insights into teaching methods and classroom dynamics; children focus groups are

Table 1. Summary of longitudinal statistical information.

Year	Group of schools	Group of educators	Group of children (A)	Class/age (A)	Group of children (B)	Class/age (B)
2023	4	100	20	6–7 years	20	9–10 years
2024	4	100	20	7–8 years	20	10–11 years

Table 2. Summary of Longitudinal qualitative information.

Year	Educators interviewed	Children focus groups	Task centered on observation and play
2023	100	40	40
2024	100	40	40

held to capture children's perspectives on their learning experiences; and 40 task-centered observations and play sessions are conducted to better understand children's interactions and engagement in various classroom settings as shown in Table 2.

Conversations Between Educators and Strategies for Children's Voice in the School

As students advance through primary school, teachers appear to be unsure about how much student voice should be included in the classroom. The survey results show an age-related trend, instructors of senior babies (Cohort A) use more techniques involving children's voices than teachers of first and fourth grades. By the fifth grade (Cohort B), these practices are used the least. The data indicate that as kids get older, teachers give them less flexibility in the classroom. This trend is consistent with interview data, which showed that instructors' approaches to incorporating children's voices differed depending on the students' ages and grade levels. Teachers in lower primary classes (Junior Infants, Senior Infants, and 1st class, ages 4–7) primarily focused on presenting children with a variety of choices. These options were largely related to classroom management, such as room layout, student seating preferences, and student work displays. According to the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment's Aistear, The Early Childhood Curriculum Framework (2009) [33–35], the framework guides decisions about children's learning preferences during play, the frequency of teacher check-ins, and the freedom to raise their hands in class. Teachers faced little obstacles and dangers in making decisions involving this age group, and as a result, there would be few modifications to pedagogy, curriculum, or assessment. Teachers of older elementary students (grades 4 and 5, or 9–11 years old) recognise that student voice is more of a supplement than an integral part of their lessons (Cook-Sather and Lundy L) [36, 37]. Despite the importance of children's voices, instructors claimed that students in this age group seldom have a say in learning-related planning or decision-making, according to contrasting survey results and interview conversations. Given that children at this age have firm opinions on matters pertaining to their education and would anticipate a more substantial and meaningful engagement resulting in a larger impact on decision-making if asked for their input, this is concerning (Lodge, 2008) [38]. Teachers' practices regarding children's voice are thus less affected by students' developmental stage and increasing cognitive abilities, and more by the possibilities presented by the curriculum and the reduced dangers associated with giving students a say or letting them participate in decision-making. Key obstacles to children's voice inclusion in junior classes include curriculum pressure, academic expectations, the pressure of standardised exams, and a lack of personal flexibility. In my classroom, I don't think kids have nearly enough of a voice to say no. As I mentioned earlier, I will make an effort to incorporate anything that catches their attention, but it's not formal. Nothing like a student circle—a time for kids to talk about what they're interested in learning more about—is planned. The curriculum has limitations, of course, but there have to be more chances for students to choose what and how they learn (Mesquita, 2023) [39]. While I recognise the value of student voice, I fear that it is currently underutilised in my classroom. (Rural. Female-Only. Non-DEIS) without a doubt, I would notice it occurring more frequently in the senior room. Reason being the student council is actively involved. Yes, that would definitely... Right now, I wouldn't say that happens nearly enough in my class. It hasn't really taken the kind of sitting down with them and letting them contribute to creating a plan, but I do pick up on things that they appreciate and could be interested in and go with it. (Educator - Open-Enrollment, Rural, Non-DEIS). In the child-led phase of the Early Childhood Curriculum Framework (Aistear), children have the greatest freedom to choose their own activities and materials, while they still have adult supervision at certain stations (Watson and Newman 2024) [40]. Then, based on what is available at the station, they formulate the plan. (Teacher - Non-DEIS, Co-ed, Rural) However, I do intend to make it a priority to incorporate more of that next year; after all that is what is meant to be happening. School policies and procedures that encourage and facilitate student voice were profoundly affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. Many educators have observed a shift in the emphasis of their lessons from students to the fundamental subjects included in the curriculum. Also, most people agreed that parents were the go-betweens for their kids' opinions during lockdown, therefore how involved parents were affected how much their kids' views were heard online. The most common reason teachers cited for students' lack of participation and involvement in online classroom discussions was their socioeconomic status (SES).

The crisis hit DEIS students very hard, according to teachers, on many levels (financial, family, resource availability, etc.). Because of this, the kids had less opportunity to speak up in the virtual classroom and express themselves. Your socioeconomic level is irrelevant to me since I think that gadgets are a problem in homes. Someone in the village may be interested in purchasing the equipment, but they have four children, two of whom are enrolled in college. Consequently, the student at our school may not be eligible to get the gadget. The demographics of the family may play a role. But in terms of social justice and equity, absolutely, it's a major deal. All the way down to the most basic necessities like food, water, and personal cleanliness. The bills must be astronomical. (Practitioner - Non-DEIS, All-Female, City School) So, it's incredibly challenging, and it's a bit of a catch-22 because kids used to hear me talk about "my rights and my work", but now they only hear that through their parents. This is a difficult task, therefore (Instructor - Both sexes).

The mean score of 4.29 indicates that innovative teaching approaches are widely recognised as having a considerable impact on children's education. The relatively small standard deviation (0.741) indicates that most respondents have a similar viewpoint on the importance of this factor. The mean is 3.29 and the standard deviation is 0.927. With a mean score of 3.29, this factor is perceived to possess a moderate degree of influence. The high standard deviation (0.927) indicates a wide range of opinions among respondents about the importance of training and professional growth in teaching methods. The average score of 4.32 is one of the highest, suggesting that the presence of technology tools and resources is considered crucial in children's education. The little standard deviation (0.729) indicates a high level of consensus among the responders on this issue. The curriculum flexibility and design received an average rating of 4.22, with a standard deviation of 0.712. A mean score of 4.22 indicates that the factors of curricular flexibility and design are considered to have a substantial impact. The low standard deviation of 0.712 indicates that there was substantial agreement among the respondents. The classroom environment has a mean score of 3.88 and a standard deviation of 0.912. The mean score of 3.88 suggests that the classroom atmosphere is judged to have a significant influence, ranging from mild to substantial. A standard deviation of 0.912 indicates a significant level of variability in the viewpoints of the participants. The mean student engagement score is 4.12 with a standard deviation of 0.976. A mean score of 4.12 indicates that student participation is considered to be a significant factor. The somewhat higher standard deviation (0.976) suggests a wider range of opinions among the participants as shown in Table 3.

The KMO measure of sampling adequacy is observe as 0.783 showing higher value compared to the threshold value of 0.600, thereby the KMO value of 0.783 indicates that factor analysis best applicable

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of influencing factors of new voices of pedagogy.

New voices of pedagogy	Mean	Std. deviation
Use of innovative teaching methods	4.29	.741
Training and professional development	3.29	.927
Access to technological tools and resources	4.32	.729
Curriculum flexibility and design	4.22	.712
Classroom environment	3.88	.912
Student engagement	4.12	.976

Table 4. KMO and Bartlett's Test new voices of children pedagogy variables.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy.		.783
Bartlett's test of sphericity	Approx. chi-square	2194.628
	Df	45
	Sig.	.000

Table 5. Total variance explained in an influencing factors of new voices for children pedagogy variables.

Component	Rotation sums of squared loadings		
	Total	% of variance	Cumulative %
1	2.952	29.521	29.521
2	2.380	23.804	53.325

to analysing of 6 importance of new voices of children pedagogy variables. The KMO value also reveals a strong sign of sampling adequacy for the present data set. Similarly, Bartlett's test of sphericity was applied to examine the relevance of the data for factor analysis of six importance of new voices of children pedagogy variables. Table 4 shows that the test value of 2194.628, is highly significant ($P < 0.000$). Hence the data is highly fit for factorisation of six importance of new voices of children pedagogy variables. Consequently, all the above measures shows that the data set is highly fit for applying factor analysis. Principle component analysis method is accepted for reducing large number of the data to independent factors. To further establish the suitability of factorisation of influencing factors of new voices of children pedagogy variables, communalities and measure of Sampling Adequacy was calculated. The results are described in Table 5. The six variables relating to influencing factors of new voices of children pedagogy has been brought out into two latent dominant factors, which explains 53.325 % of total variance in those ten variables. The two latent dominant factors are namely F1 and F2. All these factors have been observed with new names such as *Child-Centered Learning Factor (CCLF)* and *Emotional and Social Development Factor (ESDF)*.

Table 5 shows that total variance explained by each component in an influencing factor of new voices of children pedagogy variables. The six variables are concentrated into two factors using factor analysis which account for 53.325% of total variance.

The first principle component express the greatest part of total variance. It accounts for 29.521% of the total variance, the second component explaining 23.804% of variance in new voices of children pedagogy variables. Both the components has Eigen value of greater than 1 which are taken as principle components. The above table 5 reveals both factor of new voices of children pedagogy have higher Eigen value and explain good percentage of variance. Varimax rotation was accomplished to support in interpretation of the two components. The results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Rotated component matrix of new voices children pedagogy variables.

	Component	
	1	2
Incorporating inventive pedagogical approaches effectively ensures that children are engaged and find learning meaningful.	.850	
The curriculum design places a strong emphasis on allowing children to have the freedom to choose and provide their contribution in various learning activities.	.821	
The classroom setting is structured to facilitate student self-governance and self-directed learning.	.742	
Teachers employ tactics that effectively maintain children motivation and engagement in their academic pursuits.	.561	
The teaching methodologies are specifically crafted to cultivate emotional intelligence and enhance social skills in kids.		.823
Teachers undergo specialised training to satisfy the emotional and social needs of kids.		.621
Technological resources are accessible to assist pupils in effectively navigating their emotional and social difficulties.		.641
The curriculum is specifically intended to incorporate activities that facilitate emotional and social growth.		.561
Classrooms are organised in a manner that promotes social interaction and provides emotional support for pupils.		.573
Engagement tactics encompass several activities that foster the emotional and social growth of pupils.		.529

Table 6 explicates the output of rotated component matrix which explains factors with highest loadings in each variables of CCLF and CSDF of new voices of children pedagogy. The factor loading shows Child-Center Learning Factor as the most dominant factor (With factor loading: 0.850, 0.821, 0.742, 0.561 and Emotional and Social Development Factor as the second dominant factor (With factor loadings: 0.823, 0.621, 0.641, 0.561, 0.573, and 0.529).

CONCLUSION

This study, which runs from 2023 to 2024, sheds light on the impact of innovative teaching approaches, curriculum flexibility, and emotional and social development variables on student involvement and academic achievement across age groups. The longitudinal analysis shows that these elements greatly improve students' learning experiences and outcomes, especially in circumstances that promote emotional and social development. The combination of quantitative and qualitative data provides a thorough picture of how these instructional techniques affect children's educational outcomes. A quantitative analysis found crucial elements of child-centered learning and emotional and social development, demonstrating their significant impact on student involvement. Qualitative data supplemented these findings by capturing educators' and students' perspectives on how these activities are experienced and perceived in real-world settings. New Voices of Children Pedagogy, both educators and students place a high priority on innovative teaching approaches and curriculum flexibility. Educators report that when they implement these strategies, their classrooms become more interactive and responsive, giving students more freedom to choose how and what they study and giving them more chances to share what they've learned. Students find these tactics to be engaging and fun ways to learn, which boosts their interest and performance in class. Elements of emotional and social development are highlighted as crucial in the study. The importance of specialized educator training and creating welcoming classroom environments cannot be overstated when it comes to engaging students and accommodating their diverse learning styles. Both teachers and students understand the importance of creating a safe space where students can feel comfortable expressing their emotions and where they can practice social skills in order to have a positive and fruitful educational experience. Nevertheless, there are a few caveats to the study that could make the results less applicable to other contexts, such as the fact that participants may have dropped out over time or that the results are context-specific. Educators and lawmakers can still benefit from the study's suggestions, despite these caveats. Improved learning results and higher levels of student engagement are possible outcomes of creative pedagogy, adaptable course designs, and extensive social and emotional support networks. Lastly, the study highlights the importance of using creative teaching methods that adapt to the evolving needs and viewpoints of students. Educational institutions can better foster children's holistic development and provide a stimulating, engaging, and supportive learning environment if they prioritize these attributes. In addition to laying the framework for future studies aimed at enhancing instructional strategies and curriculum development for diverse student populations, the results add to the ongoing conversation regarding effective educational practices.

REFERENCES

1. Morrow V. Understanding children and childhood. Centre for Children and Young People: Background Briefing Series. 2011;1.
2. Matthews SH. A window on the 'new' sociology of childhood. *Social Compass*. 2007 Sep;1(1):322-34.
3. Federle KH. Rights flow downhill. *Int J Child Rights*. 1994;2:343.
4. Devine D. Voicing concerns about children's rights and status in school. In: Greene S, editor. *Encouraging Voices: Respecting the Insights of Young People Who Have Been Marginalized*. Dublin: National Disability Authority; 2003. p. 36-57.
5. Ofsted. Bold beginnings: The Reception curriculum in a sample of good and outstanding primary schools. November, No 170045. 2017 Oct 30.
6. Greene S, Hill M. Researching children's experience: methods and methodological issues. In: Greene S, Hogan D, editors. *Researching Children's Experience, Approaches and Methods*. London: Sage; 2005. p. 1-21.

7. Corsaro WA, Everitt JG. *The sociology of childhood*. Sage publications; 2023 Dec 20.
8. MacNaughton G, Hughes P, Smith K. Young children's rights and public policy: Practices and possibilities for citizenship in the early years. *Children & Society*. 2007 Nov;21(6):458-69.
9. Flutter J, Rudduck J. *Consulting pupils: What's in it for schools?* Routledge; 2004 Mar 4.
10. Kellett M. *Engaging with children and young people*. Centre for Children and Young People: Background Briefing Series. Southern Cross University, Falmer Press; 2011;3.
11. Woodhead M. *Childhood studies: past, present and future*. In: Kehily MJ, editor. *An Introduction to Childhood Studies*. Maidenhead: Open University Press; 2009. p. 17-33.
12. Nutbrown C, Clough P. Citizenship and inclusion in the early years: understanding and responding to children's perspectives on 'belonging'. *International Journal of Early Years Education*. 2009 Oct 1;17(3):191-206.
13. Moss P, Dahlberg G, Pence A. Getting beyond the problem with quality. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*. 2000 Jan 1;8(2):103-15.
14. Siraj-Blatchford* I, Sylva K. Researching pedagogy in English pre-schools. *British Educational Research Journal*. 2004 Sep 1;30(5):713-30.
15. Taguchi HL. Going beyond the theory/practice divide in early childhood education: Introducing an intra-active pedagogy. Routledge; 2009 Sep 10.
16. Moyles J, Adams S, Musgrove A. SPEEL study of pedagogical effectiveness. Research Report 363. Department for Education and Skills; 2002.
17. Stephen C. Pedagogy: The silent partner in early years learning. *Early years*. 2010 Mar 1;30(1):15-28.
18. Rinaldi C. In dialogue with Reggio Emilia: Listening, researching and learning. Routledge; 2021 Oct 28.
19. Formosinho J, Oliveira-Formosinho J. *Childhood Association's Pedagogical Approach*. Lisbon: Aga Khan Foundation; 2008.
20. Roberts-Holmes G. 'It's the bread and butter of our practice': experiencing the Early Years Foundation Stage. *International Journal of Early Years Education*. 2012 Mar 1;20(1):30-42.
21. Department for Education. *Statutory framework for the early years foundation stage: setting the standards for learning, development and care for children from birth to five*, 2017.
22. Rogoff B. Cognition as a collaborative process. In: Kuhn D, Siegler RS, editors. *Handbook of Child Psychology*. 5th ed. New York: John Wiley; 1998. p. 679-744.
23. Ang L. Preschool or prep school? Rethinking the role of early years education. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*. 2014 Jun;15(2):185-99.
24. Genishi C, Dyson AH. *Children, language, and literacy: Diverse learners in diverse times*. Teachers College Press; 2015 Apr 18.
25. Arnot M, Reay D. A sociology of pedagogic voice: Power, inequality and pupil consultation. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education*. 2007 Sep 1;28(3):311-25.
26. Bernstein B. *The structuring of pedagogic discourse*. Routledge; 2004 Nov 23.
27. Mayes E, Finneran R, Black R. The challenges of student voice in primary schools: Students 'having a voice' and 'speaking for' others. *Australian Journal of Education*. 2019 Aug;63(2):157-72.
28. Donegan A, Devine D, Martinez-Sainz G, Symonds J, Sloan S. Children as co-researchers in pandemic times: Power and participation in the use of digital dialogues with children during the COVID-19 lockdown. *Children & Society*. 2023 Jan;37(1):235-53.
29. Luttrell W. 'A camera is a big responsibility': A lens for analysing children's visual voices. *Visual studies*. 2010 Dec 1;25(3):224-37.
30. Bron J, Veugelers W. Why we need to involve our students in curriculum design: Five arguments for student voice. *Curriculum and teaching dialogue*. 2014;16(1/2):125.
31. Quinn S, Owen S. Digging deeper: Understanding the power of 'student voice'. *Australian Journal of Education*. 2016 Apr;60(1):60-72.
32. McGillicuddy D, Devine D. 'You feel ashamed that you are not in the higher group'—Children's psychosocial response to ability grouping in primary school. *British Educational Research Journal*. 2020 Jun;46(3):553-73.

-
33. National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA). Aistear: The Early Childhood Curriculum Framework. Dublin: NCCA; 2009.
 34. European Agency for Development in Inclusive and Special Education. Teacher education for inclusion (TE4I): key policy messages. 2011
 35. UNCRC. Convention on the Rights of the Child. New York: United Nations; 1989.
 36. Cook-Sather A. Sound, presence, and power: “Student voice” in educational research and reform. *Curriculum inquiry*. 2006 Dec 1;36(4):359-90.
 37. Lundy L, Cook-Sather A. Children’s rights and student voice: Their intersections and the implications for curriculum and pedagogy. *The SAGE handbook of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment*. 2015 Dec 3:263-77.
 38. Lodge C. Engaging student voice to improve pedagogy and learning: An exploration of examples of innovative pedagogical approaches for school improvement. *Int J Pedagog Learn*. 2008;4(5):4-19.
 39. Mesquita C. Children’s Voice in Praxiological Transformation. In *Establishing Child Centred Practice in a Changing World, Part B* 2023 Jun 9 (pp. 23-37). Emerald Publishing Limited.
 40. Watson K, Newman L. Children’s voices: Inclusive early childhood placemaking with children. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*. 2024 Jun;22(2):258-71.