

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIOECONOMIC,
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT STYLE AND
TEACHING STYLE WITH LINUS ACHIEVEMENT
IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS**

^a **Hoe Sin Ling**

^b **Yeo Kee Jiar**

^{ab} *Universiti Teknologi Malaysia*

^a **sinling.hoe@gmail.com**

^b **kjyeo_utm@yahoo.com**

Abstract: *LINUS* was a new extension of the KIA2M for continuing their objectives and purposes. Factors such as socioeconomic, classroom management style and teaching style are often overlooked. Thus, students' *LINUS* achievement has become an important issue to be studied. The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship among *LINUS* students' socioeconomic, teachers' classroom management style and teachers' teaching style in teaching *LINUS* subjects, Bahasa Melayu and Mathematics. The research site was elementary schools in the eastern zone of Kluang, Johor. This study used the quantitative method which using questionnaire as the tool for the data collection. Cluster random sampling method was applied in the selection of 102 as research respondents. All the statistical analysis performed by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 20 (SPSS 20.0). The quantitative data was analyzed through descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation) and inferential statistic involving parametric test (Rank Biserial Correlation). A pilot test was carried out for Behavior and Instructional Management Scale (BIMS) and Teaching Style (TSI) with the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient values of 0.815 and 0.837 respectively. In descriptive analysis, the study found that the highest proportion in education, occupation and income were middle school, labor business and salary between RM 2001 to RM 3001. Majority of parents' background had lowered socioeconomic. In addition, the dominant levels of classroom management style and teaching style obtained high mean scores according to interpretive scale. The inferential analysis results found little significant relationship between *LINUS* students' socioeconomic status and measures of *LINUS* achievement and non-significant relationships were found between elementary school teachers' classroom management and teachers' teaching style and student *LINUS* achievement.

Keywords: *Socioeconomic, classroom management, teaching style, LINUS achievement.*

INTRODUCTION

The issue of students who do not master literacy and numeracy skills has existed since the early formulation of the Malaysian education system and became more critical in the 1960's (Murad Dropout Report, 1972). In Malaysia, there are 54,000 of

students in year one who did not acquire the basic skills of literacy according to the Early Intervention Class in basic reading and writing (KIA2M) screening in 2008. *LINUS* was a new extension of the KIA2M for continuing their objectives and

purposes. It is distinct for the first three years of primary mainstream education.

The experience of schools confirms that there are many children who are so backward in basic subjects that they need special help. They have retarded mental developments which are often accompanied by additional handicaps, such as physical deficiencies, ill-health, and limited verbal experiences at home and emotional disturbances. Their educational problems are so acute that they need special educational treatment outside the ordinary school (Sangeeta, 2011). According to Carroll (2004), slow learners are students with below average cognitive abilities and who struggle to cope with the traditional academic demands of the regular classroom. They are those students who are unable to accomplish what is expected of their age group.

The major factors that hinder students to master literacy and numeracy are as following. Firstly, family and students' background affects the learning achievement of students (Marmot, Michael, 2004). Secondly, according to Mills (1991), the classroom management is "the teaching approach adopted by teacher is one factor that may affect student achievement. Thirdly, learning and teaching strategies (Mercer and Mercer, 1998) had a significant relationship on teachers and students. These factors had to be concerned to help the LINUS students or at-risk students before they become worse.

This study was conducted to identify the relationship between students' socioeconomic status, teachers' classroom management style and teaching style with LINUS achievement in elementary schools. The study has two phases. Firstly, a descriptive study was conducted to investigate the mean, percentage and standard deviation of students' socioeconomic status, teachers' classroom management style and teaching style. Secondly, an inferential study was conducted on the relationship between students' socioeconomic status, teachers' classroom management style and teaching style with LINUS achievement.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The experience of educators confirms that there are many children who are so backward in basic subjects that they need special help. These pupils have limited score for achievement. They need special help in the form of special class in ordinary school. Most of the slow learners struggle along in ordinary classes failing to have the special attention which they need. These pupils differ slightly from normal students in learning ability. They have learning difficulties which tend to increase if the teaching is not suitably graded to their slower rate of progress and modified to achieve the most effective ways of learning (Sangeeta, 2011). Jensen

(1980) states that students with IQ 80 to 90 who are traditionally labeled 'dull normal' are generally slower to 'catch on' to whatever is being taught if it involves symbolic, abstract or conceptual subject matter.

Socioeconomic Status (SES) is one of the most important factors that exist in influencing student achievement. Socioeconomic status consistently predicts intelligence and achievement test scores, grades, truancy, and dropout and suspension rates (Byrnes, 2003; Macionis, 2006). Students' school performance is correlated with socioeconomic status especially have most powerful influences on low-SES students. Higher-SES students tend to have higher academic achievement, and lower-SES students tend to be at greater risk for dropping out of school (Mcloyd, 1998; Miller, 1995; Potres, 1996; Stevenson et al., 1990).

Classroom management that orients students toward passivity and compliance with rigid rules can undermine their engagement in active learning, higher order-thinking, and the social construction of knowledge (Jones and Jones, 2010). Teacher-centered approach is believed that the best teaching basic skills, which involve clearly structured knowledge and skills. However, there are some criticisms about the teacher-centered approach. According to McCall (2007), teacher-centered instruction usually leads to passive, rote learning and inadequate opportunities to construct understanding and knowledge. Students learn more external motivation rather than internal motivation, too much reliance on paper-and-pencil tasks, few opportunities for real-world learning, and too little collaborative learning in small groups will lead to another important approach for learning.

However, students' perceptions of a positive learning environment and interpersonal relationships with the teacher and factors associated with learner-centered instruction were important in enhancing students' motivation and achievement (McCombs, 2001). There are three types of student-centered strategies which will be useful in lesson plans such as problem-based learning, essential questions and discovery learning. Problem-based learning emphasizes real-life problem solving (Chapin, 2009; Panasan and Nuangchalerm, 2010). Students will get involve in small-group efforts and identify issues or problems related in which students would like to explore. Teachers act as guides, helping students to monitor their own problem-solving efforts (Chen, 2010; Donnelly, 2010). A recent study also indicted that both of student-centered instruction and teacher-centered instruction promoted students' conceptual understanding and provided students with different opportunities to engage in learning (Wu and Huang, 2007).

Teaching styles are a combination of qualities, needs, beliefs, and behaviors that faculty display in the classroom and that are important in guiding and directing the way teachers teach (Grasha, 1996). Grasha is the predominant author associated with teaching styles, and he has published individual work as well as work with collaborators (Grasha, 1996; Grasha and Riechmann-Hruska, 1996; Grasha et al., 1996). Teaching styles vary in degrees and are often blended together in practice; therefore it is difficult, and inappropriate from Grasha's view, to identify someone as having only one specific style type. The Teaching Style Survey categorizes respondents into one of five teaching style types which Grasha identified in his 1996 book, *teaching with Style*. These types are expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator.

PARTICIPANTS

The respondents of the study were the teachers who were teaching in the LINUS class in government elementary schools. A total of 102 LINUS class teachers were chosen from elementary schools in the eastern zone of Kluang, Johor. Their characteristics were needed in this study include gender, education levels, age and teaching experiences.

INSTRUMENTS

A set of questionnaire was conducted for this research which consisted of five sections namely as Section A, Section B, Section C, section D and Section E. In section A, there were four items concern on respondents' demographic. A total of 3 items in Section B helped to determine the socioeconomic status of students. Section C is about students' LINUS achievement for Bahasa Melayu and Mathematics. Afterwards, Section D and E focused on the teachers' classroom management style and their teaching style.

Three instruments were used to collect data from the subject of the study. One of the instruments was the Socioeconomic Status (SES) questionnaire which is modified from "Kuppuswamy's socio-economic status scale". The second instrument is used from the "Behavior and Instructional Management Scale (BIMS) questionnaire" by Martin and Sass to examine

beliefs about play, discipline, and the relation between behavior management and instruction. The BIMS was analyzed in 24 items which 12-items were categorized as the Instructional management. Other 12-items were classified as the Behavioral management.

The last instrument used was the Teaching Style Inventory (TSI) consists of 40 questions, inclusive of only Likert Scale questions. This questionnaire was designed to identify the respondents' teaching styles. There are five types of teaching styles according to Grasha's Teaching style (TSI) Model, which are Expert, Formal, Authority, Personal Model, Facilitator and Delegator teaching styles.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

According to Table 1 below, the highest percentage on parents' or guardians' education status was middle school with 32.40%, followed by lowest percentage, degree holder with 2.00%. Parental educational level is an important predictor of children's educational and behavioral outcomes (Davis-Kean, 2005). Parents' or guardians' of LINUS students came from lower educational attainment tend to neglect the important of education and comes unexpected implications for their children.

Besides that, the highest percentage based on parents' or guardians' occupation categories was labor business with 31.40%, followed lower percentage, professional with 2.90%. According to the findings in occupation, Capsi (1998) reported that lower parental occupational status of children ages 3 to 5 and 7 to 9 predicted a higher risk of the child having periods of unemployment when making the transition from adolescence to adulthood.

Meanwhile, the highest percentage on parents' or guardians' income was between RM2001 and RM3001 with 31.40% and the lowest percentage was salary above RM5001 with 2.90%. Krueger (2004) reviews various contributions supporting the view that financial constraints significantly impact on educational attainment. Studies on educational attainment always find that an increase in parental income modestly increases the educational attainment of children.

Distribution	Education status	Frequency	Percentage
Parents' or guardians	Masters/PhD	0	0
	Degree	2	2.00
	Certificate/Diploma holders	13	12.70
	High school	22	21.60
	Middle school	33	32.40
	Primary school	30	29.40

No formal education	2	2.00
Total	102	100.00

Table 1 - Frequencies and percentages distribution on parents' or guardians' education status, occupation categories and income (N=102)

Distribution	Occupation categories	Frequency	Percentage
Parents' /guardians'	Professional	3	2.90
	Technical	13	12.70
	Administration	4	3.90
	Services	10	9.80
	Self-employment	19	18.60
	Labor business	32	31.40
	Unemployment	21	20.60
Total	102	100.00	
Distribution	Income	Frequency	Percentage
Parents' /guardians'	RM5001 and above	3	2.90
	RM4001 - RM5000	5	4.90
	RM3001 - RM4000	14	13.70
	RM2001 - RM3001	32	31.40
	RM1001 - RM2000	25	24.50
	RM1000 and below	7	6.90
	None	16	15.70
Total	102	100.00	

Based on the table 2, the highest socioeconomic status for parents' or guardians' was class of lower or upper lower (IV). There were 51 respondents or 50.00%. However, the lower socioeconomic status was class of upper (I). There were 3 respondents or 2.90%.

Social Cognitive Theory was discussed in relation to the current study. In the early 1960s, Albert Bandura demonstrated that people can learn by observing the actions of others and the consequences of those actions. Bandura's early social learning theories emphasized modeling and seeing others reinforced or punished for particular behaviors (Woolfolk, 2011).

In this study, the highest frequency in parental socioeconomic status is the class of Lower and Upper (IV). Half of the respondents was categorized to this class and indicated that parents' or guardians' of LINUS students were mostly came from lower socioeconomic status. It was consistent with Social Cognitive Theory which based on the observation of models, either in live or symbolic form. Cognitive factors might involve the student's expectations for success; social factors might include students' observing their parents' achievement behavior.

Table 2- Frequencies and percentages distribution on parents' or guardians' on the socioeconomic status (N=102)

Total score	Class of socioeconomic	Frequency	Percentage
26-29	Upper (I)	3	2.90
16-25	Upper Middle (II)	16	15.70
11-15	Middle / Lower middle (III)	19	18.70
5-10	Lower / Upper lower (IV)	51	50.00
Less than 5	Lower (V)	13	12.70
	Total	102	100.00

For table 3 below, a large majority of the students were not achieved in LINUS achievement (Bahasa Melayu) with 64.70 %. However, 35.30 % of students were able to achieve the LINUS achievement (Bahasa Melayu). Most of the students achieved the LINUS achievement (Mathematics) with 63.70 %. 36.30 % were not able to pass the LINUS achievement (Mathematics).

Bahasa Melayu is the main language subject in elementary schools. Most of the students were not able to achieve with a good result if poor of language skills or low verbal ability. However, Mathematics is fun and interesting if compared with Bahasa Melayu. Mathematics is basic mathematical operations and the data proved that students could understand the idea of simple mathematics and able to apply mathematical skills in everyday life.

Table 3 - Frequencies and percentages distribution on students' LINUS achievement (N=102)

Subject		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Bahasa Melayu	Achieved	36	35.30
	Not achieved	66	64.70
Total		102	100.00
Subject		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Mathematics	Achieved	65	63.70
	Not achieved	37	36.30
Total		102	100.00

RELIABILITY OF SCALES

In this research, two instruments were used include sets of questionnaire develop to measure the classroom management style and teaching style among teachers in elementary school. One of the instruments was the "Behavior and Instructional Management Scale (BIMS). The second instrument is used from Teaching Style Inventory (TSI).

Reliability of instruments was tested after the data collection process, table 4 shows the

reliability of each instruments used. The alpha values in this study are above 0.90. According to George & Mallory (2003), the minimum requirement of Cronbach's Alpha should be above 0.70. A reliability coefficient of 0.70 or higher is considered "acceptable" in most social science research situations. The alpha coefficient for the 24 items in classroom management style is 0.903 and the 30 items in teaching style is 0.918, suggesting that these items have relatively high internal consistency.

Table 4 - Reliability of Scales

Instruments	Cronbach's Alpha
Classroom management style	0.903
Teaching style	0.918

According to table 5, there were 60 respondents or 58.82% achieved the very high level of mean values in the Behavioral management style. The low level of mean values is only one respondent or 0.98%. However, there were 64 respondents or 62.75% achieved the high level of mean values in the Instructional management style. There was only one respondent not prefer the instructional management style with 0.98%.

Martin and Sass (2010) defined the term of classroom management into two dimensions which are instructional management and behavior management. Instructional management includes aspects of classroom life such as establishing daily procedures, allocating materials and monitoring students' independent work (Martin & Sass, 2010). However, behavior management is any-preplanned intervention aimed at preventing misbehavior. This

facet includes setting rules, establishing a reward structure, and providing opportunities for student input (Martin & Sass, 2010).

Reinforcement is the key element in Skinner's S-R theory. A reinforcer is anything that strengthens the desired response. It could be verbal praise, a good grade or a feeling of increased accomplishment or satisfaction. The results of the study showed that the level of behavioral management style was very high (M=4.59, SD=0.612). The behavior management style with the highest level was "I reward students for good behavior in the classroom" (M=5.26, SD=0.67). The result was consistent with the Skinner's theory who advocated for the frequent use of reinforcement (i.e. rewards) to modify and influence student behaviour.

Table 5 - Frequencies and percentages distribution on classroom management style

The management	Classroom	The Behavioral Management		The Instructional Management	
Value	Value Label	Frequency	percentage	Frequency	percentage
5.01 – 6.00	Very high	60	58.82	31	30.39
4.01 – 5.00	High	25	24.51	64	62.75
3.01 – 4.00	Moderate	16	15.69	6	5.88
2.01 – 3.00	Low level	1	0.98	1	0.98
1.00 – 2.00	Very low	0	0	0	0

According to table 6, the Expert teaching style and the Facilitator teaching style achieved more than 50% of respondents in the very high level of mean values. The expert teacher possesses knowledge and expertise that the students need. They will seek to maintain their status as expert with the students. It was proved that most of the teachers maintained their statuses as experts even though they are teaching in LINUS class. According to Anthony Grasha (2002), the display of knowledge can be intimidating to less experienced students especially for LINUS students.

However, the facilitator teaching style focused on student-centred style or the personal nature of teacher-student interactions. Teachers with this style will guide and direct students by asking questions, suggesting solutions, exploring options and encouraging students to develop criteria to make choices. They also will provide encouragements and supports as many as possible. It was suitable for our LINUS students who need more patience and guidance through their learning process.

Besides that, there were more than 50% of respondents achieved the high level of mean values in the Formal Authority teaching style, the Personal Model teaching style and the Delegator teaching style. According to Grasha, the personal model teaching style or demonstrator use teacher-centred style in the classroom. They have believed that

‘teaching by personal example’ and they will be the role models. Teachers with this style will help and guide their students while learning new skills and encouraging students to participate actively in the learning process.

The formal authority style is also a teacher-centred style that encourages the collaborations between student-student and student teacher. Teachers focus on contents and more concerned in providing and controlling the flow of content (Grasha, 2001). They also considered the positive and negative feedbacks of the students’ behaviour. Table 6 was proved that most of the LINUS teachers are prefer to use teacher-centred style in the LINUS classroom.

Some of the LINUS teachers prefer to teach their LINUS students with a student-centred approach, the Delegator teaching style. They will give a lot of control and responsibility for learning to students. The delegator teacher focuses on students’ capacity to function autonomously. For low achievement student (LINUS students), it will be not suitable for their learning process. The misread students’ readiness will become another issue if too much of autonomy.

Table 6 - Frequencies and percentages distribution on teaching style

The teaching style		Expert		Facilitator		Formal Authority		Personal Model		Delegator	
Value	Value Label	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
4.21 – 5.00	Very high	57	55.88	56	54.90	32	31.37	46	45.1	24	23.53
3.41 – 4.20	High	43	42.16	40	39.22	52	50.98	51	50.0	55	53.92
2.61 – 3.40	Moderate	1	0.98	5	4.90	16	15.69	4	3.92	17	16.67
1.81 – 2.60	Low	1	0.98	1	0.98	2	1.96	1	0.98	6	5.88
1.00 – 1.80	Very low	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: P= percentage, F= frequency

Based on the table 7, the rank-biserial correlation coefficient between socioeconomic status and LINUS achievement (Bahasa Melayu) was $r=0.645$ with p-value of 0.00. It denoted a positive association between socioeconomic status and LINUS achievement (Bahasa Melayu). The rank-biserial correlation coefficient between socioeconomic status and LINUS achievement (Mathematics) was $r=0.342$ with p-value of 0.00. It implied a weak association between socioeconomic status and LINUS achievement (Mathematics). There was a significant relationship between socioeconomic status and LINUS achievement (Bahasa Melayu and Mathematics). The study

found that the students’ socioeconomic status had influenced to students’ LINUS achievement.

The rank-biserial correlation coefficient $r=-0.035$ and $r=-0.150$ showed that there was very weak relationship between the behavioral management style and LINUS achievement (Bahasa Melayu and Mathematics). It was a negative correlation where the relationship between the behavioral management style and both subjects in LINUS achievement (Bahasa Melayu and Mathematics) in LINUS class was inverted. In this negative relationship, it is observed that the higher the level of the behavioral and instructional management style, the lower the value of the

LINUS achievement. No significant value was obtained when $p=0.727$ and $p=0.134$ were bigger than the level of 0.05, thus indicating there was no correlation between the behavioral management style and both subjects in LINUS achievement.

The rank-biserial correlation coefficient of the relationship between the instructional management style and LINUS achievement (Bahasa Melayu and Mathematics) were $r=-0.50$ and $r=-0.170$. It implied that there was a weak negative relationship. The results of rank-biserial correlation analysis revealed that no significant relationship exists. Therefore, there is insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis which states that "there are no significant relationship between

classroom management style and LINUS achievement in LINUS class in elementary schools."

The result of the rank-biserial correlation showed that all the teaching styles (expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator and delegator) statistically negative correlations with LINUS achievement. The null hypothesis was accepted. There was no significant relationship between the teaching style and LINUS achievement. It was not consistent with the results from Davis (2012), who showed there are significant relationships between the teaching styles (delegator, facilitator and expert) and students' Mathematics achievement.

Table 7 - The Rank-biserial Correlation between the socioeconomic status, classroom management style and teaching style with LINUS achievement (N=102)

Rank-biserial Correlation	Socio economic status	BM	IM	Expert	Facilitator	Formal Authority	Personal Model	Delegator
Bahasa Melayu	0.645**	0.035*	0.050*	-0.042*	0.032 *	0.80*	0.072*	0.054*
Mathematics	0.342**	-0.150*	-0.170*	-0.154*	-0.175*	-0.157*	-0.109*	-0.131*

Note: BM=Behavioral Management, IM=Instructional Management,

*correlation is significant at $p<0.05$, **correlation is significant at $p<0.01$

CONCLUSION

All the findings supported most of the main theories stated in the early chapters. It was confirmed the fact that there was a significant relationship of socioeconomic status on student LINUS achievement.

The current study found that no effect of behavioral and instructional management on student LINUS achievement. The result may be regarding to less diverse samples in teachers' classroom management style. The rank-biserial correlation coefficient in instructional management ($r=0.50$) is higher than behavioral management ($r=0.035$). The current differences showed that teachers used more in instructional management to manage students' behaviors in the learning process.

In contrast, no effect of teaching style on student LINUS achievement was found in the current study. It may be due to low measured reliability of the TSI scale on each teaching style. The results will be impact to the student LINUS achievement. According to McCombs and Miller (2007), research suggests not one teaching method is best for everyone and many teaching styles can be motivational. The teaching style should be matching with students' learning style to further improve student achievement in the future. Teachers should aware with their own teaching style and

students' needs in order to student success. The form of collaboration may help to increase students' learning interest.

REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (2010b). *Vicarious learning*. In D. Matsumoto (Ed.). *Cambridge dictionary of psychology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Carroll, S.A.(2004) Slow learner in the Regular Classroom: A Handout for teachers. In A.S. Canter and S.A. Carroll (Eds), *Helping children at home and school: Handouts from school psychologist*.
- Caspi A, Wright BRE, Moffitt TE, Silva PA. 1998. Early failure in the labour market: Childhood and adolescent predictors of unemployment in the transition to adulthood. *American Sociological Review* ;63:424-451.
- Chapin, J. R. (2009). *Elementary social studies* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Chen, C-H. (2010). Promoting college students' knowledge acquisition and ill-structured problem solving: Web-based integration and procedure prompts. *Computers & Education*, 55, 292-303.

- Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, F., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., et al. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Davis-Kean PE. (2005). The influence of parent education and family income on child achievement: The indirect role of parental expectations and the home environment. *Journal of Family Psychology*;19:294–304.
- Donnelly, R. (2010). Harmonizing technology with interaction in blended problem-based learning. *Computer & Education*, 54, 350-359.
- Eby, J., Herrell, A., & Jordan, M. (2006). *Teaching in K–12 schools: A reflective action approach (4th ed)*, Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Frank, R. (2002). *The Effect of Migration Experience on Birth Outcomes and Infant Mortality within Mexico*. The University of Texas at Austin.
- Grasha, A. F. (1994). A matter of style: The teacher as expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator. *College Teaching*, 42(4), 142-49.
- Grasha, A. F. (1994). A special section discovering your best teaching style. *College Teaching*, 42(4), 122-124.
- Grasha, A. F. (1996). *Teaching with style; A practical guide to enhancing learning by understanding teaching and learning styles*. Pittsburgh, PA: Alliance Publishers.
- Grasha, A. F., & Reichmann-Hruska, S. (1996). *Teaching style survey*. Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati.
- Grasha, A.F. (1996). *Teaching with style: A practical guide to enhancing learning by understanding teaching and learning styles*. Pittsburgh, PA: Alliance Publishers, (800) 718-4287.
- Grasha, A.F. 2002. *Teaching with style: Enhancing learning by understanding*
- Jenson, A.R. (1980). *Bias in Mental Testing*, Methuen and Co.Ltd, London. Pp. 23-89
- Kounin, Jacob S. (1977, c1970). *Discipline and Group Management in Classrooms*. Huntington, N. Y.: R. E. Krieger of Teacher Scholars.
- Krueger, A. B. (2004), “Inequality, too much of a good thing”, in J.J. Heckmand and A.B. Krueger (eds), *Inequality in America*, MIT Press
- Martin, N.K. & Sass, D.A. (2010). Construct Validation of the Behavior and Instructional Management Scale. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(5), 1124-1135.
- Marmot M. (2004), *Status syndrome*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Mccall, A. (2007). Supporting exemplary social studies teaching in elementary schools. *Social Studies*, 97, 161-167.
- McCombs, B. L. (2001, April). *What do we know about learners and learning? The learner-centered framework*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Seattle.
- Mercer, C. D., & Mercer, A. R. (1998). *Teaching Students with Learning Problems*. (5 ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Murad M.N. (1973). *Committee report on survey regarding education and community research (Dropout Report)*. Kuala Lumpur: Ministry of Education and Kementarian Pelajaran dan Statistic Department.
- Panasan, M., & Nuangchalerm, P. (2010). Learning outcomes of project-based and inquiry-based learning activities. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 6, 252-255.
- Sangeeta, C. (2011). Slow Learners: Their Psychology and Educational Programmes. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*. Vol.1 Issue 8, December 2011
- Santrock, J. W. (2011). *Educational Psychology* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1994). Educational resilience in inner cities. In M. C. Wang & E. W. Gordon (Eds.). *Educational resilience in inner-city America: Challenges and prospects* (pp. 45-72). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Wu, H-K., & Huang, Y-L. (2007). Ninth-grade student engagement in teacher-centered and student-centered technology-enhanced learning environments. *Science Education*, 91, 727-749.
- Woolfolk A., (2011). *Educational Psychology* (Eleventh edition). Pearson education, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hal