

## **Correlation of Teaching Styles of English Teachers with Students Engagement in Secondary Classes**

**SaimaMazloom**

Punjab School Education Department, India

**Muhammad AtharHussain**

AIOU Islamabad, Pakistan

**MohdAderiChe Noh**

Faculty of Human Sciences, Sultan Idris Education University, Malaysia. E-mail:  
aderi@fsk.upsi.edu.my

**Miftachul Huda**

Faculty of Human Sciences, Sultan Idris Education University, Malaysia. E-mail:  
halimelhuda@gmail.com

**AndinoMaseleno**

Faculty of Human Sciences, Sultan Idris Education University, Malaysia. E-mail:  
andimaseleno@gmail.com

### **ABSTRACT**

This paper is examined to look critically into the teaching style of English teachers with student's engagement in secondary class. The present study was also conducted on 24 secondary schools to investigate if there is any relationship that exists between teaching styles of English language teachers (48 teachers) and engagement of their students (720 secondary class students), by considering it as an important issue facing our teachers as well as our secondary school students particularly and education stakeholders generally. In this research study, "Know Your Teaching Style" instrument was adopted to identify the distinct teaching styles of English teachers at undergraduate level. The other research instrument "Student Engagement Scale" was self-developed and subjected to validity and reliability. The major findings of the study show that teachers adopted different teaching styles including expert, personal model, facilitator, delegator and formal authority while conducting English Class. Descriptive and inferential statistical analysis were carried out for exploring teaching styles (primary and secondary teaching styles) of the teachers and engagement levels of the students. Moreover, findings show that expert was the most dominant primary teaching style whereas facilitator was the least dominant primary teaching style. On the other hand, the major secondary teaching style was facilitator whereas formal authority was the least dominant secondary teaching style. Students taught through different teaching styles also differ in their engagement levels towards English learning. The results show that there is a positive significant as well as strong relationship of teaching styles with student engagement. The study also shows positive significant and strong relationship of teaching styles with behavioural and emotional engagement but moderate relationship with

cognitive engagement. However, overall expert, facilitator and delegator teaching styles shows positive significant and strong relationship with all sub-constructs of engagement.

**Keywords:** Teaching Styles, Student Engagement, English language Classes, Secondary level.

## INTRODUCTION

About two centuries ago, English language was induced by the Britishers in our education system. In Pre-independence period, Britishers developed an education system based on their values; they wanted to eradicate the education system based on Islamic values and languages of Indian-Muslims. They introduced English as a medium of instruction and also considered it necessary for getting government jobs. So the induction of the English language in our education system is the continuation of the Britishers education system (Ali & Mehmmod, 2012). English language is considered to be one of the major international language which emphasizes the fact that to compete at the international level, we need people who can read, write and speak English as well as can be able to convey their point of views to the other nations in their respective languages. Moreover, English is also majorly used language officially which demands to hire such employees who not only can understand but can also speak English fluently. Moreover, the world has also become a global village that raise the importance of English as the most widely spoken language in the whole world. Job market also raised the demand of employees who have strong written as well as verbal communication skills in English. Therefore, there is a great need to focus our instructional methods especially for English teaching to meet the challenges of global world.

In the recent years, student engagement also become a burning issue which not only grasps the attention of the researchers, but also educational psychologists and school personnel's especially educators that how to engage students in schools generally and in classroom learning activities particularly. The extensive literature on student engagement available in the previously conducted researches, reported that student engagement is a major factor that can lead towards greater achievement of learning outcomes. It shows that student engagement is highly correlated with the quality educational outcomes (Gunuc & Kuzu, 2014). So it is a necessary element that leads to students learning, performance, experience and achievement.

Basically, teaching and learning are two main elements of education system looks like a coin which has two sides. Effective and capable teacher and his/her teaching way majorly determine the effectiveness of teaching-learning process and significant enough to achieve learning outcomes. One major challenge teachers face that which teaching strategies should be used to grasp the students interest, how to engage students and motivate them to put their efforts to produce fruitful results. Therefore, the present study is a humble effort to explore that teaching is one of the main factor that can greatly facilitate the student engagement in classrooms.

The study presented here, intends to measure teaching styles based on Grasha's teaching style model. This model presented that by adopting blend of teaching styles, how a teacher can achieve learning outcomes to a greater extent. Grasha presented three teacher-centered and two student-centered approaches. He argued that a balance teaching approach can make a greater difference in students learning. Secondly, student engagement is usually used in broader

perspective as school engagement in different researches but the present study was based on engagement which indicates the students involvement in classroom activities (Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004) and assessed through self-report questionnaire in three dimensions (behavioural, emotional and cognitive engagement). There are several researches proved that teachers' teaching behaviours shows significant relationship with student engagement. Timostuk and Jaanila (2015) found that if a teacher adopt a balanced teaching approach, it shows more positive relationship with engagement in science classes as compared to adopt a single unique teaching style (structured and autonomy supportive teaching).

## **TYPES OF TEACHING STYLES**

Teaching is the vital element of education system that can change the whole classroom scenario by applying cluster of teaching behaviours; e.g; empathy, teachers equal access to each and every student regarding their learning problems, and effective lesson delivery which can actively involve the students in the learning process. Moreover, there are number of activities on the part of teacher e.g; classroom management, behaviour management, lesson presentation, assessment and feedback that can make a learning environment more conducive to engage students effectively.

Worldwide research studies show that there are number of teaching styles and every teacher has adopted different teaching style. These teaching styles based on teaching behaviours which are applicable to different classroom settings and situations. Various classifications of teaching styles available in existing literature e.g; formal versus informal, explanatory versus exploratory, and active versus inactive, intellectual excitement and interpersonal rapport, controlling versus autonom-supportive teaching style, assertive versus suggestive, collaborative and facilitative teaching style, experiential, instructional, explanatory and relational teaching styles, didactic and Socratic teaching style. Different researchers use different teaching styles to identify the distinctive teaching styles of teachers of different fields and discipline.

One of the most common model of teaching style based upon philosophical thoughts of teaching is "Grasha's model of teaching". Grasha (1994) initially identified student learning styles which further develop interest to explore teaching styles. Grasha (1996) found that teachers differ in their ways of teaching; subject content presentation, how to engage students and evaluate student progress. A teacher consistently utilize teaching style based on his/her philosophical belief during lesson presentation (Grasha, 1996).

### **Grasha's Teaching Styles**

Grasha distributed teaching styles into five categories. Grasha (1996) inferred that teaching style are basically teaching behaviours based on different educational beliefs and philosophies adopted by a teacher in his/ her classroom which makes them different from one another. Basically, Grasha (2002) focused to find what traits should a teacher must have for diverse disciplines and how these teaching traits can bring change in learning environment by keeping in view the students' individual differences. So he developed a model based on five different teaching styles: Expert, Formal Authority, Personal Model, Facilitator and Delegator. These teaching styles represents a wide range of teaching behaviours that are presented mostly in teaching-learning process. Grasha (2002) also elaborated clusters of teaching styles which represents different teaching methods related to each cluster. Moreover, he emphasized to utilize

blend of teaching styles to gain the desired outcomes of teaching and learning while teaching in a classroom.

### **EXPERT TEACHING STYLE**

Expert teachers focussed on detailed explanation and consider each and every aspect of information very important. Students individual differences are also very important for them to achieve the desired outcomes. They usually challenge students by asking questions to get an idea to what extent students are getting the concept and prepare their students well through their knowledge.

### **FORMAL AUTHORITY STYLE**

Formal authority teachers maintains an authority in classrooms by providing clear opportunities to their students. They provide quick feedback to the students so that they can make corrections to their work. Formal authority teachers believe in high standards and they emphasize that every task/project should be done coorrectly and in a more refine way. These teachers assign task to the students by providing clear directions about set target and learning objectives. These teachers are very good lesson planners but give a traditional presentation of lesson to the students (Grasha, 1994).

### **ROLE MODEL TEACHING STYLE**

Personal model teachers are considered to be a role model for their students. They provide guidance as well as feedback to the students which help them to increase their learning skills. These teachers are basically modelling for students when they demonstrates any topic. Personal model believes that students learn through observations so it develops their thinking skills. They highly believe on student-teacher interaction, arrange cooperative and independent sort of learning activities for their students. These teachers give freedom of choices, asking questions and encouraging students. The main purpose of personal model teachers is to develop a sense of responsibility and independence among students. These teachers like to assign projects/tasks to the students by providing them full support, direction and encouragement (Grasha,1994; Ali &Mehmood, 2012).

### **FACILITATOR TEACHING STYLE**

These teachers believe on expressive and non-judgmental feedback that improve learning skills of the students. They engage students in discussion. Their aim to develop creativity and reasoning abilities by engaging the students in question/answer session. Students are also encouraged to ask different questions to sortout the problems (Grasha, 1996). Ghanizadeh and Jahedizadeh (2016) also described that the facilitators guides and directs the learning experiences of the students, give them choices to choose an activity, give suggestions to improve their work and encourages them to take initiatives, become independent and responsible.They also emphasizes on student-teacher interaction. They emphasizes collaborative and independent learning activities. They believe to develop independence and responsibility among students. These teachers do encourage, support and direct on student request while accomplishing the task (Grasha, 1996).

## **DELEGATOR TEACHING STYLE**

This teaching style believes that students should learn at their own pace. They consider learning needs of the students very important and plan their teaching by keeping it in view. It develops skill in the learner to explore different alternate solutions for problems. Teachers encourage students to become autonomous. They develop confidence in students to take learning initiatives. Delegators also allow their students to work either independently or in a group and teacher will act as a resource person. Students have freedom to select the activity of their own interest (Grasha, 1996; Ali &Mehmood, 2012).

Due to the concreteness and distinctiveness, Grasha's teaching styles were preferred to identify the distinctive teaching styles of English language teachers of secondary schools. Garash's model offer five teaching styles which are described in terms of measurable characteristics in teaching leading to conclude about teaching styles. These described styles are also reasonable distinct having empirically measurable.

## **STUDENT ENGAGEMENT**

Engagement refers to the active involvement of a student in a learning task (Christenson et al., 2012). Conner (2016) also defined the term student engagement as the degree of responsiveness, curiosity, interest, attentiveness that students show during teaching-learning process which further led to increase the level of motivation that cause progress in their education.

Basically, student engagement indicates the students intellectual investment in learning and the students endeavour pointed towards learning, understanding, gain expertise and skills which is the main purpose of education to be promoted in the students (Newman, 1992). Hence, engagement refers to the energy that has utilized to accomplish the task as well as it is intellectual investment that engage students to complete their work by utilizing their cognition (Shaari et al., 2014).

In 1980's and 1990's, a number of theories and models of engagement were developed which laid the foundation to conduct research studies on school engagement, student engagement and classroom engagement. Most of the researches conducted on secondary education, concluded that active engagement of students in school activities leads to greater academic achievement. Moreover, social interaction and student-teacher interaction also helpful to achieve good grades. Additional researches from the late 20th and early 21st centuries also explored the relationship of engagement with students discipline, motivation and drop-out rates among high school students (Fredericks &McColskey , 2012).

### **Theoretical Frameworks for Student Engagement**

The theories developed by Finn (1992), Finn and Voelkl (1993) and Fredricks et al. (2004) laid the foundation to conduct researches on student engagement. These researches have explored that engagement is a multidimensional construct. Various models of school engagement also available in the literature e.g; Participation-Identification model (Finn, 1989), Fredricks, Blumenfeld, Friedel and Paris (2005) three-factor model and the Appleton, Christenson, Kim, and Reschly (2006) four-factor model measured School Engagement whereas the Hazel model of

school engagement( Hazel et al., 2008) offers a multidimensional measure of student engagement. The present study adopted the Fredricks, Blumenfeld, Friedel and Paris (2005) three-factor model to develop the student engagement scale and to measure the students engagement in three dimensions e.g; Behavioural, emotional and Cognitive Engagement at secondary level English level classes.

### ***The Fredricks, Blumenfeld, Friedel, and Paris (2005) three-factor model***

The three-factor model was developed on three interwoven dimensions: emotional, behavioral and cognitive engagement. The conventional research studies laid the foundation to provide an evidence that student engagement is a social-psychological construct comprised of emotional, behavioral, and cognitive dimensions. The combination of behavior, emotion, and cognition under one variable of engagement provide a detailed and enrich information about children that is impossible to study individual construct separately (Appleton, Christenson, & Furlong2008;Fredricks et al., 2004).Fredricks et al. (2004) also stated that these factors represented the mind (cognitive), the heart (emotional) and the body (behavioral), which represent engagement altogether, support each other and produce desired outcomes on the part of both teachers and students.Moreover, engagement is also influenced by both internal factors such as interactions with peers and teachers in learning contexts, and by external influences such as parents and school cultures (Reschly& Christenson, 2012). Therefore, the changeable nature of engagement makes it a malleable construct.

### **Engagement as a multidimensional Construct**

Engagement has been mostly studied by the researchers in two contexts; School engagement which encompasses both curricular as well as cocurricular activities of the students in a school (Fredricks et al., 2004; Appleton et al., 2008; Finn & Zimmer, 2012), whereas the classroom engagement focuses on students academic engagement particularly in a classroom context (Skinner &Pitzer, 2012; Gunuc&Kuzu, 2014). But in both cases, engagement is conceptualized as a metconstruct based on emotional, behavioural and cognitive indicators (Fredricks et al., 2004).

### ***Behavioral Engagement***

Birch and Ladd (1997) and Skinner and Belmont (1993) defined behavioural engagement as behaviors such as effort, persistence, concentration, attention, asking questions, and participation in learning activities. It also refers that how and to what extent the students are active, paying attention, putting effort and showing persistence (Skinner et al., 2009; Fredricks et al, 2004). Moreover, Fredricks et al. (2004) also described behavioral engagement areobservable behaviors that can easily be seen by the teacher, such as task accomplishment and participation in learning activities. The present study based on fredricks model (2005) of engagement; measured behavioural engagement in terms of attentiveness, effort and persistence shown by the secondary school students in their English language classes.

### ***Emotional Engagement***

Emotions are the main factor of engagement indicates students' emotional reactions such as happiness, interest, enjoyment and values such as students reactions towards teachers,

curriculum content and class. Students reveals emotional engagement when they reflect emotional responses to learning activities (Fredricks et al., 2004; Skinner et al., 2009; Conner, 2016).Connell (1990) stated that emotional engagement refers to positive and negative reactions to teachers, classfellows and learning activities.Emotional engagement is a combination of positive emotions like students' interest and happiness in class and negative emotions are boredom and anxiety (Gunuc&Kuzu, 2014).

The present study measured emotional enegagement in terms of Interest, anxiety and valuing in terms of students reactions towards their teacher, their classmates, their learning environment, their assesments and their study content.

### ***Cognitive Engagement***

Cognitive engagement indicates self-regulation and use of learning strategies activities (Finn, 1993; Finn et al., 1991).The extensive literature defines cognitive engagement in terms of self-regulation where students use self-regulating strategies to plan, monitor, and evaluate their cognition to gain mastery over task (Pintrich& De Groot, 1990; Zimmerman, 1990) and apply learning approaches such as rehearsal, summarize and elaborate to remember, organize and understand the material (Weinstein & Mayer, 1986).

The present study measured cognitive engagement in terms of surface learning strategy (Rote memorization/Rehearsal), deep learning strategies (summarize and elaborate to remember, organize and understand the material) and self-regulation strategies (to plan, monitor, and evaluate the cognition to gain mastery over task).

In short, all three dimensions of engagement are interrelated even though engagement is a multidimensional complex concept. The above mentioned review of literature showed that students' overall engagement depends to what extent they are involved behaviourally, emotionally and cognitively in the classroom activities (Fredrick et al., 2004).

## **METHODOLOGY**

With the theoretical assumption described before and relationship of teaching styles with students engagement to learn English in earlier section, this research explored the teaching styles of English teachers in secondary schools and recorded engagement of their respective students towards learning English. A Correlation was explored to determine whether the teaching styles can really makes a difference to engagement levels of the secondary students regarding English learning. In process different engagement levels were explored regarding five different teaching styles of Grasha's model. The importance of the paper lies in the fact that the data collected, analyzed and interpreted in terms of students'' engagement with respect to their English Language Learning will be beneficial for teachers in particular, with the help of this study the teachers will be able to know about their own teaching styles and their effectiveness in English Language Learning, it will also help them to effectively plan and implement English Language Lessons. The result of the study will also be beneficial for the recruiters in developing a selection criteria for English Language teachers. The major benefactors will be the students, in terms of better English Language learning.

## Research Design

It was assumed that different teaching styles may have a significant relationship with the engagement of the secondary students towards English Language learning. To explore it, a quantitative research was conducted by following positivism research paradigm. The research methodology adopted was Co-relational in nature i.e., finding the relationship of an independent variable (teaching styles) with a dependent variable (student Engagement) in English Language classes.

## Research Procedure

Identification of the different distinct teaching styles (Primary and Secondary) of English Language teachers, through “Know Your Teaching Style” scale.



Selection of English Language teachers with distinct teaching styles.



Administration of “Students Engagement Scale” to the students of selected teachers.



Exploring the relationship of teaching styles with the Student Engagement in English Language Classes through Descriptive and Inferential statistics.

## Population

The present study was conducted by taking into consideration the following population:

- a) All teachers (95 teachers) teaching English at secondary level classes (36 schools including 22 girls and 14 boys) affiliated with Federal Directorate of Education in Islamabad (Urban Area).
- b) English is being taught as a compulsory subject at secondary level schools, so all secondary school students were the population of the study.

## Sample

- a) The sample of the study was forty-eight (18 males & 30 females) out of 95 (38 males & 57 females) English teachers identified with distinct teaching styles from 24 secondary schools (Urban Area) of FDEI, Islamabad.
- b) On the other hand, 15 Students (10<sup>th</sup> Grade) were randomly selected against each relevant English teacher whose distinct teaching styles were identified. As 48 teachers with distinct teaching styles were identified, so 720 students were randomly selected in total.

## Sampling

According to the nature of the study, data collection was completed in two phases. In the first phase, all the teachers (95 teachers) teaching English at secondary level classes (10<sup>th</sup> Grade) were approached to fill a questionnaire “Know Your Teaching Style” to find their respective

teaching styles, while in the second phase “Student Engagement Scale” was administered to the students of each respective English teacher who was identified with distinctive teaching style. The data collected after willingness and support of the school administration and also from all English teachers. There was a lot of moveability required to approach the both samples of teachers and students. By considering all above aspects, both teachers and students sample were gathered by using two different sampling techniques.

After data collection from English teachers, each questionnaire was assessed to identify the distinct teaching styles of the teachers. The criteria for selection of teachers; a teacher must score at least 50% (to get meaningful results) for any two teaching styles included in “Know your teaching Style” inventory (Shaukat&Mehmood, 2012). Out of two teaching styles, the teaching style showing high percentage was identified as Primary Teaching Style while the other teaching style was identified as Secondary Teaching Style. Through this criteria, sample of 48 teachers were being selected.

In the second phase, simple random sampling technique was being used to select students of the respective English teachers. Number of students in each class was different. In order to maintain the uniformity and according to the Gay (2000) formula, 10% of the students population were taken as students’ sample for the present study. 15 students (10<sup>th</sup> Grade) of each respective English teacher (identified with distinct primary and secondary teaching styles) were randomly selected to measure student engagement through “student engagement scale”. Hence, 720 students against 48 English language teachers were selected as a sample out of 6,920 (total population of the students at secondary level) for this study.

## **Research Instruments**

Two research instruments were used for data collection.

### **i) “Know Your Teaching Style” Scale**

The present study adopted an instrument “Know your teaching style” developed by a researcher named “Dr.Shaukat Ali” for his Ph.d study “The effect of teaching styles on students motivation at Undergraduate level”. This instrument was adopted as it was being developed by keeping in view about the cultural and social norms of Pakistan. Secondly, it was developed to measure the perceptions of teachers teaching English, as previously it was being used at both undergraduate level and in another study (Sheikh &Mehmood, 2014) at secondary level schools. Moreover, “Know your Teaching Style” instrument explored primary and secondary teaching styles simultaneously which make it different from other inventories.

Grasha (1996) teaching styles survey provided the base for the development of “Know Your Teaching Style” instrument. This instrument was purely developed by gathering opinions of English teachers. The instrument “Know Your Teaching Style” based on 5 teaching styles (expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator and delegator) derived from Grasha Model. It was based on five paragraphs and every paragraph reflects five different teaching styles independently. Five different teaching styles comprised of different statements about teaching practices in the form of paragraphs. Each teacher had to mark the box followed by a relevant statement, otherwise left the unfilled the statement and move on to the next statement. Marked

statements coded as “1” and unfilled statements coded as “0”. Frequency and percentages counted by using cross tab for results finding.

## ii) Student Engagement Scale

For the present study, Fredricks et al. (2005) three factor model of Student Engagement provided the base for the development of “Student Engagement Scale”. Fredricks et al. (2004, 2005) presented that engagement is a multidimensional construct based on three dimensions; Behavioural, Emotional and Cognitive Engagement. This “Student Engagement Scale” was developed to determine;

1. Behavioural Engagement by using the indicators of attentiveness, effort and persistence. 21 statements were developed to find behavioural engagement altogether.
2. Emotional Engagement by using the indicators of interest, anxiety and valuing such as pupils’ reactions to the teachers, the curriculum content and class. 21 statements were developed to find emotional engagement altogether.
3. Cognitive engagement was found by using the indicators of self-regulated learning (how a student plan, monitor, and evaluate their cognition while completing a learning activity), surface learning strategy (Rote Memorization and practicing) and deep learning strategies (summarizing, elaboration to remember, organize, and understand the material). 19 statements were developed to find cognitive engagement altogether.

A likert scale questionnaire developed to find the levels of student engagement in English classes at secondary level. The scale determined the student engagement in three dimensions (emotional, behavioural and cognitive engagement) as it is a multidimensional construct (Fredricks et al., 2004, 2005). This self-developed student engagement tool based on 5-point likert scale ranging from Never (1) to Always (5). Students were asked to mark the behavioural, emotional and cognitive engagement items on a 5-point likert scale, with 1 for “never” and 5 for “always”. Few reverse coded items were also used to determine the authenticity of the students responses. The mean of the item scores of each sub-construct was used to indicate student engagement in the relevant dimension. Furthermore, the average of the three sub-constructs scores was used as the measure of student engagement. High scores indicates high levels of engagement. It investigated the students perceptions about their learning engagement in English classes.

Basically, “Student Engagement Scale” consisted of 61 statements. Each statement of the Student Engagement scale were assigned as Always 5, Often 4, Sometimes 3, Rarely 2 and Never 1. The sum of all statements of each respondent shows student’s total score on the Engagement in English Language Classes. The maximum possible score on the Student Engagement scale would be 61 items x 5 score = 305, and the minimum, 61 x 1 = 61. Then, high, moderate and low levels of Engagement were developed by using formula’s:

$$\text{Range} = \text{Highest Score} - \text{Lowest score} (305 - 61 = 244)$$

$$\text{Class Interval} = \text{Range} / \text{No of Classes} (244 / 3 = 81)$$

According to class interval, we have made 3 classes (High, moderate and low) with equal interval of 81. The mean of the item scores of each sub-construct was multiplied with the no of items used to indicate student engagement levels in the relevant dimension. So if mean score of students fall in high class, it means their level of engagement would be higher and in the same way other levels would be viceversa. Behavioural, Emotional and Cognitive Engagement levels were also identified by using above formula's:

**Table 1 Student Engagement Levels**

	<b>High Engagement Level</b>	<b>Moderate Engagement Level</b>	<b>Low Engagement Level</b>
<b>Student Engagement</b>	305-224	223-142	141-61
<b>i) Behavioural</b>	105-77	76-48	47-21
<b>ii) Emotional</b>	105-77	76-48	47-21
<b>iii) Cognitive</b>	95-70	69-44	43-19

Furthermore, the average of the three sub-constructs scores was used as the measure of student engagement. High scores indicates high levels of engagement.

### **Validation of Student Engagement Scale**

To ensure validity and reliability of the “Student Engagement Scale”, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was done as well as pilot testing was conducted. CFA used to confirm and verify the existence of the factors based on theoretical and literature grounds. CFA also decided the proper loadings of all the statements in the “Student Engagement scale. It also identified the number of statements in the scale. Confirmatory factor analysis reduced 81 statement to 61 statements as 20 weak statements were excluded. After confirmatory factor analysis, the instrument once again pilot tested to get the instrument validity.

The factor loading (estimate value) of each item of behavioural, Emotional and Cognitive Engagement shown in the table/diagram given below. These variables were measured by 61 items altogether. Factor analysis included all those items having factor loading  $\geq 0.40$  (Cua, McKone, & Schroeder, 2001).

**Table 2 CFA of Behavioural Engagement Items**

<b>Name of Variable</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>Factor Loading</b>	<b>Item Decision</b>
<b>BEA</b>	BEA1	.62	Included
	BEA 2	.68	Included
	BEA 3	.71	Included
	BEA 4	.55	Included
	BEA 5	.61	Included

	BEA 6	.52	Included
	BEA 7	.34	Excluded
	BEA 8	.56	Included
	BEA 9	.48	Included
	BEA 10	.30	Excluded
	BEA 11	.32	Excluded
<b>BEE</b>	BEE 1	.68	Included
	BEE 2	.39	Excluded
	BEE3	.63	Included
	BEE4	.40	Included
	BEE5	.61	Included
	BEE6	.14	Excluded
	BEE7	.00	Excluded
	BEE8	.27	Excluded
	BEE9	.62	Included
<b>BEP</b>	BEP1	.50	Included
	BEP2	.46	Included
	BEP3	.67	Included
	BEP4	.60	Included
	BEP5	.63	Included
	BEP6	.68	Included
	BEP7	.66	Included
	BEP8	.64	Included

---

Confirmatory factor analysis reduced 28 items to 21 items of Behavioural Engagement after excluding 7 weak items whose factor loading was less than 0.40.

**Table 3 CFA of Emotional Engagement Items**

<b>Name of Variable</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>Factor Loading</b>	<b>Item Decision</b>
<b>EEI</b>	EEI1	.34	Excluded
	EEI2	.08	Excluded
	EEI3	.60	Included
	EEI4	.62	Included
	EEI5	.49	Included
	EEI6	.57	Included
	EEI7	.52	Included
	EEI8	.48	Included
	EEI9	.35	Excluded
	EEI10	.58	Included
<b>EEV</b>	EEV1	.54	Included
	EEV2	.45	Included
	EEV3	.61	Included
	EEV4	.65	Included
	EEV5	.63	Included
	EEV6	.43	Included
	EEV7	.49	Included
	EEV8	.54	Included
	EEV9	.48	Included
<b>EEA</b>	EEA1	.62	Included
	EEA2	.62	Included
	EEA3	.81	Included
	EEA4	.63	Included
	EEA5	.25	Excluded

EEA6	.12	Excluded
EEA7	.28	Excluded
EEA8	.54	Included

Confirmatory factor analysis reduced 27 items to 21 items of Behavioural Engagement after excluding 6 weak items whose factor loading was less than 0.40.

**Table 4 CFA of Cognitive Engagement Items**

Name of Variable	Items	Factor Loading	Item Decision
<b>CES</b>	CES1	.74	included
	CES2	.44	Included
	CES3	.75	Included
	CES4	.44	Included
	CES5	.71	Included
	CES6	.41	Included
	CES7	.52	Included
	CES8	.48	Included
<b>CED</b>	CED1	.51	Included
	CED2	.60	Included
	CED3	.53	Included
	CED4	.50	Included
	CED5	.35	Excluded
	CED6	.63	Included
	CED7	.34	Excluded
	CED8	.65	Included
	CED9	.61	Included
	CED10	.60	Included

	CED11	.39	Excluded
<b>CESR</b>	CESR1	.55	Included
	CESR2	.66	Included
	CESR3	.72	Included
	CESR4	.05	Excluded
	CESR5	.09	Excluded
	CESR6	.28	Excluded
	CESR7	.32	Excluded

Confirmatory factor analysis reduced 26 items to 19 items of cognitive Engagement after excluding 7 weak items whose factor loading was less than 0.40.

### Reliability of Student Engagement Scale

A Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient calculated to define the reliability level of the student Engagement Scale.

**Table 5 Cronbach’s alpha value of “Student Engagement Scale”**

<b>Name of Variable</b>	<b>Reliability</b>	<b>No of Items</b>
Behavioral Engagement	.783	21
Emotional Engagement	.707	21
Cognitive Engagement	.755	19

The results show that our study variable ‘Behavioral Engagement’ was measured with twenty one items, the reliability of this variable is 0.783, Emotional Engagement was measured with twenty one items and reliability of these twenty one items were 0.707, Cognitive Engagement were measured with nineteen items, the reliability was 0.755. The reliability of all variables is in the range of 0.70 are acceptable (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2009). This coefficient indicates that the internal consistency between the scores obtained from the scale is very high and that the measurements are reliable.

### Data Analysis

The statistical analysis was performed using SPSS 20 and AMOS for Confirmatory factor analysis. First, descriptive statistics of variables were calculated. To identify the distinct teaching styles, frequency and percentages were found by using cross tabulation method. To find the engagement levels of the students, mean and standard deviation were calculated of all three dimensions against each teaching style, then calculated range and class intervals to find engagement levels of the students.

A special type of correlation coefficient “Point biserial Correlation Coefficient” applied to find the nature and direction of teaching style and student engagement relationship. As one of our tool “Know your teaching style” was categorical (dichotomous) whereas other was likert scale so point biserial correlation coefficient was applied to find relationship. As Hall (2010) cited that point biserial is a special type of product-moment correlation coefficient which is specially used for measuring relationship between categorical (dichotomous) and continuous variable. Our data was also showing normal distribution as well as linear relationship which are considered to be an important assumptions to apply point biserial correlation coefficient.

## RESULTS ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATIONS

The scale used for secondary school English teachers “Know Your Teaching Style”, consisted of five subheadings showing each teaching style: Expert, Delegator, Role Model, Facilitator and Formal Authority. Similarly a five point Likert scale “Student Engagement Scale” was used for the students, the five possible responses on the Engagement scale was, Always 5, Often 4, Sometimes 3, Rarely 2 and Never 1.

## FINDINGS AND RESULTS

**Table 6 Cross Tab between Primary and Secondary Teaching Styles (48)**  
**Primary Style \* Secondary Style Crosstabulation**

		Secondary Style					Total	
		Expert	Facilitator	Personal Model	Delegator	Formal Authority		
Primary Style	Expert	Count	0	8	4	4	2	18
		% of Total	0.0	16.7	8.3	8.3	4.2	37.5
	Facilitator	Count	4	0	2	1	0	7
		% of Total	8.3	0.0	4.2	2.1	0.0	14.6
	Personal Model	Count	4	6	0	1	0	11
		% of Total	8.3	12.5	0.0	2.1	0.0	22.9
	Delegator	Count	4	3	2	0	3	12
		% of Total	8.3	6.3	4.2	0.0	6.3	25.0

	Count	12	17	8	6	5	48
Total	% of Total	25.0	35.4	16.7	12.5	10.4	100.0

Table 6 reveals about primary and secondary teaching styles of the 48 selected teachers. The table also shows that expert was the majorly used primary teaching style whereas delegator was the second majorly used primary teaching style. It implies that expert (37.5%) was the most dominant primary teaching style whereas facilitator (14.6%) was the least dominant primary teaching style. Table also revealed that facilitator was the major secondary teaching style followed by expert and personal model as second and third most used secondary teaching styles among school teachers. It showed that facilitator(35.4%) was the dominant secondary teaching style whereas the least dominant secondary teaching style was formal authority (10.4%).

**Table 7 Engagement levels of secondary school students towards different teaching styles**

Teaching Styles Engagement	Student	N	levels	Mean	Std. Deviation
Expert	BEH	180	80	3.8188	.56435
	EMOT	180	74	3.5490	.46957
	COGN	180	72	3.7824	.64055
Facilitator	BEH	255	82	3.9070	.48960
	EMOT	255	77	3.6875	.53809
	COGN	255	72	3.8036	.63109
Personal Model	BEH	120	80	3.8113	.48696
	EMOT	120	76	3.6313	.46692
	COGN	120	71	3.7593	.59109
Delegator	BEH	90	83	3.9330	.54223
	EMOT	90	77	3.6763	.40945
	COGN	90	76	3.9921	.51782
Formal Authority	BEH	75	81	3.8667	.49683
	EMOT	7575		3.5458	.46457
	COGN	7573		3.8350	.56870
Total	Student Engagement	720	230	3.77	0.525

Table 7 show engagement levels of secondary school students towards different teaching styles. Overall cognitive (Mean=3.75) and behavioural (Mean=3.85) engagement levels of secondary school students regarding all five teaching styles were high as compared to their emotional (Mean=3.69) engagements in English language classes. But two student-centered teaching styles (Facilitator and delegator) also shows high level of emotional engagement. The mean of the item scores of each sub-construct was used to indicate student engagement in the relevant dimension. Furthermore, the average of the three sub-constructs scores was used as the measure of student engagement. High scores indicates high levels of engagement.

**Table 8 Relationship of Teaching Styles with Students' Engagement**

	Teaching Styles	Student Engagement
	(rpbis)	(rpbis)
Teaching Styles	1	
Students' Engagement	.793**	1

\*\* *Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)*

Table 8 shows that the point biserial correlation test was performed between teaching styles (primary and secondary) with overall students' engagement. According to the results, teaching styles have positive significant relationship with overall students' engagement ( $r=0.793$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). The results also show significant as well as strong relationship between both variables as the correlation value ( $0.793^{**}$ ) greater than 0.75. It clearly reveals that if teachers use teaching style coincide with the learning styles of the students by keeping in view the individual differences, the level of engagement will also be high in the classes while teaching.

**Table 9 Relationship of Each Teaching Style with Each Engagement sub-construct**

Teaching Styles	Engagement Sub-constructs		
	Behavioral	Emotional	Cognitive
	(rpbis)	(rpbis)	(rpbis)
Expert	.729**	.766**	.733**
Facilitator	.784**	.743**	.739**
Personal Model	.751**	.782**	.671**
Delegator	.794**	.769**	.713**
Formal Authority	.708**	.674**	.628**

\*\* *Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

\* *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Table 9 shows that point biserial correlation test was performed to find the relationship of each teaching style with three sub-constructs of engagement in English language classes. According to each teaching style, all variables have positive and significant relationship with

each engagement sub-construct. The **expert teaching style** show positive and significant relationship with behavioral engagement ( $r=0.729$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), emotional ( $r=0.766$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and cognitive engagement ( $r=0.733$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), also shows strong relationship with behavioural, emotional and cognitive engagement. The **facilitator teaching style** also shows a positive and significant relationship with behavioral engagement ( $r=0.784$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), emotional ( $r=0.743$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and cognitive engagement ( $r=0.739$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), as well as strong relationship with all three sub-constructs. The **personal model teaching style** also shows a positive and significant relationship with behavioral engagement ( $r=0.751$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), emotional ( $r=0.782$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and cognitive ( $r=0.671$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), as well as show strong relationship with behavioural and emotional but moderate relationship with cognitive engagement. The **delegator teaching style** also shows a positive and significant relationship with behavioral engagement ( $r=0.794$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), emotional ( $r=0.769$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and cognitive engagement ( $r=0.713$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), also show strong relationship with cognitive, behavioural and emotional engagement. The **formal authority teaching style** shows a positive and significant relationship with behavioral engagement ( $r=0.708$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), emotional ( $r=0.674$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and cognitive ( $r=0.628$ ,  $p<0.05$ ), also show strong relationship with behavioural but moderate with emotional and cognitive engagement.

Hence, the results shows that there is a positive significant relationship of teaching styles with student engagement and also shows a strong relationship. There is also a positive significant and strong relationship of teaching styles with behavioural and emotional engagement but moderate relationship with cognitive engagement. However, overall expert, facilitator and delegator shows positive significant and strong relationship with all sub-constructs of engagement.

## Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions

The present study was basically conducted to explore the relationship of teaching styles with student engagement in English language classes at secondary level. Different teaching styles predicts different levels of students behavioural, emotional and cognitive engagement in English classes.

The study findings revealed that English teachers were using five teaching styles i.e; expert, facilitator, personal role model, delegator and formal authority to varying degree at secondary level classes. The present study also explored the primary and secondary teaching styles of each English teacher, identified with distinctive teaching style according to the set criteria of the “Know your teaching style” tool. It was concluded that Expert and personal model was the most prevalent primary teaching styles among English teachers, which are teacher-centered approaches. The second most preferred teaching styles was delegator, which is a student-centered approach. The study results provides support to the Grasha’s teaching philosophy based on the utilization of blended teaching as English teachers were accommodating and incorporating both student-centered and teacher-centered approaches in their teaching methodology to varying degree by keeping in view the learning context as well as learning styles of the students of secondary level classes. On the other hand, the most dominant secondary teaching style was facilitator, equally administered by the male and female teachers at secondary level classes. Moreover, teachers were also using blend of different teaching styles during their classes. These findings also support the idea of the present research that a teacher does not rely on a single pattern of teaching style. They can utilize a teaching style with the combination of different other teaching styles. The present research also explored the blend of teaching styles

(primary and secondary) adopted by the English teachers at secondary level classes. Hence, findings showed that English teachers are practicing the blend of different teaching styles to varying degree in terms of achieving their objectives and fulfilling the learning needs of the students. The study declared the primary and secondary along with the rest of teaching styles on the basis of calculated percentages. It implies that our teachers are practicing the blend of teaching styles to varying degree.

The study results also indicates higher engagement levels of secondary school students regarding five different respective teaching styles in English language classes. of the English teachers were using teacher-centered (Expert and Personal Model) teaching style as a primary style which found low level of emotional engagement but high levels of behavioural and cognitive engagement. It implies that most of the students might not interested, might have anxiety to learn English due to authoritative teaching style. Two student-centered teaching styles (Facilitator and delegator) shows higher level of student engagement in all three dimensions. It implies that the students wants an activity-based and an interactive learning environment as well as an autonomous atmosphere to get meaningful learning. It also suggests a clear understanding among teachers can be of use blend/combination of teacher-centered with student-centered teaching styles to engage the students effectively. Teachers consciously be given expertise in more than one teaching styles and skill to shift teaching style considering the nature of students by conducting authentic reliable workshops. Adoption of authentic and relevant pedagogies based on activities can increase the opportunities of collaboration among students as well as among teachers and students that can grasp the students interest greatly.

Research findings also concluded that there is a positive significant and strong relationship of teaching styles (primary and secondary) with the whole student engagement as well as with each engagement sub-construct. It implies that teachers' role can not be denied in teaching-learning process. The way of teaching matters alot in promoting conducive learning environment to engage students fully in their classroom activities.

The result also show that teaching styles (primary and secondary) are significantly correlated with behavioral, emotional and cognitive engagement. Expert and personal model was majorly used in secondary schools as a primary teaching style. Both are teacher-centered approaches, which implies that teacher is final authority and they donot let their students to work independently according to their own way. Hence, students remain behaviourally active in their classes to meet their teachers standards and expectations. On the other hand, English is a crucial issue of our schools and colleges. Most of the students have very weak base regarding English; so when they donot be ableto cope with the classroom requirements, they become anxious. English Teachers might give special attention to the anxious students by initiating communication sessions to minimize their anxiety regarding English learning. Positive feedback to the students performance can make the students to value their communication skills, their subject and also value their teachers that leads towards a high level of emotional, behavioural as well as cognitive engagement in English classrooms. English teachers may develop English writing skills among students by assigning them different topics so that they might also adopt deep learning strategies for better comprehension that may lead towards high level of cognitive engagement for learning English.

Facilitator was found to be the most prevalent secondary teaching style. Its a student-centered approach; teacher act as a facilitator and students work independently so they

automatically engaged behaviourally, emotionally and cognitively more as they have to complete their task independently or with their classmates help. It also provides an opportunity to learn at their own by utilizing their own thinking processes. It implies that teachers may create such an interactive learning environment that can lead to encourage more participation, attentiveness, interest and effort of the students regarding English learning.

The result findings also show that there is a positive, significant and strong relationship of cognitive, emotional and behavioral engagement across expert, facilitator and delegator teaching style exist. Personal model and formal authority teaching style shows moderate relationship with cognitive engagement. It implies that if autonomy and support provided to the students, they can engage more effectively behaviourally, emotionally and most important cognitively. Formal authority teaching style was the least prevalent teaching style among teachers; as findings also show it has moderate relationship with emotional and cognitive engagement. It implies that students do not like to be involved in strict sort of learning environment. They would enjoy and engaged more effectively if they are provided interactive, autonomous and supportive learning environment.

## **FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

The present research study has added to the existing literature in terms of students' engagement with respect to their English Language Learning will be beneficial for teachers in particular, with the help of this study the teachers will be able to know about their own teaching styles and their effectiveness in English Language Learning, it will also help them to effectively plan and implement English Language Lessons. The result of the study will also benefit the recruiters in developing a selection criteria for English Language teachers. The major benefactors will be the students, in terms of better English Language learning.

New Contributions to the literature can be made by comparing the engagement levels of the students in English classes considering demographic variables of the students; e.g; Educational and socio-cultural background of their parents, students ages, medium of instructions in their schools, profession of their parents and so on. It may be helpful to know the reason that why they are weak in English. The replication of this study might be undertaken to add greater confidence in the findings by considering students of higher secondary schools as a study sample. This relationship might also be explored by comparing government and private secondary school students and English teachers. Future researches might also be done by comparing the engagement levels of low and high achievers of English class. The relationship of academic achievement with teaching styles and student engagement levels of English class can be carried out. The relationship of classroom learning environment with the cognitive engagement of the students of the English class can be explored. Moreover, cognitive Engagement relationship with academic achievement of Students might also be explored. Thus, a great contribution can be made by exploring different aspects of teaching as well as engagement at different level by conducting quantitative as well as qualitative research studies.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Abbas, Q., & Hussain, S. (2018). Comparative Study of Teaching Styles of Various School Groups at Secondary Level in District Chiniot of Punjab. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 2(3), 1-8. Retrieved from

- a. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327674629>.
2. Ali, S., & Mehmood, N. (2012). *Effect of Teaching on Students Motivation towards English Language Learning at Undergraduate Level*. (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis), IER, University of the Punjab.
3. Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., & Furlong, M. (2008). Student engagement with school: Critical conceptual and methodological issues of the construct. *Psychology in Schools*, 45, 369–386. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/pits.20303>
- Appleton, J. J., Christenson, S. L., Kim, D., & Reschly, A. L. (2006). Measuring cognitive and psychological engagement: Validation of the Student Engagement Instrument. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44(5), 427-445. Retrieved from [www.psychwiki.com/dms/other/labgroup/Krisztina/Appelton2006.pdf](http://www.psychwiki.com/dms/other/labgroup/Krisztina/Appelton2006.pdf)
5. Birch, S., & Ladd, G. (1997). The teacher-child relationship and children's early school adjustment. *Journal of School Psychology*, 35, 61–79. Retrieved from doi:10.1016/S0022-4405(96)00029-5
6. Christenson, S. L., Reschly, A. L., & Wylie, C. (2012). *Handbook of research on student engagement*. New York, NY, US: Springer Science Business Media. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7\\_13](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_13)
7. Connell, J. (1990). *Context, self, and action: A motivational analysis of self-system Processes across the life-span*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
8. Conner, T. (2016). Relationships: The Key to Student Engagement. *International Journal of Education and Learning*, 5 (1), 13-22. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.14257/ijel.2016.5.1.02>.
9. Cua, K.O., McKone, K.E., Schroeder, R.G., (2001), Relationships between implementation of TQM, JIT and TPM and manufacturing performance, *Journal of Operations Management* (19), 675–694. Retrieved from <https://experts.umn.edu/en/publications/relationships-between-implementation-of-tqm-jit-and-tpm-and-manuf>
10. Finn, J. D. (1993). *School engagement & students at risk*. Buffalo, NY: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from [https://www.scirp.org/\(S\(351jmbntvnsjt1aadkposzje\)\)/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1857028](https://www.scirp.org/(S(351jmbntvnsjt1aadkposzje))/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1857028).

11. Finn, J. D. (1989). Withdrawing from school. *Review of Educational Research*, 59, 117–142. Retrieved from doi:10.3102/00346543059002117
  12. Finn, J. D., Folger, J., & Cox, D. (1991). Measuring participation among elementary school students. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 50, 393–401. Retrieved from doi:10.1177/0013164491512013
- Finn, J. D., & Zimmer, K. (2012). *Student engagement: What is it? Why does it matter?* New York, NY: Springer. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2F978-1-4614-2018-7.pdf>
14. Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., and Paris, A. H. (2004). School Engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(1), 59-109. Retrieved from <http://www.sagepublications.com>.
  15. Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P., Friedel, J., & Paris, A. (2005). *School Engagement*. In K. A. Moore & L. H. Lippman (Eds.), *The Search Institute series on developmentally attentive community and society. What do children need to flourish: Conceptualizing and measuring indicators of positive development*, pp. 305–321. Springer Science Business Media. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-23823-9\\_19](https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-23823-9_19)
  16. Fredricks, J. A., & McColskey, W. (2012). *Handbook of research on student engagement*. New York, NY: Springer. Retrieved from <https://www.lcsc.org/cms/lib6/MN01001004/Centricity/Domain/108/The%20Measurement%20of%20Student%20Engagement%20A%20Comparative%20Analysis%20of%20Various%20Methods.pdf>
  17. Gay, L. R. (2000). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and applications*. Rawalpindi: Premier Printers.
  18. Ghanizadeh, A. & Jahedizadeh, S. (2016). EFL teachers' teaching style, creativity, and burnout: A path analysis approach. *Cogent Education*, 3(1). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1151997>
  19. Grasha, A. F. (1994). A matter of style: The teacher as expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator and delegator. *College Teaching*, 42, 142-149. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/87567555.1994.9926845>.
  20. Grasha, A. F. (1996). *Teaching with Style*: Pittsburgh, PA: Alliance Publishers.

21. Grasha, A. F. (2002). *Teaching with style: A practical guide to enhancing learning by understanding teaching and learning styles*. Allaince Publishers. CA.
22. Gunuc, S., &Kuzu, A. (2014). Student engagement scale: development, reliability and Validity. *Routledge*, 40(4), 587-590. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2014.938019>.
23. Hall, C. E. (2010). *Studies of single samples and whole populations: The Point Biserial and its generalizations. Multivariate Behavioural Research*, Vol.9(4), 447-459. Retrieved from [https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1207/s15327906mbr0904\\_5](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1207/s15327906mbr0904_5).
24. Hazel, C., Jack, C., Wonner, R., Albanes, J., & Gallagher, J. (2008). *Measuring student school engagement: Analysis of three models*. University of Denver
25. Mahmood, N., & Sheikh.A. (2014).Effect of different teaching styles on students' motivation towards English language learning at secondary level.*Sci.Int (Lahore)*, 26(2),825-830. Retrieved from <http://www.sci-int.com/pdf/1066298242825--830-%20ANEELA.pdf>.
26. Newman, F.M., Wehlage, G., &Lamborn, S. (1992). *The significance and sources of student engagement.Student engagement and achievement in American secondary schools*. New York: Teachers College Press. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED371047.pdf>
27. Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. (1990).Motivated and self-regulated learning components of academic performance.*Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 33–40. Retrieved from doi:10.1037/0022-0663.82.1.33
28. Reschly, A. L., & Christenson, S. L. (2012).*Handbook of research on student engagement*.New York, NY: Springer. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7\\_1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_1)
29. Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2009).*Research methods for business students, 5th edition*. Pearson Education, Harlow.
30. Shaari, A. S., Yusoff, N. M., Ghazali, I. M., Osman, R. H., &Dzahir, N. M. (2014).Relationship between lecturers' teaching styles and students' academic engagement.*Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118, 10-20.Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042814015328>.
31. Skinner, E. A., & Belmont, M. J. (1993). Motivation in the classroom: Reciprocal effects of teacher behavior and student engagement across the school year. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85, 571-581. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1994-15490-001>

32. Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T.A., & Furrer, C. J. (2009). A Motivational Perspective on Engagement and Disaffection: Conceptualization and Assessment of Children's Behavioral and Emotional Participation in Academic Activities in the Classroom. *Sage Journals*, 69(3), 500-510. Retrieved from [https://www.pdx.edu/psy/sites/www.pdx.edu/psy/files/Skinner%2C%20Kindermann%2C%20%26%20Furrer\\_EPM\\_2009\\_1.pdf](https://www.pdx.edu/psy/sites/www.pdx.edu/psy/files/Skinner%2C%20Kindermann%2C%20%26%20Furrer_EPM_2009_1.pdf).
33. Skinner, E. A., & Pitzer, J. R. (2012). *Handbook of research on student engagement*. New York, NY: Springer. Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7\\_2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_2)
34. Timostuk, I., & Jaanila, S. (2015). Primary teachers' instructional behavior as related to students' engagement in science learning. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 1597-1602. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042815041117>.
35. Weinstein, C. and Mayer, R. (1986) *Teaching of Learning Strategies. Handbook of Research on Teaching*, Macmillan, New York.
36. Zimmerman, B. J., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1990). Student differences in self-regulated learning: Relating grade, sex, and giftedness to self-efficacy and strategy use. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 51–59. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.82.1.51>