



University of Hormozgan



Educational and Behavioral
Research Center

Development and Validation of Activity Based Learning Scale among Teachers

Ritu Samaddar¹ , Deb Prasad Sikdar² 

1. Research Scholar, Department of Education, University of Kalyani, Pin- 741 235, West Bengal, India

2. Professor, Department of Education, University of Kalyani, Pin- 741 235, West Bengal, India, dpsedn@klyuniv.ac.in

Article Info

Article type:

Review Article

Article history:

Received 23 Aug. 2024

Received in revised form 5

Oct. 2023

Accepted 04 Nov. 2024

Published online 01 Dec. 2024

Keywords:

Activity-based learning,

Cronbach alpha,

Item Analysis,

Scale Development

ABSTRACT

Objective: Activity Based Learning (ABL) is a method where students continuously engage in tasks and think about them, helping them understand the teacher's desired outcomes. Classroom management is crucial for creating a conducive learning environment, allowing teachers to control the learning style and direction, preventing disruptions and discomfort. The study aimed to develop an Activity-based learning (ABL) tool related classroom management for teachers in West Bengal, India. It also aimed to determine their views on classroom management scale.

Methods: The study used convenience sampling from larger populations to estimate the number of teachers in various cities. The study involved 100 teachers who were given a self-administered version of a 28-item Activity-based learning (ABL) scale.

Results: After item analysis, the scale had 25 items remaining, covering six broad dimensions: Time Management, Content Complete, Student Interest, Class Control, Child Psychology, Preparation. Secondly The data analysis process included 306 teachers' responses in a second data set for Cronbach alpha. A high degree of statistically significant correlation was found in the scale's final iteration, with Cronbach alpha values of 0.724.

Conclusions: The comprehensive analysis revealed that the Activity-Based Learning (ABL) instrument serves as an effective tool for evaluating classroom management among teachers in the West Bengal region of India.

Cite this article: Samaddar, R. & Sikdar, D. P. (2024). Development and validation of activity based learning scale among teachers.

Iranian Journal of Educational Research, 3 (4), 51-64.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22034/3.4.51>



© The Author(s).

Publisher: University of Hormozgan.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22034/3.4.51>

Introduction

All teachers face a significant challenge in qualifying competitive and passionate students for the job market, necessitating the search for effective methods to actively engage students in the classroom. Ericksen (1978) believes that “Effective learning in the classroom depends on the teacher’s ability to maintain the interest that brings students to the course in the first place”. Teachers emphasize understanding delivered knowledge, developing problem-solving skills and critical thinking. Decision makers motivate students to create innovative solutions. Students learn passively by being receptacles of knowledge, while actively participating in the learning process (Younis 2018; English & Kitsantas 2013).

Classroom management is a crucial aspect of teaching, requiring effective control and discipline to create a conducive learning environment (Akar, 2003; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). Teachers often express concern about controlling students and maintaining discipline (Raptakis, n.d.; Shin, & Koh, 2007). Despite its direct impact on students' success, managing student behavior and resolving problems remains a stubborn task, particularly in primary schools (Yasar, 2008). Classroom management is crucial in ensuring a conducive learning environment for students. It allows teachers to control the learning style and direction of their classes, preventing disruptions and discomfort (Korkmaz, 2005). A predictable environment, more meaningful academic learning, social and emotional development, a decrease in bad behaviors, and more academic time are all facilitated by effective classroom management (Kratowill et al., 2009). It also helps prevent distractions and promotes social and emotional growth.

Panko et al. (2007) describe Activity Based Learning (ABL) as a teaching approach in which students actively participate in the learning process throughout. According to Churchill (2003), students and learners benefit from activity-based learning by building mental models for higher-order skills including information transfer and problem-solving. The most effective teaching strategies, according to Bhalli, Sattar, and Asif (2016), entail engaged student engagement in the classroom. According to Bonwell and Eison (1991), students participate in activities and reflect on them as part of activity-based learning. This strategy is a productive and efficient teaching tool since it aids students in understanding the objectives that have been set by the instructor (Kassir 2013).

Actively based learning is a student-centered instructional approach that offers difficult assignments, interesting activities, and scaffolding to increase effort and motivation. It is also referred to as cooperative learning, collaborative learning, problem-based learning, or inquiry-based learning (Singal et al., 2018; Deci & Ryan 2000). Instead of passively absorbing information, it involves students actively engaged in the learning process through a variety of engaging activities (Quin, 2012).

The goal of activity-based learning is to improve students' literacy and learning participation while strengthening their capacity for self-regulation, including organizing, observing, and assessing. According to Kudryashova et al. (2016) and Loyens et al. (2008), it fosters relationship-building and critical thinking, synthesis, and analysis. Activity-based learning approaches assist students in transitioning from memory and fundamental knowledge to active thinking skills such as analysis, creation, evaluation, and application. Motivation can be boosted by tasks that are connected to observable phenomena. Based on the idea that learning occurs best when activities are involved, activity-based education prioritizes the development of skills over the dissemination of knowledge (Edwards, 2015). Enhancing student skills, incorporating higher-order thinking, completely engaging students, and assisting them in exploring their values and attitudes are some of the key features of activity-based learning (Quin, 2012). The National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT, 2011) is in support of it.

The National Knowledge Commission (NKC) recommended in 2009 that social studies instruction that is activity-based aids students in applying their knowledge to real-world challenges. According to studies, pupils who use this method of instruction remember the material for longer than those who don't (Ozen & Ergenekon, 2011). According to a number of studies, it also aids students in reaching their objectives, promotes autonomous learning, and develops higher-order abilities and creative thinking (Shah & Rahat, 2014; Bansal & Kumar, 2012; Choo, 2007). The purpose of the project is to create and evaluate a standardized scale for evaluating instructors' use of activity-based learning in classroom management.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The following are the objectives of the current study-

1. To evaluate the Activity-based Learning Scale's items through item analysis.
2. To validate the Activity-based Learning Scale by evaluating its consistency.

Material and Methods

Design

“Convenience sampling technique has been used for the collection of relevant data in this study” (Tongco, 2007). It is a Non- Random Technique, the non-random technique involves researchers deciding what needs to be known and seeking individuals who can provide it through knowledge or experience, without requiring underlying theories or participants (Bernard, 2002).

Participants

This study involves selecting proficient individuals or groups knowledgeable about a particular phenomenon, focusing on their as opposed to random studies, availability, willingness to participate, and capacity for clear, expressive, and thoughtful communication of experiences and viewpoints (Cresswell, & Plano, 2011; Bernard, 2002; Spradley, 1979). The researcher administered a draft scale to one hundred (100) West Bengal teachers for item analysis, followed by assessing its internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha method on three hundred Six (306) teachers. The questionnaire was read by the participants before they could submit their answers, and the points were calculated using the correct scale assigned to each statement.

Item pool

The study started with the creation of a conceptual framework, a literature review, the drafting of items and questions, and the consultation of two specialists. Due to participant characteristics, none of the two instruments employed in the study—one created by Martin, Yin, and Baldwin and the other translated into Turkish—showed statistically adequate dependability. The researcher made the decision to create a brand-new activity-based learning classroom management scale (Martin et al., 1998; Savran, & Çakıroglu, 2004; Yerin-Güneri et al., 2004).

Subscale

Activity based learning (ABL) scale related to classroom management was defined as a multi-faceted construct that includes six broad dimensions: Time Management (5 items) Content Complete (3 items), Student Interest (5 items), Class Control (5 items), Child Psychology (5 items), Preparation (5 items) (Samaddar et al., 2023).

Scoring of tools

The present study uses a 5-point Likert scale with 28 questions to represent the Activity-based Learning scale for Classroom Management. The students' answers were noted using a scale from

1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). According to Mukherjee et al. (2018), the scale has a lowest potential score of 28 (scoring 1 on each of the 28 items) and a maximum possible score of 140 (ranking 5 on each of the 28 items). The scale was developed by the researchers using both positive and negative statements. The score of each item was distributed as 'Strongly Agree' = '5', 'Agree' = '4', 'Neutral' = '3', 'Disagree' = '2' 'Strongly Disagree' = '1'. In unfavorable statements score distributed as- 'Strongly Disagree' = 5, 'Disagree' = 4, 'Neutral' = 3, 'Agree' = 2, 'Strongly Agree' = 1.

Statistics

The study used an item analysis method to identify poor items from the Scale and standardize it with remaining items. Item analysis examines each item's performance independently, using classical statistics like difficulty, discrimination, distractor analysis, and reliability (Bichi, 2015; Thompson, 1985). A t-test item analysis was used to standardize the Activity-based learning associated Classroom Management Scale with good items. To evaluate the scale's reliability, Cronbach's alpha was applied.

Results

The Kelley method, commonly referred to as item analysis, is a technique used to create psychological or educational scales. It aids in locating scale or test items that efficiently differentiate between high and low scorers. If the disparities in scores between members are not taken into consideration, the ideal group size for analyzing test items is 27% from the extremes of the criterion score distribution (Kelley, 1939). In order to maximize the differences in normal distributions and provide enough cases for study, 27% is the value that is used (Karmakar et al., 2021; Wiersma & Jurs, 1990; Hetzel, 1997).

The identification of items that distinguish high and low scorers and ensuring their retention contribute to the overall discriminative strength of the scale are made possible by the Kelley technique, which is essential for item analysis in scale creation (Hetzel, 1997). According to Satyanarayana (2018), the t-test is a dependable statistical method for assessing item discrimination through extreme group means. It may be used to determine if an item discriminates in this fashion as well as the statistical significance of discrimination between high and low scorers.

Scale validation and improvement can be achieved by combining this approach with the Kelley method (Mitra et al., 2009).

Item Analysis

Table 1. Discriminant coefficients for Subscales

| Item | Upper Quadrille | | | Lower Quadrille | | | Comparison | | |
|--------|-----------------|------|------|-----------------|------|------|------------|----|---------|
| | N | Mean | SD | N | Mean | SD | t | DF | p |
| ABL1 | 27 | 3.37 | 0.25 | 27 | 2.11 | 0.21 | 3.80 | 52 | 0.000** |
| ABL2 | 27 | 4.62 | 0.21 | 27 | 3.96 | 0.27 | 3.81 | 52 | 0.000** |
| ABL 3 | 27 | 4.03 | 0.21 | 27 | 3.25 | 0.25 | 2.36 | 52 | 0.011* |
| ABL 4 | 27 | 4.88 | 0.06 | 27 | 4.48 | 0.17 | 2.23 | 52 | 0.015* |
| ABL 5 | 27 | 4.77 | 0.13 | 27 | 3.37 | 0.29 | 4.306 | 52 | 0.000** |
| ABL 6 | 27 | 4.23 | 0.23 | 27 | 4.03 | 0.22 | 4.196 | 52 | 0.000** |
| ABL 7 | 27 | 4.40 | 0.22 | 27 | 2.48 | 0.25 | 9.976 | 52 | 0.000** |
| ABL 8 | 27 | 4.92 | 0.05 | 27 | 4.59 | 0.17 | 1.789 | 52 | 0.039* |
| ABL 9 | 27 | 4.23 | 0.23 | 27 | 4.18 | 0.23 | 3.595 | 52 | 0.000** |
| ABL 10 | 27 | 4.70 | 0.13 | 27 | 2.22 | 0.25 | 8.467 | 52 | 0.000** |
| ABL 11 | 27 | 4.20 | 0.24 | 27 | 4.29 | 0.21 | 3.315 | 52 | 0.001** |
| ABL 12 | 27 | 3.98 | 0.25 | 27 | 4.48 | 0.21 | 2.40 | 52 | 0.001* |
| ABL 13 | 27 | 4.88 | 0.06 | 27 | 2.85 | 0.31 | 6.271 | 52 | 0.000** |
| ABL 14 | 27 | 4.88 | 0.08 | 27 | 4.33 | 0.22 | 2.083 | 52 | 0.012* |
| ABL 15 | 27 | 4.81 | 0.15 | 27 | 4.48 | 0.14 | 1.59 | 52 | 0.058 |
| ABL 16 | 27 | 4.07 | 0.24 | 27 | 2.70 | 0.26 | 3.796 | 52 | 0.000** |
| ABL 17 | 27 | 4.23 | 0.25 | 27 | 4.55 | 0.14 | 3.074 | 52 | 0.001** |
| ABL 18 | 27 | 4.92 | 0.05 | 27 | 3.48 | 0.28 | 4.999 | 52 | 0.000** |
| ABL 19 | 27 | 4.92 | 0.07 | 27 | 4.44 | 0.22 | 2.055 | 52 | 0.022* |
| ABL 20 | 27 | 4.62 | 0.12 | 27 | 2.27 | 0.24 | 6.873 | 52 | 0.000** |
| ABL 21 | 27 | 4.96 | 0.03 | 27 | 4.70 | 0.18 | 1.385 | 52 | 0.086 |
| ABL 22 | 27 | 4.22 | 0.22 | 27 | 4.62 | 0.14 | 2.595 | 52 | 0.006** |
| ABL 23 | 27 | 3.88 | 0.24 | 27 | 2.77 | 0.29 | 2.896 | 52 | 0.002* |
| ABL 24 | 27 | 4.92 | 0.05 | 27 | 4.03 | 0.23 | 3.686 | 52 | 0.000** |
| ABL 25 | 27 | 4.77 | 0.16 | 27 | 2.74 | 0.30 | 5.864 | 52 | 0.000** |
| ABL 26 | 27 | 4.02 | 0.25 | 27 | 4.59 | 0.18 | 2.18 | 52 | 0.016* |
| ABL 27 | 27 | 4.66 | 0.13 | 27 | 3.07 | 0.28 | 5.048 | 52 | 0.000** |
| ABL 28 | 27 | 4.85 | 0.85 | 27 | 4.18 | 0.26 | 2.371 | 52 | 0.010* |

** 0.01 level of significance; * 0.05 level of significance

Table 1 demonstrates that two items (ABL15 and ABL21) from the classroom management scale linked to activity-based learning (ABL) do not significantly differ between the highest and lowest

groups; thus, they were eliminated. Using the 0.05 level of significance, the remaining items (ABL 3, ABL 4, ABL 8, ABL 12, ABL 14, ABL 19, ABL 23, ABL 26 and ABL 28) demonstrate significant differences between the highest and lowest groups, while 19 items have significant variations using the 0.01 level of significance.

Validity

According to Cizek (2012), validity is the degree to which an instrument assesses a trait accurately. The classroom management Scale related to activity-based learning (ABL) underwent expert validation to guarantee face and content validity. A confirmatory stage in evaluating the efficacy of the generated scale when applied to the intended sample is semantic validation (Hair et al., 2019; Ciccehetti & Sparrow, 1981). It incorporates expert and resource perspectives to cut through ambiguity and enhance the language used in statements (Kimberlin & Winterstein, 2008; Ali, 2014). Validity is commonly characterized as the degree to which a measurement instrument genuinely captures the intended data. To verify face and content validity, expert validation was assumed in the case of the Classroom Management Scale related to Activity-based learning (ABL).

Reliability

The study examined 26 items from the Activity based learning scale that covered its five subdimensions. The Cronbach alpha Test for Non-additivity was employed by the researcher to evaluate the internal consistency of the final Activity-based learning (ABL) related classroom management Scale (Kimberlin & Winterstein, 2008). In order to provide an approximation of measurement reliability, the coefficient of internal consistency makes the assumption that items measuring the same construct should correlate (Cronbach, 1951). The alpha (α) correlation between two random samples of items selected from a universe resembling the test items is used to estimate the index of equivalence (Shin & Koh, 2007).

Table 2. Cronbach Alpha of the Activity-based learning Scale (ABLS)

| Dimensions | n | Total Item | Mean | SD | Cronbach's Alpha |
|------------------|-----|------------|------|------|------------------|
| Time Management | 306 | 4 | 3.93 | 0.63 | 0.308 |
| Content Complete | 306 | 3 | 4.32 | 0.61 | 0.442 |
| Student Interest | 306 | 5 | 4.39 | 0.59 | 0.471 |
| Class Control | 306 | 4 | 4.35 | 0.59 | 0.460 |
| Child Psychology | 306 | 4 | 4.13 | 0.57 | 0.459 |
| Preparation | 306 | 5 | 4.40 | 0.54 | 0.441 |
| ABLS | 306 | 25 | 4.25 | 0.39 | 0.724 |

Cronbach's Alpha for the Activity-based Learning Scale (ABLS) is 0.724, according to Table 2, whereas the alpha values for the other dimensions are 0.308, 0.442, 0.471, 0.460, 0.459, and 0.441. For internal consistency and reliability, According to Duzgun&Kirkic (2023; Hinkin, 1995), the analysis's Cronbach Alpha coefficient should be at least 0.60.

Final Scale

The Activity-based Learning Scale has 25 items in six dimensions: Time Management, Content Complete, Student Interest, Class Control, Child Psychology, and Preparation, with distributions shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Final form of Activity-based learning Scale

| SI. NO. | DIMENSION | Items | Total Items |
|---|------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Time Management | 1, 2, 3, 4 | 4 |
| 2 | Content Complete | 5,6,7 | 3 |
| 3 | Student Interest | 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 | 5 |
| 4 | Class Control | 13, 14, 15, 16 | 4 |
| 5 | Child Psychology | 17, 18, 19,20 | 4 |
| 6 | Preparation | 21, 22,23, 24, 25 | 5 |
| Activity-based learning Scale Total Item | | | 25 |

Discussion

Following the pilot trial, the study employed a 28-item activity-based learning scale for item evaluation. Verma suggested using item DI value instead of difficulty for evaluating quality (Varma, 2008; Emmer & Gerwels, 2005). Two items found no significant difference between the upper and lower groups (ABLS 15 and ABLS 21) were rejected using a 0.05 level of significance 't'-test, while 26 items were accepted using a 0.05 level and 0.01 level of significance 't'-test (Garret, 1984). Later Cronbach's alpha test is done to verify the reliability which value 0.724. Based on this, one item (ABL 2) is excluded. Statistical analyses have determined that a scale consisting of 6 factors and 25 items is valid, reliable, and usable.

Implication

This study aims to create an Activity-based Learning Scale (ABLS) to evaluate teachers' classroom management levels using Activity-based learning. The ABLS will help educational policymakers develop strategies to improve teacher classroom management performance. For further study the scale will collect data on teachers about classroom management allowing educators to measure the impact of Activity-based learning on their classroom management.

Conclusion

The Activity-based learning Scale is a reliable and valid measure of classroom management self-efficacy for teachers in West Bengal, India. Its quick administration and ability to reflect on self-efficacy during class can provide valuable insights. However, it could be improved with more challenging items to accurately track self-efficacy over time (Aloe et al., 2014). Activity-based teaching methods effectively impart content knowledge in social studies, motivating students to self-learn and improving performance. Teachers' teaching styles attract students, positively impact their understanding, and ultimately improve academic achievement for better learning results (Sarpong et al., 2020). The instrument was created to evaluate the stressors that educators in a given area encounter, offering a standardized resource for professionals, educators, and legislators to understand classroom management levels, enabling targeted interventions and support networks.

Acknowledgments

We would especially desire to express our gratitude to Dr. Santosh Mukherjee, Principal of Krishnanagar B. Ed. College in Nadia, West Bengal, for his valuable guidance and suggestions. We would also want to thank the aspiring instructors/teachers who participated in our study, as their participation enabled us to effectively finish our research.

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/supplementary material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Ethics statement

The patients/participants provided their written informed consent to participate in this study.

Author contributions

All authors contributed to the study conception and design, material preparation, data collection, and analysis. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

Funding

The authors did (not) receive support from any organization for the submitted work.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

References

- Akar, H. (2003). *Impact of constructivist learning process on preservice teacher education students' performance, retention, and attitudes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkiye,
- Ali MA.(2014). The impact of attitude regarding polio among the Muslim community of Malda district, West Bengal. Department of Education, University of Kalyani, West Bengal.
- Aloe, A. M., L. C. Amo, and M. E. Shanahan. 2014. "Classroom Management Self-Efficacy and Burnout: A Multivariate Meta-analysis." *Educational Psychology Review* 26 (1): 101–126. doi:10.1007/s10648-013-9244-0.
- Bansal, V., & Kumar, R. (2012). Activity Based Learning New Method of Learning: A Case Study of Teach-Next. *International Journal of Research in Economics and Social Sciences*, 2, 414-428.
- Bernard, H. R. (2002). *Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (3rd ed.). Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press
- Bhalli, M., Sattar, A. & Asif, M. (2016). Teaching strategies; perception of medical students used in basic science year. *The Professional Medical Journal*, vol. 23 (05), pp. 614-619.
- Bichi, A. A. (2015). Item analysis using derived science achievement test data. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 4(5):1655-1662.
- Bonwell, C. & Eison, J. (1991). *Active learning: creating excitement in the classroom*. Washington D.C.: School of Education and Human Development the George Washington University.
- Choo, C. B. (2007). Activity Based Approach to Authentic Learning in a Vocational Institute. *Educational Media International*, 44, 185-205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09523980701491633>
- Churchill, D. (2003), *Effective design principles for activity-based learning: The crucial role of 'learning objects' in science and engineering education*. Paper Presented at the Ngee Ann Polytechnic, 2.
- Ciccehetti, D. V., & Sparrow, S. A. (1981). A developing criterion for establishing inter rater reliability of specific items: applications to assessment of adaptive behavior. *Am J Ment Defic*, 86(2), 127-137.

- Cizek, G. J. (2012). Defining and distinguishing validity: Interpretations of score meaning and justifications of test use. *Psychological Methods*, 17(1), 31–43. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026975>
- Cresswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and Conducting mixed method research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Deci, E. & Ryan, R. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: human needs and the self determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, vol. 11 (4), 227-26
- Duzgun, G. & Kirkic, K. A. (2023). A developmental study of the attitude scale towards teaching arabic language (ASTTAL): Reliability and validity analysis. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 10(2): 406-421.
- Edwards, S. (2015). Active learning in the middle grades. *Middle School Journal*, vol. 46 (5), 26-32.
- Emmer, E. T., & Gerwels, M. C. (2005). *Establishing Classroom Management For Cooperative Learning*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada, April, 2005. (ERIC Number: ED490457)
- English, M. & Kitsantas, A. (2013). Supporting student self-regulated learning in problem- and project-based learning. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*, vol. 7 (2).
- Ericksen, S. C. (1978). *The Lecture. Memo to the Faculty*, 60. Ann Arbor: Center for Research on Teaching and Learning, University of Michigan
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2003). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Garret, H.E. (1984). *Statistics in Psychology and Education*. Bombay, India: Vakils Feffer and Simons Ltd. 334
- Hair, J. F., Gabriel, M. L. D. S., Silva, D., & Junior, S. B. (2019). Development and validation of attitudes measurement scales: fundamental and practical aspects, *RAUSP Management Journal*, 51(4), 490-507.
- Hetzl, S. M. (1997). *Basic Concept in Item and Test Analysis*. Texas A&M University.
- Hinkin, T. R. (1995). A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. *Journal of Management*, 21(5), 967–988. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639502100509>

- Karmakar S. Mukherjee S. Sikdar DP. (2021). Item Analysis Using a Derived Test Data of Knowledge, Attitude and Practice Regarding Drug Addiction. *IASSI Quarterly Contribution to Indian Social Science*, 40(4):708-724.
- Kassir, H. (2013). *The effectiveness of the science- inquiry teaching approach on the students' achievement and engagement in the UAE public schools*. Master Dissertation. The British University in Dubai.
- Kelley, T. L. (1939). The selection of upper and lower groups for the validation of test items. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 30(1), 17-24. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0057123>
- Kimberlin, C.L. & Winterstein, A. G. (2008). Validity and reliability of measurement instruments used in research. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacist*, 65(1): 2276-2284
- Korkmaz, I. (2005). *İstenmeyen Davranışların Önlenmesi, Sınıf Yönetim*. Ed: Zeki Kaya. Ankara: PegemYayıncılık.
- Kratochwill, T., DeRoos, R., & Blair, S. (2009). *Classroom Management: Teachers Modules*. American Psychological Association. Retrieved from <https://www.apa.org/education/k12/classroom-mgmt.aspx>
- Kudryashova, A., Gorbatova, T., Rybushkina, S. & Ivanova, E. (2016). Teacher's roles to facilitate active learning. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 7 (1), 460-466
- Loyens, S., Magda, J. & Rikers, R. (2008). Self-directed learning in problem-based learning and its relationships with self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychology Review*, vol. 20 (4),411-427.
- Martin,N.K., Yin, Z. & Baldwin, B. (1998). Classroom management training, class size and graduate study: Do these variables impact teachers' beliefs regarding classroom management style? Online available from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED420671.pdf>
- Mitra, N. K., Nagaraja, H.S., Ponnudurai, G. & Judson, J. P. (2009). *The Levels of Difficulty and Discrimination Indices in Type a Multiple-Choice Questions of Pre-clinical Semester I Multidisciplinary Summative Tests*. *IeJSME*, 3(1):2-7.
- Mukherjee, A.; Singh. P.; Satyapriya.; Rakshit. S. and Burman. Roy. R. (2018). Development and standardization of scale to measure farmer's attitude towards farmers' producer company. *Indian journal of extension education*. 54(4), 84-

90https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333394586_Development_and_Standardization_of_Scale_to_Measure_Farmer's_Attitude_Towards_Farmers_Producer_Company

National Council of Educational Research and Training. (2011). *Activity based learning Tamil Nadu*. National Council of Educational Research and Training.[Accessed 29 July 2024].

National Knowledge Commission (2009). Report to the Nation 2006-2009

Ozen, A., & Ergenekon, Y. (2011). Ozel EgitimdeEtkinlikTemelliOgretimUygulamaları. *Kuram veUygulamadaEgitimBilimleri*, 11, 351-362.

Panko, M., Kenley, R., Davies, K., Piggot-Irvine, E., Allen, B., Hede, J. & Harfield, T. (2005). *Learning styles of those in the building and construction sector. Report for Building Research*, New Zealand.

Quin, Y. (2012). Impact of active learning in the classroom on academic achievement and motivation. *Innovation Magazine*, vol. 11 (1), 51-53.

Raptakis, D.M.(n.d.). *The highly qualified teacher: Perceptions of parents, teachers, and principals at the elementary and middle school levels*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Johnson & Wale University, Rode Island: the United States of America. Online available from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/305364209>

Samaddar, R., Mukherjee, S. & Sikdar, D.P. (2023). Documentary analysis on challenges of classroom management. *International Journal of Creative Research Thought*, 11(3):c613-c6224. <https://ijcrt.org/papers/IJCRT2303292.pdf>

Sarpong, T., Sarpong, F. A., & Asor, A. O. (2020). The Influence of Activity-Based Teaching Method Used in Teaching Social Studies on Students Retention and Academic performance: A Quasi-Experimental Study of Selected Junior High School Students in Sekyere South District of Ashanti Region, Ghana. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 8, 238-254. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2020.812018>

Satyanarayana, R. (2018). *Construction of Evaluation Tools*. IGNOU; Available: http://egyankosh.ac.in/handle/12_3456789/42094 Accessed on 20th July, 2024

Savran, A. &Çakıroglu, J. (2004). Preservice science teachers' orientations to classroom management. Hacettepe *University Journal of Education Faculty*, Vol.26, 124-130,

Shah, I., & Rahat, T. (2014). Effect of Activity Based Teaching Method in Science. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2, 39-41

- Shin, S. & Koh, M. S. (2007). A cross-cultural study of teachers' beliefs and strategies on classroom behavior management in urban American and Korean school systems. *Education and Urban Society*, Vol. 39, No. 2, 286-309.
- Singal, N., Pedder, D., Malathy, D., Shanmugam, M., Manickavasagam, S. & Govindarasan, M. (2018). Insights from within activity-based learning (ABL) classrooms in Tamil Nadu, India: Teachers perspectives and practices. *International Journal of Educational Development*, vol. 60, 165-171
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
- Thompson, B. & Levitov, J. E. (1985). Using microcomputers to score and evaluate test items. *Collegiate Microcomputer*, 3:163-168.
- Tongco, M. D. C. (2007). Purposive Sampling as a Tool for Informant Selection. *Ethnobotany Research and Applications*, 5, 147–158. Retrieved from <https://ethnobotanyjournal.org/index.php/era/article/view/126>
- Varma, S. (2008). Preliminary item statistics using point-biserial correlation and p-values. Available: https://www.eddata.com/resources/publications/EDS_point_biserial
- Wiersma, W. & Jurs, S. G. (1990). *Educational measurement and testing* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 145.
- Yasar, S. (2008). *Classroom management approaches of primary school teachers*. Unpublished masters' thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkiye.
- Yerin-Guneri, O., Bulut, S., & Ozdemir, Y. (2004). Development of teacher efficacy in classroom management and discipline scale. Unpublished manuscript.
- Younis, T. (2018). *A study of the effectiveness of inquiry-based learning and project-based learning of science and language subjects at high school level in the U.A.E*. Master Dissertation. The British University in Dubai.