International Journal of Yoga, Physiotherapy and Physical Education
ISSN: 2456-5067; Impact Factor: RJIF 5.24
Received: 09-01-2019; Accepted: 12-02-2019
www.sportsjournal.in
Volume 4; Issue 2; March 2019; Page No. 14-19

Relationship between learning times and academic achievement

Rosli Hamid[1], Mohd Foazi Md Nor[2], Syed Ahmad Ezahar Syed Ambon[3], Mohd. Zainuri Embi[4], Junaidy Bin Mohamad Hashim[5]
[1-5] Institute of Malaysia Teacher Education Malaysia, Malaysia

Abstract
The purpose of this research is to identify the relationship between learning time and student's academic performance. Time of learning refers to time management given by the students toward academic or who involved themselves in extra curriculum activities. The data was gathered through questionnaires to 100 students from several boarding school in Kedah. The academic performance was measured through 2018 SPM trial exam. The data was analysed by using correlations. The research found that there is no significant [(t (100) = 0.235, p>.05)] relationship between learning time and student's academic performances. The results showed, involvement in extra curriculum activities do not effects the academic performance if students could manage their time wisely both in academic and extra curriculum activities and knows their abilities.

Keywords: relationship, learning time, student's academic performance, management

Introduction

Malaysia has shown tremendous progress in various aspects of education since attaining independence in 1957. In general, much progress has been achieved in student academic achievement including increased participation and reduction in dropouts at all levels of education, improving educational attainment, and improving educational attainment performance. So as a student, not only requires mental intelligence to achieve excellent academic performance, it should be balanced with physical fitness. To achieve this goal, the school is responsible for implementing and providing teaching and learning activities. Two concepts that are always interconnected with each other are curriculum and co-curriculum. Curriculum or more commonly known as academic subjects, covers several subjects of Bahasa Melayu, English, Modern Mathematics, Additional Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, History, Accounting and Islamic Education,

The co-curriculum is actually more of a connection to teaching and learning activities learned in the classroom, but the more important it emphasizes concepts or hidden aspects such as evaluating or developing a student's talent, leadership, or social skills. One of his activities is sports and games. Through the active involvement of the students in both fields, it is hoped that the Ministry of Education will pursue the pure desire of the Ministry of Education as contained in the National Education Philosophy to create a balanced in physical, emotional, spiritual and intellectual. The Malaysian Education Act 1961 states that time has been allocated for students engaging in co-curricular activities comprising sports and games, clubs and associations as well as uniformed units. The involvement of students in co-curriculum activities is mandatory and planning and management is submitted to the school administrators themselves (Ministry of Education, 1980).

However, engagement in sports is always regarded as a barrier to intuition. Quek (1994) [36], which states that the results of students' academic achievement in co-curricular activities (sports) are low when compared to students who are not active in co-curricular activities (sports). According to him, the active learning process of students is affected by the time and energy spent on activities in co-curriculum (sports) work.

Our society generally measures the success and excellence of a person only based on academic performance. Therefore, these negative perceptions need to be eradicated and studies should be conducted to clarify that the learning time of students actively involved in co-curricular activities does not necessarily negatively affect the achievement of student academic performance. Disciplinary Unit, School of Education Ministry Division, in 1983 found that 83% of the students considered that the focus of learning time on co-curricular activities did not affect the achievement they are in the academic field (Ministry of Education, 1990).

The Ministry of Education Malaysia and school administrators are aware of this fact and they work together to ensure that co-curricular activities, especially sports and games, run smoothly in schools. However, a large number of parents have different attitudes. They encourage their children to focus more on learning time by entering or attending tuition classes or guidance rather than participating in sports activities at school. Such views are often heard even though many studies have been denied this statement (Webb, 1969; Mohd Yusoff, 1983; Mohd Razali, 1983; Eleanor, 1984) [40, 31, 32, 17]. found that involvement in sports and other co-curricular activities does not affect academic performance and learning as long as students know to spend time on sports and academics.

According to Asiah (1985), the influence of certificate accolades has thickened among the students' parents. This led to the educational content and approach of these students to focus more on academic matters. In general, good academic achievement will guarantee a better job or future. The communities, especially parents, recognize that involvement in sports activities does not actually affect the learning time and academic achievement of their childrens.

She also pointed out that the wisdom of managing learning time, effective review strategies and high concentration in the

classroom is a more effective foundation and formula of excellence. This statement is in line with the findings of Eleanor (1984) [17] and Lim (1991) [27] that the athlete provides learning time between 2 to 5 hours a day to review the lessons.

Hence, with a balanced attention between academics and sports, students are more successful in both fields. Applying interest in sports and games should begin at primary level again. Proper and neat school planning will have a greater impact on sports and academic excellence.

Research problems

Now days, educational system is more concerned with academic achievement from outstanding achievements in sports and games. Although positive values of sports activities have been recognized and accepted among educators, the question of the impact on academic achievement is still occurring over time. Ramasamy (1985) [23], had question of learning time and student involvement in the co-curricular field is disputed by parents and teachers as it emphasizes excellent academic performance as the basis for measuring the success of an individual.

Asiah (1985) states that most students face strong expectations from teachers and parents so they can graduate with excellence in academics. From the community, some argue that active involvement in the co-curricular field has a negative impact on student academic performance.

Through this research, researchers hope to be able to answer questions about the relationship of active and inactive student learning time in the field of co-curriculum with the impact on academic achievement.

Research objective

1. Identify the learning time of active and inactive students in co-curriculum.
2. Identify academic achievement of active and inactive students in co-curriculum.
3. Comparing student learning time with students who are not active in co-curriculum
4. Compare academic achievement of active students with students inactive in co-curriculum
5. Examine the relationship between learning time and academic achievement of active and inactive students in co-curriculum

Research questions

1. Are there significant differences in learning time between active and inactive students in co-curriculum?
2. Is there a significant difference in terms of academic achievement among active and inactive students in co-curriculum?
3. Is there a significant relationship between learning time and academic achievement of students who are not active in co-curriculum?
4. Is there a significant relationship between learning time and academic achievement of active student in co-curriculum?

Research methodology

The study was conducted to determine the time of learning on the involvement of active and not active students in sports and the relationship with academic achievement in several SBP school in Kedah.

This study is a descriptive survey (survey) that examines the learning time of active and not active students in co-curriculum and the relationship with academic achievement at the Full Boarding School (SBP) school in Kedah. This study was carried out using a questionnaire instrument that presented statements showing aspects affecting learning time towards active participation of students in co-curriculum and academic achievement.

Sampling

The population of this study consists of all Form four students at Full Boarding School (SBP) in Kedah. Based on statistics, Kedah SBP schools have a total of 500 Form Four students but only 100 are randomly selected as sample of this study. Samples consisted of 55 male students and 45 female students. 65 students were categorized as active and 35 people were categorized as inactive in co-curriculum.

Findings

Analysis of respondents distribution

The actual sample of this study consisted of 100 respondents consisting of four form four students at the SBP school in Kedah. Of the total, 55 respondents of male students and female student respondents are categorized as active and inactive in co-curriculum.

Table 1: Respondent Fractions by Sex

Category	N	%
Male	55	55
Female	45	45
Total	100	100

Table 2: Respondent Fractions by Participation in Sports

Category	N	%
Active	65	65
Not Active	35	35
Total	100	100

Comparison of student learning time active and not active in co-curriculum

Comparison of learning time of active and not active students in co-curriculum is made using *t-test.* In this analysis, the mean score of active student learning time compared to the mean score of student not active in co-curriculum. Table 3 shows the results of *t- test* for student learning time by active student category and not active in co-curriculum. Observation on Table 3 shows that there is no statistically significant difference ($t(130) = -0.1885$, $p>.025$) the student's learning time is active and is not active in the co-curriculum at significant level $p <0.025$.

Table 3: Mean student learning time scores are active and not active in co-curriculum

Category	N	Mean Score	SD	t	df	Sig	Level
Active	65	2.43	0.49	-.1885	130	0.062	Moderate
Not Active	35	2.28	0.44				Low

This conclusion is supported by the findings showing the mean difference in mean score for learning time between the two groups is only 0.15. This small difference is based on the mean score of the students 'co-curricular active learning ($M = 2.43$, $SP = 0.49$) which is between 2.34 and 3.67 from the mean of the students' learning time of nonactive in sports (M

= 2.28, SP = 0.44) pause 1.00 to 2.33. The findings also reveal that the level of usage of active student learning time in co-curriculum is at moderate level and student inactivity in co-curriculum is low. However, this finding can be concluded that the total use of learning time of both categories of students is significantly different.

Comparison of academic achievement of active students with inactivity in co-curriculum

Academic achievement of active and not active students in co-curriculum compared to using *t-test*. Min score of active student scores compared to min score of students inactivity in co-curriculum. The significance of mean difference in student scores for both categories of students is determined at the level of p <.025. Table 4 shows the results of the t test analysis used to compare academic achievement of active and inactive students in co-curriculum. Observation on Table 4 shows that there is no statistically significant difference (t (130) = 0.235, p>.025) between the mean score of the students' academic achievement score in co-curriculum (M = 94.20, SP = 5.19) student academic achievement scores are inactive in co-curriculum (M = 84.40, SP = 4.74).

Table 4: Comparison of academic achievement of active students with inactivity in co-curriculum

Category	N	Mean	SD	t	df	sig	Level
Active	65	94.20	5.19	0.235	130	0.815	High
Active	35	84.40	4.74				High

This finding shows that in terms of academic achievement, active and not active students in co-curriculum have significantly different academic achievement. This finding is supported by descriptive analysis that the level of academic achievement of these two groups is high.

Relationship between learning time and academic achievement of students is active and not active in co-curriculum.

The relationship between learning time and academic achievement of active students in sports and inactivity in co-curriculum was analyzed using correlation analysis. The existence of the relationship between the two variables is determined by the significant value at the level of p <0.025. While the strength of the relationship between the two variables is determined based on the value of correlation coefficient (r).

Table 5 shows the results of the correlation analysis between academic achievement variables of students who are not active in co-curriculum with learning time. Observation on the table shows that there is no statistically significant relationship (r =.058, p>.025) between the two variables.

Table 5: Correlation analysis between academic achievement variables with learning time variables for active students in sports

Academic achievement	Learning time	
	Correlation	Significance
	-.136	.273

The findings of the test have shown that any change in learning time does not affect the academic achievement of students who are active in the co-curriculum.

Relationship between learning time and academic achievement of students who are not active in sports is shown in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Correlation analysis between academic achievement variables with learning time variables for students not active in sports

Academic ahievement	Learning time	
	Correlation	Significance
	.058	.647

Observation on Table 6 shows that there is no statistically significant relationship (r = -.136, p>.025) between academic learning and academic achievement of students who are not active in the co-curriculum. The findings also revealed that any changes in learning time did not affect academic achievement of students active in sports.

This correlation test also found that there was no statistically significant relationship (r = -. 034, p> 0.025) between the learning time of both groups of students (active sports and sports inactive students) with their academic achievement. This finding is summarized in Table 7 below: Jadual 7

Correlation analysis between academic achievement variables with learning time variables for active and not active students in sports

Table 7

Academic achievement	Learning time	
	Correlation	Significance
	.699	-.034

The findings also show that any change in learning time does not affect the academic achievement of students who are active in co-curriculum and students who are not active in the co-curriculum

Discussion, conclusion and recommendations

Discussion of Study Findings

Based on the findings of this study, it was found that there was no significant difference in the use of learning time between active students in sports and inactive students in sports. This finding explains that the use of learning time between active and inactive students in sports is no different significantly. In conclusion these findings indicate that the involvement of students with sports activities does not affect their learning time if compared with students who are not active in sports.

This finding is supported by the study of Mohamed Nor (1982), in relation to co-curricular activities in terms of sports athletes and academic achievement. His study involved a total of 600 male and female students from six secondary schools in Selangor as a sample. Overall, this study found that the participation of students in sports co-curricular activities does not actually affect the learning time and academic achievement of the students. Emphasis on some elements by students such as focusing on teaching and learning in the classroom, reviewing the lessons, attending tuition / additional classes, making school or home training succeed.

This finding is also supported by Mohd Yousof (1983), which examines the influence of student participation in co-curriculum work in three secondary schools in Slim River, Perak. It is found that among students who are involved in co-curriculum work either representing the school or not, learning time and academic performance are not affected at all. The study also found that even though these students are active in sports, they still do not ignore the lessons. They always follow the counseling classes and review their lessons.

The study also coincides with the opinion of Soltz (1986), which indicates that Colorado high school athletes have their academic performance unimpressed despite their participation in sports compared to students with a higher average grade overall score (CGPA). In conclusion, Soltz states that athletes are also good individuals and work hard while in the classroom. They wisely distribute learning time by actively engaging in sports activities. In addition, athletes are also active athletes not as a nuisance factor to academic excellence, but factors such as family background and athlete's attitude to the academic importance and management of perfect learning time are the factors that often affect them.

Based on the findings of this study, it was found that there was no significant difference in terms of academic achievement between active students in sports and inactive students in sports. The findings of this study can be summarized that the academic achievement of these two groups of students is not significantly different. In conclusion, this finding shows that the involvement of students with sports activities either active or inactive does not affect their academic achievement.

This opinion was supported by Pangle (1956), quoted by Hazwani (2001), conducted a study of athletes and non-athletes at a high school in Tewnnessee. His focus is on football and basketball activities. He has taken into consideration the academic records for a total of 392 respondents based on an average grade value (CGPA) for a period of 5 years. His conclusion of the study, there was no significant difference between the average score for athletes and non-athletes.

The findings also show that there is a contradiction with the study conducted by Kissel (1999), in a study on sports-active students at Painnesville, found that sports-active students get better grades compared to those who are inactive sports. His research also found that students involved in a sports type get better grades than students involved in two or more sports. This is because of their discretion in managing learning time more effectively such as reviewing the lessons, focusing on teaching and learning in the classroom and conducting group discussions.

The findings of this study coincide with Jee's (1988) view, through his study entitled "The involvement of students in sports activities and their relevance to academic excellence" at a secondary school in Kajang also found that the student's learning time in sports activities in fact did not affect the comparison of academic achievement between them. The ability to attend additional classes, tuition, discussion with friends and others demonstrates the wisdom of an individual or student in making time management and effective learning strategies for success.

The discussion on the relationship between learning time and academic achievement of active and inactive students in sports was based on the results of the correlation analysis between the academic achievement variables of students who were not active in sports with learning time indicating that there was no significant relationship ($r = .058$, $p > .025$) between the two variables.

While the results of the correlation analysis between academic achievement variables of active students in sports with learning time also showed that there was no significant relationship ($r = -.136$, $p > .025$) between the two variables.

The findings of this study conflict with the views of Ahmad (2001) which carried out a study titled "Co-curricular Relations and Academic Achievement in the Students". He conducted studies at Sultanah Asma Secondary School, Alor Setar Kedah. His findings shows that student learning time actively involved in co-curricular activities (sports) negatively impacts academic achievement. According to him this may be due to extreme involvement such as joining too many sporting events so that a student is too tired and can not focus on his studies.

Although this finding is in line with the study conducted by Feltz and Weiss (1984), The Impact Of Girls Interscholistic Sportt Participation On Academic Orientation, aims to evaluate the effect of learning time in co-curricular activities on academic achievement among high school students. They have divided the students into four groups of athletes, services, athletes and services and those who did not participate in any activity. From the study, there was no significant difference between the groups based on their admission test to college.

Conclusion

The findings show that active involvement in sports has negatively affected the academic achievement of a student at Sekolah Menengah Kebangsaan Agama Baling. This may be because students are able to act wisely in allocating time to review the lessons. The school administration also took responsibility for the learning time of the students by arranging planned schedules and supported by the placement factor of students in the dormitory with specific rules regarding student learning time. Therefore, a student can participate in sports activities in a controlled way and will produce a great achievement not only for the student, but also for parents and for the school.

Proposal

Here are some suggestions based on the research that has been made. It is hoped that this proposed proposal will be useful to the school or certain parties:

1. This study is a case study covering a limited population, ie at a school only. So, it can not represent all students in other schools. Otherwise, this same study could be extended to a wider area of SMK in urban, rural, district or even state levels.
2. Study on the relationship between the style or the trend of time-consuming learning with academic performance among active sports students. The findings of this study will help the school to build a dedicated time management module for athletes so that they can maintain a balance of engagement in sports and academic performance.
3. The group studied in this study is active students in sports and is not active in sports. Future studies need to expand the active scope of sports rather than just represent sports homes, but represent schools at district level, representing districts to state levels and representing states to national level. Usually students who are involved in higher tournaments will spend more time undergoing training. Are engagement stages and training times affecting their academic performance?
4. The duration of the study is only a short time. In this regard, researchers hope that in the future, the timeframe should be extended to obtain a greater number of respondents and more accurate findings in order to better the reliability of the study.
5. The study variables only examine the learning time allocation and its relationship with academic

achievement. In that regard, the researcher suggests that future studies should be more focused and deep on the variables studied. For future research it can be added as much as interests, attitudes, motivations and self-application.

6. In addition, sports bodies, especially those directly related to the school, such as the District Schools (MSSD) Council, the State Sports Council (MSSN), the State Sports Council, the National Sports Council and the Youth Ministry And Sports (KBS), should conduct studies on student engagement in sports with their academic performance to get a clearer picture of how to increase or encourage students to engage in sports activities without sacrificing their academic performance.

Closing

Through research conducted by researcher found that respondent give good cooperation and evaluation as well as positive to research about learning time student active and not active in sport and relation with academic achievement. The school is also recommended to equip the facilities and facilities for the use of students so that co-curricular activities, especially sports, are more attractive to students. Factors are always concerned about the welfare and problems faced by students who engage in sports so that they do not feel neglected should also be given due attention. Even so each student must be well-versed in managing training schedules and learning more organized so as not to interfere with the lessons. Hopefully this study will further enhance student learning time in line with the national education philosophy issued by the Curriculum Development Center, Ministry of Education Malaysia.

References

1. Alias Baba. Statistik Penyelidikan Dalam Pendidikan dan Sains Sosial. Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, UKM, Bangi, Selangor, 1997.
2. Amilia Ahmad. *Satu Kajian Mengenai Stail Pembelajaran Dikalangan Pelajar-pelajar SPH, Di Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Kampus Skudai Dan Kaitannya Dengan Keputusan Peperiksaan Semester*. Unpublished Masters Thesis, UTM, Johor, 1997.
3. Amina Noor. *Kejayaan Ditangan Pelajar: Teknik Lulus Peperiksaan dengan Cemerlang*. Kuala Lumpur, Jasmin Enterprise, 1999.
4. Anastasi A. *Psychological Testing*. London: Macmillan, 1965.
5. Bazitah Bt Abu Bakar. *Hubungan Gaya Pembelajaran Dengan Pencapaian Akademik: Tinjauan Di Tiga Buah Madrasah Sepenuh Masa Di Singapura* Unpublished Masters Thesis, UTM, Johor, 2006.
6. Beau FA. The mental ability of athletes in comparison with non-athletes in high school. American School Board Journal. 1982; 73(2):45-155.
7. Bhasah Abu Bakar. *Asas Pengukuran Bilik Darjah*. Tanjung Malim, Quantum Books, 2003.
8. Carlson NR. Psychology: The Science of Behaviour. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc, 1987.
9. Chambers B, Abrami CP. The Relationship Between Student TeamLearning Outcome and Achievement, Causal Attributions and Affect. Educational Psychology. 1991; 83:140-146.
10. Coleman JS. The Adolescent Society. New York: Free Press of Glencoa, 1983.
11. Dunn R. Learning Style: State of The Science. Journal of Higher Education. 1984; 23(1):10-19.
12. Dunn R, Dunn K. Teaching Student Through Their Individual Learning Styles: The Centre for the Study of Learning and Teaching Styles. St. John's University. Jamaica, New York, 1978.
13. Dunn R, Dunn K. Learning Styles/Teaching Styles: Should they can they be matched? Educational Leadership. January, 1979, 238-244.
14. Dunn R, Dunn K. What Is Your Childs Learning Style? The Newsletter of Parenting. 1980; 3 1):4-58.
15. Ee Ah Meng. *Pedagogi Satu Pengenalan*. 3rd Ed.. Kuala Lumpur, Penerbit Fajar Bakti Sdn. Bhd, 1992.
16. Ee Ah Meng. *Murid dan Proses Pembelajaran Asas Pendidikan 2*. Shah Alam, Penerbit Fajar Bakti Sdn. Bhd, 1995.
17. Eleanor Ann Tan Lye Neo. Kajian pencapaian akademik di kalangan para atlit dan bukan atlit di peringkat Sijil Rendah Pelajaran. Unpublished DegreeThesis, UPM, Serdang, 1984.
18. Entwistle N. Styles of Learning and Teaching. New York, John Wiley and Sons Ltd, 1981.
19. Hamzah bin Nun. Gaya Pembelajaran Pelajar Di UTM. Unpublished Degree Thesis, UTM, Johor, 1999.
20. Hii Siong Ting. *Gaya Pembelajaran Sains Tahun 5 Fakulti Pendidikan*, UTM. Unpublished Degree Thesis, UTM, Johor, 2006.
21. Honey P, Mumford A. The Manual of Learning Styles. 2nd Ed. United Kingkom : Peter Honey, 1992b.
22. Kamariah Gono. *Gaya Pembelajaran Pelajar Kursus Kejuruteraan Di Institut Teknologi Perindustrian YPJ JB*. Unpublished Degree Thesis, UTM, Johor, 2002.
23. Kantha Kumar Ramasamy. Kaedah Permainan Dalam Proses Pengajaran Pembelajaran Pendidikan Jasmani. Jurnal Institut Pendidikan Darul Aman. 1985; 19:8-13.
24. Krejcie RV, Morgan DW. Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement. 1970; 30:607-610.
25. Kruzich MJ, et.al. Assessment of Student and Faculty Learning Styles: Research and Application. 1986; 3:22-29.
26. Lee MF. Pola Gaya Pembelajaran Pelajar dan Gaya Pengajaran Guru Dikalangan Pelajar dan Guru *Sekolah-Sekolah Menengah Akademik Daerah Johor Bahru – Satu Kajian Kes*. Unpublished Degree Thesis, UTM, Johor, 2001.
27. Lim Chew Sin. Satu kajian pencapaian akademik di kalangan pelajar atlit dan bukan atlit. Unpublished Degree Thesis, UPM, Serdang, 1991.
28. Mahmood Nazar Mohamed. *Pengantar Psikologi: Satu Pengenalan Asas Kepada Jiwa Dan Tingkah Laku Manusia*. Kuala Lumpur, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1990.
29. McCarty B. The 4 MAT System: Teaching to Learning Styles with Right/Left Mode Technique. Illinois: Excel, Inc. ASCD, 1985.
30. Mohamad Najib Abdul Ghafar. *Penyelidikan Pendidikan*. Skudai.Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, 1999.
31. Mohd Razali Abdullah. Perbandingan prestasi akademik atlet dan bukan atlet di Sekolah Menengah Sultan Mahmud, Kuala Terenagganu. *Jurnal Akademik. Maktab Perguruan Kuala Terengganu*, Jilid. 1983; 9:39-47.

32. Mohd Yusoff Man. Sejauhmana penglibatan murid-murid dalam gerakerja ko-kurikulum di sekolah, mempengaruhi pencapaian akademik. Unpublished Degree Thesis, UPM, Serdang, 1983.
33. Mok Soon Sang. *Ilmu Pendidikan Untuk KPLI (Sekolah Rendah : Komponen 1&2) : Psikologi Pendidikan & Pedagogi*. Subang Jaya, Kumpulan Budiman Sdn. Bhd, 2003.
34. Muhibbin Syah. *Psikologi Pendidikan Dengan Pendekatan Baru*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya, 1995.
35. Nabihah Badar. *Perbandingan Preferen Stail Belajar Di Kalangan Pelajar Berpencapaian Tinggi dan Rendah Matapelajaran Fizik*. Unpublished Master Thesis, UM, Kuala Lumpur, 2003.
36. Quek CH. The relationship between sports participation and academic performance. Singapore: Singapore Sport Council, 1994.
37. Quek Miow Leng. Pengaruh rakan sebaya dengan pencapaian matematik di kalangan pelajar Tingkatan 4 di Daerah Batu Pahat. Unpublished DegreeThesis, UTM, Johor, 2006.
38. Van Zwanenberg N. Felder and Silverman's Index of Learning Style and Honey and Mumford's Learning Style Questionnaire: How Do They and Do They Predict Academic Performances?. Educational Psychology. 2000; 20(3):365-372.
39. Wan Zah Wan Ali. *Memahami Pembelajaran*. Utusan Publications & Distributors Sdn. Bhd. Kuala Lumpur, 2000.
40. Webb H. Professionalization of attitudes towards play among adolescent. Aspect of Contemporary Sport Sociology. Chicago: The Athletic Institute, 1969.
41. Wong Chai Ling. Gaya Pembelajaran Pelajar Ijazah Sarjana Muda Pendidikan (Kejuruteraan Awam, Kejuruteraan Elektrik dan Kejuruteraan Mekanik) Dengan Kepujian Di OUM Berdasarkan Skala Gaya Pembelajaran Grasha-Riechmann. Unpublished Degree Thesis, UTM, Johor, 2006.
42. Zaidatun Tasir, Mohd Salleh Abu. Analisis Data Berkomputer SPSS 11.5 for Windows. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Venton Publishing, 2003.
43. Zulkarnain Zakaria, Hishamuddin Som. *Analisis Data Menggunakan SPSS Windows*. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Skudai, Johor, 2001.