The Relationship between Teaching Style and Personality Type of Iranian EFL Teachers

Ramin Akbari
Akbar Mirhassani
&
Hossein Bahri
Tarbiat Modares University

Abstract
The present study is an attempt to investigate the relationship between teaching style and personality type of a sample of Iranian EFL teachers, using the Teaching Activities Preference (TAP) questionnaire (Cooper, 2001) and Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, MBTI (Myers & Myers, 1998). A third instrument called Students' Perceptions of Teachers' Success or Failure (SPTSF) questionnaire, developed by the researchers, was also used to examine the relationship between personality types of Iranian EFL teachers and their students' perceptions of the teachers' success or failure. The participants of the study comprised of 51 EFL teachers and 300 high school students. The results indicated significant differences among the MBTI types based on the teachers' teaching style preferences. Each personality type represented a particular teaching style. There was also a relationship between students' perceptions of their teachers' success or failure based on the teachers' personality types. It was found that Introverting, Intuitive, Thinking, Perceiving (INTP), Extroverting, Intuitive, Thinking, Judging (ENTJ), and Extroverting, Intuitive, Thinking, Perceiving (ENTP) teacher types were more successful than others as reported by the students. The type distribution and the predominance of Introverting, Sensing, Thinking, Judging (ISTJ), and Extroverting, Sensing, Thinking, Judging (ESTJ) types among Iranian EFL teachers were other findings of this research.

Keywords: Teaching Style, Personality Types, Iranian EFL teachers, MBTI.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years language teaching profession has witnessed an increasing awareness of a multitude of variables that contribute to the way teachers teach, or more technically, their teaching style. However, in spite of the diversity of research on the teaching style, relatively few studies have been conducted on the relationship between personality types of teachers and their teaching styles,

especially in a foreign language teaching situation. Consequently, due to the lack of research with regard to teacher characteristics, foreign language teacher educators do not possess all the necessary information needed to more effectively train and supervise foreign language teachers. Furthermore there is a growing emphasis on the knowledge of the self as a requisite for effective teaching. Banner and Cannon (1997) state, "Who we are matters to our teaching every bit as much as what we teach and how we choose to teach it". Knowledge of personality type and awareness of how personality type relates to teaching style will help teachers become more successful and confident in their teaching profession.

In fact one way to explore the diverse personality characteristics of different people in various professions has been through determining their personality types (Myers et al., 1998). Personality typing is a way by which one's preferences in life and doing activities are determined based on Jung's theory of personality types (Jung, 1923).

Theoretical Background
The Swiss psychologist Carl G. Jung published his theories on human personality in his book *Psychological Types* (1923). He suggested that human behavior was not random, but in fact predictable, and therefore classifiable. He referred to this as the *typology of individual*. Jung believed that differences in behavior were the result of preferences (Kroeger and Theusen, 1988). These preferences are formed early in life and provide the key attributes for our personalities. Jung wrote extensively on function types: Sensing (S), Intuition (N), Thinking (T), and Feeling (F). Jung also focused on the attitude types of Extroversion (E) and Introversion (I), (Hughes, 1994).

Working from his model, two American women, Katharine C. Briggs and her daughter, Isabel Briggs Myers, built a model to classify behavioral preferences. The result of their work is the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), a questionnaire or indicator that reports preferences. The four function types and the two attitude types just described were developed in Jung's theory. Myers and Briggs, when developing the MBTI, added the two types of Judgment (J) and Perception (P) to determine the individuals' preferences in dealing

with the outer world (Wolk and Nikolai, 1997). Table (1) briefly summarizes the four bipolar scales of the Myers Briggs Type Indicator:

Table 1. The four bipolar scales of the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (Myers& Myers, 1980)

Extroversion Types	Introversion Types
Prefer to gain energy from people.	Prefer to gain energy from within.
Prefer to be with other people.	Prefer to keep to oneself.
Prefer group work.	Prefer individual work.
Prefer to be open, outgoing, and talkative.	Prefer to be private, quiet, and reserved.
Sensing Types	Intuition Types
Prefer to take in information in a sequential way through the use of their five senses.	Prefer to make good guesses without going through sequential steps of reasoning.
Prefer to be more interested in the concrete and here and now.	Prefer to be more interested in theories and possibilities.
Thinking Types	Feeling Types
Prefer to make a decision more objectively, on logical, impartial grounds regardless of what people might think about it.	Prefer to come to a decision more subjectively on the basis of feelings as well as the effect of the decision on personal issues.
Prefer to be just, determined, and competent.	Prefer to be caring, devoted, and kind-hearted.
Judging Types	Perceiving Types
Prefer things to be clear and settled, and strive for closure.	Prefer matters to be open-ended for as long as possible.
Prefer to do things in an organized and planned way.	Prefer to do things in a spontaneous and unplanned way.
Prefer to be systematic, orderly, and scheduled.	Prefer to be casual, easygoing, and unconstrained.

The combination of the four bipolar scales will result in 16 personality types, summarized in the following table:

Table 2. The 16 personality types resulting from the four bipolar scales (Myers& Myers, 1980)

ISTJ	ISFJ	INFJ	INTJ
ISTP	ISFP	INFP	INTP
ESTP	ESFP	ENFP	ENTP
ESTJ	ESFJ	ENFJ	ENTJ

Each abbreviation indicates a certain type. For instance, ESTJ is an extroverting sensing thinking judging type, while INFP will refer to an introverting intuitive feeling perceiving type.

Personality Typing and Language Teaching

Personality factors are used to describe both the process of learning and the process of teaching foreign languages. It has also been suggested that individual differences in personalities can be used in learning style assessment (Lawrence, 1984; Sugarman, 1985) and teaching style prediction (Myers and Myers, 1980; Hoffman and Betkouski, 1981; Lawrence, 1997; Cooper, 2001). Furthermore, it has been suggested that once individuals know and understand their personality characteristics, it becomes easier to understand and teach those who are different from them in terms of personality (Duch, 1982; DeNovellis and Lawrence, 1983). They further pointed out that teachers' natural inclinations for a particular classroom atmosphere could be usefully studied in patterns provided by the MBTI.

Every foreign language teacher once was (or still is) a foreign language learner; therefore the learning styles preferred by the learner will undoubtedly inform those of the teacher. This idea was established by Lawrence, (1993; 1997) and Myers, et al. (1998), whose studies show that teachers generally prefer to teach in a way that satisfies their own way of learning. For example, they found that teachers who are rated as Extraverted on the MBTI like to engage in class discussions on topics. They like to have students share personal experiences, events, and ideas with the class because they themselves need opportunities to think out loud to clarify and develop their own ideas and thoughts. On the other hand, teachers who are Introverts prefer to work internally with their own thoughts and present the results of their work in forms that let them keep their privacy. They give more written assignments than oral presentations, because they feel that students perform better in written work. They prefer to let students set their own standards whenever possible (see Appendix A, which lists learning and teaching activity preferences for the MBTI personality scales).

Based on the findings of Lawrence (1997) and Myers, et al. (1998), Cooper (2001) concluded that the makeup of a teacher's personality determines what he/she will do in the classroom, that is, it determines which teaching activities will appeal to the teacher when he/she plans and teaches a lesson. In other words, matching instructional activities

with the instructor's personality preference amounts to describing teaching style; that is, teaching style can be defined as the sum total of instructional activities, techniques, and approaches that a teacher feels most comfortable using when he or she is in front of a class (Cooper, 2001).

Considering the activities that have been shown to appeal to specific personality dimensions (cf. Lawrence, 1997, and Myers, et al., 1998), Cooper (2001) designed a Teaching Activities Preference (TAP) questionnaire (see appendix B) to include activities that have been shown to appeal to those specific personality dimensions measured by MBTI. He then administered the (TAP) questionnaire to ascertain how well teaching preferences fit personality types as determined by MBTI. The principal findings of his study were: (1) the type distribution among preservice foreign language teachers of his study sample (N=38) confirmed the pattern found by other studies of foreign language teachers in the U.S.A. (Lawrence, 1996; Hunt, 1986; Heining–Boynton, 1994), a group of individuals with a high proportion of feeling types; (2) the TAP questionnaire distinguished the personality types from one another; and (3) the TAP questionnaire indicated that preferred teaching activities usually matched the personality dimensions of the participants.

Research Questions

Regarding what was discussed in the theoretical background, the following study is aimed to investigate the relationship between personality types of teachers and their teaching style preferences. Another feature of this study is to survey the possible relationship(s) between personality types of teachers and their students' perceptions of the teachers' success or failure in foreign language teaching. Accordingly, the research questions addressed in the present study are:

1. Is there any relationship between personality types of Iranian EFL teachers and their teaching style preferences?

2. Is there any relationship between personality types of Iranian EFL teachers and their students' perceptions of the teachers' success or failure in teaching?

METHOD

Subjects

The participants were 51 English language teachers who taught at high schools in Tehran Metropolis District 6 and Robat Karim, a town in SW of Tehran. They comprised of 21 males and 30 females. About 90 percent of them had at least 5 years of teaching experience (45 teachers). Convenient or available type of sampling was used for this research due to the logistical and practical (especially bureaucratic) problems connected to administration of the questionnaires. Of more than 70 teachers who received the questionnaires only 51 subjects filled in the instruments completely. Some of the teachers considered the questionnaire items as being too personal and private and did not accept to participate in the study. Also about 300 high school students of the same districts thoroughly completed the SPTSF questionnaire. This data was used to investigate the second research question.

Instrumentation

Three instruments were used in the present study: The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), the Teaching Activities Preference (TAP) questionnaire, and the Students' Perception of Teachers' Success or Failure (SPTSF) questionnaire, each of which is described below:

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)

The MBTI is one of the most widely used psychological tests administered today (Hughes, 1994). Among the non-psychiatric population, no other instrument of personality assessment is more utilized (Murray, 1990). The Educational Testing Service began to distribute the MBTI in the 1960's and studies and research began in earnest on its use and validity. It has been translated into Japanese, Spanish, French, German, Italian, and Persian for the present study, among many others. More than two million people took the MBTI in 1990 (Zemke, 1993). The main objective of the instrument as described above is to identify basic personal preferences. The scales (EI, SN, TF, and JP) are designed to point in one direction or the other (e.g., either toward E or I). They are designed to *sort* individuals into groups according to their preferences. There are specific dynamic

relationships between the scales that lead to descriptions and characteristics of 16 "types" (e.g., ESTJ), (Wolk and Nikolai, 1997).

It should be noted that the MBTI has different versions called Form G, Form F, ... In this study, Form M (Myers and Myers, 1998), the latest version of the MBTI, is used which is a 93-item, forced-choice, self–report questionnaire that takes about 45 minutes to administer, although no time limit is required for the test. Numerous studies reported reliability findings for the MBTI, the majority of which are summarized in the instrument's manual. The split-half reliability estimate ranges were EI .75 to .85, SN .73 to .91, TF .77 to .88, and JP .80 to .92. Test-retest correlations ranged from EI .73 to .89, SN .69 to .91, TF .48 to .86, and JP .69 to .87. Test-retest reliabilities show consistency over time, and MBTI results are consistent with subjects' self estimates of type. Cronbach's alpha estimates of inter-item reliability ranged from EI .74 to .83, SN .74 to .85, TF .64 to .82, and JP .78 to .84 (Myers and McCaulley, 1985).

The Teaching Activities Preference Questionnaire (TAP)

The Teaching Activities preference questionnaire (TAP) was developed by Cooper (2001) to include activities that have been shown to appeal to specific personality dimensions of MBTI (cf. Lawrence, 1997, and Myers, et al., 1998). Appendix B lists learning and teaching activity preferences for the MBTI personality dimensions, which are adapted from Lawrence (1997, 1996). In this questionnaire, the participants are asked to rate the teaching and learning activities on a 5-point scale, whereby "1" means "I don't agree with the statement at all" and "5" means "I fully agree with the statement". The questionnaire is composed of 20 statements. 18 statements deal with the first six dimensions of the MBTI, namely (E, I, S, N, T, F) while the last two statements (19 and 20) deal with Judging and Perceiving dimensions.

In addition to these 20 statements, Cooper (2001) added a 21st question, in which he asked the participants to list any other activities that teachers considered effective for teaching foreign languages. He justified this by saying: "… to give [teachers] the chance to add any

information about preferred teaching activities that might not be captured in the 20 statements" (p. 306).

SPTSF Questionnaire

The Students' Perception of Teacher's Success or Failure (SPTSF) in teaching is a questionnaire developed by the researchers to answer the second research question. This instrument asks students to rate their teachers' success or failure in teaching according to their own opinion, their teachers' opinion and a hypothetical expert's opinion on a 5-point likert-type scale. Other extra qualitative questions were provided (1 and 7) to gain more information about the students' attitudes towards their teachers. Ease of administration and comprehensibility for the students forced the researchers to avoid using a long and boring questionnaire with many items (see Appendix C).

The SPTSF questionnaire was administered to more than 300 students and the reliability for this instrument was examined through Cronbach's Alpha and it was found to be (.69). Factor Analysis showed that the test was (as intended) two-dimensional. Therefore, alpha coefficients of reliability for each dimension, which were called F1 (Q2, Q3, Q6) and F2 (Q4 and Q5) respectively, were: (.91) and (.65). The results of such analysis, using Principal Axis Factoring (PAF) are presented in the following table:

Table 3. Principal Axis Factoring confirms the extraction of two factors for SPTSF questionnaire

SPTSF Items	Factor	
	1	2
Question 2	.919	-9.32 E-02
Question 3	.915	-5.17 E-02
Question 4	8.982 E-02	.708
Question 5	6.379 E-02	.665
Question 6	.827	3.251 E-02

During the development of the test it was decided for the items to be prepared in such a way to enable the researchers to assess the respondents' answers from two points of view, namely, from the respondents' and from experts'/teachers' point of view. The

implications of the findings, which show the two-dimensionality of the SPTSF questionnaire, are discussed in the final part of this study.

Data Collection Procedure

The SPTSF questionnaire was administered to the students at high schools in parallel with the administration of MBTI, and TAP to their teachers. During the administration of the instruments it was announced to both teachers and the students that their scores on the tests and their opinions would be confidential and they had no impact on their professional and educational outcomes. The fact that these data were to be processed just for educational and academic purposes was made known to the subjects at this stage of the research project; nevertheless, several teachers did not accept to participate in the project and among those who did, there were some cases who refused to answer some questions specially in the MBTI, claiming that those questions were private and confidential. We also asked the students not to write their names on the SPTSF questionnaire and made them sure of the fact that their ratings and opinions would not be shown to their teachers. Finally among more than 70 teachers in the study we managed to gather data from 51 teachers and their students. In order to investigate the research questions the collected data were analyzed by SPSS software version 10. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the sample characteristics. Then ANOVA procedures or compensatory techniques were applied to get a more comprehensive view of the type and strength of the association between the variables.

Results

The null hypothesis for the first research question was: *"There isn't any relationship between personality types of Iranian EFL teachers and their teaching style preferences"*. It has two variables (1) Personality, which was considered as the independent variable, and (2) Teaching Style, which was the dependent variable. Pearson correlations could not be run as a precursor to regression since both correlation and regression analyses are based on the assumption that both of the variables are continuous scores, whereas personality types

here were nominal data. Hence, an ANOVA procedure was run to gain a more comprehensive view of the relationships.

Table 4. Analysis of Variance for teaching styles of various MBTI personality types

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
E	Between Groups	830.106	9	92.234	56.548	.000
	Within Groups	66.874	41	1.631		
	Total	896.980	50			
I	Between Groups	1078.107	9	119.790	140.048	.000
	Within Groups	35.069	41	.855		
	Total	1113.176	50			
S	Between Groups	939.181	9	104.353	116.450	.000
	Within Groups	36.741	41	.896		
	Total	975.922	50			
N	Between Groups	906.170	9	100.686	115.088	.000
	Within Groups	35.869	41	.875		
	Total	942.039	50			
T	Between Groups	672.069	9	74.674	79.645	.000
	Within Groups	38.441	41	.938		
	Total	710.510	50			
F	Between Groups	678.376	9	75.375	52.945	.000
	Within Groups	58.369	41	1.424		
	Total	736.745	50			
J	Between Groups	27.065	9	3.007	12.789	.000
	Within Groups	9.641	41	.235		
	Total	36.706	50			
P	Between Groups	34.243	9	3.805	8.138	.000
	Within Groups	19.169	41	.468		
	Total	53.412	50			
T S	Between Groups	152.041	9	16.893	1.641	.136
	Within Groups	421.959	41	10.292		
	Total	574.000	50			

TS = teaching style

Table (4) shows that the amounts of F values for the compared means of different personality types are significant at P< .05. We can argue that there exists a significant difference between the means of various personality types based on the teachers' scores on the TAP questionnaire. It also confirms the findings of Cooper, (2001) who claimed that his questionnaire differentiated between various

personality types. Therefore regarding the TAP questionnaire's items, used in the present study, we conclude that teaching styles in the first 6 questions of the TAP are related to the (EI) scale, teaching styles in questions 7-12 are related to the (SN) scale, teaching styles in questions 13-18 are related to the (TF) scale, and finally teaching styles in questions 19 and 20 are related to the (JP) scale (see Appendix B).

The final row of the above table shows that the total mean for all personality types does not show significant difference since all groups generally preferred all teaching activities but different personality types emphasized on particular activities (usually those matched with their personality types) and hence, the reason for variance among specific personality types. In order to measure the strength of association between each personality type scale (e.g. I, N, T,...) and the personality types in the sample we calculated Eta^2 (Eta Squared) the result of which is shown in Table 5:

Table 5. Eta squared as a measure of the strength of association between the variables

	Eta	Eta Squared
E (Style)* Personality E	.962	.925
I (Style)* Personality I	.984	.968
S (Style)* Personality S	.981	.962
N (Style)* Personality N	.981	.962
T (Style)* Personality T	.973	.946
F (Style)* Personality F	.960	.921
J (Style)* Personality J	.859	.737
P (Style)* Personality P	.801	.641
Teaching Styles* Personalities	.515	.265

The above table shows that scale *I* has the strongest association with its corresponding personality types (those personality types that have the *I* scale) followed by *S* and *N* scales. Scale *P* has the weakest association since most teachers gave a low rating to this scale. Also the frequency of teachers with this scale type was quite low compared with other scales (see Table 9).

Confirming table (4), the last row in table (5) also shows that the association between the whole teaching styles and personality types is weak (.265). This is due to the dimensionality of the TAP and MBTI questionnaires since diverse and opposing scales usually do not show strong associations and as a result of this, Eta^2 is weak.

Turning to the second research question, the null hypothesis was: *"There isn't any relationship between personality types of Iranian EFL teachers and their students' perceptions of the teachers' success or failure in teaching."*

Table 6. Kruskal-Wallis test results for SPTSF instrument

	F1	F2	SPTSF
Chi-Square	27.925	12.328	28.765
df	9	9	9
Asymp. Sig.	.001	.195	.001

As it was mentioned earlier, the results of factor analyses showed that the SPTSF questionnaire was two-dimensional. The first factor called F1 [the teachers' scores from students' and a hypothetical third person's (again students') point of view] and the second one called F2 (the teachers scores from their own point of view reported by the students). Regarding the design and the nominal nature of personality types it was decided to use a nonparametric procedure such as Kruskal-Wallis analysis to compare the two variables. The results of such procedure are described below:

Table 7. Ranks of different personality types based on means for SPTSF instrument

Rank	F1	Mean	Rank	F2	Mean	Rank	SPTSF	Mean
1	INTP	217.00	1	ISFJ	197.17	1	INTP	224.00
2	ENTJ	206.47	2	ENTP	182.58	2	ENTJ	200.09
3	ISTJ	167.02	3	INTP	164.67	3	ENTP	186.75
4	ENTP	166.75	4	ENFJ	157.39	4	ISTJ	167.42
5	ENFJ	149.00	5	ESTJ	156.09	5	ENFJ	150.70
6	ESTP	147.10	6	ISTJ	155.76	6	ESTJ	147.42
7	ESTJ	146.00	7	ENTJ	152.91	7	ESTP	123.70
8	INTJ	126.50	8	ESFJ	145.82	8	ISFJ	121.00
9	ESFJ	105.55	9	INTJ	112.86	9	INTJ	118.60
10	ISFJ	97.42	10	ESTP	111.90	10	ESFJ	106.07

As Table (6) depicts, the observed ($X^2 = 28.765$) exceeds the critical value at (p $\leq$.05), which is 16.919. Thus, the second hypothesis predicting no relationship between personality types of Iranian EFL teachers and their students' perceptions of the teachers' success or failure in teaching was rejected. Therefore, we can claim there exists a relationship between personality types of Iranian EFL teachers and their students' perceptions of the teachers' success or failure in teaching: Table (7) presents the ranks of different personality types of language teachers found in the research sample based on their mean scores given by the students on the SPTSF questionnaire. As mentioned before, questions 2, 3, and 6 of the SPTSF were called F1 and questions 4 and 5 were called F2 by the researchers (see Appendix C). The difference between F1 and F2 as shown by factor analysis, contributes to the fact that students think the teachers overestimate themselves by giving higher scores to their teaching styles while the students give (*due!* = *lower*) scores to the teachers. Therefore the scores given to the teachers for questions 4 and 5 are higher than scores given to questions 2, 3 and 6 and hence the reason for the emergence of two factors.

According to the content analysis of the students' attitudes towards their teachers in the extra qualitative questions (1 and 7), which is also confirmed by Table (7), it is evident that the students regarded INTP, ENTJ, ENTP, and ISTJ types to be more successful than other teacher types. F1, which stands for students' own attitudes towards their teachers, yields similar results with the whole SPTSF instrument, whereas F2 yields a partially upside-down ranking order.

DISCUSSION
Before we make any claim on the interpretation of the findings, it is more appropriate to discuss the MBTI administration results and gain a general view of the Iranian EFL teachers' sample distribution. The following tables show the frequency and percentage of teacher personalities based on the types and scales.

Table (8) shows that all types were not found in the sample: INFJ, ISTP, ISFP, INFP, ESFP, and ENFP (6 types) were not present. ISTJ (15 individuals) were the most frequent, followed by ESTJ (13) and

INTJ (6). Two types – ESFJ and ENFJ – had 5 representatives each. ENTJ had 3; and ISFJ, INTP, ESTP, and ENTP each had 1 representative. In terms of the frequency of each type scale (Table 9), Js represented 48 of the occurrences, followed by Ts = 40 and Ss = 35 of the occurrences. These are contrary to the Lawrence's 1996, Heining-Boynton & Heining-Boynton's 1994, and Hunt's 1986 findings, which indicate that Fs are especially attracted to foreign languages. Of course the distinction of types in terms of careers varies in different societies and the current pattern in Iran is quite opposite to the one in the U.S. based on the research findings.

Table 8. Frequency and percentage of different personality types in the sample

Types	ISTJ	ISFJ	INTJ	INTP	ESTP	ENTP	ESTJ	ESFJ	ENFJ	ENTJ
Frequency	15	1	6	1	1	1	13	5	5	3
Percentage	29.41	1.96	11.76	1.96	1.96	1.96	25.49	9.80	9.80	5.88

Table 9. Frequency and percentage of different personality scales in the sample

Scales	E	I	S	N	T	F	J	P
Frequency	28	23	35	16	40	11	48	3
Percentage	54	46	70	30	78	22	94	6

The high percentage of Js among the EFL teachers in Iran points that organization and planning in advance is highly emphasized by the participants of the research. Also, the high percentage of Ts (the opposite of Fs, which comprise the majority among the U.S. language teachers) indicates that EFL teachers in Iran are usually objective and emphasize on logic in their preferences. Giving priority to the *five senses* is well represented by the high percentage of S types in the sample. It is also interesting that Extroversion and Introversion (E = 54 % and I = 46 %) are almost equally distributed among the sample.

Ns and Fs that were highly represented among U.S. foreign language teachers are among the less preferred scales of Iranian EFL teachers. The least preferred scale (P) in the sample, which accounts for the unorganized, spontaneous behaviors, is highly avoided by Iranian EFL teachers.

One of the aims of the present study is to ensure the existence of a necessity for lessons and exercises specifically designed to accommodate the teaching and learning styles identified by the MBTI.

Another implication of this study is for attracting the right types of teachers to be EFL teachers. Jung's theory suggests that the components of an individual's personality type are largely inborn (Myers & Myers, 1980). Moreover, the findings of this study show that different skills are associated with different MBTI types. Thus, regarding the dominance of a proportion of ISTJ and ESTJ types among EFL teachers in Iran, programs should focus on attracting and retaining a diverse group of personality types, rather than focusing on curriculum changes that continue to attract a preponderance of the STJ types entering the profession. Probably one of the reasons that accounts for the poor state of the EFL profession in Iran and the students' dissatisfaction with the current situation of language teaching in the country is due to the high number of teachers with personality types different from those reported by the students to be more successful. That's why Fox-Hines & Bowersock, (1995) contend, "When a mix of types appreciates the differing contribution each brings, productivity and quality can be enhanced".

The researchers of this study think that EFL teachers should challenge themselves to insure that they are not organizing their classrooms to appeal only to students with preferences similar to their own. It is also important for teachers to understand that incongruities between their own and their students' preferences, when revealed in practice by different teachers, may well influence classroom performance, students evaluations of the teachers success or failure, and students satisfaction with their teachers, as were shown in the present study. Finally, the EFL faculty would benefit from an awareness of the teaching preferences associated with various teachers, and an appreciation for the strengths and weaknesses associated with teachers and students, as well as their personality types.

This study is an example of how teachers can be grouped into MBTI types based on their preferences. The real challenge for a teacher, as Keirsey & Bates (1984) say, "is to make use of his or her own personality type in establishing and maintaining a facilitative relationship with the differing personality types of students". Of course a teacher should remain true to his/her preferred teaching style

while at the same time accommodate and maintain a facilitative relationship with the differing learning styles of students. It was discussed earlier in this research that the styles are related to each other. This point is of great importance since teachers would have difficulty with those students whose learning styles are not similar to the teachers' teaching style. As teachers usually prefer to teach in a way that follows their own personality type therefore, knowledge of one's own type and of one's students' differing types seems to play a' crucial role in the success of every teacher.

CONCLUSIONS

The present study was an attempt to investigate the relationship between personality types and teaching style preferences of Iranian EFL teachers, using Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and a Teaching Activities Preference questionnaire. The findings showed the existence of such relationship by assigning a set of particular teaching styles to different personalities based on the scales of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The existence of the relationship between personality types of Iranian EFL teachers and their students' perceptions of the teachers' success or failure in teaching was confirmed using the SPTSF questionnaire. Certain personality types such as INTP, ENTJ, and ENTP were reported to be more successful than other personality types. The dominance of a proportion of ISTJ and ESTJ types in the sample, who were not among the successful teachers as reported by the students, was another finding of this study, which is perhaps a key factor among various existing factors that account for the poor state of language teaching profession at high schools in Iran.

Revised version accepted February 25, 2005

REFERENCES

Banner, J. M. & Cannon, H. C. (1997). The who of teaching. *Education Week on the Web*, April 16. Retrieved from: http://www.edweek.org/

Cooper, T. C. (2001). Foreign language teaching style and personality. *Foreign Language Annals*, Vol. 34, pp. 301-16.

DeNovellis, R. & Lawrence, G. (1983). Correlates of teacher personality variables (Myers-Briggs) and classroom observation data. *Research In Psychological Type*, Vol. 6, pp. 37-46.

Duch, R. G. (1982). Introducing type theory into a school system. In G. Lawrence (Ed.), *People Types and Tiger Stripes*.

Fox-Hines, R. & Bowersock, R. (1995). ISFJ, ENTP, MBTI: what's it all about? *Business and Economic Review*, Vol. 1, pp. 3-7.

Heining-Boynton, A. L. & Heining-Boynton, D. B. (1994). Learning Styles, Personality, and the Foreign Language Teacher. In: R. M. Terry (Ed.), Diversion: *Language 94, Changing Images in Foreign Languages*. Valdosa, GA: The Southern Conference on Language Teaching.

Hoffman, J. L. & Betkouski, M. (1981). A summary of Myers-Briggs Type Indicator research applications in education. *Research in Psychological Type*, Vol. 3, pp. 81-85.

Hughes, M. A. (1994). Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and Kirton Adaption-Innovation Inventory correlations. The Industrial College of the Armed Forces, National Defense University, Fort McNair, Washington, D.C. 203 19-6000.

Hunt, M. (1986). "Teachers: Foreign language in junior and senior high school" In: Macdaid, G. P. McCaulley, N. G. & Kainz, R. I. (Eds.), *Atlas of type tables*, p. 240. Gainesvill, FL: Center for Application of Psychological Type.

Jung, C. G. (1923). *Psychological types*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Keirsey, D. & Bates, M. (1984). *Please understand me: Character and Temperament Types*. Del Mar, CA: Promethean Nemesis Publishing co.

Kroeger, O. & Theusen, J. M. (1988). *Type Talk*. New York: Delacort Press, p. 7.

Lawrence, G. (1984). A synthesis of learning style research involving the MBTI. *Journal of Psychological Type*, Vol. 8, pp. 2-15.

Lawrence, G. (1993). *People types and tiger stripes*, 2nd ed. Gainesville, FL. Center for Application of Psychological Type.

Lawrence, G. (1996). *People types and tiger stripes*, 3rd ed. Gainesville, FL. Center for Application of Psychological Type.

Lawrence, G. (1997). *Looking at type and learning styles*. Gainesville, FL. Center for Application of Psychological Type.

Murray, J. B. (1990). Review of research on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, Vol. 70, pp. 1187-1202.

Myers, I. B. & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA. Consulting Psychologists Press.

Myers, I. B., McCaulley, M. H., Quenk, N. L. & Hammer, A. L. (1998). *MBTI manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*, 3rd ed., Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Myers, I. B. & Myers, P. B. (1980). *Gifts differing*. Consulting Psychologists Press: Palo Alto, CA.

Myers, P. B., & Myers, K. D. (1998). *Myers–Briggs Type Indicator, Form M.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Sugarman, L. (1985). Kolb's model of experiential learning: Touchstone for trainers, students, counselors, and clients. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, Vol. 64, pp. 264-268.

Wolk, C. & Nikolai, L. A. (1997). Personality types of accounting students and faculty: comparisons and implications. *Journal of Accounting Education*, Vol. 15.1, pp. 1-17.

Zemke, R. (1993). Second thoughts about the MBTI. *Training*, Vol. 29.4, p. 43.

APPENDIX A.
Teaching Styles Fitting Personality scales of MBTI
The Extroverting Types:
Need opportunities to think out loud; e.g., classroom discussions, working with another student, action projects involving people.

Like to clarify their ideas aloud before they add them to class discussion.

Choose to work with others, with large groups.

Readily talk over events and ideas with others.

Share personal experiences.

Want to experience things so as to understand them.

Greet people easily.

The Introverting Types:
Work internally with their own thoughts: listening, observing, lab work, reading, writing.

Process experiences at their own pace.

Present the results of their work in forms that let them keep their privacy.

Need to have time to reflect before answering questions.

Choose to work alone or with one person (pair work).

Choose written assignments over oral presentations and perform better in written work.

Prefer setting their own standards when possible.

The Sensing Types:
Do their best work with instruction that allows them to hear and touch as well as to see (or only read about) what they are learning.

Like hands-on labs and materials that can be handled.

Like relevant films and other audiovisuals.

Like computer-assisted instruction.

Appreciate first-hand experience that gives practice in the skills and concepts to be learned.

Like to engage in concrete experiences first in any learning sequence, before using the textbook.

Want to have senses fully engaged and satisfied.

Prefer memorizing to finding reasons.

Learn best from an orderly sequence of details.

Like an established routine.

The Intuitive Types:

Like assignments that allow them to rely on their own initiative.

Like real choices in the ways they work out their assignments.

Like opportunities to be inventive and original.

Like fascinating new possibilities.

Like work that stays fresh by calling for new skills, not just repetition of existing skills.

Are more imaginative than observant.

Attend more to whole concepts than to details.

Like to have and do things differently from others.

Readily grasp the meanings of words and symbols.

The Thinking Types:

Work best with lessons that are logically organized.

Like feedback that shows them specific, objective achievement.

Want logical reasons before accepting something new.

-Prefer subjects that show cause-and-effect relationships.

Try to be fair; are often impersonal and impartial.

The Feeling Types:

Prefer assignments that have the goal of contributing to others.

Like harmonious, small-group work.

Are personal and like warm personal relationships.

Are more interested in people than in things or ideas.

Take emotional relationships and ideas very seriously.

Permit feelings to override logic.

The Judging Types:

Like preplanned structure, and a teacher who carefully provides it.

Like predictability and consistency.

Prefer formalized instruction that moves in orderly sequences.

Like to have things decided and settled.

Like assignments to be clear and definite.

The Perceiving Types:

Can pursue problems in their own way.

Want to have genuine choices in assignments, such as with a system of individual contracts in which the student can negotiate some of the activities.

Want their work to feel like play.

Act spontaneously.

Like to leave things open.

Adapted from Lawrence (1997, 1996)

APPENDIX B.

Teaching Activities Preference Questionnaire

Name: School:

Directions: Please rate the following statements on a 5-point scale. A "1" means: "I don't agree with the statement at all" and a "5" means: "I fully agree with the statement."

1. I try to give students opportunities to think out loud by having them discuss things they are working on with me.

2: I like to have students share personal experiences, events, and ideas with me and with the class.

3. I like group tasks such as mobiles, collages, comic strips, story books, and songs.

4. I like to give written assignments, because I think students perform better in written work than in oral presentations.

5. When possible, I let students set their own standards for their work.

6. I think diaries and logs are effective activities for a foreign language class.

7. I think students do their best work with instruction that allows them to hear and touch as well as see what they are learning.

8. I like to use relevant films and other audiovisuals.

9. I try to provide concrete experiences first in any learning sequence, before using the textbook.

10. I like assignments that allow students to work on their own initiative in completing their assignments.

11. I like to give students opportunities to be inventive and original.

12. In my lessons, I think it is more important to attend to the whole concept than to details.

13. I think students want logical reasons before accepting something new.

14. I try to be fair, even though this may sometimes mean being impersonal.

15. I try to make sure that my lessons are logically organized.

16. I try to establish personal rapport with my students.

17. I try to incorporate small-group work in my teaching activities whenever possible.

18. I think people are more important than things or ideas, and I strive to emphasize this in my lessons.

19. Students like assignments to be clear and definite, and I try to structure my lessons in this manner.

20. I think students like to have genuine choices in assignments, such as with a system of individual contracts in which the student can negotiate some of the activities.

21. Please list any other activities and procedures that you find effective for teaching foreign languages.

Adapted from Cooper (2001)

APPENDIX C.

SPTSF Questionnaire

Teacher's Name: **School:**

1. Are you satisfied with your teacher's teaching style? To what extent?

2. Which mark of the following 5-point scale will you give to your teacher's class performance?
A) 4   B) 8   C) 12   D) 16   E) 20

3. Please assess your teacher's teaching style quality based on the following scale.
A) Very weak   B) weak   C) average   D) good   E) excellent

4. In your opinion, which mark of the following 5-point scale will your teacher give to his/her class performance?
A) 4   B) 8   C) 12   D) 16   E) 20

5. How do you think your teacher will assess his/her teaching style quality?
A) Very weak   B) weak   C) average   D) good   E) excellent

6. If an outsider or another teacher attends your teacher's class, which mark of the following scale (at most 5 marks) will he/she give to your teacher's class performance?
A) 1   B) 2   C) 3   D) 4   E) 5

7. Please add any comments or explanations you think necessary.