

Iranian EFL teachers' personality types and classroom management orientations: A correlational study

Laya Heidari^{a*}, Islamic Azad University, Turkey. layaheidari@yahoo.com

Shiva Parvaresh^b, Islamic Azad University, Iran. shiva.parvaresh21@yahoo.com

Suggested Citation:

Heidari, L. & Parvaresh, S. (2021). Iranian EFL teachers' personality types and classroom management orientations: A correlational study. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*. 13(4), 224–240. <https://doi.org/10.18844/ijlt.v13i4.5719>

Received from June 29, 2021; revised from August 11, 2021; accepted from October 9, 2021;

Selection and peer review under responsibility of Prof. Dr. Hafize Keser, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey.

©2021 Birlesik Dunya Yenilik Arastırma ve Yayıncılık Merkezi

Abstract

Language learners' achievement relies to a great extent on what goes on inside the classroom. The teachers' personality types and their classroom management orientations play a role in such achievement. The present study intended to explore Iranian EFL teachers' major personality types and classroom management orientations. Moreover, the relationship between their personality types and classroom management orientations were probed. Sixty EFL teachers were chosen through the convenience sampling method from foreign language institutes in Isfahan, Iran. The results showed that extroverted–sensing–thinking–judging type was the most frequent personality type and the interactionalist approach was the major classroom management orientation among Iranian EFL teachers teaching at language institutes. The findings of this study enhance EFL teachers', as well as directors, of language institutes' understanding of the personality type as one crucial factor related to EFL teachers' behaviour management approaches. More implications of the results and future research directions are also discussed.

Keywords: Classroom, management orientations, effective teaching, Iranian EFL teachers, personality types.

* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: Laya Heidari, Islamic Azad University, Turkey
E-mail address: layaheidari@yahoo.com

Introduction

Past investigations have demonstrated that teachers play an important role in forming compelling training, and successful teaching and learning cannot occur in poorly managed classrooms (Hattie, 2009; Jones & Jones, 2012; Marzano, Marzano & Pickering, 2003). Also, researchers (Hoy, 1990; Schmidt, 1992) have found that the effectiveness of teaching and quality of learning can be influenced by classroom managerial issues. Classroom management usually includes actions taken by teachers to establish order, engage students and elicit their cooperation (Emmer & Stough, 2001). According to Brown (2001), the major task of an EFL teacher is to manage time and materials, create communicative needs and involve students in attractive classroom activities. Teachers must prevent misbehaviours before they exhibit rather than solving them after they appear in the class. Moreover, they should attempt to act as a manager or facilitator to provide students with opportunities to speak, to act and to learn effectively (Richards & Rodgers, 2003).

It comes as no surprise that some factors relate to different strategies which teachers choose to manage a classroom. These factors could be dispositional and situational variables such as teachers' personality, teachers' attitudes, sense of efficacy and motivation and knowledge of pedagogy (Henson, 2003; Martin & Shoho, 2000; Martin, Yin & Baldwin, 1998; Muijs & Reynolds, 2001). As has been highlighted by Dickson and Wiersma (1984), the personality of teachers is a very important factor of successful and effective teaching. It is important to note that a better understanding of teacher's personality is a significant issue because teachers often have difficulty creating a positive EFL learning atmosphere (Faltis & Hudelson, 1994).

Another point worth noting is that teachers bring their personality traits to the L2 classroom that may have an influence on the language learners' achievement and thus on their final results. Stevick (1980, p.4) has contended that 'successful language learning depends less on materials, methods and linguistic analysis, and more on what goes on inside and between people in the classroom'. To put it simply, students' achievement, mental health and liking for a subject are invariably linked to the teacher's personality (Sehgal, 1996; Sehgal & Kaur, 1995).

1.1. Teachers' personality type

The behaviour of the teacher in different ways, such as an interface with students, techniques selected and learning experiences, can be affected by personality (Murray, 1972). Harkin and Turner (1997) have revealed that teaching is a complicated activity that is influenced by, in addition to other things, teachers' personality, characteristics and beliefs in their ability to affect students' outcomes. In a definition carried out by Scharle and Szabo (2000, p. 7), personality is defined as a 'dynamic organisation, inside the person of psychophysical systems that create a person's characteristic patterns of behaviour, thoughts and feelings'.

In a plethora of studies, it was noted that the reason why students in some classrooms learn more than those in other classrooms is that some teachers are more effective than others (Miller, Murnane & Willett, 2008). According to an investigation by Nick Hashim, Shah Alam and Yusoff (2014), teacher's personality is an important determinant of student proficiency in English. Dickson and Wiersma (1984) have expressed in their study that there is sufficient evidence supporting the fact which teachers' personality is a very important factor of successful teaching and that teacher effectiveness is

perceived to exist as an outcome of the characteristics of a teacher as a person. In Othman's (2009) study on a personality that influences teaching effectiveness, the findings showed that there is a significant relationship between extroversion, agreeableness and conscientiousness with teaching effectiveness, while neuroticism and openness have no significant relationship. In another study (Fatemi, Ganjali & Kafi, 2015), the relationship between EFL teachers' personality type and their effectiveness in teaching was examined from university students' perspectives. The analysis of the study proved the existence of a significant relationship between teachers' personality type and their effectiveness in teaching. Teachers' personality characteristics are reflected not only in their classroom performance, particularly in their choice of instructional activities, materials, methodologies and classroom management strategies, but also in their interaction with students as well (Henson & Chambers, 2002).

Smith (1977) maintained that teacher's personality is a significant factor in teacher's behaviour and it has a great impact on students' achievement. In recent years, studies have focused on explaining the major personality types among EFL teachers who teach at universities. For example, Akbari, Mirhassani and Bahri (2005) have found out that most Iranian EFL teachers have personality type of ISTJ and extroverted–sensing–thinking–judging (ESTJ). The research study by Alibakhshi (2011) also found that ESTJ and ISTJ were the major personality traits of Iranian EFL teachers. These results were contradicted by the experiment carried out by Ghorbani, Akbari and Ghonsooly (2015), who indicated that ISTP and ISTJ are the most frequent personality types among Iranian EFL teachers teaching at universities.

1.2. Teachers' classroom management

In a definition of classroom management by Everstone and Weinstein (2006), it is proposed as a process through which teachers try to establish a convenient and positive learning environment and control everything in the classroom. Additionally, Tal (2010) has regarded classroom management as a cyclical process that consists of advanced planning, implementation, assessment during implementation and final evaluation that includes factors related to students and their environment, intended to bring about progress in the activities carried out for the learning and emotional well-being of the students in the class.

Witcher (2003) has held that personality as one category of teaching characteristics is an important determinant of the teacher–student relationship. One aspect of this relationship can be related to the EFL teachers' classroom management. Tonelson (1981) carried out an investigation on how the character of the teacher was reflected into the working social atmosphere of the classroom which influences students and provides the stage for learning. The results revealed that particular personality characteristics of teachers are reflected in classroom instruction, especially through the teacher's use of different instructional strategies and material. Also, Cooper (2001) has stated that teachers' personality determines what they will do in their classroom, that is to say, it determines which teaching activities and techniques will be applied by teachers when they plan and teach a lesson.

In order to explain teacher's beliefs towards classroom management, three approaches, i.e., interventionist, non-interventionist and interactionalist, were conceptualised by Glickman and

Tamashiro (1980). According to this model, interventionists believe that teachers should carry out a high level of control over classroom activities. However, non-interventionists express that students ought to be permitted to show a huge impact in the classroom and teachers should be less engaged with adjusting student practices. Concerning the interactionalists, students learn appropriate behaviours because of experiencing the outside world of people and objects. In this manner, interactionalists recommend that students and teachers should share responsibility regarding classroom management.

A number of studies have examined EFL teachers' beliefs towards classroom management. In a study conducted by Evrim, Gokce and Enisa (2009), the beliefs of a Turkish EFL teacher on classroom management were examined. The study likewise explored the similarities and differences between the teacher classroom management beliefs and actual teaching practices. The study revealed that the teacher had interactionalist orientation regarding classroom management. It was also found that there was congruence between the teacher's beliefs about classroom management and her actual practices in the classroom. In another study, Ghafarpour and Nejadansari (2015) examined EFL teachers' attitudes and beliefs on classroom control and their leadership styles in two contexts of the university and private institute. The result showed that with regard to some factors of leadership style, such as intellectual stimulation and individual consideration, the two contexts play a significant role. In another study, Aliakbari and Heidarzadi (2015) investigated the relationship between EFL teachers' beliefs and actual practices of classroom management. The findings showed that EFL teachers favoured interactionalist orientation on behaviour and instructional management dimensions. It has been suggested that male teachers were not significantly different from females in terms of the relationship between their beliefs and actual practices. However, there was a significant relationship between teachers' beliefs and their actual practices of classroom management among less experienced teachers.

In order to explore Iranian EFL teachers' classroom management orientations and its relationship with teaching styles, Rahimi and Asadollahi (2012) asked 300 EFL teachers to fill in the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control (ABCC) inventory and Teaching Activities Preference questionnaire. They found that most Iranian EFL teachers were interventionist with respect to their classroom management approaches. They reasoned that teachers with an interventionist classroom management approach used more teaching activities than those with interactionalist orientation. In another study, Kazemi and Soleimani (2016) examined the possible connections among EFL teachers' classroom management approaches at two dimensions of behaviour management and instructional management and the dominant teaching style. The findings of the investigation showed that Iranian EFL teachers act as an interventionist on both behaviour and instructional management scales and utilise the formal authority educating style. Likewise, it was demonstrated that there was a strong connection between EFL teachers' teaching style and their behaviour management as well as instructional management.

Although a considerable amount of studies have investigated the relationship between EFL teachers' personality type and other factors related to teaching, a very scarce number of studies particularly in Iranian EFL context have been conducted to explore the personality type and management orientations of teachers at language institutes as well as to probe the relationship between English language teachers' personality types and their classroom management orientations. As Gholami, Sarkhosh and Abdi (2016) claimed, teachers' practices at public schools differ from those

of the teachers teaching at language institutes or private schools. As students who learn English at language institutes have more motivation to learn, this would sometimes affect how the teacher manages the class and even the teacher's personality. Thus, this study is carried out to fill this gap by answering the following research questions:

1. What are Iranian EFL language institute teachers' major personality types and major classroom management orientations?
2. Is there any significant relationship between Iranian EFL language institute teachers' personality types and their classroom management orientations?

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

The study was limited to EFL teachers who taught at intermediate and upper intermediate levels in some foreign language institutes in Isfahan, Iran. Sixty English teachers (30 males and 30 females) were chosen through the convenience sampling method. According to Dornyei's (2004) rule of thumb, the minimum number of participants for correlational studies could be 30. The age of the members of this group ranged between 22 and 56 years. These participants were holders of BA (N: 36, 60%), MA (N: 19, 31.7%) and Ph.D. (N: 5, 8.3%). They had varying years of English teaching experiences. The participants' teaching experience ranged between 5 and 15 years teaching at language institutes.

2.2. Instruments

In order to collect the required data for this study, two questionnaires were used. The first questionnaire was the Myers–Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and the second one was Behaviour and Instructional Management Scale (BIMS).

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). The MBTI is based on Carl Jung's theory of psychological type preferences and determines 16 different personality types using 4 pairs of personality traits, including a) extroversion–introversion, b) sensing–intuition, c) thinking–feeling and d) judging–perceiving. Extraverted (E) people have a tendency to act in the environment by interacting with the outside world, but introverted (I) people tend to focus on internal thoughts. Sensing (S) people focus on concrete reality and take information by using their five senses, while intuitive people use their instincts to gather information and are considered idealists. Thinking (T) people make a decision based on logic and rationality; however, feeling people pay attention to other's feelings before making a decision. People with judging preferences are organised and like to have everything in a scheduled style; on the contrary, perceiving people are more spontaneous and flexible in their lifestyle and have a desire for doing tasks at the last minutes (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). The poles of the four dichotomies that receive the most points are the letter scores they receive. These 8 letter scores combine for a possible 16 scores (Schaubhut, Herk & Thompson, 2009).

Harrington and Loffredo (2001) maintained that the MBTI is a unique and important personality assessment inventory. There are multiple forms of the MBTI, and these can be applied in different

settings. For the purpose of obtaining the data about Iranian English teachers' personality types, the Persian version of the MBTI^a (form M) was used. Before the main study, it was validated by two experts and also piloted on 20 EFL teachers. Using Cronbach's alpha, the reliability was found to be 0.77. Besides, the reliability for each personality dimension of this indicator was run and determined to be 0.75 for extraversion–introversion, 0.70 for sensing–intuition, 0.78 for thinking–feeling and 0.77 for judging–perceiving.

Behaviour and Instructional Management Scale (BIMS). In order to measure the teachers' classroom management approaches, Martin and Sass (2010) developed the BIMS which includes two subscales with 24 items: behaviours management (12 items) and instructional management (12 items). Participants' answers for each item demonstrate on a 6-point Likert scale from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. The behaviour management (BM) consists of establishing rules and a reward structure as well as forming planes to prevent misbehaviours and teachers' responses to them. The instructional management (IM) is about assigning teaching methods, arranging daily acts and directing students learning practices (Martin & Sass, 2010).

According to Martin and Sass (2010), the analysis of the behaviour management subscale of BIMS showed good internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.774$), with an average inter-item correlation of 0.377 (SD = 0.091) and results for the instructional management subscale, also demonstrated a good internal consistency for the six items ($\alpha = 0.770$), with an average inter-item correlation of 0.365 (SD = 0.092). The reliability coefficients for the two scales of the BIMS were found to be 0.721 and 0.748 for behaviour management and the instructional management, respectively (Martin & Sass 2010).

The validity of the BIMS was examined by two experts and for examining internal consistency, it was piloted on 20 EFL teachers. Using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, the reliability of the instructional management subscale and the behaviour management subscale of BIMS were found to be 0.75 and 0.71, respectively.

2.3. Data collection and analysis procedures

In order to collect the data, English teachers were given two questionnaires that included the BIMS and the MBTI. They were informed of the purpose of research and asked to fill in the questionnaires at the institute and return the completed questionnaires to the researchers after they completed them. The teachers had 20 minutes to complete the MBTI and 10 minutes to complete the BIMS.

Descriptive statistics, such as frequency distribution, mean and standard deviation, were used to explore the teachers' major personality types as well as their classroom management orientations. To find out if there is any significant relationship between EFL teachers' personality types and their classroom management orientations, Fisher's exact test was used.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Addressing the first research question

To answer the first research question, the descriptive analysis of the EFL language institute teachers' major personality types and their classroom management orientation will be presented in the two following sections.

In order to determine the EFL language institute teachers' overall personality types considering all the four distinct clusters, the calculated scores for both sides of every personality cluster were compared and the personality type with higher amount was attributed to the respondent as the dominant personality trait. Accordingly, the teachers' major personality types were determined using a 4-digit coding system (i.e., ESTJ). The frequency distributions of teachers' personality types are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1. Teachers' major personality types

Personality type	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
ESTJ	26	43.3	43.3	43.3
INTJ	9	15.0	15.0	58.3
ESFJ	6	10.0	10.0	68.3
ISTJ	6	10.0	10.0	78.3
ENTP	3	5.0	5.0	83.3
INTP	3	5.0	5.0	88.3
ENFJ	2	3.3	3.3	91.6
ENTJ	2	3.3	3.3	94.9
ISFJ	1	1.7	1.7	96.6
INFP	1	1.7	1.7	98.3
ISTP	1	1.7	1.7	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Table 1 presents the EFL language institute teachers' major personality types in a descending frequency order. According to the results, the ESTJ was the most frequent personality type (43.3%) among the EFL teachers. The other prevalent personality types were the INTJ (15%), the ESFJ (10%) and ISTJ (10%), respectively. Indeed, the four major types of personality mentioned above comprised 78.3% of the total sample, whereas the rest (21.7%) of the sample was of the ENTP (5%), INTP (5%), ENFJ (3.3%), ENTJ (3.3%), ISFJ (1.7%), INFP (1.7%) and ISTP (1.7%) types.

To determine the EFL language institute teachers' classroom management orientations, the data collected through BIMS inventory were analysed generating the descriptive statistics of the scores. As mentioned previously, the BIMS is a 24-item inventory composed of two subscales addressing two different components of classroom management including instructional management (12 items) and behaviour management (12 items).

To provide a clearer picture of the teachers' classroom management and in accordance with the theoretical framework utilised in the current study, the respondents' overall scores on both IM and BM measures were categorised into three major categories, namely non-interventionist, interactionalist and interventionist. To fulfil this categorisation, those teachers whose scores were at

least one standard deviation above the mean score were regarded as interventionist, whereas the teachers with an overall score lower than the mean minus one standard deviation ($M - 1SD$) was considered to be non-interventionist. Consequently, the scores between the two aforementioned amounts ($M - 1SD$ and $M + 1SD$) were attributed to the teachers with an interactionalist approach to classroom management. Table 2 presents the frequency distribution of different types of classroom management orientation (CMO) for both of BM and IM domains.

Table 2. Teachers' classroom management orientation

Domain	CMO	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
BM	Non-interventionist	10	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Interactionalist	38	63.3	63.3	80
	Interventionist	12	20	20	100
IM	Non-interventionist	8	13.3	13.3	13.3
	Interactionalist	42	70	70	83.3
	Interventionist	10	16.7	16.7	100

According to the results shown in Table 2, the majority of the EFL teachers favoured an interactionalist approach to both behaviour (63.3%) and instructional (70%) management. The non-interventionist approach was the least favourable approach regarding both the BM and IM domains.

3.2. Addressing the second research question

To explore whether or not the association between EFL teachers' personality types (PT) and their CMO was statistically significant, Fisher's exact test was conducted at the 0.05 level of significance. The results are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3. Fisher's exact test's results for association between teachers' CMO and PT

		Value	df	Asymp. sig. (2-sided)	Exact sig. (2-sided)
BMO	Pearson's Chi-square	32.671 ^a	20	0.037	0.027
	Likelihood ratio	32.872	20	0.035	0.025
	Fisher's exact test	26.242			0.048
	N of valid cases	60			
IMO	Pearson's Chi-square	21.392	20	0.377	0.397
	Likelihood ratio	22.224	20	0.328	0.353
	Fisher's exact test	19.593			0.385
	N of valid cases	60			

As indicated in Table 3, statistical analysis (two-sided Fisher's exact test) confirmed that the association between the teachers' personality types and their classroom management orientations (non-interventionist, interactionalist and interventionist) was found to be statistically significant with regard to the BM domain ($p < 0.05$, Fisher's exact test), but non-significant regarding the IM domain ($p = 0.385$, Fisher's exact test).

In the present study, 11 out of 16 personality types were recognised. The results revealed that ESTJ was the most frequent personality type among Iranian EFL language institute teachers. The other prevalent personality types were INTJ, ESFJ and ISTJ, respectively. This finding is consistent with the findings of a study by Akbari et al. (2005), which showed that the most frequent personality type of Iranian EFL teachers was ISTJ and ESTJ. The research study by Alibakhshi (2011) has also revealed that ESTJ and ISTJ were predominant personality types among Iranian EFL teachers. On the contrary, the study by Ghorbani et al. (2015) indicated that ISTP and ISTJ are the most frequent personality types among Iranian EFL teachers.

According to the description of the 16 personality types by Lawrence (1993, p. 27), 'people with ESTJ personality type are fact-minded, practical organiser, assertive, analytical and systematic. They are very much in touch with the external environment, push to get things done and work smoothly and efficiently'. Thus, it could be discussed that the majority of English teachers in this study tend to create order and are systematic in English classes. They seem to be serious at work and have a realistic attitude to the educational activities and topics. As the Iranian teachers teach already-available textbooks and every task or activity in the textbook is carried out based on the pre-planned syllabi, they do their best to orderly and indeed a well-ordered atmosphere is felt in the classroom. English is spreading throughout the world as the language of international communication (Widdowson, 2003), and thus Iranian teachers of English, particularly those at language institutes, try to work efficiently so that the learners learn the language with the utmost success and can use it whenever it is required, both nationally and internationally.

Language institute English teachers, like other language teachers, should talk at least during the class time. Speaking is the skill that a language teacher needs and this makes the language teachers turn out to be assertive, although they have not already managed to be so. Moreover, as Lawrence (1993) has claimed, being fact-minded is an index of ESTJ personality type people. One of the facts most English teachers encounter is the problems EFL learners have in the process of language learning. Iranian English teachers usually accept the problems and seek for the best and most appropriate solutions to remove them. Hence, they do not ignore the learning facts, and even if the learners are not aware of the problems or do not have the impression to accept them, the teachers alert them of the fact.

The second part of the finding related to the first research question is about EFL teachers' major classroom management orientations. It was shown that the majority of Iranian EFL teachers hold an interactionist orientation to both behaviour and instructional management scales. This finding lends support to the findings of the study by Aliakbari and Heidarzadi (2015), which has revealed that EFL teachers favoured interactionist orientation on behaviour and instructional management dimensions. Also, the findings of the study conducted by Evrim et al. (2009) have shown that the teacher was interactionist in her general beliefs regarding classroom management. On the contrary, a more recent study by Kazemi and Soleimani (2016) has contended that Iranian EFL teachers tended to have interventionist or controlling classroom management approaches at both dimensions of behaviour and instructional management. This result of their study supports the previous findings of Rahimi and Asadollahi (2012) showed that most Iranian EFL teachers were interventionists with respect to their classroom management approaches.

As Martin and Sass (2010) have expressed, interactionalists concentrate on teacher–student relationships and receive some techniques and strategies from both non-interventionist and interventionist perspectives. This is highlighted by Glasser (1986) that interactionist approach is a moderate level of teacher control and focus on the mutual give and take which can happen between learners and their environment. Moreover, interactionist teachers try to find solutions satisfactory to both teacher and students. Therefore, the majority of Iranian EFL teachers in this study demonstrated a tendency towards interacting with EFL learners and a relationship based on equality and impartiality between themselves and English learners in the language institutes. The benefits of interaction, for enhancing comprehension and improving communicative competence on behalf of students, have been the focus of many studies from a psycholinguistic perspective (Gass & Madden, 1985; Gass & Varonis, 1994; Long, 1981; Pica, Young & Doughty, 1987, to name a few) and from a sociocultural viewpoint (Breen, 2001; Hall & Verplaetse, 2000; Morell, 2002). As Richards (2006) has declared, second language learning is a highly interactive process and the quality of this interaction is concerned to have an impressive effect on language learning. Negotiation of meaning happens during the interaction between the teacher and the learners.

In the current study, the relationship between Iranian EFL language institute teachers' personality types and their classroom management orientations was established to be statistically significant regarding the behaviour management domain but non-significant considering the instructional management domain. 'BM' is a form of discipline that incorporates pre-planned endeavours to anticipate misbehaviour as well as the teacher's reaction to the behaviour' (Martin & Sass, 2010, p. 1126). The management of behaviour in the classroom, which Froyen and Iverson (1999, p. 181) have called as *conduct management*, refers to 'the set of procedural skills that teachers employ in their attempt to address and resolve discipline problems in the classroom'. Therefore, EFL teachers' personality types have an important role in their behaviour management approaches, for instance, when they want to guide students' actions in order to change their behaviours in a particular situation or control their destructive and negative behaviours and also when they want to set rules. However, the findings suggest that there is no relationship between English teachers' personality types and their instructional aims and methodologies.

The above findings contradict the study by Chambers, Henson and Sienty (2001). Utilising MBTI and ABCC, which is the old version of BIMS with three scales (instructional management, behaviour management and people management), they examined the predictive relationship between personality types of beginning emergency permit teachers and their beliefs concerning control in classroom management. The results of their study indicated that teachers' personality type was a strong predictor of people management beliefs.

Concerning the findings of the present study, EFL language institute teachers' personality types cannot be associated with their selection of instructional activities and materials. One reason may be related to the programmes and guidance which EFL teachers receive from the educational directors at teaching training courses. Most of the time in these classes, EFL teachers are asked to select educational materials, control instructional activities and structure daily routines in a specific way. However, the results of this study indicate that the personality type of EFL teachers has the relationship with their behaviour management orientations. It means that EFL teachers' response to the students' behaviours and also commenting on the behaviours, as well as the way in which they establish rules, is related to their personality type. In agreement with this finding, Guthrie, Schwoerer

and Coate (1998) have stated that the personality is a predisposition to act or behave in a characteristic fashion in response to one's environment. In addition, as Hogan (1991) has emphasised, a person's personality underlies a style of thinking, feeling and acting.

The result of this study presumably helps directors of foreign language institutes become aware of the relationship between EFL teachers' personality type and their behaviour management approaches. This knowledge will help them design English teacher training programmes by considering EFL teachers' personality type and training them some appropriate behaviour management strategies which adjust with their personality characteristics. Furthermore, the present study suggests that the awareness of one's own personality type is vital for every EFL teacher to gain the knowledge of the strengths as well as the weaknesses related to their personality types which influence their educational decisions and behaviours at English classes. To put it another way, teachers who are aware of their personality types can predict what kinds of activities and tasks students will enjoy, what sort of teaching methods they require and what their learning styles are (Mall-Amiri & Nakhaie, 2013).

As recommendations for further research, it is suggested that future studies should employ a qualitative method such as interviews and observation methods in order to obtain descriptive information about teachers' classroom management beliefs and behaviours. Additionally, this study examined the personality types and classroom management orientations of the EFL teachers teaching at language institutes. It would be advantageous to replicate this study using teachers who are teaching English at schools. Moreover, as another line of research, comparison can be made between EFL teachers teaching young learners and those who are teaching adults, as well as those who use other instruments like the NEO Five Factor Inventory in order to obtain the participants' personality types.

Notes

1. The MBTI questionnaire was bought from Iran Tahghigh Research Centre which had received the formal permission to use this questionnaire from the Myers and Briggs Foundation.

References

- Akbari, R, Mirhassani, A. & Bahri, H. (2005). The relationship between teaching style and personality type of Iranian EFL teachers. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(1), 1–22. Retrieved from <http://www.sid.ir/FileServer/JE/87620050101>
- Alibakhshi, G. (2011). On the impacts of gender and personality types on Iranian EFL teachers' teaching efficacy and teaching activities preferences. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 1–22. Retrieved from <http://ijal.khu.ac.ir/article-1-29-en.pdf>
- Aliakbari, M. & Heidarzadi, M. (2015). The relationship between EFL teachers' beliefs and actual practices of classroom management. *Cogent Education*, 2. <http://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2015.1039255>
- Behnam, B. & Bayazidi, M. (2013). The relationship between personality types and teaching styles in Iranian adult TEFL context. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 2, 21-32.

- https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258344172_The_relationship_between_personality_types_and_teaching_styles_in_Iranian_adult_TEFL_context
- Breen, M. (2001). Overt participation and covert participation in the language classroom. In M. Breen (Ed.) *Learner contributions to language learning: new directions in research* (pp. 112–140). Harlow, UK: Pearson.
- Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York: Longman. <https://octovany.files.wordpress.com/2013/12/ok-teaching-by-principles-h-douglas-brown.pdf>
- Cano-Garcia, F., Padilla-Munoz, E. & Carrasco-Ortiz, M. (2005). Personality and contextual variables in teacher burnout. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38, 929–940. <https://idus.us.es/xmlui/handle/11441/56856>
- Chambers, Sh. M., Henson, R. K. & Sienty, S. F. (2001). *Personality types and teaching efficacy as predictors of classroom control orientation in beginning teachers*. Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association*, New Orleans. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED452184.pdf>
- Cooper, T. C. (2001). Foreign language teaching style and personality. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34, 301–316. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2001.tb02062.x>
- Crookes, G. & Craig, Ch. (1991). Guidelines for classroom language teaching. In Celce-Murcia, M. (Ed.) *Teaching English as a second language* (pp. 43–67). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers. <http://sls.hawaii.edu/Gblog/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/Crookes-Chaudron-1991.pdf>
- DeVries, P. & Pease, E. (2000). *Success in English teaching*. London, UK: Oxford University Press. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/success-in-english-teaching-9780194421713?lang=en&cc=se>
- Dickson, G. E. & Wiersma, W. (1984). *Empirical measurement of teacher performance*. Toledo, OH: The University of Toledo, the Centre for Educational Research and Services College of Education and Allied Professions.
- Dorman, J. (2003). Testing a model for teacher burnout. *Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology*, 3, 35–47. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.596.8184&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Ebrahimi, Sh. (2015). The relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' personality traits, emotional intelligence and their job satisfaction. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 9(2), 156–163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0806.20>
- Elizabeth, C. L., May, C. M. & Chee, P. K. (2008). Building a model to define the concept of teacher success in Hong Kong. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24, 623–634. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0742051X07001138>
- Emmer, E. T. & Stough, L. M. (2001). Classroom management: a critical part of educational psychology with implication for teacher education. *Educational Psychologist*, 36(2), 103–112. http://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3602_5

- Heidari, L. & Parvaresh, S. (2021). Iranian EFL teachers' personality types and classroom management orientations: A correlational study. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 13(4), 224–240. <https://doi.org/10.18844/ijlt.v13i4.5719>
- Evertson, C. M. & Weinstein, C. S. (Eds.) (2006). *Handbook of classroom management: research, practice, and contemporary issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Evrin, E. A., Gokce, K. & Enisa, M. (2009). Exploring the relationship between teacher beliefs and styles of classroom management in relation to actual teaching practices: a case study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1, 612–617. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042809001116>
- Faltis, C. & Hudelson, S. (1994). Learning English as an additional language in K-12 schools. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 257–468. <http://doi.org/10.2307/3587303>
- Fardinpour, F. & Masoomi, M. (2014). Personality traits as a predictor of EFL teachers' burnout. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 7(3), 504–512.
- Fatemi, M., Ganjali, R. & Kafi, Z. (2015). EFL Teachers' personality type and their effectiveness in teaching: investigating the relationship. *Global Advanced Research Journal of Educational Research and Review*, 4(10), 189–195. <http://garj.org/garjerr/11/2015/4/10/efl-teachers-personality-type-and-their-effectiveness-in-teaching-investigating-the-relationship>
- Fowler, J. & Sarapli, O. (2010). Classroom management: What ELT students expect. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 3, 94–97. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042810013911>
- Froyen, L. A. & Iverson, A. M. (1999). *Schoolwide and classroom management: the reflective educator-leader*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gass, S. & Madden, C. (Eds.) (1985). *Input in second language acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Gass, S. & Varonis, E. (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 283–302. doi:10.1017/S0272263100013097
- Ghafarpour, H. & Nejadansari, D. (2015). EFL Teachers' attitudes and beliefs on class control and leadership styles in two different contexts. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 59–65.
- Gholami, J., Sarkhosh, M. & Abdi, H. (2016). An exploration of teaching practices of private, public, and public-private EFL teachers in Iran. *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability*, 18(1), 16–33.
- Ghorbani, S., Akbari, O. & Ghonsooly, B. (2015). Iranian EFL teachers' major personality types and teaching attitudes. *International Journal of Research Studies in Psychology*, 4(2), 27–40. doi:10.5861/ijrsp.2015.1036
- Glasser, W. (1986). *Control theory in the classroom*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Glickman, C. & Tamashiro, R. (1980). Classifying teachers' beliefs about discipline. *Educational Leadership*, 37(6), 459–464.

- Heidari, L. & Parvaresh, S. (2021). Iranian EFL teachers' personality types and classroom management orientations: A correlational study. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 13(4), 224–240. <https://doi.org/10.18844/ijlt.v13i4.5719>
- Guthrie, J. P., Coate, C. J. & Schwoerer, C. E. (1998). Career management strategies: the role of personality. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 13(5/6), 371–386. Retrieved from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1108/02683949810220024>
- Hall, J. K. & Verplaetse, L. S. (2000). *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Harkin, J. & Turner, G. (1997). Patterns of communication of styles of teachers in English 16-19 education. *Research in Post-compulsory Education*, 2(3), 263–281. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13596749700200021?needAccess=true>
- Harrington, R. & Loffredo, D. (2001). The relationship between life satisfaction, self-consciousness, and the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory dimensions. *Journal of Psychology*, 135(4), 439–451. doi:10.1080/00223980109603710
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed). Pearson: Longman.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. London, UK: New York: Routledge.
- Henson, R. K. (2003). *Relationships between preservice teachers' self- efficacy, task analysis, and classroom management beliefs*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED450 084).
- Henson, R. K. & Chambers, S. M. (2002). *Personality type as a predictor of teaching efficacy and classroom control beliefs in emergency certification teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the southwest educational research association, Austin.
- Hogan, R. (1991). Personality and personality measurement. *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 2(2), 873–919.
- Hoy, W. (1990). Socialization of student teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 27(2), 279–300. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.3102/00028312027002279>
- Jones, V. F. & Jones, L. S. (2012). *Comprehensive classroom management, creating communities of support and solving problems* (10th ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson
- Kazemi, A. & Soleimani, N. (2016). On the relationship between EFL teachers' classroom management approaches and the dominant teaching style: a mixed method study. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 4(2), 87–103.
- Lawrence, G. D. (1993). *People types and tiger stripes*. Gainesville, FL: Center for Applications of Psychological Type, Inc..
- Long, M. H. (1981) Questions in foreigner talk discourse. *Language Learning*, 31(1), 135–158. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1981.tb01376.x

Heidari, L. & Parvaresh, S. (2021). Iranian EFL teachers' personality types and classroom management orientations: A correlational study. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 13(4), 224–240. <https://doi.org/10.18844/ijlt.v13i4.5719>

Mall-Amiri, B. & Nakhaie, N. (2013). Comparing the performance of extrovert and introvert intermediate female EFL learners on listening and reading task. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 3(3).

Martin, N. K. & Sass, D. A. (2010). Construct validation of the Behavior and Instructional Management Scale. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(5), 1124–1135. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0742051X09002625>

Martin, N. K., Yin, Z. & Baldwin, B. (1998). Construct validation of the attitudes and beliefs on classroom control inventory. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 33, 6–15. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23870556>

Martin, N. & Shoho, A. R. (2000). *Teacher experience, training, & age: The influence of teacher characteristics on classroom management style*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Dallas, TX.

Marzano, R. (2003). *Classroom management that works*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R. J., Marzano, J. S. & Pickering, D. J. (2003). *Classroom management that works. research-based strategies for every teacher*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

Miller, R., Murnane, R. & Willett, J. B. (2008). Do teacher absences impact student achievement? Longitudinal evidence from one urban school district. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 30, 181–200. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.3102/0162373708318019>

Moncada, A. G. & Ortiz, D. I. Q. (2003). Tomorrow's EFL teacher educators. *Colombian Applied Linguistic Journal*, 5, 86–104. Retrieved from <http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/calj/n5/n5a06.pdf>

Morell, T. (2002). *La interaccion en la clase magistral: Rasgos lingüísticos del discurso interactivo en inglés* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Universidad de Alicante.

Muijs, D. & Reynolds, D. (2001). Teacher beliefs and behaviors: what really matters? *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 37(2), 3–15. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23870407>

Mullins, L. J. (2005). *Management and organizational behavior* (7th ed.), Essex, England: Pearson Education Ltd.

Murray, E. (1972). Students' perception of self-actualizing and on-self-actualizing teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 23(3), 383–387. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/002248717202300326>

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 Psychologist Press.

Myers, I. B., McCaulley, M. H., Quenk, N. L. & Hammer, A. L. (1998/2003). *MBTI manual: a guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

- Heidari, L. & Parvaresh, S. (2021). Iranian EFL teachers' personality types and classroom management orientations: A correlational study. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 13(4), 224–240. <https://doi.org/10.18844/ijlt.v13i4.5719>
- Nick Hashim, N. M. H., Shah Alam, S. & Yusoff, N. M. (2014). The relationship between teacher's personality, monitoring, learning environment, and students' EFL performance. *Journal of Language Studies*, 14(1), 112–113. <http://journalarticle.ukm.my/7002/>
- Othman, F. (2009). *A study on personality that influences teaching effectiveness* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), USM.
- Patricia, G., Julie, M. & Anne, D. (2005). *Listening to the teachers of English language learners: a survey of California teachers' challenges, experiences, and professional development needs*. University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute: UC Berkley. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6430628z>
- Pica, T., Young, R. & Doughty, C. (1987). The impact of interaction on comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(4), 737–758. <http://doi.org/10.2307/3586992>
- Pishghadam, R. & Sahebjam, S. (2012). Personality and emotional intelligence in teacher burnout. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 15 (1), 227–236. http://doi.org/10.5209/rev_SJOP.2012.v15.n1.37314
- Rahimi, M. & Asadollahi, F. (2012). EFL teachers' classroom management orientations: investigating the role of individual differences and contextual variables. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 31, 43–48. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042811029430>
- Razavi, R. (2014). EFL teachers' emotional intelligence and their personality types: exploring possible relations. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 5(2), 134–141. Retrieved from <http://www.journals.aiac.org.au/index.php/alls/article/view/323/277>
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. (2003). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sass, D. A., Lopes, J., Oliveira, C. & Martin, N. K. (2016). An evaluation of the behavior and instructional management scale's psychometric properties using Portuguese teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 55, 279–290. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0742051X16300208>
- Schaubhut, N. A., Herk, N. A. & Thompson, R. C. (2009). *MBTI Form M manual supplement*. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.
- Scharle, A. & Szabo, A. (2000). *Learner autonomy. A guide to developing learner responsibility*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/samples/cam031/00710233.pdf>
- Schaubhut, N. A., Herk, N. A. & Thompson, R. C. (2009). *MBTI Form M manual supplement*.
- Schmidt, L. (1992). The relationship between pupil control ideology and the quality of school life. *Journal of Invitational Theory and Practice*, 1(2). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ479009>
- Sehgal, M. (1996). *Adolescent stress: a review of its determinants*. Paper presented at *India Science Congress*, Patrika, 3–8 January.

Heidari, L. & Parvaresh, S. (2021). Iranian EFL teachers' personality types and classroom management orientations: A correlational study. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 13(4), 224–240. <https://doi.org/10.18844/ijlt.v13i4.5719>

Sehgal, M. & Kaur, U. (1995) *Teacher as an agent of mental health: a cross-cultural confirmation*. Proceedings of World Congress of Cultural Psychiatry, March.

Sronge, J. H., Tucker, P. D. & Hindman, J. L. (2004). *Handbook for qualities of effective teachers*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). <https://www.ascd.org/books/handbook-for-qualities-of-effective-teachers?variant=104135E4>

Stevick, E. W. (1980). *Teaching languages: a way and ways*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.38.2.376>

Tal, C. (2010). Case studies to deepen understanding and enhance classroom management skills in preschool teacher training. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 38(2), 143–152. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10643-010-0395-z>

Tonelson, S. W. (1981). The importance of teacher self-concept to create a healthy psychological environment for learning. *Education*, 102(1), 96–100.

Widdowson, H. D. (2003). *Defining issues in English language teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Witcher, B. J. (2003). Policy management of strategy. *Strategic Change*, 12(2), 83–94. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/jsc.617/full>

Zhang, L. (2007). Do personality traits make a difference in teaching styles among Chinese high school teachers? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43, 669–679. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S019188690700038>

Zhang, Q. & Watkins, D. (2007). The conception of a good tertiary EFL teacher in China. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(4), 781–790. <http://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-72>