TEACHING STYLES AND PERSONALITY TYPES OF TEACHERS

Zin Cho Cho Nway[1], Khin Hnin Nwe[2]

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate teaching styles and personality types of teachers. Quantitative and descriptive approaches were used in this study. To collect the required data, Teaching Style Inventory and Psychological Type Index (Grasha, 1996) were used as research instruments. In former measure, five subscales (expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator and delegator) were included. The later included eight subscales (extrovert, introvert, sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling, judging and perceiving). The required data were collected during December 2016. Participants were 500 teachers from Yangon and Tanintharyi Regions. As the most predominant teaching style and psychological type in this study were 'Expert' style and 'Judging' type, participants tended to possess certain knowledge and skills that students need and like order and organization. Independent sample t-test revealed that teachers in Yangon Region were higher in expert and delegator styles and introvert, sensing and feeling types than teachers in Tanintharyi Region. Moreover, rural schools' teachers were better in facilitator style and urban schools' teachers were good in introvert, sensing and feeling types. ANOVA results showed that 31-40 aged teachers were better in facilitator style and 51-above aged teachers were higher in perceiving type. There was no significant difference in teaching styles by service whereas significant differences exist in personality types. Pearson correlation revealed that personality types were correlated with teachers' teaching styles. Results from the regression analysis indicated that extrovert, introvert, intuition, feeling and thinking personality types were significant predictors for teacher-centerd teaching styles (expert, formal authority and personal model) and extrovert, intuition, thinking, feeling, judging and perceiving personality types for student-centered teaching styles (facilitator and delegator). So teachers who use the best teaching styles that suit their personality types will make their teaching more successful because effective teaching depends on the selection of teaching styles.

Key Words: Teaching Style, Personality, Personality Type

_____
[1] Senior Teacher, Basic Education High School (Branch), Shwepay, Myeik
[2] Dr, Lecturer, Department of Educational Psychology, Yangon University of Education

Introduction

Every instructor has a distinctive style of teaching. Through their styles, teachers integrate the theories or pedagogy in which they believe and the practices they adopt in the classroom. Teaching and learning process is a pedagogical act that involves both teachers and students. Both teachers and students are unique individuals who possess their own way of learning and teaching. When teachers and students understand the differences in their teaching and learning styles, learning is enhanced. Teaching styles, as Brown (2007) stated, refer to the enduring preferences within an individual and they vary with each one; therefore, the style a teacher possesses is an essential aspect to be better understand the teaching and learning process. In fact, several studies on the field of teaching styles point out that more research has to be done to really unravel the impact and the consequences of a determined teaching style on students and their learning (Eggen & Kauchak, 1996; Lightbown & Spada, 1999; Macaro, 2003).

Personality may be viewed as the dynamic organization of those traits and characteristic patterns of behavior that are unique to the individual (Callahan, 1966).   Becoming aware of one's own personality type and the personality type of others can be helpful in mounting intra-personal and inter-personal development. The key to the satisfied, successful and effective occupational and professional life is to have those personality traits most suited to one's profession, job or occupation. Specifically, teaching as novel and innovative profession demands certain personality traits to be essential for efficacy and quality performance. 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.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to investigate teaching styles and personality types of teachers.

Definitions of the Key Terms

Teaching Style: Teaching style refers to a teacher's personal behaviours and media used to transmit data to or receive it from the learners and involve the implementation of the teacher's philosophy about teaching (Brown, 2001).

Personality: Personality is the more or less stable and enduring organization of a person's character, temperament, intellect and physique, which determine his unique adjustment to the environment (Eysenck, 1971).

Personality Type: A person's characteristic pattern of major personality dimensions (introversion-extraversion, thinking-feeling, and sensation-intuition) **(**Jung, 1971).

Review of Related Literature

Individuals have the basic capability to learn and to teach; however, they are not able to learn and teach effectively in the same exact way (Gregorc, 1979). Dunn and Dunn (1979) cited that not only do students learn in considerably different ways, but certain students succeed only through selected teaching methods. Teaching methods and style stem from a specific philosophy of education, even if the teacher isn't aware of what that philosophy is. A teacher's teaching style reflects on what he values in education, what methods he believes are effective and how his students learn his subject best.

According to Grasha (1996), teaching style is viewed as a particular pattern of needs, beliefs, and behaviours that teachers display in the classroom. He also states that style is multidimensional and affect how teachers present information, interact with students, manage classroom tasks, supervise coursework, socialize students to the field, and mentor students.

Through his research, Anthony Grasha (1996) identified five potential approaches for classroom teachers:

➢ Expert (transmitter of information)

➢ Formal Authority (sets standards and defines acceptable ways of doing things)

➢ Personal Model (teaches by illustration and direct example)

➢ Facilitator (guides and directs by asking questions, exploring options, suggesting alternatives)

➢ Delegator (develops students ability to function autonomously)

Developing an effective teaching style for subject area requires time, effort, a willingness to experiment with different teaching strategies and an examination of what is effective in teaching. A teacher's teaching style is based on their educational philosophy, their classrooms demographic, what subject area they teach, and the school's mission statement. It is important to know that there are two key approaches that the other teaching theories fall into: teacher-centered and student-centered.

Since ancient times various systems of typology have been developed to explain why individuals approach to the same subject differently. One of the influential typology was Personality Type Theory developed by Jung (1921). Personality Type presents a pattern which indicates how people see the world, how information is collected and interpreted, how decisions are made, and how individuals live out lifestyle choices. Durham and Fowler (2009) expressed that while the employment of other typologies was not widespread used, modern typology attracts attention of various disciplines such as education, counseling and psychotherapy, organizational teamwork and communication, career counseling, and multicultural settings.

Based on this typology Myers and his daughter Briggs built an instrument to present behavioral preferences of individuals, called Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI). It identifies the personality preferences of an individual along four dichotomous out of which sixteen different personality types are drawn. In the last decades there has been a tremendous wave of interest to apply MBTI to find the relationship between personality type and one's success in a job, in management of time, in marriage, in child rearing, and in other contexts (Brown, 2000).

Table 1: Characteristics of Psychological Preferences

Preference	Characteristics	Additional Characteristics
Extraversion	Energized by being with people, interacting with others.	Does not mean talkative; and E can be quiet, even shy.
Introversion	Gains energy by being alone; down time generally means 'alone time'.	Introverts can be talkative and good in groups, but they need 'alone time' to recharge.
Sensing	Gather information through their five senses, detail-oriented; don't like theories as much as facts.	Like lists, clear directions, time tables. Often very literal, miss nuance, have difficulty generalizing.
Intuition	Use intuition and hunches; analytical and theoretical; see the 'big picture' and not as interested in the details.	Like to create their own plan after they understand a situation; bored by routine; comfortable with some uncertainty.
Feeling	Feelings matter, are important; like win-win solutions; generous with praise and affirmations.	Sometimes make less than ideal choices in order to please everyone; often hurt when not appreciated; can be quite sensitive to others.
Thinking	Practical, direct, expedient, logic rather than emotion.	Other people's feelings may be an afterthought; may seem insensitive.
Judging	Orderly, organized, predictable.	Feel best when work is done, things are as they should be.
Perceiving	Flexible, open-ended, somewhat spontaneous.	Fairly independent, make decisions based on mood, timing what feels right to them.

Díaz Larenas, Rodríguez Moran and Poblete Rivera (2011) investigated the title of "Comparing Teaching Styles and Personality Types of EFL Instructors in the Public and Private Sectors". Ramin Akbari, Akbar

Mirhassani and Hossein Bahri (2010) investigated the relationship between teaching styles and personality types of Iranian EFl teachers. Behnam and Bayazidi (2013) attempted to investigate the relationship between personality type of teachers and teaching styles in TEFL Iranian adult context.

Methodology

This study examined teaching styles and personality types of teachers from Yangon Region and Tanintharyi Region. In this study, descriptive survey method was used.

Sample

A total of 500 teachers were selected from 26 schools in Yangon Region and Tanintharyi Region.

Instrumentation

In this study, two instruments were used for data collection. Both instruments, teaching style inventory and personality type index, were developed by Grasha (1996). Teaching style inventory was constructed with total 40 items consisting five subscales of expert (8 items), formal authority (8 items), personal model (8 items), facilitator (8 items) and delegator (8 items).Personality types inventory included 136 items that represented eight subscales, extrovert E (7 items), introvert I (7 items), sensing S (7 items), intuition N (7 items), thinking T (7 items), feeling F (7 items), judging J (7 items) and perceiving P (7 items). The response type for each item of both instruments is a five point likert scale: 'strongly disagree' (1), 'moderately disagree' (2), 'undecided' (3), 'moderately agree' (4) and 'strongly agree' (5).The Cronbach alpha reliability of the teaching style inventory was 0.837. The Cronbach alpha reliability of the personality type inventory was 0.882.

Procedure

The required data were collected from 10 schools of Yangon Region and 16 schools of Tanintharyi Region during December 2016. Respondents used 5 point Likert scale to rate each statement in both questionnaires.

Data Analysis and Findings

To investigate the teachers' teaching styles, descriptive statistics were carried out by using descriptive procedure with the data obtained and the results are shown in table 2.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Subscales of Teachers' Teaching Styles

Variables	Mean	Mean%	SD	Min	Max
Expert	31.56	78.9%	3.281	15	40
Formal Authority	29.63	74.07%	3.281	17	40
Personal Model	30.68	76.7%	2.886	21	40
Facilitator	29.95	74.87%	3.259	19	40
Delegator	28.62	71.55%	3.745	11	40

By studying table 2, it was found that the mean percentages of the participants were the highest in expert teaching style and the lowest in delegator teaching styles. It may be interpreted that the teachers from selected schools teach their students by displaying detailed knowledge and by challenging students to enhance their competence but are weak in teaching students to develop students' capacities to function autonomously. It may be because of inequality of teacher-student ratio, the hugeness of the class-size and inadequacy of teaching materials.

In order to find out whether there were significant differences in teaching styles by region, descriptive statistics was applied.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Teachers' Teaching Styles by Region

Variables	Region	N	Mean	Mean %	Std. Deviation
Expert	Yangon	250	32.04	80.1%	3.117
	Tanintharyi	250	31.08	77.7%	3.377
Formal Authority	Yangon	250	29.82	74.55%	2.81
	Tanintharyi	250	29.44	73.6%	3.689
Personal Model	Yangon	250	30.9	77.25%	2.848
	Tanintharyi	250	30.46	76.15%	2.914
Facilitator	Yangon	250	30.12	75.3%	2.85
	Tanintharyi	250	29.78	74.45%	3.62
Delegator	Yangon	250	29.1	72.75%	3.232
	Tanintharyi	250	28.14	70.35%	4.148

Again, the independent sample *t*-test was used to examine whether the difference was significant or not.

Table 4: The Result of Independent Sample*t*-test for Teaching Styles by Region

Variables	*t*	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Expert	**3.276****	498	**0.001**	0.952
Delegator	**2.887****	498	**0.004**	0.96

According to table 4, the result of independent sample t-test confirmed that   teachers in Yangon Region were higher than those in Tanintharyi Region on expert and delegator teaching styles. So it can be concluded that teachers in Yangon Region have certain knowledge and skills that students required and encourage students to develop their capacities to function autonomously. Because they can study their subject matter to be more proficient as Yangon City has many courses and a variety of books than other townships. ANOVA was computed to find out whether there were significant differences in teaching styles by age.

Table 5: ANOVA Result for Teaching Styles by Age

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Facilitator	Between Groups	89.203	3	29.734	**2.831***	**0.038**
	Within Groups	5209.645	496	10.503		
	Total	5298.848	499			

It can be observed that there was significant difference in facilitator teaching style. And then, it was computed post-hoc comparison using Tukey HSD test to find out the difference which age is higher than that of others.

Table 6: Results of Tukey HSD Multiple Comparison for Teaching Styles by Age

Variable	(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Facilitator	31-40	51- above	**1.036***	**0.024**

It was evidently found that teachers whose age ranged between 31 and 40 were significantly likely to apply facilitator as their teaching styles. 31-40 aged teachers may be competent in teaching subject matter, establishing rapport with students and enthusiastic in teaching profession. They have much energy to perform educational programs effectively than 51-above aged teachers. It is not said that 51-aboved aged teachers are not good. Nevertheless, 51-above aged teachers were old-aged teachers and so most of them cannot attempt to be effective in teaching as 31-40 aged teachers.

ANOVA was computed to find out differences in teaching styles by service.

Table 7: ANOVA Results for Teaching Styles by Service

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Expert	Between Groups	31.987	3	10.662	0.991	0.397
	Within Groups	5339.213	496	10.765		
	Total	5371.2	499			
Formal Authority	Between Groups	62.676	3	20.892	1.952	0.12
	Within Groups	5307.874	496	10.701		
	Total	5370.55	499			
Personal Model	Between Groups	23.621	3	7.874	0.945	0.419
	Within Groups	4133.537	496	8.334		
	Total	4157.158	499			
Facilitator	Between Groups	80.73	3	26.91	2.558	0.054
	Within Groups	5218.118	496	10.52		
	Total	5298.848	499			
Delegator	Between Groups	54.156	3	18.052	1.289	0.277
	Within Groups	6945.644	496	14.003		
	Total	6999.8	499			

There was no significant difference in teaching styles of teachers by services. So it can be concluded that teaching style is not concerned with the teaching experiences.

ANOVA was computed to find out whether there were significant differences in teaching styles by township.

Table 8: ANOVA Results for Teaching Styles by Township

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Expert	Between Groups	208.574	3	69.525	**6.68*****	**0.000**
	Within Groups	5162.626	496	10.409		
	Total	5371.2	499			
Delegator	Between Groups	277.464	3	92.488	**6.824*****	**0.000**
	Within Groups	6722.336	496	13.553		
	Total	6999.8	499			

And then, it was computed post-hoc comparison using Tukey HSD test to find out the difference which age is higher than that of others.

Table 9: Results of Tukey HSD Multiple Comparison for Teaching Styles by Township

Variable	(I) Town	(J) Town	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Expert	Thayetchaung	Hlaing	**-1.898*****	**0.000**
Facilitator	Hlaing	Dawei	**1.225***	**0.039**
Delegator	Insein	Hlaing	**-1.418***	**0.017**
	Dawei	Hlaing	**-2.331*****	**0.000**
	Thayetchaung	Hlaing	**-1.482***	**0.013**

It was evidently found that Haling township was significantly different in expert, delegator and facilitator teaching styles than other townships.

The independent sample *t*-test was used to examine whether the difference was significant or not.

Table 10: The Result of Independent Sample*t*-test for Teaching Styles by School

Variables	*t*	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Facilitator	**-3.075***	498	**0.002**	-1.029

According to table 10, it can be interpreted that teachers in rural schools are higher than teachers in urban school in facilitator teaching style. Again, the independent sample *t*-test was used to examine whether the regional difference was significant or not.

Table 11: The Result of Independent Sampl e*t*-test for Personality Types by Region

Variables	*t*	*df*	Sig. *(2-tailed)*	Mean Difference
Introvert	4.615***	498	0.000	2.324
Sensing	3.267***	498	0.001	1.812
Feeling	2.905**	498	0.004	1.624

According to table 11, the result of independent sample t-test confirmed that teachers in Yangon Region were higher than those in Tanintharyi Region in introvert, sensing and feeling personality types. So, they tended to considerate others' feelings and emotion in decision making though they emphasized facts and practical information. ANOVA was computed to find out whether there were significant differences in personality types by age.

Table 12: ANOVA Results for Personality Types by Age

Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Perceiving	Between Groups	251.727	3	83.909	**3.078***	.027
	Within Groups	13523.223	496	27.265		
	Total	13774.950	499			

And then, it was computed post-hoc comparison using Tukey HSD test to find out the difference which age is higher than that of others.

Table 13: Result of Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons of Personality Types by Age

Variable	(I) age	(J) age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Perceiving	20-30	51- above	**-3.807***	**0.032**

According to table 13, the personality type of 51 and above aged teachers was significantly different from that of 20-30 aged teachers in perceiving personality types. So it can be found that 51 and above teachers are more unplanned and spontaneous in their lifestyle, including making decision than 20-30 aged teachers.ANOVA was conducted to examine the difference between services.

Table 14 : ANOVA Result for Personality Types by Service

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Judging	Between Groups	197.252	3	65.751	**3.164***	**0.024**
	Within Groups	10308.23	496	20.783		
	Total	10505.48	499			

*The mean difference is significant at 0.05 level.

Based on the result of ANOVA, personality types of teachers can be observed that there was significant difference in judging personality type at 0.05 level.To explore the relationship of teaching styles and personality types, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient were calculated.

Table 15: Inter-correlations for Teaching Styles and Personality Types

Teaching Styles	Personality Types							
	E	I	S	I	T	F	J	P
EX	.276**	.308**	.294**	.144**	.323**	.247**	.229**	.214**
FA	.221**	.214**	.251**	.096*	.314**	.234**	.271**	.201**
PM	.366**	.285**	.307**	.242**	.374**	.373**	.303**	.220**
FA	.211**	.188**	.195**	.139**	.345**	.290**	.230**	.110*
D	.171**	.223**	.261**	.131**	.230**	.279**	.273**	.221**

Note: p*<0.05, p**<0.01

Note: **E** = Extrovert, **I** = Introvert, **S** = Sensing, **N** = Intuition, **F** = Feeling, **T** = Thinking, **J** = Judging, **P** = Perceiving, **EX** = Expert, **FA** = Formal Authority, **PM** = Personal Model, **FA** = Facilitator, **D** = Delegator

   Simultaneous multiple regressions were conducted, with personality types being the independent variables and the five main teaching styles as the dependent variables.

Table 16: Multiple Regression Analysis for Teachers' Expert Teaching Style and Personality Type Subscales

Variable	B	β	t	Sig.	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F
EX	11.155		**4.74***	**.000**	.420	0.176	0.163	13.109
E	.101	.141	**2.46***	**.014**				
I	.1	.175	**3.259***	**.001**				
N	-.074	-.128	**-2.424***	**.016**				
T	.163	.204	**.892***	**.000**				

Note: p*<0.05, p**<0.01, p***<0.001

The model for teaching styles was as follow:

EX = 11.155+.101E+.1I- .074N +.163T

Note: EX = Expert Teaching Style, E = Extrovert, I = Introvert, N = Intuition, T=Thinking

Table 17: Multiple Regression Analysis for Teachers' Formal Authority Teaching Style and Personality Type Subscales

Variable	B	β	t	Sig.	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F
FA	9.769		**4.089***	**.000**	.388	0.151	0.137	10.892
N	-0.094	-0.162	**-3.018***	**.003**				
T	0.161	0.203	**3.799***	**.000**				

Note: p**<0.01, p***<0.001. The model for formal authority teaching style was follow.

   FA = 9.769-0.094N+0.161T

Note: FA= Formal authority teaching style, N = Intuition, T= Thinking

Table 18: Multiple Regression Analysis for Teachers' Personal Model Teaching Style and Personality Type Subscales

Variable	B	β	*t*	Sig.	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F
PM	9.528		**4.774*****	**.000**	.484	0.234	0.222	18.769
E	0.113	0.179	**3.249****	**.001**				
T	0.126	0.18	**3.56*****	**.000**				
F	0.09	0.197	**3.723*****	**.000**				

Note: ***p<0.001, :**p<0.01 The model for personal model teaching style was as follow.
PM = 9.528+0.113E+ 0.126T+ 0.09F
Note: PM= Personal Model Teaching Style, E= Extrovert, T= Thinking, F= Feeling

Table 19: Multiple Regression Analysis for Teachers' Facilitator Teaching Style and Personality Type Subscales

Variable	B	β	t	Sig.	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F
FA	11.005		**4.723*****	**.000**	.425	0.181	0.168	13.554
E	0.138	0.194	**3.406****	.001				
N	-0.067	-0.117	-2.218*	.027				
T	0.202	0.255	**4.878*****	.000				
F	0.103	0.198	**3.63*****	.000				
P	-0.076	-0.122	-2.355*	.019				

Note: p*<0.05, p**<0.01, p***<0.001
The model for facilitator teaching style was as follow.
FA= 11.005+ 0.138E- 0.067N+ 0.202T+ 0.103F-0.076P
Note: FA = Facilitator teaching style, E= Extrovert, N= Intuition, T= Thinking, F= Feeling, P= Perceiving

Table 20: Multiple Regression Analysis for Teachers' Delegator Teaching Style and Personality Type Subscales

Variable	B	β	t	Sig.	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F
D	8.531		**3.102***	**.002**	.370	0.137	0.122	9.707
F	0.102	0.172	**3.069***	**.002**				
J	0.127	0.156	**2.933***	**.004**				

Note: *p<0.05 .The model for delegator teaching style was follow.

D = 8.531+ 0.102F + 0.127J

Note: D = Delegator teaching style, F= Feeling, J= Judging

Conclusion

In terms of teaching styles, teachers in Yangon Region were excelled in using expert and delegator teaching styles than those in Tanintharyi Region. Moreover, it can be found that teachers having age of 31-40 were better than teachers having age of 51-above in facilitator teaching styles. But there was no significant difference in teaching styles by service. According to the school such as urban school and rural school, significant difference had been found in facilitator teaching style. Teachers in rural schools were better in facilitator teaching styles than those in urban schools.

In terms of personality types, teachers in Yangon Region were higher in introvert, sensing and feeling personality types than teachers in Tanintharyi Region. It can be found that teachers having age of 51-above were higher in perceiving personality types than teachers having age of 20-30. According to teachers' services, there was significant difference in personality types.

The results showed that extrovert, introvert, intuition and thinking personality types were significant predictors of teachers' expert teaching style and intuition and thinking personality types were significant predictors of formal authority teaching style. Moreover, extrovert, thinking and feeling personality types were significantly related to personal model teaching style. Extrovert, intuition, thinking, feeling and perceiving personality types were significantly related to facilitator teaching style. It can also be seen that delegator teaching style was influenced by feeling and judging personality types.

Acknowledgements

References

Afolabi, A. O. (2011). Personality and gender type as factors in mentor-protégé relationship: A psychologist's insight. In A.A. Olowu (Ed.) *Mentoring: A key concept in human resource Management.* Ife: Ife Centre for Psychological Studies.

Aghaei, A., & Atashpour, H. (2001). Stress and mental health, Isfahan: Paghdar Publications.

Akbari, R., Kiany, G., Imani Naeeni, M., &Karimi Allvar, N. (2008).Teachers' teaching styles, sense of efficacy and reflectivity as correlates of student's' achievement outcomes. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(1), 1-28.

Bennett, N. (1976). *Teaching styles and pupil progress.* Boston: Harvard University Press.

Brown, D. H. (2000).*Principles of language learning & teaching*. (4^{th}ed.). New York: Longman. (pp.49-58).

Brown, D. H. (2001).*Teaching by principles. An interactive approach to language pedagogy.* New York: Longman.

Brown, D. H. (2007).*Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Pearson-Longman.

Callahan, S. G. (1996). *Successful Teaching in Secondary Schools*. Glenview, 111: Scott.

Chan, K. (1996). *Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: the motivation to lead.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Dunn, R.S. & Dunn, K.J. (1979). Learning styles/teaching styles: should they...can they...be matched? *Educational Leadership*, B, 238-244.

Eggen, P., & Kauchak, D. (1996).*Strategies for teachers. Teaching content and thinking skills.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

George, J.M., (1992). *The role of personality in organizational life: Issues and evidence. J Manag.*, 18: 185-213.

Grasha, A.F. (1994). A matter of style: The teacher as expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator. *College Teaching*. 42, 142-149.

Graves, K. (2000). *Designing language courses*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Ivancevich, J. M., & Matteson, M. T. (1984).A Type A–B person–work environment interaction model for examining occupational stress and consequences. *Human Relations*, 37, 491–513.

Jung, C. G. (1921). Psychologische Typen. Zurich: Rascher.

Larenas, C. H. D., Moran, A. V. R. &Ricera, K. J. P. (2011, April).*Comparing teaching styles and personality types of EFL instructors in the public and private sectors*. Bogotá, Colombia. Pages 111-127

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1999).*How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Macaro, E. (2003). *Teaching and learning a second language. A guide to recent research and its applications.* NewYork: Continuum.

Murray, E. (1972). Students' perceptions of self-actualizing and non-self-actualizing teachers.*Journal of Teacher Education*, 23, 383-387.

Polk, J. A. (2006). Traits of effective teachers. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 107(4), p23-29.

Scharle, A., & Szabó, A. (2000).*Learner autonomy. A guide to developing learner responsibility.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spector, P. E., &O_Connell, B. J. (1994).The contribution of personality traits, negative affectivity, locus of control, and Type A to the subsequent reports of job stressors and job strains. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67, 1–11.

Zhang, L. (2008). Teachers' styles of thinking: An exploratory study. The journal of Psychology, 142, 37-55