Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL), Vol. 14, No. 1, March 2011, 1-22

On the Impacts of Gender and Personality Types on Iranian EFL Teachers' Teaching Efficacy and Teaching Activities Preferences

Goudarz Alibakhshi *
Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics, Yasouj University, Yasouj, Iran

Received 4 April 2010; revised 23 September 2010; accepted 10 December 2010

Abstract

Learning styles are assumed to be consistent with personality characteristics of individuals (Brown, 2003; Kolb, 1984). Teachers' teaching efficacy (Bandura, 1997, 1977, 1995; Wheatley, 2001) has also been found to be important in educational reform. However, the impacts of gender and personality on language teachers' teaching efficacy and teaching activities preferences have not been adequately explored. This study was an attempt to investigate the impacts of personality and gender on Iranian English teachers' teaching activities preferences and their teaching efficacy. To accomplish this, 280 male and female English language teachers participated in the study. Myers -Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), teaching efficacy, and teaching activities preference questionnaires were used. To analyze the data, descriptive statistics and Two ANOVA tests were used .The results of the study showed that ESTJ (extroverted, sensing, thinking, and judging) and ISTJ (introverted, sensing, thinking, and judging) were predominant personality types among Iranian EFL teachers. Results also indicated that both male and female teachers with different personality types have the same sense of

* *Email address*: alibakhshi@mail.yu.ac.ir
Corresponding address: Department of English Language and Literature, Yasouj University, Yasouj, Iran

teaching efficacy. It was also revealed that gender and personality influence teachers' teaching activities preferences.

Keywords: Teaching Efficacy; Teaching Styles; Personality Types; Language Teachers; Gender

Introduction

Research into the nature of language learning and teaching has highlighted the role personality factors play in these processes. Recent studies in the field of language learning and teaching, psychology, and psycholinguistics point out that many learning style theories, teaching activities and learning activities are linked to personality (Brown, 2000; Dunn & Griggs, 1998; Hohn, 1995; Ehrman, 1989, 1990). Current studies also indicate that purely cognitive theories cannot lead to successful learning and teaching processes and outcomes unless affective factors are taken into consideration (Ehrman & Oxford, 1989, 1990, 1995). Brown (2003) believes that the systematic study of the role of personality in second language acquisition can lead to a better perception of the language learning process and the development of effective teaching methods. In recent years, although learners' personality types have been investigated in order to find solutions to the perplexing problems in teaching and learning, not many contributions have been made to language teachers' personality types.

Since the late 1970s, researchers have considered teachers' efficacy -teachers' beliefs in their ability to affect students' outcomes – to be an important factor for improving teacher performance and promoting educational reform (Wheatley, 2001). In the broadest sense, "teacher efficacy" which is also called teaching efficacy (Bandura, 1997), refers to teachers' beliefs about their ability to influence students' achievement. Harkin and Turner (1997) believe that teaching is a very complex activity that is affected by, among other things, the subject matter, teachers' personality characteristics, and teachers' beliefs in their ability to affect students' outcomes. Therefore, it follows that there is no absolutely right or wrong method or technique to teach, or that teachers need to vary their approach according to particular circumstances. Different teachers may be obliged to use different teaching styles and strategies in the same circumstances due to the differences in their personality types, teaching styles and beliefs in teachers' abilities in affecting learners' achievement.

Although teaching styles, teachers' efficacy and personality types have been explored separately, very few studies have been carried out to investigate the impacts of personality types on language teachers' teaching efficacy and teaching activities. Moreover, in psychology, researchers have found significant gender-related differences in social behavior, cognitive activity, and general verbal ability (Bacon & Finnemann, 1992). Yet, in the field of second and foreign language acquisition, a comparatively small number of studies have been carried out to investigate the relationship between the variables of gender, teaching efficacy and teaching activities preferences. The main objective of the present paper is to find out whether personality type and gender have any significant impacts on Iranian EFL teachers' teaching style and teaching efficacy. More specifically, the following research questions are addressed in the present study:

1- Does gender and personality type have any significant impacts on Iranian EFL teachers' teaching efficacy?

2- Does gender and personality type have any significant impacts on Iranian EFL teachers' teaching activities preferences?

Literature Review

Teachers' Efficacy

Social cognitive theory was developed by Bandura (1997) to explain that the strength of efficacy beliefs strongly influences the control human beings exercise over their lives through agentive actions. Efficacy is defined as "beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of actions to influence the students' achievements under specific situations" (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). Over the last two decades, researchers interested in individual teacher efficacy have attempted to investigate its correlates and concluded those teachers' perceptions of self-efficacy play very important roles in students' achievements (Goodard & Goodard, 2001; Ross, 1992).

The review of the previous studies (Coladric, 1992; Riggs & Enchos, 1990; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990; Soodak & Podell, 1997) on teachers' self-efficacy indicate that there are two different dimensions to teachers' perceived efficacy: Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) – a teacher's belief that he or she can influence student learning – and Teaching Efficacy- a teacher's belief about the changes that the teaching profession can result in for students. Bandura (1977, 1997) argues that

four sources of information such as enactive mastery experiences, vicarious learning experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological arousal shape the individuals' self-efficacy. In line with Bandura's conceptualization of self efficacy, it has been suggested that teacher efficacy is multidimensional, subject-matter specific, and therefore varies across various tasks (Emmer & Hickman, 1990).

Several empirical studies have been carried out to investigate the impacts of teachers' teaching efficacy on their teaching methods. For example, Gibson and Dembo (1984) argue that there are high efficacious and low efficacious teachers and that they are significantly different. High efficacious teachers use time in a better way, criticize students' wrong responses less often, and are more effective in directing students to get the correct answers through questioning. However, low efficacy teachers spend more time in nonacademic activities and make use of less effective techniques to guide students to correct responses.

Moreover, Coladric (1992) shows that personal teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy are the strongest predictors of commitment to teaching. He suggests that teachers confident in their abilities to affect students' achievement via teaching, and the ones assuming personal responsibility for influencing student achievement are likely to have a higher commitment to teaching.

In line with the above-mentioned findings, Guskey (1988) states that teachers with greater personal efficacy have positive attitudes towards teaching. They also have a fairly high level of confidence in their teaching abilities. In other words, those who like teaching and feel certain about their abilities are highly effective in the classroom and seem to be more receptive to the application of new practices whereas teachers who are assumed to be less effective appear to be the least receptive to innovation.

Personality and Learning Style Models

Learning style (LS) is the way a student begins to focus on, process and retain new and difficult information through different perceptual channels. Styles pertain to the person as an individual and differentiate him/her from someone else. It is generally accepted that LS refers to beliefs, preferences and behaviors used by individuals to assist their learning situations (Brown, 2000; Dunn & Griggs, 1998; Hohn, 1995).

Felder (1998) holds that people have a variety of characteristic strengths in the way they take in and process information. Their learning styles may be somehow affected by their genetic make-up, their previous learning experiences, and the culture and the society they live in. Some may lay more emphasis on facts and data; others may be more comfortable with theories and mathematical models. Some may even prefer to learn actively and interactively while others function introspectively and individually.

Several conceptual and empirical research studies have been carried out to investigate the relationship between learners' learning styles and their personality types. Eysenck (1978) conceptually argued that personality and learning styles are closely linked. On the other hand, Hashway (1998) demonstrated that many style theories are personality-based. Messick (1996) also proposed that styles should be the construct that can be used to build a bridge between cognition and personality in education. Moreover, Sternberg (1994) believed that styles are the interface between intelligence and personality.

Several researchers have empirically investigated the relationships between personality and different style traits such as cognition, learning and thinking. For example, Shadbolt (1978) found that students who were high on Neuroticism performed better with structured teaching methods than they did with unstructured teaching methods.

Learning style theory began with Carl Jung in the second decade of the 20th century. He conceptualized human difference as *perception* (how we absorb information) and *judgment* (how we process the absorbed information). In his theory of psychological types, Jung developed a holistic framework for describing differences in human adaptive processes. He made a distinction between those oriented toward the external and internal world (Kolb, 1984). The main assumption of Jung's theory is that human beings constantly choose between the open act of perceiving, through sensing and intuition, and the closed act of judging, through thinking and feeling, (Mamchur, 1996; Silver et al., 2000). In his view, human individuality develops through transactions with the social environment that reward and develop one function over another.

Jung claims that information is perceived either concretely through sensing or abstractly through intuition. Then, information is judged either through the logic of

thinking or the subjectivity of feeling. There are four Jungian functions-*sensing, intuitions; feelings* and *thinking* that exist in every individual.

In line with this theory, Myers and Briggs (1975) created the Myers- Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and applied Jung's work and influenced a generation of researchers trying to understand differences in human beings. The instrument is a widely used psychological self-report questionnaire used to assess people's orientation toward the Jungian types. There are four personality dimensions and 16 distinct personality types measured by MBTI, with applications in educational, career, and family counseling settings. It identifies the preferred way an individual perceives (gathers data) and judges (makes decisions). Briefly speaking, the MBTI indicates a person's psychological preference for consistence and enduring patterns of how the world is viewed, information is collected and interpreted, how decisions are made, and how individuals live out lifestyle choices (Martin, 1997). Four separate scales exist. Each is continuous in nature and indicates a person's preference for a particular index. The four scales are: Extroversion versus Introversion, Sensing versus Intuition, Thinking versus Feeling, and Judging versus Perceiving.

Extroverted individuals obtain information through trends toward the external world of people, things, or events. They love meeting new people, thinking aloud, and being active. Introversion types seek the introspection of ideas, thoughts, and concepts. They prefer to process their thoughts internally before speaking, have finite close friends, and often like naturally deep conversations (Rushton, Morgan, & Richard, 2007).

Sensing (S) and Intuition (N) deal with individuals' preferences in how they receive and perceive information or data from the external world. Sensing types are more aware of their senses regarding their environment, are often factually based, focus on practical concrete problems, and generally believe that if something works, it is best left alone. Individuals who have a tendency to understand the world through an Intuitive process prefer to live in a world of possibilities and options, often looking toward the future. They also tend to focus on complicated abstract problems, seeing the big picture, sometimes at the expense of the details (Hirsh & Kummerow, 1997).

Thinking (T) and Feeling (F) are considered the 'rational processes' by which we come to certain conclusions and judgments regarding the information collected. Thinking types (T) prefer to focus on making decisions based on an impersonal objective position. Feeling types (F) have a tendency to respond well and easily to people's values and are adept at assessing the human impact of decisions.

Judging (J) and Perceiving (P) relate to how we 'live our outward life'. Judging types prefer to live a structured, organized life. They also tend to be self-disciplined, enjoy making decisions, and thrive on order. Perceiving types prefer to live a lifestyle that is more flexible and adaptable. They tend to thrive on spontaneity, prefer to leave things open, require more information in order to make decisions, and often get things done at the last minute (Sprague, 1997).

Sixteen possible combinations of letters are possible from the four dichotomous pairs. Each 'type' (e.g. ENTJ or ISFP) represents a dynamic interaction with individual preferences for those related traits. Martin (1997, p. 7) states that, ''the four preferences interact in dynamic and complex ways that can tell you much about who you are and how you approach the world''. Fairhurst and Fairhurst (1995) suggest that knowing one's temperament and personality is important for teachers so they can recognize the differences between their personality types and their students' learning styles.

Lawrence (1979) recorded the individual types of 5366 American teachers. He reported that the most frequently 'preferred typology' was the Extroverted-Sensing-Feeling-Judging ESFJ) teacher. Similarly, Macdaid, McCaulley, and Kainz (1986) reported that of 804 American teachers in their study, 49.50% had a combined preference for Sensing and Judgment. The second most favored combination was sensing and Feeling (40.80%). The largest percentage of the 16 types was the ISFJ profile (17.91%).

More recently, Sears et al. (1997) examined the typologies of 1281 pre-service teachers in the USA to determine if particular characteristics were associated with effective teaching. They observed a difference between the elementary pre-service students and their secondary counterparts. Students inclined toward the elementary level were more often Sensing, Feeling, and Judgment (–SFJ) profiles with no particular favoritism on the E–I scale. They describe the SFJ personality type as one who seeks order and would not likely lead either the reform movements or lead

in the educational arena as they are not particularly "comfortable with the disorder, ambiguity, and confusion that inevitably accompanies change" (p. 6). Conversely, they indicated that the opposite personality types, the –NTJ (Intuitive, Thinking, and Judging), were more attracted to secondary teaching and would be more likely to seek out change and leadership roles. They further note that the –NTJ teacher is "more oriented to the theoretical, disposed to investigate possibilities and relationships, and drawn to complexity, innovation, and change. Their intuitive and thinking nature [sic] inspires them to seek solutions to complex problems" (p. 6).

Gender and Language Teaching and Learning

In psychology, researchers who have long been interested in the relationship of gender with behavior and cognition, have found significant gender-related differences in social behavior, cognitive activity, and general verbal ability (Bacon & Finnemann, 1992). Yet, in the field of second and foreign language acquisition, a comparatively small number of studies report findings in relation to these variables.

Siebert (2003, as cited in Bernat & Lloyd, 2007), reported that male students were more likely than female students to rate their abilities highly. For example, male students were twice as likely to agree that people from their country were good at learning foreign languages. Similarly, male students were more likely to respond that they have a special ability for learning languages (25%), but only 10% of females agreed and no females strongly agreed. Male and female students also significantly differed in their assessment of how long it takes to learn a foreign language and in their assessments of beliefs related to ability.

Bacon and Finnemann (1992) investigated gender differences in self-reported beliefs about foreign language learning and authentic oral and written input. They found that female students, compared to male students, reported a higher level of motivation and strategy use in language learning, greater use of global strategies in dealing with authentic input, and a higher level of social interaction with the target language (Spanish). Tercanlioglu (2005), on the other hand, found no significant differences in beliefs about language learning of male and female full-time undergraduate EFL teacher trainees at a large Turkish university. She concluded that it is possible that age, stage of life and contextual differences in the language-

learning situation may also be important sources of group variation in learner beliefs.

Statham, Richardson, and Cook (1991) found that gender differences persisted even after controlling for course level, class size, professor's rank, and the gender ratio of the faculty in a given department. Women professors spend significantly greater proportion of time encouraging and allowing student participation than men professors.

Lacey, Saleh and Gorman (1998) found that the styles of male and female faculty members differed, especially with how much each of the genders valued student inclusion. Whereas female faculty members believed that students should be allowed to define the learning experience for themselves and discern their own style, male faculty believed they are the holder of the information and know what it is best for students.

Moreover, studies which have examined the relationship between gender and strategy use have come to mixed conclusions. Ehrman and Oxford (1989) and Oxford and Nyikos (1989) discovered distinct gender differences in strategy use. The study by Green and Oxford (1995) came to the same conclusion. Ehrman and Oxford's (1990) study, however, failed to discover any evidence of differing language learning strategy use between the sexes. It might be concluded, perhaps, that although men and women do not always demonstrate differences in language learning strategy use, where differences are found, women tend to use different language learning strategies than men.

Method

Participants

Participants in this study were 350 English language teachers teaching in Yasuj, Shiraz, Tehran, Lorestan, Bushehr, and Khuzestan (180 males, 170 females). The participants from Shiraz, Lorestan, Yasuj , and Khuzestan were selected while they were taking in-service training courses in their own cities whereas the participants from Tehran were randomly selected by a group of colleagues from different high schools in Karaj, Shahriyar, Damavand , and the other parts of Tehran. 70 out of the sample either partially answered the questionnaires or left them unanswered.

These questionnaires were excluded. Therefore, only 280 teachers (140 males, 140 females) were involved in the study. All the participants had at least five years experience in teaching English at high schools in the aforementioned provinces. 240 of the participants had Bachelor of Arts in TEFL and the rest had Master of Arts in TEFL. They were all aware of the purpose of the study and were allowed to withdraw from the study whenever they liked.

Instruments

Three different questionnaires dealing with the participants' personality types, teaching activities preferences, and teaching efficacy were used in this study. The first instrument was the translated version of Myers- Briggs personality validated by Iranian Corporation of Dynamic Tests (2006). It consists of 60 two-choice items. The participants' responses to the items indicate their personality types. The internal consistency of the participants' scores on this instrument was calculated via Cronbach alpha. The reliability was 0.88. The second instrument was teaching activities preference questionnaire including 20 five-scale items developed by Akbari, Mirhassani, and Bahri (2005), and the third was a teaching efficacy questionnaire including 34 items measuring the participants' teaching efficacy constructed and validated by Akbari and Abedniya (2006). The internal consistency of the participants' scores on teaching activities preferences and teachers' efficacy questionnaires were 0.85, and 0.83, respectively.

Procedure

This study was carried out in different phases. At first, the instruments were sent to the participants through either e-mails or postal services. They were returned within two months. When the instruments were received, they were all coded, scored, and entered into SPSS. Then, depending on research questions, appropriate statistical procedures were selected. At first, descriptive statistics (frequency and percentage) was used to analyze question dealt with personality types of Iranian English language teachers. Then, as the main questions of the study investigated the impacts of gender and personality on teachers' teaching efficacy, two different two-way ANOVA tests were used to analyze the related data. Because 14 types of personality were only possessed by about 30 % of the participants and 70% had the personality types of ISTJ and ESTJ, the number of personality types was decreased from sixteen to three. To put it simply, except for ESTJ and ISTJ, all other

personality types were viewed as one personality type known as "the other personality types"; therefore, there were three groups for each gender (totally six groups).

Results

The results of the study include: personality types of Iranian English language teachers, the impacts of gender and personality on teachers' teaching efficacy and their teaching activities preferences. The results of the personality types of Iranian language teachers are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Iranian language teachers' personality types

Personality type	Frequency	Personality types of teachers		
		Males(n=140)	Females(n=140)	Average
ESTJ	43.21%	E= 57%	E=60.7 %	58.85 %
ISTJ	29.28%	I= 43%	I=39.3 %	41.15%
ESTP	3.57%	S= (90 %	S= (84%	87%
ISTP	2.5%	N=10%	N= 16%	13%
ENTP	.71%	T=87 %	T=83%	85%
INTP	.35%	F=13 %	F=13%	15%
ENTJ	3.21%	J= 86 %	J=91%	88.5%
INTJ	2.14%	P= 14 %	P= 9 %	11.5 %
ENFP	2.5%			
INFP	.71%			
ESFP	.71%			
ISFP	1.07%			
ESFJ	3.21%			
ISFJ	1.8%			
ENFJ	1.8%			
INFJ	(7) 2.5%			

Key: (E= extroverted, I= introverted, S= sensing, I= intuitive, T= thinking, f= feeling, J= judging, and P= perceiving)

As shown in Table 1, in terms of the number of instances of each type dimension (E vs. I, S vs. N, F vs. T, and J vs. P), the results of the study indicate

that Js represented 86% of the occurrences in males and 91% in females, followed by Ts = 87 % in males and 83% in females, Ss= 90 % in males and 84% in females, and Es = 57 % of the occurrences in males and 60.7 % in females.

In terms of Iranian language teachers' personality types, based on Mayers and Briggs classification, as the descriptive statistics indicate, teachers' personality types are not normally distributed. That is, all personality types mentioned by Mayers and Briggs are not equally possessed by Iranian English language teachers. Totally, personality type of 43.21 % of the participants was ESTJ and personality type of 29.28% of the participants was ISTJ while the other personality types had 27% representatives. To put it in another way, the most frequently possessed personality types were ESTJ and ISTJ.

In order to compare the impacts of personality and gender on teachers' teaching efficacy a two-way ANOVA was computed. The results are shown in table 2.

Table 2
A two-way ANOVA for impacts of personality and gender on teaching efficacy

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	27.911	5	5.582	.036	.999
Intercept	4198333	1	4198333	2.69	.000
Personality	.000	1	.000	.000	1
Gender	27	2	13.956	.089	.91
personality * gender	.000	2	.000	.000	1
Error	27156	174	156.070		
Total	4225518	180			
Corrected Total	27184	179			

As shown in table 2, there is no significant difference between teachers with different personality types in terms of their teaching efficacy (F=.000, Sig. = 1). That is, teachers with ESTJ, ISTJ, and other personality types have the same sense of teaching efficacy. The results also indicate that the difference between male and female teachers' teaching scores is not significant (F= .089, Sig. = .915). Therefore, it could be said that personality and gender of Iranian English language teachers do

not influence their beliefs about their abilities in teaching. Another objective of the study was to investigate the impacts of gender and personality types on Iranian language teachers' teaching activities. To do so, a. two-way ANOVA test was run. The results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3
A two-way ANOVA for impacts of personality and gender on teaching activities

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	162697.	5	32539	149	.000
Intercept	2208465	1	2208465	1	.000
Personality	110112	1	110112	504	.000
Gender	24942	2	12471.	57	.000
personality * gender	27642	2	13821	63	.000
Error	37957	174	218		
Total	2409120	180			
Corrected Total	200654	179			

The results of the study indicate that personality has significant impacts on teachers' teaching activities preferences (F= 504.769, Sig. = .000). The results also indicate that gender has significant influence on teaching activities (F= 57.169, Sig. = .000). In order to locate the sources of differences, a Post Hoc test (Tukey) was run. The results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4
Multiple comparisons (Tukey HSD) for locating the sources of differences

		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
ESTJ males	ISTJ males	-.00	1.78	1
	Other personality types of Males	-6.99	2.04	.01
	ESTJ females	-1.85	1.81	.91
	ISTJ females	-1.24	1.93	.98
	Other personality types of females	3.16	2.11	.67
ISTJ males	Other personality types of males	-6.98	1.91	.04*
	ESTJ females	-1.84	1.66	03*
	ISTJ females	-1.23	1.78	.01
	Other personality types of females	3.16	1.98	. 03*
Other personality types of males	ESTJ females	5.13	1.93	.08
	ISTJ females	5.75	2.04	.04*
	Other personality types of females	10	2.22	.00*
ESTJ females	ISTJ females	.61	1.81	.99
	Other types Female	5	2.01	.13
ISTJ females	Other types Female	4	2.11	.30

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Multiple comparisons between different groups of participants (as shown in Table 4) indicate that there is a significant difference between ISTJ males and ISTJ females (Sig. = 01), ISTJ males and ESTJ females (sig. =.04), ISTJ females and females of the other personality types (ISTP, ESTP, etc.). The results also indicate that there is a significant difference between ESTJ and ISTJ male teachers'

teaching activities and teaching activities of male teachers with the other personality types except for ESTJ males. However, there is no significant difference between ESTJ males and ESTJ females.

Discussion

The main objective of the study was to investigate the impacts of personality and gender on Iranian EFL teachers' teaching efficacy and teaching activities. The results of the study indicated that all of the personality types were not equally represented. ESTJ (43.21 %) followed by ISTJ (29.28%) were the most frequent and the other personality types were not represented frequently. (The other 14 personality types were possessed by only 27 percent of the participants). In analyzing the Extroversion-Introversion (EI) dimension, (56%) were E and (44%) were I. On the Sensing-Intuition (SN) dimension, (87%) were S and (13%) were N Analyzing the Thinking-Feeling (TF) dimension, (85) were T and (15%) were F. On the final dimension, Judgment-Perception (JP), (88.9%) were J and (11.1%) were P.

Macdaid, McCaulley, and Kainz (1986) and Lawrence (1979) reported that the most frequently 'preferred typology' was the Extroverted-Sensing-Feeling-Judging ESFJ); they also reported that 49.50% had a combined preference for Sensing and Judgment. The second most favored combination was Sensing and Feeling (40.80%). It could be discussed that Iranian language teachers, in comparison with American teachers, had the highest preference for Sensing and Judging and the least preference for the combination of Sensing and Feeling. It could also be argued that those who have preference for Judging have also preference for sensing whereas American teachers have also preference for Sensing and Feeling. The other combinations are rarely possessed by Iranian teachers.

Two MBTI personality types – ESTJ and ISTJ accounted for 73% of all language professionals included in this study. Individuals with an ESTJ or ISTJ psychological type are often described as being practical and realistic. These individuals tend to solve problems in a more concrete fashion, relying on past experiences. These individuals also prefer organization and structure. This profile described industrial arts educators a significantly greater portion of the time. This finding supports past studies that examined psychological type for students and

educators who maintain an industrial arts orientation (Edmunds & Schultz, 1989; Rojewski & Holder, 1990).

The high proportion of Js among the EFL teachers in Iran points out that English language teachers in our country highly emphasize organization and planning in advance. Also, the high proportion of Ts indicates that EFL teachers in Iran are usually objective and lay more emphasis on logic in their preferences. The high percentage of S types in the sample indicates that the participants of the study give priority to the five senses. It is also interesting that Extroversion and Introversion (E= 58 % and I= 42%) are equally distributed among the participants.

The results of inferential statistics (two-way ANOVA) also indicate that there is no significant difference between male and female EFL teachers' teaching efficacy. Also, the results indicate that personality trait does not significantly influence teaching efficacy of EFL teachers. Moreover, no significant interaction between personality traits and gender of the participants was observed. That is, the participants of the study, regardless of their gender and personality traits, have the same sense of teaching efficacy. As the mean score of participants on teaching efficacy is very high (mean is 135, minimum score = 34, and maximum score = 170), it could be said that Iranian TEF teachers are efficacious. In line with Bandura (1993, 1995, 1977, 2001), it could be strongly argued that Iranian EFL teachers' sense of efficacy could contribute to Iranian learners' achievements.

Ghaith and Shaaban (1999) also believe that highly efficacious teachers are highly motivated and can manage their teaching carrier more effectively. They can also cope with classrooms with different learning and teaching conditions. Therefore, Iranian language teachers could also benefit from their sense of efficacy and motivate Iranian language learners and make the process of learning and teaching more effective.

Moreover, in line with Chacon (2005), teachers' beliefs in their instructional efficacy influence the kind of learning environment they create to orchestrate learning. Teachers with a high sense of teaching efficacy believe that difficult students can be teachable if the teacher puts extra effort. Therefore, it can be argued that in teacher education programs, in addition to raising the teachers' awareness of their abilities, they should be taught how to motivate learners, how to

manage classrooms, and what types of strategies they should apply so that their teaching would be more effective.

In terms of the relationship between teachers' teaching efficacy and teaching activities they prefer while teaching, it can be argued that there is a significant correlation between these two variables. That is, the higher the teachers' scores on teaching efficacy are, the higher their scores on teaching activities preference are. That is, efficacious teachers let students set their own standards for their work, give students opportunities to be inventive and original, make sure that their lessons are logically organized, try to be fair and to establish personal rapport with their students, think people are more important than things or ideas, like assignments to be clear and definite and also like assignments which allow students to work on their own initiative in completing their assignments.

As Gencer and Cakiroglu (2005) argue, it is generally believed that teachers' attitudes and beliefs toward classroom management have been linked to their classroom management orientations. Accordingly, it can be asserted that teachers' approaches toward managing the classroom and teaching activities in the classrooms would vary as a function of their beliefs regarding the nature of appropriate and inappropriate behaviors and how to control them of course! The significant correlation between teaching activities and teachers' efficacy of the participants' points out that efficacious teachers would prefer those activities which lead to effective learning.

Concerning the comparison between male and female language teachers' teaching activities, as the results in Table 4 indicate, there is a significant difference between males and females' teaching activities preferences. Therefore, in line with Harkin and Turner (1997), it can be argued that women, compared with men, are seen to give students more control over their learning, are less lenient in accepting poor quality work, are more confident in their work and more satisfied with their students. In effect, women are seen as less controlling than men.

The results, on the other hand, indicate that gender differences in teaching activities do not exist across all the personality types. The results of multiple comparisons between male and female teachers indicate that ISTJ females are significantly different from ISTJ and ESTJ males. That is, ISTJ females give more score to their teaching activities preferences than males of ISTJ and ESTJ traits

whereas there is no significant difference between ESTJ females and ESTJ males. The results also indicate that females of ISTJ characteristics are not significantly different from ESTJ while there is a significant difference between ISTJ females and females of the other personality characteristics such as ESTP, ISTP, ENTP, INTP, etc.

Conclusion

This study was an attempt to investigate the impacts of their personality and gender on Iranian EFL teachers' teaching activities preferences, and r teaching efficacy. Based on the results of the study, it could be concluded that Iranian language teachers do not have the same personality types. ESTJ and ISTJ personality types were dominant among Iranian language teachers. Whether male and female teachers have different personality types or not needs further investigation.

It could also be concluded that personality and gender do not influence Iranian EFL teachers' teaching efficacy, and that both male and female teachers have the same sense of teaching efficacy. Therefore, teaching efficacy is not a personality-related variable. The impacts of the other variables such as age, degree, and teaching experience, as well as socioeconomic status of teachers on teaching efficacy were not studied in this study, and thus need further research.

Moreover, viewing the results for the last two questions, it could be argued those EFL teachers' teaching activities preferences could be influenced by the variables of gender and personality. Teachers with different personality types may prefer some teaching activities which may not appeal to the other teachers and learners. Therefore, it could be implied that teachers should not expose the students to their own favorite activities. Critically speaking, a mismatch between teachers' teaching activities and learners' favorite learning styles may lead to failure in learning and teaching process. The interaction between teaching activities and teaching styles was not investigated in this study and could be a topic for further studies.

References

Abdeniya, A., & Akbari, R. (2007). *Developing an inventory for assessing Iranian language teachers' teaching efficacy (*Master's thesis). Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

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), 1-23.

Bacon, S. M. C., & Finnemann, M. D**.** (1992), Sex differences in self-reported beliefs about language learning and authentic oral and written input. *Language Learning, 42*(4), 471-495.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, *84*(2), 191–215.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, *28*(2), 117–148.

Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in Changing Societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control. Freeman*. New York: Freeman.

Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: an agentic perspective. *Annual Review Psychology*, *52*(1), 1–26.

Bernat, E., & Lloyd, R. (2007). Exploring the gender effects on EFL learners' beliefs about language learning. *Australian Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*, *7*(1), 79-91.

Bernat, E., & Rosemarie, L. (2007). Exploring the Gender Effect on EFL Learners' Beliefs about Language Learning. *Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology*, *7*(1), 79-91.

Brightman, H. J. (1998). GSU Master Teacher Program: On Learning Styles. Retrieved from *http://www.gsu.edu/~dschjb/wwwmbti*

Brown, H. D. (2003). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: A Pearson Education Company.

Chacon, C.T. (2005). Teachers' perceived efficacy among English as a foreign language teachers in middle schools in Venezula. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*, 257–272.

Coladric, T. (1992). Teachers' sense of efficacy and commitment to teaching. *Journal of Experimental Education*, *16*(3), 323-337.

Cooper, T. C. (2001). Foreign language teaching style and personality. *Foreign Language Annals*, *34*(4), 301-312.

Dembo, M., & Gibson, S. (1985). Teachers' sense of efficacy: An important factor in school achievement. *The Elementary School Journal*, *86*(2), 173-184.

Edmunds, N., & Schultz, A. H. (1989). Personality type and temperament in industrial education students: A descriptive study. *Journal of Studies in Technical Careers*, *11*(2), 183-201.

Emmer, E., & Hickman, J. (1991). Teacher efficacy in classroom management. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *51*(4), 755–765.

Eysneck, H. J. (1978).The development of personality and its relations to learning. In V. Sarris & S. Parducci (Eds.), *Perspectives in psychological examinations: Towards the year 2000* (pp.179-195). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Fairhurst, A. M., & Fairhurst, L. L. (1995). *Effective teaching effective learning: Making the personality connection in your classroom* (1st ed). Palo Alto, CA: Davis-Black.

Felder, R. (1998). Matters of Style. *ASEE Prism*, *6*(4), 18-23.

Felder, R., & Henriques, E. R. (1995). Learning and Teaching Styles in Foreign and Second Language Education. *Foreign Language Annals*, *28*(1), 21-31.

Gencer, A. S., & Cakiroglu, J. (2005). Turkish pre-service science teachers' efficacy beliefs about classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(5), 664–675.

Ghaith, G., & Shaaban, K. (1998). The relationship between perceptions of teaching concerns, teacher efficacy, and selected teacher characteristics. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 15*(5), 487-496.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*(4), 569–582.

Goodard, R. D., & Goodard, Y. L. (2001). A multilevel analysis relationship between teacher and collective efficacy in urban schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *17*(7), 807-818.

Green, J., & Oxford, R. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 Proficiency and Gender. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*(2), 261-297.

Guskey, T. R. (1981). Measurement of responsibility teachers assume for academic successes and failures in the classroom. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *32*(1), 44-56.

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.

Hirsh, S., & Kummerow, J. (1997*). Life types: Understanding yourself and make the most of who you are*. New York: Warner Books.

Hohn, R. L. (1995). *Classroom learning and teaching*. The USA: Longman Publishers.

Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. H. (1990). Socialization of student teachers. *American Educational Research Journal, 27*(2), 279–300.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Lacey, C. H., Saleh, A., & Gorman, R. (1998, October). *Teaching nine to five: A study of the teaching styles of male and female professors*. Paper presented at the Annual Women in Education Conference, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Lawrence, G. (1979*). Peoples types and tiger stripes: A practical guide to learning styles*. Gainesville, FL: Center for Applications of Psychological Type.

Macdaid, G. P., McCaulley, M. H., & Kainz, R. I. (1986). *Myers- Briggs type indicator atlas of type tables*. Gainesville, FL: Center for Applications of Psychological Type.

Madeline, E., & Oxford, R. (1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. *The Modern Language Journal, 73*(1), 1-13

Madeline, E., & Oxford, R. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *The Modern Language Journal, 74*(3), 311-327.

Mamchur, C. (1996). *Cognitive Type Theory and Learning Style*. The USA: Carolyn Marie.

Martin, C. (1997). *Looking at type: The fundamentals*. Gainesville, FL: Center for Applications of Psychological Type.

Messick, S. (1996). Bridging cognition and personality in education: The role of style in performance and development. *European Journal of Personality, 10*(5), 353-376.

Myers, I. B., & Briggs, K. (1975). *The Myers-Briggs type indicator* (Form G). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Oxford, R., & Martha, N. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students, *The Modern Language Journal, 73*(3), 291-300.

Riggs, I., & Enchos, L. (1990). Toward the development of an elementary teachers' science teaching efficacy belief instrument. *Science Education, 74*(4), 625–638.

Rojewski, J. W., & Holder, B. H. (1990). Personality type profiles of students in vocational education teacher preparation programs. *Journal of Vocational Education Research*, *15*(1), 77-91.

Ross, J. A. (1992). Teacher efficacy and the effects of coaching on student achievement. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *17*(1), 51-65.

Rushton, S., Morgan, J., & Richard, M. (2007). Teacher's Myers Briggs personality profiles: Identifying effective teacher personality traits. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *23*(3), 432–441

Schroeder, C. C. (1993). *New* students--new learning styles. Retrieved from *http://www.virtualschool.edu/mon/Academia/KierseyLearningStyles.html*

Sears, S., Kennedy, J., Kaye, J., & Gail, L. (1997). Myers-Briggs personality profiles of prospective educators. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *90*(2), 195–202.

Shadbolt, R. D. (1978). Interactive relationships between measured personality and teaching strategy variables. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *48*(2), 227-232.

Silver, H. F., Strong, R. W., & Perini, M. J. (2000). *So Each May Learn: Integrating Learning Styles and Multiple Intelligences*. The USA: Silvester Strong and Associates, Inc.

Soodak, L. C., & Podell, P. M. (1996). Teacher efficacy: Toward the understanding of a multi-faceted construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *12*(3), 401–411.

Sprague, M. M. (1997). Personality type matching and student teacher evaluation. *Contemporary Education*, *69*(1), 54–57.

Statham, A., Richardson, L., & Cook, J. A. (1991).*Gender and university teaching: A negotiated difference*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sternberg, R. J. (1988).Mental self -government: a theory of intellectual styles and their development. *Human Development*, *31*(1), 197-224.

Tercanlioglu, L. (2005). Pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about foreign language learning and how they relate to gender. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology, 5-3*(1), 145-162.

Wheatley, K. F. (2001). The potential benefits of teacher efficacy doubts for educational reform. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *18*, 5-22.