



To Probe the Predictability Power of Iranian EFL Teachers' Personality Type and Teaching Style for their Interaction Approach

Pantea Pahlavani

Assistant Professor, Department of English, Qazvin Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qazvin, Iran

ABSTRACT

It is undeniable that teachers have a vital role in the future success of their learners. So, teacher education issues, as well as teacher-related factors have received much attention in recent years in education generally, and in second language teaching especially. The main purpose of the present research was to probe the predictability of Iranian EFL teachers' personality type and teaching style with their interaction approach. To this end, 120 EFL teachers were selected from different language institutes. The participants were asked to complete three standardized questionnaires including "Teacher-Student Interaction (QTI)", the "Teaching Style Inventory (TSI)" and the "The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)". After collecting the required data, it was analyzed utilizing correlation coefficient statistical procedure as well as multiple regression analysis. The results showed a positive and significant relationship between teachers' personality and teaching style with their sense of classroom interaction. Also, facilitator teaching style among different teaching styles with two types of personality traits, i.e., thinking and extroversion, were found to be significant predictors of Iranian EFL teachers' interaction approaches. Moreover, by comparing the standardized Beta coefficients related to these three significant predictors, it was revealed thinking personality type was the most significant predictor, whereas the extroversion personality type enjoyed the least significant ones. The findings of the present study would have implications in second language teacher education and teacher training.

Keywords: EFL teachers, Classroom interaction approach, Teaching style, Personality type

1. Introduction

Teachers are the core element in all educational systems and consequently they play an important role in the success of their learners. Thus, doing research on teachers is necessary and important for having a successful society (Kulshrestha, & Singhal, 2017). The effectiveness of teachers can improve education more than any other single factor (Wright, Hom, & Sanders, 1997). As George and Visvam (2013) maintain teachers mainly guide and educate students, and many researchers have examined the factors which affect teachers and as a consequence the teaching process. These teacher-related factors could be teacher' personality (Behnam & Bayazidi, 2013; Keshavarzi & Amiri, 2016), attitudes and belief (Xu, 2012; Marashi & Azizi, 2018), behaviors (Bell, 2005), and so on. By the advent of humanistic psychology and considering the learners as active participants in every educational setting, the issue of interaction as the exchange of information between the teacher and the students or among the students has recently attracted a great deal of interest by researchers (Gibbson, 2003; Abarca, 2004; Adaba, 2017). Moreover, the issue of teachers' personality types seems to have a great impact on teacher's behavior inside or outside of the classroom. On the other hand, for many learners, teacher's style of teaching would be an influential factor in understanding the course subject. Despite the rich findings from previous researches; however, little effort has been devoted to studying L2 teachers' interactional behavior in conjunction with their teaching styles and their personality type. This study had the propensity to fill the gap in literature. In fact, the aims of this study were to investigate the relationship between EFL teachers' interaction and their teaching style and personality type in one hand, and find out any possible difference in predictability of teachers' personality type and styles with their interaction

1.1 Classroom Interaction (CI)

Interaction or human interaction is defined as "a process whereby two or more people engaged in reciprocal actions. This action may be verbal or nonverbal" (Abarca, 2004, p.2). Also, Brown (2001) considers interaction "as the heart communication; it is what communication is all about" (p.165). It happens as long as people are communicating each other and giving action and receiving the reaction in one another anywhere and anytime, including in the classroom setting. As, interaction in the classroom is an essential part of teaching learning process (Hanum, 2017), classroom Interaction (CI) is a means to enhance language skills development. In addition, Hall and Walsh (2002) state, CI plays an especially significant role as it is not only "the medium through which learning is realized and an object of pedagogical attention" (p. 186). Moreover, Hall and Verplaetse (2002) claim that "it is in their interactions with each other those teachers and students work together to create the intellectual and practical activities that shape both the form and the content of the target language, as well as the processes and outcomes of individual development" (p.10).

Accordingly, CI is one of the practices by which learning is accomplished in educational environment. Through their interactions with each other, teachers and students construct a common body of knowledge (Hawkins, 1994). There is "evidence of renewed interest in the nature of classroom talk and signs

of willingness to reassess the pedagogic value of interaction patterns between students and teachers in the language classroom” (Navab & Rezavani, 2017, p.82). Such interaction is defined as a process whereby two or more people are involved in a two-way mutual action (Celce-Murcia, 1987). So, this device could help learners be “competent enough to think critically and share their views among their peers” (Adaba, 2017, p.2). He continues to mention, this interaction which is defined as “the students’ participation requires a high degree of interpersonal communication skills” and “refers to the exchange of information between the teacher and the students or among the students” (p.2).

1.1.1 The role of teacher in classroom interaction

In a traditional classroom the teacher had the dominant role of an all-knowing leader who ‘filled’ students’ empty heads with knowledge. This role has changed and the teacher has now got many roles depending on different classroom situations. In a broad sense, he is a facilitator of learning, which includes the following (Littlewood, 1981):

- A general overseer of learning, who coordinates the activities so that they form a coherent progression from lesser to greater communicative ability;
- A classroom manager, who is responsible for grouping activities into lessons and for their overall organization;
- A language instructor, who presents new language, controls, evaluates and corrects learners’ performance;
- In free communicative activities he will act as a consultant or adviser, helping where necessary. He may move around the classroom and monitor student’s progress, strengths and weaknesses;
- Sometimes he will participate in an activity as a ‘co-communicator’ with the learners. He may encourage learners without taking their main role (p.92).

These roles are frequently interrelated and some other roles such as assessor and observer could be added as well (Harmer, 2001). The roles of a consultant or co-communicator encourage classroom interaction most, but they need the support of other roles for organizing and controlling activities. In other words, roles and responsibilities of teachers during classroom interaction could be considered as controller, assessor, observer, corrector, organizer, prompter, and resource (Adaba, 2017).

1.2 Teaching Style (TS)

According to Grasha (1996), teaching style is viewed as a particular pattern of needs, beliefs, and behaviors 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” (p. 3). It can also be defined as “the expression of the totality of one’s philosophy, beliefs, values, and behaviors” (Jarvis, 2004, p.40). Sternberg (1997) describes style is the reflection of our preferred ways of using the abilities we have.

When it comes to TS, different educators define this term differently. TS for Weimer (2009) is the collection of a teacher’s utilized behaviors to convey one of those fundamental aspects of teaching like organization, clarity, or enthusiasm. Also, to Conti and Welborn (1996), TS refers to a “teacher’s pervasive qualities that persist even though situational conditions may change” (p.21). In other words, Brookfield (1990) mentions, TS can be the expression of how teachers gain a better understanding the best implementation of their teaching vision while considering the contextual aspects of teaching.

Regardless of the content that is being taught, TS is linked with various acquirable and identifiable sets of consistent classroom behaviors by the teacher (Conti & Welborn, 1996). As many L2 scholars believe TS is an influential factor in learners’ experience of knowledge formation and academic achievement (Knowles, 1980; Churcher, 2016), there is a necessity for further studies on this teacher related issue.

Grasha (1996) identifies five teaching styles in his teaching style models. The five styles are “expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator” (p. 154). Although it may seem appropriate to place teachers into one of the five categories of TS, Grasha (1996) emphasizes that everyone who teaches possesses each of the five teaching styles to varying degrees. Based on what he considers as teaching style, expert teaching style possesses knowledge and expertise that students need and strives to maintain status as an expert among students by displaying detailed knowledge and by challenging students to enhance their competence. S/he is concerned with transmitting information and insuring that students are well prepared. Secondly, formal authority possesses status among students, concerned with providing positive and negative feedback, establishing learning goals, expectations, and rules of conduct for students. Concerned with the correct, acceptable, and standard ways to do things and with providing students with the structure they need to learn.

Next, personal model believes in “teaching by personal example” and establishes a prototype for how to think and behave. Oversees, guides, and directs by showing how to do things, and encouraging students to observe and then to emulate the instructor’s approach.

The fourth teaching style, i.e. Facilitator, emphasizes the personal nature of teacher-student interactions. Guides and directs students by asking questions, exploring options, suggesting alternatives, and encouraging them to develop criteria to make informed choices. Overall goal is to develop in students the capacity for independent action, initiative, and responsibility. She works with students on projects in a consultative fashion and tries to provide as much support and encouragement as possible. At last, Delegator is concerned with developing students’ capacity to function in an autonomous fashion. Students work independently on projects or as part of autonomous teams. The teacher is available at the request of students as a resource person.

1.3 Teacher personality type

For many years, there was a question why individuals have a different approach to the same subject (Behanm & Bayazidi, 2013) and many scholars believe this is because of personality issue. Williams and Burden (1999) define personality as an individual's characteristic patterns of thought, emotion and behavior, together with the psychological mechanisms behind those patterns. Also, personality is perceived as a “dynamic organization, inside the person, of psychophysical systems that create a person’s characteristic patterns of behavior, thoughts, and feelings” (Scharle & Szabó, 2000, p. 7). Accordingly, different typologies of personality characteristics have been provided by many scholars like Jung in 1921 and Myers and Briggs in 1975. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (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 in MBTI as continuous in nature and indicate a person’s preference for a particular index. They are as follows:

Extraversion (E) and Introversion (I) - Extraverted individuals obtain information through an orientation toward the outer world of people, events, or things. They enjoy 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 few close friends, and often seek conversations that tend to be deeper in nature.

Sensing (S) and Intuition (N) – Sensing relates to individuals’ preferences in how they receive and make sense of information or data from the external world. Sensing types are more aware of their senses in relation to 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) – They 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) – They relates 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).

Recently, a lot of researchers and scholars have intended to achieve a deep view and opinion about the effective factors in maximal use of teachers’ abilities based on their cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions of performance. For instance, several researches have been conducted on the relationship between teachers’ interaction and learners’ achievement and motivation (Košir & Tement, 2013; Nugent, 2009). The effectiveness of some other variables on teacher interaction has also been studied like different patterns of teacher interaction (Mulaya Sari, 2018), types of questioning (Rezavani & Sayyadi, 2015), teacher’s language (Jawhar, 2009), teaching context (Sundari, 2017), and teachers’ and learners’ characteristics (Jansen, 1972, Power, 1977).

With respect to the review of literature, the researcher of the present study was convinced the prediction of L2 teachers’ interaction approach through their personality type and teaching style has not been explored yet; hence the present investigation was undertaken to initially explore the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers’ personality type, teaching style, and their interaction approach. Also, the researcher intended to investigate whether there is any difference in predictability of Iranian EFL teachers’ personality type and teaching style with their interaction approach. To reiterate, the suggested research questions in this study were as following:

RQ1: Is there any statistically significant relationship between Iranian EFL teachers’ interaction approach and their teaching style or their personality type?

RQ2: Is there significant difference in predictability of Iranian EFL teachers’ personality type and teaching style with their interaction approach

2. Methodology

2.1 Participants

The participants of this study were 120 EFL teachers from two cities in Iran, i.e., Tehran and Karaj. They were including both genders enjoying different educational degrees like bachelor, master and Ph.D. in teaching English and translation. Due to the fact that many teachers were not cooperative in completing the questionnaire, the researcher did not take the experience, age, and gender of the participants into consideration. The teachers were selected based on convenience sampling, i.e., a sample of non-probability sampling where the participants are chosen based on their accessibility, availability, and proximity to the researcher (Goddard & Melville, 2004), and their willingness to participate in the present study. Table 1 summarizes the demographic information about the participants.

Table1.

Participants of the Study

Teachers	N	Level of teaching	Age range	Educational Degree
----------	---	-------------------	-----------	--------------------

Female	60	Intermediate-Advanced	22-42	B.A.,M.A., Ph.D.
Male	60	Intermediate-Advanced	23-45	B.A.,M.A., Ph.D.

2.2 Instruments

In order to accomplish the purposes of this study, three standardized questionnaires were utilized by the researcher.

2.2.1 The Questionnaire on Teacher-Student Interaction (QTI)

The Questionnaire on Teacher-Student Interaction (QTI) is a self-reporting questionnaire designed to assess teacher behavior inside the classroom, their interaction with their students and the varied perceptions or responses to these interactions. There are different versions of the QTI. The version that was utilized for the purpose of this study includes 48-question developed by (Lourdusamy & SweKhine, 2001) as a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1= never to 5= always. It should be noted that in this study teachers' responses were considered only. The reported reliability of this questionnaire is more than 0.7 and the researcher allocated 45 minutes for completing it.

2.2.2 Teaching Style Inventory (TSI)

Teaching Style Inventory (TSI) is a standardized scale constructed and validated by Grasha (1996). It is a forty-item questionnaire in a seven-point Likert scale ranging from "1= strongly disagree" to "7= strongly agree" (See Appendix B). This inventory categorizes teachers' instructional behaviors into five styles including (a) expert, (b) formal authority, (c) personal model, (d) facilitator, and (e) delegator. In fact, each subsection of TSI is composed of eight questions which enable teachers to identify their teaching. The reliability index of TSI is reported as .75 and allotted time for answering this questionnaire was 45 minutes.

2.2.3 The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)

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. It is composed of 70 forced-choice items that yield scores on each of the eight factors, as well as the famous four dimensions: introversion vs. extraversion, sensation vs. intuition, thinking vs. feeling, and judging vs. perceiving (See Appendix C). Respondents are classified into one of 16 personality types based on the largest score obtained for each bipolar scale. The reliability index of TSI is reported as 0.83 and allotted time for answering this questionnaire was 45 minutes.

2.3 Procedure

The participants of the present study were selected from certified teachers employed at different English language institutes in Tehran and Karaj cities. They were 120 male and female teachers educated in different majors of English language, with different educational degrees, and ages. Based on their willingness to participate in the study, the researcher contacted with teachers, explained the aims of the study, asked them to provide accurate responses and mention that their personal information would be confidential utilizing merely for academic purposes, they answered three questionnaires, i.e., MBTI, TSI, and QTI in pen and paper or online. The survey took participants approximately 100 minutes to complete. The procedure of data collection lasted almost three months. After collecting all questionnaires, the researcher analyzed them utilizing relevant correlation coefficient and multiple regression statistical analysis by SPSS statistical software version 25.

3. Results

Before answering the research questions of this study, it was needed to check a number of assumptions and perform some preliminary analyses. These analyses would determine the legitimacy of running the analyses along with the type of statistical techniques, i.e. parametric or non-parametric. To begin with, the assumptions of interval data and independence of participants (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) were already met as the present data were measured on an interval scale and the participants were independent of one another. In addition, it was needed to check the normality assumption of the distribution of variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). In order to check the normality of the distributions, two procedures were followed. First, Table 2 shows the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was run as a further attempt to inspect the normality of the distributions. Second, the descriptive statistics of the data were obtained and kurtosis and skewness ratios.

Table2. Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Teacher interaction	.152	120	.000	.940	120	.000
Teaching style	.145	120	.000	.829	120	.000
Teachers' Personality	.084	120	.038	.989	120	.440

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

As the results show, the p value for all three variables is less than .05, and the normality of distribution for these scores is not supported. Also, the descriptive statistics related to the obtained scores on the instruments, including the calculated values of skewness ratio and kurtosis ratio, appear below in Table 3.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics

	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error Ratio	Statistic	Std. Error Ratio		
Personality type	120	47.25	9.001	.311	.221	1.40	.389	.438	0.88
Teaching style	120	203.72	28.33	-2.065	.221	9.34	8.288	.438	18.92
Teacher interaction	120	160.02	23.06	.667	.221	3.01	-.421	.438	-0.96
Valid N (listwise)	120								

As demonstrated in Table 4.1, if both skewness ratio and kurtosis ratio values fall within the range of -1.96 and +1.96, this point can supports the normality of distribution for the scores (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Accordingly, all scores related to teaching style and teachers' personality traits were not considered normal but teacher interaction scores were normal. In this regard, the researcher concluded that the data did not meet the assumptions of parametric statistical technique. In order to find this relationship, the data were analyzed using the Spearman coefficient of correlation. Table 4 shows the result of correlation between teacher interactions and teaching style.

Table 4. Correlation between teacher interaction approach and teaching style

		Teacher Interaction	
Spearman's rho	Expert	Correlation Coefficient	.203**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.026
		N	120
	Formal authority	Correlation Coefficient	.0229**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.012
		N	120
	Personal model	Correlation Coefficient	.359**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
		N	120
	Facilitator	Correlation Coefficient	.577**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
		N	120
	Delegator	Correlation Coefficient	.270**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.003
		N	120

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to the results of the analysis reported in Table 4, it was concluded that there was a positive and significant correlation between Iranian EFL teachers' teaching styles, i.e. expert ($r=.203, p<.05, N=120$), formal authority ($r=.229, p<.05, N=120$), personal model ($r=.359, p<.05, N=120$), facilitator ($r=.557, p<.05, N=120$), delegator ($r=.270, p<.05, N=120$) and their interaction approach as p values are less than 0.05. Also, the result of correlation between teacher interactions and teachers' personality type is depicted in Table 5.

Table 5. Correlation between teacher interaction approach and teachers' personality type

		Teacher Interaction	
Spearman's rho	Extroversion	Correlation Coefficient	.456**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.026
		N	120
	Sensing	Correlation Coefficient	-0.07
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.447
		N	120
	Thinking	Correlation Coefficient	.688**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
		N	120
	Judging	Correlation Coefficient	-0.35
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.706
		N	120

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to the results of the analysis reported in Table 4.4, it was concluded that there was a positive and significant correlation between Iranian EFL teachers' interaction approaches and extroversion and thinking types of personalities as , $r = .456, n = 120, p < .05$ and, $r = .688, n = 120, p < .05$, respectively.

According to the obtained results, the researcher employed standard multiple regression statistical analysis to find out the predictability of teachers' TSS and TPT with their interaction approach. Before utilizing multiple regressions, the assumption of sample size was checked. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) proposed a formula for calculating sample size requirements, taking into account the number of independent variables: $N > 50 + 8m$ (m = the number of independent variables). In this analysis, there were two independent/predictor variables, calling for a sample including more than 66 participants. Including 120 cases, the sample pool seemed to be large enough to meet this assumption. Table 6 presents the regression model summary including the R and R².

Table 6. Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.822 ^a	.676	.656	13.530	1.731

a. Predictors: (Constant), Thinking, Extroversion, Expert, Formal authority, Personal model, Facilitator, Delegator

b. Dependent Variable: Teacher interaction

As reported in the above table, R came out to be 0.822 and R^2 came out to be 0.676. This means that the model explains 67 percent of the variance in teacher interaction approach (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003).

Table 7 reports the results of ANOVA ($F(7, 112) = 33.390, p = 0.000$), the results of which were considered significant. This means that the model can significantly predict teacher interaction approach.

Table 7. ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	42786.958	7	6112.423	33.390	.000 ^b
	Residual	20503.009	112	183.063		
	Total	63289.967	119			

a. Dependent Variable: teacher interaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), Extroversion, Thinking, Expert, Formal authority, Personal model, Facilitator, Delegator

Table 8 demonstrates the Standardized Beta Coefficients which signify the degree to which each predictor variables contribute to the prediction of the predicted variable.

Table 8. Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	
1	(Constant)	79.865	9.270		8.616	.000
	Expert	-.242	.275	-.070	-.880	.380
	formal authority	.483	.285	.149	1.692	.093
	personal model	-.185	.305	-.056	-.606	.546
	facilitator	.746	.294	.222	2.535	.013
	delegator	-.229	.261	-.068	-.877	.383
	Extroversion	1.056	.341	.204	3.096	.002
	Thinking	3.739	.421	.588	8.882	.000

a. Dependent Variable: teacher interaction

The inspection of the p values showed that extroversion and thinking personality types along with facilitator type of teaching style as predictor variables make statistically significant unique contributions to the equation as their p values are less than .05. In other words, facilitator among different teaching style and two types of personality traits could be significant predictors of Iranian EFL teachers' interaction approaches. Moreover, by comparing the standardized Beta coefficients related to these three significant predictors, it revealed thinking personality type (Beta coefficient= .588) could be the first rank significant predictor of teachers' interaction approaches and the second and third ranks go to facilitator teaching style and extroversion personality type as Beta coefficients equal with .222 and .204, respectively.

Discussion

The researcher in this study inspected Iranian EFL teachers' teaching style and personality type relationship with their interaction approach. Also, the researchers checked the possible difference in predictability of Iranian EFL teachers' personality type and teaching style with their interaction approach. Although this study was conducted in two cities with limited number of male and female EFL teachers, as well as administrating three questionnaires for teaching style (TS), personality type (PT), and interaction approach (IA) measurement, the relationships between TS and IA, as well as IA and thinking

and extroversion personality types were proved. Also, the results revealed thinking as one of the personality types were a better predictor for teachers' IA rather than their TS. Also, in this section, the results of the study are compared and contrasted in relation to the previous findings in order to test the research hypotheses of the study.

It is believed the successfulness of teaching-learning process could be highly influenced by the interactions appeared in the classroom activities (Mulya Sari, 2018). Also, the basic purpose of teacher interaction is to encourage students towards learning and to promote their positive behaviors (Košir & Tement, 2013). Accordingly, any environmental, behavioral, and psychological factors related to teachers could influence this objective. Classroom interaction involves teacher and students interacting by target language. In the classroom, communication is mostly initiated and maintained by the teachers. Accordingly, their perspectives and characteristics related to language classroom practices could impact on teacher-student interaction (Sundari, 2017).

In line with the findings of this study, some researchers believe teacher-student interaction could be in direct relationship with teachers' employed method and techniques of teaching (Lorenz, 1980), learners' task engagement (Kim, 2005), and teacher's style and expression (Chipman, 2009). Classroom interaction is a productive teaching technique which manages the language learning process. As "interaction is face-to-face communication with particular prosody, facial expression, silence, and rhythmical patterns of behavior between the participants, it provides opportunities for production and receiving feedback" (Adaba, 2017, p.3). In addition, interaction in classroom is based on the provided input by teacher as well as students. It aims to keep the learners active in the classroom by reducing the teachers' talking time and by increasing the learners' talking time in the classroom. In other words, teachers are facilitators and guide (Nugroho, 2011).

The other finding of the present study showed, thinking type of personality was a better predictor for teachers' interaction approach rather than facilitative teaching style. A thinking personality type tries to make certain conclusions and judgments regarding the information collected and prefers to focus on making decisions based on an impersonal objective position. As teacher-student interaction enjoys different patterns and it relates to multi-factors as well, it seems a thinking personality type teacher could have better decision making and problem solving (Huit, 1992), and spend more time helping students (Thompson, 1994) to have an effective interactional practice in the classroom, as well as to negotiate with students and motivate them be an active participant in learning process. It results when the teacher is an extrovert person, as well (Gibson, 2003).

Conclusion and Implications

Despite the emphasis on teacher education in modern language pedagogy and the well accepted view that L2 teachers require different programs for empowering their teaching behaviors in EFL classrooms, many aspects related to teachers have not been investigated yet. The present study aimed at investigating the relationship between teachers' TS and their interaction approach, as well as the relationship between teachers' PT and their and their interaction approach. Also, the second driving force of the present research was to identify any possible difference in predictability of Iranian EFL teachers' personality type and teaching style with their interaction approach. The results verified the significant and positive relationships among these variables. Furthermore, it was revealed two types of personality type, i.e., thinking and extroversion, and one teaching style, i.e., facilitator were significant predictors for teachers' interaction approach. It should be noted that personality type was a more significant predictor for teachers' interaction approach rather than teaching style.

Considering the results of the present study, the importance of the findings lies not only in their contribution to the literature but also in their prominent educational importance for teacher education programs in general, and learners and teachers in special. It increases "students' language performance. Not only students get the impact of the importance of good interaction but the teacher can also improve their teaching and learning process in the classroom" (Hanum, 2017, p.8). Also, Teachers can get benefit from the findings of the present research to identify their teaching style as well as personality type in order to provide interaction strategies to improve their learners' L2 learning process. Moreover, the results can help both practitioners and teacher education program designers to highlight the importance of teachers' personality types, teaching style, and teacher-students interaction in second language settings to help the pre/in-service teachers understand and practice L2 teaching profession for its ultimate goal, i.e., learners' success in L2 learning.

References

- Abarca, M.F. (2004). Interaction in the English classroom; an exploratory study. Retrieved from <http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/447/44740108.pdf>
- Adaba, H.W. (2017). Exploring the practice of teacher-student classroom interaction in EFL to develop the learners' speaking skills in Tullu Sangota primary school grade eight students in focus. *Arts and Social Science Journal*, 8 (4), 295- 313.
- 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.
- Bell, T.L. (2005). Behaviors and attitudes of effective foreign language teachers: results of a questionnaire study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(2), 259-260.
- Brookfield, S. D. (1990). *The skillful teacher*. San-Francisco: Jossey-Bass.