REPUBLIC OF TURKEY

ÇANAKKALE ONSEKIZ MART UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAM

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF COMMON MISTAKES REGARDING TEACHER PERSONALITY AND TEACHING STYLES

MASTER THESIS

Nil Mümine TEKİN

ÇANAKKALE

November, 2017

Republic of Turkey

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University

Graduate School of Educational Sciences

Department of Foreign Language Education

English Language Teaching Program

English Language Teachers' Perceptions of Common Mistakes Regarding Teacher Personality and Teaching Styles

Nil Mümine TEKİN

(Master Thesis)

Supervisor

Assist . Prof. Dr. Kürşat CESUR

Çanakkale

November, 2017

Taahhütname

Yüksek lisans tezi olarak sunduğum "English Language Teachers' Perceptions of Common Mistakes Regarding Teacher Personality and Teaching Styles" adlı çalışmanın, tarafımdan, bilimsel ahlak ve değerlere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurmaksızın yazıldığını ve yararlandığım eserlerin kaynakçada gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu, bunlara atıf yaparak yaralanmış olduğumu belirtir ve bunu onurumla doğrularım.

Tarih

15/11/2017

Nil Mümine TEKİN

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart

Üniversitesi

Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Onay

Nil Mümine TEKİN tarafından hazırlana çalışma, 15/11/2017 tarihinde yapılan tez savunma sınavı sonucunda jüri tarafından başarılı bulunmuş ve Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Tez Referans No: 10160592

	Akademik Ünvan	Adı SOYADI	İmza
Başkan	Prof. Dr.	Dinçay KÖKSAL	.....
Üye	Doç. Dr.	Zübeyde Sinem GENÇ	.....
Üye (Danışman)	Yrd. Doç. Dr.	Kürşat CESUR	.....

Tarih: 15.11.2017

İmza: .....

Akademik Unvan Adı SOYADI

Prof.Dr. Salih Zeki GENÇ
Enstitü Müdürü

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to many people who share their views and knowledge for my thesis study. Firstly, I would like to express my sincere thanks to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Kürşat CESUR for his encouragement, scientific guidance and support.

Secondly, I owe thanks to Prof. Dr Dinçay KÖKSAL, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ece ZEHİR TOPKAYA, Assist. Prof. Dr. Salim RAZI and the teachers who participated in this study and helped me with their views in carrying out this study.

I also would like to express my sincere thanks to my parents and my friends for their valuable support and patience.

Last but not least, I'm deeply grateful to my husband Research Assistant Mürsel TEKİN. Thank you for your patience, support and love at every stage of my study and my life...

Çanakkale, 2017

Nil Mümine TEKİN

Abstract

English Language Teachers' Perceptions of Common Mistakes Regarding Teacher Personality and Teaching Styles

The purpose of the current study is to examine language teachers' perceptions about common mistakes regarding their personality and teaching styles. It aims to search common mistakes made by language teachers to find out the effects of teacher personality to teaching process and their tendency to certain teaching styles based on different personality types of teachers.

In this descriptive study, both qualitative and quantitative research methodology have been applied. In the light of the literature and the experts in the field, a questionnaire was designed. The questionnaire was administered to 175 English language teachers. The researcher analyzed the internal consistency of the items in the questionnaire and got high Cronbach Alpha reliability test values. The questionnaire was administered to teachers working at primary schools, secondary schools, high schools and universities. Data collected via the questionnaires completed by the participants were analyzed with the help of Descriptive Statistics, Cronbach Alpha Reliability, Non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis Test and Non-parametric Mann-Whitney U-Test by using SPSS 20 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). Following that, 15 English language teachers were asked to answer semi-structured interview questions to interpret the quantitative results and to clarify unclear points. The interviews were transcribed and the qualitative data were analyzed by using content analysis.

The findings of descriptive statistics presented the common mistakes regarding teachers' personality and their teaching styles made by language teachers. Non-parametric tests indicated that there is a significant difference between teachers' workplace/gender/teaching experience and teacher mistakes regarding teacher personality and teaching styles. Besides, teachers who show 'extraversion' and 'agreeableness' dimensions of five-factor model of personality were observed to make mistakes more frequently. As to the most common mistakes regarding teaching styles, teachers who display 'neuroticism', 'agreeableness' and 'openness' dimensions were observed to make those mistakes more frequently than the others.

At the end of this study, common mistakes regarding English language teachers' personality and their teaching styles were examined to help teachers have awareness of cognitive, social and interpersonal skills and eliminate mistakes and misbehaviours as much as possible. The study ends with some practical implications for teachers to enhance efficiency of teaching and interaction between teacher and student. Finally, suggestions for further research have been presented to help researchers to carry out more comprehensive study in the field.

Key Words: Teacher Mistakes, Teacher Personality, Teaching Styles

Özet

İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Karakterleri ve Öğretim Yöntemleri ile İlgili Yaygın Hatalarına Dair Algıları

Bu çalışmanın amacı, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin karakterleri ve öğretim yöntemleri ile ilgili olarak yaptıkları yaygın hatalara dair algılarını incelemektir. Öğretmen karakterinin öğretim sürecine etkisini ve öğretmenlerin karakter farklılığından dolayı belli öğretim yöntemlerine olan eğilimlerini incelemek için, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin yaygın yaptıkları hataları araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır.

Bu betimsel çalışmada, nicel ve nitel araştırma metodolojisi uygulanmıştır. Literatür ve uzmanlar eşliğinde, araştırma sorularını incelemek için bir anket tasarlanmıştır. Anket 175 İngilizce öğretmenine uygulanmıştır. Anketteki maddelerin iç tutarlılığının analizinin sonucunda, yüksek Cronbach Alpha güvenilirlik testi değerleri ortaya çıkmıştır. Anket, ilkokul, ortaokul, lise ve üniversitelerde çalışan öğretmenlere uygulanmıştır. Katılımcılar tarafından doldurulan anketler vasıtasıyla toplanan veriler SPSS 20 kullanılarak; Tanımlayıcı İstatistik, Cronbach Alfa güvenilirliği, parametrik olmayan Kruskal-Wallis ve Mann-Whitney U-testi yardımıyla analiz edilmiştir. Bunu takiben, 15 İngilizce öğretmeninden nicel sonuçları yorumlamak ve belirsiz noktaları netleştirmek için yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme sorularına cevap vermeleri istendi. Görüşmeler kaydedildi ve nitel veriler içerik analizi kullanılarak analiz edildi.

Betimleyici istatistiklerin bulguları, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin, öğretmen kişilik özellikleri ve öğretim yöntemleri ile ilgili olarak sık yaptıkları hataları göstermektedir.

Parametrik olmayan testler ise, öğretmenlerin çalıştığı okul türü-cinsiyet-deneyim ile öğretmen kişilik-öğretim yöntemleri ile ilgili öğretmen hataları arasında anlamlı bir fark olduğunu göstermiştir. Ayrıca, beş faktörlü kişilik modelinin 'dışa dönük' ve 'uyumluluk' boyutlarını gösteren öğretmenlerin, yaygın hataları daha sık yaptıkları gözlenmiştir. Öğretim stilleri ile ilgili en yaygın hatalara gelince, 'nevrotiklik', 'uyumluluk' ve 'açıklık' boyutlarını sergileyen öğretmenlerin, bu hataları diğerlerinden daha sık yaptıkları gözlenmiştir.

Bu çalışmanın sonunda, öğretmenlerin bilişsel, sosyal ve kişiler arası beceriler konusunda bilinçlenmelerine yardımcı olmak ve yanlış davranışları mümkün olduğunca ortadan kaldırmak için, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin kişilik özelliklerine ve öğretim yöntemlerine ilişkin hatalar incelenmiştir. Çalışma, öğretmenlerin öğretiminin verimliliğini ve öğretmen- öğrenci arasındaki etkileşimi artırmak için bazı pratik tavsiyelerle sona ermektedir. Son olarak ise, araştırmacılara sahada daha kapsamlı bir çalışma yapmaları için bazı öneriler sunulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğretmen Hataları, Öğretmenin Karakteri, Öğretme Tarzları

Table of Contents

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi Onay.....i

Acknowledgements.....ii

Abstract.....iii

Özet.....v

Table of Contents.....vii

List of Tables.....xi

Chapter I: Introduction

Introduction.....1

Background of the Study.....1

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions.....2

Significance of the Study.....3

Limitations of the Study.....5

Assumptions of the Study.....5

Review of the literature

Introduction.....7

Personality.....7

The Five-Factor Model of Personality.....10

Matching of intellectual styles.....12

Personality and teaching.....13

Teacher effectiveness.....19

Personality traits of effective/ineffective teachers.....21

Teaching styles.....27

Active vs passive teaching styles.....28

Teaching style and personality.....29

Chapter Summary.....32

Chapter II: Methodology

Introduction.....33

Questionnaire.....33

Construction of the Questionnaire.....33

Administration of the Questionnaire.....36

Interview.....37

Main Study.....38

Setting.....38

Sampling and participants.....38

Data collection procedures.....41

Data analysis.....41

Chapter Summary.....42

Chapter III: Findings and Discussion

Introduction.....43

Findings and Discussion.....43

Findings of research question 1.....44

Findings of research question 2.....50

Findings of research question 3.....54

Findings of research question 4.....57

Chapter IV: Conclusion, Suggestions and Implications

Conclusion and Suggestions.....61

Implications for Further Study.....67

References.....70

Appendices.....80

Appendix A.....81

The item pool of the questionnaire constructed for the study.....81

Appendix B.....88

The eliminated version of the item pool.....88

Appendix C.....93

Two main parts of the questionnaire.....93

Appendix D.....96

The final version of the scale constructed for the study.....96

Appendix E.....101

Kruskal-Wallis Test Results of Difference between the Type of School They Teach and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Personality Traits.....101

Appendix F.....104

Kruskal-Wallis Test Results of Difference between the Type of School They Teach and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Teaching Styles.....104

Appendix G.....107

Mann Whitney U-Test Results of Difference between Gender of Participants and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Personality Traits.....107

Appendix H.....110

Mann Whitney U-Test Results of Difference between Gender of Participants and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Teaching Styles.....110

Appendix I.....113

Kruskal-Wallis Test Results of Difference between Teacher Experience and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Personality Traits.....113

Appendix J.....116

Kruskal-Wallis Test Results of Difference between Teacher Experience and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Teaching Styles.....116

Appendix K.....118

Interview Form.....118

List of Tables

Table No	Title	Page Number
1	Cronbach Alpha Coefficient for Internal Consistency Reliability of the Questionnaire	37
2	Gender Distribution of the English Language Teachers Involved in the Study	39
3	Experience of the English Language Teachers Involved in the Study	39
4	Type of Schools English Language Teachers Involved in the Study	40
5	Descriptive Statistics of Common Mistakes Regarding Teacher Personality Made by English Language Teachers	44
6	Descriptive Statistics of Common Mistakes Regarding Teaching Styles Made by English Language Teachers	48
7	Dimensions of the Five Factor Model of Personality	59
8	Kruskal-Wallis Test Results of Difference between the Type of School They Teach and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Personality Traits	101
9	Kruskal-Wallis Test Results of Difference between the Type of School They Teach and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Teaching Styles	104
10	Mann Whitney U-Test Results of Difference between Gender of Participants and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Personality Traits	107

11	Mann Whitney U-Test Results of Difference between Gender of Participants and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Teaching Styles	110
12	Kruskal-Wallis Test Results of Difference between Teacher Experience and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Personality Traits	113
13	Kruskal-Wallis Test Results of Difference between Teacher Experience and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Teaching Styles	116

Chapter I

Introduction

Introduction

In this chapter, an introduction to the current study "English Language Teachers' Perceptions of Common Mistakes Regarding Teacher Personality and Teaching Styles" has been indicated. In the first sub-section, background of the study has been revealed. In the next section, research questions and the hypothesis that have been grounded on the study have been presented. In next sections, the purpose and significance of the study have been revealed. Finally; in last sub-section, limitations, assumptions and the review of the literature have been included and explained.

Background of the Study

Enhancing efficiency of both language teaching and language teachers has been regarded as one of the most important topics in the literature. In this regard, efficient teaching has been interpreted in broad terms. For instance, Davey (1991) has commented that effective teaching means a set of knowledge, ability, and personal attributes that affects students. So, it can be claimed that personal traits of teachers and their preference of teaching styles contribute to effective teaching. In addition, Goldstein and Freeman (2003) have put forward a relation between effective teachers' values and their personal attitudes towards teaching. Besides, Dugan (1961) states that personality traits of teachers have been focused a lot in studies searching for effectiveness in teaching. As a result, teachers' personality traits affect learners in both cognitive and emotional ways.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The subject of the current study focuses on language teachers' perceptions regarding their personality and teaching styles. It has been aimed to investigate common mistakes made by language teachers concerning the effects of teacher personality to teaching process and their tendency to certain teaching styles based on personalities.

In this study, it has also been aimed to shed a light in the field searching qualifications of ideal teacher by examining the common mistakes made by language teachers and to present some practical implications to help educators that may contribute research studies conducted in the field for an enhanced and effective learning environment.

The study has been carried out in the light of the research questions below:

1. What are English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teacher personality and teaching style?

2. Is there a significant difference among English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teacher personality and teaching style in terms of the type of school they teach?

3. Is there a significant difference among English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teacher personality and teaching style in terms of their gender?

4. Is there a significant difference among English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teacher personality and teaching style in terms of their experience?

Significance of the Study

Possessing teaching experience or academic qualifications does not guarantee efficient teaching process. In addition to instructional skills, an efficient way of teaching includes suitable personal traits of teachers and preference of suitable teaching styles based on their personalities. Brosh (1996) states that even if experience and teaching styles enable effective teaching, what is really taken from students is personal traits of the teachers. Moreover, Walberg (1968) claims that teacher personality influences the climate of the classroom. Research studies that examine effective language teaching attributes to the personality factor as a part of students' success in language learning. Another important name in the field, Feldman (1976) associates features of effective teachers with teacher behaviours, their characteristics and personalities. It has also been stated in Feldman's study that effective teachers are the ones who are described as respectful, warm, fair, friendly and open to any new ideas, which also proves the reflection of power to the teaching and learning process by contributing the conditions of learning environment.

In another study that contributes to research carried out to promote effective teachers conducted by Amon and Reichel (2007), effective and ideal teachers have been identified as fair, calm, kind-hearted and having professional values, which also attributes to personal characteristics of teachers. In addition, Tonelson (1981) points out the relationship between teacher personality and learning atmosphere. He claims that personal characteristics of teachers and their preference of teaching styles which are based on

personal characteristics of teachers affect both teaching and learning. As a result, this study aims to contribute to develop more effective teaching process by attributing to both personality and teaching styles of language teachers.

It is inevitable that teachers will bring their personal characteristics to the classroom as well as their teaching skills, so personality traits of teachers can be seen as a reflection in their way of teaching. It is not possible for a person to isolate an important part of himself/herself, and it cannot be also expected from teachers to leave their personal identities out of the classroom.

In Turkey, teacher selection was based on only written exams which were not enough to test teachers' social and psychological identities. Following that, interviews started to be used, which can examine teachers' intra personal, interpersonal and social skills of teacher candidates. So, this study aims to draw attention to teachers' other identities other than formal instruction, which can affect the efficiency of instruction. By drawing attention to teachers' mistakes regarding their personality and teaching styles, it has been aimed that mistakes of teachers can be used to increase effective language instruction.

As a result, this study plans to present these common mistakes specially the ones that are related to personality factor of teachers and their teaching styles to be able to present ways how to enhance effective learning settings and to put forward some practical implications and solutions to them.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations have been observed in conducting this study. Firstly, in terms of setting factor, the study has been carried out by the participations of teachers from west side of Turkey. Hence, the study does not show a representation of the general idea of English teachers in Turkey. So, it cannot be put forward that the study presents an image of the whole English teachers across the country. Despite of these limitations, it has been aimed that the study can contribute to the field searching psychological factors and its effects in foreign language learning.

While selecting the most effective teacher traits, some problems have been observed due to the problem of defining and measuring those traits. At this point, Dugan (1961) states that "measurement of human characteristics can only be rough estimates at best, and the fact that educational measurements are rough and not often significantly predictive does not negate the need for these measurements nor the need for continuous effort at refinement of techniques." (p.336). Getzels and Jackson present that (1963); "despite the critical importance of the problem and a half-century of prodigious research effort, very little is known for certain about the nature and measurement of teacher personality, or about the relation between teacher personality and teacher effectiveness." (p. 574, as cited in Costin, 1973). The difficulty resulting from complicacy of human nature makes it hard to conduct studies regarding the topic in the field.

Assumptions of the Study

Such a concept 'personality' is not a term that can be measured easily, and studies investigating personality factor should not be expected to give certain results since there are numerous factors that affect the results of the studies searching for personality factor in

teaching/learning process. For instance, participant-related factors can be one of the reasons in this situation. Data taken from participants may change over time, or they may have different views over the subject in time. So, it has been assumed that this change can affect the results since this study is focusing on such a complicated data as 'human'. Besides, there is not an exact or perfect measurement in determining the personality traits of human beings.

Furthermore, complexity of human behaviours is assumed to be a vital factor that should be noticed. In trying to find ways to understand the underlying reasons of human behaviours or complexity of personality of humans, a lot has been achieved, but still, there is not a concrete way to comprehend it. Besides, context-based differences make it hard to rely on the measurements of personality and to make comments on the results of the measurement. To illustrate the topic, Mayhew (1957) presents the example of authoritarian and democratic teachers. These personality traits of teachers have resulted in numerous reactions to students within a classroom environment in different cultures. It means that behaviours of teachers who have different opinions about their approaches to the classroom due to personality differences have resulted in different reactions. While democratic behaviours work for some classrooms, it does not in others. On the other hand, in some parts of the country, teachers who display authoritarian personality traits or behaviours have been seen as more effective and successful, and democratic teaching styles or teachers seem to fail in those places. For instance, cities that are located in East part of the country prefer authoritarian teaching styles and personality traits. As a result, in making comments of studies related to the topic, such factor should be taken into consideration.

Review of the Literature

Introduction.

This chapter provides relevant information about the topic that has been examined in this study. It presents seven sub-sections. In the first one, a broad definition of personality has been presented. The second sub-section presents information about five factor model of personality, which has been deeply studied in studies searching for personality. Then, the effect of matching of thinking styles on the personality and teaching styles has been discussed. In the next one, the relationship between thinking styles and personality has been examined. In the next sub-section, the ways in relation to teacher personality and teaching styles by which teacher effectiveness can be enhanced have been presented. In the following one, studies which seek personality traits of effective and ineffective teachers have been presented and discussed by referring to the related literature in the field. The relationship between teaching style and personality has been discussed in the next part. Finally, it has ended with a summary of the current chapter.

Personality.

Scholars in the psychology field have contributed to the literature by explaining personality concept in different ways. For instance, Burger (2010) defines personality as "consistent behaviour patterns and intra-personal processes originating within the individual" (p.4). As it can be concluded from intra-personal process, the concept of personality includes emotional and cognitive aspects that lead people how to feel, think, or act. Despite the focus on intrapersonal domains of personality, external factors such as environment also affect personality development. The environment in which human beings grow up influences them in shaping their personality characteristics or what kind of human beings they will be. It leads person to act or think in a personalized manner.

While many scholars restrict personality to the observable data such as traits can be seen in acts, most of them also refer emotional or behavioural tendencies, and some scholars in the field view personality as inseparable from social context. For instance, Engler (2013) defines personality as "someone's public image" (p. 2). Victor (1976, p.4) points out context factor in a different way; "person's cognitive map or belief system enables him to 'make sense' out of his world and to respond to it more appropriately.".

Another explanation for personality has been given by Dugan (1961), he states that "Personality is complex and dynamic, and is more than a sum total of personality factors for each individual; it is also the organization of these factors and the effect of them on other people." (p. 337).

Since teaching is also an interpersonal process and interaction within the classroom is often shaped by the personality traits of teachers and students, personality characteristics of teachers have been examined in many ways to examine psychological effects in instruction. For example, many scholars put emphasis on the relationship between teacher personality and teaching effectiveness. In this sense, Barker (1946) points out the personality factor in a teacher's ability in effective instruction (as cited in Tschechtelin, 1951). Besides, Seagoe (1946) has presented the data that success of teachers chosen for the study showed correlation with the results of personality scores (as cited in Tschechtelin, 1951).

So, personality is a complex concept since it differs in every individual within the classroom and society. Describing personality with all its aspects requires a long time since every attitude of teacher indeed comes from personality factor. As a result, as Symonds has stated (1950) all matters of teaching procedure are rooted in the personality concept and its

dynamics. Although deep dynamics of personality are not easily changed, reflections of them within a classroom environment can be limited or modified. However, there is not an exact answer how deep the change can go or how long it can take for a change (Symonds, 1950).

Rushton, Murray and Paunonen (1983) also claims that teaching/learning is a social and emotional process, as a result the correlations found out in the studies between teacher personality traits and teaching effectiveness are not surprising.

In related to the personality factor in teaching process, Symonds (1950, p.689) says that;

> "Each teacher was a person of considerable depth so that the personality consisted not only of the overt manifestations as expressed in posture, gait, bearing, mannerisms, speech and behaviour, but also deeper and partially expressed or unexpressed impulses, ideals, aspirations, fears and anxieties and guilt. In short, each teacher was a unique personality."

So as to explain personality, many factors should be taken into account. In this respect, while some scholars focus on genetic factors, the others state personality development cannot be taken apart from environmental factors. Besides, 'tendency' is also mentioned as an important factor in constructing personality. Berens and Nardi (1999) claim that human beings have a natural tendency, and they see the world or make assumptions on the basis of this natural tendency. So, in understanding personality, not only the observable data such as behaviours, but also the motive of the behaviours should be taken into consideration since as mentioned earlier, personality consists of expressed and unexpressed impulses.

The Five-Factor Model of Personality.

The movement towards cognition during 1960s has led various theories based on cognition. Sternberg and Grigorenko (1995) classify these theories into three groups; cognition-centred, personality-centred and activity centred (as cited in Zhang & Sternberg, 2002). According to Zhang & Sternberg (2002); "These theories of styles have been used in the examination of people's intellectual functioning in both academic and non-academic settings." (p.4).

In this study, personality is categorized and studied under "Five-Factor Model of Personality". Within this model, five important dimensions of personality have been focused. John and Srivastava (1999) developed the Big Five Inventory that measures five dimensions of personality known as "Openness", "Conscientiousness", "Extraversion", "Agreeableness" and "Neuroticism". Goldberg (1990) also studies the personality under these five dimensions. John and Srivastava label these factors as;

- Extraversion (talkative, assertive, energetic)
- Agreeableness (good-natured, cooperative, trustful)
- Conscientiousness (orderly, responsible, dependable)
- Neuroticism (calm, not neurotic, not easily upset)
- Openness (intellectual, imaginative, independent-minded)

Costa and McCrae (1992, as cited in Komarraju and Karau, 2005) state that the Big Five traits reflect core features of personality, and shape the way of behaviours. Of all the reasons why five-factor model has gained attention and used commonly, Costa and McCrae (1992) state that it is based on longitudinal and cross-observer studies and it still keeps its

validity in different cultures.

Zhang and Sternberg (2002) question how the knowledge of these cognitive concepts may help teachers in instruction, and they list seven possible results. First, they state that having knowledge of learner' personality characteristics can help teachers in increasing the diversity of teaching styles. Second, it has been stated that teachers' awareness on the difference of students' personality types might lead them to revise their teaching styles in that they can have an unconscious prejudice to certain learners. This attitudinal change can enhance the motivation. Moreover, the awareness of different personality types may also lead teachers to initiate a revise towards their teaching styles and diversify them in accordance with learners' personality styles. At this point, one way that teachers may follow is to use a variety of teaching styles in the classroom to appeal for the majority of the classroom in that they all are unique in their ways of learning. One example for the awareness of teachers is that a teacher being aware of the diversity of personality types within a classroom can utilize more group activities which are chances for learners to interact with each other so as to make students be able to tolerate differences and respect the others, which can also promote cognitive development. Another result that has been put forward by the authors is modelling of teachers. If teachers show respect to differences, students will be more respectful too. As a result of the study, awareness of the topic will bring not only behavioural, but also cognitive change in minds.

Being able to look over the borders of present personality and seeing the dimensions of other people's personalities is an essential qualification of effective teachers, for a learning environment consists of unique and different personality types. The learning environment needs an effective instruction which means both pedagogical training and psychological training in that teachers also deal with learners' needs and emotions since learners should be taken as a whole person with educational and emotional needs.

Matching of intellectual styles.

According to Zhang (2006), the interest in searching the outcomes of matching teachers and students' intellectual styles (personality types, thinking styles, learning styles, teaching styles) has been a matter of research since it enhances the quality of instruction. It affects not only academic but also cognitive development of learners. Besides, as mentioned earlier, it also effect teachers' view of learners, their way of evaluation, their way of instruction, and their ability to individualize teaching process based on learners needs. Moreover, its effect on learners' motivation level cannot be also denied. In the study of Cafferty (1981), it has been found out that students had high grades when the student-teacher styles matched (as cited in Zhang, 2006). Matching or accommodating intellectual styles that include personality styles, thinking styles, learning styles and teaching styles has been seen vital in learners' achievement. At this point, teachers' being able to see learners' needs and individualizing the instruction according to the learners' needs and styles are accepted as important factors in the field.

Zhang (2006) have also pointed out in his study that students have been observed to be more motivated and active in the learning process when their styles matched, and he emphasised that a perfect match cannot be expected any time, but to some extent, matching between teachers and students help students benefit from the teaching process. What is suggested is the effective instruction through differentiated styles on the basis of students' needs by equalizing the conditions for all students.

As mentioned earlier, human beings are unique individuals with both their cognitive and emotional needs, and it cannot be expected that human beings have same type of personality types, but it is a vital issue in educational settings that teacher should be able to see the difference of learners from each other and also the teacher in the classroom and should be able to appeal their different needs that come from different personality types to

have a more communicative language instruction. In the study mentioned earlier, the authors have found out that learners were evaluated in a more positive way by the teacher who shows similar personality types. It can also be concluded from the study that sharing similar personality types is comprehended as an essential feature by the teachers in the study. As a result, teachers' manners to the issue of having similar or different personality types are seen necessary even in the evaluation process. At this point, teachers' reaction to the different individuals in a classroom is a serious issue in that it is something that teachers take into account. Teachers' mistakes are vital problems that need to be solved. Teachers should be able to see the differences among individuals beyond the borders in their minds. So, taking the differences into account may help teachers to appeal more learners and minds in a classroom.

Personality and teaching.

Since theorists search for the best quality in education, traits of effective teachers have been often discussed in the field. At this point, many factors such as gender, age, experience, education have been discussed to promote more effectiveness in instruction. In this sense, teacher personality has been accepted as one of the major traits in determining successful teachers. Dugan (1961) also states that personality is the factor that has been repeatedly mentioned in the studies searching effectiveness in teaching. Since personality traits determine the acts of people, a teacher's personality traits will determine behaviours of him/her, which in turn will affect the way they teach. It has been put forward that personality of teachers affects teachers in various ways; interacting with students, selecting teaching styles or materials (Murray, 1972 as cited in Arif, Rashid, Tahira & Akhter, 2012). It is not possible for one to leave one's personality traits behind the door of

classroom. Teachers go into the classroom with their backgrounds, academic education and personality traits. So, it is not possible to isolate teachers from their personality identity. As a result, teachers' personality factor and their emotional development constitute an undeniable

The related researchers in the field such as Feldman (1986) point out personality factor that can be vital in enhancing effective instruction. Knapp (1962, as cited in Costin and Grush, 1973) came to a similar conclusion as teaching effectiveness were described mainly personality traits of teachers. In an another study that points out the importance of teacher personality in effective teaching, Riley, Ryan and Lifschitz (1950) states that personality is an essential factor in determining the efficiency of instruction (as cited in Costin and Grush, 1973). Costin and Grush (ibid) presents in his study that teachers underline "skill" factor when they are asked about the efficiency of teachers, and in broader terms, "skills" factor is evaluated within personality concept. Clark (1951) claims that teachers' behaviours towards students and their reactions towards students' acts are related to the personality factor. At this point, Clark (1951) has claimed that stable mental health of teachers determines the act of teachers or their reactions towards pupil behaviours. It has been observed in the study that teachers who have been observed to have stable and good mental health are more successful in controlling their acts in possible situations that may occur during teaching process. In related to mental health, Seymour (1963) also points out that "the best of the modern young teachers doubtless have better mental health and exhibit a livelier interest in the world around them." (p. 205). Besides, Orange (2008) also points out the importance of mental health of teachers in terms of having negative effects on children.

Diagnosing the effect of teacher factor in teaching-learning process, Arif et al. (2012) also claim that "personality factor lead teachers in many ways such as in interaction with students or selecting teaching methods" (p.163). In addition, personality also leads

teachers in terms of setting up communication between themselves and learners. According to Callahan (1996), teachers' personality is an important factor in creating a learning environment in which learners will feel secure enough to act (as cited in Arif et al., 2012). In this regard, Victor (1976) underlines the relationship between teacher attitudes and teacher personality.

Personality factors of teachers are also prominent in terms of having effect of learners' affective and cognitive developments. While personality type can create more effective communication between teacher and student, it can also lead learners to be highly motivated. It cannot be denied that pathological problems that come from personality type of teacher have damage to mental health of students. A well-balanced teacher, with a healthy mental and psychological situation, can create an atmosphere in which students also can have healthy psychological development. A relaxed and friendly learning atmosphere can help teachers in enhancing learners' motivation to learn foreign language and set up positive relationships with students. Such an effect of teachers on students may trigger effective learning or create problems in many ways. A teacher who shows positive attitudes towards learners within the classroom is expected to open ways to learners to show enthusiasm towards language learning.

According to the view of Arif et al. (2012), "an over-anxious teacher with negative attitude towards pupils may unconsciously transfer his/her tensions and unresolved neurotic conflicts to pupils via his/her disturbed emotional interactions with pupils (p. 163). Such a sadistic act will also affect learners' affective development by having negative effect on learners' autonomy, independence, success in language instruction and also social behaviours both within the classroom and the society. In addition, s/he is expected to show unbalanced acts towards students, which results from conflicts of his/her personality. In defining the effect of teacher personality in teaching profession, it can be seen in the

relationship of teachers with students. Henjum (1969) has also underlined that the teacher's personality plays vital role in determining the communication between teacher and pupil. In his study, it has been also stated that both teacher and student bring personal needs and mentality as a whole person. As a result, both teachers and pupils comment anything that happens within the classroom environment according to their mentality and perceptions, that both lead to term 'personality'. Analyzing the acts from their mental barriers or cognition, teachers and students have a mutual effect on each other in developing interaction and communication. It can be concluded from the study of Henjum (1969) that desirable acts of learners can be enabled by the desirable personal characteristics of teachers. This modification in acts comes from the personality and being able to use personal characteristics in a desired way within the classroom. So, it is a mental process that results in changes in behaviours of both teachers and students.

One of the reasons in attributing such an importance to the personality characteristics of teachers is that efficient teachers seems to have acquired special skills, attitudes, specific personality traits and motivation to teach effectively. With such an advantage, enhancing the quality of instruction and affective development of learners can happen easily. A teacher does not only give academic instruction, but also opens ways for students to develop emotionally and socially. According to Witty (1947), teachers should provide factors for an effective learning environment such as security, autonomy, and respect. In addition to education, affective domain of instruction has been also underlined in that learning process does not only include cognitive ability but also emotional ability The writer has also added that enhancing developments in such ways will result in human satisfactions and values.

Symonds (1950) explains every response of a teacher or every act displayed in a classroom as a function of personality. He explains that many things teacher displays or do

in a learning environment such as manner, attitude, relationships with pupils are rooted in the personality. He adds that these cores of the personality are not something that can be easily changed in that they are established parts of personality. However, some scholars in psychology field emphasised that shaping some patterns of personality is possible, yet it can take time. To illustrate, attitudes may change in time to an extent that it can create big differences in the classroom in terms of students' development or quality of instruction. It is not certain how deep the changes are, or how successful they are in a language instruction, but it is teachers' job not to go back to established patterns of their personalities and to keep up with the changes they are trying to adapt to the different situations in the language instruction. Shaping some particular patterns of personality, or changing them if necessary is not easy to accomplish, but the psychologists state that it is possible to some extent (Marrow & French, 1945; as cited in Symonds, 1950).

Another point that should be paid attention is that teachers' personality styles affect teaching profession in that they are seen as role models by learners. Teachers' having positive personality traits that can lead students into accommodating their teachers' personality traits is an important matter in that students accept teachers as role models and they are tend to change their intellectual styles in that way. In this regard, Amatora (1954) claims that students' personality styles are influenced personality styles of teachers. However, it does not mean that standardization of personality types is expected. Human beings are different from each other as a result of their nature. Differences make society better in that they help people widen their perspectives and accept people as they are. At this point, it is not expected that students will be the same as teachers. It is pointed out in this study that personality traits of teachers are important in that it does not only affect instruction process but also affects learners' tendencies in taking teachers as role models since they will be affected somehow by the personality traits of teachers in terms of its

effect on behaviours. Consequently, it should be questioned and also investigated whether teachers have enough positive personality traits to be able to show positive manners and behaviours within the classroom context. Besides, teacher mistakes that result from personality types of teachers are also necessary factors that should be studied in that it will affect student achievement and motivation.

Pribylova (2014) states that teacher's personality is an instrument in his working. Having known themselves with strengths and weaknesses, teachers can understand students better in terms of their development (socially, personally, cognitively, and academically), finding best ways for them to comprehend the instruction and interact with them. The author emphasises the effect of teacher personality by stating that having a deeper look into their personalities and learning much about themselves will give enough knowledge and guideline in having a stable mental health.

As Symonds (1950, p.693) stated as "Every class has a distinct personality, and it is believed that the personality of a class is a function of the personality of the teacher.", the effect of personality traits of teachers may change in different classrooms. In some classrooms, energetic and friendly teachers may be more efficient, but on the other hand, in other ones, strict and authoritarian teachers may be preferred more often. Due to the different characteristics of students in numerous classrooms, personality traits of teachers are vital in determining the efficiency of the instruction since the instruction and learning atmosphere of the classroom is determined and shaped by the teacher. To illustrate, if the teachers shows a authoritarian manner towards students, students are also expected to show strict attitudes in their academic and social lives. As the writer pointed out in the study, teachers can disguise their manners, emotions and behaviour in the classroom, and for some situations and classrooms it can be essential. Not all personality traits of the teacher may work in every classroom, so it is expected to show a variety of attitudes from teachers

While Zhang (2007) underlines that the effect of personality traits of teachers shape teachers' way of teaching, he also claims that it cannot be expected from teachers to shape their whole identity. As the writer stated, the purpose here is to raise awareness of teachers. It cannot be denied that psychological factors also shape teaching styles of teachers in many ways. Although shaping one's personality is very difficult, changing teaching styles on the basis of different situations or factors is possible. Using different teaching styles can help both teachers and students in that it can appeal to different students in the classroom and it can make teachers get rid of habitual thinking styles.

At this point, Pribylova (2014) states "The teacher's personality is not genetically determined." (p. 1033). It has also been stated in the study that "Her final appearance depends on training, personal dispositions, the school and its program, pupils, parents, school material equipment." (Spendla, 1974, as cited in Pribylova, 2014, p.1033). Within these factors shaping personality of teachers, teachers' modifying their personality traits in terms of taking full advantage of the effect of their behaviours on students may change the quality of instruction and emotional effect on learners.

Teacher effectiveness.

Teacher effectiveness is a topic that has been studied for a long time since there is not a common satisfaction about what creates effective teaching (Grindler & Stratton, 1990). However, in efforts to determine teaching effectiveness, many factors such as age, experience, gender, academic background etc. have been taken into account by many scholars. However, according to Mitzel (1960), a serious problem results from an agreement about the correct criterion in evaluating teaching effectiveness (as cited in Sherman & Blackburn, 1975). In this study, personality factor will be examined with the

aim of developing the literature in the field. Sherman and Blackburn (1975) put emphasis on teacher personality factor in determining efficiency of teaching since teacher behaviours stemming from their personality traits are seen more important in that they are perceived by students themselves within a classroom setting and affect their motivation and learning. They also say that it is the personality and their personal qualities that teachers bring into the classroom as individuals. Besides, Gotham (1945) also examines personality factor in seeking teaching efficiency.

It is not easy to define characteristics of good efficient teachers in that the results may change when other factors are included (Symonds, 1950). It can be put forward that one of the most important traits of successful teachers is being adaptable. It is an important quality to adapt new conditions and adapt a variety of teaching styles to include every individual in the classroom, and it is also essential to include new teaching styles and techniques since it may widen their perspectives and have a deeper look into the profession.

In accordance with Grindler and Stratton (1990), an important factor in enhancing teaching efficiency in the classroom is to adapt, modify and adjust of teaching styles on the basis of learners, which will enhance motivation of learners. Awareness of the needs of students who show different types of personality requires differentiated instruction, different teaching styles and also teaching materials. Consequently, effective teachers are the ones who take differences of students' personality types into account. At this point, the writers point out that serving different teaching styles can help students develop awareness of different ways of thinking.

In searching characteristics of effective teachers, Reimanis (1972) puts emphasis on attitudes of teachers not only towards discipline but also towards students. He also states that one of the needs of today's students is personal recognition, so a teacher who shows

interest towards students may be more efficient in interpersonal development and communication. The writer also suggests that efficient teaching occur when teachers take students' needs and interests into consideration since they feel like being active in learning and teaching process and being recognized by teachers. He also adds that "In psychological terms, the task of the instructor is not to present his material in isolation, but to make it a part of the student's affective and cognitive structure." (p.56).

Personality traits of effective / ineffective teachers.

In searching effectiveness in education, scholars have pointed out teacher factor has paramount importance. So, many scholars point out characteristics of teachers in reaching effective and successful instruction. Among numerous characteristics of teachers, personality characteristics of them in determining teachers' success have always been a matter of interest. It has been seen as a vital factor in determining the professional success of teachers.

In searching traits of effective teachers, personality is the concept that has been mentioned often by referring teachers' personality traits such as warmth, sympathy, empathy, fairness, etc. It is seen as an ideal effective teacher factor that is efficient in enhancing interpersonal skills among students and creating a positive atmosphere in which s/he can create interpersonal relationships.

Studies undertaken by the scholars have presented a number of personality traits that have been seen as vital in learning/teaching process. However, it does not mean that there should be one typical desired personality type among teachers. It is expected that there will be variety in personality of teachers in that each person is unique and they shape their vision based on different perspectives and backgrounds than each other. Moreover,

different learning countries, cultures and settings require different personality types of teachers and it cannot be stated that a teacher can affect his/her students in the same degree. The context factor or other variables should be noticed in judging teachers and their personality traits.

In studies regarding desirable personality traits of teachers, items that have been stated a lot by the students are kindness, warmness, patience. On the other hand, Witty (1947) have studied personality traits that have been seen as negative by the students, and they have been presented as bad-tempered, intolerant, unfair, unfriendly teachers (as cited in Lamke, 1951).

In another study that searches students' perception of an effective and enjoyable classroom environment, students attributed personality factor of teachers by referring lack of sarcasm, teacher attitudes, interest towards students, lack of favouritism and etc. (Michael, Earle & Cryan, 1951). Teacher personality has been one of the factors that have been ranked high among participant students.

Mayhew (1957) has also stated that teachers who possess a warm attitude or personality trait towards students have been observed to be more effective than others in changing student misbehaviours or enhancing students' interest or motivation for language learning. On the other hand, Pribylova (2014) states that "the ideal teacher is patient, fair, consistent, responsible, balanced and competent to carry out the teaching profession (p.1036). As well as those traits, Seymour (1963, p. 205) puts forward that "There are other personality traits which are even more important in a superior teacher: a love of learning and interest in ideas, individuality, colour and imagination, a sense of humour, a creative flair, with a little spunk and courage thrown in.".

In searching the effect of personality traits, another important name Ryans (1960) contrasted teachers who showed high and low scores on three different scales. Distinguishing traits of effective teachers were friendliness, objectivity and cooperativeness (as cited in Isaacson, McKeachie & Milholland, 1963). Kelly (1929) also focused in his study that great teachers are the ones who are sympathetic, helpful, sincere and enthusiastic (as cited in Costin and Grush, 1972). Witty (1947) has also displayed a similar list of effective and successful teachers based on the answers of children. As a result, a successful teacher is friendly, flexible, fair, humorous, patient or co-operative.

About the personality traits of effective teachers, Dugan (1961, p.335) claims that;

> The teacher should be a sensitive person who recognizes and understands the needs of the child, the adult, and the community. To be understanding, he must be emotionally stable, able to project himself into the situation of those around him, he must be unselfish, concerned with the welfare of other people and willing to serve his fellow men.

In another study conducted by Murray (1975), it has been displayed that major personality traits of teachers have been observed as extraversion, fairness and leadership (as cited in Murray, Rushton & Paunonen, 1990). According to Tomasco (1980), changeability and endurance are examples of major personality traits of effective teachers on the basis of evaluations of students (as cited in Murray et al., 1990). Intellectuality, liberalism, extraversion are the common prominent personality traits of effective and successful teachers that have been observed in the study conducted by Murray et al. (1990).

Symonds (1950) points out the warmth factor in determining the personality traits of successful teachers. On the basis of what the writer stated, it can be stated that a successful

teacher prefers to have a contact with the pupils in her/his classroom. He also adds that unsuccessful teachers prefer to put a barrier between himself and the students, and they choose a distance.

An important point to teacher personality studies has been made in a study of Clinton (1930), and it presents findings on the basis of students' replies. According to the students, effective teachers have interest in students, fairness, humour and pleasing personality (as cited in Costin and Grush, 1972).

Students' evaluations on common personality traits of effective and successful teachers have displayed that they have rated high for enthusiasm, energy, sympathy, tolerance and positive manners (Feldman, 1986). Evaluations of students and colleagues for a group of teachers were not different from each other, and they displayed similar results in determining teachers' vital personality traits, but there is little agreement between students' ratings of personality traits of teachers and the teachers themselves (Feldman, 1986). It can be concluded that this little agreement may result from subjectivity of teachers due to their own responses in their own measurement. In this sense, a variety of measurement is expected to increase validity and reliability scores of the study that will be held.

In Feldman's study (1986), students and teachers have agreed on the common personality traits of effective teachers as energetic, warm, intellectual, flexible and friendly. In another study undertaken to see effect of personality factor and individual differences on teaching by Rushton et al. (1983), it has been pointed out that creative and effective teachers have been differentiated as sociable, democratic, intelligent and not authoritarian.

In another study stating personality traits of effective teachers, Pribylova (2014) has stated that a successful teacher shows personality traits such as friendliness, being interested in pupils and their problems, awareness of their personal values and finding

satisfaction in the work. As mentioned earlier, awareness of students' personal values and respecting them is a very important aspect of teachers who are expected as effective and successful. Teachers who are aware of differences of personalities within a classroom may be more efficient in comprehending and respecting to those differences and as a result, to the values of students. In this multi-personal learning environment, it may be hard for the teacher to show a wide range of personality traits to be able to reach every unique learner, have a consciousness of their development and appeal to their needs. At this point, the writer suggests that a teacher have an integrated personality. It can be concluded that teachers are expected to show a variety of personality traits, and as a result of this, a variety of teaching ways and behaviours towards learners in that teachers are the leaders in the classroom and they should be able to reach as many students as they can. Besides, this awareness can help teachers construct differentiated instruction on the basis of different needs and personality types of each individual in the classroom.

Henjum (1969) has studied the relationship between certain personality characteristics of teachers and their teaching experience. The teachers having a long time in the profession has seemed to be more dominant and legislative and less liberal. The results of the study have presented that it is vital for teachers to be highly intelligent, enthusiastic, emotionally mature, and also socially adjusted. Teachers' characteristics such as being warm, friendly and sensitive have been underlined in the study by calling it "affectivity oriented" by the participants that have been used for the study. So, this emotional effect has a big importance on students' needs in terms of both academically and personally as they are in an evolving process in that learning environment.

On the basis of these studies, personality cannot be seen as unrelated factor in determining the effect of education. In distinguishing distinctive variables that have

prominent importance in successful instruction; personality, and as a result of personality, choosing and applying particular teaching styles have been regarded as prominent factors that affect learning within the classroom.

In the end, it cannot be expected from teachers to change their personalities. However, changing, shaping or controlling one's behaviours is possible and vital in a teaching process in that teachers are shaping the future. At this point, teachers may reshape their behaviours in accordance with classroom atmosphere although their personalities suggest the opposite. Witty (1947) also suggests that teachers should question what kind of personality traits that teachers should present in a learning environment in terms of being a role model for students. This kind of awareness will lead teachers to appeal as many students as possible and lead them to help students in terms of personality development in that teachers are role models in both behavioural and emotional development. Identifying vital personality traits may help teachers to shape their behaviours and avoid misbehaviours not to present a negative impact for learners. The results of these studies can be used in employing process of teachers. The findings of the study conducted by Henjum (1969) result that teachers who have personality patterns that have intelligence, enthusiasm or emotionally adjustment are the good examples in eliciting teachers. It can enhance the effectiveness of teachers and also the cognitive development of students in that teachers are also emotionally role models for learners. Therefore, the assumption regarding the underlying effect of personality characteristics of teachers has been verified in these studies mentioned in this section.

Teaching styles.

In adapting teaching styles or shaping them, needs of learners and creativity of teachers play an important role. Educators should teach and evaluate by means of a variety of teaching skills. As Sternberg and Zhang (2005) have pointed out, "teaching should be differentiated to help each child capitalize on strengths and compensate for or correct weaknesses." (p. 252). In adapting various ways in the way of teaching, one of the aims is to enrich the toolbox of the teacher (Eberling, 2000). If teachers have more options in carrying out the instruction or ability to adapt what s/he has for the students, the instructions will be more effective and permanent. In adapting and modifying teaching styles, students, individual differences among students, their needs are the factors that should be applied in using appropriate teaching styles in the classroom (Tulbure, 2011).

Besides, Felder (1988) claims that "If our function is indeed to facilitate learning in our students and not just to cover the syllabus, we should try to understand as much as we can about how people learn." (p.489). Felder also claims that the teachers need to modify the teaching styles that they adapt in the classroom to accommodate a wide range of learning styles of students. In this sense, the writer presents that "If teaching styles were tailored to student learning style preferences, remarkable improvements in student performance and attitudes would inevitably results." (p.490). It has been put forward that if the teacher tends to adapt one way of teaching style, some students will show weak performance as compared to others inevitably. As a result, according to the writer, what should be done is to enable a balanced way of teaching by which all styles – at least most of them – are accommodated.

Besides, Raina and Vats (1979) claims that "more creative teachers would have a teaching style which favours creativity and would be more humanistic in their pupil control orientation in comparison to low creative teachers was tested." (p. 807). They also put

emphasis on personality and cognitive ability in differing creative teachers from the others. Those teachers have been claimed to have awareness, and they are described as individuals who relate the children as a person. Why such an importance is contributed is the fact that creative teachers are more successful in displaying teaching style that attribute to the creativity of students. So, a creative personality plays an important role in diversity of teaching styles. A variety of teaching styles can help to create a stimulating learning environment.

Active vs passive teaching styles.

The way teachers teach presents not only their academic knowledge but also their values. The choice in adapting teaching styles in an environment reflects who we are, values, and personal characteristics (Grasha, 1994).

Michel, Cater & Varela (2009) define active learning as "Active learning is a broadly inclusive term, used to describe several models of instruction that hold learners responsible for their own learning." (p.398). Learners become more involved in learning process as the teacher gets them engaged in classroom activities. As a result, intrinsic motivation of learners and their cognitive abilities promote due to being active participants of this social process.

On the other hand, passive teaching style is a result of traditional teaching approach. Many teachers present a traditional teaching style since it does not take much time and energy. Another important reason in teachers' adapting this way is that it enables them to present a large amount of knowledge in a short time. In a classroom in which a traditional teaching style is held, teacher gives lectures without taking students' needs or background knowledge into account. Students are passive listeners, and they do not take an active role

in this process. The active teaching style may have positive effects on students in many ways. However, the writers (ibid) draw attention to a different matter in their studies. They state that some conditions may influence the way of teaching. Since active teaching style requires time, it may not be suitable for some courses which require theoretical knowledge a lot. At this point, one thing that should be done is to reconsider the kinds of courses that will be presented.

Teaching style and personality.

Freeman (1988) states that viewing teaching as a social influence process may help more to understand teaching and its efficiency. In a classroom environment, not only is the syllabus covered, but also the interaction occurs in the classroom in that students take their teachers as role models in learning to shape their visions or cognitive styles. As to teaching formal and written instruction, educational research studies have shown the fact that not all teachers teach the same way as they have different learning styles. Dunn and Dunn (1979) state the fact that teachers prefer to teach in a way that they learn. Moreover, they also claim that different learning styles need different teaching methods and styles, which lead the problem of choosing teaching styles based on different personality styles of teachers. At this point, teachers' recognizing their own personality profiles has an important impact on understanding and teaching to those who show different personality styles and as a result, who need different teaching styles.

A number of teacher characteristics (age, gender, educational level, working environment etc.) that affect teachers' adapting teaching styles have been studied. However, personality characteristics of teachers have not been studied enough. Of the

studies searching the effect of personality in adapting teaching styles, a link between personality and teaching styles has been found (Hunt and Joyce, 1967; Thompson, 1984). Furthermore, Zhang (2007) found a meaningful relationship between personality traits of teachers and their preference of teaching styles. It has been stated that personality traits of teachers contribute to teaching styles of teachers that have been applied in a classroom environment, moreover, it has also been found in the study that teachers having a type of personality traits such as confidence have been observed to use liberal teaching styles, or those teachers have not been observed to use conservative teaching styles as it is expected (ibid). Each of personality traits of teachers has impact on choosing teaching styles to be used in the classroom. For instance, a teacher who shows authoritarian personality traits might use mechanic ways to teach. Frunza (2014) also mentions personality effect in determining the efficiency of teaching style by the attitude towards students. Furthermore, it is claimed that teachers are tend to teach in a way which is consistent with their personality types (Provost, Carson & Beidler, 1987, as cited in Thompson, 1997).

In searching creating conditions in which teachers can use their whole potentials and effectiveness, what is vital is to find out the most suitable teaching styles on the basis of differences between personality styles of teachers and students in that personality style affect both teachers and students in choosing the way how to learn or how to teach. At this point, what should be taken into consideration are psychological and educational needs of learners. Recognition of different personality traits of both teacher and students, teachers can present an incorporated way of teaching. (Cano, Garton & Raven, 1992). The Writers also claimed that “the teacher must ensure that the teaching behaviours exhibited vary such that all learners and learning styles are included in the lesson (p. 49). An effective teacher has been expected to be sensitive in adapting teaching styles according to the needs, personality and learning styles of students. In this sense, Gage and Berliner (1984, as cited

in Murray et al., 1990) points out that;

> Just as plays and movies require casting, not every actor is suitable for every role, so teaching methods require matching with the strengths and weaknesses of the teacher. If a teacher's personality in unsuited for lecturing, it will be much more worthwhile for that instructor to choose a method other than lecturing than to try to learn to use the method effectively (p. 482).

In this regard, teachers are supposed to reshape their way of teaching on the basis of learners and their needs. As Cutietta (1990) claimed, it is teachers' responsibility to shape teaching styles or their habits if necessary. However, as Frunza (2014, p. 346) has mentioned "developing an effective teaching style for your subject-area requires time, effort, a willingness to experiment with different teaching strategies, and an examination of what is effective in your teaching.". Brew and Wright (1990) present in their study that adopting various teaching styles and shaping the present one is about being open to change, which means that it is about having a liberal personality type. They also stated that newer teachers are more open to change, and more experienced teachers have been observed to be resistant to the change. Moreover, the resistance has been observed in teachers who want to keep the leader and authority role in the classroom, which is seen in teachers who presents authoritarian personality traits. Consequently, it can be put forward that the effect of personality can be seen in changing or shaping teaching styles. However, this change or shaping does not mean a radical shift. Instead, it means breaking down the mental barriers. On the other hand, taking learners and their needs into consideration does not mean that teachers can appeal all learners, and it would be schizophrenic to try to reach all students in the classroom (Thompson, 1997).

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, the concept of personality and its relation and effect to teaching styles have been introduced. Besides, background of the study with reference to the related studies in the field has been presented. Following the background section; purpose, significance of the study and research questions that have been formed for the present study have been introduced. Next, limitations and assumptions of the study have been discussed.

Following that, a brief review of the literature related to the topic studied in this study has been provided. A broad definition of personality and five factor model of personality have been presented in a detailed way. Then, the relationship between thinking styles, personality and teaching has been discussed by referring to the scholars and studies in the related literature. After presenting this relationship, its effect on effective teaching has been presented. The chapter ended with the discussion of relationship between teaching styles and personality.

Chapter II

Methodology

Introduction

In this chapter, methodology used in the study searching English language teachers' perceptions on their common mistakes regarding their personality and teaching styles has been put forward in detail. The first sub-section explains how the questionnaire has been constructed. Following the construction of the questionnaire, participants of the study, setting, data collection process and administration of the questionnaire have been explicated. Additionally, data analysis process has been presented at the end of this chapter.

Questionnaire

Construction of the Questionnaire.

The aim of the current study focuses on language teachers' perceptions on their mistakes regarding their personality and teaching styles. It aims to search common mistakes made by English language teachers in terms of the effects of teacher personality to teaching process and their tendency to certain teaching styles based on their personalities. It investigates how personal traits of teachers contribute to effective language teaching.

The researcher also aims to shed a light in the field by searching qualifications of effective teacher via searching the common mistakes made by English language teachers. It also describes some practical implications to help teachers that may help for an enhanced and effective teaching-learning interaction. The research questions help us draw some implications for the field of ELT by enhancing awareness of the teachers.

Research questions that are examined in this study are;

1. What are English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teacher personality and teaching style?
2. Is there a significant difference among English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teacher personality and teaching style in terms of the type of school they teach?
3. Is there a significant difference among English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teacher personality and teaching style in terms of their gender?
4. Is there a significant difference among English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teacher personality and teaching style in terms of their experience?

In this descriptive study, qualitative and quantitative research methodologies have been applied. Based on this research methodology design, the items of questionnaire were constructed after reviewing the related literature. In constructing the items, the ideas of supervisors who are experts in the field of English Language Teaching have been taken into account to improve the questionnaire. Considering their ideas, while some items were omitted, some items were changed. Then, items were categorized, and parts of the questionnaire were organized to find out the answers to each research question. Then, 2 main parts were constructed as 'mistakes regarding teacher personality' and 'mistakes regarding teaching styles'. Next, the items were categorized taking these two main headings into account. The items were taken from the article written by Frunza (2014) and the book by Orange (2008). As well as 2 main parts, an open-ended questions part was

also added to find out any other comments that participants may want to state to get a deeper understanding of English language teachers' perspectives. So, participants were also asked to specify mistakes that they think it might help for the study in case they may not see among the items in the two main parts.

After reviewing of the literature, 126 items were constructed as an item pool (See Appendix A). Having got the expert opinion on the subject, some items that were accepted as not related to the topic were eliminated, which ended up with 79 items (See Appendix B). With the help of the supervisor, some items have been omitted or changed as they were complex. Finally, with some omissions, revision and expert opinion of the supervisor, the final form of the questionnaire having 53 items was constructed to be implemented to get data for the present study. 53 items were categorized into two parts to be able to answer the research questions (See Appendix C). The first part which consists of 28 items aims to find out common mistakes that English Language teachers make regarding their personality traits. Having 25 items, the second part seeks to find out common mistakes regarding English Language teachers' teaching styles. In these two parts, the answers were asked to state frequency of making those mistakes by applying Likert-type-scale (5=always; 1=never). The present study aims to reflect how teacher personality traits affect teachers and their teaching styles within the classroom setting. At this point, one of the most important aims of this study is to raise awareness of English language teachers and decreasing the frequency of common mistakes that have been identified in the questionaire.

In forming the questionnaire, an introduction part that gives information about the purpose and content of the study was added to two main parts mentioned earlier. To get more reliable answers from participants, the researcher stated that the information about participants will be kept as confidential, so it wasn't asked to write their names on the questionnaire in that they may be more open and honest in answering open-ended

questions that have been added to the questionnaire. Besides the introduction, a part that asks about personal information was also included into the questionnaire. Participants were asked to state their gender, teaching experience and the type of schools in which they are working. These descriptive features of English language teachers and their relationship with frequency of common mistakes have been examined to find out if there is any relationship between them.

Administration of the Questionnaire.

The present study examined English language teachers' common mistakes made during teaching process. Hence, it has been administered to 175 English language teachers. In order to get more reliable data in gathering them; first of all, opinions of experts have been taken into consideration. So, there have been some final changes such as omission of unnecessary words, unrelated or similar items or correction of misspelled words with the help of comments of experts in the field. With those corrections from the experts, the questionnaire was revised for the final form (See Appendix D).

Analyzing the findings obtained from the pilot study, Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient has been calculated to identify internal consistency of the items for both parts. Table 1 displays the results of the internal consistency reliability analysis of the items for the both parts of the questionnaire.

Table 1

Cronbach Alpha Coefficient for Internal Consistency Reliability of the Questionnaire

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.974	.976	53

As shown in Table 1, the reliability analysis has revealed that Cronbach's alpha score has been found out as α = .97 for 2 parts, 53 items. The finding has displayed that the questionnaire has a high reliability score (Gliem & Gliem, 2003). As a result, the present questionnaire as a pilot study has been found out reliable to get data to analyze for the present study that the researcher examines. So, it has been decided to continue with the pilot study as the main study since it presents a high reliability score.

Interview

A semi-structured interview was also used to get a better and deeper understanding of teachers' perspectives on their common mistakes. The interview questions have been constructed to clarify missing points in the questionnaire and to state participants' opinions or ideas regarding the topic. 15 English language teachers contributed to the interview sessions. The interviews have been transcribed and the qualitative data has been used in data analysis process.

Main Study

Setting.

175 English language teachers from four different types of schools; primary schools, secondary schools, high schools and universities from different cities got involved in the study.

Sampling and participants.

This study aims to get perspectives of English Language teachers regarding their common mistakes within the classroom setting. The participants consists of English Language teaches working at different types of schools since there may be a relationship between type of school they are working in and making frequency of come particular common mistakes.

185 teachers working from different types of schools have contributed to this study as participants by snowball sampling technique. A website that presents the questionnaire has been created by the researcher and emailed to English language teachers. They have been asked to answer the questions and save the document. Additionally, it has been asked to send the email to other English language teachers that they know or meet. In this way, many teachers contributed to the study via the website. The total population consists of 90 female participants and 85 male participants. 10 participants' questionnaires have been accepted as invalid since there were missing items.

Table 2

Gender Distribution of the English Language Teachers Involved in the Study

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Female	90	51.4	51.4	51.4
Male	85	48.6	48.6	100.0
Total	175	100.0	100.0	

As the Table 2 displays, the number of female participants as English language teachers is more than male participants. Whether there is a relationship between the gender and frequency of common mistakes made by English language teachers have been discussed in detail in the findings section.

Table 3

Experience of the English Language Teachers Involved in the Study

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
1-7 years	72	41.1	41.1	41.1
7-14 years	59	33.7	33.7	74.9
14-... years	44	25.1	25.1	100.0
total	175	100.0	100.0	

Table 3 presents the data regarding teaching experience of the participants. Among the participants, 72 English language teachers have been observed to teach 1-7 years, who can be regarded as being just at the beginning of the teaching career. As to next group, they have 7- 14 years of English language teaching. Finally, the last group of participants are those who have been teaching at least 14 years, who are called as experienced in the ELT field. The relationship between teaching experience and frequency of some common mistakes has been examined and explained in detail in the following chapter.

Table 4

Type of Schools English Language Teachers Involved in the Study Work

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Primary School	43	24.6	24.6	24.6
Secondary School	47	26.9	26.9	51.4
High School	40	22.9	22.9	74.3
University	45	25.7	25.7	100.0
Total	175	100.0	100.0	

As it can be seen above, Table 4 gives data regarding type of schools in which participants are working. Participants that have been included to the study work at four different types of schools.

Data collection procedures.

In conducting the main study, teachers working at primary schools, secondary schools, high schools and universities have contributed as participants. Firstly, the researchers sent the questionnaires via e-mail. Secondly, those who got the e-mail have been asked to send it to English language teachers that they can reach. At this point, with the help of snowball sampling, a great number of participants have been reached for the study. Moreover, a website that is a digital form of the questionnaire has been designed to reach teachers who live and teach in different cities. Besides, 15 teachers contributed to the study by taking part in the interviews. As it is not easy to reach a great number of English language teachers, data collection process took nearly 2 months for the researcher.

Data analysis.

The data obtained from the questionnaires of participant teachers have been analyzed through SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) 21.0 for Windows. Descriptive statistics, Cronbach Alpha Coefficient Reliability, Non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis Test, Mann-Whitney U Test analysis have been carried out for this study. For the interview part, the data were transcribed. Besides, semi-structured interview questions were asked to 15 English language teachers to add missing parts and to have a better understanding of the data based on experiences and opinions (Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). The results of the interviews were examined by content analysis.

Chapter Summary

This chapter displays detailed information of the methodology used for the study. First, the construction of the questionnaire and procedures used for the study were explained in detail. Second, how the questionnaires were administered was presented. Next, main study with its participants, setting, data collection and data analysis processes were described thoroughly.

Chapter III

Findings and Discussion

Introduction

This chapter shows the findings of the data gained from the participant teachers. The statistical analysis of the data is presented in detail below. Having presented the findings, discussion and interpretation parts were included.

Findings and Discussion

RQ1: What are English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teacher personality and teaching style?

RQ1.1: What are English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teacher personality?

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics of Common Mistakes Regarding Teacher Personality Made by English Language Teachers

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
P1	175	2	5	3,95	.870
P2	175	1	5	3,97	1.072
P3	175	1	5	**2,51**	1.245
P4	175	1	5	3,81	1.058
P5	175	1	5	**3,69**	1.010
P6	175	1	5	4,26	.895
P7	175	1	7	4,47	.958
P8	175	1	5	4,54	.889
P9	175	1	5	4,34	.939
P10	175	1	5	4,24	.947
P11	175	1	5	4,50	.976
P12	175	1	5	3,97	1.061
P13	175	1	5	4,48	.927
P14	175	1	5	4,60	.773
P15	175	2	5	4,37	.826
P16	175	1	5	4,51	.757
P17	175	1	5	4,46	.828
P18	175	2	5	4,18	.908
P19	175	1	5	4,23	.880
P20	175	1	5	4,51	.808
P21	175	1	5	4,25	1.048
P22	175	1	5	4,66	.756
P23	175	2	5	4,43	.791
P24	175	1	5	4,27	1.064
P25	175	1	5	**4,70**	.665
P26	175	1	5	**4,78**	.596
P27	175	1	5	4,42	1.068
P28	175	1	5	4,31	.896

In order to find out English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teacher personality and its effect on teaching process or student-teacher interaction, descriptive statistics were analyzed. As it can be seen from Table 5, item 26 'Teachers don't have to be friendly; our responsibility is just conveying our instructional knowledge.' is the most common mistake made by the participants. Since teachers have fear of losing the authority within the classroom, they prefer a distance in their relationships. However, instead of the distance in relationship between teachers and students, some studies recommend more socialization along with the instruction in formal curriculum (Brophy, 1988). In a study conducted by Woolfolk, Rosoff and Hoy (1990), the effect of interactive perspective was underlined. They claim "the model of the humanistic perspective is the school as an educational community in which students learn through cooperative interaction and experience (p.139). Yet, teachers should be able to keep the balance between professional distance and socialization. Interviewee 8 also supported this result:

> I accept that students are the centre of education process. However, authority is also important in most language classrooms since sometimes we have at least 40 students. For such a crowded classroom, my first concern is to keep authority. Because of this reason, I avoid closer relationships with students.

Interviewee 5 also stated that:

> I make mistakes for classroom management. If you lose the order once, it is not possible to teach something. My job is not to have friendships with students. It is to teach English. So, I don't like having closer relationships with students.

The other item that has been observed to be one of the most common mistakes is item 25 'I don't respect what students believe or say.'. Participants seem to neglect considering students as social and unique individuals within the classroom. According to

them, students are the targets that should be filled up with formal instruction, and it is only teachers whose opinions, views, or decisions matter.

At this point, Colomeischi (2015) claim that teachers' personality traits, their well-being and their emotional intelligence are important factors to show positive attitudes towards their work. Lack of enthusiasm and emotional stress affect teachers' academic performances and the quality of education. Especially, emotional stress may lead teachers to make mistakes that can damage students' self-esteem or their motivation. Tirri (2001) suggests that it is not possible for a person to separate his/her personal and professional identity, so because of our personal tendencies, it is highly possible to make some moral mistakes.

As to least common mistakes, item 3 'I have distant relationship with students' is the least common mistake made by English language teachers. Teacher-students relationship is a vital element in teaching process. In addition, teachers and students should cooperate pleasantly to create a harmonious atmosphere, which is the key to new relationship between teachers and students (Sun, 2012).

Participants have been observed to have awareness and they seem to be in an effort not to make such a mistake at this point. Another item that has been seen one of the least common mistakes is item 1 'I don't feel optimistic, energetic and enthusiastic in the classroom.'. Participants regard themselves as having pleasure and satisfaction about their jobs. Another important point to be discussed is humour. Participants have been observed to have awareness for using humour in the classroom. Studies suggest that teachers with a good sense of humour have positive attitude towards their profession or their pupils and creating a positive learning environment, so humour plays an important role in teaching profession. (Torroc, McMorris & Lin, 2010; Ziv, 1979)

Interviewee 3 shared his opinion as follows:

As teachers, we have to deal with so many difficulties in the classroom. In crowded classrooms, using humour can create some management problems. Because of this reason, humour is one of the most common mistakes I make.

Item 5 has been presented as the least common mistakes, which is about making mistakes and admitting them. Participants have been observed not to have a fear of making mistakes, and if they make mistake, they tend to admit it instead of denying. As Bryant (2009) states, making mistakes does not make us less human, and mistakes will enable us to get insight to be the best.

Mistakes play a vital function in teaching; they serve to inform and direct professional practice, to promote reflection, and to facilitate personal-professional growth (Phelps, 2000). Since it is a difficult job to deal with each individual in a classroom, even the most successful teachers can make mistakes through their career. Yet, it should be regarded as an opportunity to be more effective and successful as we can learn from those mistakes and share them with the future teachers (Tirri, 2001). As a result, instead of failures, mistakes should be admitted as practices for reflection to be more effective.

RQ1.2: What are English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about their teaching styles?

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics of Common Mistakes Regarding Teaching Styles Made by English Language Teachers

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q1	175	1	5	4.25	1.110
Q2	175	1	5	4.55	.901
Q3	175	1	5	4.62	.763
Q4	175	2	5	4.36	.767
Q5	175	2	5	4.46	.801
Q6	175	1	5	**4.76**	.686
Q7	175	1	5	4.45	.963
Q8	175	2	5	4.38	.834
Q9	175	1	5	4.49	.801
Q10	175	2	5	**4.70**	.646
Q11	175	2	5	4.30	.745
Q12	175	2	5	4.07	.841
Q13	175	1	5	4.26	.908
Q14	175	1	5	4.63	.722
Q15	175	2	5	4.46	.849
Q16	175	1	5	4.49	1.005
Q17	175	1	5	4.57	.777
Q18	175	1	5	4.26	.982
Q19	175	2	5	4.64	.774
Q20	175	1	5	4.49	.801
Q21	175	1	5	4.30	1.041
Q22	175	1	5	**3.99**	1.099
Q23	175	1	5	4.20	1.130
Q24	175	2	5	4.49	.765
Q25	175	1	5	4.30	1.024
Valid N	175				

Table 6 displays the common mistakes regarding their teaching styles made by participants. Item 6 and 10 are the most common mistakes made by the participants. Item 10

‘I don’t encourage students to try to make them work better.’ shows the fact that participants make some instructional mistakes regarding motivating students. Since teachers have professional responsibilities for a limited of time, they make neglect students’ psychological needs. In this respect, teachers’ job is very difficult. As well as formal responsibilities, they should also create a learning environment in which students’ both extrinsic and intrinsic motivation will enhance. Besides, it is also expected from teachers that they should encourage students in any way and keep their motivation high. Interviewee 1 also expressed his opinion about the issue as follows:

> I’m aware that sometimes I make mistakes about students’ feelings. Teachers have so many responsibilities towards administration, parents and students. While we are carrying out those responsibilities, we may forget students’ feelings. I also don’t have enough time for that.

As to other common mistake, item 6 displays that participants make some moral mistakes in judging students. Since teachers are human beings and they are not perfect, prejudice can be seen in their judging. What is important at this point is to be aware of mistakes and the effort to avoid them.

Of all, item 22 ‘I focus on the syllabus rather than students’ needs.’ is the least common mistake made by the participants. To enhance the quality of the instruction, teachers should take individual differences and their needs into account so that they can apply different instructional strategies that are differentiated for each learner and their needs (Tulbure, 2011). However, teachers state that it is not possible all the time since they have responsibilities to the administration, too. They have a lot of workload even outside the classroom. Being aware of these facts, participants commented that syllabus is not the only factor that they pay attention. They also try to deal with students’ other problems or

needs. However, they state that the limited time given to the teachers makes it difficult to focus on each student and his/her learning needs. Interviewee 9 stated her ideas as the following:

> I have to make the mistake of focusing on syllabus not students' needs. How can they expect us to teach in a limited time in crowded classrooms with limited materials? Of course, I want to do anything different from the syllabus, but it is not so easy.

RQ2: Is there a significant difference among English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teacher personality and teaching style in terms of the type of school they teach?

RQ2.1: Is there a significant difference among English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teacher personality in terms of the type of school they teach?

To find out whether there is a significant difference between English language teachers' perceptions of their common mistakes about teacher personality and the type of school they teach, non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis Test via SPSS was carried out. Of all the items, item 2, 4, 6, 10, 12, 17, 20, 21, 25, 26 displayed significant differences between teachers' perceptions of their common mistakes about teacher personality and the type of school they teach (See Appendix E).

Item 2 was observed to have a significant difference between teachers' workplace and their mistakes regarding teacher personality [$X^2_{(3)} = 8.332$; $p < .05$]. The mean rank of the item presents that teachers tend to avoid using humour especially in universities and

primary schools since the age factor in those 2 types of schools are critical, which can be interpreted as the fear of losing authority. As Lewis (1999) mentioned, this desire for control may be related to the need for discipline in the classroom. Besides, item 4 also show the fact that teachers are in the search for order to enable classroom management [$X^2_{(3)} = 11.763$; $p < .05$]. Interviewee 7 claimed that:

> When I was teaching at school, I was more strict. Teenagers are difficult to deal with. Then, when I started to teach at secondary school, I made less mistakes in terms of teacher personality.

Item 6 shows that teachers working especially at high schools tend to make moral mistakes like grading [$X^2_{(3)} = 9.825$; $p < .05$]. Tirri (1999) underlines the importance of professional morality in teachers' work. In her study, she states that grading is a vital dilemma, and it is acknowledged by the teachers that there is a gap between ideal behaviour and actual behaviour in such a dilemma in a classroom situation. Another item that describes moral dilemmas of teaching is item 10 [$X^2_{(3)} = 12.717$; $p < .05$]. It has the highest rank especially for "university" workplace. To decrease the potential resistance of adult learners, fairness is used as a weapon by the teachers. However, fairness is in the centre of educational discourse to some extent (Fallona, 2000).

In a classroom environment and interaction, instructional education is only a small part of the whole picture. Martin and Baldwin (1995) claim that a learning environment consists of 4 dimension; namely psychological environment, setting a classroom structure, communication, and instructional management. They define that "the psychological environment includes meeting needs and interests of students, maintaining warmth, friendliness and respect, and acknowledging feelings." (1995, p.3). However; in item 20, 26 respectively, the participants have been observed to give priority only to instructional part

of the education [$X^2_{(3)} = 8.788$; $p < .05$], [$X^2_{(3)} = 8.637$; $p < .05$].

Of all different working places, it is university that has the highest rank. So, it can be clearly seen that teachers' first priority is to give instructional knowledge and the syllabus. Since the focus group is adults at universities, the relationship between teachers and students is more formal; and in teacher-students interaction, borders is felt easily. However, Andrews mentions that "both teaching and effort to improve teaching involve the whole person" (1978, p.149). He also claims that instructional development and personal development mesh together when teachers have a teaching problem. As a result, education is an umbrella term and instruction is a part of it as well as other dimensions. As item 12 suggests, teachers find it difficult to apologize especially at universities [$X^2_{(3)} = 9.924$; $p < .05$]. It may be due to the age range of students. Since teachers are teaching and interacting with young adults, it may be more difficult to accept their mistakes within the classroom. Unlike children or teenagers, young adult learners have other social roles (Knowles, 1972). As a result, teachers at universities interact with other members of the society not with children whom they can give orders easily. Item 17, 21, 25 also suggest the same idea respectively [$X^2_{(3)} = 11.942$; $p < .05$] [$X^2_{(3)} = 8.963$; $p < .05$] [$X^2_{(3)} = 10.570$; $p < .05$]. The mean ranks of these items are high especially for universities. Young adult learners can detect mistakes easier than children, so they can make more criticism. As a result, teachers at universities may face more criticism than the ones who are teaching at other types of schools.

RQ2.2: Is there a significant difference among English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about their teaching styles in terms of the type of school they teach?

In order to see whether there is a significant difference between teachers' perceptions of their common mistakes about their teaching styles and the type of school they teach, Kruskal-Wallis test has been carried out. Of all the items, item 2, 10, 13, 14 and16 displayed significant differences (See Appendix F).

Item 2 showed a significant difference between teachers' workplace and their mistakes regarding teaching styles [$X^2_{(3)} = 8.871$; $p < .05$]. The mean rank of the item presents that teachers working at universities do not focus on the effectiveness of learning environment. However, in a study conducted with respect to learning environment (Ziv, 1979), high scores indicated the effect of a positive classroom atmosphere. Furthermore, Dörnyei, (1994) also underlines the effect of learning environment on the motivation for language learning.

As to item 10 [$X^2_{(3)} = 12.079$; $p < .05$] and item 14 [$X^2_{(3)} = 10.813$; $p < .05$], there is a significant difference between teacher's workplace and teachers' effort to enhance motivation of students. Participants working at universities seem to make this mistake more than the ones working at other types of workplaces. They make less positive statements about students' success and they don't encourage their students enough, which result in demotivation among students.

Item 13 [$X^2_{(3)} = 9.535$; $p < .05$] also shows the fact that teachers especially working at universities choose learning materials without interest to students. The next item that has a high mean rank for 'university setting' is item 16 [$X^2_{(3)} = 13.907$; $p < .05$]. Of all participants, teachers who work at universities seem more reluctant to use different teaching styles. However, Amir and Jelas (2010) state "it is imperative that lecturer realized the

diverse learning style among students and conduct instruction and evaluation technique that matches the different learner in their class." (p. 684). Oxford, Hollaway and Horton-Murillo (1992) also emphasize that altering the teaching style for different learning styles of students is highly crucial. Consequently, it is vital to adapt different teaching styles to fit for students' learning styles.

Interviewee 13 claimed that:

I work at university, so I have lots of job and I teach in very crowded classrooms. So, I cannot pay attention to learning styles of each individual in my classes. So, I have to admit that I often make this mistake.

RQ3: Is there a significant difference among English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teacher personality and teaching style in terms of their gender?

RQ3.1: Is there a significant difference among English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teacher personality in terms of their gender?

The purpose of this research question is to reveal whether there is a significant difference between English language teachers' perceptions of their common mistakes about their teaching styles-their personality traits and gender of the teachers. Table 10 presents the items that reveal significant differences between participants' perceptions of their common mistakes about their personality traits and gender factor whereas Table 11 displays significant differences between participants' perceptions of their common mistakes about their teaching styles and gender of them (See Appendix G). So, common mistakes regarding teachers' personality between male and female English language teachers were

examined in detail.

As it can be seen in Table 10, many items display significant differences. However, item 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 15 and 25 respectively scored much higher than the others ($p = .000$; $p < .05$). The mean ranks of item 1, 4, 9 and 15 show the fact that female teachers make more mistakes regarding their personality traits than male teachers ($U = 2719.500$; $p = .000$; $p<.05$) ($U = 2549.500$; $p = .000$; $p < .05$) ($U = 2550.500$; $p = .000$; $p < .05$) ($U = 2674.500$; $p = .000$; $p <.05$). As a result, male teachers seem more neutral and they can limit the effects of their personality traits more appropriately compared to female teachers.

Besides, item 5 and 12 show that female teachers have difficulty in accepting making mistakes regarding their personality factor and apologizing to students when necessary within the classroom ($U = 2740.500$; $p = .000$; $p < .05$) ($U = 2637.500$; $p = .000$; $p < .05$).

Moreover, another problem for female teachers is paying attention to personal needs of learners as it can be seen in the mean ranks of item 8, 9 and 25 ($U = 2753.000$; $p = .000$; $p < .05$) ($U = 2550.500$; $p = .000$; $p < .05$) ($U = 2958.000$; $p = .000$; $p < .05$). Female teachers seem to make more mistakes such as not respecting to students ideas or having bad expectations towards students, which may be due to early burn-out.

In the literature, studies conducted to determine the effect of gender issue on personality traits suggested that females were more internally controlled than males whereas males were more assertive and less anxious than females (Feingold, 1994). The writer also noted that females scored higher than males on anxiety, trust and tender-mindedness.

RQ3.2: Is there a significant difference among English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teaching styles in terms of their gender?

As it can be seen in Table 10, many items display significant differences in terms of gender factor. However, item 2, 3, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, 21, 22 and 23 respectively scored much higher than the others, which is vital to examine and discuss (See Appendix H).

Table 11 gives detailed information whether there is a significant difference between English language teachers' perceptions of their common mistakes about their teaching styles and the gender of the teachers. The literature examines factors that attribute to difference in teaching style, one of which is the gender issue. Lacey, Saleh and Gorman (1998) claimed that male teachers' teaching styles were more dominant whereas female teachers' styles were more informal and open. However, as the mean ranks of item 3 and 21 presented in this study, female teachers were more dominant than male teachers in this study, which may be resulted from culture difference between the studies conducted at different countries ($U = 2973.000$; $p = .001$; $p < .05$) ($U = 2648.500$; $p = .000$; $p < .05$).

As it can be clearly seen from the mean ranks of item 7, 16 and 23; male teachers were more careful in applying different teaching styles to appeal different needs of each individual within the classroom ($U = 2447.500$; $p = .000$; $p < .05$) ($U = 2868.500$; $p = .000$; $p < .05$) ($U = 2500.500$; $p = .000$; $p < .05$). On the other hand, female teachers were observed to make more mistakes regarding using different teaching styles or using different assessing tools. They were observed to be more conservative in reshaping their teaching styles or changing if necessary.

The scores of item 2, 10, 19 and 22 revealed that female teachers had certain limits about their job description ($U = 2811.500$; $p = .000$; $p < .05$) ($U = 3015.000$; $p = .001$; $p <$

.05) (U = 2760.500; p = .000; p < .05) (U = 2684.500; p = .000; p < .05). According to them, their job is limited to applying the necessities of the syllabus; not enabling an effective learning environment or helping them outside the classroom.

Besides, as item 13 shows, female teachers' frequency of making mistakes regarding not paying attention to learners' needs was much higher than the male participants.

RQ4: Is there a significant difference among English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teacher personality and teaching style in terms of their experience?

RQ4.1: Is there a significant difference among English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teacher personality in terms of their experience?

In order to determine whether there is a significant difference between English language teachers' perceptions of their common mistakes about teacher personality traits and their teaching experience, non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis Test via SPSS was conducted (See Appendix I). Of all the items in the first part, item 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, 19, 21 and 24 respectively showed significant differences between teachers' perceptions of their common mistakes about teacher personality and their teaching experience [$X^2_{(2)}$ = 16.799; p < .05] [$X^2_{(2)}$ = 8.432; p < .05] [$X^2_{(2)}$ = 6.668; p < .05] [$X^2_{(2)}$ = 8.864; p < .05] [$X^2_{(2)}$ = 6.973; p < .05] [$X^2_{(2)}$ = 6.017; p < .05] [$X^2_{(2)}$ = 6.108 ; p < .05] [$X^2_{(2)}$ = 7.774; p < .05].

Participants who have less teaching experience have been observed that they make mistakes regarding their personality traits more than the ones who have more teaching experience. It can be seen that as the teaching experience increases, the mean rank of making mistakes due to teacher personality decreases. It can be interpreted in two ways: the

more experienced teachers are, the less they make mistakes; or experienced teachers were reluctant to accept making mistakes due to their personality traits. This reluctance may be explained with what Hoekstra, Beijaard, Brekelmans and Korthagen (2007) report.

The writers claim that teachers do not only learn from formal teaching programmes, but they also learn from their teaching experiences with the students within the classroom. At this point, participants who are more experienced believe that they are more effective due to this experience and as a result, they make less mistakes compared to novice teachers or teachers who are less experienced. However, some studies claim that experienced teachers tend to make more mistakes than the novice or less experienced teachers. Shohani, Azizifar, Gowhary and Jamalinesari (2015, p. 451) explain this situation as;

> The reason behind the novice teachers' sensitive approach towards students might be the fact that they have studied classroom management and teaching methods more recently than the experienced teachers. Experienced teachers might well be losing their patience in time because they have dealt with so many problematic students, which may result in their using the verbal intervention method.

RQ4.2: Is there a significant difference among English language teachers' perceptions of common mistakes about teaching styles in terms of their experience?

A Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted to determine if there is a significant difference between participants' perceptions of their common mistakes about their teaching styles and their teaching experience (See Appendix J). In the second part of the questionnaire, item 7, 9, 16 and 21 indicated significant differences respectively [$X^2_{(2)} = 6.139$; $p < .05$] [$X^2_{(2)} = 6.380$; $p < .05$] [$X^2_{(2)} = 6.917$; $p < .05$] [$X^2_{(2)} = 7.961$; $p < .05$].

The mean ranks of the items 7 and 16 present that less experienced participants make more mistakes regarding using different teaching ways during the formal instruction. It can be explained with the wide range of teaching experience and having a great amount of teaching techniques due to years of teaching. In this respect, Melnick and Meister (2008) point out that teachers having less experience especially have fear of classroom discipline and dealing with the individual differences in the classroom; moreover, they are less effective in using different teaching methods.

Besides, item 21 reveals that less experienced teachers have fear of losing the authority in the classroom and desire to maintain the control of the teaching process. On the other hand, experienced teachers seem to be more confident in relaxing the rules, which can be interpreted as the power of experiencing a great amount of different problems and solutions to solve them.

Table 7

Dimensions of the Five Factor Model of Personality

	Part 1 items	Part 2 items
Extraversion	1,2,3	18
Agreeableness	5,6,7,8,10,13,14,15,16,17,18 19,20,23,24,25,26	3,4,9,10,14,
Conscientiousness	11	1,2,7,8,11,12,19,20,25
Neuroticism	4,9,12,21,22,27,28	5,6,15
Openness		13,16,17,21,22,23,24

As it can be seen from the Table above, teachers' frequent mistakes from part one reveal that they show low rate for "extraversion" and "agreeableness" types of personality. In other words, teachers who are less energetic and co-operative tend to make more mistakes from part one.

On the other hand, as to mistakes revealed in the second part of the questionnaire, teachers who display low rate for "neuroticism", "agreeableness" and "openness" make mistakes regarding teaching styles more frequently since they are defined as less orderly, calm, intellectual and independent-minded.

Chapter IV

Conclusion, Suggestions and Implications

Conclusion and Suggestions

This study aims to extend the literature by searching effect of teachers' personality types on teaching styles and seeking possible mistakes resulted from them. This study does not aim to find out imperfect results since it deals with human and personality factor, but it still searches reliable data to present.

Personality factor in seeking efficiency of teaching has been accepted as vital to improve qualities of teachers themselves or their teaching styles in teaching process. Wishing to be more successful in classroom setting, teachers may focus on modifying their personality traits in accordance with students' needs or situations that often happen in the classroom.

In this sense, this study is in attempt to present and expand the knowledge of enhancing teaching effectiveness and avoiding mistakes in the classroom by comprehending the relationship between teacher personality and teacher behaviours. Moreover, it has been also aimed that identifying mistakes resulting from different personality styles of both teachers and students may assist teachers to avoid them and to have awareness of differences among students and teachers in terms of styles. The awareness mentioned above can lead teachers underline their strengths and avoid weaknesses. The point that has been made in this study is the fact that teachers should be able to see the different personality types within each individual in the classroom. Seeing the differences, teachers may reshape his/ her way of teaching and avoid mistakes that may

harm learning process or emotional development of students. A number of personality traits have been related to effectiveness of teaching in this study, so educators and researchers may take the effect of these traits into account to promote effectiveness of the learning.

Training teachers to raise awareness of the effect of their personality traits may help teachers for avoiding misbehaviours, teaching style mistakes, enhancing learners' motivation. It is expected that teachers may benefit from this study in that they can see how important of this awareness in underlying some positive personality traits or trying to modify inherent personality traits when necessary. Zhang (2007) also underlines the awareness of teachers about the link between personality traits and teaching styles. According to the writer, this awareness can help teachers to change, modify teaching styles, or get rid of habits in teaching by making them more flexible. Besides, Barbetta, Norona and Bicard (2005) also suggest that teachers should be flexible to be able to meet changing needs of students. However, findings of the study present that teachers especially working at universities do not pay attention to the needs of learners. Besides, the mean rank of item 13 in Table 9 displays that they do not choose teaching materials on the basis of learner needs. The reason why the mean rank of 'university setting' is much higher than the other types of workplaces can be interpreted as teachers working at universities define their jobs from narrower perspectives than the other teachers. They consider their jobs as carrying out formal responsibilities. It can also be seen in item 10 in Table 9 that teachers working at universities do not pay attention to motivation or psychological needs of learners. At this point, this study also found out that female teachers have those narrower perspectives much more than male teachers. Item 2, 10, 19 and 22 in Table 11 show that female teachers have some limits. Their main concern is syllabus, not other factors of teaching. They do not pay attention to learning environment, learners' personal needs and problems, or they avoid helping students outside the borders of school. With this respect, item 7 and 16 in Table 13

display that less experienced teachers make mistake of not using different teaching styles more frequently than experienced teacher. The reason can be the fact that experienced teaches have wide range of teaching experience and as a result, they possess more teaching techniques. On the other hand, as it can be seen from item 21 in Table 13 less experienced teachers have fear of losing the authority in the classroom. Since less experienced teachers' main concern is classroom discipline, they tend to make this mistake much more than experienced teachers.

Non-parametric tests have displayed that there is a significant difference between teachers' workplace/gender/teaching experience and teachers' mistakes regarding teacher personality and teaching styles. Besides, teachers who show 'extraversion' and 'agreeableness' dimensions of five-factor model of personality have been observed to make mistakes more frequently which have already been diagnosed as the most common by non-parametric tests. On the other hand, as to the most common mistakes regarding teaching styles, teachers who display 'neuroticism', 'agreeableness' and 'openness' dimensions have been observed to make those mistakes more frequently than the other participants.

A classroom should represent a variety of personality types, in which differences among individuals are respected. Teachers should be aware of the fact that each person is unique coming from different backgrounds and having different personality traits, psychological and educational needs. Having this awareness, teachers should notice this diversity and be open to any other differences in teaching process and adopting different teaching styles. Consequently, this difference in each individual requires different teaching styles. However, item 16 in Table 9 presents that teachers working at universities make more mistakes than other ones in applying diverse teaching styles that match different learning styles of learners. The underlying reason of this situation may be the fact that they consider their students as young adult learners and they think that it is learners' job to learn.

They share this responsibility by putting burden of teaching on learners' shoulders. So, as it can be seen from the mean rank of item 2 in Table 9, they make mistake of ignoring effectiveness of teaching much more than other teachers working at other types of workplaces. On the other hand, it has been presented in item 7, 16 and 23 in Table 11 that male teachers are more careful in using different teaching styles on basis of learner needs than female teachers. Female teachers have been observed to be more reluctant and conservative in using different teaching styles or reshaping them when necessary. Besides, item 13 in Table 9 presents that female teachers make mistake of ignoring learner needs much more than male teachers. The reason behind this gender difference can be the psychology of females. As it can be seen from the mean ranks of item 3 and 21 in Table 11 and item 25 in Table 10, female teachers have been observed to be more dominant and pessimistic. They make more mistakes in respecting different ideas, and they seem more pessimistic about students or their success.

At this point, teachers' recognizing their own personality traits has a huge impact on applying as many teaching styles as possible. In accordance with interview results, participants stated that they are aware of the effect of their personality to the teaching process and they accept that they make mistakes regarding their personalities. Teachers have some certain teaching styles based on their beliefs or assumptions about how the instruction should be carried out. Dunn and Frazier points out that "these beliefs involve value decisions that affect style by internally influencing teachers to choose various methods that are compatible with their teaching values (1990, p.362). On the other hand, as Dunn (1981) said, each person learns differently from others regardless of any factor. So, a cognitive and personal diversity exists in a learning environment, which should be taken into consideration during interacting and instruction. Consequently, teaching styles should meet the needs of this diversity (Cothran, Kulinna & Ward, 2000).

Consequently, teachers' personality plays an important role. Such a teacher who can adapt different teaching styles according to the diversity within the classroom should have a liberal personality type. For instance, teachers who display authoritarian personality traits have difficulty in changing teaching methods and techniques. In this respect, item 1, 4, 9 and 15 in Table 10 show that female teachers make more personality mistakes than male teachers. Male teachers have been observed to be more neutral in limiting the effects of their personality traits compared to female teachers, and female teachers seem to have problems in being objective in the classroom. Besides, on making mistakes regarding personality traits, female teachers have been observed to be more stubborn in accepting making the mistake and apologizing (see item 5 and 12 in Table 10). In this sense, as it can be seen in Table 12, less experienced teachers make this mistake more frequently than experienced teachers, too.

Changing teaching styles does not mean a radical change. What is needed is to be open to differences and change. It is not possible for a teacher to be able to reach each student. However, it is still necessary to consider that each person is unique showing different characteristics, and they should have this awareness. Teachers may show unwillingness to change since they adopt teaching styles that they feel secure and comfortable, and this drastic change means experiencing unfamiliar ways. However, what is wanted is not a whole change in teaching, instead, what is expected is to be able to be open to small changes when necessary to satisfy learners' needs as much as possible.

With respect to teacher-students relationships, it is presented in item 20 and 26 in Table 8 that teachers working at universities have more formal relationship than the other teachers working at other schools. Their priority is formal instruction and they avoid closer relationship with students. Since learners at universities are young adult who have other social roles in society, teachers may see them as potential resistance to any desire or rule of

them. This desire to keep distance may be the reason of university teachers' avoiding to apologize when they make mistakes (see item 12 in Table 8). Since these young adults can make more criticism or detect mistakes of teachers easier than other age groups, university teachers seem more negative and distant to students (see item 17, 21 and 25 in Table 7).

With regard to five-factor model, mistakes that are regard to "agreeableness" and "neuroticism" for the first part of the questionnaire have been observed to be made more frequently than others. In other words, teachers who feel less concern and empathy for other people and who are more stressful make those mistakes more frequently. As to the second part of the questionnaire that seeks mistakes regarding teaching styles, mistakes that are regard to "conscientiousness" and "openness" have been seen to be made more frequently. So, teachers who have less impulse, less creative and who resist new ideas and dislike changes make them more frequently compared to others.

In searching solution for problems regarding personality traits of teachers, Arif et al. (2012) presents the idea of training teachers in teacher training programmes of faculties in terms of developing 'empathy' and 'interpersonal skills'. It has been put forward by the authors that success at a job comes with these two concepts. Having those skills as vital aspects of personalities, being successful as a teacher is to be certain. Teachers possessing some personality traits are the individual that have a huge effect on students. Moreover, being a teacher demands having a great deal of positive traits of personality in that teachers appeal to a big number of individual by affecting them in behavioural, cognitive and also emotional ways. Students shape who they are according to the people with whom they contact. The variety of positive examples within the society, family and most importantly within the learning environment can help learners to add positive patterns to their personalities. So, in regard with effective teachers, personality factor has a big role in determining the success and their effects on students. As a result, training programmes for

developing interpersonal and empathy skills should be conducted to enhance cognitive dimension of the instruction.

Another point in which personality traits of teachers should be taken into account is the teacher selection to the educational institutes. Tests will choose teacher candidates who are well-informed without paying attention to mental health of the teachers. Whether they display personality traits which are suitable for classroom environment are not questioned by these tests. As well as giving formal instruction, they also integrate their personality traits to the teaching process. Besides, as Johnson (1992) claims, cognitive dimensions of teachers such as their thoughts, judgements or decisions affect the instruction, as a result, in order to understand teachers' instructional choices, teachers' cognitive traits should be examined. Since interviews have started to be used in teacher selection process in Turkey, personality tests that seek intra personal, interpersonal and social skills of teacher candidates can be also applied by the experts.

Teacher personality is a factor that cannot be neglected. In efforts to select teachers to the educational institutes, personality types should be seen as vital as the other traits that teachers have, but it should be also noted that there is not one type of efficient teacher personality type.

Implications for Further Study

The study has focused on personality factor within the classroom context. However, a teacher is a whole person with his/ her professional and social life. The impact of social or personal lives of teachers on personality traits that they reflect in their way of behaviours within a classroom can be examined in a more detailed way to contribute to the field in

further studies.

Moreover, for further studies, it can be also searched how teachers perceive themselves and their personality traits within a classroom context and outside the classroom. On the basis of these differences, it can be searched how they consider themselves, and what kind of factors lead them to present differentiated personality traits, and how it is perceived by students.

Different cultures and settings require different personality types of teachers. The context factor or other variables should be taken into account in judging teachers and their personality traits. Furthermore, a study that focuses on the diversity of participants who teach in different regions of the country may be more effective in searching whether personality factor lead teachers to develop certain teaching styles.

As well as using questionnaire which takes teachers' responses, other techniques that take students responses can be also used to examine the issue from different perspectives. The difference between how teachers regard themselves and how students regard the teachers can be examined in further studies in order to search characteristics of an effective language teacher. Since just teachers' view on the topic may not be objective enough, getting students' responses may help a lot. Consultations of teachers' peer may also help teachers to consider their mistakes regarding their personality traits and teaching styles. Reflection from peers can enhance the objectivity of the results since teachers may have difficulty in criticizing their actions. As a result, using a variety of sources may develop reliability and validity of the study. Besides, the classroom setting or working environment may restrict the expressions of teachers since. In interpreting the data, it should be taken into account that teachers may modify their behaviours or restrict themselves. So, inconsistencies in studies searching personality may be seen under these

conditions. On the other hand, self-evaluation inventories may also lead distortion in that they may explain themselves on the basis of an image that they want to have. A solution in searching for more reliable and valid date for the studies examining personality traits has been put forward by Lamke (1951). He states that the reliability of studies concerning personality and effectiveness of personality traits could be measured by examining the extremes of teachers and isolating the rest. In this sense, the most effective personality traits and the poorest personality traits of teachers could be searched in that it may give more reliable results. On the other hand, acceptable or unacceptable personality traits of teachers on the basis of students' views could be also examined.

References

Amatora, S. M. (1954). Similarity in teacher and pupil personality. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, 37*(1), 45-50.

Amir, R. & Jelas, Z. M. (2010). Teaching and learning styles in higher education institutions: Do they match?. *Procedia Social and Behvioral Sciences, 7*(C), 680-684.

Amon, S. & Reichel, N. (2007). Who is the ideal teacher? Am I? Similarity and difference in perception of students of education regarding the qualities of a good teacher and of their own qualities as teachers. *Teachers and Teaching, 13* (5), 441-464.

Andrews, J. D. W. (1978). Growth of a teacher. *The Journal of Higher Education, 49*(2), 136-150.

Arif, M. I., Rashid, A., Tahira, S. S. & Akhter, M. (2012). Personality and teaching: An investigation into prospective teachers' personality. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 2*(17), 161-171.

Barbetta, P. M., Norona, K. L. & Bicard, D. F. (2005). Classroom behaviour management: A dozen common mistakes and what to do instead. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth,49*(3), 11-19.

Barrett, L. A. (1991). Relationship of Observable Teaching Effectiveness Behaviours to MBTI Personality Types. *Paper presented at the International Conference for the Association of Psychological Type*, Richmond, VA.

Berens, L. V. & Nardi, D. (1999). *The Sixteen Personality Types.* California: Telos Publications.

Bloom, B. D. & Crabtree, B. F. (2006). The qualitative research interview. *Medical Education, 40*(4), 314-321.

Brew, A. & Wright, T. (1990). Changing teaching styles. *Distance Education, 11*(2), 183-212.

Brophy, J. (1988). Educating teachers about managing classrooms and students. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 4*(1), 1-18.

Brosh, H. (1996). Perceived characteristics of the effective language teacher. *Foreign Language Annals, 29* (2), 125-136.

Bryant, L. E. (2009). Becoming a better teacher: Learning from our mistakes. *Communication Studies, 54*(2), 130-132.

Burger, J. (2010). *Personality.* Stamford: Cengage Learning.

Cano, J., Garton, B. L. & Raven, M. R. (1992). Learning styles, teaching styles and personality styles of preservice teachers of agricultural education. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 33*(1), 46-52.

Clark, E. J. (1951). The Relationship between the personality traits of elementary school teachers and their evaluation of objectionable pupil behaviour. *The Journal of Educational Research, 45*(1), 61-66.

Colomeischi, A. A. (2015). Teachers' burnout in relation with their emotional intelligence and personality traits. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 180*(1), 1067-1073.

Costa, P. T. & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Four ways five factors are basic. *Personality and Individual Differences, 13*(6), 653-665.

Costin, F. & Grush, J. E. (1973). Personality correlates of teacher-student behaviour in the college classroom. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 65*(1), 35-44.

Cutietta, R. A. (1990). Adapt your teaching style to your students. *Music Educators Journal. 76*(6), 31-36.

Davey, B. (1991). Evaluating teacher competence through the use of performance assessment task: An overview. *Journal of Personal Evaluation in Education, 5* (1), 121-132.

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(3), 273-284).

Dugan, R. R (1961). Personality and the effective teacher. *Journal of Teacher Education, 12*(3), 335-337.

Dunn, K. J. & Frazier, E. R. (1990). Teaching styles. *Journal of Reading, Writing, and Learning Disabilities International: Overcoming Learning Difficulties, 6*(3), 347-367.

Dunn, R. (1981). Teaching in a purple fog: What we don't know about learning style. *NASSP Bulletin, 65*(443), 33-36.

Dunn. R. S. & Dunn, K. J. (1979). Learning styles / teaching styles: Should they...can they... be matched? *Educational Leadership, 36,* 238-244.

Eberling, D. (2000). Adapting your teaching to any learning style. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(3), 247-248.

Engler, B. (2013). *Personality Theories.* Belmont: Cengage Learning.

Fallona, C. (2000). Manner in teaching: A study in observing and interpreting teachers' moral virtues. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*(7), 681-695.

Feingold, A. (1994). Gender differences in personality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 11*6(3),429-456.

Felder, R. M. (1988). How Students Learn: Adapting Teaching Styles to Learning Styles. IEEE-ASEE Frontiers in Education Conference Proceedings, Raleigh, North Carolina, 89-493.

Feldman, K. A. (1976). The superior college teacher from the students' view. *Research in Higher Education, 5* (3), 243-288.

Feldman, K. A. (1986). The perceived instructional effectiveness of college teachers as related to their personality and attitudinal characteristics. *Research in Higher Education, 24*(2), 139-213.

Freeman, H. R. (1988). Perceptions of teacher characteristics and students' judgements of teacher effectiveness. *Teaching of Psychology, 15*(3), 158-160.

Frunza, V. (2014). Implications of teaching styles on learning efficiency. *Social and Behavioral Sciences, 127*, 342-346.

Gliem, J. A. & Gliem, R. R. (2003). Calculating, Interpreting, and Reporting Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Likert-Type Scales. *Presented at the Midwest Research-to-Practise Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education,*

The Ohio State University.

https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/344/Gliem+&+Gliem.pdf?sequence=1

Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative "Description of Personality": The big five-factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59* (6), 1216-1229.

Goldstein, L. S. & Freeman, D. (2003). Challenges enacting caring teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 54* (5), 441- 454.

Gotham, R. E. (1945). Personality and teaching efficiency. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 14*(2), 157-165.

Grasha, A. F. (1994). A matter of style: The teacher as expert formal authority, personal model, facilitator and delegator. *College Teaching, 42*(4), 142-149.

Grindler, M. C. & Stratton, B. D. (1990). Type indicator and its relationship to teaching and learning styles. *Action in Teacher Education, 12*(1), 31-34.

Henjum, A. (1969). A study of the significance of student teachers' personality characteristics. *The Journal of Teacher Education, 20* (2), 143-147.

Hoekstra, A.; Beijaard, D.; Brekelmans, M. & Korthagen, F. (2007). Experienced teachers' informal learning from classroom teaching. *Teachers and Teaching, 13*(2), 191-208.

Hunt, D. E. & Joyce, B. R. (1967). Teacher trainee personality and initial teaching style. *American Educational Research Journal, 4*(3), 253-259.

Isaacson, R. L., McKeachie, W. J. & Milholland, J. E. (1963). Correlation of teacher personality variables and student ratings. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 54*(2), 110-117.

John, O. P. & Srivastava, S. (1999). The big give trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford Press.

Johnson, K. E. (1992). Learning to teach: Instructional actions and decisions of pre service ESL teachers. *Tesol Quarterly, 26*(3), 507-535.

Knowles, M. S. (1972). Innovations in teaching styles and approaches based upon adult learning. *Journal of Education for Social Work, 8*(2), 32-39.

Komarraju, M. & Karau, S. J. (2005). The relationship between the big five personality traits and academic motivation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*(2005), 557-567.

Lacey, C. H., Saleh, A. & Gorman, R. (1998). Teaching Nine to Five: A Study of the Teaching Styles of Male and Female Professors. *Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Women in Educational Leadership Conference,* Lincoln, NE.

Lamke, T. A. (1951). Personality and teaching success. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 20*(2), 217-259.

Lewis, R. (1999). Teachers coping with the stress of classroom discipline. *Social Psychology of Education, 3*(3), 155-171.

Martin; N. K. & Baldwin, B. (1995). Beliefs Regarding Classroom Management Style: Relationships to Particular Teacher Personality Characteristics. *Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction service No. ED 387 461)

Mayhew, L. B. (1957). Personality and teaching. *Journal of Communication, 7*(2), 83-89.

Melnick, S. A. & Meister, D. G. (2008). A comparison of beginning and experienced teachers' concerns. *Educational Research Quarterly, 31*(3), 39-56.

Michael, W. B., Earle, E. H. & Cryan, E. W. (1951). Survey of student-teacher relationships. *The Journal of Educational Research, 44*(9), 657-674.

Michel, N.; Cater, J. J. & Varela, O. (2009). Active versus passive teaching styles: An empirical study of student learning outcomes. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 20*(4), 397-418.

Murray, H. G., Rushton, J. P., Paunonen, S. V. (1990). Teacher personality traits and student instructional ratings in six types of university courses. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(2), 250-261.

Orange, C. (2008). *25 Biggest Mistakes Teachers Make and How to Avoid Them.* Thousands Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Oxford, R. L. ; Hollaway, M. E. & Horton-Murillo, D. (1992). Language learning styles: Research and practical considerations for teaching in the multicultural tertiary ESL/EFL classroom. *System, 20*(4), 439-456.

Phelps, P. H. (2000). Mistakes as vehicles for educating teachers. *Action in Teacher Education, 21*(4), 41-49.

Pribylova, J. (2014). Personal characteristics of primary school teachers. *Procedia-Social and Behvioral Sciences*, *112*, 1033-1036.

Raina, M. K. & Vats, A. (1979). Creativity, teaching style and pupil control. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 23*(4), 807-811.

Reimanis, G. (1972). *Teaching Effectiveness and the Interaction between Teaching Methods, Student and Teacher Characteristics. Final Report.* New York: Corning Community College.

Rushton, J. P., Murray, H. G. & Paunonen, S. V. (1983). Personality, research creativity, and teaching effectiveness in university professors. *Scientometrics, 5*(2), 93-116.

Seymour, H. (1963). Personality traits for teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 14*(2), 205.

Sherman, B. R. & Blackburn, R. T. (1975). Personal characteristics and teaching effectiveness of college faculty. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 67*(1), 124-131.

Shohani, S.; Azizifar, A.; Gowhary, H. & Jamalinesari, A. (2015). The relationship between novice and experienced teachers' self-efficacy for personal teaching and external influences. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 185*(2015), 446-452.

Sun, Z. (2012). An empirical study on new teacher-student relationships and questioning strategies in ESL classroom. *English Language Teaching, 5*(7), 175-183.

Symonds, P. M. (1950). Reflections on observations of teachers. *The Journal of Educational Research, 43*(9), 688-696.

Thompson, T. C. (1997). Learning styles and teaching styles: Who should adapt to whom?. *Business Communication Quarterly, 60*(2), 125-127.

Tirri, K. (1999). Teachers' perceptions of moral dilemmas at school. *Journal of Moral Education, 28*(1), 31-47.

Tirri, K. (2001). What Can We Learn from Our Mistakes? *Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Seattle*, USA, April 11, 2001.

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

Torok, S. E., McMorris, R. F. & Lin, W. C. (2010). Is humour an appreciated teaching tool? Perceptions of professors' teaching styles and use of humour. *College Teaching, 52*(1), 14-20.

Tschechtelin, M. A. (1951). A study in teacher personality. *The Journal of Educational Research, 44*(9), 709-714.

Tulbure, C. (2011). Do different learning styles require differentiated teaching strategies? *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, (11)*, 155-159.

Victor, J. B. (1976). Relation between teacher belief and teacher personality in four samples of teacher trainees. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 45*(1), 4-9.

Walberg, H. J. (1968). Teacher personality and classroom climate. *Educational & School Psychology, 5* (2), 163-169.

Witty, P. (1947). An analysis of the personality traits of the effective teacher. *The Journal of Educational Research, 40*(9), 662-671.

Woolfolk, A.E., Rosoff, B. & Hoy, W.K. (1990). Teachers' sense of efficacy and their beliefs about managing students. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 6*(2), 137-148.

Zhang, L. F. (2006). Does student-teacher thinking style match/mismatch matter in students' achievement? *Educational Psychology: An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology, 26*(3), 395-409.

Zhang, L. F. (2007). Do personality traits make a difference in teaching styles among Chinese high school teachers?. *Personality and Individual Differences, 43*(4), 669-679.

Zhang, L. F. & Sternberg, R. J. (2002). Thinking styles and teachers' characteristics. *International Journal of Psychology, 37*(1), 3-12.

Ziv, A. (1979). The teacher's sense of humour and the atmosphere in the classroom. *School Psychology International, 1*(2), 21-23.

Appendices

Appendix A: The Item Pool of the Scale Constructed for the Study

Appendix B: The Eliminated Version of the Item Pool

Appendix C: Two Main Parts of the Questionnaire

Appendix D: The Final Version of the Scale Constructed for the Study

Appendix E: Kruskal-Wallis Test Results of Difference between the Type of School They Teach and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Personality Traits

Appendix F: Kruskal-Wallis Test Results of Difference between the Type of School They Teach and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Teaching Styles

Appendix G: Mann Whitney U-Test Results of Difference between Gender of Participants and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Personality Traits

Appendix H: Mann Whitney U-Test Results of Difference between Gender of Participants and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Teaching Styles

Appendix I: Kruskal-Wallis Test Results of Difference between Teacher Experience and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Personality Traits

Appendix J: Kruskal-Wallis Test Results of Difference between Teacher Experience and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Teaching Styles

Appendix K: Interview Form

Appendix A

The Item Pool of the Scale Constructed for the Study

1. I don't have interest to students and classroom activities.
2. I don't feel optimistic, energetic and enthusiastic in the classroom.
3. I lack optimism, energy and enthusiasm towards students in the classroom.
4. I think I am very serious during the lesson.
5. I don't show humour in the classroom.
6. I feel impatient to students' actions.
7. I avoid using sarcasm.
8. I don't show sympathy to students in my work.
9. I have distant relationship with students.
10. I'm not aware of the problems or needs of the students.
11. I don't make effort to encourage students to work better.
12. My instructions are not clear.
13. I don't appreciate students work.
14. I don't provide opportunities for students to solve their problems.
15. I don't have self-control and I can be easily disturbed by any behaviour of students.
16. I don't admit my errors easily.
17. I'm not honest and objective in treatment of students.
18. I'm not friendly and courteous in dealing with students.
19. I don't help students in their personal problems as well as the school.
20. I don't urge students to effort.
21. I don't recognize students' efforts.
22. I don't encourage students to try to make them work better.

23. My classroom activities are not well organized or methodical.
24. My instruction doesn't meet the need of each student.
25. I use learning materials and techniques without interest to students.
26. I don't make positive statements about their successes or failures that will attribute to their effort or ability.
27. If I make a mistake, I don't apologize from students.
28. If I make a mistake towards a student that can hurt his/her personality or self-esteem, I don't apologize to him/her personally.
29. I don't admit that I made an educational mistake as students have no capacity to detect it.
30. Admission of mistakes is sign of weakness, an authority in the classroom shouldn't do that.
31. When I'm interacting with students, I just focus on their verbal patterns, not their body language.
32. If students have problems in understanding the topic, I don't try use different ways to re-explain it.
33. I generally have bad expectations for students.
34. I don't try to encourage students to become independent in their thinking and behaviours
35. I don't praise students' efforts when they make mistakes.
36. I don't treat fairly to the students in the classroom.
37. I don't criticize myself in the classroom since I can lose the authority.
38. I don't display fair treatment for the students I don't like in the classroom.
39. I think that my job is only conveying instructional knowledge, not to help their personal or emotional development.

40. I communicate with students in a strict manner both in the classroom and out of the classroom.
41. I don't take students feelings in to account while I'm punishing them.
42. I don't use appropriate punishments for the unwanted behaviour of students.
43. If I make a mistake that will hurt a student, I don't apologize to the student.
44. I don't learn from my mistakes.
45. I don't model moral behaviours in the classroom.
46. I don't make my students accountable.
47. I don't believe that teaching is a helping profession.
48. I don't protect my students from situations in which their personal identities will be damaged.
49. I don't treat fairly to both male and female students.
50. I avoid any mistreatment that may harm to students' self-esteem and motivation. (positive one)
51. I may show negative attitudes that can damage students' self-esteem.
52. I don't include teaching styles that will promote the accomplishments of students and future success.
53. I don't show patience and understanding towards their hard work and effort.
54. If I show rude behaviours towards students, I don't apologize from students.
55. If students make mistakes, I show lack of value to them.
56. I'm not aware of the fact that I should model to students for kind behaviours.
57. I don't think that my job in the classroom is to suppress any bias and to insist on fairness.
58. In any existence of problems in the classroom, I'm not sensitive to the students' feelings.

59. I treat in an offensive way when there is a problem.
60. I make negative criticisms of the students instantly.
61. I don't balance my negative criticisms with positive ones.
62. I ignore students' suggestions for the lesson or subject matter.
63. I try to impose my ideas on students.
64. I don't evaluate or revise students' work.
65. I don't use humour in an appropriate way.
66. I don't show empathy towards students.
67. I don't show any attempt to understand students' instructional and personal problems.
68. I'm indifferent to students' problems.
69. I don't spend time for listening students if it is not related to the lesson.
70. I don't show concern to students' problems if it is not related to my lesson or field.
71. I have difficulty in handling negative situations within the classroom.
72. I have strict rules, and I don't relax them whatever happens in case students manipulate it.
73. I'm insensitive to students' distress.
74. I don't show interest to students' distress since my job is to cover the syllabus.
75. I don't respect students' ideas if they are different from mine.
76. I focus on the syllabus rather than students' needs.
77. I don't see them as individuals, so what they think about the lesson or me is not important to me.
78. I assess students' performance or work by using one single assessment tool, so I don't take their differences into account.
79. I try to motive my students by using punishment rather than reward.
80. I can define myself as a traditional teacher.

81. I like to be the authority of the classroom.
82. I don't like to put learners on the stage since I am the only leader of the classroom.
83. If my students don't agree with me, it makes me angry.
84. Since I'm authority of the classroom, it should be only me whose opinion matters in educational matters.
85. I don't consult students' opinions in any matter in the classroom.
86. I don't think that students should be active in discussion about educational matters.
87. I don't take students' opinions into consideration
88. I don't values students' responses if they don't agree with me.
89. I use negative phrases in interacting with students.
90. I don't respect what students believe or say.
91. I don't try to make them feel more confident and hopeful since my job is teaching.
92. I only consider students' educational needs, students' personal needs or problems are not my problem.
93. Teachers don't have to be friendly, our responsibility is just convey our instructional knowledge.
94. Teachers are not friends of students, they are the authoritarians who should be respected.
95. I don't use humour in my way of teaching.
96. I only focus on my instructional objectives, and my communication with students is only about instruction.
97. I don't take students' personality development into account while I'm correcting students.
98. I can't tolerate getting criticism from students.

99. I don’t accept any criticism from students because I don’t make any mistake in terms of my academic knowledge.
100. I don’t include teaching materials that will foster creativity in students.
101. I make criticism by using harsh words.
102. I don’t take students choices into account since it in only the teacher who should make decisions.
103. I don’t treat both male and female students fairly.
104. Students cannot approach to me as if I am their friends.
105. I can say that I don’t have a good reputation among students.
106. I don’t create a warm and supportive classroom environment as I think it is not my job.
107. My priority is not to develop mutual trust or respect in the classroom, it is to teach English.
108. I can show hostile behaviours if my students criticize me.
109. If I see students have negative opinions about me, I don’t make any effort to change it.
110. I don’t supply a creative environment in which students feel free to take risks.
111. I make negative personal statements about students.
112. I don’t have an empathetic attitude towards the students.
113. I don’t try to understand students or their feelings when they do something wrong, I just punish them.
114. If students have instructional or personal problems, I don’t try to be empathetic or listen o them.
115. If students have educational problems, I don’t try to encourage them by motivating them.

116. If students have problems in my way of teaching, I don't try to use another way to teach.
117. I don't have differentiated instruction, I just appeal to one single type of learner.
118. Students' race, gender or socioeconomic status influence my judgement.
119. I don't behave equally students since their backgrounds are different from each other.
120. I don't take full responsibility of my actions in the classroom.
121. If I prejudice or have negative feelings for students in the classroom, I can show it by low grades or excluding both physically and emotionally.
122. In evaluating students, I focus only negative parts and lower the grade according to them.
123. In making judgements of the students, I tend to do in regard to negative things.
124. I may neglect the positive when I see the negative in students or their work in the class.
125. If I feel to criticize a student's work, firstly I focus on the negative part, then the positive part.
126. I don't make my criticism in a proper perspective.

Appendix B

The Eliminated Version of the Item Pool

1. I don't feel optimistic, energetic and enthusiastic in the classroom.
2. I don't show humour in the classroom.
3. I feel impatient to students' actions.
4. I avoid using sarcasm.
5. I don't show sympathy to students in my work.
6. I have distant relationship with students.
7. I don't have self-control and I can be easily disturbed by any behaviour of students.
8. I don't admit my errors easily.
9. I'm not honest and objective in treatment of students.
10. I'm not friendly and courteous in dealing with students.
11. I don't help students in their personal problems as well as the school.
12. I don't urge students to effort.
13. I don't encourage students to try to make them work better.
14. My classroom activities are not well organized or methodical.
15. My instruction doesn't meet the need of each student.
16. I use learning materials and techniques without interest to students.
17. I don't make positive statements about their successes or failures that will attribute to their effort or ability.
18. If I make a mistake towards a student that can hurt his/her personality or self-esteem, I don't apologize to him/her personally.
19. I don't admit that I made an educational mistake as students have no capacity to detect it.

20. Admission of mistakes is sign of weakness, an authority in the classroom shouldn't do that.
21. If students have problems in understanding the topic, I don't try use different ways to re-explain it.
22. I generally have bad expectations for students.
23. I don't try to encourage students to become independent in their thinking and behaviours
24. I don't treat fairly to the students in the classroom.
25. I don't criticize myself in the classroom since I can lose the authority.
26. I don't display fair treatment for the students I don't like in the classroom.
27. I think that my job is only conveying instructional knowledge, not to help their personal or emotional development.
28. I communicate with students in a strict manner both in the classroom and out of the classroom.
29. If I make a mistake that will hurt a student, I don't apologize to the student.
30. I don't learn from my mistakes.
31. I don't model moral and prosocial behaviours in the classroom.
32. I don't believe that teaching is a helping profession.
33. I don't protect my students from situations in which their personal identities will be damaged.
34. I don't treat fairly to both male and female students.
35. I don't avoid any mistreatment that may harm to students' self-esteem and motivation.
36. I may show negative attitudes that can damage students' self-esteem.
37. I don't include teaching styles that will promote the accomplishments of students and future success.

38. I don’t show patience and understanding towards their hard work and effort.
39. If I show rude behaviours towards students, I don’t apologize from students.
40. I don’t think that my job in the classroom is to suppress any bias and to insist on fairness.
41. In any existence of problems in the classroom, I’m not sensitive to the students’ feelings.
42. I treat in an offensive way when there is a problem.
43. I don’t balance my negative criticisms with positive ones.
44. I don’t use humour in an appropriate way.
45. I don’t show empathy towards students.
46. I have strict rules, and I don’t relax them whatever happens in case students manipulate it.
47. I don’t show interest to students’ distress since my job is to cover the syllabus.
48. I don’t respect students’ ideas if they are different from mine.
49. I focus on the syllabus rather than students’ needs.
50. I assess students’ performance or work by using one single assessment tool, so I don’t take their differences into account.
51. I try to motive my students by using punishment rather than reward.
52. I don’t like to put learners on the stage since I am the only leader of the classroom.
53. If my students don’t agree with me, it makes me angry.
54. Since I’m authority of the classroom, it should be only me whose opinion matters in educational matters.
55. I don’t values students’ responses if they don’t agree with me.
56. I use negative phrases in interacting with students.
57. I don’t respect what students believe or say.

58. I don't try to make them feel more confident and hopeful since my job is teaching.
59. I only consider students' educational needs, students' personal needs or problems are not my problem.
60. Teachers don't have to be friendly, our responsibility is just convey our instructional knowledge.
61. I don't use humour in my way of teaching.
62. I don't take students' personality development into account while I'm correcting students.
63. I can't tolerate getting criticism from students.
64. I don't include teaching materials that will foster creativity in students.
65. Students cannot approach to me as if I am their friends.
66. I don't create a warm and supportive classroom environment as I think it is not my job.
67. My priority is not to develop mutual trust or respect in the classroom, it is to teach English.
68. I can show hostile behaviours if my students criticize me.
69. I don't supply a creative environment in which students feel free to take risks.
70. I don't have an empathetic attitude towards the students.
71. I don't try to understand students or their feelings when they do something wrong, I just punish them.
72. If students have problems in my way of teaching, I don't try to use another way to teach.
73. I don't have differentiated instruction, I just appeal to one single type of learner.
74. Students' race, gender or socioeconomic status influence my judgement.
75. I don't behave equally students since their backgrounds are different from each other.

76. I don’t take full responsibility of my actions in the classroom.

77. If I prejudice or have negative feelings for students in the classroom, I can show it by low grades or excluding both physically and emotionally.

78. In making judgements of the students, I tend to do in regard to negative things.

79. I may neglect the positive when I see the negative in students or their work in the class.

Appendix C

Two Main Parts of the Questionnaire

PART 1

1. I don't feel optimistic, energetic and enthusiastic in the classroom.
2. I don't show humour in the classroom.
3. I have distant relationship with students.
4. I can be easily disturbed by any behaviour of students.
5. I don't admit my errors easily.
6. I'm not honest and objective in treatment of students.
7. I'm not friendly and kind while dealing with students problems.
8. I don't help students in their personal problems as well as the school.
9. I generally have bad expectations for students.
10. I don't threat my students fairly
11. I don't criticize myself in the classroom since I can lose the authority.
12. If I make a mistake that will hurt a student, I don't apologize to the student.
13. I don't model moral behaviours in the classroom.
14. I may show negative attitudes that can damage students self-esteem.
15. I don't show patience and understanding towards their hard work and effort.
16. In any existence of problems in the classroom, I'm not sensitive to the students' feelings.
17. I treat in an offensive way when there is a problem.
18. I don't balance my negative criticisms with positive ones.
19. I don't show empathy towards students.
20. I don't show interest to students' distress since my job is to cover the syllabus.

21. I don't respect students' ideas if they are different from mine.

22. If my students don't agree with me, it makes me angry.

23. Since I'm authority of the classroom, it should be only me whose opinion matters in educational matters.

24. I don't value students' responses if they don't agree with me.

25. I don't respect what students believe or say.

26. Teachers don't have to be friendly; our responsibility is just conveying our instructional knowledge.

27. I can't tolerate getting criticism from students.

28. I don't take full responsibility of my actions in the classroom.

PART 2

1. My priority is not to develop mutual trust or respect in the classroom, it is to teach English.

2. I don't create a warm and supportive classroom environment as I think it is not my job.

3. I don't show sympathy to students in my work.

4. I may neglect students' positive sides when I see negative aspects in their work.

5. If I have negative feelings for a student in the classroom, I can show it by low grades or excluding both physically and emotionally.

6. Students' race, gender or socioeconomic statuses influence my judgement.

7. If students have problems in my way of teaching, I don't try to use another way to teach.

8. I don't supply a creative environment in which students feel free to take risks.

9. I don’t take students’ personality development into account while I’m correcting students.

10. I don’t encourage students to try to make them work better.

11. My classroom activities are not well organized.

12. My instruction doesn’t meet the need of each student.

13. I use learning materials and techniques without interest to students.

14. I don’t make positive statements about their successes

15. I don’t admit that I made an educational mistake as students have no capacity to detect it.

16. If students have problems in understanding the topic, I don’t try use different ways to re-explain it.

17. I don’t try to encourage students to become independent in their thinking and behaviours

18. I communicate with students in a strict manner in the classroom.

19. I don’t believe that teaching is a helping profession.

20. I don’t include teaching styles that will promote the accomplishments of students and future success.

21. I have strict rules, and I don’t relax them whatever happens in case students manipulate it.

22. I focus on the syllabus rather than students’ needs.

23. I assess students’ performance or work by using one single assessment tool, so I don’t take their differences into account.

24. I tend to use punishment more than rewards.

25. I only consider students’ educational needs, students’ personal needs or problems are not my problem.

Appendix D

The Final Version of the Scale Constructed for the Study

Dear English Language Teachers,
This questionnaire has been prepared to form a basis for a study entitled as "**English Language Teachers' Perceptions on Their Common Mistakes regarding their Personality and Teaching Styles**". Your experiences and ideas are of great importance regarding the study. Sincerity of your responses is extremely important for the reliability of the study. Thank you in advance for your contribution.

Note: As the survey will be evaluated *in bulk and kept confidential*, you do not need to write your name.

Ins. Nil M. Tekin
Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University
Institute of Educational Sciences Department of Foreign Language Education Postgraduate Student

Gender: ( ) Female ( ) Male

Years of experience in teaching: ( ) 1-7 ( ) 7-14 ( ) 14-…..

Type of school you are working in: ( ) primary school ( ) secondary school ( ) high school ( ) university

PART 1

This part consists of English language teachers' common mistakes concerning personality factor. Please put a cross (X) to the suitable choice according to how often you make the mistake.	ALWAYS	USUALLY	OFTEN	SOMETIMES	NEVER
1. I don't feel optimistic, energetic and enthusiastic in the classroom.					
2. I don't show humour in the classroom.					
3. I have distant relationship with students.					
4. I can be easily disturbed by any behaviour of students.					
5. I don't admit my errors easily.					
6. I'm not honest and objective in treatment of students.					
7. I'm not friendly and kind while dealing with students problems.					
8. I don't help students in their personal problems as well as the school.					
9. I generally have bad expectations for students.					
10. I don't threat my students fairly.					

11. I don't criticize myself in the classroom since I can lose the authority.					
12. If I make a mistake that will hurt a student, I don't apologize to the student.					
13. I don't model moral behaviours in the classroom.					
14. I may show negative attitudes that can damage students' self-esteem.					
15. I don't show patience and understanding towards their hard work and effort.					
16. In any existence of problems in the classroom, I'm not sensitive to the students' feelings.					
17. I treat in an offensive way when there is a problem.					
18. I don't balance my negative criticisms with positive ones.					
19. I don't show empathy towards students.					
20. I don't show interest to students' distress since my job is to cover the syllabus.					
21. I don't respect students' ideas if they are different from mine.					
22. If my students don't agree with me, it makes me angry.					
23. Since I'm authority of the classroom, it should be only me whose opinion matters in educational matters.					
24. I don't value students' responses if they don't agree with me.					
25. I don't respect what students believe or say.					
26. Teachers don't have to be friendly; our responsibility is just conveying our instructional knowledge.					
27. I can't tolerate getting criticism from students.					
28. I don't take full responsibility of my actions in the classroom.					

What is your most striking experience in your English classes regarding your personality traits?

....
....
....
....
.....

PART 2

This part consists of English language teachers' common mistakes concerning teaching styles. Please put a cross (X) to the suitable choice according to how often you make the mistake.	**ALWAYS**	**USUALLY**	**OFTEN**	**SOMETIMES**	**NEVER**
1. My priority is not to develop mutual trust or respect in the classroom, it is to teach English.					
2. I don't create a warm and supportive classroom environment as I think it is not my job.					
3. I don't show sympathy to students in my work.					
4. I may neglect students' positive sides when I see negative aspects in their work.					
5. If I have negative feelings for students in the classroom, I can show it by low grades or excluding both physically and emotionally.					
6. Students' race, gender or socioeconomic statuses influence my judgement.					
7. If students have problems in my way of teaching, I don't try to use another way to teach.					
8. I don't supply a creative environment in which students feel free to take risks.					
9. I don't take students' personality development into account while I'm correcting students.					
10. I don't encourage students to try to make them work better.					
11. My classroom activities are not well organized.					
12. My instruction doesn't meet the need of each student.					
13. I use learning materials and techniques without interest to students.					
14. I don't make positive statements about their success.					
15. I don't admit that I made an educational mistake as students have no capacity to detect it.					
16. If students have problems in understanding the topic, I don't try use different ways to re-explain it.					
17. I don't try to encourage students to become independent in their thinking and behaviours.					
18. I communicate with students in a strict manner in the classroom.					
19. I don't believe that teaching is a helping profession.					
20. I don't include teaching styles that will promote the accomplishments of students and future success.					
21. I have strict rules, and I don't relax them whatever happens in case students manipulate it.					
22. I focus on the syllabus rather than students' needs.					

23. I assess students' performance or work by using one single assessment tool, so I don't take their differences into account.					
24. I tend to use punishment more than rewards.					
25. I only consider students' educational needs, students' personal needs or problems are not my problem.					

- What is your most striking experience in your English classes regarding your teaching styles?

PILOTING THE QUESTIONARE

1. How long did it take you to complete this questionnaire?

……

2. Were the instructions clear?

……

3. Were any of the questions/ sentences unclear or ambiguous? If so, can you write which and why?

……
……
…….

4. Are there any words or phrases that you want to be explained? If yes, can you please write them?

……
……

5. Did you object to answering any of the question?

……
……
……

6. In your opinion, has any major topic been omitted? If yes, can you please write which topics should also be included in this questionnaire?

.....
.....
.....
.....

7. Was the layout of the questionnaire clear/ attractive?

.....
.....

8. Any comments?

.....
.....
.....
.....

(Adapted from Bell,1993)

Appendix E

Table 8

Kruskal-Wallis Test Results of Difference between the Type of School They Teach and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Personality Traits

	school	N	Mean Rank	df	Chi-Square X^2	p
P1	primary school	43	90,42	3	5.893	.117
	secondary school	47	87,98			
	high school	40	73,79			
	university	45	98,34			
P2	primary school	43	92,77	3	8.332	**.040**
	secondary school	47	79,85			
	high school	40	76,24			
	university	45	102,41			
P3	primary school	43	94,86	3	4.330	.228
	secondary school	47	91,11			
	high school	40	74,35			
	university	45	90,33			
P4	primary school	43	99,30	3	11.763	**.008**
	secondary school	47	84,97			
	high school	40	67,70			
	university	45	98,41			
P5	primary school	43	84,91	3	.988	.804
	secondary school	47	88,83			
	high school	40	84,53			
	university	45	93,18			
P6	primary school	43	71,33	3	9.825	**.020**
	secondary school	47	90,79			
	high school	40	99,59			
	university	45	90,72			
P7	primary school	43	82,44	3	4.085	.252
	secondary school	47	91,44			
	high school	40	81,14			
	university	45	95,82			
P8	primary school	43	88,97	3	7.761	.051
	secondary school	47	101,63			
	high school	40	75,60			
	university	45	83,87			

P9	primary school	43	82,95	3	2.445	.485
	secondary school	47	92,21			
	high school	40	81,58			
	university	45	94,13			
P10	primary school	43	80,72	3	12.717	**.005**
	secondary school	47	91,96			
	high school	40	74,33			
	university	45	102,98			
P11	primary school	43	87,10	3	6.016	.111
	secondary school	47	90,38			
	high school	40	73,75			
	university	45	99,03			
P12	primary school	43	89,37	3	9.924	**.019**
	secondary school	47	86,95			
	high school	40	72,91			
	university	45	101,20			
P13	primary school	43	80,73	3	7.429	.059
	secondary school	47	97,62			
	high school	40	78,28			
	university	45	93,54			
P14	primary school	43	81,80	3	5.546	.136
	secondary school	47	85,09			
	high school	40	82,83			
	university	45	101,57			
P15	primary school	43	77,49	3	5.974	.113
	secondary school	47	93,66			
	high school	40	82,59			
	university	45	96,94			
P16	primary school	43	80,13	3	3.428	.330
	secondary school	47	88,38			
	high school	40	85,90			
	university	45	96,99			
P17	primary school	43	74,99	3	11.942	**.008**
	secondary school	47	92,94			
	high school	40	76,94			
	university	45	105,11			
P18	primary school	43	76,97	3	4.196	.241
	secondary school	47	93,74			
	high school	40	85,38			
	university	45	94,88			
P19	primary school	43	93,78	3	2.091	.554
	secondary school	47	85,98			
	high school	40	81,28			

P20	university	45	90,57	3	8.788	**.032**
	primary school	43	84,92			
	secondary school	47	89,07			
	high school	40	73,63			
	university	45	102,60			
P21	primary school	43	85,58	3	8.963	**.030**
	secondary school	47	87,94			
	high school	40	76,79			
	university	45	100,34			
P22	primary school	43	85,40	3	1.205	.752
	secondary school	47	87,93			
	high school	40	84,30			
	university	45	93,86			
P23	primary school	43	89,73	3	2.596	.458
	secondary school	47	87,43			
	high school	40	79,31			
	university	45	94,67			
P24	primary school	43	86,03	3	4.513	.211
	secondary school	47	90,24			
	high school	40	79,25			
	university	45	95,31			
P25	primary school	43	83,01	3	10.570	**.014**
	secondary school	47	92,56			
	high school	40	77,31			
	university	45	97,50			
P26	primary school	43	93,41	3	8.637	**.035**
	secondary school	47	88,09			
	high school	40	72,11			
	university	45	96,87			
P27	primary school	43	83,35	3	7.607	.055
	secondary school	47	87,48			
	high school	40	76,84			
	university	45	102,91			
P28	primary school	43	80,23	3	6.628	.085
	secondary school	47	93,32			
	high school	40	78,75			
	university	45	98,09			

Appendix F

Table 9

Kruskal-Wallis Test Results of Difference between the Type of School They Teach and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Teaching Styles

	School	N	Mean Rank	df	Chi-Square	p
Q1	primary school	43	85,74	3	7.341	.062
	secondary school	47	101,05			
	high school	40	74,86			
	University	45	88,20			
Q2	primary school	43	88,87	3	7.871	**.049**
	secondary school	47	91,66			
	high school	40	73,55			
	University	45	96,19			
Q3	primary school	43	83,09	3	6.100	.107
	secondary school	47	89,24			
	high school	40	79,65			
	University	45	98,81			
Q4	primary school	43	88,52	3	.088	.993
	secondary school	47	88,60			
	high school	40	88,70			
	University	45	86,26			
Q5	primary school	43	84,51	3	2.506	.474
	secondary school	47	87,17			
	high school	40	83,16			
	University	45	96,50			
Q6	primary school	43	83,38	3	2.819	.420
	secondary school	47	92,74			
	high school	40	84,89			
	University	45	90,22			
Q7	primary school	43	90,19	3	3.641	.420
	secondary school	47	87,11			
	high school	40	78,43			
	University	45	95,36			
Q8	primary school	43	90,50	3	6.407	.093
	secondary school	47	83,69			
	high school	40	76,61			
	University	45	100,23			

Q9	primary school	43	90,88	3	3.179	.365
	secondary school	47	89,66			
	high school	40	77,58			
	University	45	92,78			
Q10	primary school	43	92,05	3	12.079	**.007**
	secondary school	47	83,11			
	high school	40	75,13			
	university	45	100,69			
Q11	primary school	43	77,91	3	4.667	.198
	secondary school	47	95,68			
	high school	40	82,71			
	university	45	94,32			
Q12	primary school	43	81,86	3	4.626	.201
	secondary school	47	92,23			
	high school	40	78,66			
	university	45	97,74			
Q13	primary school	43	83,88	3	9.535	**.023**
	secondary school	47	93,97			
	high school	40	71,36			
	university	45	100,49			
Q14	primary school	43	86,21	3	10.813	
	secondary school	47	90,52			
	high school	40	73,18			
	university	45	100,26			
Q15	primary school	43	90,43	3	3.875	.275
	secondary school	47	79,00			
	high school	40	86,60			
	university	45	96,32			
Q16	primary school	43	80,48	3	13.907	**.003**
	secondary school	47	86,38			
	high school	40	77,61			
	university	45	106,11			
Q17	primary school	43	77,47	3	5.527	.137
	secondary school	47	91,96			
	high school	40	85,05			
	university	45	96,56			
Q18	primary school	43	82,08	3	4.115	.249
	secondary school	47	84,54			
	high school	40	85,14			
	university	45	99,81			

Q19	primary school	43	85,90	3	2.488	.478
	secondary school	47	87,90			
	high school	40	82,74			
	university	45	94,79			
Q20	primary school	43	81,95	3	4.656	.199
	secondary school	47	86,43			
	high school	40	83,25			
	university	45	99,64			
Q21	primary school	43	98,70	3	5.968	.113
	secondary school	47	84,13			
	high school	40	76,30			
	university	45	92,22			
Q22	primary school	43	89,36	3	1.123	.771
	secondary school	47	91,31			
	high school	40	81,14			
	university	45	89,34			
Q23	primary school	43	80,85	3	5.466	.141
	secondary school	47	90,89			
	high school	40	79,43			
	university	45	99,43			
Q24	primary school	43	76,98	3	5.502	.139
	secondary school	47	94,97			
	high school	40	83,84			
	university	45	94,96			
Q25	primary school	43	86,85	3	1.238	.744
	secondary school	47	92,24			
	high school	40	82,08			
	university	45	89,93			

Appendix G

Table 10

Mann Whitney U-Test Results of Difference between Gender of Participants and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Personality Traits

	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
P1	female	90	100.28	9025.50	2719.500	**.000**
	male	85	74.99	6374.50		
P2	female	90	99.83	8984.50	2760.500	**.001**
	male	85	75.48	6415.50		
P3	female	90	94.43	8499.00	3246.000	.071
	male	85	81.19	6901.00		
P4	female	90	102.17	9195.50	2549.500	**.000**
	male	85	72.99	6204.50		
P5	female	90	100.05	9004.50	2740.500	**.000**
	male	85	75.24	6395.50		
P6	female	90	93.09	8378.00	3367.000	.106
	male	85	82.61	7022.00		
P7	female	90	95.56	8600.00	3145.000	**.010**
	male	85	80.00	6800.00		
P8	female	90	99.91	8991.50	2753.000	**.000**
	male	85	75.39	6408.50		
P9	female	90	102.16	9194.50	2550.500	**.000**
	male	85	73.01	6205.50		
P10	female	90	95.35	8581.50	3163.500	**.013**
	male	85	80.22	6818.50		
P11	female	90	96.20	8658.00	3087.000	**.020**
	male	85	79.32	6742.00		

	female	90	101.19	9107.50	2637.500	**.000**
P12	male	85	74.03	6292.50		
	female	90	91.77	8259.50	3485.500	.197
P13	male	85	84.01	7140.50		
	female	90	97.59	8783.50	2961.500	**.004**
P14	male	85	77.84	6616.50		
	female	90	100.78	9070.50	2674.500	**.000**
P15	male	85	74.46	6329.50		
	female	90	92.87	8358.50	3386.500	.127
P16	male	85	82.84	7041.50		
	female	90	94.42	8497.50	3247.500	.064
P17	male	85	81.21	6902.50		
	female	90	92.28	8305.50	3439.500	.213
P18	male	85	83.46	7094.50		
	female	90	93.48	8413.00	3332.000	.078
P19	male	85	82.20	6987.00		
	female	90	99.52	8956.50	2788.500	**.001**
P20	male	85	75.81	6443.50		
	female	90	94.41	8497.00	3248.000	**.018**
P21	male	85	81.21	6903.00		
	female	90	97.56	8780.50	2964.500	**.003**
P22	male	85	77.88	6619.50		
	female	90	93.99	8459.00	3286.000	.068
P23	male	85	81.66	6941.00		
	female	90	96.41	8676.50	3068.500	**.002**
P24	male	85	79.10	6723.50		

P25	female	90	97.63	8787.00	2958.000	**.000**
	male	85	77.80	6613.00		
P26	female	90	96.43	8678.50	3066.500	**.006**
	male	85	79.08	6721.50		
P27	female	90	93.34	8401.00	3344.000	.112
	male	85	82.34	6999.00		
P28	female	90	97.20	8748.00	2997.000	**.003**
	male	85	78.26	6652.00		

Appendix H

Table 11

Mann Whitney U-Test Results of Difference between Gender of Participants and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Teaching Styles

	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
Q1	female	90	95.18	8566.50	3178.500	**.031**
	male	85	80.39	6833.50		
Q2	female	90	99.26	8933.50	2811.500	**.000**
	male	85	76.08	6466.50		
Q3	female	90	97.47	8772.00	2973.000	**.001**
	male	85	77.98	6628.00		
Q4	female	90	93.83	8444.50	3300.500	.084
	male	85	81.83	6955.50		
Q5	female	90	93.74	8437.00	3308.000	.072
	male	85	81.92	6963.00		
Q6	female	90	94.13	8471.50	3273.500	**.006**
	male	85	81.51	6928.50		
Q7	female	90	103.31	9297.50	2447.500	**.000**
	male	85	71.79	6102.50		
Q8	female	90	93.14	8383.00	3362.000	.121
	male	85	82.55	7017.00		
Q9	female	90	97.00	8730.00	3015.000	**.004**
	male	85	78.47	6670.00		

	female	90	97.00	8730.00		
Q10	male	85	78.47	6670.00	3015.000	**.001**
	female	90	92.88	8359.00		
Q11	male	85	82.84	7041.00	3386.000	.153
	female	90	95.27	8574.00		
Q12	male	85	80.31	6826.00	3171.000	**.035**
	female	90	100.89	9080.00		
Q13	male	85	74.35	6320.00	2665.000	**.000**
	female	90	96.41	8677.00		
Q14	male	85	79.09	6723.00	3068.000	**.003**
	female	90	96.02	8642.00		
Q15	male	85	79.51	6758.00	3103.000	**.012**
	female	90	98.63	8876.50		
Q16	male	85	76.75	6523.50	2868.500	**.000**
	femal	90	95.41	8587.00		
Q17	male	85	80.15	6813.00	3158.000	**.013**
	femal	90	96.78	8710.50		
Q18	male	85	78.70	6689.50	3034.500	**.009**
	femal	90	99.83	8984.50		
Q19	male	85	75.48	6415.50	2760.500	**.000**
	femal	90	96.52	8687.00		
Q20	male	85	78.98	6713.00	3058.000	**.007**
	femal	90	101.07	9096.50		
Q21	male	85	74.16	6303.50	2648.500	**.000**
	femal	90	100.67	9060.50		
Q22	male	85	74.58	6339.50	2684.500	**.000**
	femal	90	102.72	9244.50		
Q23	male	85	72.42	6155.50	2500.500	**.000**

	female	90	96.62	8696.00		**.007**
Q24	male	85	78.87	6704.00	3049.000	
	femal	90	97.41	8766.50		
Q25	male	85	78.04	6633.50	2978.500	**.004**

Appendix I

Table 12

Kruskal-Wallis Test Results of Difference between Teacher Experience and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Personality Traits

	experience	N	Mean Rank	df	Chi-Square X^2	p
	1-7 years	72	88,53	2	1.967	.374
P1	7-14 years	59	93,25			
	14 - ... years	44	80,10			
	1-7 years	72	96,35	2	16.799	**.000**
P2	7-14 years	59	96,84			
	14 - ... years	44	62,49			
	1-7 years	72	87,25	2	1.700	.427
P3	7-14 years	59	93,86			
	14 - ... years	44	81,38			
	1-7 years	72	89,26	2	.722	.697
P4	7-14 years	59	90,39			
	14 - ... years	44	82,73			
	1-7 years	72	96,96	2	8.432	**.015**
P5	7-14 years	59	89,53			
	14 - ... years	44	71,28			
	1-7 years	72	88,10	2	1.224	.542
P6	7-14 years	59	91,96			
	14 - ... years	44	82,52			
	1-7 years	72	86,83	2	6.668	**.036**
P7	7-14 years	59	97,53			
	14 - ... years	44	77,14			
	1-7 years	72	93,63	2	5.016	.081
P8	7-14 years	59	90,81			
	14 - ... years	44	75,03			
	1-7 years	72	88,31	2	3.883	.143
P9	7-14 years	59	95,57			
	14 - ... years	44	77,35			
	1-7 years	72	92,88	2	8.864	**.012**
P10	7-14 years	59	93,69			
	14 - ... years	44	72,39			

	1-7 years	72	89,76	2		
P11	7-14 years	59	96,61		5.949	.051
	14 - ... years	44	73,58			
	1-7 years	72	95,13	2		
P12	7-14 years	59	89,48		6.973	**.031**
	14 - ... years	44	74,34			
	1-7 years	72	90,90	2		
P13	7-14 years	59	90,86		2.728	.256
	14 - ... years	44	79,42			
	1-7 years	72	87,48	2		
P14	7-14 years	59	97,47		5.581	.061
	14 - ... years	44	76,16			
	1-7 years	72	91,17	2	1.925	.382
P15	7-14 years	59	89,88			
	14 - ... years	44	80,28			
	1-7 years	72	87,44			
P16	7-14 years	59	96,92	2	5.329	.070
	14 - ... years	44	76,95			
	1-7 years	72	87,65	2	.055	.973
P17	7-14 years	59	89,13			
	14 - ... years	44	87,07			
	1-7 years	72	91,98	2	5.597	.061
P18	7-14 years	59	93,86			
	14 - ... years	44	73,63			
	1-7 years	72	93,77	2	6.017	**.049**
P19	7-14 years	59	90,92			
	14 - ... years	44	74,65			
	1-7 years	72	94,91	2	5.288	.071
P20	7-14 years	59	89,30			
	14 - ... years	44	74,95			
	1-7 years	72	94,17	2	6.108	**.047**
P21	7-14 years	59	88,80			
	14 - ... years	44	76,83			
	1-7 years	72	94,03	2	2.651	.266
P22	7-14 years	59	86,19			
	14 - ... years	44	80,57			
	1-7 years	72	95,19	2	3.943	.139
P23	7-14 years	59	86,28			
	14 - ... years	44	78,53			
	1-7 years	72	92,03	2	7.774	**.021**
P24	7-14 years	59	92,86			
	14 - ... years	44	74,90			

P25	1-7 years	72	92,63	2	10.765	**.005**
	7-14 years	59	92,50			
	14 - ... years	44	74,40			
P26	1-7 years	72	95,57	2	5.011	.082
	7-14 years	59	86,14			
	14 - ... years	44	78,10			
P27	1-7 years	72	90,53	2	.418	.811
	7-14 years	59	87,06			
	14 - ... years	44	85,13			
P28	1-7 years	72	91,63	2	.945	.623
	7-14 years	59	84,64			
	14 - ... years	44	86,57			

Appendix J

Table 13

Kruskal-Wallis Test Results of Difference between Teacher Experience and Perceptions of Their Common Mistakes regarding Their Teaching Styles

	Experience	N	Mean Rank	df	Chi-Square X2	p
	1-7 years	72	89,37			
Q1	7-14 years	59	92,00	2	1.757	.415
	14 - ... years	44	80,40			
	1-7 years	72	93,22			
Q2	7-14 years	59	90,52	2	5.608	.061
	14 - ... years	44	76,09			
	1-7 years	72	91,08			
Q3	7-14 years	59	90,41	2	2.682	.262
	14 - ... years	44	79,74			
	1-7 years	72	92,56			
Q4	7-14 years	59	93,09	2	5.709	.058
	14 - ... years	44	73,72			
	1-7 years	72	84,21			
Q5	7-14 years	59	90,58	2	.929	.628
	14 - ... years	44	90,75			
	1-7 years	72	89,81			
Q6	7-14 years	59	88,63	2	.979	.613
	14 - ... years	44	84,19			
	1-7 years	72	95,25			
Q7	7-14 years	59	88,49	2	6.139	**.046**
	14 - ... years	44	75,48			
	1-7 years	72	91,62			
Q8	7-14 years	59	90,14	2	2.260	.323
	14 - ... years	44	79,22			
	1-7 years	72	92,40			
Q9	7-14 years	59	93,17		6.380	**.041**
	14 - ... years	44	73,86	2		
Q10	7-14 years	59	90,05		3.839	.147
	14 - ... years	44	78,89	2		
	1-7 years	72	82,82			
Q11	7-14 years	59	89,52		1.805	.406
	14 - ... years	44	94,44	2		

	1-7 years	72	84,38			
Q12	7-14 years	59	93,87	2	1.42	.491
	14 - ... years	44	86,05			
	1-7 years	72	89,28	2		
Q13	7-14 years	59	91,22		1.18	.553
	14 - ... years	44	81,58			
	1-7 years	72	89,13	2		
Q14	7-14 years	59	89,62		.649	.723
	14 - ... years	44	83,98			
	1-7 years	72	92,86			
Q15	7-14 years	59	89,53	2	3.33	.189
	14 - ... years	44	78,00			
	1-7 years	72	93,92			
Q16	7-14 years	59	90,71	2	6.91	**.031**
	14 - ... years	44	74,68			
	1-7 years	72	88,90			
Q17	7-14 years	59	93,64	2	3.33	.189
	14 - ... years	44	78,97			
	1-7 years	72	91,85			
Q18	7-14 years	59	89,08	2	1.78	.409
	14 - ... years	44	80,26			
	1-7 years	72	93,17		3.93	.140
Q19	7-14 years	59	88,26	2		
	14 - ... years	44	79,19			
	1-7 years	72	91,74			
Q20	7-14 years	59	92,61	2	4.77	.092
	14 - ... years	44	75,70			
	1-7 years	72	92,23	2		
Q21	7-14 years	59	95,00		7.96	**.019**
	14 - ... years	44	71,69			
	1-7 years	72	89,28			
Q22	7-14 years	59	91,81	2	1.42	.489
	14 - ... years	44	80,80			
	1-7 years	72	91,81			
Q23	7-14 years	59	92,74	2	4.47	.107
	14 - ... vears	44	75.41			
	1-7 years	72	88,74	2		
Q24	7-14 years	59	93,64		2.80	.246
	14 - ... years	44	79,24			
	1-7 years	72	92,56	2		
Q25	7-14 years	59	91,31		4.17	.124
	14 - ... years	44	76,11			

Appendix K

INTERVIEW FORM

Intervieweer: Nil Mümine TEKİN

Interviewee:

Date:

Duration:

Dear Colleagues

I am conducting a research on "English Language Teachers' Perceptions of Common Mistakes Regarding Teacher Personality and Teaching Styles". Your experiences and ideas are of great importance regarding for this study. Sincerity of your responses is extremely important for the reliability of the study. This interview will almost take 15-20 minutes.

Thank you in advance for your contribution.

1. Do you make mistakes as a result of your personality traits?
2. If yes, what are your mistakes regarding your personality traits in your English classes?
3. Do you make mistakes regarding your teaching styles?
4. If yes, what are your mistakes regarding your teaching styles in your English classes?