

The Impact of Teachers' Reflectivity and Gender on Their Intellectual Excitement and Interpersonal Teaching Style

Siavash Keshavarzi

Department of English Language, Fars Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Fars, Iran

Mohammad Reza Falahati Qadimi Fumani

Computational Linguistics Research Department, Regional Information Center for Science and Technology, Shiraz, Iran

Abstract—The purpose of this study was to investigate the impact of teachers' reflectivity and gender on their use of intellectual excitement and interpersonal rapport teaching styles. Fifty EFL teachers (25 male and 25 female) in various English Language Institutes in Shiraz, Fars province, Iran were selected through availability sampling. The participants were all from the 23-42 age group. Their degree level ranged from BA to MA in TEFL (30 teachers), English Literature (10 teachers) and Linguistics (10 teachers). The teachers' teaching experience ranged between 5 and 10 years. They were given the teacher reflectivity questionnaire introduced by Akbari, Behzadpour and Davvand (2010) and Lowman's (1995) Two Dimensional Teaching style scale. To analyze the data, use was made of inferential statistics including correlation, independent sample T-test and Two-way ANOVA. The results indicated that there was a significant relationship between teachers' reflectivity and teaching style. Gender was shown to have no effect on teacher's reflectivity. Gender was of course observed to be a contributing factor in teaching style, and finally teachers' reflectivity and gender did not reveal any impact on teaching style.

Index Terms—language teaching, reflection, teaching style, teacher's gender, interpersonal rapport, intellectual excitement

I. INTRODUCTION

Due to its role in problem solving and decision making process, reflective teaching has received a lot of attention by teachers and researchers in the realm of language teaching. According to Ken Zeichner and Liston (1996, p. 207), "There is no such thing as an unreflective teacher." Milrood (1999, p. 10) defines reflection as "the process of mirroring the environment non-judgmentally or critically for the purpose of decision-making." Schon (1987) describes reflection as a way of presenting and dealing with the problems of practice, of allowing the self to be more open to different possibilities during the process of presenting teaching problems and then putting those problems in context in order to discover actions to improve the situation. Schon names two types of reflection including "reflection on action", which takes place after a teaching episode to allow mental reconstruction and analysis of the actions and events, and "reflection in action" which happens during the act of teaching and entails interpreting, analyzing, and providing solutions to the complex situations in the classroom. Boud, Keogh and Walker (1985, p. 19) view reflection as "intellectual and affective abilities in which individuals engage to explore their experiences in order to achieve new understandings and appreciations". Teachers generally reflect on their teaching and students' learning, how effective their instructional decisions are, approaches to teaching, improving practice and cognitive awareness of their reflective processes (McAlpine, Weston, Berthiaume & Fairbank-Roch, 2004).

Reflection can exert impacts on teachers' teaching style as well. Teaching style refers to a teacher's pervasive qualities that persist even though situational conditions may change (Conti & Welborn, 1996, cited in Akbari, Kiany, Imami Naeeni, Karimi Allvar, 2008). In other words, teaching style is the expression of the totality of one's philosophy, beliefs, values, and behaviors (Jarvis, 2004, cited in Akbari, 2008).

Many researchers have already undertaken research on learning and teaching style. Peacock (2001), for example, studied the correlation between learning and teaching styles based on Reid's hypotheses. He found out that a mismatch between teaching and learning styles could lead to learning failure, frustration and demotivation. He further found that learners favored kinesthetic and auditory styles while teachers favored kinesthetic, group and auditory styles. Zhenhui (2001) analyzed matching teaching styles with learning styles in East Asian contexts. He concluded that an effective matching between teaching and learning styles could only be achieved when teachers were aware of their learners' needs, capacities, potentials, and learning style preferences. He also stated that a wise and careful change in the style could create a teacher-student style matching. Dunn and Dunn (1993) studied how people learn and they noticed that some

students achieved knowledge only through selective methods. They mentioned an array of elements affecting the learning style: environmental, emotional, sociological and physical elements. Reid (1995) said:

Learning styles are internally based on characteristics of individuals for intake of understanding of new information. All learners have individual attributes related to the learning processes. Some people may rely on visual presentations, others prefer spoken language; still others may respond better to hand-on activities. It is evident that people learn differently and these differences in learning abound ESL/EFL settings. (p. 13)

Purpose of the Study

Although this field of research has attracted abundant attention on the part of researchers all over the globe, the present study intends to investigate the impact of teachers' reflectivity and gender on their use of intellectual excitement and interpersonal rapport teaching styles in an EFL context. Based on this broad objective, the following research questions were formulated:

1. Is there any relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Teaching Style (Intellectual Excitement and Interpersonal Rapport considered as a single group)?
 - 1.1: Is there any relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Intellectual Excitement?
 - 1.2: Is there any relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Interpersonal Rapport?
2. Is there a significant difference between males and females in Teaching Style (Intellectual Excitement and Interpersonal Rapport considered as a single group)?
 - 2.1 Is there a significant difference between males and females in Intellectual Excitement?
 - 2.2. Is there a significant difference between males and females in Interpersonal Rapport?
3. Is the interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender effective on the Teaching Style (Interpersonal Rapport and Intellectual Excitement considered as a single group)?
 - 3.1. Is the interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender effective on Intellectual Excitement?
 - 3.2. Is the interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender effective on Interpersonal Rapport?

Accordingly, the following hypotheses were also introduced:

- H1. There is a relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Teaching Style (Intellectual Excitement and Interpersonal Rapport considered as a single group).
- H1.1. There is a relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Intellectual Excitement.
 - H1.2. There is a relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Interpersonal Rapport.
- H2. There is a significant difference between males and females in Teaching Style (Intellectual Excitement and Interpersonal Rapport considered as a single group).
- H2.1. There is a significant difference between males and females in Intellectual Excitement.
 - H2.2. There is a significant difference between males and females in Interpersonal Rapport.
- H3. The interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender is effective on the Teaching Style (Interpersonal Rapport and Intellectual Excitement considered as a single group).
- H3.1. The interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender is effective on Intellectual Excitement.
 - H3.2. The interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender is effective on Interpersonal Rapport.

II. METHODOLOGY

Participants of the Study

The participants of the study included 25 male and 25 female English teachers selected from 7 English language institutes namely Sa'i Institute, Modarres Boys Institute, Aburayhan Institute, Modarres Girls Institute, Setareh Institute, Borna Institute and Shokouh Institute using availability sampling. In all, there were 32 English language institutes in Shiraz. The participants were all within the 23-42 age group and they held a B.A. or M.A. degree in one of the following majors: *TEFL*, *English Literature* or *Linguistics*. Further, their teaching experience ranged between 5 and 10 years.

Instruments of the Study

Teacher reflectivity questionnaire. The teacher reflectivity questionnaire used in this study was that proposed by Akbari, Behzadpour and Davvand (2010). The questionnaire included 29 items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1=never to 5=always (Appendix I). Different dimensions of reflectivity including affective, cognitive, metacognitive, practical and critical were considered. This questionnaire was used here for a number of reasons: First, it fit the objectives of the present study. Second, it had been used highly frequently by researchers from different parts of the world. Third, its validity and reliability had been checked several times with different datasets. Finally, it covered Akbari, Behzadpour and Davvand's (2010) five reflectivities namely affective, cognitive, metacognitive, practical and critical.

Lowman's two-dimensional teaching style scale. Being a dependable measure developed by Lowman (1995), this scale was used to assess teachers' teaching style by investigating their perceptions and preferences with respect to concepts of Intellectual Excitement (IE) and Interpersonal Rapport (IR). The scoring system in this instrument is based on a 5-point Likert scale beginning with 1 representing that 0% to 10% of the time the item applied to the respondents and ending with 5 showing that 95% to 100% of the time the item was true about them. It included 22 items (Appendix II), eleven of which measured teachers' IE and the rest measured teachers' IR.

Analysis of Reliability

In this study, Cronbach's Alpha was used to compute a reliability score for each of the following scales: Teacher Reflectivity, Teaching Style and its components, Intellectual Excitement and finally Interpersonal Rapport. Based on the findings (c.f. Table 1), all the reliabilities computed were above 0.7 (note that a reliability score of 0.7 or above is considered convenient or highly reliable.). This entailed that the questionnaires drawn on in this study were all reliable and accordingly suitable to be used as instruments in this study.

TABLE 1.
CRONBACH'S ALPHA COMPUTED FOR THE FOUR SCALES.

Statistics	scale	Cronbach's Alpha	No of Items	No. of Participants
Teacher Reflectivity		0.838	29	50
Teaching Style		0.887	22	50
Intellectual Excitement		0.795	11	50
Interpersonal Rapport		0.821	11	50

Purpose of the Study

In all, 50 teachers – 25 males and 25 females – from 7 language institutes in Shiraz completed two questionnaires namely teacher's reflectivity questionnaire proposed by Akbari, Behzadpour and Dadvand (2010) and Lowman's two-dimensional teaching style scale proposed by Lowman (1995). The questionnaires had been set based on a 5-point Likert scale. "The Likert scale is usually used in questionnaires where a special kind of survey question uses a set of ordered responses. Usually, the responses are arranged on a scale of 1 to 5" (Yamini & Rahimi, 2007, pp. 13-14). It took about 30 minutes for the teachers to answer the items on the questionnaires. A brief instruction was, of course, given to participants before questionnaire administration. Moreover, they were informed, in advance, of the purpose of the survey. Participants were requested to answer each statement carefully.

Data Analysis Procedure

To analyze the data, both descriptive and inferential statistics were drawn on. First, for each of the variables of the study namely Teacher Reflectivity, Teaching Style (Intellectual Excitement and Interpersonal Rapport) descriptive statistics including mean, median, standard deviation, minimum and maximum were presented. Then, for each variable a histogram including a normal curve was provided. Later, to test the hypotheses of the study use was also made of inferential statistics including Pearson correlation, t-independent and two-way ANOVA. In order to use these tests, the data needed to be normally distributed. Hence, prior to dealing with the hypotheses of the study, normality of the variables' distribution was checked using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test.

III. RESULTS

In Table 2, descriptive statistics for variables, Teacher Reflectivity, Teaching Style and its components: Intellectual Excitement and Interpersonal Rapport have been summarized. The results, in this table, indicated that the mean score for Teacher Reflectivity was 3.45 (SD=0.467), with a range of 2.07 to 4.83. Half of the participants were above 3.43 (median). As regards the Teaching Style, the mean score obtained was 4.13 (SD=0.515) and the scores ranged between 2.18 and 5. In this scale, most of the participants were above 4.20 (median).

TABLE 2.
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS ON TEACHER REFLECTIVITY, TEACHING STYLE, INTELLECTUAL EXCITEMENT AND INTERPERSONAL RAPPORT.

Variable	Gender	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Teacher Reflectivity	Male	3.35	3.38	0.530	2.07	4.83
	Female	3.56	3.66	0.373	2.83	4.10
	Total	3.45	3.43	0.467	2.07	4.83
Teaching Style	Male	3.99	4.09	0.624	2.18	5.00
	Female	4.28	4.41	0.327	3.41	4.86
	Total	4.13	4.20	0.515	2.18	5.00
Intellectual Excitement	Male	3.93	4.00	0.653	2.18	5.00
	Female	4.24	4.27	0.329	3.55	4.91
	Total	4.08	4.18	0.535	2.18	5.00
Interpersonal Rapport	Male	4.04	4.27	0.640	2.18	5.00
	Female	4.33	4.45	0.468	3.27	4.91
	Total	4.19	4.32	0.573	2.18	5.00

Similarly, in Intellectual Excitement, the mean score obtained was 4.0813 (SD=0.535). Further, the scores ranged between 2.18 and 5. In this scale, most of the participants were above 4.18 (median). Finally, the mean score computed for Interpersonal Rapport was 4.19 (SD=0.573) and the scores ranged between 2.18 and 5. In this scale, most of the participants were above 4.32 (median).

To test the hypotheses, use was made of Pearson correlation, t-independent and two-way ANOVA. The precondition for the application of such tests is that the data should be normally distributed. Thus, before getting to the hypotheses of the study, normality of the variables distribution was checked by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test (Table 3).

TABLE 3.
KOLMOGOROV TEST OF NORMAL DISTRIBUTION OF VARIABLES.

Variable	Z	Sig.
Teacher Reflectivity	0.470	0.980
Teaching Style	1.217	0.104
Intellectual Excitement	1.231	0.096
Interpersonal Rapport	1.276	0.077

The above table shows the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test. Since the p-values obtained were all greater than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$) for all the variables (Teacher Reflectivity and Teaching Style (and its two subparts Intellectual Excitement and Interpersonal Rapport)), the statistics were not significant which means that all the distributions were normal. In what follows, each research question will be analyzed separately.

Analysis of Research Question 1

Q1: Is there any relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Teaching Style (Intellectual Excitement and Interpersonal Rapport considered as a single group)?

Hypothesis 1: There is a relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Teaching Style (Intellectual Excitement and Interpersonal Rapport considered as a single group).

TABLE 4.
PEARSON CORRELATION BETWEEN TEACHER REFLECTIVITY AND TEACHING STYLE (INTELLECTUAL EXCITEMENT AND INTERPERSONAL RAPPORT AS A SINGLE GROUP)

Variables	Statistics	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
Teacher Reflectivity and Teaching Style		0.299	0.035	50

As presented in Table 4, the correlation between Teacher Reflectivity and Teaching Style (Intellectual Excitement and Interpersonal Rapport as a single group) was significant at the level of 0.05 ($P = 0.035 < 0.05$). Thus, there was a significant relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Teaching Style as a whole. The Pearson correlation was 0.299 which is an average correlation. Based on the results, the two variables are directly correlated, since the correlation is positive. Hence, hypothesis 1 is accepted.

Analysis of Research Question 1.1

Q 1.1: Is there any relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Intellectual Excitement?

Hypothesis 1.1: There is a relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Intellectual Excitement.

TABLE 5.
PEARSON CORRELATION BETWEEN TEACHER REFLECTIVITY AND INTELLECTUAL EXCITEMENT.

Variables	Statistics	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
Teacher Reflectivity and Intellectual Excitement		0.284	0.046	50

As presented in Table 5, the correlation between Teacher Reflectivity and Intellectual Excitement was significant at the level of 0.05 ($P = 0.035 < 0.05$). Thus, there was a significant relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Intellectual Excitement. The Pearson correlation was 0.299 which is an average correlation. The two variables are directly correlated, since the correlation is positive. It means that Teacher Reflectivity increases with an increase in the other variable, say, Intellectual Excitement. Thus, hypothesis 1.1 is accepted.

Analysis of Research Question 1.2

Q 1.2: Is there any relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Interpersonal Rapport?

Hypothesis 1.2: There is a relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Interpersonal Rapport.

TABLE 6.
PEARSON CORRELATION BETWEEN TEACHER REFLECTIVITY AND INTERPERSONAL RAPPORT.

Variables	Statistics	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
Teachers' Reflectivity and Interpersonal Rapport		0.272	0.056	50

As indicated in Table 6, the correlation between Teacher Reflectivity and Interpersonal Rapport was not significant at the level of 0.05 ($P = 0.056 > 0.05$). Thus, there was no significant relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Interpersonal Rapport. Hence, hypothesis 1.2 is rejected.

Analysis of research Question 2

Q 2: Is there any significant difference between males and females in Teaching Style (Intellectual Excitement and Interpersonal Rapport considered as a single group)?

Hypothesis 2: There is a significant difference between males and females in Teaching Style (Intellectual Excitement and Interpersonal Rapport considered as a single group).

TABLE 7.
THE INDEPENDENT T-TEST FOR COMPARISON OF TEACHING STYLE (INTELLECTUAL EXCITEMENT AND INTERPERSONAL RAPPORT CONSIDERED AS A SINGLE GROUP) IN MALES AND FEMALES.

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Mean Difference	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Male	25	3.99	0.624	0.125	-0.29	-2.10	48	0.041
Female	25	4.28	0.327	0.065				

As illustrated in Table 7, the independent sample t-test revealed that there was a significant difference between the two genders (male and female teachers) in terms of their Teaching Style (Intellectual Excitement and Interpersonal Rapport considered as a single group) ($p=0.041<0.05$). Comparison of the mean scores obtained by the two groups, males and females, revealed that Teaching Style in the female group was significantly higher than that in the male group. Based on this finding, hypothesis 2 is accepted.

Analysis of Research Question 2.1

Q 2.1: Is there any significant difference between males and females in Intellectual Excitement?

Hypothesis 2.1: There is a significant difference between males and females in Intellectual Excitement.

TABLE 8.
THE INDEPENDENT T-TEST FOR COMPARISON OF INTELLECTUAL EXCITEMENT IN MALES AND FEMALES.

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Mean Difference	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Male	25	3.93	0.653	0.131	-0.31	-2.11	48	0.040
Female	25	4.24	0.329	0.066				

The result of the independent sample t-test as presented in Table 8 showed that there was a significant difference between male and female teachers in Intellectual Excitement ($p=0.040<0.05$). Comparison of the mean scores obtained in the two groups revealed that Intellectual Excitement in the female group was significantly higher than that in the male group. Accordingly, hypothesis 2.1 is accepted.

Analysis of Research Question 2.2

Q 2.2: Is there any significant difference between males and females in Interpersonal Rapport?

Hypothesis 2.2: There is a significant difference between males and females in Interpersonal Rapport.

TABLE 9.
THE INDEPENDENT T-TEST FOR COMPARISON OF INTERPERSONAL RAPPORT IN MALES AND FEMALES.

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Mean Difference	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Male	25	4.04	0.640	0.128	-0.28	-1.79	48	0.080
Female	25	4.33	0.468	0.094				

The result of the independent sample t-test as presented in Table 9 showed that there was no significant difference between male and female teachers in Interpersonal Rapport ($p=0.080>0.05$). Intellectual Excitement mean in females was slightly greater than that in the males group, but this difference was not statistically significant. Thus, hypothesis 2.2 is rejected.

Analysis of Research Question 3

Q 3: Is the interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender effective on the Teaching Style (Interpersonal Rapport and Intellectual Excitement considered as a single group)?

Hypothesis 3: The interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender is effective on the Teaching Style (Interpersonal Rapport and Intellectual Excitement considered as a single group).

To analyze this hypothesis, Teacher Reflectivity was categorized into three groups namely low, medium and high. The cut points were considered mean plus/minus half of standard variation (3.45 ± 0.23). So, those with a Teacher Reflectivity of lower than 3.22 were considered as low group, and those with a Teacher Reflectivity of 3.22 to 3.68 and above 3.68 were considered as medium and high groups respectively.

Then, the effect of gender and Teacher Reflectivity on Teaching Style (Interpersonal Rapport and Intellectual Excitement considered as a single group) was tested using two-way analysis of variance (two-way ANOVA) as reported in Table 10 below.

TABLE 10.
THE TWO-WAY ANOVA FOR THE EFFECT OF GENDER AND TEACHER REFLECTIVITY ON TEACHING STYLE (INTERPERSONAL RAPPORT AND INTELLECTUAL EXCITEMENT CONSIDERED AS A SINGLE GROUP).

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Gender	0.534	1	0.534	2.147	0.150
Teacher Reflectivity Level	0.771	2	0.386	1.551	0.223
Gender * Teacher Reflectivity Level	0.387	2	0.194	0.779	0.465
Error	10.935	44	0.249		
Total	867.357	50			

In Table 10, the interaction effect of Teacher Reflectivity Level and gender on Teaching Style was analyzed based on two-way ANOVA. The results showed that the effect was not significant ($p=0.465>0.05$). This means that the interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender was not significantly effective on Teaching Style (Interpersonal Rapport and Intellectual Excitement considered as a single group). Thus, hypothesis 3 is rejected.

Analysis of Research Question 3.1

Q 3.1: Is the interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender effective on Intellectual Excitement?

Hypothesis 3.1: The interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender is effective on Intellectual Excitement.

The effect of gender and Teacher Reflectivity on Intellectual Excitement was tested by two-way analysis of variance (two-way ANOVA) as reported in Table 11.

TABLE 11.
THE TWO-WAY ANOVA FOR THE EFFECT OF GENDER AND TEACHER REFLECTIVITY ON INTELLECTUAL EXCITEMENT.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Gender	0.668	1	0.668	2.437	0.126
Teacher Reflectivity Level	0.737	2	0.369	1.345	0.271
Gender * Teacher Reflectivity Level	0.096	2	0.048	0.176	0.839
Error	12.064	44	0.274		
Total	847.099	50			

In Table 11, the interaction effect of Teacher Reflectivity Level and gender on Intellectual Excitement was analyzed using two-way ANOVA. The results indicated that the effect was not significant ($p=0.839>0.05$). This means that the interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender is not significantly effective on Intellectual Excitement. Thus, hypothesis 3.1 is rejected.

Analysis of Research Question 3.2

Q 3.2: Is the interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender effective on Interpersonal Rapport?

Hypothesis 3.2: The interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender is effective on Interpersonal Rapport.

The effect of gender and Teacher Reflectivity on Interpersonal Rapport was tested by two-way analysis of variance (two-way ANOVA) as reported in Table 12.

TABLE 12.
THE TWO-WAY ANOVA FOR THE EFFECT OF GENDER AND TEACHER REFLECTIVITY ON INTERPERSONAL RAPPORT.

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Gender	0.414	1	0.414	1.334	0.254
Teacher Reflectivity Level	0.806	2	0.403	1.299	0.283
Gender * Teacher Reflectivity Level	0.934	2	0.467	1.504	0.233
Error	13.655	44	0.310		
Total	892.000	50			

In Table 12, the interaction effect of Teacher Reflectivity Level and gender on Interpersonal Rapport was analyzed based on two-way ANOVA. The results indicated that the effect was not significant ($p=0.233>0.05$). This means that the interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender was not significantly effective on Interpersonal Rapport. Thus, hypothesis 3.2 is rejected.

IV. DISCUSSION

In this section, each research question will be restated and all the relevant discussions pertaining to that research question will be provided under it. For ease of discussion, each research question will be discussed separately:

For the first research question, "Is there any relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Teaching Style (Intellectual Excitement and Interpersonal Rapport considered as a single group)?" a significant and positive relationship was observed between Teacher Reflectivity and Teaching Style as a whole. Milrod (1999) and Zeincher and Liston (1966) also found a positive relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Teaching Style (as a whole). This asserts that Teacher reflectivity and Teaching Style are interrelated and should not be seen or considered separately, each can reinforce the other. For the question, "Is there any relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Intellectual Excitement?" a significant relationship was observed between Teacher Reflectivity and Intellectual Excitement. This

finding is in line with the finding of McAlpine, et al. (2004). This shows that these two variables are interwoven and should be seen with regard to each other. With regard to the question no significant relationship was found between Teacher Reflectivity and Interpersonal Rapport. This finding was in line with the finding of Louden (1992, cited in Sarsar, 2008).

Regarding the second research question of the study, “Is there any significant difference between males and females in Teaching Style (Intellectual Excitement and Interpersonal Rapport considered as a single group)?” Teaching Style in the female group was observed to be significantly higher than that in the male group. Dewey (1933) also reported such differences between males and females. With regard to the question, “Is there any significant difference between males and females in Intellectual Excitement?” a significant difference was reported between males and females in Intellectual Excitement in favor of the female group. This finding is in line with the finding reported by Zeichner and Liston (1966). In contrast, in the research question, “Is there any significant difference between males and females in Interpersonal Rapport?” the Intellectual Excitement mean in females was slightly greater than that in the males group, but this difference was not statistically significant. This finding is in line with the finding reported by Valli (1993).

Regarding the third research question, “Is the interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender effective on the Teaching Style (Interpersonal Rapport and Intellectual Excitement considered as a single group)?” the interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender was not found to be significantly effective on Teaching Style (Interpersonal Rapport and Intellectual Excitement considered as a single group) a finding which is similar to that reported by McCombs and Miller (2007). Further, the interaction effect of Teacher Reflectivity Level and gender on Intellectual Excitement was observed to be insignificant, that is, the interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender was not significantly effective on Intellectual Excitement. This finding is in line with the finding reported by Boud, Keogh and Walker (1985). Similarly, the interaction effect of Teacher Reflectivity Level and gender on Interpersonal Rapport was found to be insignificant. This finding is in line with the findings reported by Louden (1992, cited in Sarsar, 2008).

V. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The findings reported in this paper are of theoretical and pedagogical implications. The findings support theories, techniques and models dealing with Teacher Reflectivity and Teaching Style. The findings here assert the importance of such variables in academic settings. The findings enjoy pedagogical implications as well. They can be used by teachers, curriculum planners, syllabi designers, authors of academic books and all those involved in education. The findings also show that the two instruments developed could also be used in Iranian context to collect data from teachers.

VI. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

No piece of research could be deemed as perfect and complete. Accordingly, the following limitations were imposed on the present research:

- Due to time limitation, only 50 participants (equal males and females groups) were included in this research.
- All the teachers were from English language institutes in Shiraz. Had the researcher had more time, teachers from other cities or from other academic levels (i.e. university level) could have been added to the research.
- To select the participants, availability sampling was used. Had the researcher selected other, more objective, sampling techniques, the results could have more generalizability.
- Two tools were used in this research – one for Teacher Reflectivity and one for Teaching Style. Other tools available for the same topics could have been used had the researcher formulated other objectives as well.
- In all, three variables were considered in this research. Had the researcher had more time, more variables could have been included.

VII. PROSPECTS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Based on the results reported in this research, a series of other research works could be undertaken a few examples of which have been mentioned below:

- In this thesis, the relationship between Teacher Reflectivity and Teaching Style was studied. Other researchers can add other variables as well.
- In this thesis, gender differences were studied in Teacher Reflectivity, but the age of the participants were not taken into consideration. Other researchers can work on such issues but using a larger sample size.
- In this thesis, the effect of the interaction of Teacher Reflectivity and gender on the Teaching Style was studied. Others could incorporate student variables as well in their studies.
- Other researchers could add other instruments as well in their studies.

APPENDIX I

Questionnaire A:
The teacher reflectivity questionnaire
Dear respondent,

This questionnaire is devised with the aim of looking into your actual teaching practices as a professional teacher. To that end, your careful completion of the questionnaire will definitely contribute to obtaining real data which is crucial for more accurate findings. Therefore, please check the box which best describes your actual teaching practices. The information will be kept confidential and will be used just for research purposes. Thank you very much in advance for your time and cooperation.

Name: **Gender:** Male Female
Level: No Degree BA in English MA in English PhD in English
 Degree in other Fields of Study (please specify):
Teaching Experience (years):

	1: Never	2: Rarely	3: Sometimes	4: Often	5: Always
Items	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
1. I have a file where I keep my teaching for reviewing purposes.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I talk about my classroom experience with my colleagues and seek their advice/feedback.	1	2	3	4	5
3. After each lesson, I write about the accomplishments/failures of that lesson or I talk about the lesson to a colleague.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I discuss practical/theoretical issues with my colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I observe other teachers' classrooms to learn about their efficient practices.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I ask my peers to observe my teaching and comment on my teaching performance	1	2	3	4	5
7. I read books/articles related to effective teaching to improve my classroom performance.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I participate in workshops/conferences related to teaching/learning issues.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I think of writing articles based on my classroom experiences.	1	2	3	4	5
Items	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
10. I look at journal articles or search the internet to see what the recent developments in my profession are.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I carry out small scale research activities in my classes to become better informed of learning/teaching processes.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I think of classroom events as potential research topics and think of finding a method for investigating them.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I talk to my students to learn about their learning styles and preferences.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I talk to my students to learn about their family backgrounds, hobbies, interests and abilities.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I ask my students whether they like a teaching task or not.	1	2	3	4	5
16. As a teacher, I think about my teaching philosophy and the way it is affecting my teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I think of the ways my biography or my background affects the way I define myself as a teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I think of the meaning or significance of my job as a teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I try to find out which aspects of my teaching provide me with a sense of satisfaction.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I think about my strengths and weaknesses as a teacher.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I think of the positive/negative role models I have had as a student and the way they have affected me in my practice.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I think of inconsistencies and contradictions that occur in my classroom practice.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I think about instances of social injustice in my own surroundings and try to discuss them in my classes.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I think of ways to enable my students to change their social lives in fighting poverty, discrimination, and gender bias.	1	2	3	4	5
25. In my teaching, I include less-discussed topics, such as old age, AIDS, discrimination against women and minorities, and poverty.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I think about the political aspects of my teaching and the way I may affect my students' political views.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I think of ways through which I can promote tolerance and democracy in my classes and in the society in general.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I think about the ways gender, social class, and race influence my students' achievements.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I think of outside social events that can influence my teaching inside the class.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX II

Questionnaire B:

Dear respondent,

The following questions form a self-assessment of your two-dimensional teaching style. It is matched to a student version; allowing you to easily compare your results with your students' assessment of your style. Read each item carefully. Think about how you usually behave when teaching. Then circle the letter that most closely describes your style. Circle only one choice for each question. Use the following key for your answers:

A = Always ≈ 90 to 100% of the time

O = Often \approx 67% to 89% of the time

T = Try to, but not consistent \approx 33% to 67% of the time

S = Seldom \approx 11 to 33% of the time

N = Never \approx 0 to 10% of the time

Questions 1-11	5	4	3	2	1
1. I enjoy teaching.	A	O	T	S	N
2. I create, communicate, and assess student's achievement of learning objectives.	A	O	T	S	N
3. I organize the material to be presented, as if I, myself, know little about it.	A	O	T	S	N
4. I am surprised that the class period has ended, because the time passed quickly.	A	O	T	S	N
5. I explain to students how different concepts relate to each other.	A	O	T	S	N
6. I let students know how they must perform to achieve certain grades, and provide them updates on their grade status.	A	O	T	S	N
7. I refer to, and have students use, the reference materials (e.g. textbooks, articles, etc.).	A	O	T	S	N
8. I am confident about my knowledge of the course content.	A	O	T	S	N
9. I tell students what will happen during the class period.	A	O	T	S	N
10. I am enthusiastic about the course context.	A	O	T	S	N
11. I take care with how I present information (e.g. speaking clearly, writing neatly, etc.)	A	O	T	S	N
Using that A=5, O=4, T=3, S=2, and N=1, sum up the scores from each column for questions 1 through 11, and record the subtotals.					
Sum up the sub-totals and record here.					
Questions 12-22	5	4	3	2	1
12. I believe that my students are capable of performing well.	A	O	T	S	N
13. I encourage questions from my students.	A	O	T	S	N
14. I respect my students as individuals.	A	O	T	S	N
15. I acknowledge students' learning needs and their feelings about class management (e.g. schedule, policies, etc.)	A	O	T	S	N
16. I interact with students outside of the classroom.	A	O	T	S	N
17. I encourage students to take personal responsibility (s.a. completing the assign work, being engaged, knowing the syllabus, etc.) for their learning.	A	O	T	S	N
Questions 12-22	5	4	3	2	1
18. I maintain regular office hours and welcome those students that od visit my office.	A	O	T	S	N
19. I give students advance notice of change and explain how it will affect them.	A	O	T	S	N
20. I get to class early.	A	O	T	S	N
21. I learn the names of the students in my class.	A	O	T	S	N
22. I care about the students' understanding of the material.	A	O	T	S	N
Using that A=5, O=4, T=3, S=2, and N=1, sum up the scores from each column for questions 12 through 22, and record the subtotals.					
Sum up the sub-totals and record here.					

REFERENCES

- [1] Akbari, R., Behzadpoor, F., & Davvand, B. (2010). Development of English language teaching reflection inventory. *System*, 38, 211-227.
- [2] Akbari, R., Kiany, G. R., Imani Naeni, M., & Karimi Allvar, N. (2008). Teachers' teaching styles, sense of efficacy and reflectivity as correlates of students' achievement outcomes. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 11, 1-22.
- [3] Boud, D., Keogh, R., & Walker, D. (Eds.). (1985). *Reflection: turning experience into learning*. London: Kogan.
- [4] Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- [5] Dunn, R., & Dunn, K. (1993). Learning styles/teaching styles: Should they can they... be matched? *Educational Leadership*, 36, 238-244.
- [6] Lowman, J. (1995). *Mastering the techniques of teaching* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.
- [7] McAlpine, L., Weston, C., Berthiaume, D., & Fairbank-Roch, G. (2004). Reflection on teaching: Types and goals of reflection. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 10, 337-363.
- [8] McCombs, B. L., & Miller, L. (2007). *Learner-centered classroom practices and assessment: Maximizing student motivation, learning, and achievement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- [9] Milrood, R. (1999). *A module for English language teacher trainers*. British Council: Moscow.
- [10] Peacock, M. (2001). Match or mismatch? Learning styles and teaching styles in EFL. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11, 1-20.
- [11] Reid, J. (1995). *Learning styles in the EFL/ESL classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle publisher.
- [12] Sarsar, M. N. (2008). Adopting a reflective approach to professional development, Retrieved February 9, 2009 from EBSCO Online Database Education Research. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true%20&db=eht%20&AN=20815234%20&site=ehost-live>.
- [13] Schon, R. (1987). *Educating reflective practitioners*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- [14] Valli, L. (1993). Reflective teacher education programs: An analysis of case studies. In J. Calderhead (Ed.). *Conceptualizing Reflection in Teacher Development* (pp.11- 22). Albany, NJ: Suny Press.

- [15] Yamini, M., & Rahimi, M. (2007). A guide to statistics and SPSS for research in TEFL, linguistics and related disciplines. Shiraz: Koushamher.
- [16] Zeichner, K. M., Liston, D. P. (1996). Reflective teaching: an introduction. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, New Jersey.
- [17] Zhenhui, R. (2001). Matching teaching styles with learning styles for ESL/EFL instruction. *The Internet TESL Journal*. Retrieved January 05, 2013 from <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Zhenhui-TeachingStyles.html>.

Siavash Keshavarzi is an M.A. student of TEFL, Department of English Language, Fars Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Fars, Iran. His research hobbies are language teaching and language related studies.



Mohammad Reza Falahati Qadimi Fumani is an Assistant Professor of Computational Linguistics. He currently works at the Department of Computational Linguistics at RICEST (www.ricest.ac.ir). He also teaches at different governmental and non-governmental universities in Iran and acts as supervisor of M.A. theses on translation, linguistics and language teaching studies. He is also a researcher and has already published more than 30 articles, 10 books and has completed more than 10 research projects and has already held a number of workshop series for students of the aforementioned fields. His research hobbies are translation, linguistics, computational linguistics, language teaching and NLP (Natural language Processing).