Issues in Language Teaching (ILT), Vol. 8, No. 1, 225-248, June 2019

Investigating the Relationship between Teaching Styles and Emotional Intelligence among Iranian English Instructors

Sasan Baleghizadeh*
Associate Professor, Applied Linguistics, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran

Maryam Shakouri
M.A. in TEFL, Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran

Abstract

This study investigated the relationship between five teaching styles and emotional intelligence among 102 Iranian English instructors from different universities in Tehran, Iran. To this end, the participants were asked to fill in two questionnaires, including the Teaching Styles Inventory (version 3.0) and the Emotional Intelligence Scale. To analyze the data, standard multiple regression analyses were run. The results demonstrated that among various teaching styles, including expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator, merely the delegator style had a statistically significant association with emotional intelligence. Furthermore, the relationship between personal model style and emotional intelligence was considerable, though not statistically significant. The findings and their implications are fully discussed.

Key words: Teaching styles, Emotional intelligence, English instructors, Iranian
***Corresponding author's email:** s_baleghizadeh@sbu.ac.ir

INTRODUCTION

A growing need for intensifying learning quality suggests how imperative it is to analyze teachers' style of teaching as a fundamental factor, impacting learners' achievement (Aitkin & Zuzovsky, 1994) and to interpret the elements associated with this construct which contributes to obtaining

valuable information about the features of effective styles. Among these factors, the emotional climate of educational contexts is believed to be affected by different aspects of teaching styles (Grasha, 1996). As emotions are a fundamental domain of personality (Petrides, 2011) and as personality of teachers is associated with their teaching styles (Cooper, 2001), investigating the relationship between emotional intelligence as a personality trait (Petrides, 2011) and teaching styles can shed more light on the ways of performing effective teaching considering the fact that both constructs are associated with learner achievement (Aitkin & Zuzovsky, 1994; Kremenitzer, 2005).

Reviewing the related literature in teacher education area reveals that teaching style and emotional intelligence have been individually explored in diverse studies (e.g., Alavinia & Agha Alikhani, 2014; Briesmaster & Briesmaster-Paredes, 2015), particularly in mainstream education. However, very rarely have there been studies to explore the relationship between these two factors. In applied linguistics, as literature review proves, the scarcity of research with respect to these two variables is more notable. Undoubtedly, the paucity of research in this domain provides an adequate logic to consider seeking the relationship between teachers' teaching styles and their emotional intelligence. To fill this gap, this study aims at examining the relationship between teaching styles and emotional intelligence among Iranian English instructors.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teaching Styles

Reviewing the related literature has proved that defining teaching style and identifying its various elements are complicated due to its multidimensional nature (Grasha, 1996). Different authors (e.g. Cooper, 2001; Fischer & Fischer, 1979; Lowman, 1995) highlighted different aspects of teaching

styles; hence there are diverse perspectives about the construct. For the purpose of this study, among various models of teaching styles (e.g. Cooper, 2001; Fischer & Fischer, 1979; Lowman, 1995) Grasha's (1996) teaching styles model was applied. Grasha (1996) defines teaching style "as a pattern of needs, beliefs, and behaviors that faculty display in their classroom" (p. 152) and presents five types of styles, named Expert, Formal authority, Personal model, Facilitator, and Delegator. Grasha (1996) believes that "everyone who teaches possesses each of the five teaching styles to varying degrees" (p. 153). It has been clarified through Grasha's studies that teachers' styles affect the way they present information, behave and interact with learners, apply classroom tasks, and involve students to the field. In his model, Grasha (1996) takes the significant role of learners' styles of learning into account in identifying teaching styles. He also grounded his model on the basis of classroom experiences in order to both achieve reliable and valid information and facilitate recommendations for instructional practices. Furthermore, his model is not only a descriptive one, defining and emphasizing specific styles, but also a prescriptive one, specifying how various teaching styles can be adopted or modified. As a result, all these above-mentioned features along with the empirical support and practicality of the model assured the researchers to select Grasha's model in the current study. In the following section, the features of the five styles in Grasha's (1996) model are introduced.

In Grasha's (1996) model, a teacher with expert style is "concerned with transmitting information" and "possesses knowledge and expertise that students need", while trying to "maintain status as an expert among students by displaying detailed knowledge" (p.154). A teacher with formal authority style "possesses status among students because of knowledge and role as a faculty member" and "is concerned with providing positive and negative feedback, establishing learning goals, expectations, and rules of conduct for students" (Grasha, 1996, p.154). The teacher with this style also considers the standard ways of doing things in his/her class. Teachers with personal model style "believe in teaching by personal example", "establish a

prototype for how to think and behave", and "oversees, guides, and directs by showing how to do things, and encouraging students to observe and then to emulate the instructor's approach" (Grasha, 1996, p.154). Facilitator teachers focus on "the personal nature of teacher-student interactions" and "work with students on projects in a consultative fashion" (Grasha, 1996, p.154). They try to guide their students by asking questions and exploring options and alternatives. Finally, teachers with delegator style are "concerned with developing students' capacity to function in an autonomous fashion" and "available at the request of students as a resource person" (Grasha, 1996, p.154).

It has been demonstrated through various studies that teaching style is an element influencing learners' achievement (e.g. Aitkin & Zuzovsky, 1994; Ngware, Oketch & Mutisya, 2014). Grasha (1996) believes that teaching styles, learning styles, and instructional processes are all interdependent. Moreover, it has been found that teaching style is correlated with teachers' self-efficacy (Baleghizadeh & Shakouri, 2017; Dilekli & Tezci, 2016; Heidari, Nourmohammadi & Nowrouzi, 2012), personality type of teachers (Cooper, 2001; Zhang, 2007), and their classroom management (Rahimi & Asadollahi, 2011; Yilmaz & Çavaş, 2008). All these studies exhibit that various factors should be considered while studying this construct in different educational settings.

Emotional Intelligence

It is believed that the origin of Emotional Intelligence (EI) is deeply rooted in the early attempts of Thorndike (1920) in specifying *social intelligence,* which he defines as the ability to discern and manage individuals in a society in order to behave wisely in human relations (Thorndike, 1920). Later on, in 1983 Howard Gardner regenerated Thorndike's view by introducing eight different types of intelligence (Goleman, 1998), among

which *interpersonal* and *intrapersonal* intelligences paved the way for the substantial development of EI. It is believed that Salovey and Mayer (1990) first introduced and coined emotional intelligence based on Gardner's identifications and the significance of individual differences. Salovey and Mayer (1990) defined EI as "the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions" (p. 189).

Since the emergence of EI, various studies have been done to examine different possible factors in association with Emotional Intelligence. For example, emotional intelligence has been found to be at the center of good professional performance (Cote & Miners, 2006; Goleman, 1995). It has been also proved that the scarcity of EI skills is associated with anxiety and depression, (Dewaele et al., 2008; Salguero et al., 2012; Silk et al., 2003). Moreover, Wubbels and Levy (1991) discuss that teachers' affective traits and learners' emotional improvement are strongly related to each other. Teachers' emotions are found to affect how they think and solve problems (Isen, 1993). Teachers with more positive emotions may create and develop better ideas and coping skills in their teaching performance (Frederickson, 2001). Considering the importance of teachers' EI, Kremenitzer (2005) declares that "an increase in a teacher's emotional intelligence significantly impacts on student learning in a powerful way both in academic and interpersonal domains" (p. 6). In addition, it has been reported that EI is positively associated with teachers' sense of self-efficacy (e.g. Koçoğlu, 2011; Rastegar & Memarpour, 2009) and their commitment and satisfaction (Iordanoglou, 2007).

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Reviewing the literature reveals that studies investigating the relationship between teaching styles and EI have been very rare. To the best of the researchers' knowledge, Akbari and Tavassoli (2011) and Mousapour and

Khorram's (2015) study are the only studies which examined the relationship between these two constructs and reported that they are significantly correlated. As these two constructs are positively associated with learner achievement (Aitkin & Zuzovsky, 1994; Kremenitzer, 2005) and as both constructs can be learnt and modified (Goleman, 1995; Grasha, 1996) to improve the quality of teaching performance, it seems essential to investigate the relationship between teaching styles and EI in various contexts to heighten learning quality. Hence, this is the aim of the present study to examine the relationship between these two constructs among Iranian English instructors. The research questions of the study are as follows:

1. Is there any relationship between Iranian English instructors' teaching styles and their emotional intelligence?
2. To what extent can Iranian English instructors' teaching styles contribute to the prediction of their EI?

METHOD

Participants

The participants of this study consisted of 102 university instructors (aged 29-52), teaching General English to B.A. (Bachelor of Arts) students, majoring in various non-English fields of study, such as physics, math, engineering, and biology. They were 54 females and 48 males and held either M.A. (n=45) or Ph.D. (n=57) degrees with different teaching experience (1-36 years). The participants consisted of the instructors from various state universities in Tehran, Iran and they were selected based on feasibility and practicality criteria.

Instruments

Teaching Styles Inventory (Version 3.0)

The Teaching Styles Inventory (version 3.0), designed by Grasha (1996), was applied in the current research to study the participants' teaching styles. It encompasses 40 items, identifying the five types of teaching style, named *expert*, *formal authority*, *personal model*, *facilitator*, and *delegator*. The mean score of the eight items associated with each style is assessed to specify that specific style. Moreover, a 7-point Likert scale in which *1* represents *strongly disagree* and *7* stands for *strongly agree*, was utilized to measure each item of the instrument. The wide application of this instrument as well as the findings of Grasha's own studies has endorsed the reliability and validity of the scale. In this research, the reliability of this scale was computed and the obtained average Cronbach's alpha of the five teaching styles was 0.75 which is a satisfying index of reliability. The results of the obtained Cronbach's alpha of each style are as follows: expert (0.69), formal authority (0.70), personal model (0.75), facilitator (0.77), and delegator (0.81).

Emotional Intelligence Scale

In order to identify the instructors' EI, the Emotional Intelligence Scale was utilized in the current study. It is a self-report inventory, designed by Schutte, Malouff, Hall, Haggerty, Cooper, Golden, and Dornheim (1998) based on Salovey and Mayer's (1990) original model of emotional intelligence. It consists of four subscales, named *perception of emotions*, *managing own emotions*, *managing others emotions*, and *utilization of emotions*. In this scale, respondents rank themselves on each of the 33 items using a five-point Likert-type scale in which *1* represents *strongly disagree* and *5* represents *strongly agree*. Ultimately, total score is computed by reverse coding items 5, 28, and 33, and then summing all items (Schutte et al., 1998). The original EIS indicated high internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha ranging from 0.87 to 0.90) (Schutte et al., 1998). In the current study the reliability of EIS was calculated and Cronbach's alpha was found to be 0.88.

Data Collection Procedure

First, the participants were selected from the different state universities in Tehran, Iran, using convenience sampling. The participants were ensured that their cooperation was absolutely voluntary and their answers would be utilized for research purposes. Hence, all the questionnaires were coded numerically to consider anonymity and confidentiality elements into account. To collect data, the questionnaires were simultaneously distributed among the participants through either hard copy or soft copy. The participants were asked to fill out the questionnaires honestly and precisely. The detailed instructions for completing the questionnaires were provided in each copy in order to obtain valid and reliable data. As university instructors are mostly busy individuals, it was predicted that they might not have enough time to fill out the questionnaires; therefore 10-day time was given to the participants, although 30-minute time could suffice to complete the questionnaires. Ultimately, out of 115 distributed questionnaires, 102 completed ones were returned to the researchers.

Data Analysis

First, the descriptive statistics (see Table 1) on the two questionnaires, such as standard deviations and means were calculated. Then, multiple regression analysis was carried out to examine the relationship between the different subscales of teaching style and the total EI. Multiple regression analysis provided information about whether and how EI can predict teaching styles. All these statistical analyses were run applying Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.

RESULTS

Table 1 summarizes the descriptive statistics on teaching styles and emotional intelligence. The descriptive statistics of each item in both scales are presented in Appendix 1.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics on different teaching styles and total EI

	M	SD	N
EI total	132.48	14.31	102
Expert	41.36	6.12	102
Formal authority	40.71	5.12	102
Personal model	40.67	6.24	102
Facilitator	41.11	6.67	102
Delegator	38.37	6.12	102

To find the relationship between the subscales of teaching style and total EI, and to explore to what extent English instructors' teaching styles can contribute to the prediction of their EI, a standard multiple regression analysis was conducted. The assumptions of multicollinearity, normal distribution, homogeneity of variance, and linearity were checked before running the regression analysis and they were all met. The results (Table 2) revealed that among teaching styles, only delegator style (β=.31, p=.01) was significantly associated with EI. It was also indicated that the relationship between personal model style and EI was considerable although not statistically significant (β= .26, p=.06). The results for the relationship between EI and the other styles are as follows: EI and (1) expert style (β=.10, p=.3), (2) formal authority style (β=.00, p=.9), facilitator style (β= -.02, p=.8). Moreover, part correlation in table 2 demonstrates the relative importance of each teaching style and its square indicates the variance of the total scores of EI uniquely explained by each teaching style which is as follows: expert: 6.94%, formal authority: 0%, personal model: 36.26%, facilitator: 0.14% and delegator: 56.65%. Table 3 also depicts the correlations among teaching styles and EI.

Table 2: The results of multiple regression for teaching styles and EI (dependent variable: EI total)

	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	p	Correlations		
						Zero-order	partial	part
Model	B	Std. Error	Beta					
(Constant)	70.80	11.23		6.30	0.00			
Expert	0.25	0.28	0.10	0.87	0.38	0.38	0.08	0.07
Formal A[1]	0.01	0.38	0.00	0.04	0.96	0.38	0.00	0.00
Personal M[2]	0.60	0.32	0.26	1.86	0.06	0.44	0.18	0.16
Facilitator	-0.04	0.27	-0.02	-0.17	0.86	0.35	-0.01	-0.01
Delegator	0.72	0.29	0.31	2.42	**0.01***	0.43	0.24	0.20

*significant
[1]Formal A: Formal authority
[2]Personal M: Personal model

Table 3: correlations among teaching styles and EI

		EI total	Expert	Formal authority	Personal model	Facilitator	Delegator
EI total	Pearson correlation	1.00	.386	.381	.449	.350	.435
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	102	102	102	102	102	102
Expert	Pearson correlation	.386	1.00	.665	.660	.293	.343
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.001	.000
	N	102	102	102	102	102	102
Formal Authority	Pearson correlation	.381	.665	1.00	.729	.307	.378
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.001	.000
	N	102	102	102	102	102	102
Personal model	Pearson correlation	.449	.660	.729	1.00	.442	.383
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	102	102	102	102	102	102
Facilitator	Pearson correlation	.350	.293	.307	.442	1.00	.717
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.001	.001	.000		.000
	N	102	102	102	102	102	102
Delegator	Pearson correlation	.435	.343	.378	.383	.717	1.00
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	102	102	102	102	102	102

	N						
Delegator	Pearson	.435	.343	.378	.383	.717	1.00
correlation		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	Sig. (1-tailed)	102	102	102	102	102	102
	N						

Further, it was found that the model containing all the subcategories of teaching style can predict 29% of the dependable variable that is emotional intelligence (see Table 4). As it is indicated in table 4, the R square value equals 0.29 which means that the model encompassing the five subscales of teaching styles explains 29% of the variance of total scores of emotional intelligence. The adjusted R-square is also .25, demonstrating that 25% of variation is explained by only the five teaching styles as the independent variables that actually affect EI as the dependent variable in the model.

Table 4: Model summary (dependent variable: EI)

Model	R	R square	Adjusted R square	Std. error of estimate
1	0.53 [a]	0.29	0.25	12.37

a. Predictors: (Constant), Expert, Formal Authority, Personal Model, Facilitator, and Delegator

DISCUSSION

As mentioned earlier, the purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between various teaching styles and EI among Iranian English instructors. To this end, the collected data were analyzed running multiple regression analysis and the results illustrated that among the teaching styles only the delegator style had a significant relationship with EI and the correlation between the other styles and EI was not statistically significant. However, the results of regression analysis demonstrated that the model, containing the five subscales of teaching style, explained 29% of the variance of total scores of EI. In other words, when all the five styles were engaged in the instructors' performance, it could be stated that teaching

styles could predict 29% of EI level. As explained earlier, every teacher possesses each style to varying degrees and each style is always performed in his/her classes but to varying degrees (Grasha, 1996); therefore, based on the findings of this study, it can be concluded that teachers' EI should be taken into consideration beside other affecting factors, when it is aimed to investigate their teaching styles. This finding is in line with the theoretical definitions of both constructs. Emotional intelligence is explicated as "the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions" (Salovey & Mayer, 1990, p. 189). As this definition illustrates, the information obtained through emotions affects and guides individuals' thinking and actions, and since teaching style is delineated "as a pattern of needs, beliefs, and behaviors that faculty display in their classroom" (Grasha, 1996, p. 152), it can be concluded that EI can be associated with teaching styles because emotions can affect teachers' patterns of beliefs and behaviors which are displayed in their classes as styles.

Additionally, the finding is consistent with the studies which have demonstrated that teachers' emotions and feelings are directly engaged in their teaching performance. For example, Grasha (1996) states that the specific elements of teachers' style of teaching influence the emotional climate in their classroom (Grasha, 1996). Moreover, in simple terms Hargreaves (1998) notes that "emotions are at the heart of teaching" (p. 835).

The finding is also in harmony with the study of Cooper (2001) and Zhang (2007), who found that teaching styles are significantly associated with the personality type of teachers. It is essential to notice that emotions are a fundamental aspect of personality (Petrides, 2011) and emotional intelligence is identified in various studies (e.g. Petrides, 2011; Schutte et al. 1998) as a personality trait.

Moreover, the result is consistent with the study of Akbari and Tavassoli (2011) and Mousapour and Khorram (2015), demonstrating a significant relationship between teaching styles and EI.

With regard to expert style, the results depicted no statistically significant relationship with EI. As previously noted, teachers dominantly inclined toward expert style are chiefly preoccupied with presenting facts and concepts rather than being concerned with the emotionality of teaching process. As Hargreaves (1998) stated, a teaching phenomenon, which is engaged with emotionality, "is not just a matter of knowing one's subject, being efficient, having the correct competences, or learning all the right techniques" (p.835). He added that teaching inevitably involves and depends on extensive amount of emotional understanding since it is an emotional practice, engaging relationships with others (Hargreaves, 1998). He also asserts that emotional misunderstanding is a significant educational fact and among teachers one of the features that misunderstanding originates from, is preoccupation with subject matter content (Hargreaves, 1998). Hence, it is evident that why expert style was not found to be significantly correlated with EI.

Considering the positive association between EI and self-efficacy, which has been confirmed in various studies (e.g. Koçoğlu, 2011; Rastegar & Memarpour, 2009), the finding is in line with that of Heidari et al. (2012), who reported the least amount of self-efficacy for the expert style in a study seeking the relationship between teaching styles and self-efficacy.

With respect to the formal authority style, the results also showed no significant relationship with EI. Teachers who have extensive tendency toward this style have strict expectations and less flexibility in setting standards for their students. Therefore, flexibility, introduced as one of the main features of EI and defined as "the ability to adjust one's feelings, thoughts, and behavior to changing situations and conditions" (Bar-On, 2000, p. 366), is not the main concern of teachers with formal authority style. Furthermore, they typically give rigid feedback when their students perform unsatisfactorily, which shows that empathizing with students is not

the matter of importance for these teachers. It is essential to notice that empathy is one of the qualities of EI and defined as "the ability to be aware of, understand, and appreciate the feelings of others" (Bar-On, 2000, p. 365).

Hence, with respect to the above-mentioned issues, it is obvious that in these conditions, rather than observing students' preferences and feelings, fulfilling teacher's expectations is crucial even when they are in contradiction to students' preferences. This can be originated from teachers' indifference toward or inability in emotionally understanding their students. Woods and Jeffrey (1996) stated that teachers highlighting their carrier's emotional aspects go beyond the bounds of teaching only based on set standards or utilizing confirmed techniques. Hence, all the above-mentioned explanations justify the finding of this study about formal authority style, which was not significantly associated with EI.

Another issue in the findings is that the study did not demonstrate any relationship between EI and the facilitator style. As mentioned earlier, facilitator teachers emphasize establishing effective teacher-student interactions (Grasha, 1996). This means that they are able in managing interpersonal relationship, which is one of the main features of EI and means "the ability to establish and maintain mutually satisfying relationships that are characterized by emotional closeness, intimacy, and by giving and receiving affection" (Bar-On, 2000, p. 365). Further, consulting with and guiding students on how to improve their learning process, is one of the main concerns of facilitator teachers (Grasha, 1996). This delineates that they concern social responsibility, which is another main aspect of emotional intelligent and defined as "the ability to demonstrate oneself as a cooperative, contributing, and constructive member of one's social group" (Bar-On, 2000, p. 365). Moreover, respecting learners' preferences in learning area is very fundamental in facilitator teachers' teaching process (Grasha, 1996). This necessitates possessing "personal flexibility" (Grasha, 1996, p. 154) in dealing with students' preferences. It should be noted that flexibility is one of the elements of EI and means "the ability to adjust one's

feelings, thoughts, and behavior to changing situations and conditions" (Bar-On, 2000, p. 366). It is evident that all these features necessitate facilitator teachers being able to emotionally understand their students, or in other words, being emotionally intelligent. Therefore, it is surprising why the results didn't depict any significant relationship between EI and this style. The reason that may explain why this finding was obtained can be related to the matter of context. It should be noticed that General English classes at universities are usually conducted with large number of students and the time to present the materials is limited in these classes. As Grasha (1996) found in his study with 560 college instructors, "time pressure" and the "size of the class" (p. 156) are among the factors influencing teaching styles. Since applying facilitator style is so time-consuming (Grasha, 1996) the university instructors preferred not to perform it in their classes. Hence, it can be inferred that, this finding was observed because the facilitator style was not utilized considerably among English university instructors.

With regard to the relationship between personal model style and EI, the results depicted considerable association, though not statistically significant. As noted earlier, the peculiar feature of this style is, to have a belief in teaching by personal examples and building prototype for how to think and act. This may involve both a learner and a teacher to "enter into the field of experience of another and experience for herself/himself the same or similar experiences experienced by another" which is prerequisite for emotional understanding as Denzin (1984, p.137) stated. He explicated that "the subjective interpretation of another's emotional experience from one's own standpoint is central to emotional understanding" (Denzin, 1984, p.137). In other words, emotional understanding can take place when individuals share feelings in common with others (Hargreaves, 1998). Additionally, teachers with personal model style may possess substantial ability of assertiveness which aids them to express their attitudes and experiences, and ask students to follow them. Assertiveness, as one of the aspects of EI, is defined as "the ability to express feelings, beliefs, and thoughts and to defend one's rights in a nondestructive manner" (Bar-On,

2000, p. 365). As a result, all these explanations may justify the considerable, though not statistically significant, relationship between personal model style and EI. However, no strong claims can be made in this regard and further investigations should be pursued to scrutinize the relationship between these two factors.

Finally, the results depicted that the association between delegator style and EI was statistically significant. According to Grasha (1996), the main concern of delegator teachers is to apply class activities inspiring students to enhance their own ideas about various issues of the course content. This necessitates students being engaged, risk-taker, creative, able to deal with challenge, and motivated in the learning process. Obviously, it can be inferred that assertiveness, self-actualization, independence, problem-solving ability, and stress-tolerance, which are all the aspects of EI (Bar-On, 2000), set the conditions, which are prerequisite to gain the mentioned skills. As teachers' affective traits and students' emotional improvement are greatly related to each other (Wubbels & Levy, 1991), it is evident that emotionally intelligent teachers can train their learners better to be skilled in the mentioned features. As a result, because performing delegator style calls for preparing learners to obtain all these skills and improve them during the learning process and because one of the qualities that teachers should have to train learners efficiently to get these skills is emotional intelligence, it can be inferred that to be a delegator teacher necessitates being emotionally intelligent. It was also found that emotionally intelligent teachers are passionate beings who not only fill their classes with delight and enjoyment, but also with challenge and creativity (Hargreaves, 1998) which are among the main features of performing delegator style (Grasha, 1996). Furthermore, considering the significant relationship between self-efficacy and EI (e.g., Rastegar & Memarpour, 2009), this finding is consistent with that of Heidari et al. (2012), who reported the highest amount of self-efficacy for delegator style.

As the studies seeking the relationship between teaching styles and EI are limited, it was not plausible for the researchers to compare the

findings of the current study with those of others, hence to assert strong claims should await further investigations.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The results of the present study depict that emotional intelligence is one of the elements correlated with teaching styles and should be taken into consideration beside other affecting factors, when it is aimed to investigate teachers' teaching styles. It is important to note that both teachers' EI and their teaching styles are influential factors affecting student learning (Aitkin & Zuzovsky, 1994; Kremenitzer, 2005). Hence, the findings of this study emphasize the significance of applying those teaching styles associated with EI to augment the quality of teaching performance and in turn the excellence of learning process.

The current study may have important, although preliminary, implications for EFL teachers, policymakers, administrators, and educators. Firstly, the findings of this study should be used to augment the awareness of both EFL teachers and policymakers at universities to notice that many elements, encompassing teachers' emotional intelligence, predispose instructors to employ particular teaching styles in their General English classes. Hence, each EFL instructor will possess distinct teaching styles. Additionally, since it has been corroborated that teaching styles can be modified in a step-by-step fashion (Grasha, 1996) and since EI has been proved as a factor which can be taught and developed (Goleman, 1995), English instructors should be assisted in teacher education programs to be able to employ styles associated with EI so they can generate more effective learning environment.

The findings of this study have some limitations which should be considered. First, similar to any correlational probe, it cannot be assumed that the observed relationship between teaching styles and EI are causal in nature; therefore, future investigation should conduct experimental and longitudinal research methods to capture a more thorough perspective about

the variables. Second, in the present study, the data were not a representative sample of the total population of English instructors, so the findings cannot be generalized beyond the context in which the research was carried out.

The findings of the current study have brought about some areas of interest for further investigation. As both teaching style and EI are crucial factors in the domain of pedagogy, investigating these two constructs in contexts, other than EFL classes and university environment can be a good idea to intensify the realization of these variables in other contexts. Considering the fact that the present study only investigated the relationship between the subscales of teaching style and total EI, probing the relationship between the subscales of teaching style and the subcategories of EI can provide more thorough views about these two constructs.

REFERENCES

Aitkin, M., & Zuzovsky, R. (1994). Multilevel interaction models and their use in the analysis of large-scale school effectiveness studies. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *5*, 45-73.

Akbari, R. & Tavassoli, K. (2011). Teacher efficacy, burnout, teaching style, and emotional intelligence: Possible relationships and differences. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL)*, *14*(2), 31-61.

Alavinia, P., & Agha Alikhani, M. (2014). Willingness to communicate reappraised in the light of emotional intelligence and gender differences. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*, 143-152.

Baleghizadeh, S., & Shakouri, M. (2017). Investigating the relationship between teaching styles and teacher self-efficacy among some Iranian ESP university instructors. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *54*(4), 394-402.

Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence. Insights from the emotional quotient inventory (EQ-I). In R. Bar-On & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, assessment, and*

application at home, school, and in the workplace (pp. 363-388). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Briesmaster, M., & Briesmaster-Paredes, J. (2015). The relationship between teaching styles and NNPSETs' anxiety levels. *System*, *49*, 145-156.

Cooper, T. C. (2001). Foreign language teaching style and personality. *Foreign language Annals, 34*(4), 301-317.

Cote, S., & Miners, C. T. H. (2006). Emotional intelligence, cognitive intelligence, and job performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *51*(1), 1-28.

Denzin, N. (1984). *On understanding emotion*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dewaele, J. M., Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2008). Effects of trait emotional intelligence and sociobiographical variables on communicative anxiety and foreign language anxiety among adult multilinguals: a review and empirical investigation. *Language Learning, 58*(4), 911-960.

Dilekli, Y., & Tezci, E. (2016). The relationship among teachers' classroom practices for teaching thinking skills, teachers' self-efficacy towards teaching thinking skills and teachers' teaching styles. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, *21*, 144-151.

Fischer, B. B., & Fischer, L. (1979). Styles in teaching and learning. *Educational Leadership*, *36* (4), 245-254.

Frederickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotion in positive psychology: The broadening-and-build theory of positive emotion. *American Psychology*, *56*, 218-226.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

Grasha, A. F. (1996). *Teaching with style*. United States of America: Alliance Publishers.

Hargreaves, A. (1998). The emotional practice of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *14* (8), 835-854.

Heidari, F., Nourmohammadi, E., & Nowrouzi, H. (2012). On the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' self-efficacy beliefs and their teaching styles. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *4*(3), 536-550.

Iordanoglou, D. (2007). The teacher as leader: the relationship between emotional intelligence, leadership effectiveness, commitment, and satisfaction. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *1*, 57-66.

Isen, A. M. (1993). Positive affect and decision making. In M. Lewis & J. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 261-277). New York: Guilford Press.

Koçoğlu, Z. (2011). Emotional intelligence and teacher efficacy: A study of Turkish EFL pre-service teachers. *Teacher Development*, *15*, 471- 484.

Kremenitzer, J. P. (2005). The emotionally intelligent early childhood educator: Self-reflective journaling. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, *33*, 3-9.

Lowman, J. (1995). *Mastering the techniques of teaching*. (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mousapour, G., & Khorram, A. (2015). The relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' emotional intelligence and their teaching styles. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, *4*(4), 3-14.

Ngware M. W., Oketch, M., & Mutisya, M. (2014). Does teaching style explain differences in learner achievement in low and high performing schools in Kenya? *International Journal of Educational Development*, *36*, 3-12.

Petrides, K. V. (2011). Ability and trait emotional intelligence. In T. Chamorro-Premuzic, S. V. Stumm, & A. Furnham (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell handbook of individual differences* (pp. 656-678). United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Rahimi, M., & Asadollahi, F. (2011). On the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' classroom management orientations and teaching style. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *31*, 49-55.

Rastegar, M., & Memarpour, S. (2009). The relationship between emotional intelligence and self-efficacy among Iranian EFL teachers. *System*, *37*, 700-707.

Salguero, J. M., Extremera, N., & Fernández-Berrocal, P. (2012). Emotional intelligence and depression: The moderator role of gender. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *53*, 29-32.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, *9*, 185-211.

Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden C. J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of

emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *25*, 167-177.

Silk, J. S., Steinberg, L., & Morris, A. S. (2003). Adolescents' emotion regulation in daily life: Links to depressive symptoms and problem behavior. *Child Development*, *74*, 1869-1880.

Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its uses. *Harper's Magazine*, *140*, 227-235.

Woods, P., Jeffrey, B. (1996). *Teachable moments*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Wubbels, T., & Levy, J. (1991). A comparison of interpersonal behavior of Dutch and American teachers. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *15*, 1-18.

Yılmaz, H., & Çavaş, P. H. (2008). The effect of teaching practice on pre-service elementary teachers' science teaching efficacy and classroom management beliefs. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics*, *Science, and Technology Education*, *4*(1), 45-54.

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

Appendix 1: Descriptive statistics on the items in Teaching Styles Inventory (Version 3.0) and Emotional Intelligence Scale

Items of the questionnaires	Mean	SD
1) Facts, concepts, and principles are the most important things that students should acquire	5.09	1.58
2) I set high standards for students in this class.	5.06	1.29
3) What I say and do models appropriate ways for students to think about issues in the content.	5.04	1.30
4) My teaching goals and methods address a variety of student learning styles.	5	1.37
5) Students typically work on course projects alone with little supervision from me.	3.67	1.54
6) Sharing my knowledge and expertise with students is very important to me.	6.10	1.20
7) I give students negative feedback when their performance is unsatisfactory.	4.08	1.89

8) Students are encouraged to emulate the example I provide.	4.40	1.53
9) I spend time consulting with students on how to improve their work on individual and/or group projects.	5.41	1.33
10) Activities in this class encourage students to develop their own ideas about content issues.	5.57	1.03
11) What I have to say about a topic is important for students to acquire a broader perspective on the issues in that area.	5.78	1.05
12) Students would describe my standards and expectations as somewhat strict and rigid.	4.34	1.60
13) I typically show students how and what to do in order to master course content.	5.11	1.34
14) Small group discussions are employed to help students develop their ability to think critically.	4.95	1.71
15) Students design one or more self-directed learning experiences.	4.37	1.64
16) I want students to leave this course well prepared for further work in this area.	5.49	1.45
17) It is my responsibility to define what students must learn and how they should learn it.	5.28	1.45
18) Examples from my personal experiences often are used to illustrate points about the material.	5.89	1.08
19) I guide students' work on course projects by asking questions, exploring options, and suggesting alternative ways to do things.	5.54	1.28
20) Developing the ability of students to think and work independently is an important goal.	5.89	1.24
21) Lecturing is a significant part of how I teach each of the class sessions.	4.86	1.49
22) I provide very clear guidelines for how I want tasks completed in this course.	5.71	1.13
23) I often show students how they can use various principles and concepts.	5.50	1.14
24) Course activities encourage students to take initiative and responsibility for their learning.	5.50	1.29
25) Students take responsibility for teaching part of the class sessions.	4.50	1.68
26) My expertise is typically used to resolve disagreements about content issues.	4.93	1.36
27) This course has very specific goals and objectives that I want to accomplish.	5.42	1.30
28) Students receive frequent verbal and/or written comments on their performance.	4.95	1.50
29) I solicit student advice about how and what to teach in this course.	4.28	1.55
30) Students set their own pace for completing independent and/or group projects.	4.31	1.51
31) Students might describe me as a "storehouse of knowledge" who dispenses the facts, principles, and concepts they need.	4.43	1.36
32) My expectations for what I want students to do in this class are clearly	5.28	1.40

stated in the syllabus.		
33) Eventually, many students begin to think like me about course content.	4.60	1.27
34) Students can make choices among activities in order to complete course requirements.	4.54	1.40
35) My approach to teaching is similar to a manager of a work group who delegates tasks and responsibilities to subordinates.	4.65	1.57
36) There is more material in this course than I have time available to cover it.	4.65	1.59
37) My standards and expectations help students develop the discipline they need to learn.	5.50	1.12
38) Students might describe me as a "coach" who works closely with someone to correct problems in how they think and behave.	5.15	1.33
39) I give students a lot of personal support and encouragement to do well in this course.	5.87	1.24
40) I assume the role of a resource person who is available to students whenever they need help.	5.38	1.28
41. I know when to speak about my personal problems to others.	4.14	1.08
42. When I am faced with obstacles, I remember times I faced similar obstacles and overcame them.	4.17	0.83
43. I expect that I will do well on most things I try.	4.17	0.91
44. Other people find it easy to confide in me.	4.09	0.92
45. I find it hard to understand the non-verbal messages of other people.	3.68	1.33
46. Some of the major events of my life have led me to re-evaluate what is important and not important.	4.09	1.01
47. When my mood changes, I see new possibilities.	3.68	0.99
48. Emotions are one of the things that make my life worth living.	4.25	0.85
49. I am aware of my emotions as I experience them.	4.47	0.72
50. I expect good things to happen.	4.19	0.90
51. I like to share my emotions with others.	3.47	1.19
52. When I experience a positive emotion, I know how to make it last.	3.81	0.96
53. I arrange events others enjoy.	3.88	0.96
54. I seek out activities that make me happy.	4.01	0.83
55. I am aware of the non-verbal messages I send to others.	3.97	0.86
56. I present myself in a way that makes a good impression on others.	4.13	0.93
57. When I am in a positive mood, solving problems is easy for me.	4.25	0.93
58. By looking at their facial expressions, I recognize the emotions people are experiencing.	4.33	0.77
59. I know why my emotions change.	4.10	0.92
60. When I am in a positive mood, I am able to come up with new ideas.	4.38	0.80
61. I have control over my emotions.	3.83	0.92
62. I easily recognize my emotions as I experience them.	4.23	0.89
63. I motivate myself by imagining a good outcome to tasks I take on.	4.10	0.91

64. I compliment others when they have done something well.	4.37	0.99
65. I am aware of the non-verbal messages other people send.	3.94	1.01
66. When another person tells me about an important event in his or her life, I almost feel as though I experienced this event myself.	3.85	0.99
67. When I feel a change in emotions, I tend to come up with new ideas.	3.72	0.90
68. When I am faced with a challenge, I give up because I believe I will fail.	4.03	1.00
69. I know what other people are feeling just by looking at them.	3.46	1.10
70. I help other people feel better when they are down.	4.09	0.78
71. I use good moods to help myself keep trying in the face of obstacles.	4.12	0.69
72. I can tell how people are feeling by listening to the tone of their voice.	3.97	0.84
73. It is difficult for me to understand why people feel the way they do.	3.35	1.11