The Relationship between Personality Types and Teaching Styles of Turkish Teachers

Serdar Derman [1] 🆔 **Selçuk Peker** [2] 🆔 **Ali Umut Aşcı** [3] 🆔

[1] Assoc. Prof. Dr., Necmettin Erbakan Universiy, Ahmet Keleşoğlu Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish Education, Konya, Türkiye
serdarderman@erbakan.edu.tr

[2] Prof. Dr., Necmettin Erbakan Universiy, Ereğli Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish Education, Konya, Türkiye
speker@erbakan.edu.tr

[3] Dr., Ministry of National Education, Aksaray, Türkiye
aliumut68@gmail.com

Article Info	ABSTRACT
	The aim of this study is to reveal the relationship between personality types and teaching styles of Turkish teachers and to examine these characteristics according to gender, age and years of service variables. The study group of the research, which was conducted according to the relational survey model, one of the quantitative research methods, consisted of 105 Turkish teachers working in various provinces in Turkey. "Grasha-Reichmann Teaching Style Scale" developed by Grasha (1994) and "Five Factor Personality Scale" developed by John et al. (1991) were used in the study. Data were collected through Google Form. Due to skewed distribution, the Mann-Whitney U test was used in the analysis of the gender variable, and the Kruskal Wallis H Test was used in the analysis of the age and seniority variables. In addition, the relationship between teaching styles and personality types was examined with Spearman's rho. According to the findings, knowledge transmitter teaching style was found to be medium while authoritarian, personal, guide and counselor teaching styles were found to be high. In addition, teachers' extraversion, agreeableness, self-discipline and openness to development personality types show positive personality values, while neuroticism personality type has a negative personality value. While significant differences were found in personality types and teaching styles according to gender variable, significant differences were not found according to age and seniority variables. While there was no significant relationship between neuroticism personality type and all teaching styles, a positive and significant relationship was found between other personality types and teaching styles.

INTRODUCTION

With the fundamental changes in today's educational approach, the constructivist approach, in which the individual actively participates in the learning process, has taken a prominent position in the field of education. This approach is based on the idea that individuals make learning meaningful by constructing their own knowledge structures rather than receiving and consuming knowledge as an external element. The constructivist educational approach acknowledges that the learning process is shaped by individual differences and aims to create a flexible, participatory, and student-centered environment to support this process. This has led to significant changes in both teaching methods and techniques, as well as in the roles of teachers and students (Gülten & Özkan, 2014). At this point, the teaching styles of educators have also been influenced by these changes.

In the traditional educational approach, the teacher was seen as the sole source and transmitter of knowledge. However, the constructivist approach has transformed this one-sided role of the teacher into that of a guide who leads the learning process, provides direction, and helps learners realize their potential (Akpınar & Ergin, 2005). As a guide, the teacher focuses on nurturing learners to become independent thinkers and problem solvers by considering their interests and needs. In this regard, teachers use effective questioning techniques to encourage students to think critically. Additionally, teachers prepare learning materials and environments that support students' learning processes, develop collaborative working methods, and continuously improve the learning process through ongoing assessment (Fer & Cırık, 2007; Orlich et al., 2012). Alongside these goals, effective classroom management also emerges as a key element of teaching (Wang, Haertel & Walberg, 1993). This is because classroom management is a critical factor that directly affects the efficiency and quality of learning processes. In this context, the teacher plays the most decisive role in the classroom environment. The teacher's primary responsibility is to encourage positive behaviors that support the learning process, ensure their continuity, and minimize negative behaviors. This not only contributes to improving the learning environment but also helps shape students' overall behavior in a positive direction. For educational processes to be conducted effectively, teachers' instructional styles play a determining role (Cohen & Amidon, 2004). Therefore, various factors such as teachers' past experiences, their readiness to teach, individual teaching styles, and distinct personality types must be taken into account.

The educational process is shaped by the teaching styles and personality types of teachers (Kim, 1993). Each teacher adopts different methods for delivering knowledge, interacting with students, and organizing the learning environment. Behind these methods lie the teacher's personality traits, values, experiences, and educational philosophy. Teaching styles define how teachers conduct their lessons, while personality types have a profound influence on how these styles are applied (Erkan & Şirin, 2024; Üredi, 2006). These two factors significantly determine the quality of the educational environment and students' learning experiences (Behnam & Bayazidi, 2013).

Teaching styles encompass the behaviors teachers' exhibit in the classroom, the learning opportunities they offer to students, and their lesson planning strategies. For example, a teacher perceived as an authority on knowledge may adopt an expert approach, providing students with a detailed and disciplined learning environment. On the other hand, a teacher who emphasizes students' individual responsibilities may prefer a facilitator teaching style, encouraging independent learning. Teaching styles are not only shaped by the teacher's preferences but also by the content of the lesson, the needs of the students, and educational goals (Çelebi, 2006). In this context, a teacher may combine multiple teaching styles in different situations; for instance, adopting an expert approach when delivering theoretical knowledge while taking on a guiding role during practical activities.

Personality types profoundly influence the way teaching styles are implemented and their overall impact (Andabai, 2013). An introverted teacher tends to focus on creating a structured and planned learning environment, where discipline and order may form the core elements of their teaching style. On

the other hand, an extroverted teacher may place greater importance on building individual relationships with students through a more social and dynamic approach, employing more flexible teaching methods. Teachers with creative and innovative personalities can develop different techniques to make the learning process more engaging and to capture students' interest (Gençer et al., 2023). This diversity not only addresses different learning styles among students but also enriches the teaching environment.

The combination of teaching styles and personality types has a direct effect on students' academic success and learning experiences. For example, teachers with a high level of knowledge and a disciplined approach can enhance students' academic performance. However, since this approach may limit students' active participation, it is important to use flexible and interactive methods to support students' motivation for learning (Alan, 2020). Similarly, a teaching environment where teachers provide individual guidance and encourage students to actively participate in the learning process increases both learning retention and students' confidence and sense of responsibility (Yıldırım & Dönmez, 2008). In this process, it is essential for teachers to adopt a flexible attitude and consider both their own personality traits and the individual needs of their students. Every classroom is a unique community with its own dynamics, and teachers are expected to develop strategies that align with these dynamics. For example, while an authoritarian approach may be effective in one classroom, another classroom may require a strategy focused on greater independence and creative freedom for students. Teachers can strike a balance between their teaching styles and personality types by analyzing their strengths and the needs of the classroom environment (Raven et al., 1993). In this way, a learning environment that supports both academic success and the development of students' individual potential can be created. Success in education is not merely about transmitting knowledge but also about enabling students to discover themselves in the learning process—something that requires a harmonious combination of the teacher's personality and teaching style.

Teaching Styles

Each teacher may adopt different methods and strategies in the teaching process. This diversity directly affects the educational process. The constructivist approach acknowledges that educators may follow different paths and methods in the teaching process. Every educator has a different teaching style, motivation, area of interest, and set of needs (Kulinna & Cothran, 2003). Therefore, when planning teaching processes, it is important to consider not only the individual differences of students but also those of educators (Turgut et al., 2016). Teachers' ability to adopt flexible teaching styles enhances the quality of the process through which learners access and construct knowledge. For this reason, teaching style becomes a focal concept in the educational process.

Teaching style is defined as a teacher's personal approach and preferences in presenting information, interacting with students, and guiding the learning process (Dunn & Dunn, 1979; Heimlich & Norland, 2002). This style is shaped by the teacher's beliefs, values, pedagogical understanding, and individual characteristics related to education. At the same time, it evolves in harmony with external factors such as the subject matter, the needs of the class, and the learning objectives. Teaching style manifests itself in various dimensions, such as classroom management, communication style, use of learning materials, and assessment methods. Within the broad understanding of teaching styles, various classifications have been made by Dunn & Dunn (1979), Fischer & Fischer (1979), Witkin (1979), Ellis (1979), Brostrom (1979), Joyce & Weil (1980), Broudy (1982), Butler (1987), Heimlich & Van Tilburg (1990), Borich (1992), Brekelmans, Levy & Rodriguez (1993), Quirk (1994), Grasha (1996), Levine (1998), and Mosston (2002). Among these classifications, the teaching style classification developed by Grasha (1996) has been chosen for detailed examination in this study based on expert opinions. Grasha (1996) explained teaching styles through a classification model designed to define teachers' interactions in the classroom and their approaches to teaching methods. This model focuses on understanding teachers' individual characteristics and preferred teaching methods. Grasha (1996) developed teaching styles for teachers around 5 elements:

1) Expert Teaching Style: The expert teaching style is an instructional approach in which the teacher is regarded as an authority and a source of knowledge in the classroom, based on their expertise and experience. In this style, the teacher emphasizes their deep knowledge and expertise in a particular subject area and focuses on transmitting this knowledge to students. The teacher's role is to ensure that students master the subject thoroughly and are equipped with sufficient knowledge in that area.

2) Authoritative Teaching Style: The authoritative teaching style is characterized by the teacher maintaining strong authority and control in the classroom, with clearly defined rules and expectations. In this style, teachers deliver information to students directly and systematically while closely monitoring student behavior and the learning process.

3) Personal Teaching Style: The personal teaching style is an instructional approach in which the teacher serves as a guide and model in the classroom, helping students learn by demonstrating their own behaviors and thought processes. In this style, the teacher acts as a "role model," sharing their experiences and methods to show students how to develop specific skills, attitudes, and knowledge sets.

4) Facilitator Teaching Style: The facilitator teaching style involves the teacher assuming the role of a guide or consultant in the learning process, providing support based on students' individual needs and learning styles. In this style, the teacher places the student at the center of learning and focuses on helping students develop independent thinking, problem-solving, and collaboration skills. Rather than authoritarian knowledge transmission, the facilitator teacher helps students actively shape their own learning processes.

5) Delegator Teaching Style: The delegator teaching style involves the teacher gradually transferring authority over the learning process to students, focusing on helping them develop independent learning and problem-solving skills. In this style, the teacher initially provides guidance but encourages students to take responsibility for their own learning and manage their own learning processes as the process progresses.

Personality Types

Personality types are psychological concepts used to understand and classify the way individuals think, feel and behave (Atkinson et al., 1993). Such typologies are the result of efforts to understand the traits that people show similar tendencies in different situations. Personality types help to understand how individuals interact with environmental and social factors and how they react in certain situations (Robbins & Judge, 2011).

There are two main approaches to understanding personality types: Typological Approach and Dimensional Approach. The typological approach is based on the idea that individuals can be divided into certain categories. In this approach, people are grouped under patterns or types. Although the typological approach facilitates personality analysis, it carries the risk of ignoring individual differences. The dimensional approach, on the other hand, evaluates personality on the basis of certain traits and argues that each individual may carry these traits at different intensities. The most well-known model of the dimensional approach, the Five Factor Model, examines personality in five basic dimensions: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability and openness (John et al., 1991). This model can analyze the differences between individuals in a more detailed way by evaluating personality traits on a spectrum. While the typological approach provides a clearer framework because it categorizes personality, the dimensional approach is more comprehensive in explaining individual differences. Both approaches often complement each other by offering different perspectives in personality analysis.

The methods used to measure personality types are usually based on psychometric instruments. These instruments draw conclusions by analyzing individuals' responses to their own behaviors, thoughts and feelings. Measurements are based on two basic approaches: self-assessment scales and behavioral observations and projection tests (Avcu, 2006; Taner, 2005). Self-assessment scales ask individuals to

evaluate their reactions to certain situations or their general behavior. Responses to statements such as "I feel energetic and outgoing" can be given as an example. Behavioral observations and projection tests are more complex methods based on observing individuals' natural behavior or their reactions to a task. Projection tests try to reveal the unconscious thoughts and feelings of the individual.

When we look at the researchers who conducted studies on personality types, important names come to the fore. Carl Jung (1921) is the founder of the Theory of Psychological Types. Gordon Allport developed one of the first comprehensive theories to classify personality traits and introduced the concept of trait. Hans Eysenck developed the three-dimensional personality model. Eysenck (1975) associated personality with biological foundations and defined the dimensions of personality as extraversion-introversion and neuroticism-stability. Raymond Cattell (1973) defined 16 personality factors using factor analysis technique. Paul Costa and Robert McCrae (1992) are the researchers who developed the Five Factor Model of Personality and popularized the NEO-PI tests in personality assessment. Isabel Briggs Myers and Katharine Cook Briggs (1962) developed Jung's theory and created the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Based on the literature created by these prominent researchers, the measurement tools developed to measure personality types are listed below:

1. Five Factor Personality Model (Big Five): It measures personality in five dimensions: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability and openness to experience. NEO-PI-R (NEO Personality Inventory-Revised) and NEO-FFI (Five-Factor Inventory) measurement tools are used.

2. Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI): Based on Carl Jung's theory of psychological types. It classifies people into 16 different personality types. It focuses on four basic dimensions: Introversion/Extraversion, Intuition/Sensation, Thinking/Feeling and Perceiving/Judging.

3. Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI): It is a clinically used tool. It was developed to assess individuals' personality structure and potential mental health problems.

4. Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ): Based on the theory of Hans Eysenck. It measures personality in three dimensions: Psychoticism, Extraversion/Introversion, Neuroticism.

5. 16 Personality Factor Inventory (16PF): Developed by Raymond Cattell. It assesses personality traits on 16 primary factors and five secondary dimensions.

6. Rorschach Test: A type of projection test. The unconscious thoughts and feelings of the individual are analyzed through reactions to inkblots.

7. Thematic Apperception Test (TAT): The participant is asked to tell stories about ambiguous images. The stories reveal the individual's motivations and inner conflicts.

Many theories have been developed to systematically understand and measure human personality. One of the most widely accepted approaches among these is the Five Factor Personality Model. Developed in 1991 by John, Donahue and Kentle, this model explains human personality in terms of five basic dimensions. These dimensions allow individuals' personality traits to be evaluated on a scientific basis. The dimensions are listed and explained below:

Extraversion: This dimension measures whether the individual is energetic, sociable and outgoing (Trouba, 2007). Individuals with high levels of extraversion generally enjoy social activities, are comfortable expressing themselves and communicate easily with others. Individuals with lower levels are more introverted, quiet and enjoy solitary activities.

Agreeableness: Agreeableness reflects the extent to which an individual is warm, helpful and empathetic towards others (Moody, 2007). Individuals with high agreeableness exhibit a structure that is open to cooperation, kind and cares about the feelings of others. People with low agreeableness may be more competitive and critical.

Responsibility: Responsibility dimension refers to individuals' tendency to act in an organized, planned and disciplined manner (Digman & Takemoto-Chock, 1981). Individuals with high levels of responsibility are generally goal-oriented, reliable and self-disciplined. Individuals with lower levels may be unplanned, disorganized and sometimes negligent.

Emotional Stability: This dimension assesses an individual's capacity to cope with stress and emotional stability (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Individuals with low emotional stability (or high neuroticism) are more anxious, emotionally volatile and sensitive to stressful situations. Individuals with high levels of emotional stability are generally calmer, more confident and emotionally controlled.

Openness to Experience: Openness to experience refers to individuals' interest in innovations, different ideas and creative processes (Church, 1993). People who are high on this dimension are generally imaginative, intellectually curious and prone to artistic activities. Those with lower levels are more traditional, practical and cautious towards innovations.

The Five-Factor Personality Model helps us understand many situations in individuals' lives. Personality traits play a determining role in various areas such as career choice, job satisfaction, social relationships, stress management, and even health (Merdan, 2013). For example, individuals with a high level of conscientiousness tend to be more successful in the workplace, while a high level of extraversion can make it easier to form strong social bonds. The Five-Factor Personality Model provides a strong framework for understanding individual differences and respecting these differences (Demirci, Özler, & Girgin, 2009). Moreover, it can be considered an effective tool for fostering personal awareness and helping individuals better understand themselves.

Purpose

The main aim of the research is to identify the personality types and teaching styles adopted by Turkish language teachers and to determine whether these characteristics differ according to the variables of gender, age, and years of service. In line with this aim, data were collected from Turkish language teachers working in secondary schools affiliated with the Ministry of National Education. The sub-problems of the research are listed below:

1. What are the teaching styles and personality types of Turkish language teachers?

2. Is there a significant relationship between gender, age, professional seniority, and the teaching styles preferred by teachers?

3. Is there a significant relationship between gender, age, professional seniority, and the personality types of teachers?

4. Is there a significant relationship between the teaching styles and personality types of Turkish language teachers?

METHOD

In this study, the correlational survey model, which is one of the quantitative research methods, was used. The correlational survey model is a type of research that aims to examine the relationships between variables. This method is used to determine the existence, direction, and degree of the relationship between two or more variables. Understanding how dependent and independent variables affect each other is an important step in scientific research, and the correlational survey method addresses this need.

Within the scope of this model, it is investigated whether the variables change together, that is, whether there is a connection or interaction between them (Karasar, 2011). The data obtained during this process not only reveal whether two variables act together but also allow us to understand the direction and level of this relationship. This method is an important tool for understanding the existence of relationships. Due to these characteristics of the correlational survey method, it was preferred in this study

to examine the relationship between the personality types and teaching styles of Turkish language teachers.

Study Group

The study group of the research consists of a total of 105 Turkish language teachers, including 46 female and 59 male teachers, working in secondary schools affiliated with the Ministry of National Education. The study group was determined using the convenience sampling method.

In research, the convenience sampling method is frequently preferred when it is difficult to reach all individuals in the population or when it is not possible to identify each individual separately. One of the main reasons for choosing this method is that it allows the researcher to reach a target-sized study group. According to Büyüköztürk et al. (2008), this method provides a practical solution for researchers, especially when the population is large and difficult to access. Considering the difficulty of reaching the entire population, the convenience sampling method facilitates the process and increases the feasibility of the research.

Data Collection Instruments

Teaching Styles Scale

In this study, the "Grasha-Reichmann Teaching Style Inventory," developed by Grasha (1994), was used to determine teachers' teaching styles. The Turkish adaptation of this scale was carried out by Sarıtaş and Süral (2010), who also conducted validity and reliability studies. The scale consists of 40 items and includes five different sub-dimensions. It is structured as a five-point Likert-type scale. Participants were asked to express their level of agreement with each statement on the scale. The sub-dimensions of the scale are as follows: The "Expert" teaching style reflects a knowledge transmission-oriented approach. The "Formal Authority" style represents the teacher's strong orientation toward classroom management and control. The "Personal" teaching style aims to establish a close relationship between the teacher and the student. The "Facilitator" and "Delegator" styles are related to the teacher's role in guiding and supporting students when needed. Sarıtaş and Süral (2010) determined the linguistic validity ratio of the scale as .80 during the Turkish adaptation process. In the reliability analysis of the scale, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was calculated as .875. In the analysis conducted with the study group within the scope of this research, the internal consistency coefficient of the scale was found to be quite high at .91. This finding indicates that the scale provides both reliable and consistent results.

Personality Types Scale

In the study, the Big Five Personality Scale, developed by John et al. (1991), was used to determine teachers' personality types. The scale consists of 44 items and is structured as a five-point Likert-type measure. It includes the sub-dimensions of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness to experience, and neuroticism. Participants were asked to express their level of agreement with each statement on the scale. The Turkish adaptation of the scale was conducted by Alkan (2006). The reliability results for the sub-dimensions of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness to experience, and neuroticism were found to be .89, .67, .79, .79, and .79, respectively. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the overall scale was calculated as .87, and the internal consistency coefficient was measured at .89. These findings indicate that the scale provides both reliable and consistent results.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data were collected from 105 Turkish teachers through Google Forms during the 2024–2025 academic year. Teachers were contacted, and the necessary information was provided to ensure more objective responses.

The data analysis process began with distribution analyses of the collected data. SPSS 25 statistical software was used for the distribution analysis and other tests. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was employed for the distribution analysis since the sample size exceeded 50 (n=105). According to Büyüköztürk (2002), the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is more suitable for distribution analyses in studies

with more than 50 participants. The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov distribution analysis for the data obtained from the Teaching Styles Scale and the Personality Types Scale applied to teachers are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. *Scatter analysis results*

Tests	Kolmogorov-Simirnov Test				
	Statistic	df	Sig	Skewness	Kurtosis
Teaching Styles Scale	,175	105	,000	-1,877	5,438
Personality Types Scale	,116	105	,001	-1,276	2,360

Significance (Sig.) values lower than p<0.05 in the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test indicate that the data are not normally distributed (Büyüköztürk, 2002). Skewness and kurtosis values were also examined. If the skewness coefficient is not within the range of +1 and -1, the data are considered to be non-normally distributed (Köklü, Büyüköztürk & Çokluk Bökeoğlu, 2007). In addition to these values, histograms of the data were reviewed, confirming characteristics of non-normal distribution. As a result of the analyses, the Mann-Whitney U test was used for gender-related analyses, while the Kruskal-Wallis H test was applied for age and seniority-related analyses. The relationship between teaching styles and personality types was examined using Spearman's Rank-Order Correlation. The results regarding teachers' teaching styles and personality types were presented using mean scores and corresponding ratings. The confidence interval was set at 95%, and p<0.05 was considered significant in the analyses.

For the evaluation of the sub-dimensions of teaching styles, the average score thresholds determined by Grasha (1994) were used as the evaluation criteria. The score thresholds for teaching styles set by Grasha (1994) are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. *Teaching styles rating*

Teaching styles	Degree of Teaching Styles		
	Low	Medium	High
Expert Teaching Style	[1.0 - 2.8]	[2.9 - 3.8]	[3.9 - 5.0]
Authoritative Teaching Style	[1.0 - 1.8]	[1.9 - 3.0]	[3.1 - 5.0]
Personal Teaching Style	[1.0 - 2.8]	[2.9 - 3.4]	[3.5 - 5.0]
Facilitator Teaching Style	[1.0 - 2.9]	[3.0 - 4.0]	[4.1 - 5.0]
Delegator Teaching Style	[1.0 - 1.8]	[1.9 - 2.8]	[2.9 - 5.0]

Regarding personality types, the mean scores of the items representing each sub-dimension were calculated. Since the neutral value of the scale is 3, mean scores above 3 indicate positive personality traits, while scores below 3 reflect negative personality traits (Göl Battı, 2019).

Ethic

Ethics committee permission for the study was obtained from Necmettin Erbakan University Social and Human Sciences Scientific Research Ethics Committee (Date: 03.05.2024/2024/394 Protocol No: 09).

FINDINGS

The first sub-question of the study is expressed as "What are the teaching styles and personality types of Turkish teachers?" The results of the analysis related to this sub-question are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. *Teaching styles of Turkish teachers*

	Teaching Styles				
	Expert Teaching Style	Authoritative Teaching Style	Personal Teaching Style	Facilitator Teaching Style	Delegator Teaching Style
Mean	3,7485	3,6417	3,9767	4,1129	3,7366
Degree	Medium	High	High	High	High

According to Table 3, the information-conveying teaching style was found to be at a moderate level, while the authoritarian, personal, guiding, and advising teaching styles were determined to be at a high level.

The analysis results related to the personality types of the Turkish teachers who participated in the study are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. *Personality types of Turkish teachers*

	Personality Types				
	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Openness to experience	Neuroticism
Mean	3,6929	3,9937	3,6635	3,7952	2,8190
Degree	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive	Negative

According to Table 4, the agreeableness personality type had the highest mean score, while the neuroticism personality type had a significantly lower mean score compared to other groups. The mean scores of the extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness to experience personality types were found to be close to each other. Additionally, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience showed positive personality traits, whereas neuroticism displayed negative personality traits.

The second sub-question of the study is expressed as "Is there a significant relationship between gender, age, professional experience, and the teaching styles preferred by teachers?" The results of the Mann-Whitney U test related to this sub-question are presented in the tables below.

Table 5. *Teachers' teaching styles according to gender variable*

Teaching Styles	Group	n	Rank Average	Ordinal Sum	U	p
Expert Teaching Style	Male	59	48,25	2846,50	1076,500	,069
	Female	46	59,10	2718,50		
Authoritative Teaching Style	Male	59	49,75	2935,00	1165,000	,214
	Female	46	57,17	2630,00		
Personal Teaching Style	Male	59	46,67	2753,50	983,500	,015*
	Female	46	61,12	2811,50		
Facilitator Teaching Style	Male	59	47,72	2815,50	1045,500	,043*
	Female	46	59,77	2749,50		
Delegator Teaching Style	Male	59	49,77	2936,50	1166,500	,218
	Female	46	57,14	2628,50		

*p<0,05

According to Table 5, there was no statistically significant relationship between gender and the information-conveying (U=1076.500, p=0.069, p>0.05), authoritarian (U=1165.500, p=0.214, p>0.05), and advising (U=1166.500, p=0.218, p>0.05) teaching styles. However, a statistically significant difference in favor of female teachers was found in the personal (U=983.500, p=0.015, p<0.05) and guiding (U=1045.500, p=0.043, p<0.05) teaching styles.

The results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test related to teachers' teaching styles based on age groups are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. *Teachers' teaching styles according to age variable*

Teaching Styles	Age	n	Rank Average	df	X²	p
Expert Teaching Style	22-27	14	55,43	5	4,227	,517
	28-33	19	51,26			
	34-39	23	54,57			
	40-45	29	55,76			
	46-51	15	53,97			
	52 +	5	26,70			
Authoritative Teaching Style	22-27	14	55,68	5	4,227	,430
	28-33	19	48,58			
	34-39	23	55,17			
	40-45	29	57,24			
	46-51	15	53,27			
	52 +	5	26,90			
Personal Teaching Style	22-27	14	57,21	5	4,725	,450
	28-33	19	49,32			
	34-39	23	57,11			
	40-45	29	54,81			
	46-51	15	52,57			

Teaching Styles	Age	n	Rank Average	df	X²	p
	52 +	5	27,10			
Facilitator Teaching Style	22-27	14	57,46	5	5,669	,340
	28-33	19	55,29			
	34-39	23	56,39			
	40-45	29	51,19			
	46-51	15	54,17			
	52 +	5	23,20			
Delegator Teaching Style	22-27	14	53,18	5	4,601	,466
	28-33	19	53,76			
	34-39	23	58,07			
	40-45	29	55,02			
	46-51	15	48,70			
	52 +	5	27,50			

According to the mean ranks in Table 6, the scores of teachers aged 52 and above were lower than those of other age groups, which were more balanced. However, no statistically significant difference was found between teaching styles and age groups (p>0.05).

The results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test related to teachers' teaching styles based on professional experience are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. *Teachers' teaching styles according to seniority variable*

Teaching Styles	Seniority	n	Rank Average	df	X²	p
Expert Teaching Style	1-5 years	16	56,63	4	1,848	,764
	6-11 years	21	49,88			
	12-17 years	24	58,17			
	18-23 years	31	52,15			
	24 +	13	46,08			
Authoritative Teaching Style	1-5 years	16	53,34	4	,355	,986
	6-11 years	21	51,43			
	12-17 years	24	54,60			
	18-23 years	31	54,16			
	24 +	13	49,38			
Personal Teaching Style	1-5 years	16	55,47	4	1,358	,852
	6-11 years	21	50,76			
	12-17 years	24	58,42			
	18-23 years	31	50,32			
	24 +	13	49,96			
Facilitator Teaching Style	1-5 years	16	55,81	4	1,174	,882
	6-11 years	21	56,50			
	12-17 years	24	53,42			
	18-23 years	31	51,81			
	24 +	13	45,96			
Delegator Teaching Style	1-5 years	16	54,38	4	3,953	,412
	6-11 years	21	52,48			
	12-17 years	24	62,13			
	18-23 years	31	49,76			
	24 +	13	43,04			

According to Table 7, the scores of teachers with 52 years of experience and above were lower than those of other age groups, which were similarly distributed. However, no statistically significant difference was found between teaching styles and professional experience groups (p>0.05).

The third sub-question of the study is expressed as "Is there a significant relationship between gender, age, professional experience, and the personality types of teachers?" The results of the analysis related to this sub-question are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. *Personality types of teachers according to the gender variable*

Personality Types	Group	n	Rank Average	Ordinal Sum	U	p
Extraversion	Male	59	46,42	2739,00	969,000	,012*
	Female	46	61,43	2826,00		
Agreeableness	Male	59	48,24	2846,00	1076,000	,069

	Female	46	59,11	2719,00		
Conscientiousness	Male	59	44,90	2649,00	879,000	,002*
	Female	46	63,39	2916,00		
Openness to experience	Male	59	51,50	3038,50	1268,500	,567
	Female	46	54,92	2526,50		
Neuroticism	Male	59	50,08	2955,00	1185,000	,266
	Female	46	56,74	2610,00		

*p<0,05

According to Table 8, no statistically significant relationship was found between gender and the agreeableness (U=1076.000, p=0.069, p>0.05), openness to experience (U=1268.500, p=0.567, p>0.05), and neuroticism (U=1185.000, p=0.266, p>0.05) personality types. However, a statistically significant difference in favor of female teachers was found in the extraversion (U=969.000, p=0.012, p<0.05) and conscientiousness (U=879.000, p=0.002, p<0.05) personality types.

The results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test related to teachers' personality types based on age groups are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. *Personality types of teachers according to the age variable*

Personality Types	Age	n	Rank Average	df	X^2	p
Extraversion	22-27	14	66,68	5	7,299	,199
	28-33	19	48,03			
	34-39	23	49,30			
	40-45	29	58,84			
	46-51	15	47,33			
	52 +	5	33,70			
Agreeableness	22-27	14	57,21	5	4,693	,454
	28-33	19	56,29			
	34-39	23	47,30			
	40-45	29	53,91			
	46-51	15	59,33			
	52 +	5	30,60			
Conscientiousness	22-27	14	61,14	5	4,261	,512
	28-33	19	44,21			
	34-39	23	48,85			
	40-45	29	54,26			
	46-51	15	61,37			
	52 +	5	50,30			
Openness to experience	22-27	14	61,11	5	6,068	,300
	28-33	19	58,58			
	34-39	23	51,37			
	40-45	29	52,84			
	46-51	15	50,53			
	52 +	5	24,90			
Neuroticism	22-27	14	51,75	5	4,967	,420
	28-33	19	59,53			
	34-39	23	61,48			
	40-45	29	47,40			
	46-51	15	44,10			
	52 +	5	51,90			

According to the mean ranks in Table 9, the scores of teachers aged 52 and above were lower than those of other age groups in the extraversion, agreeableness, and openness to experience personality types. Additionally, the scores were higher in the 22–27 age group for extraversion, the 46–51, 22–27, and 23–33 age groups for agreeableness, the 22–27 and 46–51 age groups for conscientiousness, the 22–27 and 28–33 age groups for openness to experience, and the 34–39 and 28–33 age groups for neuroticism. However, no statistically significant difference was found between personality types and age groups (p>0.05).

The results of the Kruskal-Wallis H test related to teachers' personality types based on professional experience are presented in Table 10.

Table 10. *Personality types of teachers according to the seniority variable*

Personality Types	Seniority	n	Rank Average	df	X²	p
Extraversion	1-5 years	16	63,88	4	4,254	,373
	6-11 years	21	51,14			
	12-17 years	24	46,35			
	18-23 years	31	56,47			
	24 +	13	46,62			
Agreeableness	1-5 years	16	57,09	4	3,657	,454
	6-11 years	21	56,48			
	12-17 years	24	43,33			
	18-23 years	31	57,11			
	24 +	13	50,38			
Conscientiousness	1-5 years	16	57,28	4	2,340	,673
	6-11 years	21	44,88			
	12-17 years	24	51,58			
	18-23 years	31	55,79			
	24 +	13	56,81			
Openness to experience	1-5 years	16	59,25	4	2,983	,561
	6-11 years	21	57,93			
	12-17 years	24	50,10			
	18-23 years	31	53,06			
	24 +	13	42,54			
Neuroticism	1-5 years	16	49,94	4	5,720	,221
	6-11 years	21	62,21			
	12-17 years	24	58,50			
	18-23 years	31	43,81			
	24 +	13	53,65			

According to the mean ranks in Table 10, the scores of teachers with 12–17 years of experience were lower for extraversion and agreeableness, 6–11 years of experience for conscientiousness, 24 years or more for openness to experience, and 18–23 years for neuroticism. Higher scores were observed for the 1–5 year group in extraversion, the 18–23 and 1–5 year groups in agreeableness, the 1–5 year group in conscientiousness, the 1–5 year group in openness to experience, and the 6–11 year group in neuroticism. However, no statistically significant difference was found between personality types and professional experience groups (p>0.05).

The fourth sub-question of the study is expressed as "Is there a significant relationship between the teaching styles and personality types of Turkish teachers?" The results of the analysis related to this sub-question are presented in Table 11.

Table 11. *Spearman Ordinal Correlation on teachers' teaching styles and personality types*

Personality Types		Teaching Styles				
		Expert Teaching Style	Authoritative Teaching Style	Personal Teaching Style	Facilitator Teaching Style	Delegator Teaching Style
Extraversion	Spearman r	,282	,214	,358	,467	,328
	p	,004*	,028*	,000*	,000*	,001*
Agreeableness	Spearman r	,401	,272	,436	,537	,283
	p	,000*	,005*	,000*	,000*	,003*
Conscientiousness	Spearman r	,397	,276	,435	,504	,348
	p	,000*	,004*	,000*	,000*	,000*
Openness to experience	Spearman r	,352	,269	,450	,560	,410
	p	,000*	,005*	,000*	,000*	,000*
Neuroticism	Spearman r	-,039	,026	-,011	-,111	,024
	p	,690	,796	,911	,261	,805

* The correlation was significant at the p<0.05 level.

According to Table 11, the relationship between personality types and teaching styles is shown in

terms of level and direction. For the extraversion personality type, a low positive and significant relationship was found with information-conveying (r=0.282, p<0.004) and authoritarian (r=0.214, p<0.028) teaching styles, and a moderate positive and significant relationship was found with personal (r=0.358, p<0.000), guiding (r=0.467, p<0.000), and advising (r=0.328, p<0.001) teaching styles. For the agreeableness personality type, a moderate positive and significant relationship was found with information-conveying (r=0.401, p<0.000) and personal (r=0.436, p<0.000) teaching styles, and a low positive and significant relationship was found with authoritarian (r=0.272, p<0.005) and advising (r=0.283, p<0.003) teaching styles. For the conscientiousness personality type, a moderate positive and significant relationship was found with information-conveying (r=0.397, p<0.000), personal (r=0.435, p<0.000), guiding (r=0.504, p<0.000), and advising (r=0.348, p<0.000) teaching styles, and a low positive and significant relationship was found with authoritarian (r=0.276, p<0.004) teaching style. For the openness to experience personality type, a moderate positive and significant relationship was found with information-conveying (r=0.352, p<0.000), personal (r=0.450, p<0.000), guiding (r=0.560, p<0.000), and advising (r=0.410, p<0.000) teaching styles, and a low positive and significant relationship was found with authoritarian (r=0.269, p<0.005) teaching style. No significant relationship was found between the neuroticism personality type and any teaching style (p>0.05). However, a positive relationship was identified with authoritarian (r=0.026) and advising (r=0.024) teaching styles, and a negative relationship was found with information-conveying (r=-0.039), personal (r=-0.011), and guiding (r=-0.111) teaching styles.

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS

The study shows that Turkish language teachers predominantly prefer student-centered teaching styles. This tendency may be influenced by the constructivist approach, which has become the core focus of education. The prominence of the guiding teaching style in the study's findings is consistent with the results of previous studies conducted by Süral (2013), Babadoğan, Kassenova & Karaşahinoğlu (2014), and Dinçer et al. (2017).

According to the average scores obtained, Turkish language teachers exhibited positive personality traits in the personality types of agreeableness, openness to experience, extroversion, and conscientiousness. On the other hand, they displayed negative personality traits in the neuroticism personality type. The fact that Turkish language teachers demonstrated positive traits in agreeableness indicates that they are reliable, tolerant, and cooperative, and can easily adapt to new situations. In addition, Hellriegel and Slocum (2009) state that individuals with a compatible personality type have better communication skills. Their openness to experience suggests that they are receptive to new and constructive ideas, have a rich imagination, approach events and situations from different perspectives, and are willing to change their thoughts in response to new information and experiences. Teachers who are open to development are more likely to adapt to the technological conditions of the evolving world and make necessary adjustments and updates in their educational methods, thereby creating more effective learning environments (Van der Linden et al., 2010). Positive traits in extroversion imply that Turkish language teachers are confident individuals with strong communication skills and a proactive attitude. Their positive traits in conscientiousness reflect that they are responsible in their professional lives, follow the plans and programs they prepare or those provided by the ministry, and demonstrate determination and perseverance. The negative traits in neuroticism suggest that Turkish language teachers are emotionally stable and not prone to emotional inconsistency. It is stated that individuals with high levels of neuroticism experience more stress in the face of daily events, while individuals with low levels of neuroticism are calm and well-adjusted (Burger, 2019). Teachers with low scores in neuroticism are calm, optimistic, and free from negative outlooks, which is considered beneficial for the educational environment. Emotionally unstable and aggressive individuals can create an insecure environment, reducing the overall efficiency of the working environment (Barrick et al., 2001). These findings are consistent with the results obtained in studies conducted by Yıldızoğlu & Burgaz (2014), Atmaca (2020), and Göksal (2022).

While no significant relationship was found between gender and the teaching styles of information provider, authoritarian, and advisor, a significant relationship was found in favor of female teachers in the

personal and guiding teaching styles. This result suggests that female teachers are more inclined than male teachers to act as role models by helping students understand their strengths and areas for development. This tendency may stem from the fact that women teachers grow up learning to behave differently in terms of communication preferences and perspectives on child rearing from the early years of their lives, and that they see the teaching profession as an extension of their maternal instinct (Goldenberg & Goldenberg, 2008; Ünal, 2008). These findings align with those reported in studies by Lloyd (2002), Süral (2010), and Saracaloğlu et al. (2011). When examining the personality types of Turkish language teachers in terms of gender differences, significant relationships were found in favor of female teachers in the personality types of extroversion and conscientiousness. This finding indicates that female teachers are more outgoing, confident, responsible, and determined than male teachers. This situation may be attributed to female teachers' more professional approach to their work. These findings are consistent with the results obtained by Demirci (2003) and Oktay (2007).

Although no significant relationship was found between the teaching styles of Turkish language teachers and the variables of age and seniority, it was observed that teachers with lower age and years of service generally had higher average scores in teaching styles. This may be because younger teachers are more likely to have received training on different teaching styles due to the evolving understanding of education or because they can more easily adapt to these changes. These findings are consistent with the results of studies conducted by Üredi (2006), Mutluoğlu (2012), Ağgez (2015), and Dilekli (2015). Similarly, no significant relationship was found between the personality types of Turkish language teachers and the variables of age and seniority. However, younger teachers generally achieved higher average scores in the personality types of openness to experience, agreeableness, and extroversion than other age and seniority groups. This may be because younger teachers have developed themselves more in areas such as social interaction, communication skills, and adaptability to innovation than teachers in other age and seniority groups. These findings are consistent with the results reported by Sav (2007), Sevgi (2017), Aydın, Canavar & İşlek (2021), and Ünsal and İhtiyaroğlu (2022).

When examining the relationship between the teaching styles and personality types of Turkish language teachers, no significant relationship was found between the neuroticism personality type and any of the teaching styles. However, a positive and significant relationship was found between the other personality types and teaching styles. This finding indicates that teachers who exhibit extroversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience are more likely to prefer the teaching styles of information provider, authoritarian, personal, guiding, and advisor. Since this relationship is positive, an increase in the related personality trait also increases the preference for the associated teaching style. Teachers' having positive personality types and teaching styles affect students' attitudes towards the lesson, learning, participation and academic achievement (McCollin, 2000; Valencic, 2001; Wentzel, 2002). On the other hand, the negative relationship between the neuroticism personality type and the teaching styles of information provider, personal, and guiding suggests that as neuroticism increases, the tendency to adopt these three teaching styles decreases or vice versa. In this context, it can be concluded that teachers' emotional stability influences their behavior in learning environments, such as being a source of information, serving as a role model, and acting as a guide. This situation may affect the efficiency of learning environments and student motivation (Pavlovic, Stanisavljevic-Petrovic & Injac, 2017). These findings are consistent with the results obtained in studies conducted by Büyükuysal (2016), Eser (2017), Sevgi (2017), and Baş (2018).

Based on the results obtained from the research, the suggestions put forward by the researchers are listed below:

- The effect of teachers/students' personality types or teaching/learning styles on students' interests, attitudes or academic achievements towards the relevant course can be investigated. More scientific research needs to be done to delve deeper into the relationship between personality types and teaching styles.

- Pre-service training programs should be organized so that pre-service training programs

can develop teaching styles suitable for the personality characteristics of teacher candidates.

- Professional cooperation environments should be encouraged among teachers where different experiences will be shared according to their personality types.

- Technological tools that will support teaching processes in accordance with personality types should be developed and introduced.

Author Contribution Rates: The authors contributed equally to this study.

Conflict of Interest: There is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

REFERENCES

Ağgez, İ. T. (2015). *Teaching styles used by physical education teachers.* Unpublished dissertation, Kırıkkale University, Kırıkkale.

Akpınar, E., & Ergin, Ö. (2005). The role of science teacher in constructivist theory. *Elementary Education Online*, *4*(2), 55-64.

Alan, Y. (2020). The opinions of teachers regarding the usage of interactive whiteboard in Turkish classes. *Journal of Mother Tongue Education, 8*(3), 694-707. https://doi.org/10.16916/aded.679706

Alkan, N. (2006). *Validity and reliability study of the Five Factor Personality scale*. Unpublished study. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380910272_BES_FAKTOR_KISILIK_OLCEGININ_GECERLIK_VE_GUVENILIRLIK_CALISMASI

Allen, R. F. (1988). *The relationship betwen learning style and teaching style of secondary teachers in South Central Kansas*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Manhattan, USA.

Andabai, P. (2013). Teacher's personality and classroom management of tertiary institutions in Nigeria: The issues and perspectives. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies, 2*(5), 73-78. https://doi.org/10.5901/ajis.2013.v2n5p73.

Atkinson, L. R., Atkinson, R. C., Smith, E. E., & Ben, D. J.(1993). *Introduction to psychology* (11th edition). Fort Worth.

Atmaca, T. (2020). The relationship between the personality types of teachers and alienation from the profession. *Bolu Abant Izzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education, 20* (1), 491-506.

Avcu, G. (2006). *Linguistic equivalence, validity, reliability and norm study of Symptom Assessment Questionnaire (SA-45®) problem screening scale for Türkiye conditions*. Unpublished dissertation, Marmara University, İstanbul.

Aydın, R., Canavar, O., & İşlek, M. (2021). A study on A and B personality structures of teachers. *International Journal of Social Sciences in Turkic Cultural Geography, 6*(2), 165-182.

Babadoğan, C., Kassenova, A., & Karaşahinoğlu, A. (2014). Investigation of learning and teaching style of teachers based on some variables. *The Journal of Educational Sciences and Practice, 13*(26), 125-146.

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*(1-2), 9–30. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00160

Baş, M. (2018). *Investigation of the relationship between primary teacher candidates and personality features and learning styles.* Unpublished dissertation, Kırıkkale University, Kırıkkale.

Behnam, B., & Bayazidi, M. (2013). The relationship between personality types and teaching styles in Iranian adult TEFL context. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching. 2*, 21-32.

Burger, J. M. (2019). *Personality*. Cengage Learning.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2002). *Handbook of Data Analysis for Social Sciences: Statistics, Research Design, SPSS Applications and Interpretation* (24th edition). Pegem Akademi.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2008). *Scientific research methods in education* (25th edition). Pegem Akademi.

Büyükuysal, E. (2016). *The relation between the class management strategies and personality traits of English teachers in highs schools.* Unpublished dissertation, Bülent Ecevit University, Zonguldak.

Church, M. K. (1993). *Investigation and measurement of personality structure in a Non-Western Culture: Relating indigenous Philiphinne dimensions to the Big Five Model.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, Washington, USA.

Cohen J. H., & Amidon, E. J. (2004). Reward and punishment histories: A way of predicting teaching style?. *Journal of Educational Research, 97*(5). 269-280. https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.97.5.269-280

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). The five-factor model of personality and its relevance to personality disorders. *Journal of personality disorders, 6*(4), 343-359. https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.1992.6.4.343

Çelebi, C. (2006). *The Effect of cooperative learning based to constructive approach to students achevement and attitudes at primary school 5th year social studies lesson.* Unpublished dissertation, Selçuk University, Konya.

Demirci, S. (2003). *Relationships between five peronality factors traits and job satisfaction of teachers.* Unpublished dissertation, Karadeniz Teknik University, Trabzon.

Demirci, M. K., Özler, D. E., & Girgin, B. (2009). The effects of the five factor personality model on emotional harassment (mobbing) in the workplace - An application in hospital enterprises. *Journal of Azerbaijani Studies, 10*(3-4), 13-39.

Digman, J. M., & Takemoto-Chock, N. K. (1981). Factors in the natural language of personality: Re-analysis, comparison, and interpretation of six major studies. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 16*(2), 149-170. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr1602_2

Dilekli, Y. (2015). *The relationship among teachers' classroom practices for teaching thinking skills, teachers' self-efficacy towards teaching thinking skills and teachers' teaching styles.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Balıkesir University, Balıkesir.

Dinçer, B., Saracaloğlu, A. S., Karademir, Ç. A., & Dedebali, N. C. (2017). Determining teaching styles, self-efficacy believes and job satisfaction of teachers. *Education Sciences, 12*(1), 58-85.

Dunn, R. S., & Dunn, K. J. (1979). Learning styles and teaching styles: Should They… Can They… Be Matched? *Educational Leadership, 36*(4), 238-244.

Erkan, İ., & Şirin, T. (2024). The relationship between teacher candidates' enneagram personality types and classroom management self-efficacy beliefs. *Journal of The Human and Social Science Researches, 13*(3), 1481-1502. https://doi.org/10.15869/itobiad.1379771

Eser, S. (2017). *The mediation role of learning styles and academic motivation in the influence of personal traits on attitudes toward profession: A research on undergraduate students of Tour Guiding.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Mersin University, Mersin.

Fer, S., & Cırık, İ. (2007). *Constructivist learning - From theory to practice.* Morpa.

Gençer, E. Ö., Taşyürek, F., Duran, Y., & Ulukaya, B. (2023). Teachers' learning and teaching experiences in the context of technological transformation: A review. *Ulusal Eğitim Dergisi*, *3*(11), 1958-1978.

Goldenberg, H., & Goldenberg, I. (2008). *Family therapy* (6. Edition). Thomson/Brooks/Cole.

Göksal, M. (2022). Investigating the relationship between the five factor personality features and organizational citizenship behaviors of primary school teachers. *Turkish Journal of Management and Economics Research, 3*(2), 131-146.

Göl Battı, D. (2019). *Investigation of the relationship between personality and leadership types of primary school administrators.* Unpublished dissertation, Mersin University, Mersin.

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. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.1994.9926845

Grasha, A. F. (1996). *Teaching with style.* Alliance Publishers.

Gülten, D. Ç., & Özkan, E. (2014). The ınvestigation of primary school teacher's teaching styles in terms of various variables. *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 23*(2014), 193-218.

Heimlich, J. E., & Norland, E. (2002). Teaching style: Where are we now? *New Direction For Adult And Continuing Education, 93*, 17-26. https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.46

Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J. W. (2009). *Organizational behaviour* (12nd Edition). South-Western Centrage Learning.

John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The big five inventory-versions 4a and 54.* Berkeley, University of California, Institute of Personality and Social Research.

Kim, K. (1993). *The relationship between teaching style and personality characteristic of group piano teacher*. Unpublished dissertation, Boston University, Boston.

Köklü, N., Büyüköztürk, Ş., & Çokluk Bökeoğlu, Ö. (2007). *Statistics for social sciences* (18th edition). Pegem Akademi.

Kulinna, P. H., & Cothran, D. J. (2003). Physical education teacher's self-reported use and perceptions of various teaching styles. *Learning and Instruction, 13*(6), 597-609. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752(02)00044-0

Lloyd, D. G. (2002). *Teaching styles and faculty attitudes towards computer technology in teaching and learning at a college in Ontario.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.

McCollin, E. (2000). *Faculty and student perceptions o f teaching styles: Do teaching styles differ for traditional and nontraditional students?* Paper presented at the Annual Conference of Mid-South Educational Research Association 15-17 November 2000, Bowing Green, KY, USA.

Merdan, E. (2013). Research the relationship between 'Five factor personality theory' and business values: A research in banking. *Gümüshane University Electronic Journal of the Institute of Social Science*, *4*(7), 140-159.

Moody, M. C. (2007), *Adaptive behvior in intercultural environments: The relationship between cultural intelligence factors and Big Five Personality Traits.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, Washington, USA.

Mutluoğlu, A. (2012). *Examining primary mathematics teachers' technological pedagogical content knowledge according to their preffered teaching styles.* Unpublished dissertation, Necmettin Erbakan University, Konya.

Oktay, H. (2007). *The relationship between motivation and personality characteristics of primary and high schools.* Unpublished dissertation, Yeditepe University, İstanbul.

Orlich, D., Harder, R., Callahan, R., Trevisan, M., & Brown, A. (2012). *Teaching strategies: A guide to effective instruction*. Cengage Learning.

Pavlovic, D., Stanisavljevic-Petrovic, Z., & Injac, M. (2017). Teachers' characteristics and development of students' attitudes towards school. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers, 8*(1), 239-252.

Raven, M. R., Cano, J., Carton, B. L., & Shelhamer, V. (1993). A comparision of learning styles, teaching styles and personality styles of preservice montana and ohio agriculture teachers. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 34*(1), 40-50. https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.1993.01001

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2011). *Organizational behaviour*. Pearson Education.

Saracaloğlu, A. S., Dedebali, N.C., Dinçer, B., & Dursun, F. (2011). Investigation of teaching styles of primary school, science and techonology, Turkish teachers. *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy Education Sciences, 6*(3), 2313-2327.

Sarıtaş, E., & Süral, S. (2010). Grasha-Reichmann learning and teaching style of the scale study Turkish adaptation. *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy, 5*(4), 2162-2177.

Sav, İ. (2007). *The relationship personality traits and and their coping strategies of counselors.* Unpublished dissertation, Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir.

Sevgi, F. (2017). *An analysis of the relationship between the personality types and the class management styles of classroom teachers for different variables (Kayseri province).* Unpublished dissertation, Erciyes University, Kayseri.

Süral, S. (2010). The comparison of teaching styles of teaching staffs who worked in different faculties of Pamukkale University. *Education Sciences, 5*(3), 1226-1242.

Süral, S. (2013). *The relationship between primary school teachers' teaching styles with the attitudes towards the teaching profession and classroom management approaches.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Adnan Menderes University, Aydın.

Taner, G. (2005). *A study about the point of views of the teachers on the issue of the techniques of individual identification and practising it in pre-education classes.* Unpublished dissertation, Selçuk University, Konya.

Trouba, E. J. (2007). *A person-organization fit study of the Big Five Personality Model and attraction to organizations with varying compensation system characteristics.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, DePaul University, Chicago, USA.

Turgut, Ü., Salar, R., Aksakallı, A., & Gürbüz, F. (2016). Investigation of teachers' views about reflection on individual differences to teaching process: A qualitative study. *Journal of Bayburt Faculty of Education, 11*(2), 431-444.

Ünal, L. I. (2008). Neoliberalism, flexible employment and women teachers: A conceptual framework. In E. A. Ateş & H. Çağlayan (Eds.), *Social rights and job security of women working in education and science sectors* (97-106). EğitimSen yayınları.

Ünsal, Y., & İhtiyaroğlu, N. (2022). Analyzing the relationship between teachers' personality traits and effective communication skills. *Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University Journal of Education, 9*(1), 98-109.

Üredi, L. (2006). *I. and II. level primary education teachers' perceptions about teaching profession according to their styles preference.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Marmara University, İstanbul.

Valencic, K. M. (2001). *An investigation of teacher' temperament and students' perceptions of teacher: Communication behavior and students' attitudes toward teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, Morgantown.

Van der Linden, D., Scholte, R. H., Cillessen, A. H., te Nijenhuis, J., & Segers, E. (2010). Classroom ratings of likeability and popularity are related to the Big Five and the general factor of personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *44*(5), 669-672. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2010.08.007

Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1993). Toward a knowledge base for school learning. *Review of Educational Research, 63*(3), 249-294. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543063003249

Wentzel, K. R. (2002). Are effective teachers like good parents? Teaching styles and student adjustment in early adolescence. *Child Development, 73*(1), 287-301. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00406

Yıldırım, M. C., & Dönmez, B. (2008). A study about the effects of constructivist learning approach practices on classroom management *Elementary Education Online*, *7*(3), 664-679.

Yıldızoğlu, H., & Burgaz, B. (2014). The relationship between school administrators' five factor personality traits and their conflict management style preferences. *Hacettepe University Journal of Educationi, 29*(29-2), 295-310.