Exploring the Relationship Between Iranian EFL Teachers' Teaching Style and Multiple Dimensions of Self-Efficacy

Seyedhamed Sadoughvanini[1]
Elham Yazdanmehr[2]

Contributor roles: Seyedhamed Sadoughvanini: Conceptualization, Methodology.
Elham Yazdanmehr: Data collection, Writing- Original draft preparation and review, Corresponding author

Citation: Sadoughvanini, S. and Yazdanmehr, E. (2026). Exploring the Relationship between Iranian EFL Teachers' Teaching Style and Multiple Dimensions of Self-Efficacy. *Colomb. Appl. Linguistic. J.*, *28*(1), pp. 1-24.
Received: 13-Jan.-2025 / **Accepted:** 18-Oct.-2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.14483/22487085.23158

Abstract

Following the social cognitive theory, this cross-sectional, correlational study aimed to explore Iranian English as Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' preferred teaching style and its effect on their perceived self-efficacy in accomplishing specific classroom tasks. To this aim, Grasha's Teaching Style Inventory (TSI) and Tschannen-Moran Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) were used to test teaching style preferences and self-efficacy. To this aim, 233 EFL teachers from both Iranian public schools and private language institutes were included. Data were analyzed using the chi-square test, one-way ANOVA, and Bonferroni post hoc comparisons. Results showed that facilitator and personal model teaching styles were the two most frequent styles. Regarding participants' self-efficacy, those who adopted a facilitator teaching style reported the highest scores across all subscales of self-efficacy. Additionally, a statistically significant difference was found between the self-efficacy levels of teachers with facilitator versus formal authority teaching styles ($p = 0.000$). These findings have important implications for teacher education programs in Iran, highlighting the need for the programs to provide teachers with enough opportunities to develop communicative teaching practices, engage students effectively, and enhance their sense of self-efficacy. Teacher trainers can monitor teachers' progress in self-efficacy and accordingly modify the teaching methods, to acknowledge teacher psychology involved in teacher practice.

Keywords: EFL, self-efficacy, social cognitive theory, teachers, teaching style

1 Bahar Institute of Higher Education. hamed.sadough@gmail.com
2 Attar Institute of Higher Education. yazdanmehr@attar.ac.ir

Explorando la relación entre el estilo de enseñanza de los profesores iraníes de EFL y múltiples dimensiones de la autoeficacia

Resumen

Siguiendo la teoría sociocognitiva, el presente estudio transversal y correlacional tuvo como objetivo explorar el estilo de enseñanza preferido de los profesores iraníes de inglés como lengua extranjera (EFL) y su efecto en su autoeficacia percibida en el desempeño de una tarea de enseñanza específica en clase. Se utilizaron el Inventario de Estilo de Enseñanza de Grasha (TSI) y la Escala de Sentido de Eficacia de los Profesores de Tschannen-Moran (TSES) para evaluar las preferencias de estilo de enseñanza y la autoeficacia. Un total de 233 profesores de EFL de escuelas secundarias públicas iraníes e institutos de idiomas privados fueron incluidos en este estudio. Los datos fueron analizados mediante la prueba de chi-cuadrado, ANOVA de una vía y el post hoc de Duncan. Los resultados mostraron que los estilos de enseñanza más preferidos entre los profesores iraníes de EFL fueron el estilo de facilitador y el estilo de modelo personal. Con respecto al estado de autoeficacia de los participantes, el estilo de enseñanza de facilitador mostró tener las puntuaciones más altas en todas las subescalas de autoeficacia que los profesores de EFL percibieron en clase. Los hallazgos también evidenciaron una diferencia estadísticamente significativa entre la autoeficacia de los docentes en los estilos de enseñanza de facilitador y de autoridad formal ($p = 0{,}000$). Este estudio tiene implicaciones para los programas de formación docente en Irán, ya que destaca la necesidad de proporcionar a los profesores oportunidades suficientes para aprender a enseñar comunicativamente, involucrar adecuadamente a los estudiantes y mejorar su sentido de autoeficacia docente. Los capacitadores docentes pueden monitorear el progreso o los cambios en la autoeficacia docente y, en consecuencia, modificar los métodos de enseñanza para reconocer la psicología docente involucrada en la práctica docente.

Palabras clave: autoeficacia, docentes, EFL, estilo de enseñanza, teoría cognitiva social

Introduction

Based on the social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1997, 2001), an effective teacher-student rapport fundamentally depends on the strength of teachers' beliefs in their ability to form a successful relationship with students. Teachers' self-efficacy is a powerful dimension of teacher perceptions while engaged in class-based tasks in which they feel competent (Bandura, 1997). Despite its importance, limited research has examined how EFL teachers' self-efficacy relates to their teaching style, particularly in the Iranian context. One possible explanation is that teacher psychology is relatively new in the Asian EFL context compared with learner psychology. Another explanation is that Asian educational psychology has been more influenced by Western ideas of classroom events, marked by fewer attempts to contextualize learner/teacher psychology (Biggs & Watkins, 2006). There are hopes that teacher psychology, with its process-based nature to education, makes progress in Asian and in Iranian educational context.

Teaching style, according to Jarvis (2004), reflects teachers' underlying philosophy translated into classroom practice. It represents their perceived values of all aspects of teaching and learning. It represents all teaching strategies, measures, and approaches teachers employ during instruction (Cooper, 2001). In recent years, teaching style has been investigated in relation to several other constructs, such as teacher's content knowledge (e.g., Tschannen-Moran *et al*., 1998), teachers' classroom behavior (Zhang, 2007), classroom management (e.g., Yilmaz & Cavaş, 2008), and instructional context (Rahimi & Nabliou, 2010). Multiple theoretical frameworks have been proposed to highlight the significance of teacher self-efficacy (e.g., Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001), locus of control (Kennedy *et al*., 1991), and the relationship between self-efficacy and classroom management style (Abu-Tineh *et al*., 2011). However, none explored the relationship between EFL teachers' teaching style and multiple aspects of self-efficacy. The present study aimed to address this gap and explore the interplay between EFL teachers' teaching style and self-efficacy in Iran.

Theoretical models

The theoretical model used to assess teachers' self-efficacy in the present study was suggested by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (1998), drawing on Bandura's (1997) original definition of self-efficacy. Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) comprises three sub-scales, efficacy for instructional strategies, efficacy for classroom management, and efficacy for student engagement. The first subscale examines the extent to which the teacher can employ a variety of assessment strategies. The second measures teachers' perceived ability to manage disruptive behaviors in class. The third explores their capability to motivate students and help them believe they can succeed in schoolwork.

To assess teachers' teaching styles, the study adopted the theoretical model proposed by Grasha (1996) with five teaching styles, expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator. Teachers with an expert style care more about maintaining their own status as an expert by transmitting knowledge the learners need. Teachers with the formal authority style are more like faculty members and serve as the center of class, and emphasize acceptable standards and also set goals for student learning. Teachers with a personal model style try to set an example for students' behavior and thought. Teachers with a facilitator teaching style help students make the right decisions by raising challenging questions, suggesting solutions, offering alternatives, and encouraging to set the right criteria. Teachers with a delegator style help students achieve independence and self-reliance, functioning as resources who remain approachable when needed.

Research questions

The present study addressed the following research questions:

1. What is the dominant teaching style among Iranian EFL teachers?

1.1. What is the dominant teaching style among Iranian EFL teachers in public schools?

1.2. What is the dominant teaching style among Iranian EFL teachers in private language institutes?

2. Is there any statistically significant difference among Iranian EFL teachers' teaching styles regarding self-efficacy?

2.1. Is there any statistically significant difference among Iranian EFL school teachers' teaching styles regarding self-efficacy?

2.2. Is there any statistically significant difference among Iranian EFL private language teachers' teaching styles regarding self-efficacy?

3. Is there any statistically significant difference among Iranian EFL teachers' teaching style regarding all subscales of self-efficacy?

3.1. Is there any statistically significant difference among Iranian EFL school teachers' teaching style regarding all subscales of self-efficacy?

3.2. Is there any statistically significant difference among Iranian EFL institute teachers' teaching style regarding all subscales of self-efficacy?

Literature Review

Due to the wide range of studies on each of the two variables independently, the present review focuses only on research that has examined both variables together in EFL teaching contexts within the past decade.

Baleghizadeh and Shakouri (2015) investigated the relationship between teaching styles and teacher self-efficacy among Iranian ESP university teachers, and found a significant relationship, with the personal model style showing the strongest association with high levels of perceived self-efficacy. Safa and Ghonsooly (2015) tested the relationship among Iranian EFL teachers' self-efficacy, teaching experience, and class management style. Their sample was limited to teachers in the private sector holding a master's degree. They found a statistically significant positive relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and class management styles.

Dilekli and Tezci (2015) explored the relationship among teachers' instruction of thinking skills, self-efficacy in teaching such skills, and teaching styles. One thousand teachers completed the Teachers' Classroom Practices for Teaching Thinking Scale, the Teaching Thinking Skills Scale, and Grasha's (1996) Teaching Style Scale. The facilitator teaching style showed to be associated with higher self-efficacy. The Facilitator style was the predictor variable, yet the other styles had no effect on the model. When self-efficacy was included as a variable, the delegator style no longer exerted an effect. Overall, the facilitator style had stronger predictive power than the delegator, expert, authority, and personal model styles.

Khany and Aliabadi (2016) explored whether the combined effect of teaching styles, self-efficacy, and learners' learning styles affected students' academic achievement. Structural equation modeling showed that the variables both directly and indirectly contributed to academic achievement, with efficacy in classroom management being the most powerful predictor of learners' achievement in Iranian EFL context.

Khanshan and Yousefi (2020) studied the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' self-efficacy and teaching practice, mediated by teachers' occupational characteristics, including their field of study. Seventy teachers from soft sciences, hard sciences and English language teaching (ELT) participated in this mixed-method study, which included questionnaire-based, observational, and interview-based research, to measure teacher self-efficacy. Correlation analysis showed that teacher self-efficacy in soft and hard sciences was significantly correlated with their act of teaching. The relationship between teachers' efficacy and teaching was not statistically significant.

In a case study in Mashhad, Iran, Ghorbanzadeh (2022) explored the relationship between female EFL teachers' teaching style and self-efficacy. They found a significant relationship between high school female teachers' teaching style and self-efficacy. Ramakrishnan *et al*. (2022) explored the relationship between teaching style, self-efficacy, and competency among vocational education teachers in Malaysia, and found that teaching style was positively associated with teacher's self-efficacy, which was positively correlated with teacher's competency. Self-efficacy mediated the relationship between teaching style and competency, suggesting that positive teaching styles can strengthen teachers' self-efficacy and, consequently, enhance confidence in employing a variety of teaching styles.

In their research in the Iranian EFL context, Modirkhamene and Hassanzad (2023) found that in-field self-efficacious EFL teachers had a significantly better teaching experience and performance in class, particularly in classroom management. In another study with a larger sample, Divsar (2023) used multiple regression which confirmed the direction of the path model illuminating the predictability power of teachers' self-efficacy and teaching practice especially class management. Similarly, in a study of high schools in Zanjan Province, Mohammadi *et al*. (2024) found a significant effect of self-efficacy on EFL teachers' teaching responsibility, rapport, competency building and commitment to teaching job.

Methodology

Participants and setting

In this ex post facto, cross-sectional, correlational study, a total number of 233 Iranian EFL teachers from private institutes and high schools from the metropolises of Mashhad, Bojnourd, Birjand, Tehran, Ardebil, Ilam, Sanandaj, Ahvaz, Semnan, and Kerman participated. Both public and private sectors were included because, despite the mandatory EFL curriculum in schools, English is also exceptionally popular in Iran's private sector. Most Iranian EFL teachers have experience teaching in either or both sectors, and private language institutes operate in almost every major city. Including both sectors therefore increased the representativeness of sample.

The age range was 20-51, and all teachers completed the questionnaires anonymously. The teachers taught at either intermediate or upper-intermediate level and held bachelor's, master's degrees or PhDs in Applied Linguistics. Data collection took place in February 2023. Convenience and snowball samplings were used to make sure participants were willing to share ideas and perceptions honestly. However, it is acknowledged that the snowball sampling can limit the generalizability of findings. The teachers were asked to forward the survey link to the colleagues they knew, yet were asked not to consult over the questions and answers. Every respondent was supposed to complete the survey independently. The soft copy of both questionnaires was sent to 320 teachers on Telegram and WhatsApp. Incomplete questionnaires were omitted leaving 233 sets of data finally to analyze (with a dropout rate of 37%). The inclusion criteria were affiliation with a public or private language institute in Iran, the age of at least 22, teaching experience of at least one year, Iranian nationality and willingness to participate.

Instruments

Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)

The TSES, developed by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001), consists of 24 items on a Likert-scale with three subscales: efficacy for classroom management, efficacy for instructional strategies, and efficacy for student engagement. All items are self-reported nine-point scale measures. Scale anchors correspond to 1 = *Nothing*, 3 = *Very little*, 5 = *Some influence*, 7 = *Quite a bit*, and 9 = *A great deal*. Both the 12-item short form and the 24-item long form have shown strong reliability and validity, with subscale reliabilities ranging from .87 to .91 for the long form and .81 to .86 for the short form. In Iran, Safari (2024) recently tested and reported Cronbach's alpha coefficients, with a reliability of .94 for the long form, .87 for efficacy in student engagement, .91 for efficacy in instructional strategies, and .90 for efficacy in classroom management. Two sample items are "To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?" and "How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?"

Teaching Style Inventory (TSI)

This 40-item measurement instrument was developed by Grasha (1996) to measure the teaching styles. The internal consistency was estimated at 0.88 (Grasha, 2006) and 0.88 in the Iranian context, reported by Faruji (2021). A Likert scale was used with scores ranging from 1 = *Strongly agree* to 5 = *Strongly disagree*. The five subscales were expert style, formal authority, personal model, facilitator and delegator style. They represented a continuum from teacher-oriented to student-oriented instruction, with the "Expert" style being the most teacher-oriented. How Bandura's (2001) four sources of self-efficacy (i.e., mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological/emotional states) may operate along the four teaching styles can be conceptualized as below:

Table 1. *Bandura's Sources of Self-efficacy along the Four Teaching Styles*

Teaching Style Source Of Self-Efficacy	Expert	Formal Authority	Personal Model	Facilitator	Delegator
Mastery Experiences	Structured Tasks Build Skill	Clear Expectations Foster Success	Modeling Success Through Action	Scaffolded Exploration Builds Confidence	Independent Tasks Reinforce Autonomy
Vicarious Experiences	Limited (Focus On Content)	May Use Examples, But Less Modeling	Strong—Students Observe Teacher	Peer Collaboration Encouraged	Peer-Led Learning Dominates
Verbal Persuasion	Feedback Is Content-Focused	Reinforcement Through Rules	Encouragement Via Modeling	Frequent Feedback And Support	Peer And Self-Feedback
Emotional States	May Overlook Affective Factors	Stress From Rigid Structure	Supportive Through Empathy	Emotionally Responsive	Students Self-Regulate

Movement from the expert teaching style to delegator style represents a shift from teacher-centered to learner-centered teaching. As shown in Table 1, each teaching style can be speculated to benefit from all sources of self-efficacy suggested by Bandura (2001), although the ways and degrees in which these sources operate vary across styles. For example, in the expert teaching style, mastery experiences can manifest the use of structured skill-building tasks, while the same source of self-efficacy can manifest, for the delegator teaching style (the most learner-centered teaching style), as independent tasks aiming to foster learner autonomy in class.

Two sample TSI items are "My teaching goals and methods address a variety of student learning styles." and "I give students negative feedback when their performance is unsatisfactory."

Data collection and analysis

To collect the required data, the two instruments were provided as a Google Form hyperlink sent via WhatsApp and Telegram, the popular social networks in Iran. The two questionnaires were combined into a single survey, beginning with demographic questions (i.e., name, age, sex, educational level), teaching context (school or institute), and the proficiency level taught.

Descriptive statistics (e.g., mean, standard deviation, range of scores) as well as inferential statistics (e.g., Chi-Square test, one-way ANOVA) were run in SPSS26.

Results

Firstly, the data normality was examined using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and Shapiro-Wilk test.

Table 2. *Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk Test Results*

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		Shapiro-Wilk	
	Statistic	Sig.	Statistic	Sig.
Efficacy in Student Engagement	0.98	0.29	0.96	0.25
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	0.70	0.70	0.95	0.15
Efficacy in Classroom Management	0.94	0.33	0.97	0.40
Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale	0.85	0.45	0.98	0.49
Expert	1.04	0.22	0.97	0.46
Formal Authority	0.99	0.27	0.99	0.48
Personal Model	1.14	0.14	0.96	0.31
Facilitator	1.10	0.17	0.95	0.21
Delegator	0.92	0.35	0.96	0.36
Teaching Styles	0.84	0.47	0.97	0.17

The results of both tests of normality check in Table 2 show that the data have been normally distributed.

Answer to the first research question

The first research question examined the dominant teaching style among Iranian EFL teachers. Pearson's chi-square test of association was run to this aim.

Table 3. *Chi-square Test Results of Finding the Dominant Teaching Style*

	Group
Chi-Square	68.524
Df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

As Table 3 shows, at $p<0.05$, there is a statistically significant difference between the distribution of at least two groups. Table 4 provides information about the frequency and percentage of each teaching style.

Table 4. *Frequency and Percentage of Teaching Styles*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Expert	32	13.73	13.73	13.7
	Formal Authority	32	13.73	13.73	27.5
	Personal Model	61	26.18	26.18	53.6
	Facilitator	89	38.20	38.20	91.8
	Delegator	19	8.15	8.15	100.0
	Total	233	100.00	100.00	

The highest percentage belongs to the facilitator style. The order of frequency is facilitator style > personal model > expert and formal > authority > delegator.

The first subquestion of RQ1 examined the dominant teaching style among EFL teachers in public schools. The chi-squared test results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. *Chi-Square Test Results of the Dominant Teaching Style among School Teachers*

	Group
Chi-Square	26.580
Df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

Table 5 shows that the p-value for testing the difference in frequency of five teaching styles among school teachers is 0.000 (< 0.05). With 95% confidence, it can be claimed that there is a significant difference between the frequency of at least two groups.

Table 6. *Frequency and Percentage of Teaching Styles among School Teachers*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Expert	13	18.84	18.84	18.8
	Formal Authority	5	7.25	7.25	26.1
	Personal Model	22	31.88	31.88	58.0
	Facilitator	25	36.23	36.23	94.2
	Delegator	4	5.80	5.80	100.0
	Total	69	100.00	100.00	

As shown in Table 6, the most dominant teaching style among school teachers was the facilitator style, followed by the Personal model, Expert, Formal authority and Delegator.

The dominant teaching style in the private sector was addressed in the second subquestion of RQ1. The chi-square test results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. *Chi-Square Test Results of the Dominant Teaching Style among Private Institute Teachers*

	Group
Chi-Square	36.790
Df	4
Asymp. Sig.	.000

According to Table 7, the p-value of testing the difference in frequency of five teaching styles among school teachers is 0.000 (< 0.05). Thus, with 95% confidence, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the frequency of at least two groups.

Table 8. *Frequency and Percentage of Teaching Styles among Private Institute Teachers*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Expert	19	12.10	12.10	12.10
	Formal Authority	27	17.20	17.20	29.30
	Personal Model	39	24.84	24.84	54.14
	Facilitator	57	36.31	36.31	90.45
	Delegator	15	9.55	9.55	100.00
	Total	157	100.00	100.00	

According to Table 8, the most dominant teaching style among institute teachers was the facilitator style, followed by Personal model, Formal authority, Expert and Delegator styles.

Answer to the second research question

The second research question asked whether there was a statistically significant difference among Iranian EFL teachers' teaching styles regarding their self-efficacy. To address this question, a one-way ANOVA was conducted.

Table 9. *One-Way ANOVA Test of Differences in Teachers' Self-Efficacy across Teaching Styles*

	Sum of squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Between Groups	18.434	4	4.608	3.136	0.015	0.064
Within Groups	335.059	228	1.470			
Total	353.493	232				

One-way ANOVA indicated a statistically significant difference among the groups. With 95% confidence, it can be concluded there is a significant difference between the self-efficacy of teachers in at least two teaching styles. Multiple comparisons were controlled with Bonferroni.

Table 10. *Bonferroni Post Hoc Test of Differences in Teachers' Self-Efficacy across Teaching Styles*

Multiple Comparisons Dependent Variable: Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale Bonferroni						
(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Expert	Formal Authority	0.07	0.30	1.00	-0.79	0.93
	Personal Model	-0.50	0.26	0.59	-1.25	0.25
	Facilitator	-0.58	0.25	0.21	-1.29	0.13
	Delegator	0.03	0.35	1.00	-0.97	1.02
Formal Authority	Expert	-0.07	0.30	1.00	-0.93	0.79
	Personal Model	-0.57	0.26	0.32	-1.32	0.18
	Facilitator	-0.65	0.25	0.10	-1.36	0.06
	Delegator	-0.04	0.35	1.00	-1.03	0.96
Personal Model	Expert	0.50	0.26	0.59	-0.25	1.25
	Formal Authority	0.57	0.26	0.32	-0.18	1.32
	Facilitator	-0.08	0.20	1.00	-0.65	0.49
	Delegator	0.53	0.32	0.96	-0.37	1.43
Facilitator	Expert	0.58	0.25	0.21	-0.13	1.29
	Formal Authority	0.65	0.25	0.10	-0.06	1.36
	Personal Model	0.08	0.20	1.00	-0.49	0.65
	Delegator	0.61	0.31	0.47	-0.26	1.48
Delegator	Expert	-0.03	0.35	1.00	-1.02	0.97
	Formal Authority	0.04	0.35	1.00	-0.96	1.03
	Personal Model	-0.53	0.32	0.96	-1.43	0.37
	Facilitator	-0.61	0.31	0.47	-1.48	0.26

According to Table 10, based on the Bonferroni post hoc test, no significant differences were found between the groups.

Table 11. *Mean Scores of Teachers' Self-Efficacy across Teaching Styles*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Expert	32	6.41	1.41	0.24	5.90	6.91	2.66	8.66
Formal Authority	32	6.34	1.42	0.25	5.83	6.85	3.58	8.54
Personal Model	61	6.91	1.20	0.15	6.60	7.22	1.45	8.79
Facilitator	89	6.99	1.03	0.10	6.77	7.21	2.95	8.75
Delegator	19	6.38	1.27	0.29	5.76	6.99	4.62	8.95
Total	233	6.75	1.23	0.08	6.59	6.91	1.45	8.95

According to Table 11, teachers with a facilitator teaching style reported higher self-efficacy, reflected in the highest mean score. The personal model style had the second-highest mean score, followed by Expert, Delegator, and Formal authority styles.

One secondary question of RQ2 examined whether there was any significant difference between school teachers' teaching styles and self-efficacy. Here are the one-way ANOVA test results:

Table 12. *One-Way ANOVA Test of Differences in School Teachers' Self-Efficacy across Teaching Styles*

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Between Groups	12.03	4	3.00	1.580	0.19	0.033
Within Groups	121.90	64	1.90			
Total	133.94	68				

As Table 12 shows, one-way ANOVA did not reveal statistically significant differences between the groups. With 95% confidence, it can be concluded there is no significant difference between school teachers' self-efficacy across the teaching styles.

Table 13. *Mean Scores of School Teachers' Self-Efficacy across Teaching Styles*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Expert	13	5.86	1.39	0.38	5.02	6.71	4.00	7.66
Formal Authority	5	7.35	0.75	0.33	6.41	8.28	6.20	8.29
Personal Model	22	6.57	1.61	0.34	5.86	7.29	1.45	8.79
Facilitator	25	6.34	1.26	0.25	5.82	6.86	2.95	8.04
Delegator	4	7.30	1.04	0.52	5.64	8.95	6.29	8.75
Total	69	6.45	1.40	0.16	6.11	6.79	1.45	8.79

As illustrated in Table 13, school teachers with a formal authority style had the highest mean self-efficacy score. This was followed by the Delegator style, and then the Personal model, Facilitator, and Expert styles.

The second subquestion of RQ2 sought to find whether there was any significant difference between the teaching styles of private language institutes' teachers and self-efficacy. To answer this question, one-way ANOVA was conducted.

Table 14. *One-Way ANOVA Test of Differences in Private Language Institute Teachers' Self-Efficacy across Teaching Styles*

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Between Groups	4.68	4	1.17	4.00	0.00	0.095
Within Groups	44.39	152	0.29			
Total	49.07	156				

As Table 14 shows, there is a statistically significant difference between groups. With 95% confidence, it can be claimed there is a statistically significant difference between the self-efficacy of teachers in private sector across at least two teaching styles. Multiple comparisons were controlled with Bonferroni.

Table 15. *Bonferroni Post Hoc Test Results of Differences in Self-Efficacy of Teachers at Private Institutes across Teaching Styles*

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Teaching Styles

Bonferroni

(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Expert	Formal Authority	.34639	.16184	.339	-.1146	.8074
	Personal Model	-.06329	.15120	1.000	-.4940	.3674
	Facilitator	-.12281	.14317	1.000	-.5306	.2850
	Delegator	.17658	.18667	1.000	-.3552	.7083
Formal Authority	Expert	-.34639	.16184	.339	-.8074	.1146
	Personal Model	**-.40969***	**.13530**	**.029**	-.7951	-.0243
	Facilitator	**-.46920***	**.12626**	**.003**	-.8289	-.1095
	Delegator	-.16981	.17404	1.000	-.6656	.3260
Personal Model	Expert	.06329	.15120	1.000	-.3674	.4940
	Formal Authority	.40969*	.13530	.029	.0243	.7951
	Facilitator	-.05951	.11231	1.000	-.3794	.2604
	Delegator	.23987	.16420	1.000	-.2279	.7076
Facilitator	Expert	.12281	.14317	1.000	-.2850	.5306
	Formal Authority	.46920*	.12626	.003	.1095	.8289
	Personal Model	.05951	.11231	1.000	-.2604	.3794
	Delegator	.29939	.15683	.582	-.1474	.7461
Delegator	Expert	-.17658	.18667	1.000	-.7083	.3552
	Formal Authority	.16981	.17404	1.000	-.3260	.6656
	Personal Model	-.23987	.16420	1.000	-.7076	.2279
	Facilitator	-.29939	.15683	.582	-.7461	.1474

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

According to Table 15, Bonferroni post hoc test showed a significant difference between the two groups Formal authority and Personal model ($p = 0.029 < 0.05$). There is also a difference between the Formal authority and Facilitator ($p = 0.003 < 0.05$).

Table 16. *Mean Scores of Private Institute Teachers' Self-Efficacy across Teaching Styles*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Expert	19	6.78	1.32	0.30	6.14	7.42	2.66	8.66
Formal Authority	27	6.15	1.45	0.27	5.58	6.73	3.58	8.54
Personal Model	39	7.10	0.87	0.13	6.82	7.38	5.33	8.66
Facilitator	57	7.32	0.80	0.10	7.11	7.53	4.33	8.75
Delegator	15	6.13	1.25	0.32	5.44	6.82	4.62	8.95
Total	157	6.88	1.15	0.09	6.70	7.07	2.66	8.95

As Table 16 shows, EFL teachers at private institutes with a facilitator teaching style had the highest self-efficacy score, followed by the Personal model, Expert, Formal authority, and Delegator styles.

Answer to the third research question

The third research question sought to find whether there was any statistically significant difference among Iranian EFL teachers' teaching style across different subscales of self-efficacy. One-way ANOVA was used to answer this question.

Table 17. *One-Way ANOVA Test of Differences in Subscales of Self-Efficacy across Teaching Styles*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Between Groups	20.48	4	5.12	3.05	.01	0.067
	Within Groups	382.11	228	1.67			
	Total	402.60	232				
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Between Groups	21.06	4	5.26	3.57	.00	0.066
	Within Groups	335.64	228	1.47			
	Total	356.71	232				
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Between Groups	16.58	4	4.14	2.30	.05	0.039
	Within Groups	410.23	228	1.79			
	Total	426.81	232				

As summarized in Table 17, one-way ANOVA showed a statistically significant difference between the teaching styles. With 95% confidence, it can be claimed there is a significant difference between the student engagement sub-scale of self-efficacy. There is a statistically significant difference between the teaching styles. With 95% confidence, it can be claimed there is a significant difference between the efficacy in instructional strategies sub-scale of self-efficacy in at least two teaching styles.

Furthermore, one-way ANOVA showed a statistically significant difference between groups. With 95% confidence, it can be claimed there is no significant difference between the efficacy in classroom management sub-scale of teachers' self-efficacy across the teaching styles. Multiple comparisons were controlled with Bonferroni.

Table 18. *Bonferroni Post Hoc Test of Differences in Efficacy in Student Engagement Sub-Scale of Teachers' Self-Efficacy across Teaching Styles*

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Efficacy in Student Engagement

Bonferroni

(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Expert	Formal Authority	.14453	.32365	1.000	-.7729	1.0619
	Personal Model	-.45562	.28257	1.000	-1.2566	.3454
	Facilitator	-.63689	.26684	.178	-1.3933	.1195
	Delegator	-.15234	.37494	1.000	-1.2152	.9105
Formal Authority	Expert	-.14453	.32365	1.000	-1.0619	.7729
	Personal Model	-.60015	.28257	.348	-1.4011	.2008
	Facilitator	**-.78143***	**.26684**	**.038**	-1.5378	-.0250
	Delegator	-.29687	.37494	1.000	-1.3597	.7659

Personal Model	Expert	.45562	.28257	1.000	-.3454	1.2566
	Formal Authority	.60015	.28257	.348	-.2008	1.4011
	Facilitator	-.18127	.21519	1.000	-.7912	.4287
	Delegator	.30328	.34012	1.000	-.6608	1.2674
Facilitator	Expert	.63689	.26684	.178	-.1195	1.3933
	Formal Authority	**.78143***	**.26684**	**.038**	.0250	1.5378
	Personal Model	.18127	.21519	1.000	-.4287	.7912
	Delegator	.48455	.32717	1.000	-.4428	1.4119
Delegator	Expert	.15234	.37494	1.000	-.9105	1.2152
	Formal Authority	.29688	.37494	1.000	-.7659	1.3597
	Personal Model	-.30328	.34012	1.000	-1.2674	.6608
	Facilitator	-.48455	.32717	1.000	-1.4119	.4428

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

As Table 18 shows, there is a statistically significant difference between the personal model and facilitator styles (P = 0.03 <0.05) and between facilitator and formal authority styles (p = 0.03 < .05). The post hoc test results are presented below:

Table 19. *Bonferroni Post Hoc Test of Differences in the Efficacy in Instructional Strategies Sub-Scale of Teachers' Self-Efficacy across Teaching Styles*

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Efficacy in Instructional Strategies

Bonferroni

(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Expert	Formal Authority	.00781	.30333	1.000	-.8520	.8676
	Personal Model	-.52497	.26484	.487	-1.2757	.2257
	Facilitator	-.54977	.25009	.289	-1.2587	.1591
	Delegator	.29071	.35140	1.000	-.7054	1.2868
Formal Authority	Expert	-.00781	.30333	1.000	-.8676	.8520
	Personal Model	-.53279	.26484	.454	-1.2835	.2179
	Facilitator	-.55758	.25009	.268	-1.2665	.1513
	Delegator	.28289	.35140	1.000	-.7132	1.2790
Personal Model	Expert	.52497	.26484	.487	-.2257	1.2757
	Formal Authority	.53279	.26484	.454	-.2179	1.2835
	Facilitator	-.02480	.20168	1.000	-.5965	.5469
	Delegator	.81568	.31877	.111	-.0879	1.7193
Facilitator	Expert	.54977	.25009	.289	-.1591	1.2587
	Formal Authority	.55758	.25009	.268	-.1513	1.2665
	Personal Model	.02480	.20168	1.000	-.5469	.5965
	Delegator	.84048	.30663	.066	-.0287	1.7097
Delegator	Expert	-.29071	.35140	1.000	-1.2868	.7054
	Formal Authority	-.28289	.35140	1.000	-1.2790	.7132
	Personal Model	-.81568	.31877	.111	-1.7193	.0879
	Facilitator	-.84048	.30663	.066	-1.7097	.0287

As it can be seen, no statistically significant differences were found between the groups.

Table 20. *Mean Scores of Self-efficacy Subscales across Teaching Styles*

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Expert	32	6.34	1.47	0.26	5.81	6.87	2.12	9.00
	Formal Authority	32	6.20	1.55	0.27	5.64	6.76	2.87	8.75
	Personal Model	61	6.80	1.28	0.16	6.47	7.13	1.37	9.00
	Facilitator	89	6.98	1.11	0.11	6.75	7.21	3.25	9.00
	Delegator	19	6.50	1.32	0.30	5.85	7.14	4.25	9.00
	Total	233	6.70	1.31	0.08	6.53	6.87	1.37	9.00
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Expert	32	6.50	1.41	0.25	5.99	7.01	3.37	8.25
	Formal Authority	32	6.50	1.37	0.24	6.00	6.99	3.50	8.62
	Personal Model	61	7.03	1.22	0.15	6.71	7.34	1.75	8.87
	Facilitator	89	7.05	0.99	0.10	6.84	7.26	3.12	8.87
	Delegator	19	6.21	1.44	0.33	5.52	6.91	3.87	9.00
	Total	233	6.83	1.24	0.08	6.67	6.99	1.75	9.00
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Expert	32	6.37	1.58	0.28	5.80	6.94	2.37	9.00
	Formal Authority	32	6.32	1.53	0.27	5.77	6.88	3.37	8.37
	Personal Model	61	6.90	1.30	0.16	6.56	7.23	1.25	9.00
	Facilitator	89	6.93	1.19	0.12	6.68	7.18	2.50	9.00
	Delegator	19	6.42	1.33	0.30	5.78	7.07	4.00	9.00
	Total	233	6.72	1.35	0.08	6.55	6.90	1.25	9.00

As the table shows, Iranian EFL teachers with a facilitator teaching style have higher scores in all subscales of self-efficacy.

The first subquestion of RQ3 explored whether there was any statistically significant difference between the teaching styles of school teachers across the subscales of self-efficacy. One-way ANOVA was used to answer this research question.

Table 21. *One-Way ANOVA Test of Differences in Self-efficacy Subscales of School Teachers across Teaching Styles*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Between Groups	11.42	4	2.85	1.33	0.26	0.019
	Within Groups	137.45	64	2.14			
	Total	148.88	68				
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Between Groups	10.45	4	2.61	1.35	0.25	0.021
	Within Groups	123.29	64	1.92			
	Total	133.74	68				
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Between Groups	17.35	4	4.34	1.88	0.12	0.049
	Within Groups	147.46	64	2.30			
	Total	164.82	68				

One-way ANOVA revealed no statistically significant difference between the teaching styles. With 95% confidence, it can be claimed there is no statistically significant difference between the efficacy in student engagement subscale of self-efficacy of school teachers across teaching styles. One-way ANOVA showed a statistically significant difference between the teaching styles. With 95% confidence, it can be concluded there is no statistically significant difference in efficacy in instructional strategies subscale of school teachers' self-efficacy across teaching styles. There is a statistically significant difference between the teaching styles in terms of this subscale of self-efficacy. With 95% confidence, it can be claimed there is no significant difference between efficacy in classroom management subscale of self-efficacy in school teachers across the teaching styles. Table 22 shows the mean scores of the self-efficacy subscales of school teachers across the teaching styles.

Table 22. *Mean Scores of Self-Efficacy Subscales of Iranian School Teachers across Teaching Styles*

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Expert	13	5.78	1.37	0.38	4.96	6.61	3.75	8.00
	Formal Authority	5	7.30	1.21	0.54	5.79	8.80	5.25	8.37
	Personal Model	22	6.43	1.67	0.35	5.69	7.17	1.37	9.00
	Facilitator	25	6.38	1.36	0.27	5.81	6.94	3.25	8.37
	Delegator	4	7.18	1.36	0.68	5.02	9.35	5.75	9.00
	Total	69	6.39	1.48	0.17	6.04	6.75	1.37	9.00

	Expert	13	5.98	1.61	0.44	5.00	6.95	3.37	8.25
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Formal Authority	5	7.57	0.45	0.20	7.00	8.14	7.00	8.25
	Personal Model	22	6.58	1.60	0.34	5.87	7.29	1.75	8.87
	Facilitator	25	6.46	1.19	0.24	5.96	6.95	3.12	8.25
	Delegator	4	7.00	0.87	0.43	5.61	8.38	6.25	8.25
	Total	69	6.52	1.40	0.16	6.18	6.85	1.75	8.87
	Expert	13	5.82	1.54	0.42	4.89	6.75	3.75	8.50
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Formal Authority	5	7.17	0.94	0.42	6.00	8.34	5.75	8.25
	Personal Model	22	6.71	1.74	0.37	5.94	7.49	1.25	9.00
	Facilitator	25	6.19	1.42	0.28	5.60	6.77	2.50	8.25
	Delegator	4	7.71	0.92	0.46	6.24	9.19	6.87	9.00
	Total	69	6.44	1.55	0.18	6.07	6.82	1.25	9.00

The scores of efficacy in student engagement and efficacy in instructional strategies subscales are higher for school teachers with a formal authority teaching style. The score of efficacy in classroom management is higher for school teachers with a delegator teaching style.

The second subquestion of RQ3 explored whether there was any statistically significant difference between the teaching styles of private sector teachers across the self-efficacy subscales. One-way ANOVA was used and the results are presented in Table 23.

Table 23. *One-Way ANOVA Test of Differences in Self-Efficacy Subscales of Private Institute Teachers across Different Teaching Styles*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	η^2
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Between Groups	35.73	4	8.93	6.55	0.00	0.147
	Within Groups	207.20	152	1.36			
	Total	242.93	156				
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Between Groups	39.67	4	9.91	8.84	0.00	0.189
	Within Groups	170.45	152	1.12			
	Total	210.13	156				
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Between Groups	34.22	4	8.55	6.00	0.00	0.136
	Within Groups	216.60	152	1.42			
	Total	250.82	156				

There is a statistically significant difference in efficacy in student engagement across the teaching styles. With 95% confidence, it can be claimed there is a statistically significant difference in the self-efficacy of private language institute teachers in at least two teaching styles. One-way ANOVA showed a statistically significant difference in efficacy in instructional strategies. With 95% confidence, it can be claimed there is a statistically significant difference between the private sector teachers' self-efficacy in at least two teaching styles. It also shows a statistically significant difference in efficacy in classroom management across the teaching styles. With 95% confidence, it can be claimed there is a significant difference between efficacy in classroom management of institute teachers' self-efficacy in at least two teaching styles. The post hoc test showed which two teaching styles differed.

Table 24. *Bonferroni Post Hoc Test of Differences in Efficacy in Student Engagement Subscale of Private Institute Teachers' Self-Efficacy across Teaching Styles*

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Efficacy in Student Engagement

Bonferroni

(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Expert	Formal Authority	.73026	.34962	.384	-.2657	1.7262
	Personal Model	-.28256	.32665	1.000	-1.2130	.6479
	Facilitator	-.55263	.30929	.760	-1.4337	.3284
	Delegator	.41360	.40327	1.000	-.7351	1.5623
Formal Authority	Expert	-.73026	.34962	.384	-1.7262	.2657
	Personal Model	**-1.01282***	**.29230**	**.007**	-1.8455	-.1802
	Facilitator	**-1.28289***	**.27277**	**.000**	-2.0599	-.5059
	Delegator	-.31667	.37599	1.000	-1.3877	.7544
Personal Model	Expert	.28256	.32665	1.000	-.6479	1.2130
	Formal Authority	**1.01282***	**.29230**	**.007**	.1802	1.8455
	Facilitator	-.27007	.24263	1.000	-.9612	.4211
	Delegator	.69615	.35473	.515	-.3143	1.7066
Facilitator	Expert	.55263	.30929	.760	-.3284	1.4337
	Formal Authority	**1.28289***	**.27277**	**.000**	.5059	2.0599
	Personal Model	.27007	.24263	1.000	-.4211	.9612
	Delegator	**.96623***	**.33881**	**.049**	.0011	1.9314
Delegator	Expert	-.41360	.40327	1.000	-1.5623	.7351
	Formal Authority	.31667	.37599	1.000	-.7544	1.3877
	Personal Model	-.69615	.35473	.515	-1.7066	.3143
	Facilitator	**-.96623***	**.33881**	**.049**	-1.9314	-.0011

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

According to Table 24, there is a statistically significant difference between the Formal authority and Personal model styles (P = .007 <0.05). There is a statistically significant difference between Formal authority and Facilitator groups in terms of efficacy in student engagement (P = .000 <0.05. There is a statistically significant difference between Facilitator and Delegator styles in terms of student engagement (P = .049 <0.05).

Table 25. *Bonferroni Post Hoc Test of Differences in Efficacy in Instructional Strategies Subscale of Private Institute Teachers' Self-Efficacy across Teaching Styles*

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Efficacy in Instructional Strategies

Bonferroni

(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Expert	Formal Authority	.56750	.31711	.755	-.3358	1.4708
	Personal Model	-.41684	.29627	1.000	-1.2608	.4271
	Facilitator	-.51316	.28053	.693	-1.3123	.2860
	Delegator	.86009	.36576	.200	-.1818	1.9020
Formal Authority	Expert	-.56750	.31711	.755	-1.4708	.3358
	Personal Model	**-.98433***	**.26512**	**.003**	-1.7395	-.2291
	Facilitator	**-1.08065***	**.24740**	**.000**	-1.7854	-.3759
	Delegator	.29259	.34102	1.000	-.6788	1.2640
Personal Model	Expert	.41684	.29627	1.000	-.4271	1.2608
	Formal Authority	**.98433***	**.26512**	**.003**	.2291	1.7395
	Facilitator	-.09632	.22006	1.000	-.7232	.5306
	Delegator	**1.27692***	**.32174**	**.001**	.3604	2.1934
Facilitator	Expert	.51316	.28053	.693	-.2860	1.3123
	Formal Authority	**1.08065***	**.24740**	**.000**	.3759	1.7854
	Personal Model	.09632	.22006	1.000	-.5306	.7232
	Delegator	**1.37325***	**.30730**	**.000**	.4979	2.2486
Delegator	Expert	-.86009	.36576	.200	-1.9020	.1818
	Formal Authority	-.29259	.34102	1.000	-1.2640	.6788
	Personal Model	-1.27692*	.32174	.001	-2.1934	-.3604
	Facilitator	**-1.37325***	**.30730**	**.000**	-2.2486	-.4979

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 25 reports a statistically significant difference between Formal authority and Facilitator styles in terms of efficacy in instructional strategies (P = .000 <0.05). It also shows a statistically significant difference between Formal authority and Personal model teaching styles (P = .003 <0.05). It evidences a statistically significant difference between the Delegator and Personal model teaching styles (P = .001 <0.05). A significant difference is also found between the Delegator and Facilitator teaching styles (P = .000 < 0.05) as well as between Facilitator and Formal authority (p = .000 < .05). Yet, no significant difference was found between the other teaching styles in terms of efficacy in instructional strategies.

Table 26. *Bonferroni Post Hoc Test of Differences in Efficacy in Classroom Management Subscale of Private Institute Teachers' Self-Efficacy across Teaching Styles*

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Efficacy in Classroom Management						
Bonferroni						
(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Expert	Formal Authority	.57870	.35746	1.000	-.4396	1.5970
	Personal Model	-.25962	.33397	1.000	-1.2110	.6917
	Facilitator	-.55482	.31623	.814	-1.4556	.3460
	Delegator	.66667	.41231	1.000	-.5078	1.8412
Formal Authority	Expert	-.57870	.35746	1.000	-1.5970	.4396
	Personal Model	-.83832	.29886	.057	-1.6896	.0130
	Facilitator	**-1.13353***	**.27889**	**.001**	-1.9280	-.3391
	Delegator	.08796	.38442	1.000	-1.0071	1.1830
Personal Model	Expert	.25962	.33397	1.000	-.6917	1.2110
	Formal Authority	.83832	.29886	.057	-.0130	1.6896
	Facilitator	-.29521	.24807	1.000	-1.0019	.4114
	Delegator	.92628	.36268	.116	-.1069	1.9594
Facilitator	Expert	.55482	.31623	.814	-.3460	1.4556
	Formal Authority	**1.13353***	**.27889**	**.001**	.3391	1.9280
	Personal Model	.29521	.24807	1.000	-.4114	1.0019
	Delegator	**1.22149***	**.34641**	**.006**	.2347	2.2083
Delegator	Expert	-.66667	.41231	1.000	-1.8412	.5078
	Formal Authority	-.08796	.38442	1.000	-1.1830	1.0071
	Personal Model	-.92628	.36268	.116	-1.9594	.1069
	Facilitator	**-1.22149***	**.34641**	**.006**	-2.2083	-.2347

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

As shown in Table 26, there is a significant difference between Formal authority and Facilitator styles in terms of efficacy in classroom management ($P = 0.001 < 0.05$). There is a significant difference between the Facilitator and Delegator styles in terms of efficacy in class management ($P = 0.006 < 0.05$).

Table 27. *Mean Scores of Self-Efficacy Subscales of Private Institute Teachers across Teaching Styles*

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Efficacy in Student Engagement	Expert	19	6.73	1.44	0.33	6.03	7.42	2.12	9.00
	Formal Authority	27	6.00	1.54	0.29	5.38	6.61	2.87	8.75
	Personal Model	39	7.01	0.97	0.15	6.69	7.32	5.00	8.50
	Facilitator	57	7.28	0.91	0.12	7.03	7.52	4.12	9.00
	Delegator	15	6.31	1.30	0.33	5.59	7.04	4.25	8.87
	Total	157	6.83	1.24	0.10	6.63	7.03	2.12	9.00

	Expert	19	6.86	1.16	0.26	6.30	7.43	3.50	8.25
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	Formal Authority	27	6.30	1.39	0.26	5.74	6.85	3.50	8.62
	Personal Model	39	7.28	0.87	0.13	7.00	7.56	5.25	8.87
	Facilitator	57	7.38	0.78	0.10	7.17	7.58	5.25	8.87
	Delegator	15	6.00	1.51	0.39	5.16	6.84	3.87	9.00
	Total	157	6.97	1.16	0.09	6.79	7.16	3.50	9.00
	Expert	19	6.75	1.54	0.35	6.00	7.493	2.37	9.00
Efficacy in Classroom Management	Formal Authority	27	6.17	1.58	0.30	5.54	6.799	3.37	8.37
	Personal Model	39	7.01	0.98	0.15	6.69	7.329	5.00	8.87
	Facilitator	57	7.30	0.95	0.12	7.05	7.557	3.62	9.00
	Delegator	15	6.08	1.22	0.31	5.40	6.760	4.00	9.00
	Total	157	6.85	1.26	0.10	6.65	7.053	2.37	9.00

The mean scores of all self-efficacy subscales are higher in private language institute teachers with a facilitator teaching style.

Discussions

The present study showed that the facilitator teaching style was the most dominant style among teachers. The popularity of the facilitating role of teacher can be at least partly attributed to the popularity of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in Iran's educational system over the past two decades. In the public sector, the existing English language coursebooks (i.e., *Prospect* and *Vision*) have been developed based on CLT. In the private sector, in the past two decades, CLT has dominated the courses. Thus, in many training courses, teachers learn to adopt a facilitator role in class. This finding aligns with previous literarure. Ghonsooly *et al*. (2017) reported that Iranian EFL teachers with a facilitator teaching style were more engaged in providing a learning environment conducive to learning and promoting higher levels of motivation in students. Consistent with Grasha's (2002) description, facilitator teachers help students make the right decisions to achieve goals, explore alternatives, suggest solutions, and encourage independent action (Grasha, 2002). These results also resonate with Ghanizadeh and Jahedizadeh (2016), who found that facilitator teachers favored learner-centered approaches that foregrounded personalized teacher–student interaction. Overall, these teachers' main concern is to develop the capacity for independent action, initiative, and responsibility in students (Ghanizadeh & Rostami, 2015).

The present study also showed that the facilitator teaching style was associated with higher self-efficacy. This finding is ratified by Dilekli and Tezci (2015), who found that the facilitator style could lead to L2 teachers' higher self-efficacy. Ghorbanzadeh (2022) reported an association between EFL teachers' teaching style and their efficacy. These findings are also consistent with two other studies (Artino, 2012; Gibson & Dembo, 1984). As Khanshan and Yousefi (2020) noted, teachers' perceived efficacy strengthens classroom instructional practices. According to Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001), teacher efficacy reflects teachers' capacity to select and execute appropriate instructional

actions. Teaching style, as defined by Grasha (1996), reflects patterns of needs, beliefs, and behaviors enacted in class. Thus, teacher efficacy manifests within each teaching style, as teachers' beliefs shape their behaviors and intentions in class. More specifically, Iranian EFL teachers with the facilitator teaching style have higher self-efficacy at language institutes, and teachers with the formal authority teaching style have higher self-efficacy. The latter may be explained by the more formal and structured nature of school contexts in Iran, as well as significantly larger class sizes than private institutes, often two or three times as large. Thus, probably, the formal authority teaching style works better in populated classes to build and maintain teacher self-efficacy.

This study also tested the differences among Iranian EFL teachers' teaching styles concerning each self-efficacy subscale. Private institute teachers with a facilitator teaching style obtained higher scores in all self-efficacy subcategories, which can be justified by the popularity of CLT in the private sector and the expected teacher-facilitator role. In contrast, the scores of efficacy in student engagement and efficacy in instructional strategies are higher for school teachers with the formal authority style. This finding can be explained by larger class sizes in public schools, as discussed in relation to the second research question. Formal authority can be speculated to work better in managing students in larger classes and helping the teacher build the right level of self-efficacy and maintaining it in class. The efficacy score in classroom management subcategory is higher for school teachers with the delegator teaching style. Similarly, Ghonsooly (2015) reported a statistically significant positive relationship between Iranian L2 teachers' self-efficacy and class management. Furthermore, the institute teachers who favored the facilitator teaching style had higher scores of all self-efficacy subscales, which is explainable in light of the popularity of teacher-facilitator role advocated in the L2 private sector in Iran.

Conclusions

This study revealed notable differences in teaching style preferences and perceived self-efficacy among Iranian EFL teachers in public and private sectors. Overall, the facilitator teaching style showed to be dominant. Attention to this teaching style and how it could increase teachers' self-efficacy should be incorporated into EFL teacher education in Iran. Dominance of L2 teachers' facilitating role in Iran can be largely due to the popularity of communicative approach. L2 teacher trainers in Iran should be aware of the dominance of facilitating teaching style in Iranian EFL context and adapt instructions to find ways to help teachers build and maintain self-efficacy in class management, student management and instructional strategies.

The finding that different categories of self-efficacy vary across different preferred teaching styles has important implications for teacher training courses and professional development programs in Iran. By linking teacher psychology to classroom practice, this study contributes to broader ELT literature on teacher cognition and behavior. This study links teacher psychology to practical aspects in real classrooms. It unravels how multiple categories of teacher self-efficacy work in tandem with the teaching style in class, and how the former can affect the latter. These findings fill the gap between the pure investigation of teacher psychology and what actually happens in the dynamic context of classroom. Further research is required to trace the ongoing changes in preferred teaching style(s) under the effect of efficacy for instructional strategies, efficacy for classroom management, and efficacy for student engagement. The present study relied solely on quantitative methods. Future investigations can benefit from qualitative or mixed-methods approaches to enrich data and capture teachers' experiences more comprehensively. The questionnaire-based procedure is always faced with certain cautions due to the self-report nature of data collection. In-depth interviews used in qualitative studies can be used to provide a more representative image of the trait of interest. Besides, the convenience and snowball sampling used here were non-probabilistic, which can threaten the representativeness and generalizability of findings. Future researchers can also use longitudinal traces of self-efficacy building and maintenance through real-time in classroom teaching. For this purpose, more sophisticated statistical procedures within the structural equation modeling framework are recommended, allowing data to be collected at several points throughout a semester. Such an approach makes it possible to trace changes in teacher's self-efficacy from the beginning to the end (of semester) in association with a particular teaching style that the teacher preferably adopts in class (e.g., the facilitator style in the context of Iran).

References

Abu-Tineh, A., Khasawneh, S., & Khalaileh, H. (2011). Teacher self-efficacy and management styles in Jordanian schools. *Management in Education, 25*(4), 175–181. https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020611420597

Artino Jr., A. R. (2012). Academic self-efficacy: From educational theory to instructional practice. *Perspectives on Medical Education, 1*, 76-85. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40037-012-0012-5

Baleghizadeh, S., & Shakouri, M. (2015). 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. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2015.1087329

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W H Freeman/Times Books/Henry Holt & Co.

Bandura A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1

Biggs, J., & Watkins, J. (2006). Classroom Learning: Educational Psychology for the Asian Teacher. (1998). *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 18*(1), 97–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/0218879980180111

Cooper, T. C. (2001). Foreign language style and personality. *Foreign Language Annals, 34*, 301-16. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2001.tb02062.x

De Coninck, K., Walker, J., Dotger, B., & Vanderlinde, R. (2020). Measuring student teachers' self-efficacy beliefs about family-teacher communication: Scale construction and validation. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 64*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.100820

Dilekli, Y., & Tezci, E. (2015). 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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2016.06.001

Divsar H. (2023). A structural equation modeling of the dynamic interplay among EFL teachers' classroom management approaches, self-efficacy dimensions, and personality types. *Language Related Research, 14*(3), 213-237. https://doi.org/10.48311/LRR.14.3.213

Faruji, L. F. (2021). Teachers' teaching styles at English language institutes in Iran. *International Journal Social Sciences and Education, 2*(1), 364-373.

Ghanizadeh, A., & Jahedizadeh, S. (2016). EFL teachers' teaching style, creativity, and burnout: A path analysis approach. *Cogent Education, 3*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1151997

Ghanizadeh, A., & Rostami, S. (2015). A Dörnyei-inspired study on second language motivation: A cross-comparison analysis in public and private contexts. P*sychological Studies, 60*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12646-015-0328-4

Ghonsooly, B., Heydarnejad, T., & Hosseini Fatemi, A. (2017). An exploration of EFL teachers' teaching styles and emotions. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 4*(2), 26-46.

Ghorbanzadeh, A. (2022). Study of the relationship between teaching style and teacher efficacy: A quantitative case study in Mashhad, Iran. *Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies, 1*(1), 23-32. https://oiccpress.com/jals/article/view/5559

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*(4), 569–582. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.76.4.569

Grasha, A. F. (1996). *Teaching with styles: A practical guide to enhance learning by understanding learning and teaching styles*. Alliance Publisher.

Grasha, A. F. (2002). The dynamics of one-on-one teaching. *College Teaching, 50*(4), 139-146. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567550209595895

Grasha, A. F. (2006). *Teaching with style: A practical guide to enhancing learning by understanding teaching and learning styles*. Alliance Publishers.

Hajovsky, D. B., Chesnut, S. R., & Jensen, K. M. (2020). The role of teachers' self-efficacy beliefs in the development of teacher-student relationships. *Journal of School Psychology, 82*, 141-158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2020.09.001

Jarvis, P. (2004). *Adult education and lifelong learning: Theory and practice*. Routledge Falmer.

Kennedy, C. J., Probart, C. K., & Dormanm, S. M. (1991). The relationship between radon knowledge, concern and behavior, and health values, health locus of control and preventive health behaviors. *Health Education Quarterly, 18*(3), 319-29. https://doi.org/10.1177/109019819101800305

Khanshan, S. K., & Yousefi, M. H. (2020). The relationship between self-efficacy and instructional practice of in-service soft disciplines, hard disciplines and EFL teachers. *Asian. J. Second. Foreign. Lang. Educ., 5*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-0080-8

Khany, R., & Aliabadi, H. T. (2016). Can learning styles, teaching styles, and teachers' self-efficacy predict Iranian EFL students' language learning achievements? A structural equation modeling analysis. *Teaching English Language, 10*(2), 95-112.

Mohammadi, M., Yousefi, M. H., & Salimi, A. (2024). The role of self-efficacy instruction in EFL teachers' professional development: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of Language and Translation, 14*(2), 77-98.

Modirkhamene, S. & Hassanzad, K. (2023). In-field vs. out-of-field EFL teachers' self-efficacy, classroom management styles and students' performance. *Interdisciplinary Studies in English Language Teaching, 1*(2), 117-129. https://doi.org/10.22080/iselt.2022.23589.1036

Rahimi, M., & Nabilou, Z. (2011). Iranian EFL teachers' effectiveness of instructional behavior in public and private high schools. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 12*(1), 67-78. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-010-9111-3

Ramakrishnan, R., Salleh, N. M., & Aliza, A. (2022). The relationship between teaching style, self-efficacy and competency in vocational special education teachers. *Akademika, 92*, 81-94. https://doi.org/10.17576/akad-2022-92IK1-07

Safa, S., & Ghonsooly, B. (2015). Examining the relationship among sense of self-efficacy, teaching experience and beliefs about classroom management: A case of Iranian EFL teachers. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 2*(8), 273-283.

Safari, I. (2024). A study on the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' job satisfaction and self-efficacy. *Journal of Studies in Learning and Teaching English, 13*(4), 21-33.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68*, 202–248. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543068002202

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 783–805. https://doi.org/10.1016/ S0742-051(01)00036-1

Yilmaz, H., & Cavaş, P. (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*, 45–54. https://doi.org/10.12973/ejmste/75305

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. https://doi.org/:10.1016/j.paid.2007.01.009