Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching

Volume 04, Issue 1, (2014) 42-58

www.awer-center.org/gjflt/

The role of Iranian EFL teachers' reflectivity and teaching style in the students' achievement

Farhad Ghorban Dordinejad*, Shahid Rajaee Teacher Training University, Tehran, Iran.
Minoo Rashvand, Shahid Rajaee Teacher Training University, Tehran, Iran.

Suggested Citation:
Dordinejad, F., G. & Rashvand, M. (2014). The role of Iranian EFL teachers' reflectivity and teaching style in the students' achievement *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *4*(1), 42-58. Retrived on 3 May 2014 from http://www.world-education-center.org/index.php/GJFLT/article/view/2822

Received 19 December, 2013; revised 19 April, 2014; accepted 29 April, 2014.
Selection and peer review under responsibility of Associate Prof Dr. Ali Rahimi, Bangkok University.
©2014 SPROC LTD. Academic World Education & Research Center. All rights reserved.

Abstract

Reflectivity and teaching styles are considered as major factors in developing teaching profession. Since Language teachers with high level of reflectivity and appropriate teaching styles can teach effectively, this study has been conducted to investigate the role of Iranian EFL teachers' reflectivity and their teaching style in their students' achievement. To do so, 70 EFL high-school teachers of Qazvin Province participated in the study. Two questionnaires of reflectivity and teaching style preferences were used and also every teacher list of students' final exam scores was taken to collect the required data. The result of this study revealed that there was a significant relationship between teachers' reflectivity and their teaching style preferences and also from the six subscales of teachers' reflectivity, affective and moral components could predict the teachers' style significantly. Also from the two variables of teachers' reflectivity and their teaching style, the first one could predict the students' achievement and among the subscales of reflective teaching, the meta-cognitive element could predict the students' achievement significantly.

Keywords: teachers' reflectivity, teaching style, Iranian EFL Teachers, learning achievement

ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: **Farhad Ghorban Dordinejad,** Shahid Rajaee Teacher Training University, Tehran, Iran. *E-mail address*: fdordy@srttu.edu

1. Introduction

One of the problems that the educational system is faced with is teachers' method of teaching and unfortunately there is no difference in their present teaching techniques and that of the last two or three generations (Imam Jomeh, 2006). Now the question is that what happened to the learners' today needs? What happened to the different changes that are happening today? Don't the learners need to progress with these changes? What is the role of teachers in this issue?

According to Murphy (2001), there are many ways for teacher's to grow professionally either in themselves or within the courses they teach, this can be classroom images including insights, second guesses, resolution and plans for the future. But as Imam Jomeh (2006) stated, unfortunately this way of thinking is neglected in our training systems and our teachers just transfer an old and routine training system to other generations. Reflection does not consist of steps or procedures or a series of fixed principles to be used by teachers. According to Imam Jomeh (2006), the authorities should change educational system based on research and thinking instead of raising the level of individual's knowledge, so that the students turned into independent and lifelong learners. For achieving this purpose, the first priority is referred to the teacher. The teacher plays a central role in educational system because the education system objectives must be eventually materialized by the teacher. There are many ways for the professional growth of the teachers and one of these ways that has been considered in this study is reflective teaching.

Cooper (2001) emphasized the importance of a match between teachers' personality and their method of teaching. Also according to humanism, since people are different and each personality type represents a particular teaching style, everyone has distinct personality which is specific to him/ herself. So the other factor of interest which is considered in this study is teachers' specific style of teaching.

Moreover, as Atamturk (2009) stated, teachers, to be qualified in their teaching, need a professional growth in their work to be able to cope with the different situations in the class and this professional growth can be achieved in pre-service and in-service classes.

According to Clarke (2005), a thing that our new teachers are always thinking about is their effectiveness in classroom management and pedagogical issues. Once entering in the classroom in the school environment, new teachers are isolated from their peers and mentors of the university/college setting as well as their colleagues within the school itself. Also the school system does not support them immediately and all the responsibilities are on the shoulder of the teachers. This system necessitates that teachers should take those skills and strategies with them into the classroom. In this way transitioning from the theory learned in their courses to the instructional practice in their classrooms is a difficult and challenging task.

The professional growth in teachers can be achieved in many ways that can be either in themselves or in their courses they teach (Murphy, 2001).Reflecting on teaching is frequently cited as a fundamental practice for personal and professional development. And since teaching changes from one context to the next, the skills teachers develop in one tutorial session may be markedly different from those required in another (Urgenor, 2011).

According to Dewey (1933), Schon (1987) and Van Manen (1977) (as cited in Pedro, 2001), reflection has been proposed as an important concept with sound theoretical foundation in education. And as Dewey stated reflection is said to begin when one inquires into his or her own experiences and relevant knowledge to find meaning in his or her own beliefs and also he referred to reflective practice as intelligent action and called it reflective teaching (Pedro, 2001).

About the variable of teaching style in this research Atamturk (2009), stated that teaching strategies are developed at the first stages of teaching experiences and since everyone has a unique characteristic which can be defined as teaching styles, they possibly follow a specific route and do the same all the time. But Cooper (2001), mentioned that it is important to first consider the personality of the teacher and then to search a method which matches to that personality.

Yayli (2009) explained that according to constructivist principles, learning is basically a social activity and learners create their own learning through utilizing their experiences and beliefs. The concerns on how in-service and pre-service teachers develop themselves professionally in their own contexts, how they shape and monitor their experiences necessitate reflection to be reinforced in teacher education programs.

Teaching styles which often considered as teachers' views on teaching and learning and their preferred behavior have also received a considerable attention within the educational literature over the past two decades. There is some evidence that teaching styles can help to interpret the influences of teachers on student achievement and on attitudes towards subjects, and that teaching behavior and teaching styles can make an important difference to student learning. Research on teaching and teacher education (within the tradition of teacher thinking) emphasizes the importance of beliefs, thoughts, judgments, knowledge, attitudes and theories of teachers for teaching practice (Opdenakker & Damme, 2006).

In this research the researcher wanted to relate teachers' reflectivity and their specific teaching style to pre-service and in-service classes and workshops that are held occasionally in schools and private institutes and to inform teacher educators of the possible effect of these two variables on the teachers' professional growth. So what have been done in this research are first to find out whether teachers' reflectivity and teaching style can predict the students' achievement and then which components of teachers' reflectivity can predict the students' achievement.

The research questions of the current study are as following:

1. Is there any relationship between EFL teacher's reflectivity and their preference of teaching styles?
2. Which components of EFL teachers' reflectivity have more predictive power in predicting teachers' teaching style preference?
3. What is the role of EFL teachers' reflectivity and teaching style in high and low achievers?
4. What is the role of teachers' reflectivity components in the high and low achievers?

1.1. Historical Background

In 1966, the Coleman Report (as cited in Schwerdt & Wuppermann, 2008) found that schools and teachers were not important in determining student achievement when a student's family background and his environment provided by peers and neighborhood were taken into account. Richardson (1990 as cited in Pechaco, 2005) has explained that it was in the 1970s that educators began to show interest for reflection and inquiry. From that time, qualitative research based on ethnography started to grow popularity. Later on, in the 1980's, Donald Schon elaborated Dewey's foundational outlooks on reflection (Pacheco, 2005).

When Shon introduced the concept of reflective practice, many schools,colleges, and departments of education began designing teacher education and professional development programs based on this concept. As the concept gaine dpopularity, some researchers noted that these programs which were incorporated reflective practice in their teacher education programs were focusing on the process of reflective practice while neglecting important content in teacher education. These researchers recommended thatfor a more contextual approach to the concept of reflective practice, it's better to combine Dewey's philosophyon the moral, situational aspects of teaching with Schon's process of reflective teaching (Ferraro, 2001).

1.2. Teacher's Reflectivity

John Dewy known as one of the generators of reflection and defines reflective practice as "active, persistent and careful consideration of any belief and knowledge in the grounds that support it" (Kurt & Atamtürk, 2009). Dewey refers to reflection as a way of helping teachers to use their teaching skills to help students' meaningful learning, thus leading to conscious understanding (Loughran, 2005).

The term "reflective practice," coined by Schon (1987), focuses on the ways people think about their experiences and formulate responses as the experiences happen. This approach makes a clear distinction between "reflection in action" and "reflection on action" (Clarke, 2005). Reflection-in-action is the real life challenges that teachers are faced with while they teach in the classroom. It is those interactions with experience that result in the sudden and unanticipated ways in which we come to see experience differently. Reflection-in-action is understood through 'Phrases like thinking on your feet, and learning by doing and suggest not only that we can think about doing but that we can think about doing something while doing it. Some of the most interesting examples of this process occur in the midst of a performance (Akbari, Behzadpoor & Dadvand, 2010; Loughran, 2005; Russell & Munby, 2005).

On the other hand, reflection-on-action is the reflection of the teachers after the events. The common use of this type of reflection is in groups. It refers to the systematic and deliberate thinking back over one's actions that characterizes much of what we do when we pause after an action and attend to what we believe has occurred. Reflection-on-action is the basis of much of the literature pertaining to reflective teaching and reflective teacher education, and is similar to Dewey's notion of reflection (Akbari, Behzadpoor & Dadvand, 2010; Loughran, 2005; Russell & Munby, 2005).

Jurgen Habermas (1974), like Dewey, also had many things to say about reflection and experience. In his opinion reflective practices is as a way of questioning experience and, in so doing, freeing the mind from unchallenged assumptions. His work is also in line with Schon's in the sense that he believed that knowledge is sought on the basis of self-interest (Ghaye, 2011).

According to Abell et al. (1988 as cited in Yeh, 2004), reflective teaching focuses on teachers' capacities to reconstruct their personal theories with respect to teaching and learning and, further, it maximizes their creative ability to improve their own teaching practices. Thus if a teacher training program is to nurture reflective teachers, it must provide them with realistic opportunities to practice their newly-learned skills in typical classroom setting. Incorporating such practices in a teacher program, however, is often difficult due to time, place, and other constraints (Yeh, 2004).

As Imam Jomeh (2006) declared, reflection does not consist of steps or procedures or a series of fixed principles to be used by teachers. We should change educational system on the basis of research and thinking instead of raising the level of individual's knowledge, so that the students turned into independent and lifelong learners. Hillier (2005), defined lifelong learning as following:

"Lifelong learning, as the name implies, is about learning that takes place throughout a person's life. It is meant to be continuous, and therefore does not stop at the end of compulsory schooling. Lifelong learning is also called lifetime learning, continuing education, and within Europe terms like 'education permanent' attempt to capture the meaning of learning throughout life".

Reflection provides a means for understanding teaching. An essential feature of this involves equipping the emerging teacher with the capacity to understand why certain practices are effective and others are not. For this to take place, a wide variety of professional knowledge is required, which is acquired through discussion, experience and sharing practice with others. A fundamental principle behind the reflective practitioner model of teacher education is the belief that in order to progress as professionals, student teachers not only need to know how to teach in certain ways but also why those methods are effective (Philips, 2007).

McEntee, Appleby, Dowd, Hole, and Silva (2003), declared that reflective practitioners combat passivity, constantly attempting to use their minds and to engage students in the same difficult activity, to dive deeper into their teaching and its effects, rather than drifting on the surface of practice.

1.2.1. Methods of Reflection

Urgenor (2011), outlined two methods of reflection which are as following:

a. Action Research

Reflective practice can be more formally encouraged and directed as action research (Kember & Kelly, 1993). Action research involves systematically changing your teaching using 'on the ground' evidence that suggests the changes you make are in the right direction and enhancing student learning. The target of action research is the teacher, not the change that's being implemented.

b. Guided Reflection

To help progress reflection from dialogic to critical, Johns (1994) developed the concept of guided reflection. This involves engaging with a series of questions that help you to explore and reconsider your motivation or rationale for your actions. These can be designed by a third party or by the individual themselves and serve as a guide through the reflection process. Questions can include: What was I trying to achieve? Why did I do [activity] as I did? What were the consequences of [activity] etc.

1.2.2. Why Critical Reflection is Important?

Leitch and Day (2000), believe that there are three reasons why reflective practice important in the learning life' of the effective teacher. The first raeson is the nature of teaching. The assumption is that since teaching and learning are complex processes and since there is not necessarily one right approach, deliberating among competing versions of good teaching and recasting past understandings and current practices are likely to lead to improvement. The second is that engaging in reflective practice is a means of helping individuals towards greater self-knowledge and self-challenge – 'a useful way of achieving personal development' through. Finally reflective practice is considered to be central to the growth of teachers as inquirers who engage in collaborative research with others from inside and outside the school in generating knowledge of practice rather than finding themselves as objects whose role is to implement existing theory in practice.

1.2.3. Components of Reflective Teaching

Akbari developed a six components model of teachers' reflection that consists of practical, cognitive, meta-cognitive, affective, critical and moral which are as following (Akbari, Behzadpoor & Dadvand, 2010):

Practical element: This component includes those items that deal with the tools and the actual practice of reflection. Different tools/procedures for the reflective practice include 'journal writing,' 'lesson reports,' 'surveys and questionnaires,' 'audio and video recordings,' 'observation,' 'action research,' 'teaching portfolios,' 'group discussions,' 'analyzing critical incidents.

Cognitive element: This element is related to teachers' attempts for developing professional growth. Conducting small-scale classroom research projects, attending conferences and workshops, and reading the professional literature are among the behaviors included in this domain.

Learner element (affective): This component deals with a teacher's reflecting on his/her students, how they are learning and how learners respond or behave emotionally in their classes.

Meta-cognitive element: This component is considered with teachers and their reflections on their own beliefs and personality, the way they define their practice, their own emotional constitutes, etc.

Critical element: This component includes items that refer to the socio-political aspects of teaching and reflections upon those. Items falling in this category are about teachers' reflecting on the political significance of their practice and introducing topics related to race, gender and social class.

Moral element: these items check for teachers' reflecting on moral issues.

1.2.4. Previous Studies of Teachers' Reflectivity

Richards and Lockhart (2007) reported a study which was done by Atamtürk, in which the participants were found to use reflection-in-action more than reflection-on-action. Reflection-on-action was found to be ignored by the majority of the teachers. This level of reflection can be achieved by thinking back our experiences, testing our existing beliefs and questioning decisions and their results. This can be expressed in writing reflective journals, audio journals, action research, and keeping professional portfolios. In a study done by Choy and San Oo (2012), it was found that most of the teachers did not reflect deeply on their teaching practices. They did not seem to practice the four learning processes: assumption analysis, contextual awareness, imaginative speculation and reflective skepticism which were indicative of reflection. It would suggest that critical thinking is practiced minimally among teachers.

Ward and Mc Cotter (2004), in a study analyzed exemplars of student teacher reflection coming from two very different approaches to outcomes-based teacher preparation. They used these exemplars to develop a rubric that illuminates the dimensions and qualities of reflection. This rubric helps clarify how meaningful reflection and an emphasis on learning are not incompatible if the focus is placed on the process of learning, rather than on outcomes alone. Finally, theyconcluded that engagement in the process of reflection and reflection on the moral enterprise of teaching can be considered as important outcomes in their own right.

Golubich (1997 as cited in Pedro, 2001) proposed a conceptual model of a reflective landscape in his study. He examined existing aspects of teaching that deterred or constricted reflective practice. He contended that teaching must be expanded beyond pedagogical practice to include the broader context of schooling and education in a democratic society.

1.3. Teaching Styles

Teacher's style is a permanent character, not dictated by students' learning styles. Teaching style was determined to be part of one's personal make-up and any instructional process that tried to mold how a teacher taught would either encourage and reinforce a preferred style, or generate pressures to modify. The teacher's personality preceded any choice and was always a strong, if not the first, contributing factor to a teaching style (Andrews, 2004). To develop a teaching style, educators must become knowledgeable in certain areas of teaching and in their expert field in order to understand how to transfer learning. Being an expert in one field does not necessarily mean that one knows how to transfer the learning to students. Educators develop their own teaching styles by understanding their own teaching philosophy (Baskas, 2012).

According to Cooper (2001), teacher's personality determines what he or she will do in the classroom and which activities he/she will prefer to do when planning a teaching. So, teaching style preferences can be defined as the whole instructional activities, techniques and approaches that the teacher feels more appropriate when using in the classroom.

Akbari and Bahri (2005) stated that personality factors are used both for process of learning and process of teaching and it has been said that individual differences in personalities can be used in learning style assessment and teaching style prediction. Also it has been said that once individuals know themselves personally, it is easier to understand those who are different from them in terms of personality.

As Sternberg (as cited in Zhang, 2005) mentioned, "just as there are many ways of governing a society, there are many ways of using our abilities. These different ways of using our abilities can be perceived as our thinking styles."

The teaching style is important because it influences students' motivation, emotion, and performance: students from the classes of more supportive teachers show more intrinsic motivation, higher levels of perceived competence and more self-esteem than pupils in the classes of more controlling teachers (Alivernini, Lucidi & Manganeli, 2012).

Hanson and Silver (1998) go so far as to suggest that teachers who rely exclusively on one or two functions are neither effective nor mentally healthy. Such teachers, unable to draw on all of the functions in service of their students, become mired in a pattern of dysfunctional behavior that eventually deteriorates into a distortion of their preferred teaching style (Pajak, 2003).

Studies show that academic achievement, student attitudes, and student behavior at all levels of training can be significantly increased by matching teaching styles to learning styles. This is not to say that the best thing the teacher can do for his students is to use his preferred modes of instruction exclusively. Students will inevitably be invited to deal with problems and challenges that require the use of their less preferred modes, and so should regularly be given practice in the use of those changes (Felder & Henriques, 1995).

1.3.1. Components of Teaching Styles

Cooper (2001) introduced the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) which is the instrument for determining personality type that was developed by Swiss psychologist Carl Jung and two American women, Katharine Briggs and her daughter, Isahel Briggs Myers. Based on this instrument there are four personality dimensions and 16 distinct personality types. MBTI identifies four dichotomies that teacher may prefer in their process of teaching which are as following:

Myers, Mc Caulley, et al. (1998 as cited in Cooper, 2001) describe the four dichotomies or dimensions of personality in detail as following:

Extroversion and introversion (E-I), refer to the individuals attitudes toward life. Extroverts focus their main attention to the outer world, people and objects. On the other hand, introverts focus their attention to the inner world like concepts, ideas and internal experiences.

Sensing and intuition dichotomy (S-N), refer to ways of understanding facts, phenomenon, etc. the sensing style is preference toward observable facts or happening through the existence of five senses. Intuitive style, on the other hand relies more on the meaning, relationships or possibilities that are working beyond the scope of conscious mind.

Thinking and feeling dichotomy (T-F) refer to individual's judgments and decisions about their understanding. The thinking style relies primarily on the process of thinking, i.e. he or she makes decisions on the basis of logical consequences. On the other hand, feeling style relies primarily on the decisions about personal or social values.

Judging and perceiving dichotomy (J-P), refer to the attitudes of individuals in dealing with the outer world.

2. Methodology

In this study, the research method is quantitative and it was carried out within the framework of post-facto design using descriptive and correlational research method.

2.1. Participants

The participants of this study were 70 male and female teachers of Qazvin province who were teaching in the third grade of high-school. The sample consists of 39 (55.7 %) female teachers and 31(44.28 %) male teachers and their age range was approximately 20-35 years.

2.2. Instruments

Three instruments were used for doing this research. The first one was Akbari (2010) questionnaire of reflectivity which consists of 24 items on a 5 Point Liker scale ranging from 1 = never to 5 = always. The subscales which are covered in this questionnaire are practical element, cognitive element, learner (affective) element, meta-cognitive element, critical element and moral element that are specified clearly in the study to recognize different aspects of teacher's reflectivity. The Cronbach alpha reliability of the questionnaire was estimated to be .91. the second one was Cooper (2001) questionnaire of style preference which includes 20 items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree", and the third one was the list of students' final scores that were related to the teachers participated in this study. The test was a standardized test which includes items on spelling, structure (multiple choice and open-ended), vocabulary use, language Functions, pronunciation, reading comprehension (Sentence and text comprehension), and scrambled sentences.

2.3. Procedure

In this study first the two questionnaires were completed by the participants. Then the score list of every teacher was taken by the permission of the authorities. In the next step, the collected data were analyzed through SPSS 20 software. The final step was discussing the results and writing the report.

2.4. Data Analysis

In order to test the hypotheses formulated in this study, different statistical procedures are used. For the first research question, Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used for finding the relationship between teachers' reflectivity and their teaching style.

For the second research question which was whether the subscales of teachers' reflectivity can predict teachers' style, multiple regressions analysis was used. Multiple regressions tell us how much of the variance in the dependent variable (teaching style) can be explained by the independent variables (practical, cognitive, meta-cognitive, affective, critical and moral elements) (Pallant, 2010).

To find the answer of the third research question, logistic regression was used to find out whether the variables of teachers' reflectivity and teaching style can predict students' achievement significantly.

And finally the analysis of the fourth research question is similar to the third one. Logistic regression analysis was used to find out which subscales of teachers' reflectivity can predict students' achievements significantly.

3. Results

The results of the relationship between EFL teachers' reflectivity and their preference of teaching styles using Pearson Correlation Coefficient are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Teachers' reflectivity and their teaching style correlation Coefficient

		reflectivity	style
reflectivity	Pearson Correlation	1	.560**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	70	70
style	Pearson Correlation	.560**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	70	70

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In the above table, the relationship between teachers' reflectivity and their teaching style was investigated using Pearson Product-moment correlation coefficient. The results revealed that there is a positive correlation between the two variables, $r = .56$, $n=70$, $p < .01$.

In the second research question the researcher wanted to clarify which subscales of teachers' reflectivity; practical, cognitive, meta-cognitive, affective, critical, and moral can predict the teaching style significantly. For answering this question, stepwise regression was taken to determine which of the independent variables can predict teachers' style preferences. The results of stepwise multiple regressions are presented in Table 2. and 3.

Table 2. Model Summary[c] for determining how much of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the model

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.501[a]	.251	.240	7.17985	.251	22.732	1	68	.000
2	.580[b]	.337	.317	6.80504	.086	8.697	1	67	.004

a. Predictors: (Constant), moral

b. Predictors: (Constant), moral, affective

c. Dependent Variable: style

Table 3. ANOVAa for assessing the statistical significance of the results

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1171.855	1	1171.855	22.732	.000[b]
	Residual	3505.416	68	51.550		
	Total	4677.271	69			
2	Regression	1574.601	2	787.300	17.001	.000[c]
	Residual	3102.671	67	46.309		
	Total	4677.271	69			

a. Dependent Variable: style

b. Predictors: (Constant), moral

c. Predictors: (Constant), moral, affective

Table 2.and 3. Reveal that model one adjusted to the data F (1.68) =22. 732, p<0.001 which is the moral element that accounts for about 24% variance in teaching style (R2=.240). Also the second subscale i.e. affective element adjusted to the data F (2.67) =17.001, p<0.001 and this subscale along with the moral element account for about 31% variance in teaching style (R2=.317).

Table 4. Coefficients[a] for determining which of the variables included in the model contributed to the prediction of the dependent variable

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	56.299	4.599		12.241	.000	47.122	65.477					
moral	1.391	.292	.501	4.768	.000	.809	1.973	.501	.501	.501	1.000	1.000
(Constant)	51.976	4.599		11.301	.000	42.796	61.156					
moral	.937	.317	.337	2.960	.004	.305	1.569	.501	.340	.294	.763	1.310
affective	.797	.270	.336	2.949	.004	.257	1.336	.500	.339	.293	.763	1.310

a. Dependent Variable: style

Table 4.shows that among the six factors of teachers' reflectivity that were examined in the current study, moral and affective factors came out as the best predicators of teaching style preference.

For answering the third research question which was the role of EFL teachers' reflectivity and teaching style in high and low achievers, binary logistic regression was performed. For doing so, first the average score of every teacher list of scores was taken and then the average score of the whole averages was taken as a determiner score to classify the students into high-achievers and low-achievers. The students' average scores range of every teacher was 8.81-17.50 and the average of these scores was about 13.90. The scores above 13.90 were considered as high-achievers and those below this were considered as low-achievers.

Table 5. Classification Table a, b, results of the analysis without independent variables

Observed			Predicted		
			Categorical dependent		Percentage Correct
			low-achievers	High-achievers	
Step 0	Categorical dependent	Low-achievers 0		30	.0
		High-achievers 0		40	100.0
	Overall Percentage				57.1

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. The cut value is .500

Table 5. is the result of the analysis without any of the independent variables. In this table, headed Block 0, the overall percentage of correctly classified cases is 57.1 percent. We hope that later when our set of predicator variables is entered we will be able to improve the accuracy of these predictions.

Table 6. ClassificationTable[a] for considering the improvement when the predicator variables are included in the model

Observed			Predicted		
			Categorical dependent		Percentage Correct
			Low-achievers	High-achievers	
Step 1	Categorical dependent	Low-achievers	20	10	66.7
		High-achievers	10	30	75.0
	Overall Percentage				71.4

a. The cut value is .500

Table 6.provides an indication of how well the model is able to predict the correct category of teachers' achievement for each case. This table shows how much improvement there is when the predicator variables are included in the model. The model correctly classified 71.4 percent of cases overall, an improvement over the 57.1 percent in Block 0.

Table 7. Variables in the Equation, contribution or importance of each of predicator variables

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I.for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1[a]	reflectivity	.118	.034	11.783	1	.001	1.125	1.052	1.204
	style	.015	.039	.147	1	.702	1.015	.940	1.096
	Constant	-10.282	3.227	10.153	1	.001	.000		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: reflectivity, style.

Table 7.gives us information about the contribution or importance of each of our predicator variables. The Wald column revealed that the reflectivity variable contributes significantly to the predictive ability of the model and also it shows no significant result to the predictive ability of the teaching style.

Direct logistic regression was performed to assess the role of teachers' reflectivity and their teaching style on a likelihood of having high achiever or low achiever students. The model contained two independent variables (teachers' reflectivity and teachers' style).The full model containing all predictors was statistically significant, $\chi 2$ (2, 70) = 24.21, $p < .001$. The model as a whole explained between 29.2 % (Cox and Snell R square) and 39.3% (Nagelkerke R squared) of the variance in students' achievements, and correctly classified 71.4 % of cases. As shown in Table 4.7, only teachers' reflectivity made a unique statistically significant contribution to the model.

For the fourth research question which was the role of teachers' reflectivity components in high and low achievers, again binary logistic regression was used and the procedures of dividing the students to high-achievers and low-achievers was like the previous question but this time the degree of reflectivity components' prediction on students' achievement was considered.

Table 8. Classification Table[a,b], results of the analysis without independent variables

	Observed		Predicted		
			Categorical dependent		Percentage Correct
			Low-achievers	High-achievers	
Step 0	Categorical dependent	Low-achievers	0	30	.0
		high achievers	0	40	100.0
	Overall Percentage				57.1

a. Constant is included in the model.
b. The cut value is .500

Table 8.is the result of the analysis without any of our independent variables. In this table, headed Block 0, the overall percentage of correctly classified cases is 57.1 percent. We hope that later when our set of predicator variables is entered we will be able to improve the accuracy of these predictions.

Table 9. Classification Tablea for considering the improvement when the predicator variables are included in the model

Observed			Predicted		
			Categorical dependent		Percentage Correct
			Low-achievers	High-achievers	
Step 1	Categorical dependent	Low-achievers	20	10	66.7
		High-achievers	9	31	77.5
	Overall Percentage				72.9

a. The cut value is .500

Table 9.provides an indication of how well the model is able to predict the correct category of teachers' achievement for each case. This table shows how much improvement there is when the predicator variables are included in the model. The model correctly classified 72.9 percent of cases overall, an improvement over the 57.1 percent in Block 0.

Table 10. Variables in the Equation, contribution or importance of each of predicator variables

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I.for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1[a]	Practical	.090	.112	.650	1	.420	1.094	.879	1.362
	Cognitive	-.157	.137	1.307	1	.253	.855	.654	1.118
	Meta-cognitive	.500	.161	9.685	1	.002	1.648	1.203	2.258
	Affective	.078	.111	.488	1	.485	1.081	.869	1.344
	Critical	.111	.120	.847	1	.357	1.117	.882	1.414
	Moral	.064	.150	.183	1	.669	1.066	.795	1.429
	Constant	-9.828	2.821	12.139	1	.000	.000		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: practical, cognitive, meta-cognitive, affective, critical, moral.

Table 10.gives us information about the contribution or importance of each of our predicator variables. The Wald column revealed that the meta-cognitive component contribute significantly to the predictive ability of the model.

Direct logistic regression was performed to assess the role of a number of factors on a likelihood of having high achiever students. The model contained six independent variables (practical, cognitive, meta-cognitive, affective, critical, and moral).The full model containing all predictors was statistically significant, $\chi 2$ (6, 70) = 34.14, $p < .001$. The model as a whole explained between 38.6% (Cox and Snell R square) and 51.8% (Nagelkerke R squared) of the variance in students' achievements, and correctly classified 72.9 % of cases. As shown in Table 3, only meta-cognitive component of teachers' reflectivity made a unique statistically significant contribution to the model.

4. Discussion

The results of the relationship between teachers' reflectivity and teaching style showed that these two variables are significantly related. Since the correlation was positive, it may be assumed that teachers with high level of reflectivity can use a variety of teaching style in the classroom and this in turn may lead to positive classroom outcomes. Also Zhang (2007) stated that the variety of teaching styles should not only increase teachers' flexibility of thinking and reduce the restrictiveness of habitual thinking, but also expand students' learning modes. From this statement, it can be assumed that using a variety of teaching style and thinking in teaching or reflective teaching are directly related.

Also the results of multiple regressions showed that from the 6 subscales of teachers' reflectivity; practical, cognitive, meta-cognitive, affective, critical and moral, only two components of moral and affective factors could predict teachers' style. It means that teachers with moral and affective component of teachers' reflectivity can use the variety of teaching style better. For the first effective element which was moral factor which is defined as teachers' reflection on moral issues, Dewey (1909 as cited in Pacheco, 2005) confirmed its effect by suggesting that "a moral individual would treat professional actions as experimental and reflect upon the actions and their consequences". Leitch and Day (2000) clarified Dewey's considerations by explaining that being an effective "reflective practitioner" is more than just improving practice and developing additional competence. A reflective practitioner should have a set of attitudes towards teaching practice based upon broader understandings of self, society and moral purposes (Akbari, Kiani, Imani & Karimi 2008). For the second effective factor which was affective element, it may be assumed that since affective factor deals with the teachers' reflection on his/her students, how they are learning and how learners respond or behave emotionally in the classroom, it may have a good predictive power for the teachers' teaching style because it provides an interpersonal rapport and pays attention to the students' needs and wants.

The results of the first logistic regression showed that from two variables of teachers' reflectivity and their specific style, only the first one could predict the students' high achievement in the classroom. so the more teachers use the skills and methods of reflective teaching, the more high-achiever students they will have in the classroom. Although there is little, if any, empirical research investigating the relationship between teachers' reflectivity and students' achievement, numerous professionals in the field like Shon (1987) have explored the benefits of teachers' effectiveness at the theoretical level and the reflectivity is recognized as the most important schooling factors influencing students' achievement (Akbari et al. 2008). The overall finding of these studies suggests that reflective practice helps to free teachers from impulsive and routine behavior. It helps teachers to build their daily experiences, allows them to act in a deliberate critical and intentional manner, raises their awareness about teaching, enables deeper understanding and triggers positive change (Farrell, 2007). So it can be assumed that the current study is to somehow in line with the previous studies. For the role of teachers' style on students' achievement, the outcome of this regression couldn't predict students' achievement which is in line with a study which was conducted in 2004 by Andrews in which there was no significant correlation between teaching style and teachers' class average percentile of reading achievement scores.

Finally, the results of the second logistic regression revealed that teachers with meta-cognitive characteristics can be the most beneficial teachers in the students' achievement. Akbari and Bahri (2005) stated that practically, very little, if any, empirical research evidence exists on the effectiveness of the teachers in the students' outcome and nobody still knows which set of teacher characteristics raise students' achievement and what qualities of the teacher might contribute to positive students outcomes. Since meta-cognitive element is defined as teachers' reflections on their own beliefs and personality and it's a practice of teachers on their own emotional constitutes, it can be assumed that because the meta-cognitive element is possibly the most comprehensive element among the other elements and teachers with this characteristics may think more on their own works and eventually have more reflective thinking, they may have the more effective classes and more high-achiever students.

5. Pedagogical Implication

The results of this study suggest that teaching the methods of reflective teaching in pre-service and in-service teacher education classes can be a good way for improving the effectiveness of the teachers and eventually for improving the quality of the classes. These classes can familiarize the teachers with reflective approaches to teaching and teach them how to establish professional growth based on students today's needs.

As the finding of the present study imply, reflective teaching is an important concepts in the process of teaching. Language teachers and authorities in pre-service and in-services classes and also workshops may benefit from the findings of this study.

6. Suggestions for Further Research

The present study considered the correlations and relationships between the reflectivity and style of the teachers and students' achievements with some possible limitations. But reflectivity of the teachers is an important issue and the researchers can go further and do some practical studies and put it into practical works with conducting some beneficial treatments in the classroom. Murphy (2001) introduced 5 ways for putting the reflective teaching into practice which are five-minute papers, teacher assessment surveys, student focus groups, retrospective field notes and non-supervisory peer feedback. Each of these ways is useful for getting the experiential results from reflectivity. It is hoped that the findings of this study be an incentive for other researchers to know the importance of teachers' reflectivity and their style and do not neglect the impressive role of teachers in the process of teaching and finally do some practical work to show the impact of these elements in practice.

A second suggestion for future research is to repeat this exact study with a larger population in order to increase generalizability. Repeating the study using a greater population of Iran school teachers would be one suggestion as well as repeating the study in another state that has different students' achievement evaluation.

A third suggestion is considering the role of teachers' style component which were specified in Cooper questionnaire of teaching style preference on the students' achievements to find out what kinds of teachers with what style of teaching can manage the classes better and have high-achiever students.

7. Conclusions

The current study investigated the role of teachers' reflectivity and their specific style on students' achievement. The findings revealed that teachers' reflectivity is an important concept in the process of teacher education and teachers with this characteristic can have professional growth in their work and have more effective classes than those with routine way of teaching. Also it can be concluded that teachers' reflectivity and its subscales have some positive role in students' achievement, it means that the reflective teachers in the process of teaching often get the better outcomes based on the students' scores. Moreover it was revealed that reflective teachers use the variety of teaching style in their teaching that this factor in its turn can lead to positive results in the classroom.

References

Akbari, R., & Bahri, H. (2005).The Relationship between Teaching Style and Personality Type of Iranian EFL Teachers. *Archive of SID, 8(1).*

Akbari, R., & Kiany, G., &Imani Naeeni, M., & KarimiAlvar, N. (2008).Teachers' Teaching Styles, Sense of Efficacy and Reflectivity as Correlates of Students' Achievement Outcomes. *Archive of SID, IJAL, 11(1).*

Akbari, R., Behzadpoor, F., & Dadvand, B. (2010). Development of English Language Teaching Reflection Inventory. *System, 38,* 211-227.

Alivernini, F., Lucidi, F., & Manganelli, S. (2012). The validation of a scale measuring teaching styles in the Italian context. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *46*, 1487-1490.

Andrews, J. (2004). *Teacher Certification, Teaching Style, And Student Achievement in Arizona Charter Schools.* Arizona, U.S.A : Liberty University, Ph.D. Dissertation.

Atamtürk, A. (2009). MIP instances. *University of California, Berkeley http://www. ieor. berkeley. edu/~ atamturk/data.*

Baskas, R. (2012).Compare and Contrast Principles of Practice. *Walden University.*

Choy, C., & SanOo, P. (2012). Reflective thinking and teaching practices: a precursor for incorporating critical thinking into the classroom. *International Journal of Instruction, 5(1), 167-182.*

Clarke, J. (2005). Reflective Teaching Model: A Tool for Motivation, Collaboration, Self-reflection, and Innovation in Learning. *Georgia State University.*

Cooper, T. (2001). Foreign Language Teaching Style and Personality. *Foreign Language Annals, 34(4)301-16.*

Dewey, J. (1933). How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educational process. *Lexington, MA: Heath*.

Farrell, T. (2007).*Reflective Language Teaching: From Research to Practice.* Continuum, Canada.

Felder, R., & Henriques, E. (1995). Learning and Teaching Styles in Foreign and Second Language Education. *Foreign Language Annals, 28*(1), 21–31.

Ferraro, J. (2001): Reflective Practice and Professional Development**.** The Educational Resources information center (ERIC). Digest Number: 00-3.

Ghaye, T. (2011).*Teaching and Learning through Reflective Practice*. Routledge, Tyalor and Francis Group, London and New York.

Habermas, J. (1974). Rationalism divided in two: a reply to Albert. *Positivism and Sociology. London: Heinemann Educational Books*.

Hillier, Y. (2005). *Reflective Teaching in Further and Adult Education.* Continuum, London.

Imam Jomeh, M. (2006). *Examining Reflective Teaching Approaches: Presenting Theoretical framework of Reflective Teacher Training Curriculum and Comparing to Teacher Training Curriculum Approach of Iran.* Tehran, Iran: ShahidRajaie University, Ph.D. dissertation.

Johns, M. W. (1994). Sleepiness in different situations measured by the Epworth Sleepiness Scale. *SLEEP-NEW YORK-*, *17*, 703-703.

Kember, D., & Kelly, M., (1993). Improving Teaching Through Action Research Herdsa Green Guide, 14

Kurt, M., & Atamtürk, N. (2009). Reflective Practice and its Role in Stimulating Personal and Professional Growth. *ZaidOdeh, Arab American University.*

Leitch, R., & Day, C. (2000).Action Research and Reflective Practice: towards a holistic view. *Educational Action Research, 8(1).*

Loughran, J. (2005). *Developing Reflective Practice: Learning about Teaching and Learning through Modeling.* Palmer Press, London, Washington, D.C.

McEntee, G., & Appleby, J., & Dowd, J., & Grant, G., & Hole, S., & Silva, P. (2003). *At the Heart of Teaching, A Guide to Reflective Practice.* Teachers College Press, Columbia University, New York and London.

Murphy, J.M., (2001). Reflective teaching in ELT. In: CelceMurcia, M. (Ed.), Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. Heinle & Heinle, Boston, 499-514.

Opdenakker, M., & Damme, J. (2006). Teacher characteristics and teaching styles as effectiveness enhancing factors of classroom practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education.*

Pacheco, A. (2005). Reflective Teaching and its impact on Foreign Language Teaching. *RevistaElectrónica, Numero Extraordinario 5.*

Pajak, E. (2003). *Honoring Diverse Teaching Styles.* ASCD, United States of America.

Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS Survival Manual.* Open University Press, Australia

Pedro, J. (2001). *Reflection in teacher education: exploring pre-service teacher's meanings of reflective practice*. Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Ph.D. dissertation.

Philips, R. (2007). *Reflective Teaching of History 11-18.* SAGE, New York, London.

Richards, J., & Lockhart, C. (2007). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms.* Cambridge University Press, New York.

Russell, T., & Munby, H. (2005). *Teachers and Teaching: From Classroom to Reflection.* London, TheFalmer Press.

Schön, D.A. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions. *San Francisco*.

Schwerdt, G., &Wuppermann, A. (2008). Do Teaching Practices Influence Student Achievement? *University of Munich.*

Urgenor, P. (2011). Tutor, Demonstrator and Coordinator Development at UCD.*Dublin, UCD Teaching and Learning.*

Van Manen, M. (1977). Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical. *Curriculum inquiry*, *6*(3), 205-228.

Ward, J., &MacCotter, S. (2004). Reflection as a Visible Outcome for Pre-service Teachers. *Teaching and teacher Education, 20 (3), 243-257.*

Yayli, D. (2009). Reflective practices of preservice teachers in a listening skill course in an ELT department. *Procedia, Social and Behavioral Sciences, 1 (1), 1820-1824.*

Yeh, U. (2004). Nurturing Reflecting Teaching during Critical Thinking Instruction in a Computer Simulation Program. *NationalChengchi University, Taiwan.*

Zhang, L. (2007). Do personality traits make a difference in teaching styles among Chinese high school teachers? *Personality and Individual Differences43, 669-679.*

Zhang, L., & Huang, J. & Zhang, L. (2005). Preferences in Teaching Styles Among Hong Kong and US University Students. *Personality and Individual Differences 39, 1319-1331.*