

سلام الله عليكم



Tarbiat Modares University (TMU)

**TEFL Department
Faculty of Humanities**

**Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in
Teaching English as a Foreign Language**

**Developing a Typology of Second Language Teachers: Patterning the
Variations**

By
Nabi Karimi (Allvar)

Supervisor
Dr. Ramin Akbari

First Advisor
Dr. Gholam Reza Kiany

Second Advisor:
Dr. Mohsen Imani Naeni

Autumn- 1388

تأییدیه اعضای هیأت داوران حاضر در جلسه دفاع از رساله دکتری

اعضای هیأت داوران نسخه نهایی رساله آقای / خانم نبی کریمی تحت عنوان:
طراحی مدل تیپولوژیکی معلمان آموزش زبان انگلیسی: الگو پردازی تفاوتها

را از نظر شکل (فرم) و محتوی بررسی نموده و پذیرش آن را برای دریافت درجه دکتری تخصصی (Ph.D) پیشنهاد می کنند.

ردیف	اعضای هیأت داوران	نام و نام خانوادگی	رتبه علمی	امضا
1	استاد راهنما	دکتر رامین اکبری	استادیار	
2	استاد مشاور	دکتر غلامرضا کیانی	دانشیار	
7	استاد مشاور	دکتر محسن ایمانی نایینی	استادیار	
4	استاد ناظر (داخلی)	دکتر سید محمد علوی	دانشیار	
5	استاد ناظر (داخلی)	دکتر عباسعلی رضایی	استادیار	
6	استاد ناظر (خارجی)	دکتر پرویز بیرجندی	استاد	
7	استاد ناظر (خارجی)	دکتر سوسن مرندی	استادیار	
8	نماینده تحصیلات تکمیلی	دکتر رضا غفارثمر	استادیار	

آیین‌نامه حق مالکیت مادی و معنوی در مورد نتایج پژوهش‌های علمی

دانشگاه تربیت مدرس

مقدمه: با عنایت به سیاست‌های پژوهشی و فناوری دانشگاه در راستای تحقق عدالت و کرامت انسانها که لازمه شکوفایی علمی و فنی است و رعایت حقوق مادی و معنوی دانشگاه و پژوهشگران، لازم است اعضای هیأت علمی، دانشجویان، دانش‌آموختگان و دیگر همکاران طرح، در مورد نتایج پژوهش‌های علمی که تحت عناوین پایان‌نامه، رساله و طرح‌های تحقیقاتی با هماهنگی دانشگاه انجام شده است، موارد زیر را رعایت نمایند:

ماده 1- حق نشر و تکثیر پایان‌نامه/ رساله و درآمدهای حاصل از آنها متعلق به دانشگاه می‌باشد ولی حقوق معنوی پدید آورندگان محفوظ خواهد بود.

ماده 2- انتشار مقاله یا مقالات مستخرج از پایان‌نامه/ رساله به صورت چاپ در نشریات علمی و یا ارائه در مجامع علمی باید به نام دانشگاه بوده و با تایید استاد راهنمای اصلی، یکی از اساتید راهنما، مشاور و یا دانشجو مسئول مکاتبات مقاله باشد. ولی مسئولیت علمی مقاله مستخرج از پایان‌نامه و رساله به عهده اساتید راهنما و دانشجو می‌باشد.

تبصره: در مقالاتی که پس از دانش‌آموختگی بصورت ترکیبی از اطلاعات جدید و نتایج حاصل از پایان‌نامه/ رساله نیز منتشر می‌شود نیز باید نام دانشگاه درج شود.

ماده 3- انتشار کتاب، نرم افزار و یا آثار ویژه (اثری هنری مانند فیلم، عکس، نقاشی و نمایشنامه) حاصل از نتایج پایان‌نامه/ رساله و تمامی طرح‌های تحقیقاتی کلیه واحدهای دانشگاه اعم از دانشکده‌ها، مراکز تحقیقاتی، پژوهشکده‌ها، پارک علم و فناوری و دیگر واحدها باید با مجوز کتبی صادره از معاونت پژوهشی دانشگاه و براساس آئین‌نامه‌های مصوب انجام شود.

ماده 4- ثبت اختراع و تدوین دانش فنی و یا ارائه یافته‌ها در جشنواره‌های ملی، منطقه‌ای و بین‌المللی که حاصل نتایج مستخرج از پایان‌نامه/ رساله و تمامی طرح‌های تحقیقاتی دانشگاه می‌باشد، باید با هماهنگی استاد راهنما یا مجری طرح از طریق معاونت پژوهشی دانشگاه انجام گیرد.

ماده 5- این آیین‌نامه در 5 ماده و یک تبصره در تاریخ 87/4/1 در شورای پژوهشی و در تاریخ 87/4/23 در هیأت رئیسه دانشگاه به تایید رسید و در جلسه مورخ 87/7/15 شورای دانشگاه به تصویب رسیده و از تاریخ تصویب در شورای دانشگاه لازم‌الاجرا است.

آیین نامه چاپ پایان نامه (رساله) های دانشجویان دانشگاه تربیت مدرس

نظر به اینکه چاپ و انتشار پایان نامه (رساله) های تحصیلی دانشجویان دانشگاه تربیت مدرس، مبین بخشی از فعالیت های علمی - پژوهشی دانشگاه است بنابراین به منظور آگاهی و رعایت حقوق دانشگاه، دانش آموختگان این دانشگاه نسبت به رعایت موارد ذیل متعهد می شوند:

ماده 1: در صورت اقدام به چاپ پایان نامه (رساله) ی خود، مراتب را قبلاً به طور کتبی به «دفتر نشر آثار علمی» دانشگاه اطلاع دهد.

ماده 2: در صفحه سوم کتاب (پس از برگ شناسنامه) عبارت ذیل را چاپ کند:
«کتاب حاضر، حاصل پایان نامه کارشناسی ارشد/ رساله دکتری نگارنده در رشته آموزش زبان انگلیسی است که در سال 89/88 در دانشکده ادبیات و علوم انسانی دانشگاه تربیت مدرس به راهنمایی سرکار خانم/جناب آقای دکتر رامین اکبری، مشاوره سرکار خانم/جناب آقای دکتر غلامرضا کیانی و مشاوره سرکار خانم/جناب آقای دکتر محسن ایمانی نایینی از آن دفاع شده است.»

ماده 3: به منظور جبران بخشی از هزینه های انتشارات دانشگاه، تعداد یک درصد شمارگان کتاب (در هر نوبت چاپ) را به «دفتر نشر آثار علمی» دانشگاه اهدا کند. دانشگاه می تواند مازاد نیاز خود را به نفع مرکز نشر در معرض فروش قرار دهد.

ماده 4: در صورت عدم رعایت ماده 3، 50٪ بهای شمارگان چاپ شده را به عنوان خسارت به دانشگاه تربیت مدرس، تأدیه کند.

ماده 5: دانشجو تعهد و قبول می کند در صورت خودداری از پرداخت بهای خسارت، دانشگاه می تواند خسارت مذکور را از طریق مراجع قضایی مطالبه و وصول کند؛ به علاوه به دانشگاه حق می دهد به منظور استیفای حقوق خود، از طریق دادگاه، معادل وجه مذکور در ماده 4 را از محل توقیف کتابهای عرضه شده نگارنده برای فروش، تأمین نماید.

ماده 6: اینجانب نبی کریمی دانشجوی رشته آموزش زبان انگلیسی مقطع دکتری

تعهد فوق و ضمانت اجرایی آن را قبول کرده، به آن ملتزم می شوم.

نام و نام خانوادگی: نبی کریمی

تاریخ و امضا:

Dedicated to:

My Most Efficacious and Reflective Teacher:

Dr. Ramin Akbari

Acknowledgements

There are many who, in one way or another, contributed to the successful accomplishment of my dissertation. The list of individuals is extended and under the risk of omission. Any oversight is unintended.

First of all, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my knowledgeable supervisor, **Dr. Ramin Akbari**, for the continuous support, encouragement, invaluable guidance, and thoughtful feedback which gave me the required confidence to carry forward and complete this dissertation. You are the one who cheered for me whether I had taken a baby step or leapt the highest hurdle. Your faith in me never wavered as you encouraged me when I got really tired and wondered if it was all worthwhile. Your peace in the time of trouble was amazing to watch and provided me with courage when I was momentarily paralyzed by thought of the next step. I cannot express how touched I have been by your sincerity and commitment to education and raising standards. You are truly one who has and will continue to make a difference in this world. You have had a tremendous impact on my academic life and provided me with many lessons. I cannot find adequate words of appreciation to acknowledge all your goodness. I just say “Thank you for having the strength to carry on. I will never forget you!”

I would also like to cordially thank **Dr. Gholam Reza Kiany** for being my advisor and mentor both in this dissertation and in all my years at Tarbiat Modares University. You are the person who taught me how to get meaning out of the nonsensical numbers. You are an inspiration to all in your goodness, grace, and “go get them” attitude, which has always been encouraging to me. From you I have learned how to be positive, helpful, cooperative, considerate and kind towards my own students. You are a remarkable professor. I will cherish your thought in my mind forever.

My deep appreciation also goes to **Dr. Reza Ghafar Samar**, the esteemed head of the English Department of Tarbiat Modares University. You are the professor who taught me how to appreciate and enjoy the subtleties of language use in society. You have been a great source of inspiration to me during my educational journey at TMU. Your thought will ring in my mind well beyond graduation.

I also acknowledge the sincere cooperation of **Dr. Mohsen Imani Naeeni**, whom I was honored to know from the beginning of working on this dissertation. Your moral support was a great source of courage. Thank you!

I would also like to welcome this opportunity to commemorate the unforgettable memory of my late professor, **Dr. Seyyed Akbar Mirhassani**, whose kind fatherly words of encouragements I shall never forget. May God bless his soul!

I would also like to welcome the opportunity to express my heartfelt gratitude to my wife who tolerated all the hardships and loneliness during the four years of my Ph.D. You were a great source of inspiration.

My sincere thanks should as well be extended to my dear classmates, **Mr. Goudarz Alibakhshi and Ms. Sara Jalali**, who always understood what each step meant along the way. Your turn is coming and we can celebrate doctor to doctor. I am so very proud of you and love you more than you can know.

Last but not the least, I am most appreciative to the many classroom teachers who completed surveys that provided necessary information and also those whose classes I video-recorded. Friends and co-workers also offered support and encouragement all along the way.

Everyone's contribution is valued; I am indebted to you all.

Abstract

Despite the long and rich history of typology research (Fisher and Ransom, 1995) and its wide application to understanding diverse groups of populations, the logic of typological thinking has been left underappreciated in teacher studies and at times when the term has been used with reference to teachers in the educational literature, it has come to carry the simplistic meaning of an intuitive ordinary classification (e.g. Jay and Johnson, 2002; Chadbourne, 2003). Thus, to make up for the dearth of research in this area, the present study aimed at developing an empirical typology of English language teachers. To this aim, 400 Iranian English language teachers, teaching at both private language institutes and high schools from across the country, participated in the study by filling out questionnaires measuring five important teacher-related variables (teacher's personality structure, degree of reflectivity, self efficacy, attitude to professional development, and teaching style). A Two-Step Cluster Analysis run for the purpose of analysing the data revealed the existence of three clusters of teachers among the community of ELT teachers and K-Means Clustering Technique handed in the performance profile (relative share of each cluster on the variables investigated) for each cluster of teachers. The characteristics of each of these clusters of teachers are enumerated based on their performance profiles and with reference to theoretical and empirical literature.

Besides that, the study also aimed at testing the newly-developed typology to find out which of the clusters of teachers would have a better academic performance tested through the lens of student achievement. To investigate this question, the researcher selected 90 students enrolled for "Level 1 Interchange Intro" in four institutes in Ilam as the participants, in three groups. The three groups of the participants, after receiving a pre-test, were taught by nine teachers, each three of them representing one of the three types of teachers, for 10 sessions and then received a pos-test. One-way ANOVA, run for this purpose, attested to the significant effect of teacher type on students' achievement outcomes.

To answer the third question of the study, we selected six teachers, each two of them representing one of the three types, as the participants. Attempts were made to select the participant teachers who were almost equal in terms of academic degree, class level, the coursework taught, and experience.

Stimulated Recall Technique was used for data collection purpose. Identification of the dominant thought categories of the three clusters of teachers was carried out by segmenting, coding and categorizing them. The analyses revealed that Language Management (35%), Procedure Check (12.73), Affective (12.16), Self-Reflection (7.22), and Progress Review (6.63) were the dominant categories of Type A teachers. Language Management (40.33), Procedure Check (12.10), Affective (11.46), and Progress Review (6.79), comprised the dominant categories of Type B teachers. Self-Reflection, which forms the fourth dominant pedagogical thought category (henceforth: PTC) of Type A teachers, is excluded from Type B teachers' list of dominant PTCs. Type C teachers' dominant PTCs included Language Management (41.60), Procedure Check (10.70), Progress Review (6.81), and Note Behaviour (6.32).

After that, the statistical significance of the dominant PTCs list was tested. The results of chi-square analyses revealed the existence of a significant difference among the three types of teachers in terms of the frequency with which they produced pedagogical thoughts.

Table of Contents

Nomenclature	Page
Table of Contents.....	I
List of Tables.....	II
Lists of Graphs.....	IV
1. Introduction and Overview	1
1.1. Introduction	2
1.2. Typology Research	4
1.3. Statement of the Problem	5
1.4. Questions of the Study	9
1.5. Hypotheses of the Study.....	10
1.6. Significance of the Study	10
1.7. Operational Definitions of the Technical Terms	14
1.8. Limitations of the Study	16
1.9. Organization of the Remainder of the Study	18
2. Review of the Related Theory and Literature.....	19
2.1. The Importance of Teacher in Pedagogical Programs	20
2.2. Teacher's Degree of Reflectivity	23
2.2.1. Defining Reflectivity	23
2.2.2. The Benefits and Effects of Reflective Practice	29
2.2.3. How Teachers Develop Reflective Ability	37
2.3. Teacher Efficacy	40
2.3.1. The Theoretical Background: Bandura's (1986) Social Cognitive Theory	41
2.3.2. Defining General Efficacy and Teacher Efficacy	47
2.3.3. The Effects of Teacher Sense of Efficacy on Teaching Effectiveness and Students' Achievement	50
2.4. Teacher Professional Development	55
2.4.1. Defining Professional Development	55
2.4.2. Quality and Appropriate Time for Professional Development	57
2.4.3. Models of Professional Development	59
2.4.4. The Impacts of Professional Development on Teacher and Student Performance	62

2.5. Teacher's Teaching Style	65
2.5.1. Definition and Theoretical Conceptualization of Teaching Style.....	66
2.5.2. The Effects of Teaching Style on Teacher and Student Performance	70
2.6. Teacher Personality Structure	73
2.6.1. Personality Defined	74
2.6.2. An Overview of the Five-Factor Model of Personality	76
2.6.3. The Impacts of Teacher Personality on Teacher Effectiveness and Student Outcomes	82
2.7. Teacher's Knowledge Structure	85
2.7.1. Pedagogical Knowledge Base.....	85
2.7.2. Pedagogical Knowledge Base in the Literature	88
3. Methodology.....	92
3.1. Introduction	93
3.2. Participants of the Study	93
3.3. Sample Size	96
3.4. Sampling Procedure	97
3.5. Instrumentation	97
3.5.1. Big Five Personality Inventory (NEO-FFI)	97
3.5.2. Lowman's (1995) Two-Dimensional Teaching Style Scale....	98
3.5.3. Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)	98
3.5.4. Teachers' Attitudes about Professional Development Scale (TAP).....	99
3.5.5. Teacher Reflectivity Questionnaire	99
3.5.6. Stimulated-Recall Technique	100
3.5.7. The Pre-Test	100
3.5.8. The Achievement Post-Test	101
3.6. Design	101
3.7. Data Collection	104
3.7.1. First Question	104
3.7.2. Second Question	104
3.7.3. Third Question	104
3.8. Data Analysis	105
3.8.1. First question	105
3.8.2. Second Question	106
3.8.3. Third Question	106
3.9. Procedure	108
3.9.1. First Question	108

3.9.2. Second Question	108
3.9.3. Third Question	109
4. Results and Discussion.....	111
4.1. Introduction	112
4.2. Investigation and Analysis of Hypothesis One	113
4.2.1. Characteristics of Type 1 (Type A) Teachers	117
4.2.2. Characteristics of Type 3 (Type C) Teachers	121
4.2.3. Characteristics of Type 2 (Type B) Teachers	124
4.3. Investigation and Analysis of the Second Hypothesis	127
4.4. Investigation and Analysis of the Third Hypothesis	142
4.4.1. Dominant Pedagogical Thought Categories of the Three Teacher Types	145
4.4.2. Comparing Teachers' Total Number of PTCs	147
4.4.3. Comparing Dominant PTCs across the Types of Teachers....	152
5. Summary, Suggestions and Implications.....	158
5.1. Introduction	159
5.2. Overview of the Study	159
5.3. Pedagogical Implications of the Study	165
5.3.1. Implications for ELT Teacher Education	165
5.3.2. Implications for ELT Research	166
5.3.3. Implications for ELT Teacher Recruitment	166
5.4. Directions for Further Research and Investigation	167
References	170
Appendix A.....	194
Appendix B.....	204
Appendix C.....	207

List of Tables

Table 1-1 Personality dimensions and the poles of traits they form.....	79
Table 4-1 The Number of Teachers per Cluster.....	114
Table 4-2 Initial Cluster Centers.....	115
Table 4-3 Iteration History	116
Table 4-4 Relative Contribution of the Variables to Each Cluster	116
Table 4-5 Number of Cases in Each Cluster.....	117
Table 4-6 The Descriptive Statistics of the Three Clusters (Pre-Test).....	128
Table 4-7 One-Way ANOVA Results (Pre-Test).....	128
Table 4-8 The Descriptive Statistics of the Three Clusters (Post-Test).....	129
Table 4-9 One-Way ANOVA Results (Post-Test).....	129
Table 4-10 Post-Hoc ANOVA Results.....	129
Table 4-11 Homogeneous Subsets.....	130
Table 4-12 Categories of Pedagogical Knowledge Base of Type "A" Teachers (Raw Frequency and Percent).....	143
Table 4-13 Categories of Pedagogical Knowledge Base of Type "B" Teachers (Raw Frequency and Percent).....	144
Table 4-14 Categories of Pedagogical Knowledge Base of Type "C" Teachers (Raw Frequency and Percent).....	145
Table 4-15 Chi-Square Test for the Total Number of PTCs of the Three Types of Teachers.....	148
Graph 4-1 Bar Graph for the Total Number of PTCs of the Three Types of Teachers.....	149
Table 4-16 Chi-Square Test for the Total Number of PTCs of Type A and Type C Teachers.....	149
Table 4-17 Chi-Square Test for the Total Number of PTCs of Type B and Type C Teachers.....	150
Table 4-18. Chi-Square Test for the Total Number of PTCs of Type A and Type B Teachers.....	151
Table 4-19 The Edited Table of Chi-Square Results.....	152

Lists of Graphs

Figure 1-1 Reflective Teaching Cycle.....37

Chapter 1

Introduction and Overview

Developing a Typology of Second Language Teachers: Patterning the Variations

“Taxonomy is always a contentious issue because the world does not come to us in neat little packages” (S. J. Gould, 1981, p. 158).

1-1 Introduction

The prospective success and health of any profession rests in its efforts to recruit vibrant, highly effective and efficient members (Travers, 1999). Teaching is no exception in this respect, as the success of teaching and any pedagogical program is believed to lie, to a significant extent, with the people doing it, i.e. the teachers (Sanders and Rivers 1996; Goldhaber, 2002; Alexander and Fuller 2005; etc). Much along this line of thought, there has recently emerged a substantial theoretical and practical shift of emphasis, mostly in mainstream education, toward acknowledging that teachers are among the principal components of any pedagogical program and that they are said to be any educational system's principal resources (Wayne and Youngs, 2003). Concomitant with this shift of emphasis, in the past ten years, a burgeoning research base has provided increasing empirical evidence that teachers are the most important factors influencing student achievement and that they hold the key means to seal the gaps in students' achievement outcomes (Sanders, 1998, 2000; Ferguson, 1991, 1998; Goldhaber, 2002).

No one can, indeed, claim that recruiting highly qualified teachers does not contribute to the success of any pedagogical program. In the words of Alexander (2005), few, if at all, educators “would argue with the contention that all things being equal, highly qualified

teachers produce greater student achievement than comparatively less qualified teachers” (p.2).

This claim can be supported from both intuitions and reflections on the matter and the results of empirical studies carried out mostly in the mainstream education, all pointing out that a substantial portion of the variance in student learning is attributable to teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2000). This is best manifested in Sanders (1998) who concludes that the “single largest factor affecting academic growth of populations of students is differences in effectiveness of individual classroom teachers” (P. 27).

Although late relative to mainstream education, the issue of teacher quality and effectiveness in the field of second language pedagogy has also come to be seriously acknowledged (Freeman and Johnson, 1998). But despite the importance of teacher effectiveness in bringing about significant gains in student achievement, few, if any, attempts have been made to get to know teachers in terms of effective or ineffective performance and educational/ instructional success or failure in second language pedagogy. Educationalists, administrators, policy-makers and stake-holders, institutions, educational leaders, etc. still do not know how to distinguish effective and ineffective teachers; what teachers to recruit and which teachers best serve their purpose. This is, to a large extent, due to the fact that there is not yet a neat classificatory model categorizing teachers in terms of their characteristics and attributes to impose parsimony on the unruly, unexplained and unaccounted-for variation among the teachers (Guarino, Santibanez, and Daley, 2006). The existence of such a classificatory system, which we call a *typology* in the present study, is something definitely missing both in the mainstream education and in second language pedagogy.

1-2 Typology Research

Typology research is not novel; it has a long and rich history (Fisher and Ransom, 1995). It has been applied to a wide range of groups of people and has aided the understandings of many populations including rapists (Groth, 1979), wife batterers (Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart, 1994), compulsive buyers (DeSarbo and Edwards, 1996), alcohol-dependent men (Johnson, et al., 1996), burglars (Vaughn, et al., 2008), heroin addicts and their families (Cancrini, et al., 1988), newly married couples (Goodrich, Ryder, and Rausch, 1968), community-based couples (Fitzpatrick, 1988), criminals (Levin and McDevitt, 1993), women experiencing miscarriage (Wai Elsie, 2007), entrepreneurs (Miner, 1997), families (Fisher and Ransom, 1995), and even pathological gamblers (Blaszczynski and Nower, 2001). Typology research acknowledges the existence of specific subtypes of individuals, with individuals in each subtype being influenced by different factors and yet displaying similar phenomenological features (Blaszczynski and Nower, 2001). It enables the classifications and descriptions of individuals rather than variables (Olson, 1981), and allows researchers to group individuals with similar characteristics into subgroups of a larger sample (Stith, Jester, and Bird, 1992). Treating the populations of interest as a single homogeneous group can mask the effects of independent variables, which may differ across various subgroups (DeSarbo and Edwards, 1996); the main purpose of typology research is to solve this masking problem. Having grouped individuals into various subtypes, one may look into the effects of independent variables in each subtype separately. Since specific attempts can be made to compare various subgroups and to pinpoint how each group differs from the other, it is possible to observe the different processes underlying the subject matter (Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rahman,

and Stuart, 2000). They integrate what may otherwise appear to be unrelated information in ways that can take on new meaning (Lorr, 1983). While typology research has been an important issue in many disciplines, the logic of typological thinking has been underappreciated in teacher studies and wherever the term typology has been used with reference to teachers in the literature, it tends to get the simplistic meaning of an intuitive ordinary classification (e.g. Baratta, 2001; Jay and Johnson, 2002; Chadbourne, 2003).

1-3 Statement of the Problem and Purpose of the Study

Concomitant to the high importance and paramount status attached to teacher and teaching effectiveness is the realization that every educational institution should focus on the recruitment and retention of effective teachers and that every classroom should be staffed with a highly qualified and effective teacher. But, as mentioned earlier, empirical evidence is not always clear regarding the characteristics of effective teachers and how to go about distinguishing teachers in terms of acceptable or unacceptable performance in teaching and the matter is blurred by the confusion surrounding it (Guarino, Santibanez, and Daley, 2006). Part of this confusion can definitely stem from the bewildering diversity among teachers which makes it really difficult for administrators and educational stakeholders to know what type of teachers best serve their purpose. A look at any other field including psychology, biology, botany, sociology, linguistics and even mainstream education reveals that almost all sciences have employed typological classifications of their subject matter (Jung, 1981). There have been some few inconsistent attempts, in second language education, at classifying and categorizing teachers based mostly on one specific source of variation like teaching style, personality, thinking style, etc, (Brown, 2000).