Individual Difference Theory in Faculty Development: What Faculty Developers Should Know about Style

Betty Lou Leaver

Rebecca L. Oxford

Over the past three decades and more, growing attention has been paid to the need to tailor instruction to meet the differing learning and affective styles of students. However, little has been written about doing the same for faculty.

Typically, the purpose of faculty development is to empower new and experienced teachers by providing information, enhancing self-confidence, and developing attitudes and beliefs favorable to effective teaching. Such empowerment usually requires teachers to change their teaching behaviors— and change does not come automatically or identically to all teachers. Rather, "teachers change in areas [in which] they are already primed to change, and this priming depends on their individual characteristics and prior experiences" (Pennington 1996, 340).

Obviously, then, faculty development is more successful when developers plan programs sensitive to individual differences among the teachers they are instructing (Leaver and Oxford 2000). One of the most frequent causes of supervisor error in the workplace, according to Van Fleet (1973), is failure to treat employees as individuals. Likewise, one of the most significant sources of failure in faculty development is failure to treat faculty as individuals. "Attempts to influence teachers' behavior will have an impact only in areas where the input is valued and salient to the individual, and where it is congruent with and interpretable within, the teacher's own world of thought and action" (Pennington 1996, 340).

The failure of faculty developers to treat teachers as individuals is ironic, given that in recent years much has become known about the individualized nature of learning (see Ehrman, in this volume, for a discussion of psychological variables in foreign-language learning and their application to

learning and teaching in the classroom). As more teachers become familiar with individual difference theories and the various ways in which students learn, more classrooms are reflecting lessons that accommodate diversity.[1]

Language program managers, however, even those who advocate learner-centered instruction, typically treat teachers as though they were all cut from the same cloth. While the best of them may expect teachers to incorporate learner differences into lesson planning and conduct, too infrequently do they take such differences into account when structuring their own faculty development activities.[2] Typically, a given lecture, discussion, workshop, or project approach is selected for all teachers, and that choice is dictated by the faculty developer's preference, logistical needs, or other requirements. Yet, if experience with successful learning in foreign-language classrooms is any example,[3] faculty development programs are better if they are specially designed to optimize the growth of teachers who very likely differ significantly.[4]

This article focuses on (1) the current state of faculty development for foreign-language teachers, (2) individual difference theory in regard to learning styles, (3) general faculty development structures and how individual differences apply to those structures, and (4) teacher empowerment as the overarching goal of faculty development. Many examples in this article come from the United States, but the main principles apply equally well to teacher development around the world and are especially applicable to situations in which staffs employ teachers from two or more cultures.

---

[1]In fact, much of the movement to redesign the current "obsolete" system of education in the US focuses on individual differences in the learning process (Wagner 2003; Kegan and Lahey 2001). Not focusing on individual differences is now obsolete!

[2]In fact, except for our own work, to date no major book chapter or article has addressed this topic.

[3]Several programs have reported improved outcomes after the introduction of learner-centered instruction (Ehrman 1996; Leaver 1986; Robin 1999).

[4]Moreover, teachers who are taught in differentiated ways receive models of how to differentiate in their own classrooms. One of the authors recently attended a seminar at a prestigious school of education, dedicated to the topic of school reform, only to have the two instructors spend three days teaching in a modified transmission mode: lecture with power point slides, followed by moderate amounts of small-group instruction in which all members and all groups did the same activity. One of the key beliefs of the seminar instructors: the importance of differentiated instruction for effective learning.

Preparing foreign-language teachers

Most foreign-language teachers in the United States receive their initial training in a school of education or in a foreign-language department. Neither mode, as currently practiced, provides teachers with an example to emulate in differentiating among learners—although a growing number of programs do teach the basics of individual difference theory. In both cases, the concept of learner difference, if it is taught at all, remains at the theoretical level. Teachers may receive some in-class practice in application of the theory but, unfortunately, most do not experience those applications in their own learning. As a result, future teachers often receive mixed messages. Their teachers and texts promote the benefits of learner-centered instruction, yet their own education is either teacher-centered or curriculum-centered.

In schools of education

Colleges, schools, and departments of education prepare candidates for a state teaching credential at the elementary or secondary school level. Few teacher-education programs are designed to prepare candidates to teach at the postsecondary level. At this level, in whatever few preparatory programs exist, the focus tends to be on acquiring linguistic knowledge, language skills, and pedagogical theory (as opposed to strategies and actual practice).

Individual differences—and individual difference theory—play a very small role in most teacher-education programs. Many programs require an educational psychology course, in which learner differences are mentioned but often without significant emphasis; a few leading programs include courses specifically about learner differences from the point of view of learning or teaching styles but still do not practice what they preach in that the courses are often presented as lectures or discussions—whether or not the class is composed primarily of learners who favor that approach.

Virtually all teacher-education programs require a one-semester practicum or internship in which the candidate learns about teaching methods and classroom discipline and rarely receives in-depth information or feedback on how to deal with learner differences. One bright spot, however, is that the National Council on the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has

developed standards that require teachers to show an understanding of the different ways in which individual students learn (2002). If teachers must understand learner differences for accreditation, it is reasonable to hope that schools of education will eventually include that information in their coursework—and, as a backwash effect, accommodate individual learning styles in their own classrooms, even in courses in teaching methods or classroom discipline.

In foreign-language departments

In the United States, most teachers of foreign language at the postsecondary level are trained in university foreign-language departments. At the university level, initial education of teachers, especially teaching assistants (TAs), may be limited to a short set of meetings or seminars. All too often, matters of scheduling and policy take precedence over discussion and demonstration of effective instructional techniques. Structuring the format of the meeting to accommodate the learning styles of individual TAs would not occur to the faculty member in charge of the meeting. The undergraduate language program—the financial backbone of many foreign-language departments and the most administratively challenging part of the department's work—is often in the care of junior faculty, many of whom feel uneasy about their responsibility because they do not have a background in teaching, let alone experience in individualizing instruction.

Inexperienced assistant professors of foreign languages, those frequently assigned the task of managing the university's undergraduate language program, usually hold degrees in literature, linguistics, or culture and know little about individual differences, language teaching, language learning, second-language acquisition, applied linguistics, or education. Sometimes they need and desire faculty development and support even more intensely than the TAs who serve under them. Few are prepared to accommodate the learning styles of TAs.

Ongoing faculty development

Although the approaches taken by schools of education and foreign-language departments have their merits, neither can offer new or prospective faculty the

diverse experiences they need to become confident and skilled language teachers. One reason is that many beginning teachers do not fully recognize the areas in which they need help until they have accumulated significant experience in their own classrooms. Another reason is that initial teacher preparation can offer only a limited range of hands-on teaching experiences, a range bounded by factors such as the length and design of the program and the number of field placements possible during it. Yet a third reason is that some faculty will find positions in specialty programs that require skills not encountered in the typical university or high school teaching situation, skills that teachers are not likely to acquire through initial faculty development. Ongoing faculty development is therefore essential for most foreign-language teachers.

Continuing professional development for foreign-language teachers can include a vast assortment of activities. The list might include, among other activities, education and training[5] (courses, workshops, conferences, informal training experiences), teamwork, observation (by faculty developers, by peers, self-observation), and feedback. The penultimate section of this chapter discusses in greater depth some general structures for faculty development.

Many elementary school, secondary school, and university foreign-language teachers receive ongoing—or at least sporadic—faculty development through courses, workshops, and professional conferences. Rarely do faculty developers, who are often brought in from outside the program, demonstrate sensitivity to learner differences in their presentations. This may explain the lack of enthusiasm with which some teachers attend in-service sessions.

Many foreign-language teachers attend professional conferences at their own expense. Whether a teacher will be willing to do this depends to a great extent on that teacher's learning style and the amount of self-actualization that the teacher receives from the conference mode of learning.

In the university setting, foreign-language departments sometimes arrange ongoing seminars or workshops for TAs and junior faculty. Again, these are rarely taught by faculty developers capable of accommodating a range of learning styles, and, as a result, all TAs and junior faculty are expected to

acquire in the same ways the information presented in these seminars and workshops. The amount of teacher improvement that occurs in these cases often depends on the extent to which workshop leaders' styles match those of the majority of the TAs, with individual TAs benefiting in accordance with the amount of similarity—or disparity—between their styles and those of the instructor.

For school teachers in the United States, ongoing faculty development courses or workshops are organized by states, school districts, schools, or universities. A relatively new trend in the United States is the implementation of the professional development school (PDS) model, in which a school-university partnership offers teachers ongoing courses or workshops from university faculty, often at the school site, and encourages joint research on instructional issues, such as ways to enhance student participation in classes. In practice, the PDS model provides more faculty development for school teachers than for university faculty, although everyone learns something. Foreign and second languages are receiving attention in the PDS movement, although math, science, and reading usually take top billing. The degree to which individual differences among teachers are accommodated in PDS efforts differs vastly from one site to another.

Another promising source of faculty development is the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), a powerful and authoritative organization of state departments of education (INTASC 2002). So far, INTASC has paid far more attention to teacher assessment and accountability than to support and development, despite the term "support" in the organization's title. Currently INTASC's main work is creating general ("core") performance standards for new teachers in every subject area; establishing specific performance standards for new teachers in math, science, and special education (but not yet foreign languages); and designing methods for assessing new teachers' performance against the standards. Only time will determine whether INTASC will actually provide a genuinely meaningful form of ongoing support and faculty development to new teachers—as opposed to

---

[5] This article does not differentiate between education and training. Both terms are used as synonyms for faculty development. For an examination of the differences between the two terms see Azevedo 1990.

merely providing tools to assess them—and whether the organization will directly address individual differences as part of ongoing faculty development.

No matter who provides ongoing faculty development or what form that development takes, a key area of concern should be individual differences in style—learning style, teaching style, and interpersonal style. Initial and ongoing development of foreign-language faculty should be organized in ways that accommodate teachers' individual differences.

Individual difference theory—and learning and teaching styles

Individual differences occupy three domains: *personality* (how one individual relates to others), *cognition* (how a learner processes—understands, stores, and recalls—information), and *perception* (how a learner prefers to acquire information). Below we have selected representative styles from each of these domains; readers who are interested in one or another domain are encouraged to explore more style models to find those that work best for their purposes.[6]

Other domains have been suggested, such as physioenvironmental preferences (Dunn and Dunn 1978), wherein temperature, light, "satiety," noise, and other ambient influences enhance or impede learning. To our knowledge, little or no research has yet been conducted on how these preferences affect the success of faculty development efforts. However, we have informally observed these preferences in many faculty development participants. If the room is too cold, too warm, too dark, or too bright, or if coffee and sodas are not provided during an all-day session, teachers complain that such factors interfere with their professional growth. Research is clearly warranted in this area, but we will not discuss physioenvironmental preferences further in this article.

Personality types

What constitutes the uniqueness of each person is, in great part, his or her individual personality. Today's prevailing concepts of personality emanate from the work of Carl Jung (1971), whose theories and research united many

aspects of philosophy, psychology, and sociology. Recent years have seen the emergence of personality typologies manifested primarily in two related measurement instruments used in the United States that work well in ongoing faculty development: the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) (Myers and Briggs 1976; Myers 1993) and, extrapolated from the MBTI, the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (KTS) (Keirsey and Bates 1988). Both systems posit four dimensions: Extraversion (Jung's preferred spelling) versus introversion, sensing versus intuiting, feeling versus thinking, and judging versus perceiving. The last is unique to Myers and Briggs and represents their interpretation of the fourth category proposed by Jung: rational/irrational.

Personality differences play a very important role in faculty development. When personalities of the faculty developer (supervisor, mentor, seminar leader, peer, or other individual) and the teacher are the same, fewer interpersonal difficulties are likely to occur. Where personalities do not match, there is much room for misunderstanding. We have summarized the individual dimensions in accordance with the MBTI and the KTS categories in table X.1 below and have included related recommendations for faculty development. Most of the recommendations (like those offered in connection with tables X.2 and X.3) can be used to accommodate the learning styles of students in the foreign-language classroom.

Table X.1   Personality types

Style	Description	Recommendations for faculty developers
Extraversion	Extraverts get their energy from the external world, which, in turn, often influences their values and ideas. They like to be with people—many people.	Plan for much group interaction.
Introversion	Introverts get their energy from within themselves, which sometimes results in their being set in their opinions. They prefer to be with a small number of people—one is often best.	Plan for limited interaction and one-on-one or small-group interaction.
Sensing	Sensers focus on the here and now. They usually consider reality more important than possibility.	Provide detailed information and statistics.
Intuition	Intuiters focus on tomorrow. They usually consider possibility more important than actuality.	Focus on possibility and develop gut instincts.
Feeling	Feelers often place people above principle. They tend to display their feelings through words.	Praise effort; show concern; empathize.

---

[6]We would refer readers to an extensive summary of the state of the art in individual difference theory that was published relatively recently in System, "A Brief Overview of Individual Differences in Second Language Learning" (Ehrman, Leaver, and Oxford 2003).

Thinking	Thinkers often place principle above people. They tend to display their feelings through actions.	Praise work product; show concern with deeds; offer fixes.
Judging	Judgers work to deadline. They feel better after an action has been accomplished or a decision made.	Use pilot projects to implement new ideas.
Perceiving	Deadlines amuse perceivers; they prefer flexbility. They like to keep their options open; once an action has been completed or a decision made, they often feel a let-down.	Use brainstorming before implementing new ideas.

As shown in table X.1, successful faculty developers provide extensive interaction for Extraverts but limited interaction for Introverts, are highly directive and sequential with Sensers but allow great amounts of freedom and flow for Intuiters, offer empathy to Feelers but demonstrate objectivity to Thinkers, and set firm deadlines and interim goals for Judgers but recognize Perceivers' need to keep options open.

At first it might seem impossible to meet all these needs at the same time, and some faculty developers might want to give up. However, three approaches can accomplish the challenging but rewarding task of accommodating such diverse differences among a group of teachers:

- Full individualization within (or exclusive of) the group.

- A compromise model in which all participants receive in-style treatment for a significant amount of the allotted time.

- A model that provides systematic variety and delivers instruction in each major style. The choice of models sometimes depends on the personal preference of the faculty developer, but more often it depends on the resources and time available.

Whenever it is feasible we prefer the first model—full individualization. In this model, teachers are given options in planning and carrying out their own professional development, just as they are responsible for portfolio assessment in the foreign-language classroom.[7] Some learners will participate in group work and others in individual work; some will learn through project completion and others through team-teaching; some will prefer to read about

---

[7]Portfolio assessment, for those who have not heard of this decade-old replacement for more traditional forms of determining learner achievement, requires students to turn in compilations of their work over the semester or term; from this, the teacher assigns a grade. In some courses, old-fashioned multiple choice, fill-in, essay, and short-answer tests (which, by nature, are generally not individualized) are also used.

new ideas and others will prefer to hear them in a lecture or through discussion. In a fully individualized approach to faculty development, each of these preferences is honored. Although this approach requires planning, flexibility, and access to style-related resources, it provides the optimal conditions for faculty growth.

In some instances, institutional, time-related, or resource constraints prevent the faculty developer from providing full individualization. In such situations, a compromise model is necessary to offer in-style faculty development for a significant proportion of the available time. Here are some examples of the compromise model.

When large-group work is unavoidable, related small-group instruction may be used to provide greater amounts of time on task in style-appropriate ways.

When a clear majority of teachers exhibits one set of styles and a minority an opposing set, sessions can be pitched to the majority, with the minority accommodated in one of three ways:

- The option to choose an alternative path for some or all of the time. Typically the alternative path is offered by the faculty developer; sometimes it may be suggested by the learner.

- Individualized in-style follow-up.

- Counseling on how to work out of style and ideas on how to modify input to better match one's style. This model has been successfully used by a number of faculty developers, ranging from those with staffs of fewer than a dozen teachers to those with staffs of 150 teachers or more (Leaver forthcoming). It is in use in language programs in the United States, Asia, Central Asia, Europe, Latin America, and Russia. The model works best in situations in which the faculty developer knows the teachers and has defined their styles.

When neither total individualization nor the compromise model is feasible, a third model is available. This model involves systematically varying the types of tasks used in the development sessions. A good way to create systematic variety is to use a "learning cycle" that is designed to include all the tasks and activities in a given class session or workshop.

Oxford (2000) frequently uses a five-part faculty development learning cycle for foreign-language teachers. The cycle begins with the "hook," in which individuals' motivation, interest, and background knowledge are activated through the use of brainstorming, a personal story, a brief video clip, or another short, attention-grabbing event. The hook segment is often favored by Intuiters and Perceivers.

The second part consists of direct, structured, logical explanations and examples given by the faculty developer. This is often preferred by Sensers and Judgers.

The third part of the learning cycle is focused on application and practice of new ideas. Here, the faculty developer provides various kinds of practice scenarios, role-plays, problems to solve, or other activities that can be done alone, in pairs, or in groups. Depending on the nature of the tasks included by the faculty developer in this third segment, virtually every personality type can find some kind of style-appropriate practice.

The fourth segment of the cycle offers personalized activities that allow significant choice. A Feeling teacher might decide to write down his or her highly personal experiences or feelings about a relevant situation, while a Thinking teacher describes and analyzes an instructional problem and generates logical ways to solve it.

The fifth segment is self-evaluation, which can be done in either a close-ended, analytic, checklist mode (preferred by Sensers, Thinkers, and Judgers) or an open-ended mode allowing for free statement (preferred by Intuiters, Feelers, and Perceivers).

In this five-part cycle, the faculty developer gives each individual several opportunities to experience professional growth in style, that is, in ways that match his or her personality. Not every part of the learning cycle will be equally comfortable for each person—everyone will prefer certain parts to others. However, a systematic learning cycle ensures that at some point in the cycle each teacher will experience style harmony while doing faculty development activities. Style harmony, when provided at least part of the time in an expectable way, leads to greater satisfaction and learning than does the chaos of a style-war situation (see Oxford, Ehrman, and Lavine 1991). This

model may be necessary—even virtuous—in situations in which the faculty developer does not yet know the teachers and their styles, especially in situations such as one-time seminars given by a visiting faculty developer.

Cognitive styles

How individuals process thought forms the basis of the many cognitive style typologies that exist today.

Cognitive styles include preferences for information acquisition, which depends strongly on sentient memory activity (especially recognition and comprehension), as well as on information processing and review activity.[8] In their E&L Construct, which encompasses a large number of proposed cognitive styles, Ehrman and Leaver (1997, 2002, 2003) systemize the chaotic proliferation of proposed learning styles into one cognitive construct, composed of two overarching categories that they label *synoptic* and *ectenic*.[9] The following descriptors can be applied to these two general types.

- *Synoptic*: impulsivity, holistic understanding, induction, assembly, synthesis, focus on wholes, focus on similarities, desire to order things in one's own way, tendency to blend the trees into the forest.

- *Ectenic*: reflectivity, atomistic processing, deduction, disassembly, analysis, focus on details, focus on differences, desire for an existing order to things, tendency to miss the forest for the trees.

Table X.2   Two categories of cognitive styles

Style	Description	Recommendations for faculty developers
Synoptic	Synoptic learners take an impulsive and holistic approach to learning, inhaling new ideas and reinventing them in their	Allow learners to discover and develop their own ideas.

[8]While some researchers have found patterns of correlation between cognitive styles and personality types, these two categories measure very different things. Personality types refer to emotional forms of intelligence, ways of interacting with other people, ways of forming relationships, i.e. the affective domain, which does, of course, affect cognition in certain ways. Cognitive styles refer to intellectual forms of intelligence, ways of interacting with information, ways of processing new ideas, i.e. the cognitive domain.

[9] For a more detailed discussion of the E&L Construct and its component elements, which include ten subscales, subordinated to the overarching categories, see Ehrman, this volume. Some foreign-language teachers have referred to them colloquially as *global* and *analytic*; however, as Ehrman and Leaver (1997, 2002, 2003) have demonstrated, global (big-picture/holistic) learning is not the opposite of analytic (disassembly) learning but of particular (small-detail/atomistic) learning, with synthetic (assembly) learning being the opposite of analytic learning.

	own mold. Synoptic teachers tend to prefer methods that allow induction and learning through discovery.	
Ectenic	Ectenic learners take a reflective and atomistic approach to learning, processing new ideas in detail by disassembling them. Ectenic teachers tend to prefer methods that include explanation and deduction.	Provide details and explanations for new ideas.

Source: Ehrman and Leaver (1997, 2002).

Given these differences, it should be clear that not every teacher has to take the same path, receive the same input, be in the same room at the same time, attend the same workshops (or any workshop), or turn in the same kind of work as his or her peers in order to make a faculty development program effective. In fact, fully individualized faculty development programs typically yield greater improvement in teaching quality and satisfaction than do more traditional ones. Teachers who receive individualized instruction not only learn better for themselves but also they are able to experience a model that they can then use, with or without adaptation, for their own students. They can begin to understand (and to "feel on their skin," as the Russian saying goes) that not all learners need the same kind of input, the same rate of input, the same kind of error correction, or the same form of testing.

Since the form and substance of fully individualized faculty development programs will vary with each group of teachers and depend on the learning styles of the faculty present, no generic plan or formula can be applied to all groups of teachers. Rather, the successful faculty developer in individualized programs maintains a variety of potential activities and requirements geared to each of the styles. Teachers may choose among them and add their own suggestions. Only the goal remains the same for all teachers.

Synoptic and Ectenic learners need very different approaches to learning, interacting, and faculty development (table X.2). For example, Synoptic faculty, being generally impulsive learners, often dominate faculty development sessions (especially if they are Extraverts), whereas Ectenic faculty, being generally reflective learners, can find that the discussion has moved to a new topic by the time they are ready to participate in the previous one. The style-conscious faculty developer will know when to move the discussion forward and when to hold it back, depending on the learning styles of the participants. Similarly, a deductive presentation can disconcert Synoptic faculty, who learn from structuring raw material into patterns and generalities

on their own, whereas the lack of already-organized material can thoroughly confuse the Ectenic learner, and, in this case, the style-wise faculty developer will allow the inductive (Synoptic) learner an opportunity to make his or her own deductions before proceeding with explanation and practice. If details are important, the style-aware faculty developer will pair a leveler (Synoptic learner who sees similarities and patterns but misses differences) with a sharpener (Ectenic learner who cannot find patterns but sees differences among words and morphemes), a global learner (Synoptic learner who sees the forest) with a particular learner (Ectenic learner who sees the trees). If, on the one hand, the material is highly abstract (accessible to Ectenic learners), the individualizing faculty developer will find a way to add concrete experience or experimentation to the presentation of the material for Synoptic learners; on other hand, if the material is highly concrete (accessible to Synoptic learners), the same faculty developer will find a way to couch the activities in theory for Ectenic learners. When the material is highly sequenced, the faculty developer will find ways to allow for some trial-and-error (random, stochastic) learning for the Synoptic teacher, and when the material seems to have no particular organizing features, the faculty developer will impose a structure and sequence for the Ectenic leaner.[10]

When the program is based on systematic variety, the five-part Faculty Development Learning Cycle, described above, can meet the needs of different cognitive styles. For example, Synoptic teachers especially enjoy the "hook," while Ectenic teachers like the second segment, in which principles, guidelines, and ideas are presented directly in a logical sequence. The third, fourth, and fifth segments can be organized so that various activities cater to each cognitive style.

Perceptual styles

Many terms have been applied to perceptual styles: perceptual styles, sensory preferences, and "modalities." Generally the best known of learning styles and possibly the best understood, they refer to the physiological channels through

---

[10]The E&L Construct posits that learners do not have one or another style but rather a mix of styles that can mix and match poles, resulting in a complex learner profile; see Ehrman, this volume.

which learners take in or perceive information. Those channels include, but are not limited to, the visual, the auditory, and the motor (table X.3).[11]

We suggest [or Leaver (1998) and Oxford et al. (2004) have suggested that each of these three primary perceptual modalities can be subdivided, yielding six perceptual styles which were in the ALSAT (AGSI/ACTR Learning Styles Assessment Tool) (Leaver, 1993; Leaver and Leaver 1996).[12] These styles are Visual-Verbal learners (those who "see" words in their head), Visual Imagists (those who picture what they are reading or hearing), Auditory-Aural learners (those who learn from listening to others), Auditory-Oral learners (those who learn from talking aloud, hearing the sound of their own voice and repeating what others have said), Fine-Motor learners (those who learn by using their fine motor muscles, as in writing), and Motor-Kinesthetic learners (those who learn by using their gross motor muscles. Yet another kind of motor learner is the tactile learner (a student who learns through touch and manipulation of objects) (Dunn 1996; Reid 1998), labeled here Motor-Tactile. Recommendations for working with each of these perceptual styles are given in table X.3. These and other perceptual styles are also found in the *Style Orientation Scale (*Oxford et al., 2004, forthcoming).[13]

Table X.3   Perceptual styles

Style	Description	Recommendation
Visual	Visual learners learn through visualization or by seeing print and pictures. They fare poorly in authentic-language environments that do not include visual support. In faculty development activities they nearly always need accompanying handouts. When teaching they generally provide visual support.	
	Imagists see pictures in their heads. They like texts with pictures, and they like to watch films. They may not be able to retrieve information verbatim because they tend to store information as images; when recalling it they tend to use different words.	For Imagist teachers, provide diagrams, pictures, demonstrations, and other visual explanations. . Encourage them to create, use, and share their own visual aids.

---

[11] Other modalities include gustatory and olfactory learning—not of special value (or feasibly introduced) to faculty development programs, although funded scientific research is now being conducted on the mechanism of olfactory learning under the assumption that it might someday make a practical difference.
[12]A number of learning styles exist that test the basic three modalities, sometimes called KAV, for Kinesthetic-Auditory-Visual (ignoring the fine motor style altogether). There are those that deal with all four aspects! Dozens of tests can be found on the Internet; our recommendation for a validated one that has been used in a number of California schools is the Barsch instrument (nd).
[13]Oxford (2001) refers to three kinds of visual learners—visual pictorial, visual-word, and visual spatial, as well as to mechanical-tactile learners.

	Verbalists see letters and words in their head. Sometimes they can reproduce entire texts from visual memory. They like to read anything (literature, newspapers, advertisements, letters). They tend to be rapid readers and have good reading skills.	Allow Visual Verbalist teachers to prepare for workshops and meetings by providing them with written information ahead of time. Make sure handouts and agendas have plenty of information for them to read.
Auditory	Auditory learners learn by hearing or making sounds. Most auditory teachers prefer instructional methodologies like the Audio-Lingual Method.	
	Aural learners learn by listening to others. Formats such as roundtables, discussions, lectures, films, and small-group instruction work well for them. Some aural learners, especially if they have an Abstract-Random or reflective cognitive style, may need time to absorb input (even that provided through auditory channels) before being ready to participate.	Allow Aural teachers to listen to information via films, lectures, peer presentations, discussions, and small-group work.
	Oral learners learn by listening to themselves (or through mouth movements). They often dominate conversations and interrupt other people. Some oral learners subvocalize (talk to themselves softly) or silently "mouth" words or sentences. They may be the only students who learn by reading aloud (Leaver 1998). Because they love to talk, oral learners can sometimes usurp a faculty development session, especially one conducted in an auditory manner	Give Oral teachers enough opportunity to talk, but set time limits and avoid domination by Oral teachers. In cooperative group work, Oral teachers should *not* always be given the role of discussion leader or group reporter. Make sure they give others a chance to talk.
Motor	Motor learning is accomplished through the use of fine or gross motor muscles. Motor learners like to teach vocabulary and grammar through Total Physical Response, take field trips, and watch films—the latter being a vicarious form of movement.	
	Fine-Motor learners learn by using their fingers and other fine motor muscles. Because they like to write, draw, and doodle, they illustrate their lessons on the board and in handouts and use computers in the classroom and to prepare lessons.	Give Fine-Motor teachers the opportunity to write copious notes, draw pictures, or doodle. (Doodling is not a sign of disrespect, boredom, or inattention.)
	Kinesthetic learners learn by using their gross motor muscles (arms, legs, body). They like to teach vocabulary and grammar through Total Physical Response, take field trips, and watch films. Depending on the program and their other cognitive styles, they can also enjoy a computer-based approach to faculty development.	Give Kinesthetic teachers opportunities to move, act, and otherwise get physically involved in learning.
	Tactile learners learn by touching and manipulating objects. Board games with multiple pieces, simulations involving concrete objects, and similar "manipulatables" work better than discussion in evoking ideas in tactile learners.	Provide teachers with materials that they can use in concrete ways to understand and develop ideas.

Source: Adapted from Leaver, 1998

The mix of learning style possibilities and, therefore, the infinite variety of learner profiles, is now becoming quite rich. At least, 400,000 different learner profiles emerge from the myriad possible personality, cognitive, and sensory combinations (Leaver, 1998). This overwhelming variety is manageable by the ordinary faculty developer, however, because many combinations simply do not occur, except in extraordinary circumstances, and other combinations

can be anticipated. For example, it is rare for an Ectenic learner to be Kinesthetic and quite common for Kinesthetic learners to be Intuitive-Thinkers with preferences for Synoptic learning, with strengths in the Concrete and Random subscales. Nonetheless, the extraordinary does creep into the ordinary life, and we have met the Kinesthetic Sensing-Judging learner who is Synoptic in one set of substyles (Concrete and Random) and Ectenic in another set of substyles (Sharpening and Particular learning). Such a learner is a challenge for the classroom teacher, and should such a student eventually become a teacher, he or she may well be a challenge for the faculty developer (and even find some difficulty in lifelong independent learning). The best defense and offense in all cases is to understand the underlying three categories of styles—personality, cognitive, and perceptual—and to begin to watch for the profiles that emerge. Understanding the individual styles that compose the learning profile helps the faculty developer understand the overall profile and teach to it.[14] It also helps the faculty developer to know when it is necessary to individualize and how much: In some cases, where the learner profile is a predictable, typical one with patterns of styles being those that are commonly seen, it is sometimes possible to select out which subsets of styles will be addressed, and in other cases, where the material and/or information to be dealt with is of one style or another, it is possible to plan a large-scale adaptation (as in making written material accessible to auditory learners through videos and lectures and to kinesthetic learners through videos and small-group enactments).

In the area of perceptual styles, the fully individualized and systematic variety models of faculty development can readily coincide, and the five-part Faculty Development Learning Cycle can address the entire range of perceptual styles. The hook might include visual stimuli (such as concept maps, photos from the newspaper), auditory input (songs, discussion), motor input (raising hands for a quick opinion survey, passing around an object), or a combination (TV film clip uniting visual and auditory). All of the perceptual modalities can be employed for different (or even the same) segments of the learning cycle,

---

[14]Leaver (1998, 2005, forthcoming) suggests that teachers, administrators, and faculty developers who are overwhelmed by the complexity and richness of learner profiles begin by working with just one category of individual difference: personality, cognitive, or perceptual. Once there is familiarity and comfort with one set of styles, the other sets can be added to it. At this point, a system of managing style differences has been developed and adding more style variables to it can be just more of the same.

depending on the faculty developer's decisions about the needs of the teachers in a given group.

Structuring faculty development programs

In deciding how to structure a faculty development effort, several elements must be considered. These include, at a minimum, the participants' experience, program stability (or desire for change), and, of course, styles.

Teacher experience

Most models of faculty development assume that the participants are inexperienced teachers, but experienced teachers often want faculty development, too. Many participants in faculty development programs are seasoned veterans who happen to have moved to a different program, whose program has been significantly revised, or whose institution or government has added new requirements for foreign-language instruction or assessment. Even teachers who remain in a fairly stable program without significant external pressures or changes often need faculty development because they face challenges stemming from their students' individual differences, new teaching methods that must be mastered, and new findings from research studies.

Program stability or programmatic change

In most programs, change is gradual. Under such circumstances, faculty development is likely to be either an occasional activity, spurred by interest in a new idea in the field, or, in more successful programs, a regularly occurring event. Time spent over a long period would be considered an "extensive" form of faculty development—one that leads to program stability.

In other institutions, radical program changes may be desired by the administration, parents, students, or clients. In such cases, program stability is less important than incisive course correction. The changes might be dictated by new educational norms or by geopolitical considerations, depending on the nature of the institution and the probable employment trajectories of its

graduates.[15] Sometimes an administration uses a nearly complete turn-over in faculty to design a very different kind of language-learning program.[16] Depending on the reason for the change, faculty development may be needed restructure course content, introduce innovative methods, or redesign the entire program. In the latter case, the nature of the language major and the balance of service courses and more traditional language and literature may be shifted. Radical change typically calls for "intensive" faculty development— much effort over a short period of time.

Style considerations

In any kind of faculty development—extensive, intensive, or a combination— personal style plays a significant role. When an understanding of style infuses the faculty development program with the most relevant and informative elements for each learner, one can expect overall teaching performance to improve more rapidly than would be the case with a generic approach. What is more, fidelity to style can set an important example for teachers to follow in centering their own instruction on the needs of learners.

Good style-sensitive faculty development programs give teachers more of the education and experience they need than do more generic programs. The specific form of faculty development offered in style-sensitive programs will vary as a single set of principles comes to be expressed in a variety of tasks and formats (Leaver and Oxford 2000, 57). An effective faculty development program is generally a combination of common elements useful for all teachers and other elements relevant to subgroups.

In faculty development programs that are fully individualized, the faculty developer assists teachers in setting up a development portfolio (or plan) composed of appropriate, useful, and reasonable activities. Some

---

[15]The growing unrest in American public school administrations in the wake of the No Child Left Behind political agenda has resulted in the proposal of very radical changes, such as reinventing the entire school system (Wagner, 2003). Much of the impetus behind this proposal (reinventing the entire school system) has been the change in employment requirements for graduates of school programs. Today's school graduates who are planning to enter the workplace need basically the same set of skills as those entering the university (*ibid*.) This calls for an immense change in the kinds of courses offered and outcomes intended.

[16]One institution, about four years ago, closed down the entire foreign-language department, temporarily relying on study-abroad programs to manage student foreign-language-learning needs, in order to revamp the foreign language program in its entirety.

participants might emphasize modeling, a particularly effective learning tool for Synoptic learners who are Abstract and Random. Others, such as Visual learners who are also Introverted Thinkers, may prefer assigned readings or the library, where they can read information on a range of topics related to their classroom experiences and program initiatives. Their Auditory and Kinesthetic peers may well choose seminars and workshops. Still others, such as Extraverted, Abstract, Random Sensers, might make their development plans with a focus on co-teaching and other forms of interactive sharing, whereas their Introverted counterparts would probably prefer to observe demonstration classes.[17]

Talking about style can greatly increase the effectiveness and acceptance of a program that accommodates different participant styles. It can also help participants accept each other's differences as normal and be willing (with growing comfort) to work outside of their style preferences from time to time without complaint. Through discussions about style, teachers will come to understand the source of their discomfort and see why certain common elements need to be taught in non-style-sensitive ways.

With these considerations in mind, faculty developers can weave many structures from common and unique strands. The combinations will be determined by the needs of the program and the styles represented among the faculty, and by other factors, including affective ones, that lie outside the scope of this discussion.

Delivering style-sensitive faculty development

Faculty development, initial and ongoing, has many faces and forms. It takes place between individuals (such as the faculty developer and each teacher), as well as in solo reflection and group interactions. It occurs as a planned part of formal supervision and in informal chatting in the hallway.

---

[17]Some faculty developers fear the full individualization approach to faculty development, believing that teachers may not understand the reasons for disparate treatment. Major concern might come from those who seek authority figures to tell them what to do, who dislike much choice, and who prefer a "single correct way" for *everyone* to do things. However, most teachers know their own style preferences, at least on a subconscious level, and, in our experience, will generally accept differential treatment when it matches their style preferences.

Five general structures, chosen for their ubiquity and representativeness, are presented below. In selecting activities for each, several elements must be considered, including teachers' experience, program stability (or desire for change), and, of course, personal styles.

The five structures are (1) education and training, (2) teamwork, (3) observation, (4) formal feedback sessions, and (5) evaluation.

Education and training

Education and training of new and experienced teachers can take place in many venues and through many activities, some formal, some informal. Activities undertaken outside the program may include courses in instructional methodology, technology, psychology, classroom management, and other subjects, as well as conferences, seminars, and workshops. Activities within the program may include formal instruction in preservice and in-service workshops and informal instruction in staff meetings. The examples provided below—workshops, staff meetings, modeling/demonstration, co-teaching, and career enhancement—are representative activities; the full range of education and training activities is far greater.

Workshops. Workshops may be conducted at an external location or event, such as a conference, or in-house by the program's own faculty developer. Whether the workshop is external or internal, style conflicts can emerge if the workshop format reflects only the favored style of the workshop leader and does not speak to the styles of all the participants. The workshop leader may lecture, for example—catering to the Auditory and Ectenic participants but disadvantaging participants with Visual and Motor preferences, along with their Synoptic peers, especially those with a need for Concrete and Random (trial and error) learning.

Style conflicts can also occur if the workshop leader does not present new ideas in conceptual terms that are consistent with the participants' styles. Grenfell (1998) illustrates the importance of individual differences in a workshop situation with four students. Student 1 learns best if provided with a hypothetical situation; student 2 wants to develop a method for himself; student 3 wants to be given a prescription; and student 4 is very flexible—any of the previous three kinds of presentations will work for her. Reaching all

these individuals in the same workshop can be accomplished through small-group instruction (and allowing some participants to choose to work alone) or by presenting the material in multiple forms.

If a conflict in style between leader and participants is left untreated, it can undermine the comprehension and acceptability of the new ideas for many participants, for whom the workshop is likely to prove a waste of time. Worse, the ideas presented may not stand a chance of being implemented in the classrooms of the disaffected participants.

Preservice and in-service workshops are a popular format in many faculty development programs. Formal workshops can be successfully used with all personality types if the composition of the participants is taken into account in planning the event. Among the style differences most significant in the workshop format are Extraversion-Introversion and perceptual style differences. With large numbers of Introverts in a workshop group, a highly interactive activity—even an interactive lecture—is probably not the best format. In such cases pairs or small groups work better. Each group or pair selects a spokesperson to share conclusions, results, and ideas with the larger group.

With Extraverts, a large-group format generally works better, since one or more Extraverts can take over a small group unless the workshop leader has the foresight to assign specific roles that prevent one person from dominating. If the leader is unskilled at working with Extraverts, workshops can become free-for-alls, with Introverts generally electing not to participate (and their lack of participation often going unnoticed by workshop leaders).

Leaders can evoke greater enthusiasm and understanding among workshop participants by taking into account perceptual differences. Visual participants generally need some form of visual support—such as extensive use of the blackboard, handouts with diagrams, or note-taking outlines. They also benefit from advance distribution of readings on the topics to be covered. (But keep in mind that visual learners can become so distracted by a text in front of them that they stop listening to the presenter.)

For Auditory participants, workshop leaders will want to include participatory lectures and discussion. Assigning a large amount of advance

reading to auditory learners often results in overload or failure to complete the assignment.

Motor participants, of course, need the opportunity to move. For Fine-Motor learners, there should be naturally occurring opportunities to write, draw, and doodle. Adding work with real objects is also helpful.[18] Motor-Kinesthetic learners find workshops unbearable if they cannot move during the learning process. At the very least, they need to be able to change positions through small-group activities, presentations, and the like. Motor-Tactile participants require at least a modicum of work with real objects, something easily accomplished by using games or simulations involving manipulable objects.

Workshop leaders who understand the source of resistance to their ideas can take steps to reduce it. Typically, this means analyzing the learning style of the teacher-participants and locating conflicts between what is being asked of them and what they hold as obvious or sacrosanct.

Some styles simply present greater resistance to new ideas than do others. Sensing participants are often considered "difficult," especially by Intuitive workshop leaders, when in fact, the difficulty is nothing more than a style conflict. Leaders who present radically new ideas may need to prepare the soil for Sensing teachers. Intuitive leaders (and supervisors) often present new ideas and new programs as exciting new ventures derived from common sense, without considering the Sensing teachers' need for fact-based arguments in favor of changes. "Seeing is believing" for the Sensing teacher, while "faith in oneself" is the approach of the Intuitive workshop leader. This often leads to out-of-hand rejection of new ideas by Sensing teachers, whose only evidence of their advantage is banner-waving by intuitive workshop leaders and participants.

Likewise, if the group is largely Intuitive and the workshop leader is a Senser, the leader will quickly lose the attention of the Intuitives by proceeding according to instinct. Intuitive participants pay attention to possibilities, ideas, and concepts. They quickly become bored with statistics and fact-based

---

[18] Some style researchers include "touchers" in the Kinesthetic or Fine-Motor categories. However, others suggest, as mentioned earlier in this paper, that learners who learn from touching objects, as opposed to manipulating them, form yet another perceptual style category: Tactile learners.

arguments. They would prefer to have a theoretical construct, even if it is not yet worked out, and a rationale; they will work out the rest on their own over time.

Strongly Visual teachers often resist auditory approaches. In the language classroom, auditory approaches include the Audio-Lingual Method (Lado 1964), and the early version of the Total Physical Response technique (Asher 1988). Visual teachers, especially those who are also Ectenic in style, dislike auditory tasks and fight to keep their decontextualized flashcards and word lists, even while trying to implement communicative approaches. Similarly, Visual workshop leaders often assume that others need the same kind of visual support that they themselves need, and they sometimes unknowingly reject auditory participants' desire for background noise and oral interaction. Many workshops ignore Visual-Spatial learners, who need spatial cues presented in a visual format, though it would be simple to include workshop activities involving map work (on any place or topic), board games with spatial elements, or, in some instances, hypermedia (see Oxford, 2004, for an in-depth description of the Visual-Spatial learner).

Auditory teachers might want to include large amounts of reading aloud in their language classrooms—a technique that has proven ineffective for most learners but that works for Auditory-Oral individuals. When elimination of reading aloud is suggested, such teachers may resist unless a very strong rationale is given and alternatives are presented. Likewise, workshop leaders who are Auditory sometimes fail to recognize that Visual workshop participants need constant visual stimulation and that such participants gain little from oral presentations and discussions that are not supported by visual input.

Workshop leaders typically provide lots of activities, including note-taking, that suit the Fine-Motor participant. However, the style requirements of the two other Motor types, Motor-Kinesthetic and Motor-Tactile, are often forgotten. There has been, after all, an institutional and cultural bias against the use of movement and objects in many classrooms beyond elementary school for a number of years. Although movement and objects have been used in science labs, until recently they have been eschewed by many teachers of math, social studies, and other subjects, even foreign languages, with the

exception of a short flirtation with Cuisenaire rods (Gattegno 1988) two decades ago.

To cater more effectively to Motor-Kinesthetic participants, workshop leaders might include drama, games, and other physical activities, all of which can be related to the topic at hand. Motor-Tactile teachers like to work with real objects, and this is often possible if the workshop leader takes the time to think of objects relevant to the workshop theme.

In workshops that deal with teaching methods, leaders can readily demonstrate ways in which language teachers can include more movement and touch in their own classrooms. For instance, leaders can show teachers who are neither Motor-Kinesthetic nor Motor-Tactile how to incorporate elements of Total Physical Response and other movement and touch activities into language classrooms. Using a treasure hunt to teach verbs of motion can be especially effective for learners who need to move their bodies and touch real objects.

Although this seems like common sense, many non-Motor teachers require all students, no matter what their style preferences, to sit still and complete workbook pages, recite dialogues, or give oral answers to textbook exercises. When presented with the possibility of teaching verbs of motion using motion and objects, such teachers may resist. After all, *they* once learned the accurate use of verbs of motion without leaving their seats.

It is the job of the workshop leader to sensitize such teachers about the needs of Motor-Kinesthetic and Motor-Tactile students and to provide practice in a range of workshop activities involving movement and touch. Teachers who have become sensitized to differing perceptual styles—through formal instruction in individual difference theory and through hands-on workshop activities—are more likely to consider incorporating tactile and kinesthetic activities in their own classrooms.

Staff Meetings. There are many small opportunities for faculty development. Even at routine staff meetings, a few minutes can be taken at the end (even better—at the beginning) of the meeting to accommodate faculty development activities and short discussions. Meetings are greeted with varying degrees of

enthusiasm or resignation by the various personality types. Much, of course, depends on their content, length, and nature. Important style differences at staff meetings include Extraversion-Introversion and perceptual preferences.

At the end of an intensive meeting or a day full of highly interactive work, Extraverts can be energized enough to begin the day anew. In working with Extraverted teachers, faculty developers need to invest time in personal interaction, but that interaction does not necessarily have to be one-on-one. Many Extraverts are satisfied with group interaction.

In contrast, Introverts need time to regenerate after intensive or group interaction. Faculty developers may need to meet with them one-on-one in a quiet environment away from group activities—perhaps before or after a staff meeting. If there is to be a difficult discussion—about teaching performance, for instance—Introverts may need time before the meeting to prepare and after the meeting to sort through their reactions. When at a meeting, Introverted teachers may not want to know all these details. They may not want to have long meetings to discuss matters they consider best decided by the program supervisor.

To get the most out of faculty development segments of a staff meeting, it is often helpful to begin with the development topic, rather than to finish with it, so that minds are fresh. In order not to tire Introverted teachers, Extraverted program managers may want to set time limits for meetings, including the faculty development aspects.

In sensory terms, the same recommendations exist as were given for conducting workshops: visual support for Visual teachers, discussions for Auditory teachers, movement for Motor-Kinesthetic teachers, and use of objects, if possible, for Motor-Tactile teachers. Motor teachers who must sit for long periods of time sometimes feel confined and either stop listening or resist input. This is yet another reason for beginning staff meetings with the faculty development portion.

Modeling/Demonstration. Few of today's teachers were educated in learner-centered classrooms, so they may lack early models of the technique. Faculty developers who want teachers to be able to use learner-centered instruction—including showing sensitivity to style differences—in their own classrooms can

model this behavior for teachers by providing a wide variety of activities keyed to different styles. They can also model other very important attributes of learner-centeredness: courtesy, democracy, empathy, asking rather than demanding, and risk-taking. Risk-taking is important not only in language learning but also in faculty development, when new teaching concepts are shown and implemented. It comes most readily to Synoptic teachers with strong preferences for Concrete and Random learning, especially those who are also Intuitive. Other teachers may need the faculty developer's support and protection before taking risks.

Today's foreign-language teachers were typically educated in Grammar-Translation, Audiolingual, or Cognitive Code methods, and their natural instinct is to reproduce the same methods in their own classrooms. Faculty developers can model newer, more communicatively authentic ways of teaching. Modeling alone may be enough to effect change in teachers who learn through observation. Others may need more explicit communication, requiring faculty developers to explain aspects of what is being modeled before or after the modeling. One of the most effective means of passing along new methods is through a demonstration classroom in which the faculty developer models particular techniques and asks teachers to discuss or reproduce them.

Co-Teaching. Co-teaching puts a faculty developer together with a teacher. Together, they plan lessons, teach classes, and discuss outcomes. An effective way to introduce teaching techniques to new teachers—and new teaching techniques to experienced teachers—co- teaching is useful in many ways: building relationships, developing specific techniques, and helping teachers differentiate among learners. Preparing and conducting lessons together allows the faculty developer to observe the teacher's approach and instincts.

There is the added advantage of being able to conduct "formative evaluation"—evaluation that occurs during the development phase, rather than at the very end (Azavedo 1990). Formative evaluation allows on-the-spot assistance and immediate improvement, whereas a post-observation discussion is frequently only a belated critique that does not help the teacher very much. For many teachers, particularly those who like spontaneity and do not need to

reflect deeply before making instructional changes, such immediate feedback is very effective. Faculty developers have often found that co-teaching can significantly reduce the amount of calendar time required to guide a new teacher.

Extraverts tend to be more comfortable than Introverts with co-teaching. Although experience can help Introverts to be more comfortable with it, most Introverted teachers, regardless of experience, seem to need time to adjust to the idea of co-teaching—as well as time to prepare for a co-taught class.

Teamwork

Teamwork can be one of the most effective, intensive, and sometimes volatile means of conducting faculty development. It fosters sharing of ideas and experience and allows teachers to learn from each other. Teams also serve as safe havens in which teachers can try out new ideas and techniques, some of which may have been suggested in workshops or other faculty development activities.

Team Composition and Interaction. There are, of course, ideal combinations of like and compatible styles around which to organize teams, but the scatter of styles in any given group usually precludes perfect composition. Fortunately, any combination of personality types, cognitive styles, and perceptual preferences can work harmoniously toward a common goal if faculty developers are careful to help them avoid the most common conflicts. In teams, such conflicts are most likely to arise from differences in personality type and cognitive style. They can be alleviated and even avoided by the style-sensitive faculty developer.

One typical conflict is between Extraverts and Introverts in public interactions. To temper the Extraverts' tendency to take over discussion sessions, the team can adopt a meeting format in which agenda items have time limits, thereby limiting the time any one individual can hold forth on any one topic. Or each team member might be made responsible for leading the discussion on a specific topic, thus giving Introverts the opportunity to

participate on a near-equal basis with the Extraverts on the team—at least on their assigned topic.

Introverts also benefit when the agenda is prepared and distributed in advance; they then have time to think about the various items and prepare comments. (Introverts are more likely to offer prepared comments than impromptu ones.) Team leaders, faculty developers, and supervisors can further encourage input from Introverts by soliciting wrap-up comments from each team member.

Tannen (1994) suggests equalizing the power between men and women at meetings through *nemawashi*, a Japanese tradition in which supervisors and team leaders meet privately with each team member to determine conflicts and disagreements before the meeting. Thus prepared, the leaders are better able to guide the meeting toward consensus. Or team leaders and faculty developers can meet ahead of time with Introverts to note their concerns, bringing them up in the course of the meeting (and asking the appropriate team member to comment on them) if they do not arise naturally.

Another area of naturally occurring conflict is between Sensing and Intuiting teachers. Sensers typically set simple goals that are attainable in a defined (usually short) period of time. Kroeger and Thuesen (1992) suggest that Sensing people tend to subscribe to the "KISS principle" (Keep It Simple, Stupid). Intuitives, on the other hand, with their futuristic and theoretical orientation, tend to set challenging, long-term, and complex or multiple goals that Sensing teachers can find overwhelming.

If faculty developers wish to facilitate curricular changes, such as moving into a communicative mode of teaching or implementing a grant program, they might divide tasks so that both sets of teachers are working comfortably in style. Thus, Intuitive teachers might be asked to define strategic goals, and Sensing teachers to break them down into specific actions and milestones. As Leaver and Oxford (2000) note in their discussion of mentoring teaching assistants, "all teachers ultimately need to agree to both the strategy and the tactics, [but] they all do not have to be involved in developing both" (60).

Whereas Extraverted-Introverted and Sensing-Intuitive differences can cause discomfort among team members, Thinking-Feeling differences can

generate palpable hostility. Since the values of Thinkers and Feelers are nearly absolute contradictions, some assistance from the outside may be needed to develop harmony when both types are equally represented on the team. (Formal team-building activities can help in this regard.) Thinking teachers can be taught to show compassion for their Feeling colleagues, even if doing so seems uncomfortably "touchy-feely," and Feeling teachers can learn to express themselves through logic, rather than feeling.

The Judging-Perceiving difference can also create tension. Perceivers want to explore all options before embarking on new projects. Brainstorming sessions delight them, and deadlines, so dear to Judgers, amuse them—until anger flares from the stress of working out of style. Judgers, when working with Perceivers, often accuse the Perceivers of procrastination. The Judgers would prefer to forge ahead with new ideas, try them out, and then resolve any problems that appear. Perceivers are uncomfortable making significant changes without exploring all possible problems and solutions in advance.

The conflict between Judgers and Perceivers comes from their very different attitudes toward closure. It does not help, either, that most organizations, like society in general, value the Judging approach to work and life over the Perceiving (Kroeger and Thuesen 1992).

Committee work can accommodate the talents of both Judging and Perceiving teachers without frustrating both. Perceiving teachers can brainstorm solutions to thorny issues, while Judging teachers develop new pilot projects—to generate more thorny issues.

Cognitive style differences, too, can cause conflict on a team. In developing a new curriculum, for example, Synoptic team members can be relied upon to devise innovative approaches, Ectenic individuals with strengths on the Abstract and Random subscales to obtain the needed observations and feedback, with strengths on the Abstract and Sequential subscales to research the options, and with strengths on the Concrete and Sequential subscales to determine how to implement each approach. With a style-oriented assignment of responsibilities, even the most junior faculty member can bring real talent to the task, and all faculty can grow in significant ways by learning from each other.

Ectenic-Synoptic differences can be yet another area to which faculty developers may want to be sensitive. Ectenic teachers frequently need much more time to reflect upon issues and may want far more details than Synoptic teachers. In a team, often the Synoptic learners assert their leadership early, while the Ectenics continue to contemplate the goal ahead. Faculty developers can help by making all participants aware of such pitfalls and ensuring that Ectenic learners assume some team leadership.

When dealing with specific issues, both styles can be accommodated. While Ectenics analyze the situation under discussion, Synoptics can be encouraged to work on related areas or on a completely different task. The two groups can then be called back together to share their ideas.

Team Communication. Accomplishing team goals in faculty development and curriculum change depends on good communication. And if the team is to communicate, its members need to understand each other—not only their overt messages but also the manner in which those messages are delivered.

Woodward (1999) suggests six different communication styles associated with certain personality types (based on the KTS) and cognitive tempos (based on the Impulsive-Reflective subscales[19] of the E&L Construct). *Anticipative* is the style typically found in Impulsive Intuitive Thinkers; *Dynamic,* in Impulsive Sensing Judgers; *Responsive,* in both kinds of Intuitive Feelers; *Detached,* in both kinds of Sensing Perceivers; *Involved,* in Reflective Intuitive Thinkers; and *Reactive,* in Reflective Sensing Judgers.

Making communication explicit and sending appropriate signals can do much to prevent communication errors. Because those signals will generally be interpreted in style-dependent ways, however, senders and recipients both must understand how users of another style are likely to interpret signals.

A pause, for example, is generally interpreted by an Anticipative communicator as signifying a lack of something to say, unexpressed disagreement, hostility, confusion, or one of a host of other negatives.

19Impulsive-Reflective differences, first defined by Messick and Associates (1976), refer to the speed with which one is internally compelled to complete an activity. Impulsive learners generally begin

Anticipative communicators rarely pause, and hearing someone else do so makes them uncomfortable—thus the negative interpretation. Dynamic communicators take a similar attitude toward pauses. Involved communicators, on the other hand, are very comfortable with pauses and use them regularly as they think about their responses. They do not interpret pauses negatively. In working on a team, then, Anticipative and Dynamic teachers need to give others room to respond and not become impatient with silence.

Involved communicators tend to provoke discomfort in another way as well—by closing the physical space between themselves and their interlocutors. Faculty developers can help by intervening and talking about style when conflicts arise, demonstrating active listening techniques, helping determine intended meanings, and revealing why an interpretation may have been incorrect.

An explicit approach to communication takes time, but failure to communicate ultimately takes more time. An explicit approach takes into account not only communication style but other styles as well. For example, Sensing Judging and Ectenic teachers need specific rules, content, and deadlines, whether those specifics come from a supervisor, a faculty developer, or team members. Sensing Perceivers, on the other hand, need to know the limits of choices that are available or permitted. Ectenic teachers generally need step-by-step instructions and nearly always do if they are Sequential learners. Intuitive Thinking teachers require explanations based on logic, and Synoptic teachers sometimes need help, when working on a team, in reigning in their risk-taking and independence. Once again, the best teams can talk about these differences, understand that styles are a matter of difference, not of quality or merit, and accommodate their team members as they would their students—or as they would have the faculty developer accommodate them.

Putting all these aspects together in a large, team-based program can be a very daunting task, one that requires much practice. At one institute, the supervisor (a dean) structured a management team to teach others to communicate and work well in teams, regardless of the team members' styles. In this case, the team consisted of the dean, associate deans, department

---

immediately, talk while thinking, and then go on to the next activity. Reflective learners generally pause immediately, talk after thinking, and reconsider before going on to the next activity.

chairpersons, and a faculty developer. For a full week, capable teachers managed the school while the management team carried out a staff development program based on first-hand learning about personality and communication styles. The week away from the workplace brought long-term benefits far outweighing the missed forty hours: The teachers who had stepped in as administrators quickly developed a better understanding of the problems faced by the administrators and passed along a new tolerance that spread throughout the school.

Team-Teaching. Team teaching, or what is sometimes called "four-handed teaching" (Goroshko and Slutsky 1999), is a wonderfully effective and entertaining form of faculty development. Team teaching differs from co-teaching in that it involves joint teaching by peers, whereas co-teaching is done by a teacher and a faculty developer.

Team teaching has many advantages for students, including more time on task, more teacher attention, smaller groups, and modeling of interaction in the foreign language by the two teachers. Just as important for faculty development, team teaching can provide much opportunity for teachers to learn from each other as they prepare lessons together, conduct classes, and discuss their students' successes and problems. In pairing teachers, however, it is important to take into account their personality types, cognitive styles, perceptual styles, and even, in some cases, communication styles. The most important differences seem to relate to cognitive styles. Since Ectenics and Synoptics learn in different ways, they include very different kinds of activities in their lessons. Ectenics generally prefer to teach grammar and vocabulary deductively—by explaining specific rules and asking students to apply them. Synoptics, by nature, prefer inductive teaching, in which students are expected to figure out the rules and patterns based on observation. Equally important, such differences can make it difficult to agree on classroom activities. For instance, when a workshop leader conducted lesson-planning sessions in many locales with dozens of teachers, she divided teachers into groups based on cognitive style preferences. The groups produced very different lesson plans on the same topics. Plans made by one group were generally unpalatable to teachers of the opposite learning style. Such differences can become

exaggerated when teachers of opposite styles are forced to work together on a regular basis. One of the most effective ways to manage differences is to talk about them openly, educating teachers about individual difference theory and providing a personal example of acceptance of all styles.

For purposes of team teaching, the differences between Extraverts and Introverts may be the most striking. Generally, Extraverts are more successful when paired with other Extraverts and Introverts when paired with other Introverts. Of course, when two teachers are sensitive to—and accommodating of—matters of personal style, they generally can teach together harmoniously and successfully, no matter how potentially explosive their opposing styles. Admittedly, it may take a little time for them to figure out the balance of interaction that will be needed or accepted from each of them.

Examples of such accommodation are plentiful. In one case, an Extravert and an Introvert were team-teaching together for the first time. The Extravert, while teaching the first half of the session, was flamboyant and comical and made special efforts to engage all the students. The Introvert taught the second half in a much quieter, more restrained way. The two presentations contrasted so strongly that the students were jarred by the experience.

When the class was over, the two teachers discussed the advantages and disadvantages of each approach. The Extravert's instruction had the advantage of being more entertaining and inclusive, although some Introverted students felt uncomfortable with the amount of interaction. The Introverted teacher's instruction had the advantage of not pressuring the Introverted students and of holding to a more consistent pace, but some students found it a lot less interesting.

With this knowledge, the two teachers organized their next team-teaching session using the five-part learning cycle described earlier. Each teacher taught the parts of the lesson that were most suited to his personality type. In the next team-taught class, the Extravert took care of the opening hook; the Introvert then presented new information about vocabulary, structures, and content. The Introvert and the Extravert took turns leading the practice activities, with the Introvert facilitating certain individual practice activities and the Extravert facilitating interactive tasks. They came together to

lead the final sections, those devoted to personalization and learner self-evaluation.

The two had told their students at the beginning of the class who would be handling which parts of the lesson. Everyone was comfortable and productive because the team teachers were each teaching from their "strong suits," and the students knew what to expect.

Of secondary concern in team teaching is the Judging-Perceiving difference. The Judger will often want to move on in the lesson plan sooner than the Perceiver, but otherwise few of the differences that cause conflict between Judgers and Perceivers are likely to appear in classroom teaching.

Conflict is much more likely to occur in lesson planning. Typically, Judgers see the lesson plan as a product to be prepared. They want to begin committing words to paper immediately. Perceivers, on the other hand, conceive of the task of preparing the lesson plan as a process. They want to spend more time in anticipating student reactions and considering various aspects of the lesson.

A faculty developer can assist the Judging-Perceiving pair to avoid a major conflict by guiding them to set time limits—more than the Judger wants and less than the Perceiver wants—in which to prepare the lesson plan. In troublesome cases, the teachers can agree on specific actions to be taken in preparing the lesson, with a time frame for each action. (This will create some irritation for the Perceiver, unless he or she is style sensitive. Some of the actions may be accomplished separately, thus allowing each teacher to work in style while preparing the lesson plan.

The cycle, then, would consist of an agreement on the overall amount of time to be spent preparing the lesson plan, followed by an agreement about how much time should be used for (a) initial discussions and brainstorming, (b) individual thinking and taking detailed notes, and (c) getting back together again to make final decisions. The participants should decide that it is OK for the Judger to use any time left over from the individual planning phase to do some other form of work, go out for a walk, or check email while the Perceiver continues to cogitate. Such an agreement will lessen the stress between the fast-finisher and the slow-but-steady finisher. Just as the lesson-planning

process is a form of compromise, the resulting lesson plan will probably represent a compromise.

Perceptual differences, too, can play a role in team teaching. These differences, though, are easily worked into a positive contribution to the team effort. The Visual teacher usually remembers to prepare handouts when the Auditory teacher has forgotten them, and the Motor teacher generally has sets of physically active tasks or objects that can be used to teach many different linguistic phenomena. Working together in this way, teachers with different perceptual styles can make excellent partners.

Observation

Although teamwork is a useful part of faculty development, observation of teaching is often just as valuable, particularly when it is followed by formal feedback, as discussed later.

Observation can be done by faculty developers, peers, supervisors,[20] and even—through a combination of self-observation and reflective teaching—by the teacher under observation. Some teachers are more comfortable with outside observation than others; their comfort level depends, to a great extent, on their styles. Likewise, some teachers are more capable of self-observation and reflective teaching than others. Skill at self-observation is frequently a style issue. Reflective teaching, on the other hand, depends on a set of skills and strategies that can be taught.

Observation by the Faculty Developer. Observation by the faculty developer is a traditional approach to on-the-job faculty development. Accurate assessments of observed lessons depend partly on the observer's level of preparation. By considering in advance the main focus of observation for a given day or week faculty developers can make more of their time. For instance, the focus might be error correction, classroom interaction, pacing, clarity of objectives for the lesson, fulfillment of objectives, or scaffolding by the teacher. Some faculty developers prefer to write a specific set of questions or use an observational checklist; for others knowing the general focus is enough.

---

[20] Observation by supervisors is not relevant to this article, unless the supervisor is also the faculty developer.

Most faculty developers find it essential to take notes in order to remember key details or gain a basis for further analysis and synthesis. Occasionally, the faculty developer decides to videotape the observation, but this requires advance agreement with the teacher and the class being observed.

Accuracy of assessment is crucial in an observation. Yet accurate assessments are not always possible unless faculty developers recognize that individuals with certain personality types act very differently when an observer is present, thus creating classroom situations that may not reflect the natural, unobserved state. Some teachers' observed classes are better than their routine classes, while others' are not as successful. In fact, few classes are unaffected by the presence of an observer. One is tempted to invoke the axiom of quantum physics and contemporary qualitative educational research: The observer has such an impact on the observed that one cannot assume that the observed state is the same as the natural state.

Accuracy of assessment can be diminished when the observed teacher becomes excited, either positively or negatively, due to the observation. Certain teachers, such as Extraverted Synoptic individuals, relish being observed. They are natural risk-takers who love to perform. They generally put on a good show for their students, but when the faculty developer steps into the room to observe, Extraverted Synoptic teachers may be even livelier and more successful than usual. Thus, the fact of being observed may cause the teacher to exaggerate some personal tendencies, and the observation may not reflect daily reality.

Other teachers are usually affected in a negative way by being observed. Most Introverted Feelers, for example, feel deeply anxious when observed, and the more nervous among them can lose their concentration and perform poorly. Similarly, Sensing Perceivers may be distressed by observation. Athough they are considered to be physical risk-takers, their tolerance for physical risk does not extend to being observed; in fact, many Sensing Perceivers become very nervous when observers are present.

Accuracy of assessment is by no means guaranteed if the teachers being assessed are anxious. When teachers are anxious, lessons suffer, and observed lessons are much poorer than typical lessons. In front of observers, some anxious teachers lose proficiency, while others rely more on their students'

mother tongue. Such teachers may find that reflective self-observation and student feedback can be more helpful than feedback from the faculty developer, and the faculty developer must recognize this fact.

Many Intuitive Thinkers are not concerned about the faculty developer's visit. Intuitive Thinkers are natural actors—many character actors in Hollywood have this personality type. Intuitive Thinking teachers rarely become nervous when observed. Nor are they particularly inspired by being observed. Therefore, it might be safe to assume that observed classes taught by Intuitive Thinking teachers are similar to their unobserved classes. But Intuitive Thinkers want to do things their own way, and they may feel that the observer will encroach upon their freedom.

Under certain circumstances, in fact, Intuitive Thinkers can become quite distressed by a faculty developer's visit. Intuitive Thinking teachers who are highly Introverted may well feel uncomfortable being observed. Other Intuitive Thinkers may believe that their language skills are not adequately developed in comparison to the faculty developer, especially if the faculty developer is a native speaker. For the Intuitive Thinker, a sense of competence is of paramount importance, and when that sense of competence is threatened, severe anxiety can result. Intuitive Thinkers who are new on the job may be quite proficient in the language but feel linguistically incompetent and therefore lose control of the language in front of the observer (Horwitz 1996).

Although it may seem difficult to gauge immediately whether the observer has had a positive, neutral, or negative impact on the teacher and the class, there are many ways to determine the accuracy of an observation. The first is to replay with the instructor whatever the faculty developer thinks he or she has observed. Where there are discrepancies in goals and perceptions, the instructor should be able to identify them. Watching student behavior in the classroom also helps. If students act as if they are used to an activity, then it is very likely that the teacher uses it frequently. If students appear confused about how to carry out an exceptionally good activity or one that has been recommended in faculty development workshops, it is a reasonable assumption that this is a new experience for them and that the observer is seeing not a typical lesson but the teacher's desire to impress the observer. (In a perverse way, then, the observation has had a positive impact on the teacher.) On the

other hand, if students make mistakes or seem not to have done their homework but do know how to carry out an activity, it is likely that the activity is familiar to the class but the observer is making the *students* nervous. Where there are doubts about whether the observation reflects actual practice, student feedback on the class observed and on the run of classes taught by the observed instructor can be particularly valuable. Observations can also be balanced against the student proficiency results of the teacher being observed.

Observation by Peers. Many teachers benefit from observing their colleagues in practice. Team members can help each other by opening their classrooms to their colleagues. Junior faculty can visit the classes of more experienced teachers. Teachers who have developed a special teaching technique or have been unusually successful at implementing new ideas might invite colleagues into their classroom.

Some teachers, clumped in certain personality types, are typically more willing to visit colleagues and more open to having their classrooms visited. For those who are less willing it is best not to force an uncomfortable situation, given the many other ways to do faculty development.

Extraverts are more likely than Introverts to open their classrooms to colleagues and to visit classrooms of their peers. Introverted teachers who believe that they can learn specific techniques from certain peers and who have themselves identified the classes they would like to visit are more likely than other Introverted teachers to participate readily in the observation component of a faculty development program.

Intuitive Thinkers, especially those who are Introverted, may not be eager to observe or be observed, because they like to do things is in their own way and may feel that others deserve similar treatment.

Teachers who are Synoptic in their randomness and Ectenic in their abstraction teachers learn best from demonstration and may benefit the most both from demonstration classrooms and from observing the routine teaching of their colleagues. These teachers are particularly good at seeing details, figuring out teachers' goals, and determining how to incorporate new ideas into their own lesson plans.

Conversely, Synoptic teachers sometimes miss many of the details of the lessons that they observe. Synoptic teachers may compensate for this tendency by arranging a follow-up discussion between teacher and observer. In fact, a post-observation meeting is a good practice in most instances, no matter what styles of teachers are involved.

In programs where tolerance has developed from an understanding of individual differences, peer observation can be a powerful tool for the development of new teachers. In one program that met this description, the supervisor asked three teachers to open their classrooms to a new teacher. She made the request in a written note to all three. Each recipient was asked to help the new teacher with one of three important kinds of activities. The three teachers, of course, agreed to help the new teacher, but, seeing that each of them had special skills in differing areas, they also arranged to visit each other's classes.

Self-Observation. Observation need not always involve another person, such as a faculty developer or peer. Teachers can observe their own work.

The effectiveness of reflective, self-observant teaching depends on a set of skills and strategies that can be taught, although "learning to be reflective through collaborative action research, and reflection itself, is a time-consuming, intensive process" (Pennington 1996, 321).

Reflective self-observation only works when teachers are willing to spend time and cognitive energy to assess their own teaching. Those who are most willing usually value self-reflection, introspection, and self-observation in the teaching process.

Intuitive Thinkers can be very good at reflective teaching and self-analysis, even though otherwise they are not highly attentive to details. For two reasons, however, Intuitive Thinkers are often reluctant to share the results of their analysis with anyone else. First, they do not necessarily recognize external authority, and second, they are self-critical enough not to want or need additional criticism. (They often interpret nearly any form of feedback as criticism.)

Sensing teachers may be ill at ease when asked to use much self-reflection, even though in general they are good at noticing details. Their preference is often to seek feedback from those in authority.

For some teachers, journals are a good way to keep a record of observations of their own teaching (Moore, 1996). However, teachers differ in their interest in taking and rereading notes—and in their ability to pay attention to details. Most Synoptics, for example, make fewer detailed observations and notes than Ectenics, especially if the format used is a post-class journal. For Synoptics, the best approach may be to videotape or audiotape the classroom and then replay the tape as many times as needed to identify relevant details. Compared with Introverted teachers, who tend to be reflective, Extraverts (especially Synoptics) are less likely to have the patience for or interest in keeping journals. Intuitive Thinkers may find journals to be too touchy-feely, an attribute that does not bother their Intuitive Feeling counterparts.

The mechanisms used for reflective self-observation, then, may be myriad within a faculty development program. Allowing teachers to conduct their self-observations in their own style usually provides the best results and the greatest level of comfort.

Formal feedback

Observation usually leads to feedback, one of the most effective means of faculty development—if done appropriately. Done without finesse, feedback not only may be ineffective in creating change but also may cause teachers to resist any new ideas proposed by the faculty developer.

Faculty developers differ in how they plan, conduct, and evaluate feedback sessions. Each of these elements is equally important to the successful use of feedback in a faculty development program.

Planning. Planning helps the faculty developer achieve the most effective results from feedback sessions. Many effective faculty developers plan the session in detail, to the point of preparing written documents and rehearsing before each session. Other successful faculty developers simply review the

teacher's file, think back to prior experiences with the teacher, and develop a few general questions, with the idea that the teacher should assume responsibility for pointing out the areas in which he or she wants counseling and guidance.

Considerations in planning a feedback session include the following. Who should initiate it? Where and when should it be held? How much structure should it have? What materials should be used? Who should ask most of the questions? Should the feedback be supportive or evaluative? (Supportive feedback is preferred by most teachers and faculty developers.) How much directiveness is needed or desired by the teacher? How often should feedback be given? Is the teacher able to self-reflect with any depth and critical awareness? What outcomes are anticipated or expected? How should negative reactions be handled?

The topics to be discussed will, of course, be related to the overall development activities and goals. Areas in which the teacher has contributed to program goals and reached development goals should be noted, as well as those in which more assistance and practice are needed.

Planning location and time is essential to a successful feedback session. Ectenics and Sensers usually need time to consider feedback and new ideas before being able to discuss them coherently. Extraverts and Synoptics, on the other hand, who tend to be impulsive, often want immediate feedback and become anxious if it is not forthcoming.

Planning should include the attitude to be taken—calm, firm, tentative. The attitude will not only be tied in with the topic and goal, but also with the teacher's personality type—which is probably the most important individual difference to consider when devising feedback strategies. A calm approach may be needed to counteract the occasional outbursts of Extraverted Feeling Judgers, who can become vocally emotional when they disagree with the faculty developer or feel that something negative is being said about them. A firm attitude is generally needed only when a teacher is on probation, is not performing up to standard, has not benefited from earlier faculty development efforts, and resists input from the faculty developer. A tentative approach sometimes works well at removing the walls built by some kinds of difficult teachers, who may be talented and knowledgeable but resist input.

Tentativeness is likely to be advantageous in working with Feeling teachers, who, by nature, want to help people. Reversing the relationship so that the new teacher can provide a service by complying with the faculty developer's request gives the teacher a sense of control—with the result that defensive barriers disappear.

Thinking individuals, on the other hand, usually want very different treatment. Developers should avoid pushing their competency button. Thinking teachers will often accept any kind of negative input, even when openly stated, as long as their competence is not questioned. Faculty developers should know that most Thinking teachers criticize themselves more closely than their supervisors do.

Many newly hired teachers are in fact quite experienced. Some have simply changed from secondary to postsecondary teaching, or vice versa. Others may have taken time off for family reasons or for another career. In these cases, updating to contemporary teaching methods may be needed.

Some experienced teachers may resist change because their previous success came using other ways of teaching. Careful planning of the feedback session in such cases can help reduce resistance. Feeling teachers, for example, take input much more readily if their experience and skills are acknowledged and appreciated. Thinking teachers like to come up with their own plans for making changes, so plan ahead to move the discussion in this direction.

Feedback does not have to be negative. In fact, the more positive it can be, the more likely it is that faculty development will continue on an upward curve. Knowing what to praise, however, is as important as knowing where to make changes. Most Feeling teachers want to praised for their efforts, Thinking teachers for their products or competence.

Rehearsing. Rehearsing the feedback session has several important benefits. First, it helps the faculty developer get into the right frame of mind, one in which he or she will not react to "button-pushing" by a confused or hostile teacher. Second, negative reactions can often be predicted and thereby avoided, especially if the faculty developer rehearses with a colleague or friend who has the same personality type or cognitive style as the teacher who will

receive the feedback. Third, rehearsing prepares the faculty developer to set a tone of sharing, so that even if the session is not thoroughly positive, at least it will be viewed as supportive and productive. Fourth, in rehearsing, especially with a colleague of unlike personality type, questions can be anticipated and answers considered.

Too much rehearsing can lead to stilted discussion. Some faculty developers, particularly Extraverted Perceivers, dislike having to be tied to what seems like a "script." They prefer to let the themes and questions emerge naturally during the session. The faculty developer must judge how much rehearsal (and how much preparation in general) is advisable in a particular instance with a specific teacher.

Conducting the Session. Feedback sessions conducted in style can be highly satisfying for teachers and faculty developers, as well as productive in terms of program improvement. As with observation, the focus might be the effectiveness of error-correction techniques, the amount and kind of classroom interaction, pacing, clarity of objectives, fulfillment of objectives, scaffolding by the teacher, and so on.

Introverts, especially those who are Ectenic, require time to respond to feedback. Allow time for silence. Many Extraverts, particularly Auditory ones, will want to keep talking and may not take time to reflect, at least not in the feedback session itself. Sometimes teachers who are not able to reflect on the spot should be given time to think about their performance later on. Better yet, give them a set of general questions to ponder before the feedback session.

Sensing teachers will want details. Sometimes, to Intuitive faculty developers, the questions of Sensing teachers may seem like nit-picking. Nevertheless, Sensers need such details to understand what it is they need to do.

Faculty developers who are Thinkers may need to prepare themselves for the emotions that may arise in Feeling teachers during the session. Feelers, especially Extraverted Feelers, may sometimes react defensively to negative comments. Whereas Thinking teachers in such cases will generally try to use logic to defend the choices they made in the classroom, Feeling teachers will

often personalize not only the faculty developer's critical comments but also the rest of the feedback session. They may then tune out and thus fail to receive the benefit of the criticism. They may even say things that offend or hurt the faculty developer.

Many Feelers will become calmer about the discussion in a day or two, and will expect the faculty developer, too, to let the emotions (however strongly expressed) fade away. For some faculty developers, especially Thinkers, this is difficult, but it is important to realize that the Feeling teacher's emotions of the moment are not necessarily durable ones. When on the receiving end of Feeling teachers' emotional responses faculty developers must react calmly and forgive them on the spot. Building walls of defense is the least effective means of creating change—and change is the essence of faculty development.

It may also help to remember that Feeling teachers respond to praise for their efforts. To them, effort represents personal loyalty and can be more important than the actual product. The faculty developer who waits for the product (a temptation of the Thinking type) often misses important opportunities for motivating Feeling teachers. Feeling teachers want their supervisors, mentors, and teachers to be kind and caring. In feedback, comments that reveal the faculty developer's recognition of the Feeling teacher's effort can do much to motivate the teacher to keep trying to improve.

Thinking teachers, on the other hand, are often uncomfortable in the presence of emotion. They care more that the results of their work are valued and that they are considered competent than whether their efforts are noticed. When asked how they feel about something they have done or about a comment the faculty developer has made, Thinking teachers may say they have been put on the spot. Without reacting in the presence of the faculty developer, they may resent the attempt to elicit emotion. They want their achievements to be noticed, and they want to be rewarded for them. It is the personalization—the praise for effort, the eliciting of emotion—that bothers Thinking individuals.

If a feedback session pinpoints a problem to be resolved, new teaching practices to be implemented, or any other correction to be made, Judging teachers are likely to start proposing plans of action on the spot. For Perceiving

(and many Ectenic) teachers, on the other hand, time will be needed. For those who are averse to or amused by deadlines, a deadline is nevertheless needed. It is entirely reasonable to ask the Perceiving teacher to prepare a plan of action and to bring it to the faculty developer at a time of the teacher's choosing during the week after the feedback session.

Faculty developers may need to make allowances for Motor teachers' need to use their muscles—to draw, doodle, stand up, or move around the room during the feedback session. Taking a walk together when thorny issues need to be discussed can help Motor-Kinesthetic teachers think and interact better.

Following up

Feedback sessions that are not followed up amount to little more than shots in the dark. Intuitive Thinking and Synoptic teachers might do something independently with the information; teachers with other styles are not as likely to do so. Therefore, plans need to be made during the feedback session for actions to be taken by the teacher and the faculty developer. In some cases, issues uncovered during the observation or feedback processes may be relevant to a large number of the faculty. These cases point out obvious topics for the next series of faculty development activities.

More often than not feedback is a multi-step, multi-meeting process—not a one-time activity. In some cases, feedback may prove to be a slow process. The slower it is, the more likely it is to be crucial to an individual teacher's development.

Evaluation. Since feedback is evaluative, it is important to consider evaluation and its forms in greater detail. Evaluation can determine just what teaching skills are most in need of development, both for individual teachers and for groups. Evaluation can also assess the effectiveness of faculty development activities.

Unfortunately, evaluation is rarely viewed in its positive, supportive light, especially if the faculty developer is also a supervisor whose comments can affect the teacher's performance rating and future salary. Sometimes the

teacher being evaluated has had negative experiences in the past and now tries to avoid evaluation. Sometimes the faculty developer has lived through miserable experiences with past evaluations and does not feel comfortable doing them. In these cases, a new and more positive way of viewing evaluation is essential.

Evaluation can be either formative or summative. Formative evaluations yield diagnostic information that can help the parties make improvements over a period of teaching or learning; it serves as a coaching mechanism. In contrast, summative evaluations are usually done at the end of set period of time; they underpin personnel actions. As part of a comprehensive faculty development program, formative evaluation is used to create positive change, while summative evaluation is used to assess whether positive change has occurred.

The teacher needs to know in advance which kind of evaluation is being done. Beyond that minimum degree of preparation, style differences can affect how evaluations are perceived and whether or not they are effective. The suggestions made below are meant for faculty developers who are also supervisors or who have been assigned the task of evaluation as part of their faculty development duties.

Formative and summative evaluation should always be considered separate activities. Some administrators think that, because they have the trust of the teachers who work for them, they can take a shortcut and safely conduct both kinds simultaneously, but, contend Stanley and Popham (1988, 59), "they are deluding themselves." Formative evaluation may well be the most important and most useful of all faculty development tools—mixing it with summative evaluation dilutes its effectiveness. As with other activities, the effectiveness of formative evaluation is increased when style issues are kept in mind. Especially important are differences in personality and perceptual style.

Many faculty developers find Intuitive Thinkers the most difficult to evaluate. Although very self-critical, many Intuitive Thinkers do not accept outside input as readily as they do their own ideas. Nobody has authority over them simply by virtue of holding an important position. Therefore, the faculty developer has to prove his or her own competence before the Intuitive Thinker will pay attention to evaluative comments. This can often be accomplished in

other faculty development activities, such as demonstration classrooms and four-handed teaching.

Feeling teachers often personalize negative aspects of evaluations. Sandwiching the negative between two positives often helps soften the blow. (While Feelers usually appreciate this approach, Intuitive Thinkers see through it and sometimes conclude that the faculty developer is trying to manipulate them; as a result, they accept neither the positive nor the negative input.) Extraverted Feelers are more likely than Introverted Feelers to express anger or frustration directly to the faculty developer. Introverted Feelers are more likely to internalize their anger, showing it later in an unrelated way. Letting the Introverted teacher know that he or she is valued, regardless of what the evaluation may say, can help in these cases. The goal should be to establish positive motivation, which wields significant power, as opposed to negative motivation, which can impeded the ability to store and recall information (Goleman 1995).

Sensing Judging teachers are in many ways the easiest to evaluate formatively. In general, they want to "follow the rules" and do what they are "supposed to do." But they want many details, often more than faculty developers who are not fellow Sensing Judgers are ready to give.

The Visual teacher needs to see the formative evaluation in writing, preferably some time before any discussion of it. The Auditory teacher understands the contents better if they are discussed first—a written version can be left for review. The Motor-Kinesthetic teacher appreciates a discussion spent while taking a walk or over a meal. Providing the Fine-Motor teachers with the opportunity to take notes during the discussion generally helps them understand better. Motor-Tactile teachers, particularly those who are also Visual, may like to have reports that they can pick up and look at during formative evaluation discussions.

Empowering foreign-language teachers

Successful development of foreign-language faculty ultimately leads to their empowerment—that is, to the realization of their full potential as educators. Faculty developers can facilitate the empowerment process by helping teachers

become more independent and thereby more prepared to take on significantly expanded roles in the foreign-language program.

Developing independence

To realize their full potential, foreign-language teachers need the freedom to pursue their own ideas and to develop independence of thought. The form of freedom to be given will depend, to some extent, on the style of the teacher. Some teachers quickly develop independence in their approaches to teaching and learning; some appear to have been born independent. Other teachers need to be pushed and pulled into independence; they would rather have someone else tell them what to do—and to be able to pass the blame if things go wrong.

Among the naturally independent teachers are the Intuitive Thinkers and the Concrete and Random subscales of the Synoptic axis on the E&L Construct—styles that often occur together. These teachers are always mentally independent. Even in the most rigidly controlled program, they will find ways to experiment with their own ideas. They do not look for permission to be creative—they just do it. In fact, they cannot do otherwise: There is no way for them to avoid being creative even if they are ordered to do so. Once they understand program goals and have become familiar with the various methods and techniques that are essential to meeting those goals, they can be let loose to devise their own permutations and ideas.

Less independent types may need more help and encouragement. Sensing Judgers usually want to know that they are getting things right and meeting requirements; letting them know that innovation has a place in the program and that independent thinking is valued can help. Sensing Judgers, particularly those who are sequential and concrete, want instructions and examples of how to do things before they are ready to march out on their own. Sensing-Judgers who are Abstract and Sequential usually seek templates to use as guidelines; and Intuitive Feelers who are Abstract and Random want to observe how empowered teachers work.

Providing support

Foreign-language teachers, like all teachers, need support if they are to become fully empowered. Even the most talented can at times benefit from a cheerleader. And all teachers need to know that it is okay to fail at times. If they do not have the ability or opportunity to risk failure, many teachers will not try out new ideas or innovate on their own. Some need more support than others—a trait that derives from differences in personality and cognitive style. The kinds of support that teachers find useful also vary with style.

Feeling Perceiving teachers want emotional support. They do not want to be given resource materials or challenging assignments unless they are also recognized as loyal, worthwhile, effortful, caring, and well-intentioned human beings.

Sensing Judging and Sequential teachers want informational support. They are delighted to receive large packages of materials and information and are not waiting for the next warm, supportive interaction with the faculty developer.

Concrete teachers who are also Random prefer to use trial and error in most of their endeavors. They learn by doing, especially when the doing is their own decision, and are frustrated by material that has been predigested (organized) for them. An important question for them—one that often strikes fear in faculty developers and very likely brought premature gray to their parents—is "What if …?" Such teachers are great experimenters and risk-takers. Faculty developers can support them by staying out of the way. They need to be allowed to succeed or fail; they need the chance to try, no matter what the outcome.

Conclusion

Successful faculty development programs provide teachers with new information; allow them to consider their own values and beliefs; encourage them to make their own judgments; and allow them to make positive changes within their own classrooms. The very best programs do this in accordance with teachers' needs. Usually this means teaching, developing, talking, and

working in ways consistent with the teacher's personality type and cognitive and perceptual styles.

Faculty developers should take individual differences in type and style into account in designing development sessions and activities. By talking directly about style, modeling style-sensitivity and understanding, and orienting one's teaching to the style preferences of individual learners, faculty developers can greatly improve foreign-language teaching while enhancing teachers' morale and expanding their knowledge.

An added benefit, by no means a trivial one, is that teachers who experience style-based faculty development are much more likely to use style-sensitive, learner-centered instruction in their own classrooms.

References

Asher, J. (1988). *Total physical response*. Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Productions.

Azevedo, M. M. (1990). Professional development of teaching assistants: Training versus education. *ADFL Bulletin* 22(1): 24–28.

Barsch, J. nd. *Barsch Learning Style Inventory*. http://www.wou.edu/provost/aalc/learning/BarschLS_Inventory.html.

Butler, K. (2001). *ViewPoints: Styles of thinking and learning*. Columbia, CT: The Learner's Dimension.

Dunn, R. (1989) Learning Style Inventory: An inventory for the identification of how individuals in grades 3 through 12 prefer to learn. Entwhistle, NJ: Price Systems.

Dunn, R. S., and K. Dunn (1978). *Teaching students through their individual learning styles*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Dunn, R. S. (1996). *How to implement and supervise a learning style program.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Ehrman, M. E. (1996). *Understanding second language learning difficulties*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ehrman, M., and B. L. Leaver (1997). Sorting out global and analytic functions in second language learning. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Applied Linguists, March, Orlando, FL.

Ehrman, M. E., and B. L. Leaver (2002). Development of a profile approach to learning style diagnosis. Unpublished manuscript submitted for publication.

Ehrman, M. E., B. L. Leaver, and R. Oxford. 2003. A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning." *System* 31 (3): 313-330.

Gattegno, C. (1978). *Common sense of teaching foreign languages*. NY: Educational Solutions.

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

Goroshko, N., and L. Slutsky (1999). Four-handed teaching. In B. L. Leaver (Ed.), *Twelve years of dialogue on teaching Russian*. Washington, DC: ACTR/ACCELS.

Grenfell, M. (1998). *Training teachers in practice*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Horwitz, E. (1996). Meeting the cognitive and emotional needs of new foreign language teachers. In Z. Moore (Ed.), *Foreign language teacher education: Multiple perspectives*. New York: University Press of America.

INTASC (2002). http://www.ccsso.org/intasc.html.

Kegan, R., and L. L. Bates. (2003). How the way we talk can change the way we work: Seven languages for transformation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Keirsey, D., and M. A. Bates (1988). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis.

Kolb, D., R. Irwin, and J. McIntyre. (1979). Organizational psychology: An experimental approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kroeger, O., and J. M. Thuesen (1992). *Type at work*. New York: Dell.

Lado, R. (1964). *Language teaching: A scientific approach*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Leaver, B. L. (1986). Hemisphericity of the brain and foreign language teaching. *Folia Slavica* (8) 1: 76–90.

Leaver, B. L. (1988). *Report of differences in modes of strategy instruction*. Unpublished manuscript, Defense Language Institute, Monterey, CA.

Leaver, B. L. (1998). *Teaching the whole class: Fifth edition*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt.

Leaver, B. L. (2005). *Teaching the whole class: Sixth edition.* Salinas, CA: MSI Press.

Leaver, B. L. Forthcoming. *Language program management*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Leaver, Echo E., and Betty Lou Leaver. (1996). *AGSI Learning Styles Assessment Tool*. Salinas, CA: The AGSI Press. Revised 2000 by Echo Leaver as ACTR Learning Styles Assessment Tool; available on the Internet at www.actr.org/russnet/ALSAT/html.

Leaver, B. L., and R. L. Oxford (2000). Mentoring in style: Using style information to enhance mentoring of foreign language teachers. In B. Rifkin (Ed.), *Mentoring foreign language teaching assistants, lecturers, and adjunct faculty*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Messick, S., and Associates. (1976). Individuality in learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Moore, Z. (1996). Journaling: A path to reflective teacher development. In Z. Moore (Ed.), *Foreign language teacher education: Multiple perspectives*. New York: University Press of America.

Myers, I. (1993). *Gifts differing*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Myers, I. B., and K. Briggs (1976). *The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

NCATE (2002). http://www.ncate.org/standard/m_stds.htm.

Oxford, R. L. (2000). A five-part learning cycle for language lesson planning and faculty development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the

Greater Washington Association of Teachers of Foreign Languages, Washington, DC.

Oxford, R. L. (2001). Visual-word, visual-pictorial, and visual-spatial learning styles. Lecture, "Learning Styles and Strategies" course, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Oxford, R.L., Jung, S-H., Zhang, Y., Yin, C. & Zdanoski, J. (2004). *Style Orientation Scale,* Version 1. Unpublished questionnaire used for pilot testing. University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Oxford, R.L., Jung, S-H., Zhang, Y., & Yin, C. (forthcoming). *Style Orientation Scale,* Version 2. University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Oxford, R. L., M. E. Ehrman, and R. Z. Lavine (1991). Style wars: Teacher-student style conflicts in the language classroom. In S. S. Magnan (Ed.), *Challenges for the 1990s for college language programs*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle/Thomson International.

Pask, G., and B. C. E. Scott (1975). Learning strategies and individual competence. In J. M. Whitehead (Ed.), *Personality and learning I: A reader prepared by the Personality and Learning Course Team and The Open University*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Pennington, M. (1996). When input becomes intake: Tracing the sources of attitude change. In D. Freeman and J. C. Richards (Eds.)*, Teacher learning in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reid, J. (1998). *Understanding learning styles in the second language classroom.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Richards, J. C. (1998). *Beyond training: Perspectives on language teacher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robin, R. (1999). Talking about grammar: Time to call time out. In B. L. Leaver (Ed.), *Twelve years of dialogue on teaching Russian*. Washington, DC: ACTR/ACCELS.

Tannen, D. (1994). *Talking from 9 to 5: Women and men in the workplace—Language, sex, and power*. New York: Avon.

Van Fleet, J. K. (1973). *The 22 biggest mistakes managers make and how to correct them*. West Nyack, NY: Parker.

Wagner, T. (2003). Making the grade: Reinventing America's schools. New York: Routledge Farmer.

Woodward, L. (1999). Communication in style. In B. L. Leaver (Ed.), *Twelve years of dialogue on teaching Russian*. Washington, DC: ACTR/ACCELS.