



The Interface among Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Intelligences, Language Teaching Anxiety, and Classroom Management Beliefs: The Case of EAP Instructors

Mavadat Saidi^{1*}, Zohreh Bayatshahbazi²

^{1,2} *English Department, Shahid Rajaei Teacher Training University, Tehran, Iran*

*Corresponding author: m.saidi@sru.ac.ir

(Received: 2020/12/14; Accepted: 2021/4/12)

Online publication: 2021/4/26

Abstract

The current study aimed to investigate the relationship among English for academic purposes instructors' interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence types, language teaching anxiety, and classroom management beliefs taking a correlational research design. To this end, a convenient sample of 98 EAP instructors were asked to complete the excerpted sections of McKenzie's Multiple Intelligences Questionnaire, Teacher Anxiety Scale, and Behavior and Instructional Management Scale. The results of Pearson product-moment tests revealed a significant negative relationship between interpersonal intelligence and classroom management beliefs while no significant link was observed between intrapersonal intelligence and classroom management beliefs. The same results were obtained for the possible relationship between these two intelligence types and language teaching anxiety. Furthermore, a significant negative relationship was found between EAP instructors' language teaching anxiety and classroom management beliefs. The multiple regression analysis also showed that interpersonal intelligence could strongly predict EAP instructors' classroom management beliefs. Furthermore, the two independent samples t-tests demonstrated that language and content instructors differed with regard to their language teaching anxiety and classroom management beliefs in EAP classes. The results were discussed in light of previously existing literature and some pedagogical implications were presented for EAP teacher training courses.

Keywords: classroom management beliefs, English for academic purposes, EAP language instructor, EAP content instructor, interpersonal intelligence, intrapersonal intelligence, language teaching anxiety

Introduction

Intelligence has been viewed as a fixed construct which was represented in the individuals' ability to provide correct answers to the IQ test items (Smith, 2001). This view has been dominant in educational contexts till Gardner (1983) put forth the multiple intelligences theory and expounded on intelligence as a problem-solving ability which is demonstrated in one's degree of flexibility and adaptability in new situations. He introduced seven types of intelligence including verbal/linguistic, logical/mathematical, musical, spatial/visual, bodily/kinesthetic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal and added two types, natural and existential later. MI theory was grounded on two main claims in which all human beings are supposed to possess eight types of intelligence while they have distinct profiles of intelligence types (Gardner, 2005).

MI theory revolutionized the views towards intelligence in educational settings and evoked a new line of research. In this regard, most studies have been focused on language learners. Previous studies have demonstrated the lasting impact of applying MI principles in the classrooms on the students' achievements and mobilizing their intelligences. In this regard, research has revealed the positive influence of multiple intelligences on the students' accomplishments in writing activities (Borek, 2003; Eng & Mustapha, 2010; Grow, 1990; Marefat, 2007; Saidi, 2020a; Zeraatpishe, Seifoori, & Hadidi Tamjid, 2020), reading skill (McMahon, Ross, & Parks, 2002) and language learning strategies (Akbari & Hosseini, 2008).

Despite the large bulk of research on language learners' multiple intelligences, scant attention has been allocated to the teachers' multiple intelligences. In this regard, English teachers' linguistic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal intelligences have been related to their self-efficacy beliefs (Saidi, 2020b; Tajeddin & Saidi, 2011). Furthermore, Khosravi and Saidi (2014) found a positive relationship between English for academic purposes instructors' personal intelligences and self-efficacy beliefs. In another study, Dolati and Tahriri (2017) investigated the types of activities EFL teachers used in their classes taking into account their multiple intelligences and found out that only teachers with a high level of logical intelligence were significantly different from their colleagues in terms of the activities they employed. In a recent attempt, Erdem and Keklik (2020) also attempted to examine the pre-service teachers' multiple intelligences profiles. Their findings indicated lower levels of musical and verbal intelligences among the participants. Moreover, variations of MI profiles were noticed with

regard to the prospective teachers' gender, field of study, and year of college.

These studies have indicated the important influence of multiple intelligences on the instructors' teaching practices. Being linked to the teachers' perceptions of their self-efficacy (Saidi, 2018) and their instructional procedures, multiple intelligences may be hypothesized to contribute to the way teachers handle the instructional and behavioral dilemmas in their classes. Indeed, managing the classroom entails taking advantage of all the existing resources, and thereby, may be influenced by a wide range of physical, cognitive, and affective characteristics teachers possess (Erdem & Keklik, 2020). Marzano and Marzano (2003) considered classroom management as a noteworthy area of research in educational settings which form an essential part of the teaching process. Classroom management strategies were defined as "the most valuable skills set a teacher can have" (Landu, 2001, p.4). They entail a wide range of teachers' attempts to monitor classroom activities (Burden, 2005).

The teachers' classroom management strategies may be considered on a continuum ranging from non-interventionist to interventionist, with interactionist located between them (Glickman & Tamashiro, 1980). Non-interventionist teachers presume that the students possess inner drives which need to be fully expressed and adhere to student-centered principles and practices (Martin, Tin, & Baldwin, 1998). Contrarily, interventionist teachers are inclined to take more authoritative stances in their classes and try to control the students. The interactionist teachers, midway between the two extremes, highlight "what the individual does to modify the external environment, as well as what the environment does to shape the individual" (Martin et al., 1998, p.7).

Numerous studies have proved the role of experience and gender (Martin, Yin, & Mayall, 2006) and individual differences (Rahimi & Asadollahi, 2012) in the instructional and behavioral procedures the teachers adopt to manage their classes. In this sense, the more experienced teachers were found to take a more controlling approach. On the other hand, the female teachers demonstrated a higher tendency to take the interventionist approach. Furthermore, Rahimi and Asadollahi's (2012) study revealed the influence of teachers' education and district of school on their classroom management strategies. However, their study contradicted the previously conducted ones in that it disapproved the mediation of such variables as age, experience, and school type in the way teachers control their classes.

Another set of studies has attempted to cast light on the correspondence between teachers' classroom management beliefs and practice (Aliakbari &

Heidarzadi, 2015). In a recent attempt, Saidi (2018) found a significant relationship between the English teachers' instructional management and their self-efficacy beliefs while she observed a weak relationship between the behavioral management and self-efficacy beliefs. Moreover, no significant difference was found between male and female English teachers considering their self-efficacy beliefs and classroom management strategies.

On the other hand, to manage the classroom in an organized way, teachers' personal traits play a key role (Erdem & Keklik, 2020; Rahimi & Asadollahi, 2012). One of those affective variables which might make an impact on the teachers' teaching perceptions and practices is their teaching anxiety level which seems to have remained untouched (Alipour & Gorjian, 2014). As Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) asserted, language class is a locus of anxiety for teachers. The classes are even more stressful in universities where the instructors teach English to university students with higher levels of expectations and more informed attendance. Teaching anxiety refers to the anxiety related to the planning and implementation of classroom activities. Indeed, it is experienced associated with the instructors' instructional and behavioral management (Gardner & Leak, 1994). This factor seems to be of higher prominence in English for academic purposes course in which both the content knowledge and language knowledge are prioritized. EAP courses are offered by the content (subject specialists) or language (English language teaching specialists) instructors to students of almost all majors in Iranian universities. The need-based and student-centered nature of these courses put a heavy burden of responsibility on the instructors (Khosravi & Saidi, 2014).

Bearing the substantial role of the EAP instructors in bringing about successful learning experiences and taking into account the scarcely existing literature on the teachers' multiple intelligences and teaching anxiety as well as the instructors' delicate job in EAP courses, the current study aimed to explore the possible relationship between Iranian EAP instructors' interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence types, language teaching anxiety, and classroom management beliefs. It is worth noting that interpersonal intelligence as "the ability to perceive and make distinctions in the moods, intentions, and feelings of other people" and "the sensitivity to facial expressions, voice, and gestures" and intrapersonal intelligence as "having an accurate picture of oneself (one's strengths and limitations)" and "the capacity for self-discipline, self-understanding, and self-esteem" (Armstrong, 2000, p. 2) were considered as they have been linked to EAP instructors' self-efficacy beliefs in the existing literature (Khosravi & Saidi,

2014) and self-efficacy has been shown to be correlated with classroom management beliefs among English instructors (Saidi, 2018). Moreover, since previous studies have revealed the marked dissimilarities with regard to the language and content EAP instructors' teaching practices (Atai, Babaii, & Taherkhani, 2017), the study further attempted to see if there was a significant difference between these two groups in terms of their language teaching anxiety and classroom management beliefs. The study particularly addressed the following questions:

RQ1: Is there any significant relationship between Iranian EAP instructors' interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence types and their classroom management beliefs?

RQ2: Is there any significant relationship between Iranian EAP instructors' interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence types and their language teaching anxiety?

RQ3: Is there any significant relationship between Iranian EAP instructors' language teaching anxiety and their classroom management beliefs?

RQ4: Among interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence types and language teaching anxiety, which one predicts the classroom management beliefs?

RQ5: Is there any significant difference between language and content EAP instructors in terms of their language teaching anxiety?

RQ6: Is there any significant difference between language and content EAP instructors in terms of their classroom management beliefs?

Method

Participants

A convenient sample of 98 Iranian EAP instructors (45 males and 52 females) aged between 37 and 60 years old participated in this study. They have been teaching English for academic purposes to the students of various fields of study for 2 to 15 years. The participants included both content instructors (49) who held postgraduate degrees in non-English majors including engineering, law, nutrition, psychology, physical education, geography, physics, and biology and language instructors (49) who had postgraduate degrees in English majors, namely Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) (33), English literature (9) and Translation Studies (7).

Instruments

In order to gather the required data, the following instruments were used:

a) McKenzie's Multiple Intelligences Questionnaire: The relevant items for interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences were extracted from this questionnaire with an overall internal consistency of 0.85-0.90 (Razmjoo, 2008; Razmjoo, Sahragard, & Sadri, 2009). There are 10 five-point Likert-scale items for each intelligence types, ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree). The calculated reliability using the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient were 0.87 and 0.85 for interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence types, respectively.

b) Language Teaching Anxiety: In order to determine the EAP instructors' teaching anxiety scores, Capel's (1997) Teacher Anxiety Scale was utilized. It includes 26 five-point Likert-scale items ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The calculated Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was 0.91.

c) Classroom Management Scale: In order to determine the scores on classroom management beliefs, Behavior and Instructional Management Scale (BIMS) inventory was used (Martin & Sass, 2010). It consists of 24 six-point Likert-scale items on instructional management (12 items) and behavior management (12 items) ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Higher subscale scores signify a more controlling interventionist approach and lower subscale scores show a less controlling, non-interventionist approach. The overall reliability for the inventory was calculated via Cronbach's Alpha as 0.80. The reliability coefficients were 0.79 and 0.82 for the instructional and behavioral management, respectively.

The EAP instructors were asked to jot down their demographic information, namely age, gender, educational degree, and years of teaching EAP courses.

Procedures

The questionnaires were sent to the EAP instructors via email. They were asked to answer the excerpted items from multiple intelligences questionnaire. Then, they were asked to complete BIMS inventory and language teaching anxiety scale based on their experiences in EAP classes.

They were requested to provide their demographic information as well. All the participants were assured to the anonymity of the data.

Design

The study had a correlational design. Similar to ex post facto design, the correlational design entails no manipulation of the variables. The design pursues the relationships among two or more variables within a single group of the participants, and makes it possible to explore the strength of relationships among variables (Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, & Razavieh, 2010). The study was conducted in the EAP context. EAP instruction in Iran encompasses three distinct generations (Atai, 2002). The first generation experienced EAP courses offered with the cooperation of Western academic centers. The second generation of EAP courses was developed by the government and led to the production of a limited set of EAP textbooks. The third generation advanced through tailoring EAP textbooks to the peculiarities of numerous fields of study. The currently held EAP courses aim to fulfill the gap between the students' general English competence and their discipline-specialist knowledge and skills. The courses are mostly offered by the content instructors while some are presented by the language instructors. The students mostly take a three-credit general English course followed by their EAP courses.

Data Analysis

To answer the research questions, both descriptive and inferential statistics were used. The data were entered into SPSS. To answer the first three research questions, investigating the relationship among interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence types, language teaching anxiety, and classroom management beliefs, three Pearson product-moment correlation tests were used. Then, in order to address the fourth research question, a multiple regression analysis was applied. Furthermore, two independent samples t-tests were run in order to answer the fifth and sixth research questions investigating the possible differences between EAP language and content instructors with regard to their language teaching anxiety and classroom management beliefs.

Results

Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics for the participants' interpersonal intelligence, intrapersonal intelligence, language teaching anxiety, and classroom management beliefs.

Table1

Descriptive Statistics for Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Intelligence Types, Language Teaching Anxiety, and Classroom Management Beliefs

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Interpersonal intelligence	98	29	49	37.40	6.25
Intrapersonal intelligence	98	27	48	36.55	6.58
Language teaching anxiety	98	50	110	76.70	15.57
Classroom management beliefs	98	94	139	59.60	15.42
Instructional management	98	46	70	58.80	7.60
Behavioral management	98	46	71	60.40	7.93

As indicated in Table1, the total mean of Iranian EAP instructors' interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence types were 37.40 and 26.55, respectively. This indicated a high level of personal intelligences among the participants. The total mean of Iranian EAP instructors' language teaching anxiety was 76.70 which revealed that the instructors experience a high level of teaching anxiety in EAP classes. Furthermore, the total mean of the instructional and behavioral management beliefs were 58.80 and 60.40, respectively. This showed that the instructors tended to adopt a more controlling, interventionist approach in their EAP classes.

To find out the relationship between Iranian EAP instructors' interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence types and their classroom management beliefs, a Pearson product-moment correlation test was used. Table 2 presents the results.

Table 2
The Results of Correlation between Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Intelligence Types and Classroom Management Beliefs

Variable	Instructional management	Sig.	Behavioral management	Sig.	Classroom management	Sig.
Interpersonal intelligence	-0.72*	0.00	-0.77*	0.00	-0.75*	0.00
Intrapersonal intelligence	-0.18	0.44	-0.23	0.27	-0.20	0.37

As Table 2 illustrates, there is a significant negative relationship between interpersonal intelligence and instructional ($r=-0.72$, $p\leq 0.01$) and behavioral ($r=-0.77$, $p\leq 0.01$) management beliefs- that is, higher level of interpersonal intelligence is associated with less controlling management beliefs among Iranian EAP instructors. However, the relationship is non-significant between interpersonal intelligence and instructional ($r=-0.18$, $p\leq 0.01$) and behavioral ($r=-0.23$) management beliefs.

To investigate the relationship between Iranian EAP instructors' interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence types and language teaching anxiety, a Pearson product-moment correlation was used. Table 3 displays the results.

Table 3
The Results of Correlation between Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Intelligence Types and Language Teaching Anxiety

Variable	Language teaching anxiety	Sig.
Interpersonal intelligence	-0.59*	0.01
Intrapersonal intelligence	-0.00	0.98

As Table 3 shows, there is a significant negative relationship between interpersonal intelligence and language teaching anxiety ($r=-0.54$, $p\leq 0.01$) while the relationship between intrapersonal intelligence and language teaching anxiety ($r=-0.00$, $p\leq 0.01$) is non-significant. This finding suggested that higher level of interpersonal intelligence was associated with lower level of language teaching anxiety.

In order to examine the relationship between Iranian EAP instructors' language teaching anxiety and classroom management beliefs, a Pearson product-moment correlation test was run. Table 4 shows the results.

Table 4

The Results of Correlation between Language Teaching Anxiety and Classroom Management Beliefs

Variable	Instructional management	Sig.	Behavioral management	Sig.
Language teaching anxiety	0.76*	0.00	0.76*	0.00

As Table 4 suggests, there is a significant positive relationship between language teaching anxiety and instructional ($r= 0.76, p\leq 0.01$) and behavioral ($r= 0.76, p\leq 0.01$) management beliefs. These findings imply that higher degree of language teaching anxiety is linked to higher tendency towards more controlling approach towards classroom management.

The fourth research question aimed to see which of the two highly-correlated variables (i.e., interpersonal intelligence and language teaching anxiety) was a strong predictor of the Iranian EAP instructors' classroom management beliefs. A multiple regression analysis was conducted. Since no significant relationship was found between intrapersonal intelligence and classroom management beliefs, it was not included in the regression analysis. The results are presented in Tables 5, 6, and 7.

Table 5

Model Summary Investigating Multiple Correlation Coefficients, the Adjusted and Unadjusted R of the Variables

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	St. error of the estimate
0.868	0.754	0.725	8.086

a: Dependent variable: Classroom management beliefs

As Table 5 shows, the multiple correlation coefficient (R) is 0.86 ($R^2= 0.75$) and the adjusted R square is 0.72. This indicates that 72% of the variance in the Iranian EAP instructors' classroom management beliefs can be predicted from the combination of interpersonal intelligence and language teaching anxiety.

Table 6 illustrates the ANOVA results to investigate whether these two variables significantly predicted Iranian EAP instructors' classroom management beliefs.

Table 6
ANOVA Results

	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Regression	3407.453	2	1703.72	26.05	0.00
Residual	1111.747				
Total	4519.200				

a: Dependent variable: Classroom management beliefs

b: Predictors: (Constant), interpersonal intelligence, language teaching anxiety

Table 6 shows both interpersonal intelligence and language teaching anxiety significantly predicted Iranian EAP instructors' classroom management beliefs, $F = 26.05$, $p = 0.00 \leq 0.01$. Table 7 displays the amount of contribution of each of the independent variables (interpersonal intelligence and language teaching anxiety) to the dependent one (classroom management beliefs).

Table 7
The Amount of Contribution of Interpersonal Intelligence and Language Teaching Anxiety to Classroom Management Beliefs

	B	Std. error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	123.96	21.404		5.792	0.000
Interpersonal intelligence	0.508	0.142	0.513	3.563	0.002
Language teaching anxiety	-1.169	0.355	-0.474	-3.292	0.004

As Table 7 depicts, both interpersonal intelligence and language teaching anxiety were significant predictors of Iranian EAP instructors' classroom management beliefs; however, interpersonal intelligence was found to be a stronger predictor (Beta= 0.51, $t = 3.56$, $p = 0.002 \leq 0.01$).

In order to see if there was any significant difference between language and content EAP instructors in terms of their language teaching anxiety and classroom management beliefs, two independent samples t-tests were conducted. Table 8 illustrates the results.

Table 8

The Results of Independent Samples T-Tests for Language and Content EAP Instructors

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	T	df	Sig.
Instructional management	Language	49	65.50	2.87	-8.958	96	0.00
	Content	49	52.10	3.75			
Behavioral management	Language	49	67.50	67.50		96	0.00
	Content	49	53.30	53.30			
Language teaching anxiety	Language	49	89.30	10.49		96	0.00
	Content	49	64.10	7.01			

As Table 8 displays, there is a significant difference between language and content EAP instructors in terms of their language teaching anxiety (Sig.= 0.000, $p \leq 0.01$), instructional (Sig.= 0.000, $p \leq 0.01$), and behavioral (Sig.= 0.000, $p \leq 0.01$) management beliefs. The findings suggested that language teachers experienced higher levels of language teaching anxiety in EAP classes compared to their content counterparts. Furthermore, they seemed to adopt a more controlling approach in instructional and behavioral management of the EAP classes.

Discussion

The study aimed to investigate the possible relationship between Iranian EAP instructors' interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence types, language teaching anxiety, and classroom management beliefs. It further attempted to see if there was any significant difference between language and content EAP instructors in terms of their language teaching anxiety and classroom management beliefs.

The findings revealed that both language and content instructors adopt an interventionist approach towards the instructional and behavioral management in EAP classes. However, the language EAP instructors were found to be more interventionist. The results were at odds with those of previous studies (Alakbari & Heidarzadi, 2015; Evrim, Gökçe, & Erisa, 2009; Swanson, O'Connnor, & Cooney, 1990). Since EAO instructors receive no formal teacher training, they may think that allowing students to gain control in the class would put them in a difficult position to handle

subject-related problems. In this sense, language EAP instructors' lack of subject-related contents may result in adopting a more controlling approach. Indeed, it may be an avoidance strategy to resolve the probable critical incidents (Atai & Nejadghanbar, 2017).

Moreover, the results revealed that both language and content EAP instructors felt highly anxious teaching English to the students of various disciplines. This might underlie the burden which EAP courses put on the teachers in order to reach a maximum level of accountability and efficiency (Khosravi & Saidi, 2014). In this regard, the result corroborated the findings of the previously conducted studies which testified to the English university instructors' anxiety in their classes (Alipour & Gorjian, 2014). Gearing the EAP courses to the intended group of students' academic needs seems to be a daunting task for both groups. However, the findings indicated higher levels of language teaching anxiety among language EAP instructors which might be justified by their probable lack of content, subject-related knowledge. As Wu and Badger (2009) stated, EAP courses are the locus of "In-Class Subject Knowledge Dilemma" which expose the instructors to numerous "unpredictable situations" (p. 19). Hence, the EAP instructors might be perturbed by the discipline-based requirements of the courses which might exceed their content knowledge (Atai & Nejadghanbar, 2017). Indeed, language EAP instructors might encounter unexpected incidents which demand "discipline-related content which does not fall within their realm of expertise" (Atai & Nejadghanbar, 2017, p. 2). Moreover, lack of a consistent model for the EAP teaching practices in Iran might render language EAP instructors more anxious than their content counterparts (Atai & Fatahi-Majd, 2014). On the other hand, some degree of anxiety seems to be needed as an impetus behind the EAP instructors' attempts to fulfill the expectations of the academic discourse communities and tailoring EAP courses to the specific needs of the learners in various disciplines.

Furthermore, the results demonstrated a negative correlation between interpersonal and instructional and behavioral management beliefs while no significant relationship was found between intrapersonal intelligence and instructional and behavioral management beliefs. It seems that the interpersonal intelligence and classroom management beliefs are attributed of a general ability, that is, benefiting from one's capabilities and their

awareness of their strengths and weaknesses to achieve their optimal goals (Khosravi & Saidi, 2014). Being able to discern and differentiate the students' various feelings, moods, and needs would enable the EAP instructors to take risks and adopt a less controlling approach to the instructional and behavioral management beliefs (Armstrong, 2000; Khosravi & Saidi, 2014). Having a good perception of their capabilities to establish a successful communication with the learners would expedite the EAP instructors' instructional and behavioral management beliefs (Aliakbari & Heidarzadi, 2015).

Furthermore, the results disclosed the significant negative relationship between interpersonal intelligence and language teaching anxiety while no significant correlation was discovered between intrapersonal intelligence and language teaching anxiety. Being aware of the learners' feelings would make the EAP instructors more confident of being able to teach English to the students of other disciplines (Alipour & Gorjian, 2014). In this regard, the results validated those of previous studies which have divulged the contribution of interpersonal intelligence to the EAP instructors' self-efficacy beliefs (Khosravi & Saidi, 2014). Undoubtedly, being interpersonally perspicacious would empower the instructors overcome the oncoming challenges. Hence, those of higher interpersonal intelligence seem to be less anxious when they are put in risky, stressful situations (Alipour & Gorjian, 2014).

Considering the findings of the present study, it seems that Iranian EAP instructors' higher interpersonal intelligence would lead to lower language teaching anxiety and less controlling approach towards instructional and behavioral management in EAP classes. The results of the study enrich the available literature on teachers' individual differences and classroom management beliefs. The results also carry some pedagogical implications for EAP teacher training courses. In this regard, numerous workshops can be held to enhance teachers' interpersonal skills and instructional and behavioral management strategies, in particular, the EAP instructors' confidence in holding EAP courses, geared to the students' various discipline-related needs. To have a more detailed understanding of the EAP instructors' individual characteristics and their possible link with their

classroom management beliefs, further studies might be conducted via qualitative instruments (e.g., interviews, observations). Moreover, future studies can focus on the possible relationship between the instructors' personal intelligences, language teaching anxiety, and self-efficacy beliefs in EAP classes. In addition, more research may be conducted to explore the possible differences among the instructors' classroom management beliefs and practices in terms of the contextual factors.

Declaration of interest: none

References

- Akbari, R., & Hosseini, K. (2008). Multiple intelligences and language learning strategies: Investigating possible relations. *System*, 36 (2), 141-155.
- Aliakbari, M., & Heidarzadi, M. (2015). The relationship between EFL teachers' beliefs and actual practices of classroom management. *Cogent Education*, 2, 1-13.
- Alipour, M., & Gorjian, B. (2014). The survey of instructors'/professors' anxiety level in teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) courses among BA, MA and PhD courses in Khuzestan province. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 6(3), 453-470.
- Armstrong, T. (2000). *Multiple intelligences in the classroom*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. CH., Sorensen, Ch., & Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education*. Belmont, CA: Cengage.
- Atai, M. R. (2002). Iranian EAP programs in practice: A study of key methodological aspects. *Sheikhbahae Reserch Bulletin*, 1(2), 1-15.
- Atai, M. R., & Fatahi-Majd, M. (2014). Exploring the practices and cognitions of Iranian ELT instructors and subject teachers in teaching EAP reading comprehension. *English for Specific Purposes*, 33(1), 27-28.
- Atai, M. R., & Nejadghanbar, H. (2017). Exploring Iranian EAP teachers' subject-related critical incidents. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 29, 1-12.
- Atai, M. R., Babaii, E., & Taherkhani, R. (2017). Exploring Iranian EAP Teachers' Pedagogic Content Knowledge and Teaching Practices, and Students' Beliefs about EAP Teachers' Methodology. *Issues in Language Teaching*, 6(1), 27-1.

- Borek, J. (2003). Inclusion and the multiple intelligence: Creating a student-centered curriculum. *The Quarterly- National Writing Project*, 25 (4), 24-28.
- Burden, P. R. (2005). *Powerful classroom management strategies: Motivating students to learn*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin press.
- Dolati, Z., & Tahriri, A. (2017). EFL teachers' multiple intelligences and their teaching classroom practices. *Sage Open*, 1-12.
- Eng, L. L., & Mustapha, G. (2010). Enhancing writing ability through multiple intelligences strategies. *Pertanika Journal of Sociology, Science, and Humanities*, 18 (5), 53-63.
- Erdem, D., & Keklik, I. (2020). Multiple intelligences profiles in prospective teachers. *Education Reform Journal*, 5(1), 27-44.
- Evrin, E. A., Gökçe, K., & Enisa, M. (2009). Exploring the relationship between teacher beliefs and styles on classroom management in relation to actual teaching practices: A case study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 1, 612-617.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of Multiple Intelligences*. NYC: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (2005, May 25). *Multiple lenses in the mind* [Paper Presentation]. ExpoGestian Conference, Bogota Colombia.
- Gardner, L., & Leak, G. (1994). Characteristics and correlates of teaching anxiety among college psychology teachers. *Teaching of Psychology*, 21 (1), 28-32.
- Glickman, C. D., & Tamashiro, R. T. (1980). Clarifying teachers' beliefs about discipline. *Educational Leadership*, 37, 459-464.
- Grow, G. (1990). Writing and multiple intelligences (ED406643). Retrieved from ERIC. <http://www.longleaf.net/ggrow>.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. A. (1986). Foreign language anxiety. *Modern Language Journal*, 70, 123-32.
- Khosravi, M., & Saidi, M. (2014). Investigating the relationship between multiple intelligences and self-efficacy: The case of Iranian EAP instructors. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 11(1), 90-97.
- Landau, B. M. (2001). *Teaching classroom management: A stand-alone necessity for preparing new teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Seattle, WA.
- Marefat, F. (2007). Multiple intelligence: Voices from an EFL writing class [Special issue]. *Pazhuhesh-e Zabanha-ye Khareji*, 32, 145-162.

- Martin, N. K., & Sass, D. A. (2010). Construct validation of the behavior and instructional management scale. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*, 1124-1135.
- Martin, N. K., Yin, Z., & Baldwin, B. (1998). Construct validation of the attitudes and beliefs on classroom control inventory. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 33*, 6-15.
- Martin, N., Yin, Z., & Mayall, H. (2006). *Classroom management training, teaching experience and gender: Do these variables impact teachers' attitudes and beliefs toward classroom management style?* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin, TX.
- Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). The key to classroom management. *Educational Leadership, 61*, 6-13.
- McMahon, S. D., Rose, D. S., & Parks, M. (2004). Multiple intelligences and reading achievement: An examination of the Teele Inventory of multiple intelligences. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 73* (1), 41-52.
- Rahimi, M., & Asadollahi, F. (2012). On the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers' classroom management orientations and teaching style. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 31*, 49-55.
- Razmjoo, S. A. (2008). On the relationship between multiple intelligences and language proficiency. *The Reading Matrix, 8*(2), 155-174.
- Razmjoo, S. A., Sahragard, R., & Sadri, M. (2009). On the relationship between multiple intelligences, vocabulary learning knowledge and vocabulary learning strategies among the Iranian EFL learners. *The Iranian EFL Journal, 3*, 82-110.
- Saidi, M. (2018). *The relationship between EFL teachers' classroom management strategies and their self-efficacy beliefs*. Paper presented at the 10th National Conference on Education, Shahid Rajaei Teacher Training University, Tehran, Iran.
- Saidi, M. (2020a). The relationship between Iranian EFL learners' linguistics and logical intelligences and the frequency of fallacies and evidence in their argumentative writing: A gender-based study. *The Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice, 12*(25), 151-169.
- Saidi, M. (2020b). Interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences: Are they related to EFL teachers' self-efficacy beliefs? *Asian Journal of English Language and Pedagogy, 8*(1), 53-61.
- Smith, E. (2001). Implications of multiple intelligences theory for second language learning. *Post-script, 1* (1), 32-52.

- Swanson, H. L., O'Connor, J. E., & Cooney, J. B. (1990). An information processing analysis of expert novice teachers' problem solving. *American Educational Research Journal*, 27, 533-557.
- Tajeddin, Z., & Saidi, M. (2011). *The interface between teachers' multiple intelligences and their self-efficacy beliefs through structural equation modeling*. Paper presented at the 9th International TELLSI Conference, Ilam, Iran.
- Wu, H., & Badger, R. G. (2009). In a strange and uncharted land: ESP teachers' strategies for dealing with unpredicted problems in subject knowledge during the class. *English for Specific Purposes*, 28 (1), 19-32.
- Zeraatpishe, M., Seifoori, Z., & Hadidi Tamjid, N. (2020). The impact of multiple intelligence-oriented writing tasks on the accuracy, fluency, and organization of ELT students' writing. *The Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, 12(25), 1-31.

Biodata

Mavadat Saidi is an assistant professor of TEFL at Shahid Rajaei Teacher Training University, Tehran, Iran. Her areas of interest include discourse analysis, ESP/EAP, and teacher education.

Zohreh Bayatshahbazi is an MA student of TEFL at Shahid Rajaei Teacher Training University. She is working on her thesis. Her areas of interest include English for academic purposes and teacher education.