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Abstract

This study investigated EFL teachers’ introvert and extravert personality and their relationship with the ability to control ripple effect in classrooms. Accordingly, 80 male and female teachers were asked to complete a personality form called Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) in order determine their personality type (introvert and extravert) and the degree of introversion or extraversion: slight, moderate, clear, and very clear. Then, they were either observed or asked to fill in a classroom management observation form to consider how they encounter with the misbehavior in class and their capability to stop it. To consider the relationship between being an introvert and its effect on controlling ripple effect a nonparametric test, spearman’s rho, was used. To figure out whether introverts are better at controlling ripple effect or extraverts both personality types were compared to each other using regression. The results showed that teachers’ personality had a straight relationship with their ability to control ripple effect so that the more introvert a teacher is, the better he/she can control ripple effect.
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Introduction

In EFL classes, teachers usually face some behavioral problems done by students. In some cases, this problem can expand in the whole class or be stopped in time which totally depends on the teacher’s response. When a teacher corrects misbehavior in one student, this positively influences the behavior of other students and the clarity and firmness of the correction can influence the behavior (Kounin, 1974). The effect can be greater when the teacher distinctly names the unacceptable behavior and gives the reasons to withhold. Firmness, that is, conveying an “I mean it” attitude, enhances it. Ripple effect can be enhanced by teachers’ attitude (Charles, 1978). As Kounin asserts if class members see that one student is breaking a class rule and getting away with it, they may learn that rule breaking is not always followed by unpleasant consequences. The students may be less inhibited in the future about breaking the class rule. If the rule breaker is a well-liked, high-status class leader, the effect of the modeling may be even more pronounced. One psychologist has called this phenomenon the ripple effect.

The ripple effect can work to the teacher’s benefit. When the teacher deals effectively (not necessarily harshly) with a rule breaker, especially a class leader, the idea of breaking the rule may be inhibited for other students who view the interaction. This doesn’t mean that teachers must reprimand each student who breaks a rule. But once a teacher has called for a particular action, following through is an important part of capitalizing on the ripple effect (Woolfolk, Winne, & Perry, 2003).

The ripple effect is a disorder which occurs when the teacher corrects misbehavior in one student, and this positively influences the behavior of other nearby students. (Kounin, 1974)

Ripple effect is a consequence of misbehavior which is of two types of negative and positive ripple effect (Forrester, 1981). As Charles (1978) asserts the ripple effect is greater when teacher clearly names the unacceptable behavior and gives reasons and is weaker at post-secondary level. Teachers’ at-
titude, either introversion or extroversion enhances the ripple effect. Classroom behaviorist theorist coined the term ripple effect in 1970. Kounin's first observed this pattern in his students' behavior. He later described this phenomenon as the “Ripple Effect”. According to Cohen, et al. (2004), factors influencing the ripple effect are in three areas: Clarity and Firmness and roughness. According to Kounin and Gump (1958). These are three dimensions of the control techniques used by the teachers.

Clarity. This technique involves the teacher’s directions to the children. It says how clearly the directions define the misbehavior which the teacher wanted to stop. For example, a teacher might call a student and say: “Tommy, stop it!” or “Tommy you can’t do that” or “Tommy, that will do!” however emphatically said, these directions did not clarify Tommy’s misbehavior and what Tommy was to stop doing. Teachers might use one of several approaches to make sure the students understood what was expected of them. For example, the teachers might use directions such as “Tommy, don’t take the blocks away from Johnny while he’s using them.” which define student’s misbehavior or directions like “Tommy, in kindergarten we ask for things. We don’t grab it.” One teacher might clearly tell Tommy how to stop the misbehavior: “Tommy put those blocks down and look at the picture books” (Kounin, &Gump, 1958).

Firmness. Firmness involves how the teachers say “I mean it”? for example, by touching or guiding the child, by speaking emphatically, by walking close to the child, or by following through which is focusing steadily on the misbehaving child until he conformed. If the teacher brushed over the trouble lightly, the correction conveyed little firmness. (Kounin, &Gump, 1958)

Roughness. It describes techniques in which the teacher showed hostility or anger. For example, if the teacher touches the child, the touch has more pressure than necessary, or if the teacher gives the child a warning look, the look is angry rather than serious. (Kounin, &Gump, 1958)

### Personality Types

Based on classification of Myers and Briggs (1921), an initial category of personality type was developed. According to their classification, personality types are classified based on people’s favorite world: Extraversion (E) or (I) introversion, their information: Sensing (S) or iNtuition (N), decisions: Sensing (S) or Thinking (T) and structure: Thinking (T) or Feeling (F).

In Myers–Briggs literature the terms extraversion and introversion are used as what Jung first used them. Extraversion means “outward-turning” and introversion means “inward-turning”.

The preferences for extraversion and introversion are often called “attitudes”. Briggs and Myers recognized that “extraverted attitude” can operate in the external world of behavior, action, people, and things and “introverted attitude” can operate internal world of ideas and reflection.

In our study we focus on the basic dichotomy: extraversion or introversion.

The four functions operate in conjunction with the attitudes (extraversion and introversion). Each function is used in either an extraverted or introverted way.

According to Myers and Briggs (1921), there is a preference clarity category which is shown on a scale as “slight,” “moderate,” “clear,” or “very clear”. For each personality type we should identify the preference clarity category. It describes only how consistently we chose one pole of a preference over its opposite. The MBTI measures preferences, not abilities, maturity, or development.

It should be confessed that teachers with the same personality can have different reactions to misbehaviors in the class. That is to say, the way that different teachers manage the class and control the ripple effect in class is mostly dependent on their personality, but it should not be denied that their gender may play a role as well.

Accordingly, this study concerns the following questions:

1. Do extroverted teachers control ripple effect in EFL classes better than introvert teachers?
2. To what extent is the state of being an introvert teacher important in controlling ripple effect in class?
3. To what extent is the state of being an extravert teacher important in controlling ripple effect in class?

This research has been committed to reject or confirm the following hypotheses in controlling class ripple effect:

1. There is no relationship between extrovert and introvert teachers in controlling ripple effect.
2. There is no relationship between the degree of being an introvert teacher and ripple effect control.
3. There is no relationship between the degree of being an extrovert teacher and ripple effect control.

**Literature Review**

In recent years different studies have been done on discipline problems and learners’ misbehaviors in EFL classes, some studies considered the gender differences regarding the types and amount of learners’ misbehaviors. A study conducted in Iran by an M.A. student of Payame Noor university with 151 EFL students who were first grade students of six different high schools in Rasht investigated the difference between male and female EFL classes in terms of the amount of different kinds of misbehaviors based on direct observations and teachers’ point of view through questionnaires. Ghanipour, Vahdani, & Mansoori (2013) asserted the following results:

The findings showed that while male EFL classes were marked by distracting, abusive and activity-related discipline problems, female classes demonstrated more instances of distracting, rule-related and assessment-related misbehaviors. Additionally, a significant difference was found between the amount of discipline problems in male and female learners regarding the misbehavior types of ‘talking out of turn’, ‘distracting noise’, ‘cheeky or impertinent remarks’, and ‘forgetting learning materials’ in which EFL male classes outnumbered female classes. On the other hand, female EFL classes significantly surpassed male classes with regard to the misbehavior type of ‘cheating in exams’ according to both observations and teachers’ point of view. (p. 261)

Another study done by Rahimia & Hosseini (2012) investigated misbehavior in EFL classes from students’ perspectives. Data were gathered via questionnaires, observations and semi-structured interviews from 6 teachers and 22 misbehaving students in six different schools with three different socio-economic levels. The data revealed that misbehaving students’ explanations and interpretations of misbehavior, their causes and the interventions strategies used did not always share similar attributes with those of their teachers.

A study done by Jacob Kounin and Paul V. Gump (1958) sought the answer to the problem which is “while the teacher is correcting student A, what effect is the disciplinary measure having on student B, who is sitting nearby, taking in what is happening?” Answers to this problem were sought in the kindergarten of twenty-six representative Detroit schools. In the study reported, fifty-one undergraduates served as observers. The students began their observations on the first days of the new school year. The observers were carefully instructed on their assignment. They were to note any incident in which a kindergartner watched the teacher correct another child for misbehavior. They were to report in detail on three phases of each incident: the behavior of the watching child immediately before the incident, the behavior of the teacher and the child who was being corrected during the incident, and the behavior of the watching child for two minutes after the incident. Four hundred and six such incidents were analyzed. In the analysis, the control technique was classified itself, the behavior of the watching child immediately before the incident, the behavior of the teacher and the child who was being corrected during the incident, and the behavior of the watching child for two minutes after the incident. Four hundred and six such incidents were analyzed. In the analysis, the control technique was classified itself, the behavior of the watching child immediately before the incident, the behavior of the teacher and the child who was being corrected during the incident, and the behavior of the watching child for two minutes after the incident. Four hundred and six such incidents were analyzed. In the analysis, the control technique was classified itself, the behavior of the watching child immediately before the incident, the behavior of the teacher and the child who was being corrected during the incident, and the behavior of the watching child for two minutes after the incident. Four hundred and six such incidents were analyzed. In the analysis, the control technique was classified itself, the behavior of the watching child immediately before the incident, the behavior of the teacher and the child who was being corrected during the incident, and the behavior of the watching child for two minutes after the incident. Four hundred and six such incidents were analyzed. In the analysis, the control technique was classified itself, the behavior of the watching child immediately before the incident, the behavior of the teacher and the child who was being corrected during the incident, and the behavior of the watching child for two minutes after the incident. Four hundred and six such incidents were analyzed. In the analysis, the control technique was classified itself, the behavior of the watching child immediately before the incident, the behavior of the teacher and the child who was being corrected during the incident, and the behavior of the watching child for two minutes after the incident. Four hundred and six such incidents were analyzed. In the analysis, the control technique was classified itself, the behavior of the watching child immediately before the incident, the behavior of the teacher and the child who was being corrected during the incident, and the behavior of the watching child for two minutes after the incident.
firmness, and the roughness of the technique. When the teacher made it clear what behavior she objected to or what behavior she expected, the watching children responded with increased conformance and decreased non-conformance. If the teacher’s behavior conveyed firmness, the watching children sometimes responded with increased conformance and decreased non-conformance. This reaction occurred if the watching children had been misbehaving or interested in a child who was misbehaving. If the teacher used rough techniques, the children showed behavior disruption but non-conformance.

In a study done by Mehrak Rahimi and Fatemeh Abdollahi (2011) the focus was on classroom management orientation. This study investigated Iranian EFL teachers’ classroom management orientation and their relationship with teachers’ individual differences and contextual variables. In this study three hundred male and female EFL teachers filled the Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control inventory and a personal information questionnaire. The results of this study showed that teachers’ classroom management orientations were not related to their age, gender, experience and school type. However, teachers’ educational level and the district of school location were related to only instructional management, implying that teachers with MA degrees and those who worked in unprivileged areas were found to be less interventionist and less controlling teachers.

Another study which was done by Mehrak Rahimi and Fatemeh Abdollahi (2011) explores the relationship between Iranian EFL teachers’ classroom management orientations and teaching style teachers employ in English classes. Three hundred EFL teachers filled in Attitudes and Beliefs on Classroom Control inventory and Teaching Activities Preferences questionnaire. The result of the study showed that most Iranian EFL teachers were interventionist with respect to their classroom management approaches. Furthermore, it was found that teachers who were more interventionist in their classroom management used more teaching activities than those teachers with internationalist classroom management orientation. It also revealed that classroom management orientations could predict 28% of the variance of teaching style.

Methodology

Participants
The participants involved in this study were 80 EFL teachers who were selected randomly from some English institutes of Rasht city. Then the MBTI test was given to them in order to identify their personality according to being introverted or extraverted, and the preference clarity category as “slight,” “moderate,” “clear,” or “very clear”. Then the selected teachers were given a questionnaire so as to determine their control on ripple effect in class.

Instruments
Two major data collection instruments were applied in this study to investigate teachers’ personality and how they control misbehaviors in class:

Personality test: To start with, as teachers’ personality is the most important factor in this study, a psychological test called MBTI which is prepared by Katharine C. Briggs and Isabel Briggs Myer was given to them in order to indicate whether they have an introvert or extrovert personality and also identify their preference clarity category which is shown on a scale as “slight,” “moderate,” “clear,” or “very clear”.

Questionnaire: In order to measure the ripple effect in classes, a conceptual questionnaire was designed through reviewing the related literature. First four standard misbehavior observation forms were selected. After that, they were submitted to an expert panel consisting of 12 experienced teachers in order to determine the content validity of the given test. Moreover, the reliability of the test was determined by Cronbach’s alpha. As the questionnaire was confirmed by the expert panel as a ripple effect questionnaire, it was employed either by observing the teachers’ classes or by interviewing them.

Data Analysis
In this study, the most important variable to be considered is the personality of the teachers. We should keep in mind that teachers with the same personality can have different reactions to misbehaviors in the class. That is to say, the way that different teachers manage the class and control the ripple effect in class is mostly dependent on their personality. To achieve the mentioned goals, the following statistical procedures will be followed:

1. Regression
2. Spearman’s rho Correlation Coefficients

Results and discussion

The relationship between being an introvert and its effect on controlling ripple effect
In the first step the relationship between being an
introvert and its effect on controlling ripple effect was considered. As it was mentioned before there were 4 degrees of introversion: slight, moderate, clear, and very clear. As the independent variable of the study which is these 4 degrees of introversion an ordinal variable we used a nonparametric test, spearman’s rho. By using spearman’s rho we tried to find the relationship between these degrees of introversion (personality rank) and the ability to control ripple effect. Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics of this relationship:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality rank</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Ripple effect</th>
<th>Personality rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.538**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

As it is seen in the table, the amount of sig is less than 0.15 which shows that these two variables have strong correlation with each other and the amount of correlation coefficient is -0.538 which shows as this number is negative it has a reverse linear relationship. It shows that the more the degree of introversion is, the less ripple effect can be seen in class, so we can say that introvert teachers have good control on their class and ripple effect can hardly be seen in introvert teachers’ classes.

The relationship between being an extravert and its effect on controlling the ripple effect

In the second step, the relationship between being an extravert and its effect on controlling the ripple effect was considered. As it was mentioned before there were 4 degrees of extraversion: slight, moderate, clear, and very clear. Since these four degrees of extraversion are assumed to be the independent variable of the study which is an ordinal one, for exploring the relationship between them and the ability to control ripple effect, we used the same nonparametric test, spearman’s rho. Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of this relationship:

In table 2, the amount of correlation coefficient is 0.251 which shows that there is a direct relationship between the two variables. Since the amount of sig is less than 0.15, the correlation between the two variables is accepted. Accordingly, we can say that the more the degree of extraversion is, the more ripple effect can be seen in class. Therefore, it can be concluded that extravert teachers have less control on the classroom misbehaviors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality rank</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Ripple effect</th>
<th>Personality rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality rank</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Ripple effect</th>
<th>Personality rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: ANOVA for comparing personality types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.112</td>
<td>13.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>6.043</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.154</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), personality rank  
b. Dependent Variable: ripple effect

### Table 4: Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.971</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>16.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality rank</td>
<td>-.198</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: ripple effect
The comparison between introvert and extravert teachers’ ability in controlling ripple effect

In the third step the purpose was to figure out whether introverts are better at controlling ripple effect or extraverts. Therefore, both personality types were compared to each other using regression. The result of this comparison is shown in Table 3:

In the next step, after we accepted the regression model we must see whether the residuals obey a normal distribution. According to the histogram, we can see that the residuals are approximately coincident with the normal curve.

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between EFL teachers’ introvert and extravert personality with their ability to control ripple effect in class.

The findings indicated that personality is related to teachers’ ability to control ripple effect and introvert teachers are more controlling and rigid. This shows that if English teachers are more extravert, they will be more vivacious, animated, talkative, energetic in class than introverts, so it influences the students and makes them be more excited and talkative, but when teachers are more introvert (reserved), students become more observant and attentive, hence the amount of ripple effects happening in class decreases and there will be a better learning situation.

Moreover, the degree of introversion and extraversion was effective so that the more very clear introvert a teacher is the more capable he/she is in controlling ripple effect. Also, the slight extravert teachers who in degree were near to introversion were more controlling than very clear extraverts.
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