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Abstract—This study was an attempt to investigate the difference between extrovert and introvert EFL teachers' classroom management. For this purpose, 30 extrovert and 30 introvert female teachers of Gatt Language Center (GLC) and Kish Language School in Tehran were chosen among 120 female teachers who filled in Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) and had more than three years of experience in teaching English and were willing to take part in this study after a briefing session. Then each teacher’s class was observed by the researcher two times with one or two-session gaps in between, and Murdoch’s (2000) Checklist was used to score each teacher’s ability in classroom management each time separately. The total score for each teacher’s classroom management was calculated based on the mean of values given to the teacher by the researcher from two observations. To find out the significant difference between extrovert and introvert EFL teachers’ classroom management, an independent sample t-test was carried out. This study revealed a significant difference between extrovert and introvert EFL teachers’ classroom management. It is found out that extrovert EFL teachers are better than introvert teachers at managing adult EFL learners’ classes.

Index Terms—classroom management, extroversion, introversion

I. INTRODUCTION

Today most of the countries try to obtain sustainable development as the most important factor in improvement and success. The role of human resource and its development is crystal clear. So teaching the human force paves the way for reaching the goals of development in societies. Moreover, teaching can give people an equal chance to play role in shaping the society and reach their goals.

Teaching is an “art”. It “is a profession—one with a long and respected history” (Tauber, 2007, p.13); it can be one of the most rewarding and at the same time one of the complex professions. As a multidimensional craft many factors can bring about success to it including classroom management. Doyle (1980, as cited in Yasar, 2008) states that classroom management is the fundamental task of teaching for creating the condition in that productive and competent construction can happen.

Many researchers suggest classroom management as one of the important factors which affects and facilitates learning process (Yasar, 2008). The ability of teachers to organize classroom and manage the behavior of their students is critical to achieving positive education outcomes (Emmer & Stough, 2001). So classroom management is the number one concern of teachers and the ability to improve harmonious and mutually respectful relationship with students is one predictor of who will stay in teaching profession (Barkley & Partin, 2009). Oliver and Reschly (2007) state that, “Effective classroom management requires teachers to be adept at employing multiple strategies and to be skilled at recognizing when current strategies are ineffective and modifications are necessary” (p.8). They also emphasized on the necessity of a systematic preparation and professional development for developing teachers’ ability in classroom management in today’s classrooms with various range of learners. Tauber (2007) noted that classroom management can be taught, but as it is a broad concept, these trainings usually are not sufficient. Although most teacher education programs now require some form of training in classroom management, there are some states that do not require any instruction in classroom management (Clement, 2010; Windshcitl, 2005).

On the other hand the single most important factor influencing students’ learning and achievement is the teacher (Marzano, Marzano, & Pickering, 2003). Some teachers are more successful in classroom management (Barkley & Partin, 2009), and as Martin (2004) restates, multiple factors affect teachers’ ability to create positive environment. Beside experience, there are several other factors that affect teachers’ classroom management abilities (Hicks, 2012). One of them among many, can be teachers’ personality type.

In accordance with Parvin (1996, as cited in Rhodewalt, 2008) “Personality is the complex organization of cognitions, affects, and behaviors that gives direction and pattern (coherence) to the person’s life. Personality consists of both structures and processes and reflects both nature (genes) and nurture experience” (p.1). Burruss and Kaenzig (1999) mentioned that Jung (1923) was one of the early leaders in the exploration of personality and is credited with
developing the constructs of extroversion and introversion. He saw human behavior or habits as patterns and attempted to understand and explain differences in personality according to those unique and variable patterns.

Thompson (2012) states that, “People span the spectrum of introversion and extroversion from a high preference for one or the other, to varying degrees of a balance somewhere in the middle” (p.6). He further mentions “The main differences that identify introverts and extroverts are the source of their personal energy, their sense of boundaries and their comfort zone” (p.6). Ischinger (2009) found the strong relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and their personality. Personality is related to teaching efficacy and, as a result, to all three subscales (student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management) (Briers, Harlin & Roberts, 2007).

Teachers’ personality type plays a role in classroom management. Teachers’ knowledge about their personality type and as a result about their efficacy affects their ability in having different strategies in classes. Harris (1998, as cited in Shindler, 2010) believes that a teachers’ personal style of teaching and classroom management can be affected by his/her personality because he/she has specific way to convert his/her personal style into an effective teaching behavior in accordance with his/her personality.

A. Classroom Management

Laslett and Smith (1993) mention that management is a skill in teaching through which all learners are engaged in learning process actively. They also noted “management emphasizes that learning and teaching are complementary activities. “Management is not a variety of techniques or external structures that you do to students. But rather, management is something accomplished with students in particular learning contexts” (Martin, 2004, p.420).

Throughout the history different definitions for the term of classroom management can be seen by various educators with different views. “It can be defined as a way of organizing the physical setting of the classroom, students, resources and the equipment so that effective and successful teaching and learning can take place” (Sakizli & Sariohen, 2006, p.13). “Doyle (1986) expressed the classroom management as actions and strategies that teachers use to maintain order” (Yasar, 2008, p.2). Classroom management is “a teacher’s efforts to establish and maintain the classroom as an effective environment for teaching and learning” (Brophy, 1986, as cited in Yasar, 2008, p.10). Also we can see the broader and more comprehensive definition of this term “Martin and Baldwin (1992) believe that classroom management is all teacher efforts to oversee a multitude of activities in the classroom including learning, social interaction and students behaviors. Classroom management constitutes three broad dimensions; person, instruction and discipline” (Yasar, 2008, p.2). “At its best, classroom management is not only a means to effective instruction, it also becomes a vehicle for providing students with a sense of community and with increased skills in interpersonal communication, conflict management and self-control” (Jones, 1996, as cited in Martin, 2004, p.406). Adeyemo (2012) notes that, “classroom management is very important, and is the “heart of teaching” and paves the way for “exciting and dynamic experience” for teachers and students. Generally the aim of classroom management is to maximize students’ engagement” (p.372).

Emmer, Sanford, Clements, and Martin (1982, as cited in Marzano, Marzano and Pickering, 2003) reveal that, “poor management wastes class time reduces students’ time on task and detracts from the quality of the learning environment” (p.4). Marzano, Marzano and Pickering (2003) mention that in poorly managed classroom, “Teachers struggle to teach, and students most likely learn much less than they should. In contrast, well managed classrooms provide an environment in which teaching and learning can flourish” (p.1) and can provide moving and lively learning experience for everyone involved (Kaliska, 2002). Effectively managed classroom is essential for building instructional program and also is vital for creating the atmosphere in which teachers and students have mutual respect and caring (Fisher, Hoover & McLeod, 2003). Due to vital effect on teachers, students and classroom procedures, classroom management has become an integral part of language teaching and learning process (Sakizli & Sariohen, 2006).


B. Classroom Management in the Past and Present Time

Yasar (2008) in his article compares the differences between new and past views to classroom management:

“Traditional approaches were mostly based on the behavioral principles and laws of learning. (Goffin, 1994). The child was often viewed as the recipient of knowledge and teacher had the control over the students and subject matter. As a result of behavioral approach to instruction, teachers preferred behavioral classroom management techniques that consistent with their way of instruction. The behavioral model requires strong intrusion and management techniques on the part of the teacher (Garrett, 2005). Teacher is the leading person and therefore, has the responsibility of all ongoing issues in the classroom; from students’ motivation to misbehaviors” (p.2).

Teacher was a passive taker not an active giver and “and it does not allow for any space for change or any opportunity to think and make decisions” (Donuk & Sendan, 2009, p.1).

A shift occurred from behaviorist perspective to constructivist perspective (Donuk & Sendan, 2009). Yasar (2008) indicates the newer view to classroom management:

Over the past years, cognitive theories’ reflections have been observed on education and the curriculum; and instruction has been affected by the principles of constructivist approach all over the world (Brophy, 1999). As stated by Elen, Clarebout, Leonard and Lowyck (2007), with the advent of constructivism, the educational settings have been enriched by the concept of ‘student-centered learning environment’. This new concept is used to describe curriculum
and instructional settings in which students’ learning activities take place. The student-centered orientation emphasizes the individual value of the student and attempts to help him develop more positive social - emotional aspects of his behavior. Classroom organization integrates student needs, interests, experiences, and personalization into learning activities. (p.2)

As a consequence, classroom activities have changed. Yasar (2008) also mentions to this change:

Classroom activities are designed to facilitate self-expression, to encourage consideration of the viewpoint of another, to increase creative acts, to develop purposeful listening and to encourage critical thinking. Student-centered learning environments may be in various forms. Bereiter and Scardamalia (cited in Elen et al., 2007, p. 1) for instance, distinguish between ‘messing around’, ‘hands-on learning or guided discovery’, ‘learning through problem solving’, ‘curiosity driven inquiry’, and ‘theory improvement inquiry’. While student-centered learning environments differ in form and purpose, they also share common basic features. In most so-called student-centered learning environments learners are presented with an authentic task in order to induce relevant learning experiences. For instance, rather than presenting information on global warming to students in a lecture, students are asked to make a report on the changing weather conditions in their own region. (P.2-3)

Yasar (2008) also indicates that, “as a result of this change in the curriculum and instructional approaches, teachers should adapt their approaches to classroom management. Rogers and Freiberg (1994) suggest that such a shift requires teachers to adopt a student-centered rather than teacher-centered orientation toward classroom management” (p. 3).

C. Personality Trait

Personality traits are: “stable, inner, personal dispositions that determine relatively consistent patterns of behavior (including feelings and thoughts) across different situations” (Chamorro-Permuzic & Furnham, 2010, p.129-130). Chamorro-Permuzic and Furnham’s (2010) idea is that personality traits cause people show similar behavior in different situations and also make the people’s behavior different from the behavior of the others. So to understand personality traits we should understand and consider both the way people are different from each other and the way they are similar. Personality is the “real self” of each person, and defines the way people think and behave (Dai, 2008). “Personality traits are thus organizational constructs; they influence how individuals organize their behavior to meet environmental demands and new challenges” (Caspri, 1998, as cited in Costa & McCrae, 2006, p.98). We usually use the term of personality traits to explain others behaviors and also our own behaviors. It starts from a classification of fixed and observable patterns of behavior (taxonomy) to the extend to which people differ on these dimensions to predict variance in other observable behaviors, outcomes, or constructs like happiness, health, reaction time, or academic and job performance (Chamorro-Permuzic et al, 2005).

D. Dimensions of Personality

Eysenck (Big Three):

Eysenck (1947, as cited in Zuckerman, 2005) introduces three dimensional system for personality: extroversion-introversion (E), neuroticism (N) = emotional instability versus stability, psychoticism (P) = tough-minded antisocial and psychotic tendencies versus socialized humaneness = tender mindedness. Eysenck (1998) notes that, “It seemed to me that central to any conce

Zuckerman (2005) mentions to Haan’s (1981) factor analysis that he found factors which were the same at all age period:

Cognitively invested: Interest in ideas resembling one facet of Costa and McCrae’s Openness to Experience factor (Haan, 1981, as cited in Zuckerman, 2005).

Open/Closed to Self: resembling the broader factor (Haan, 1981, as cited in Zuckerman, 2005).

Emotionally under/overcontrolled: aggressive, rebellious, and unpredictable at one extreme and emotionally guarded at the other. This resembles Eysenck’s P factor (Haan, 1981, as cited in Zuckerman, 2005).


Block:

Bock (2001, as cited in Zuckerman, 2005) states two factor theory of personality based on correlations with other major systems:

Ego-undercontrol/overcontrol: could be considered as impulsive.

Ego-resilience: could be considered as stable extroversion (high E, low N).
Gray:

Gray (1987, as cited in Zuckerman, 2005) has been a theorist in the field of psychobiological personality and an active researcher in comparative neuropsychology who has tried to work up from neurobehavioral studies on rats to human personality traits. He used Eysenck’s as coordinates. He introduces three dimensions:

- Anxiety: “as now conceived of as a bipolar dimension with anxiety disorders at one pole and psychopathic types, characterized by an abnormal absence of anxiety, at the other. Anxiety is high N, low E (introversion), and low P” (Zuckerman, 2005, p.19).
- Impulsive: “defined as a dimension going from stable introversion and low P to high N, E, and P” (Zuckerman, 2005, p.19).
- Fight-flight: “defined with the P dimension. People who are high on this dimension, have a strong unconditioned reaction to punishment or withdrawal of reward itself; however their reaction is aggressive or active avoidance” (Zuckerman, 2005, p.22).

Tellegen:

Tellegen (1985, as cited in Zuckerman, 2005) defines a three-factor dimension for personality which was similar to Eysenck’s model with considering Costa and McCrae model. Here are the factors and their component subfactors:

- Positive emotionality (PE): social potency, social closeness, achievement, and well-being (Tellegen, 1985, as cited in Zuckerman, 2005).
- Negative emotionality (NE): aggression, alienation, and stress reaction (Tellegen, 1985, as cited in Zuckerman, 2005).
- Constraint: traditionalism: control, and harm avoidance (Tellegen, 1985, as cited in Zuckerman, 2005).

Cloninger:

Cloninger is a biological psychiatrist and his trait model is based on psychobiological theory of personality (the same as Eysenck) but his scales were not developed items’ factor analysis (Zuckerman, 2005). Cloninger developed sub trait or facet scales for each of major traits:

- Harm Avoidance (HA): “1. anticipatory worry versus optimism; 2. Fear of uncertainty versus confidence; 3. shyness versus gregariousness; 4. fatigability versus vigor. It should be noted that subscales 1 and 2 resemble N scales in other tests, whereas 3 and 4 are usually measures of E in other models. Thus, HA might be expected to correlate with E as well as N in other tests” (Cloninger, as cited in Zuckerman, 2005, p.24-25).
- Reward Dependence (RD): “1. sentimentality versus insensitivity; 2. Persistence versus irresoluteness; 3. attachment versus detachment; 4. dependence versus independence: Note that persistence; regarded as a fourth trait of temperament is listed as a subtrait of RD, but later analyses showed it to be independent of the RD dimension” (Cloninger, as cited in Zuckerman, 2005, p.25).
- Self-directiveness (SD): “1. responsibility versus blaming; 2 purposeful versus goal undirected; 3. resourcefulness versus apathy; 4. self-acceptance versus self-striving; 5. congruent second nature” (Cloninger, as cited in Zuckerman, 2005, p.25).
- Cooperativeness (C): “1. social acceptance versus intolerance; 2. Empathy versus social disinterest; 3. helpfulness versus unhelpfulness; 4. Compassion versus revengefulness; 5. pure-hearted versus self-serving” (Cloninger, as cited in Zuckerman, 2005, p.25).

Goldberg:


 Intellect or Openness to Experience: “creative, imaginative, intellectual, philosophical, and artistic, versus uncreative, unimaginative, unintellectual, unintelligent, and simple” (Goldberg, 1990, 1994, as cited in Zuckerman, 2005, p.26).

 Costa and McCrae:

The Five-Factor model has been greatly accepted as a satisfactory classification of personality traits. (Costa & McCrae, 2003):

Neuroticism (N): anxiety, angry hostility, depression, self-consciousness, impulsiveness, vulnerability (Deary, Mathews, & Whiteman, 2009; Zuckerman, 2005). Neuroticism “represents the proneness of the individual to experience
unpleasant and disturbing emotions and to have corresponding disturbances in thoughts and actions” (Vestre, 1984, as cited in Costa & McCrae, 2003, p.46).


Openness (O): fantasy, aesthetics, feelings, actions, ideas, values (Deary, Mathews, & Whiteman, 2009; Zuckerman, 2005). Openness “refers to receptiveness to new ideas, approaches, and experiences” (Costa & McCrae, 2003, p.46).

Agreeableness (A): trust, straightforwardness, altruism, compliance, modesty, tender-mindedness (Deary, Mathews, & Whiteman, 2009; Zuckerman, 2005). Agreeableness “is seen in selfless concern for others and in trusting and generous sentiments. Low Agreeableness (or Antagonism) is tough minded and hardheaded. Although agreeable people are nicer than antagonistic people, antagonism, too, has its virtues” (Costa & McCrae, 2003, p.46).

Conscientiousness (C): competence, order, dutifulness, achievement striving, self-discipline, deliberation (Deary, Mathews, & Whiteman, 2009; Zuckerman, 2005). Conscientiousness “Highly conscientious people are dutiful and self-disciplined, but also ambitious and hardworking, sometimes to the point of being ‘workaholics.’ Men and women low in Conscientiousness are easygoing and less exacting with themselves or others” (Costa & McCrae, 2003, p.46-47).

Jung's (1923-1971, as cited in Costa & McCrae, 2003) theory of psychological type was the foundation of many studies and Jungian attitude of introversion and extroversion became famous. Although psychoanalytic theory has little influence on modern specific psychology, the initial difference between extroverts and introverts would preserve in most psychometrical proved theories in personality (Chamorro-Permuzic & Furnham, 2005).

E. Extroversion

Extroversion is “attitude-type characterized by concentration of interest on the external object” (Jung, 1989, p.394). As Canli (2006) infers, some people are famous for their laughter, the party is wherever they are, they attract people, social contact is valuable for them, they enjoy good times whenever they are with other people, even while they are in a room with strangers, they can be the best friend for them. These people give meaning to the concept of extroversion. Each person is different from others in emotional reactiveness and these differences depend on their personality; some studies reported extroverts report positive experiences than introverts, so extroversion relates to positive affect (Costa & McCrae, 1980, as cited in Canli, 2006). Deary, Mathews, and Whiteman (2009) point out that, extroverts have tendency to use problem-focused coping strategies that help them to have high self-esteem and to cope with life events effectively.

Depue (2006) believes that in accordance with structural work in personality, interpersonal nature of extroversion is not unitary, but it includes two independent higher order traits. Those are Affiliation and Agency. Affiliation reflects taking pleasure and valuing close interpersonal ties, and being warm and friendly and loving. Agency reflects social power of control and pleasure of leadership roles, assertiveness, and a subjective sense of efficacy in fulfilling goals.

Extroversion refers to high activity (arousal), tendency toward social behavior, assertiveness, the experience of positive emotions, and impulsiveness (Busato, Prins, Elshout, & Hamaker, 2000, as cited in Chamorro-Permuzic & Furnham, 2005). Extroversion can be defined both in broad senses and in narrow senses. Zuckerman (2005) states that, the narrowest one is limited to sociability and the broad one includes different subtraits.

Hogan (1982, as cited in Chamorro-Permuzic & Furnham, 2010) expresses the dimensions of extroversion as sociability, ambition, likability, adjustment, prudence, and intellect. He divided extroversion into two main subcategories: Sociability and Ambition. So some extroverts may have tendency to experience positive effect, be sociable, and like other people's company, on the other hand some extroverts may be dominance, self-confident, and leaders.

F. Introversion

Introversion is “Attitude-type characterized by orientation in life through subjective psychic contents” (Jung, 1989, p.369).

Introversion is “an innate temperament beginning at birth that reveals itself in a collection of preferences in behavior” (Thompson, 2012, p.6).

Introversion as Helgoe (2008) expresses is not explained by lack, it is a wellspring of riches. Introversion is defined as a preference and they prefer a rich inner life to a vast social life, talking with a close friend to sharing stories in a group, developing their ideas internally to interactively. They keep their best things inside until it is ready. She also notes that introverts mostly felt anxious. They could not think spontaneously but they are good thinkers when they are still and unmoving. They prefer to follow an inner guide. The time that they feel invasion, they automatically turn off to protect their central sources. At this time they could not access themselves, and they may feel that they have to practice extroversion, go underground, or go crazy (2008).

Burruss and Kaenzing (1999) indicate that many introverts have the ability to learn to appear as extroverts while it is needed. Some training through instruction and practices of speaking in public, debate, drama, music, social skills, etc. could help them to wear the extroversion mask when necessary Introverts usually hide their inner worlds and do not permit other people go into them, this issue guide others to make a lot of decisions about introverts and their needs.

Introverts prefer spacious interactions with fewer people. They can become the carries of family and societal problems. They put less value on what is outside and spend less energy there; so their tendency toward inside should not
mistakenly considered as phobia or problem. They should be recognized, if not, they will face problem soon (Helgoe, 2008).

Broadly speaking Helgoe (2008) emphasizes that introverts are different group of people who look at life from the inside out; they gain energy and power through inner reflection, get more excited by ideas than by external activities; in conversation they listen well and expect others to listen well to them, they think first and then talk; they hold the ability to step back, be calm, and get perspective, they like writing because they can express themselves in this way. They may have lots of people around but they take their own path. Solitude is the source of power for introverts and they prefer to spend some of their times alone as an alternative to people and competition. Also Thompson (2012) believes that introverts have positive attributes, they are good at listening, planning, concentration on tasks for a long time, uninterrupted period of time, taking time to think, focusing, and they can act independently. Introverts try to be perfect in school, keep all negative feelings inside and then take them home and express talk to the person they trust—usually their moms (Silverman, 2012).

G. Classroom Management and Teachers’ Personality Traits

It is more than 65 years that teacher personality has been an area of interest in educational and psychological researches. Teacher personality has been noticed as a possible prominent factor in effective classrooms (Thomason, 2011), and since 1943 researchers were asking, “what are the personality traits of a successful teacher?” (Thomason, 2011, p.22). Thomason (2011) states that these personality researches bring the opportunity for teacher to have better understanding about themselves and their roles in classroom communications. This understanding may cause impetus for change and adaption. Harris (1998, as cited in Shindler, 2010) indicates that each teacher has his/her own exclusive personality which is the origin of the specific teacher’s personal style of teaching and classroom management. Although we may call classroom management style originates from attitudes and pedagogical choices, in the field of personality, each teacher can discover a way to translate his/her personal style into an effective teaching behavior.

For having successful teachers with satisfactory ability in classroom management, factors such as personality type, that influence this ability may need to be taken in to consideration. This study attempted to determine if extroversion/introversion in teachers plays any role in their classroom management. In other words, the researcher intended to reveal if there is any significant difference between extrovert and introvert English teachers in their ability in classroom management. Accordingly, the following question was raised.

• Is there any significant difference between extrovert and introvert EFL teachers’ classroom management?

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Participants

The participants of the present study were 60 female EFL teachers (30 extroverts and 30 introverts) who were teaching adult language learners in Gatt Language Center (GLC) and Kish Language School. They all have more than three years of experience in teaching English. They were chosen among 120 teachers who answered the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) and were willing to participate in this study. The learners they taught had different language proficiencies.

B. Instrumentation

In order to conduct this study, the following instruments were used.

Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI):

The EPI is “a questionnaire to assess the personality traits of a person” (Eysenck et al, 1985, as cited in Dibah & Marashi, 2013, p.547). It was devised by German psychologists Hans Jurgen Eysenck and his wife B.G Eysenck (1964). This questionnaire “initially conceptualized personality as two biologically-based categories of temperament which include extroversion/introversion and neuroticism/stability. This huge validated test consists of 57 Yes/No items” (Dibah & Marashi, 2013, p.547). EPI has two parallel forms (A and B) (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1964). “Those who fill out the EPI receive three different kinds of scores: the E score which is related to how much extrovert a person is, the N score measuring the neuroticism, and the Lie score which tries to measure how socially desirable a person has wanted to prove to be. The E score is computed out of 24 since it consists of 24 items, the N score is out of 24, and the Lie score is out of 9” (Dibah & Marashi, 2013, p.547). As there is a negative correlation between E and N (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1964) and according to many researchers who proved that questionnaires of neuroticism measure the same personality quality as introversion questionnaires (Bernreuter, 1934, as cited in Eysenck, 1998), N score measuring the introversion. Based on Eysenck and Eysenck (1964) “test-retest reliabilities of EPI are between 0.84 and 0.94 for the complete test and between 0.80 and 0.97 for the separate forms” (p.15).

The Yes/No answers “should be given based on the usual way of acting or thinking of an individual” (Dibah & Marashi, 2013, p.547). 15 minutes were allocated for answering this questionnaire.

Murdoch’s (2000) checklist:

To evaluate the teachers’ classroom management in the process of this study, Murdoch’s (2000) checklist was used. It had been prepared for observing language teachers (Brown, 2000, as cited in Marashi & Zaferanuchi, 2010). This checklist has 54 items each followed by four values from 1 to 4 (4=excellent, 3=above average, 2=average,
l=satisfactory) and N/A meaning not applicable. It contains three parts: Part A is ELT competences including 24 questions, part B is general teaching competences including 10 questions, and part C is teaching competence including 20 questions. As this instrument is very detailed and some parts were not directly related to the variables of this research, classroom management and the teachers’ personality type, the 30 questions which are related to variables considered in this study were extracted.

The total score was calculated based on the mean of values given to the teachers by the researcher from two observations.

C. Procedure

To conduct this research a briefing session was arranged for the teachers who teach adult classes at all levels at Gatt Language Center (GLC) and Kish Language School. The researcher ensured the teachers that the results of the EPI and the observation sessions would be used merely for the research purpose and that they would not be considered by the language school administration, and no intervention on the side of the observer would take place in their classes. 120 teachers who were interested in taking part in this study were enrolled. Then the EPI was given to all of them. After extracting the data from EPI, teachers who had less than three years of experience in teaching English and also teachers who obtained 5 and more in lie score of EPI were omitted from the study. In accordance with the result of this questionnaire, extrovert and introvert teachers were distinguished. Thirty extrovert and thirty introvert teachers were chosen.

Observation was the main technique of collecting data in this research. The researcher observed each of the 60 teachers’ classes twice. Muijs and Reynold (2001, as cited in Mrashi & Zaferanchi, 2010) argue that to have effective observation, using some kind of standard instrument which enables the observer to note what he/she means to observe, is needed. So the researcher used Murdoch’s (2000) evaluation checklist. To eliminate the influences of atmosphere, time and teacher’s mood, the same classes with the same students and level, at the same time, and with just one or two sessions in between were observed. Ultimately, the obtained mean of the two observations for each teacher was taken into the final calculations.

D. Design

In this study, a descriptive, ex post facto design was adopted. The aim of the study was to investigate the difference between extrovert and introvert EFL teachers in classroom management. Personality trait, with two modality (extroversion and introversion), was taken as the independent variable, and classroom management as the dependent variable. Teachers’ age and proficiency level may possibly act as intervening variables.

E. Statistical Analysis

For doing the statistical procedure to verify the research hypothesis, the researcher used both descriptive and inferential statistics. The first statistical procedure was to conduct a series of descriptive data analyses consisting of mean, median, standard deviation, and standard error of mean. To investigate if there is a significant difference between extrovert and introvert EFL teachers’ classroom management, an independent sample t-test was used.

III. Result and Analysis

To compare the classroom management of the two groups of teachers, a t test had to be applied. But, firstly the assumption of normality of distributions was checked. The following table shows the descriptive statistics that contains information on the skewness of the distribution of the scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Skewness ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroverted</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90.50</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>99.133</td>
<td>4.08093</td>
<td>-0.294</td>
<td>0.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introverted</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>100.50</td>
<td>86.183</td>
<td>7.20809</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table 1. shows, the skewness ratios for the two groups of scores are within the normality range of ±1.96, hence the normality of both distributions. The following graphs visually show how the scores were distributed:
A. Testing the Hypothesis

As table 1 depicts, the extroverted teachers obtained a higher mean score on their classroom management. To see whether the difference is statistically significant or not a t test was applied. The following table shows the result:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test for</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>F: 8.926, Sig.: .004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t: 8.563, df: 58, Sig. (2-tailed): .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference: 12.95000, Std. Error Difference: 1.51229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference: Lower: 9.92282, Upper: 15.97718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>F: 8.563, Sig.: 45.859, .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t: 8.563, df: 45.859, Sig. (2-tailed): .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Difference: 12.95000, Std. Error Difference: 1.51229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference: Lower: 9.90567, Upper: 15.99433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above, the variances were not homogeneous in the two sets of scores (F=8.92, p=.004<.05) as the second assumption for t test. Therefore, in the second raw in the table titled Equal variances not assumed is applied. Here, it is shown that the difference was significant (t=8.56, p=.000<.05). Therefore, the null hypothesis of this research is rejected, with the conclusion that extroverted EFL teachers were significantly more successful in classroom management, as determined by tokens stipulated in the observation checklist, than introverted teachers. The following graph visually depicts the means of the two groups of teachers:

Figure 3. Bar graph representing the CM means of extroverted and introverted teachers

B. Discussion
Based on the outcome of this study, there was a significant difference between extrovert and introvert EFL teachers in managing their classrooms effectively. It was revealed that, extrovert teachers could manage their classes more effectively compared with the introvert teachers.

The significant difference between teachers’ effectiveness in managing classrooms with two different personality types and obtaining a higher mean score by extrovert teachers indicated that extrovert teachers can be more effective classroom managers for adult learners. They are more successful in managing their classroom in comparison with introvert ones.

The key element in a classroom is a teacher who both teaches new subject matter and provides an atmosphere for students to bloom by his/her effective classroom management. Many factors affect teachers' effective classroom management, one of them is teachers' personality trait (Thomason, 2011). Teachers are both extrovert and introvert. However, teachers with higher level of extroversion are more effective (Rushon, Morgan & Richard, 2007, as cited in Thomason, 2011). It is because of the tendency that they have toward the social interaction, and that they interact well with their students (Thomason, 2011). It is proved that effective teachers have better organized classrooms and face less behavioral problem and intrusion (Yasar, 2008). Extrovert teachers usually apply student centered courses and classrooms. They prefer interactive discussion, group project, and experiential learning. Extroverted teacher tended to employ the facilitator teaching styles. The extroverted teacher often used guiding and directing the students by asking some questions, building the personal relationship with the students, designing some activities to encourage the students to develop their confidences, and always involving the students in teaching learning activities. In this ways, the teacher was influenced by her personality as an extroverted teacher (Jensen, 1987, as cited in Ningrum, 2009).

IV. Conclusion

Improving learners’ achievement is the paramount concern of all teachers and also is the goal of teaching. Applying proper and suitable classroom management style could enhance teaching and learning outcome. Moreover teachers’ personality affects their attitude towards teaching and learning process and their classroom management style. Considering teachers’ personality trait, they are both extrovert and introvert.

The outcome of this study showed that extrovert teachers and introvert teachers are significantly different in managing their classes effectively. The analysis of the collected data revealed that extrovert teachers are better classroom managers.

Although some studies suggest that introvert teachers are loved by hyperactive students and could control and help them to do their class work in quietness (Little, as cited in Bloom, 2013), extrovert teachers due to having social interaction, perform a better relationship with adult learners (Thomason, 2011). Extrovert teachers apply student-centered courses and introvert teachers apply teacher-centered courses (Jensen, 1987, as cited in Ningrum, 2009). In this study the observations of thirty extrovert and thirty introvert teachers’ classes indicated that introvert teachers focus on discipline more. On the other hand extrovert teachers try to increase learners’ autonomy, they are more creative, active and energetic, convey their enthusiasm to the learners, have more lively classes, have more group work, engage learners in class activities, and are aware of every event in their classes. All in all they are superior in managing adult classes and obtaining the goal of teaching.

Pedagogical Implications

The finding of this study has shown that extrovert teachers are more successful in managing their classrooms as determined by the criteria specified in Murdoch’s checklist. Taking the above mentioned supremacy for extrovert teachers in classroom management into account could bring positive results. Extrovert teachers are more sociable and have convenient interaction. They ensure learners that the class is a safe and confident place, engage all learners in the class activities, and at the same time they are aware of every single event in the class. In such a class that is managed by an extrovert teacher, due to teacher's role as a facilitator, a well-managed class, a beneficial teacher-students relationship, engaging learners in teaching-learning process and having the sense of belonging, learners will participate more in class activities eagerly. Besides, observation sessions made clear that classes with extrovert teachers were more active, and lively; in those classes teachers were enthusiast to the topics and as a whole to the teaching, and conveyed their enthusiasm to their students. So in extrovert teachers' classes mostly there was joy among students and they were interested in the context and class activities, as a result they enjoy learning a foreign language. Therefore, ensuring the centrality of the learners’ attention, the classroom atmosphere could be more effectively controlled and oriented towards the objectives of the lessons.

The result of this study could have implications for teachers, teacher trainers as well as syllabus designers. The following sections touch upon these implications.

Implications for EFL Teachers

Teacher's ability to manage the classroom effectively is crucial to enhance positive learning outcomes. Although a good classroom manager is a teacher who uses the specific techniques and skills for managing the classrooms in teachers' training courses (Marzano, Marzano, & Pickering, 2003), classroom management skills are taught in teacher training courses are sine qua non, they are not per se adequate.
As previously mentioned, extrovert teachers are more effective in classroom management; teachers' personality trait affects teaching-learning process. First of all it is essential for teachers to be aware of their personality trait to understand themselves and their roles in teaching-learning process. Then they can take advantage of observing extrovert teachers' classes and discuss after classes about the techniques they used and try to apply successful ones in their teaching. Also whenever introvert teachers face a problem, they can ask their extrovert colleagues for their help and guidance. It could be beneficial for teachers to try to pretend as an extrovert teacher and replicate their techniques in classroom management namely being active, alive, sociable, preferring group works, having satisfactory teacher-student relationship, transferring their eager to students, and creating a friendly, safe, and positive learning environment to improve students' learning.

Implications for Syllabus Designers

When the importance of classroom management in effective teaching is crystal clear and the teachers' personality trait is proved to affect teachers' classroom management ability, indubitably reconsideration of teachers' training courses would be essential. After and while preparing student teachers with required skills during training courses, syllabus designers and administrators should design the program in which extrovert student teachers are asked to have more demos and presentation in those sessions to model good classroom management and hence assist introvert ones.

Teaching some classroom management skills to teachers in pre service training courses is essential, but it cannot prepare teachers completely for all the challenges they will face in their classes (Ischinger, 2009). So alongside pre service training courses, it is beneficial that administrators and syllabus designers design in service training courses and programs this may include the observation of other extrovert teachers, providing conferences and meeting in which teachers could explain their problems and extrovert colleagues could share their experiences.
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