



**A COMPARISON OF UNIVERSITY PREP-SCHOOL EFL
STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR INSTRUCTORS'
NONVERBAL IMMEDIACY WITH THEIR INSTRUCTORS'
PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR OWN NONVERBAL IMMEDIACY**



Merve Erdoğan

**MA THESIS
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT**

**GAZİ UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES**

MARCH, 2018

TELİF HAKKI VE TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU

Bu tezin tüm hakları saklıdır. Kaynak göstermek koşuluyla tezin teslim tarihinden itibaren iki yıl sonra tezden fotokopi çekilebilir.

YAZARIN

Adı: Merve

Soyadı: ERDOĞAN

Bölümü: Yabancı Diller Eğitimi / İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

İmza:

Teslim Tarihi: gg/aa/2018

TEZİN

Türkçe Adı: Üniversite İngilizce Hazırlık Okulu Öğrencilerinin Okutmanlarının Sözsüz Yakınlıkları Hakkındaki Algılarıyla Okutmanların Kendi Sözsüz Yakınlık Algılarının Karşılaştırılması

İngilizce Adı: A Comparison of University Prep-School EFL Students' Perceptions of Their Instructors' Nonverbal Immediacy with Their Instructors' Perceptions of Their Own Nonverbal Immediacy

ETİK İLKELERE UYGUNLUK BEYANI

Tez yazma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyduđumu, yararlandıđım tüm kaynakları kaynak gösterme ilkelerine uygun olarak kaynakçada belirttiđimi ve bu bölümler dışındaki tüm ifadelerin şahsıma ait olduđunu beyan ederim.

Yazar Adı Soyadı: Merve ERDOĐAN

İmza:

JÜRİ ONAY SAYFASI

Merve ERDOĞAN tarafından hazırlanan “A Comparison of University Prep-School EFL Students’ Perceptions of Their Instructors’ Nonverbal Immediacy with Their Instructors’ Perceptions of Their Own Nonverbal Immediacy” adlı tez çalışması aşağıdaki jüri tarafından oy birliği / oy çokluğu ile Gazi Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı’nda Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Danışman: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Gültekin BORAN

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, Gazi Üniversitesi

Başkan: Doç. Dr. Gonca YANGIN EKŞİ

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, Gazi Üniversitesi

Üye: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Neslihan ÖZKAN


İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, Ufuk Üniversitesi

Tez Savunma Tarihi: 19/03/2018

Bu tezin İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı’nda Yüksek Lisans tezi olması için şartları yerine getirdiğini onaylıyorum.

Prof. Dr. Selma YEL

Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürü



To my beloved mother Gülay ERDOĞAN

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I immensely thank all the people who have helped me during my master study. First of all, I would love to thank and express my deep gratitude to Dr. Instructor Gültekin BORAN, my research supervisor, for his patient guidance, enthusiastic encouragement and useful critiques of this research work during the course of my master program and thesis work.

In addition, I am thankful to students and instructors of Gazi University and Atılım University for their invaluable participation in the research and sharing their opinions sincerely.

Above all, to my family, I wish to express my greatest thanks to my mother, Gülay ERDOĞAN for always being supportive and caring, my father, Yavuz ERDOĞAN for always being compassionate, supportive and respectful and my beloved brother, Mustafa Berkay ERDOĞAN for being a loving friend. This thesis would not have been possible without their gracious and valuable supports, they all kept me going. I am forever grateful to you.

**ÜNİVERSİTE İNGİLİZCE HAZIRLIK OKULU ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN
OKUTMANLARININ SÖZSÜZ YAKINLIKLARI HAKKINDAKİ
ALGILARIYLA OKUTMANLARIN KENDİ SÖZSÜZ YAKINLIK
ALGILARININ KARŞILAŞTIRILMASI**

(Yüksek Lisans Tezi)

Merve ERDOĞAN

**GAZİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ**

Mart, 2018

ÖZ

Bu çalışmanın ana amaçları İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretiminde sözsüz yakınlık davranış becerilerinin önemini belirtmek, öz değerlendirmenin yeterli olmadığına ve bu nedenle okutmanlar ve öğrenciler arasındaki belirgin farklılıkların gösterilmesinin önemine dikkat çekmek, okutmanların sözsüz yakınlık becerilerinin farkındalığını vurgulamak ve sözsüz yakınlık konusunun üniversitelerdeki İngiliz dili eğitimi bölümlerinde metod derslerinin müfredatlarında yer verilmesini önermektir. Bu amaçlar doğrultusunda hem okutman hem de öğrenci perspektifinden okutmanların sözsüz yakınlık davranışlarının hali hazırda bulunan seviyeleri, güçlü ve zayıf yönleri araştırılmaya çalışılmıştır. Ayrıca, okutmanlar ile öğrenciler arasında okutmanların sözsüz yakınlık davranışlarının algılanmasında önemli farklılıklar olup olmadığı, okutmanların sözsüz yakınlık becerilerinin İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesinde öğrenci motivasyonu üzerinde etkisi olup olmadığı bulunmaya çalışılmıştır. Ek olarak, okutmanların sözsüz yakınlık becerilerinden güçlü ve zayıf yönlerinin farkındalığını artırmaya ve okutmanların cinsiyetlerinin bu sözsüz yakınlık davranışlarını sergilerken önemli bir etkisi olup olmadığı bulunmaya gayret edilmiştir. Bu nedenle, okutmanlara sözsüz yakınlık ölçeği öz bildirimli uygulanmıştır ve öğrenciler için sözsüz yakınlık ölçeği gözlem bildirim ölçeği düzenlenerek uygulanmış ve motivasyon analizi için öğrencilere uygulanan anketlere son bir bölüm eklenmiştir. Bu iki anket, üniversitelerin hazırlık okullarında bulunan 455 öğrenci ve 28 okutmana araştırmacı gözetiminde eş zamanlı olarak yaklaşık 1 hafta süren bir zaman diliminde uygulanmıştır. Bu katılımcılar uygun örnekleme ile seçilmişlerdir.

Çalışma doğası gereği bir nicel çalışma olduğu için tüm veriler sosyal bilimler istatistik programı kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Motivasyon analizi için öğrencilere uygulanan anketin sonuna bir anket sonrası bölüm eklenmiştir. Çalışmanın sonuçları okutmanların ve öğrencilerin, okutmanların sözsüz yakınlık davranışlarını algılamaları arasında belirgin farklılıklar olduğunu ortaya çıkarmaktadır. Sonuçlar aynı zamanda hem okutman hem öğrenci bakış açısından okutmanların sözsüz yakınlık davranışlarından hangi yönlerin güçlü hangi yönlerin zayıf olduğunu ve okutmanların cinsiyetinin sözsüz yakınlık davranışlarını sergilerken önemsiz etkisini göstermektedir. Dahası, bu çalışma okutmanların sözsüz yakınlık becerilerinin İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesinde öğrenci motivasyonunun üzerinde olumlu bir etkiye sahip olduğunu ortaya çıkarmaktadır. Bu nedenle, bu çalışma sözsüz yakınlık becerilerinin farkındalığının artırılması fikrini, bu becerilerin uygulamalarının öğretilmesi ve geliştirilmesini, sözsüz olarak daha yakın olabilmek için bazı ipuçları ve yöntemlerin verilmesini ve bu becerilerin İngiliz dili eğitimi bölümlerindeki metod derslerinde yer verilmesini daha çok desteklemektedir.



Anahtar Sözcükler: Sözsüz Yakınlık (SY), Sözsüz Yakınlık Davranışları, Öğrenci Motivasyonu, Öğretmen Eğitimi, Sözsüz İletişim

Sayfa Adedi: 81

Danışman: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Gültekin BORAN

**A COMPARISON OF UNIVERSITY PREP-SCHOOL EFL
STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR INSTRUCTORS'
NONVERBAL IMMEDIACY WITH THEIR INSTRUCTORS'
PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR OWN NONVERBAL IMMEDIACY
(MA Thesis)**

Merve ERDOĞAN

**GAZİ UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES**

March, 2018

ABSTRACT

The main aims of this study were firstly to highlight the importance of nonverbal immediacy behaviours in English Language Teaching (ELT), to point out that self-assessment is not enough that is why it is important to show significant differences between both students and instructors. Secondly, it aimed to emphasize instructors' awareness of their nonverbal immediacy and suggest that the issue of nonverbal immediacy should be included in the syllabuses of the methodology courses at ELT teachers training programs of universities. In line with these aims, it was attempted to investigate the existing levels of instructors' nonverbal immediacy behaviours from both students and instructors' perspectives, the strong and weak aspects of instructors' nonverbal immediacy behaviours from both students and instructors' perspectives. Additionally, it was attempted to find out whether there are significant differences between students and instructors' perceptions in terms of instructors' nonverbal immediacy behaviours and whether instructor gender has a significant effect in performing these nonverbal immediacy behaviours during EFL class. Therefore, nonverbal immediacy scale self-report for instructors and nonverbal immediacy scale observation report for students were adopted and conducted, and for motivation analysis a post section was added to the scales of students. These two scales were conducted for 455 students and 28 instructors at prep schools of two different universities simultaneously in the eye of researcher on the final weekdays of school. These participants were selected with convenience sampling. The data were analysed using only SPSS, as the study was a quantitative study in its

nature. The results of the study uncover the significant differences between students and instructors' perceptions of instructors' nonverbal immediacy behaviours. The results also show the strong and weak aspects of instructors' nonverbal immediacy behaviours from both parties' angles, the insignificant effect of instructor gender on nonverbal immediacy behaviours of instructors. What is more, this study reveals that instructors' nonverbal immediacy skills have a positive effect on students' motivation to English as a foreign language. Therefore it reinforces the idea of increasing awareness of instructors' nonverbal immediacy skills, teaching and improving nonverbal immediacy skills practices, giving some tips and methods to instructors in order to be nonverbally immediate and placing these skills at the method classes of English language teaching departments.



Key Words: Nonverbal Immediacy (NI), Nonverbal Immediacy Behaviours, Student Motivation, Teacher Training, Nonverbal Communication

Page Number: 81

Supervisor: Dr. Instructor Gültekin BORAN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TELİF HAKKI VE TEZ FOTOKOPİ İZİN FORMU	i
ETİK İLKELERE UYGUNLUK BEYANI.....	ii
JÜRİ ONAY SAYFASI.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
ÖZ	vi
ABSTRACT	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xiv
CHAPTER I.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background to the Study.....	1
1.2. Problem Statement.....	2
1.3. Aims of the Study	4
1.4. Significance of the Study	4
1.5. Assumptions.....	5
1.6. Limitations.....	5
1.7. Definitions.....	6
CHAPTER 2	7
LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1. Introduction.....	7
2.2. Nonverbal Communication.....	7
2.3. History of Nonverbal Communication.....	8
2.4. Nonverbal Immediacy and English as a Foreign Language Teaching.....	10
2.4.1. Nonverbal Immediacy.....	10

2.4.1.1. Nonverbal Immediacy Behaviours	12
2.4.1.1.1. <i>Eye Contact</i>	13
2.4.1.1.2. <i>Facial Expressions</i>	14
2.4.1.1.3. <i>Gestures</i>	16
2.4.1.1.4. <i>Voice</i>	18
2.4.1.1.4.1. <i>Pitch</i>	19
2.4.1.1.4.2. <i>Rate</i>	20
2.4.1.1.4.3. <i>Volume</i>	21
2.4.1.1.4.4. <i>Pause of Vocal Fillers</i>	21
2.4.1.1.4.5. <i>Silence</i>	21
2.4.1.1.4.6. <i>Intonation</i>	22
2.4.1.1.5. <i>Proxemics</i>	22
2.4.1.1.6. <i>Touch</i>	25
2.4.1.1.7. <i>Clothing</i>	28
2.4.1.1.8. <i>Scent</i>	29
2.5. Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy	30
2.6. Motivation and Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy	34
CHAPTER 3	37
METHODOLOGY	37
3.1. Reference to the Problem Statement and Aims of the Study	37
3.2. Research Design	38
3.3. Universe and Sampling	39
3.4. Participants	39
3.5. Data Collection	40
3.6. Instruments	41
3.6.1. Nonverbal Immediacy Scale Self-Report	41
3.6.2. Nonverbal Immediacy Scale Observation Report	42
3.6.2.1. Validity and Reliability of Scale	42
3.7. Data Analysis	44
3.8. Limitations	44
CHAPTER 4	47
DATA ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF THE RESULTS	47
4.1. Descriptive Results about the Participants	48

4.3. Results Related to the First Research Question	49
4.4. Results Related to the Second Research Question	50
4.5. Results Related to the Third Research Question	54
4.6. Results Related to the Fourth Research Question	56
4.7. Results Related to the Fifth Research Question.....	58
CHAPTER 5	61
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS	61
5.1. Summary of the Research Study	61
5.2. Conclusion	62
5.3. Implications and Suggestions.....	65
5.3.1. Tips to Create Nonverbally Immediate Instructors.....	67
REFERENCES	69
APPENDICES	77
Appendix 1. Nonverbal Immediacy Scale-Self Report (NIS-S)	78
Appendix 2. Nonverbal Immediacy Scale-Observer Report (NIS-O).....	79
Appendix 3. Sözsüz İletişim Düzeyi Ölçeği'nin Türkçe Versiyonu.....	80
Appendix 4. Permission to Use NIS-O Questionnaire	81

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. <i>Aspects of Nonverbal Behaviours</i>	12
Table 2. <i>Nonverbal Immediacy Scale-Self Report (NIS-S)</i>	41
Table 3. <i>Nonverbal Immediacy Scale-Observation Report—NIS-O</i>	43
Table 4. <i>Descriptive Statistics of the Participants</i>	48
Table 5. <i>Descriptive Results for the Total Scores of NIS</i>	48
Table 6. <i>Distribution of the Students’ Perceptions about Instructors’ Nonverbal Immediacy Effect on Their Motivation toward English Language Class</i>	49
Table 7. <i>Independent Samples T-Test for Differences in Nonverbal Immediacy</i>	51
Table 8. <i>Independent Samples T-Test for Differences in Nonverbal Immediacy Scale Items</i>	53
Table 9. <i>Aspects of Instructors’ Nonverbal Immediacy According to Students’ Perceptions</i>	55
Table 10. <i>Aspects of Instructors’ Nonverbal Immediacy According to Instructors’ Perceptions</i>	57
Table 11. <i>Nonverbal Immediacy Observer-report According to Gender of the Students’ Instructor</i>	58
Table 12. <i>Nonverbal Immediacy Self-report According to Gender of the Instructor</i>	59

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EFA	: Exploratory Factor Analysis
EFL	: English as a Foreign Language
ELT	: English Language Teaching
KMO	: Kaiser – Meyer – Olkin
L2	: Target Language/Second Language
NI	: Nonverbal Immediacy
NIS-O	: Nonverbal Immediacy Scale- Observer Report
NIS-S	: Nonverbal Immediacy Scale- Self Report
NVB	: Nonverbal Behaviours
SPSS	: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
USA	: United States of America

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the Study

There is a considerable increase in the number of people learning a second or foreign language because the importance of being able to use a language other than one's first language has become respected in globalized world (Harmer, 1991, p. 13). Along with these increasing numbers of people, there comes a rising interest to define language-learning essentials. In relation to this aim, scholars have come up with many essentials. Fortunately, there is an option to pick up some of them to give priority for increasing learners' success in second language (L2) or their level of proficiency in the target language. In this respect, depending on scholars' stance in language learning and teaching it can be possible to narrow these essentials.

From the point of the researcher in this study, nonverbal immediacy is considered as one of these fundamentals. Assessing the importance of nonverbal immediacy in communication, it can be stated that nonverbal immediacy may have a big role in effective teaching as it is interconnected with effective communication. To make it clear, nonverbal immediacy behavior helps learners develop their affective learning, cognitive learning and motivation. In order to learn and teach a language successfully, these skills are significantly critical. Studies show that student immediacy also has impacts on teachers. At that point, English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers certainly need immediacy behaviors in class both for themselves and for students. Therefore, many researchers have been doing research on this issue for the last few decades. Seeing from all these studies, immediacy is proved as an essential aspect of effective teaching and learning. As an instructor in a prep school in Turkey, the researcher of the study believes that achieving appropriate immediacy is also one of the core fields to focus in EFL teaching. In relation to this aim, many educators

come up with the question of how to. To this end, much research has been done and is still being conducted.

In this chapter, theoretical framework of the study is systematically discussed. The problem is explained in detail referring to the related literature. Its aims and research questions are presented with regard to the problem stated before. Moreover, significance of the study is illuminated from both methodological and practical perspectives. As a final point, assumptions and limitations are elucidated thoroughly in terms of data collection, procedures, participants, and administration of the research.

1.2. Problem Statement

Although teacher nonverbal immediacy has been on the stage for the last few decades, it has received a wide range of respect in effective instructional communication, as numerous reasons exist for focusing on this part of instructional communication. One of the most prominent reasons is that it holds a central position in effective communication, and effective communication and effective instructional communication are intertwined in their nature. This intertwined relationship results in cognitive learning, affective learning and motivation. Not surprisingly, it is wise to employ instructor nonverbal immediacy to motivate students during the class.

Classical lecturing was common in traditional foreign language teaching, but with the advent of reformation in teaching styles, this classical style was seen dull and ineffective. To this end, it was urgent to make use of some other sciences like communication discipline. Being linked to communication discipline, teacher communication behaviors (nonverbal immediacy, teacher clarity, teacher caring), student traits (communication apprehension, communication competence, willingness to talk, shyness) have gained importance to fulfill these essentials in teaching. As suggested by the above discussion, most of these skills either derive from motivation or lead to motivation. With regard to this, it can be stated that teacher communication behaviors and instructional outcomes take motivation as a mediating factor between them (McCroskey, Richmond, & Bennett, 2006). In the light of sayings, looking at the relationship between teacher nonverbal immediacy being one of the communication behaviors and student motivation being one of the instructional outcomes is notably central or underlying concept.

Much of the research has focused on teacher nonverbal immediacy itself; few studies examined the differences and correlations between students' perceptions of teacher nonverbal immediacy and teachers' perceptions of their own nonverbal immediacy. Additionally, there were some speculations on the reliability and validity of students' assessments of their teachers' nonverbal immediacy behaviors. Therefore, it is an outstanding research idea to look at these differences and correlations to compare them with previous studies.

To sum up, examinations on the differences and correlations between students' perceptions of their instructors' nonverbal immediacy and instructors' perceptions of their own nonverbal immediacy has risen as a core point. To make it clear, it is questioned how valid instructors perceive their own nonverbal immediacy themselves, and whether their perceptions correlated positively with students' assessments of them. Additionally, students' assessments of their teacher nonverbal immediacy scale report have any relationship with their motivation. The researcher of this study believes that moderate/appropriate instructor nonverbal immediacy has positive impacts on overall student motivation, and instructors need to support their verbal language with their nonverbal language while they are lecturing or teaching. Teachers should take this relationship into account, even though motivation is obviously a complicated issue and not just dependent on teacher nonverbal immediacy.

In brief, the highlighted problem by the researcher is that teachers may perceive their nonverbal immediacy behaviors much differently from their students, or they may not be fully aware of their nonverbal language, and this unawareness or misperception may lead to low motivation. As motivation is a critical point in teaching and learning, teachers should be given classes or seminars about nonverbal immediacy behaviors to increase their students' motivation and gain a perspective on it.

The findings are anticipated to provide an understanding of instructors' perceptions of their nonverbal immediacy behaviors; and contribute to the related literature by shedding light into some nonverbal immediacy aspects that teachers should be aware while they are teaching English as a second language. This study is also believed to make instructors see the relationship between motivation and appropriate nonverbal immediacy behaviors. Regarding this, they might be more eager to get some training of these skills if they need any.

1.3. Aims of the Study

This research aimed to find out the differences between students' perceptions of their instructors' nonverbal immediacy and instructors' stated perceptions of their own nonverbal immediacy, and how students and instructors differ between these two in terms of instructors' gender in their nonverbal immediacy levels. In accordance with this aim, it targeted to present which nonverbal immediacy skills of instructors are strong enough or in need of enhancing from both instructor perspective and student perspective. Accordingly, the study planned to investigate at how instructors' nonverbal immediacy is perceived and how instructors' nonverbal immediacy impact student motivation. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, this study attempted to raise teacher nonverbal immediacy awareness and see the impact of it on student motivation. In relation to these aims, the following research questions are directed to answer:

1. Does instructors' nonverbal immediacy impact Ss' motivation?
2. Are there any differences between students' perceptions of their instructors' nonverbal immediacy and instructors' stated perceptions of their own nonverbal immediacy?
3. Which aspects of instructors' nonverbal immediacy are weak and need to be enhanced and which aspects of their nonverbal immediacy are strong according to students' perceptions of their instructors' nonverbal immediacy?
4. Which aspects of instructors' nonverbal immediacy are weak and need to be enhanced and which aspects of their own nonverbal immediacy are strong according to instructors' perceptions of their own nonverbal immediacy?
5. Is there a significant difference between students' perceptions of their instructors' nonverbal immediacy and instructors' perceptions of their own nonverbal immediacy in terms of gender?

Hopefully, the results of the study will have added a different dimension to the discussions about instructor nonverbal immediacy, instructors' perceptions of their own nonverbal immediacy and students' perceptions of instructors' nonverbal immediacy in terms of instructor gender as a variable.

1.4. Significance of the Study

The issue of observing higher education teachers has increasingly been a prominent concern over the past decades. Correspondingly, observing teacher nonverbal immediacy

in higher education has become popular. On a broader view, teacher nonverbal immediacy has usually been studied and associated with several learning types, student traits, positive student effects, and motivation (Andersen, 1979; Chesebro & McCroskey, 2001; Christophel, 1990; Gorham & Zakahi, 1990; Menzel & Carrell, 1999; Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1986; Witt & Wheelless, 2001). Additionally, some correlation research in terms of higher student satisfaction, higher ratings of faculty has been observed (Rester & Edwards, 2007).

On the other hand, there are not many studies regarding teacher nonverbal immediacy awareness and gender. For this reason, it is important to show how aware teachers are of their nonverbal immediacy behaviors or how much difference there is between females and males in their nonverbal immediacy levels. In relation to these aims, this study may contribute to increase teacher nonverbal immediacy behavior awareness by shedding light into the dark points, and to indicate how successful they are.

1.5. Assumptions

Regarding the aims, this study is based on Nonverbal Immediacy Scale- Self Report (NIS-S) for instructors, and its Turkish translated version Nonverbal Immediacy Scale- Observer Report (NIS-O) for students. First assumption of this research is that NIS-S is assumed to ensure its validity and reliability because it was used and confirmed in many studies before. Secondly, participant students of the study are assumed to understand the tool for it is translated into their native language by experts and piloted for 74 students. Assessing the piloting, it is assumed for its reliability accounting for .866 in cronbach alpha. Thirdly, all participants, instructors and students are assumed to assess themselves sincerely and clearly.

1.6. Limitations

Considering data collection and participants, the study had two limitations, restricted time and participants. First of all, it was conducted with English prep school students and EFL instructors of these prep schools of universities. Second limitation of the study is that it was done in two universities in Ankara while there are a lot of different kind of universities around the country and the world. Third limitation is that self-report may contain a bit inflated data, similarly, observation report may contain personal bias of the observer and in

this study they are used as instruments (McDonald, 2008). Also, this study excluded the other EFL instructors and students in service departments. In other words, its scope is not wide.

1.7. Definitions

Immediacy: It refers to enhancing closeness to and nonverbal interaction with another (Mehrabian, 1972, p. 21)

Nonverbal immediacy: Nonverbal Immediacy is a term used among communication researchers to describe nonverbal behaviors that communicate liking, a positive evaluation of others, or positive affect to others. These behaviors typically include looking at someone, leaning toward someone, touching someone in a non-threatening manner, sitting near someone, smiling, and speaking in an animated way (Mehrabian 1969; Mehrabian 1971).

Instructional communication: Instructional communication is considered to be a unique area of study rooted in the three-party field of research conducted among learning psychology, pedagogy and communication studies (Mottet & Beebe, 2006).

Affective learning: The acquisition of behaviors involved in expressing feelings in attitudes, appreciations and values (Krashen, 1987, p. 31).

Cognitive learning: The acquisition or modification of new knowledge by experience (Fetsco and McClure, 2005, p. 56)

Motivation: The practices involved in the initiation, direction and stimulation of individual behavior (Parkinson & Colman, 1995, p. 38).

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This chapter is related to theoretical background and relevant studies about nonverbal immediacy. It includes five main parts. In the first part, nonverbal communication and a brief history of it; secondly, nonverbal immediacy and English as a foreign language teaching; in the third part, nonverbal immediacy behaviours and their applications to EFL are presented. Also, fourth part is based on teacher nonverbal immediacy and the final part includes teacher nonverbal immediacy and motivation.

2.2. Nonverbal Communication

As Hall and Knapp (2013) define ‘Nonverbal Communication’ is universal and persuasive, but indefinable in many ways. They also proclaim that it is not easy to portray and to work on it, and causing it being more difficult to be conscious of in daily life (p. 3). Actually nonverbal communication is more complicated and more culture oriented than what this definition refers to. Nonverbal communication always effects daily conversations. Canfield (2002) framed the definition in those words:

...Nonverbal communication is a dynamic process that engages the mind, body and society as intersubjective entities. Humans create symbolic meanings for and attach them to the behaviors of self and others. They are influenced by the contexts of action and by master themes in society. In inner conversations with the self or self-talk, humans propose and enact lines of action to fulfill the perceived demands of the situation or the expectations of others. In this dramaturgy of behavior, humans learn to modify their nonverbal behaviors to meet the demands of new situations. Human identity, achieved in interaction, is poignantly expressed in self-presentations (p. 27).

There is also another statement defining it as a tiny part of the total message during the conversation between two parties. Communication professionals usually approve that when two people are engaged in a face-to-face conversation, vocal elements such as tone,

pronunciation, rate, volume, and intonation conveys the most of the message. What is more, the most important part of the message is transferred by kinesics, gestures, postures, facial expressions, clothing, and even scent or a blend of them. Similarly, this is observed in the classroom as the way it is. Teachers always give more information and impression with their nonverbal communication skills more than anything else (Negi, 2009).

Canfield (2002) also stated that other than kinesics, facial expressions, clothing and the other factors; some factors such as cultural, social and psychological that are being rooted in the context of everyday life play a role in nonverbal communication as well. In relation to this, he also claimed that nonverbal communication is a dynamic process that includes all these elements and is also manipulated by these dynamic elements (p. 27). However, this research is not based on these cultural, social, and psychological factors of nonverbal communication as its theoretical framework is not based on them.

In teaching, the importance of communication skills is well known by professional teachers. While communicating, the need for voice and gestures is undeniable. People perceive others with their gestures, voice etc. Previous research shows that when we speak, facial expressions, gestures, voice variety (tone-pitch-rate etc.), and other communication behaviors take on stage even they outweigh the meanings of words. Additionally, immediacy behaviors namely communication skills are inferred as liking in many communication settings such as a classroom in which it is always open for teachers to interact with students, and therefore these communication skills have a big role in teaching. Hence, students' affective, cognitive, and perceived learning outcomes are improved via being more immediate either verbally or nonverbally (Hinkle, 2011).

2.3. History of Nonverbal Communication

Although the systematic study of nonverbal communication mainly came into existence after World War II, significant early knowledge sources were uncovered way before. What is more, it was easy to find out that ancient Chinese, Greek, and Roman scholars mentioned what is currently called nonverbal behavior. Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* could be a key source of knowledge deciphering gestures transcribed in the first century. There are a lot of fields including animal behavior, anthropology, dance, linguistics, philosophy, psychiatry, psychology, sociology, and speech having a history of nonverbal communication

(Asendorpf & Wallbott, 1982; Davis, 1979; DePaulo & Friedman, 1998; Hecht & Ambady, 1999; as cited in Knapp, Hall, & Horgan, 2013, p. 23).

1970s and 1980s had detailed research related to nonverbal communication. From those years, it has been still continuing to be more informative and helpful in many fields. Education is also one of these fields, which has accumulated a great deal of data related to nonverbal communication in teaching. With regard to this, it is not surprising to see that English language teaching, one of the tiring and demanding teaching fields in all its steps, has taken advantage of nonverbal communication in its many phases. Additionally, this awareness is becoming more popular all over the world (Stamatis, 2011).

Although it is believed that the main part of communication is usually about interpretation, Miller (1981) claimed that almost %80 of communication in the class settings is not verbal but nonverbal (p. 7). Additionally, there have been several claims related to the connections between social and emotional intelligence and nonverbal signals. Consequently, these resources make it vital to communicate beyond the words focusing on intention and interpretation of the communicators. In addition to these, as nearly %80 of communication is nonverbal developing a deep awareness of nonverbal communication behaviors appears vital. Moreover, analyzing the links between nonverbal signals and social and emotional intelligence it is apparently evident that thinking, cognition, affection and emotions go hand in hand (Miller, 1981 p. 8).

Additionally, the importance of nonverbal immediacy behaviors is not just for teaching or daily life but also for work. Some research analyzed the relationships of organizational orientations and Machiavellianism with nonverbal immediacy and job satisfaction. Accordingly, it showed that the organizational orientations (i.e., upward mobile, ambivalent, and indifferent) and Machiavellianism were important predictors of employee nonverbal immediacy and job satisfaction. In relation to these, it can be stated that if they are satisfied with their jobs, they are more likely to behave immediate or vice versa. Furthermore, they are also more capable of communicating with people, and consequently more disposed to display high job performance, organizational commitment and citizenship. All these findings mean that good work is good income, and this is very important not just for employee but employers (Goodboy & McCroskey, 2008). In relation to these, this may be not far from the truth for teachers, and if they feel job satisfaction that is very important for both teachers and for students, they probably display nonverbal

immediacy or vice versa. At this point, it is wise to highlight this link in schools, and act accordingly.

Touching is also a controversial topic in most nonverbal immediacy research. Some studies have not included touching as a nonverbal behavior for different reasons. One of the reasons is that it can be interpreted as sexual harassment when it is done by opposite sexes. At that point, the message interpretation and culture of people become eminent because while some believe touching is dangerous, the others do not (Rester & Edwards, 2007).

In this part, the general meaning of nonverbal communication and history of nonverbal communication have been described briefly.

2.4. Nonverbal Immediacy and English as a Foreign Language Teaching

2.4.1. Nonverbal Immediacy

There are many expressions for nonverbal immediacy, but for the first time it was put into words by the social psychologist Albert Mehrabian and conceptualized as those communication behaviors that "enhance closeness to and nonverbal interaction with another" (Mehrabian, 1969, p. 203, as cited in Allen, Witt & Wheelless, 2006), and this notion has seen a wide range of respect from many scholars. Mehrabian's theory is based on an idea such as "people approach what they like and avoid what they don't like" (Mehrabian, 1981, p. 22), and he described a number of both verbal and nonverbal communication behaviors that contribute to reduce the perceived physical or psychological distance between communicators (as cited in Allen, Witt & Wheelless, 2006). With regard to this, people can be aware of nonverbal behavior displays in a larger extent thanks to Mehrabian's *immediacy principle*. In other words, Mehrabian's (1968) *immediacy principle* could be explicated as people's clinging to the things they favor, regarding highly they like while paying less attention or ignoring the things they dislike valuing negatively, or discreditingly. This theory, which results in psychological closeness, simultaneously aids the communication between people.

In addition to this, Mehrabian (1971) claimed that "it is not common to observe communicators prefer transferring complicated information in a subliminal way rather than transferring it with words. That indicates the vitality of giving verbally the complicated information to listeners. On the other hand, implied communication namely nonverbal

behaviors mostly handle the communication about feelings and likes–dislikes or attitudes” (pp. 1-3).

Many scholars often state this well-known saying “Language is for communication” in their studies, but few define what exactly communication is (Allen, 1999, p. 469). Canale expresses communication as interchanging the information verbally and nonverbally between people, and this expression clarifies the reality that communication is multidimensional and has different characteristics (cited in Allen, 1999, p. 469).

Firstly, It is estimated that nonverbal communication is about %65 in any communication setting (Burgeon, Buller, and Woodall, 1989 as cited in Allen, 1999). In addition to this, experts estimate that %82 of all teacher communication is nonverbal (Kellogg and Lawson, 1993, cited in Allen, 1999).

With regard to these, classroom communication mainly consists of nonverbal communication, and therefore it is not surprising to witness nonverbal immediacy plays a key role in classroom communication. From previous research, it is supposed that both verbal and nonverbal immediacy are associated with students’ motivation, retention, success, their willingness to talk and classroom communication apprehension. In order to make them more successful, motivated and speak English more during the class, teachers have good reasons to be more immediate both verbally and nonverbally. However, many scholars advocate that high immediacy of teachers might be troublesome.

When it is looked through related research, Mehrabian’s (1971) idea that using immediacy excessively may not be desirable looks quiet reasonable. In brief, in terms of instructional communication especially for the benefits of students, the concept of teacher immediacy has gathered gigantic popularity (p. 24). Considering all these popularity and benefits of nonverbal immediacy behaviours there come out a question, and it is wise to ask what these behaviours are.

Eye contact, facial expressions, movements, smiling, humour and vocal variety are included in the nonverbal immediacy behaviours (McCroskey, Richmond, Sallinen, Fayer, Barraclough, 1995). There is also other research considering touch, odour (smell), proximity, clothing and intuition as other nonverbal behaviours (Guerro & Floyd, 2006, p. 8). At this point, it will be gone in depth defining every one of these nonverbal behaviours.

Table 1

Aspects of Nonverbal Behaviours

Kinesics	Body motions (blushes, shrugs, eye movement, foot-tapping, drumming fingers)
Proxemics	Spatial separation (in relation both the social and physical environment)
Haptics	Touch
Oculesics	Eye contact
Chronemics	Use of time, waiting, pausing
Olfactics	Smell
Vocalics	Tone of voice, timbre, volume, speed
Sound Symbols	Grunting, mmm, er, ah, uh-huh, mumbling,
Silence	Absence of sound (muteness, stillness, secrecy)
Adornment	Clothing, jewellery, hairstyle
Posture	Position of the body (characteristic or assumed)
Locomotion	Walking, running, staggering, limping
Expression	Frowns, grimaces, smirks, smiles, pouting

Note: From Darn, 2005, pp. 1-4.

This is another categorization of nonverbal immediacy behaviors by Darn (2005). This categorization entails some details and gives clear explanations related to these behaviours.

2.4.1.1. Nonverbal Immediacy Behaviours

A lot of studies show that the impact of immediacy through verbal communication and nonverbal communication, or both could be great, but communicating nonverbally provides a better immediacy than communicating verbally (Christophel, 1990; Christensen & Menzel, 1998; Rodriguez, Plax, Kearney, 1996). Therefore, nonverbal immediacy behaviors have eminence not daily communication but also instructional communication. Nonverbal immediacy behaviors for instructors in the university classroom include eye contact, facial expressions, gestures, vcoice, proxemics, touch, clothing, and scent etc.

2.4.1.1.1. Eye Contact

Eye contact or gaze is one of the most significant nonverbal immediacy behaviours in communication. As inferred from this saying “The eyes are the windows of soul,” eye contact is very important in nonverbal immediacy. It is evidently clear from someone’s direct gazing what the underlying intention of person is; there is also a bunch of research and experiments related to this issue in psychology measuring the accuracy of these judgements. To highlight it, Argyle and Dean (1965) stated that looking in the eye constantly for brief phases is one of the essentials of social interaction while people are communicating, additionally, they assumed looking is more frequent in listening time than speaking time, and this looking consists of glances around 3-10 seconds in length. However, if these seconds are longer, it is likely to deal with anxiety. He also underlined that absence of eye contact causes people not to feel communicate completely. Furthermore, they mentioned that there were a lot of subjective functions of eye contact such as dominance, hate, friendship, love, openness, information seeking etc.. Similarly, effective instructional teaching demands a great deal of eye contact. Thus, benefiting eye contact in EFL is not an option but a necessity. In an EFL class, a student looking at a point usually shows what he is interested in or not. Observing this student, teacher usually has a powerful guess about what to do in practice. Despite the significance of eye contacting as nonverbal immediacy behaviour in EFL teaching, there is still little interest in using this behaviour while communicating with students. When people use eye movement and eye contact, they show their focus, direction, and duration of gaze in relation to other participants (Khan, 2001).

Considering above statements, it is fairly advantageous in EFL classrooms. For example, Huang (2011) suggested that when teacher greets students or talks to students, if eye contact is guaranteed, it indicates that channels for communication are not just closed even beyond they are open enough to communicate effectively.

In classroom, according to Huang two types of teacher eye contact are usually used. The first one is looking around that has a powerful effect in classroom teaching. Hence, its roles are so valuable that get students’ attention to the topic, make them eager to participate in the class and be more careful while thinking about the lesson and gives a chance to pick students who practically know the answers to questions asked before. The second one is gazing or looking carefully that is usually benefited for students’ bad behaviours or

meaning something on purpose. By eye contacting or gazing, Huang (2011) suggests that teachers signal a lot of manners such as coldness, responsibility, accountability, connection, and indifference. Additionally, he also mentioned that there was some other study categorizing this type of teacher look, and it indicates that eye movement has some functions such as checking student concentrating on the lesson, indicating a student teacher's intention to talk to students or want students to do something else. It also encourages students to listen to those giving a speech and to maintain their attention, and holds the attention of students who are not being addressed.

Students usually clarify that they are more intense in EFL classes than other classes as they have to speak another language besides answering the question itself. Therefore, in EFL there is more need to use eye contact when teacher asks the questions to students; his eyes should give students confidence, warmth, and intimacy. Thanks to this eye contact, students may feel more self-confident, courageous, free and ready to communicate in L2 during the EFL class. At this point, naturally, the atmosphere of the EFL classroom is improved by means (Huang, 2011).

2.4.1.1.2. Facial Expressions

As face is a central aspect of human body, there is no surprise that face and facial expressions play an important role in communication. Likewise, people usually judge others according to their faces and facial expressions. Therefore, there is a tendency to think that the way a person's face was created and contoured has powerful effects on others. Facial structures or characteristics can be an advantage or a disadvantage for a person regarding the common thoughts in relation to these features. However, it is possible to change the impressions related to face endowment with the help of using of some facial expressions to some extent in a study (Hall & Knapp 2013, p. 131).

Facial expressions being another part of kinesics have a meaningful role in EFL classroom. Because of showing the attitudes of the speakers, Sueyoshi and Hardison (2005) claimed that EFL learners usually prefer to look at faces of their interlocutors in order to get a better comprehension as face shows the attitudes of speakers. The major source of facial movements is depicted as lip movements, signaling readiness to speak as the speaker's attempt to open his mouth, but they are not the only movements on face for sure. Additionally, Ekman and Friesen claimed that people having a nice smile on their face have

such benefits as providing joy and gladness, showing willingness to talk and being a part of the conversation and greeting others. As to eyebrows, they indicate happiness in greeting by flashing a smile, but the eyebrows also show that there is not enough satisfaction and comprehension if they meet in the middle. On the other hand, a person showing his disgust by wrinkling of his nose may be considered as funny. According to Ekman and Friesen, in order to transmit their facial emotions, some types of human actions like simulation, intensification, neutralization, deintensification and masking are used (1978, as cited in Gregersen, 2007).

If it is looked at them from the perspective of EFL teachers, there might be some examples. To start with, EFL teachers tend to simulate a facial affect or display emotions which they really have none. The underlying reason for this simulation may be to hide their real uncertain feeling. The EFL teachers exaggerate their facial expression, or try to show more feelings than they really do who are moderately content with their student's oral performance. To make it intensify, teacher puts a big smile on his face so as to encourage his student more. Secondly, the neutralizer teacher, presenting such a mood that actually nothing is felt, is a teacher who stays cool and stone-faced in class with an intention of hiding his surprised, innermost joy when he/she sees that his unsure answer to his students' question is correct indeed, and he pretends that he has been all sure about it. Thirdly, to be able to make de-intensification of emotion, it is usually given the appearance of feeling less than what is actually felt. For example, EFL teacher who sees his students win the English language scholarship in town. He may put a half smile on his face not to show he really wants to cry aloud. Finally, masking the face is namely disguising his emotions with something else. Teacher masks his face trying to appear he is not when, in reality, he is angry with his students for they do not listen to his warnings about the exam, do not study well and fail eventually (Gregersen, 2007).

According to Knapp, Hall and Horgan (2013) the facial communication takes the role of words that people say, and is often assumed more sincerely and permanently. There is another well-known saying "Actions speak louder than words." In other words, our facial expressions mean more than what we say or feel. Pointing out this theory, it is evidently clear that the significance of nonverbal immediacy behaviors especially the facial movements cannot be underestimated (p. 260).

2.4.1.1.3. *Gestures*

Some studies show that four types of gestures exist for effective communication and these are illustrators, regulators, emblems, and affect displays respectively (Gregersen, 2007). At first, illustrators are behaviours that combine or highlight the verbal message people give. These gestures are usually used right before or at the same time with a lexical item for transmitting the same meaning. The functions of illustrators are to make communication easier and more meaningful if the clarity of the words is low under some circumstances especially when there is so much noise (Sueyoshi & Hardison, 2005). Similarly, in an EFL class, these gestures are crucially helpful for L2 learners to comprehend sentences a speaker says for they support the meaning of sentences in a contextual way simultaneously transmitting some clues related to the sentences. These gestures help not only students but also teachers. At this point, EFL teachers play critical roles, as they are the role models, leaders, and facilitators in class. To exemplify that: a teacher asking his students to open their books and showing an action of opening his own book using his hand movements makes message more comprehensible for students. Another example could be a teacher asking his students to underline the correct answers at the same time demonstrating the action of underlining with the help of his hand sends messages directly and appropriately. Secondly, regulators embracing eye movement, control turn-taking and different parts of interpersonal communication are also important. What regulators do for people is to end their speech and to evolve their turn taking in a smooth transition. This part of communication is vital, without it; there is no conversation at all but a monologue (Gregersen, 2007). Besides, Duncan (1972) asserted that every conversation consists of timings as to who speaks when, and this is generally conducted without conscious effort and in a fairly smooth way thanks to some regulators like the ending gestures, gaze direction changes or the way speakers look at hearer motioning a sentence ends. However, the way speakers end their speech is not the same for all languages. Therefore, L2 learners may have some difficulties in conversations with native speakers or their native teachers because of interruptions and ambiguities among speakers, consequently, those problems result in anxiety and uncertainty among speakers. In order not to face such problems in EFL class, teaching students not just English but also English language nonverbal behaviors especially the ones, which can hinder the meaning of sentences, may aid (Gregersen, 2007). Thirdly, emblems are used on purpose to send a message, and they are possible to translate into words. As these gestures may swap roles of words, their word

meanings are usually clear within a country. However, these emblems can mean different things amongst countries. What is more, even though they may mean a good thing in a culture, they are possible to indicate an insulting or sexual message in another country. To illustrate this; being an emblem -the ring gesture, with the thumb and forefinger meeting to make a circle, showing “you’re worth zero” in France and Belgium; “money” in Japan; “asshole” in parts of southern Italy; and in Greece and Turkey, it is an impolite or vulgar sexual invitation. For many the United States of America residents, it surely means “A-Okay” (Knapp, Hall & Horgan, 2013, p. 206). In relation to these, in EFL classes, EFL teachers may talk about the meaning of diversity of these emblems, and learners may comprehend the meaning of the emblems for not having any troubles in communication. To give an example; the sideways movement of the head by an Australian speaker showing negativity or meaning no as a reply would be troublesome for a language learner who is not from Australia, and assumes this emblem -the sideways head movement mean yes (Gregersen, 2007). Therefore, EFL learners must reformulate the meaning of this emblem. At this point, it is vital to be more aware of this diversity for EFL teachers and act according to it in EFL classes. Finally, affectionate behaviors are one of the most preminent behaviors used in the creation of relationships and keeping these relationships alive. In freshly growing relationships, affect displays commonly perform severe actions by which interactive progress is assessed (King & Christensen, 1983, as cited in Guerrero & Floyd, 2006, p. 84). The repertoires of specific affection displays in personal relationships, families, or all cultures will vary as a function of learning and social construction. Guerrero and Floyd (2006) said that there are some studies related to the nature of affectionate behavior, which is an extension of fostering behavior, has a fundamental place for mankind, and affectionate behavior is usually mutual among cultures (p. 84). Therefore, great number of nonverbal behaviors transferring affection is largely predictable all over the world. However, Gregersen (2007) suggested that some differences still exist among cultures. Accordingly, language learners can have some difficulties in learning process, and he gave such an example that some Russian students having a course in the USA often whine that their professors smiling too much, on the contrary, professors who teach Russian students sometimes suppose that their Russian students do not enjoy their classes! At that point, there seems to be a misinterpretation of emotions, as cultures differ in their affect displays. Therefore, EFL teachers must consider this misinterpretation meticulously in their EFL teaching process. To prevent this misunderstanding, they can train themselves to have

enough understanding about not only their own native language affection displays but also English native language affection displays, and to show their existing or strived knowledge in class when they talk to their students and modifying students when they communicate. Similarly, teachers can transmit these behaviors via smiling, crying or liking etc. Consequently, affect displays being such outstanding nonverbal behaviors are crucial for language learning.

2.4.1.1.4. Voice

Vocal features or paralinguistic that we often use in communications are nonverbal features of oral communication, and they are related to all oral cues that are disconnected from visible language. Mobaraki (2014) defined these cues as the verbal components beyond the words themselves. When people use these oral components, they send immediate emotional expression transferred by the sound of the voice. The diversity of these characteristics is huge including senses of fear, anger, sincerity, kindness, willingness, and strictness. Even though two voices might sound alike, each voice involves various assets making it unique (p. 38). These vocal features of the expressions in oral communication outweigh the meanings of our articulated expressions: to prove the statement it is usually said how we say something is more important than what we say. It is possible to divide paralinguistic characteristics into many categories, but in the present study focus will be the most important vocalic cues that change the gist of our speech. These are pitch, rate, volume, vocal fillers or pause, silence, and stress.

Beebe (1980) claimed that several studies accept the idea that paralinguistic cues affect students' perceptions of teachers. Other investigations, however, did not record clear relationships between paralinguistic cues and student achievement or student attitudes toward teacher. To start with, Pearce (1971, as cited in Beebe 1980) discovered that conversational vocal delivery enhanced credibility more than does dynamic vocal delivery. In relation to these, another study was designed to determine how vocal behavior of college teacher influences his students' attachment toward him and students' perceptions of him. Results indicated that teacher variations in pitch, tempo and quality do not significantly impact students' attitudes toward the teacher, but a teacher's credibility does seem to be partially dependent upon the degree to which the teacher's verbal and paralinguistic behaviors.

Several researchers have found that paralanguage conveys quite a lot of cues for receivers such as contradiction, detracting of the messages either verbal or nonverbal (e.g., Addington, 1968; Ambady & Rosenthal, 1992; Buller & Aune, 1988; Hecht & LaFrance, 1995; Kimble & Seidel, 1991; Sohn, 1995, as cited in Hinkle, 2011).

Likewise, Richmond (2002) found that the very disrupting nonverbal behavior displayed by instructors is a monotone voice, as it signals no enthusiasm or interest. On the other hand, students credit good vocal expressiveness as sincerity and immediacy. Also, students want teachers to present a lively and animated voice (Richmond, 2002). Besides, Knapp (1971) claimed that increased learning is not likely with poor vocalic. Therefore, voice is an element playing a noteworthy role in this study as being one of the important factors of teacher immediacy behaviors.

2.4.1.1.4.1. Pitch

The pitch of voice is an indicator of highness or deepness levels of voice sounds. In other words, people have voices that belong to a standard primary frequency, which is called pitch. Normally, men's voices have a lower pitch than women do, and when compared to children, adults have deeper voices. Additionally, speakers are observed more competent if they use a higher and more varied pitch of voice. Furthermore, low pitch voices convey messages of strength, sexiness and maturity, and high pitch voices convey messages of anxiety, vulnerability, and apprehension (Mobaraki, 2014, p. 54).

Miller (1988) explained in his booklet that trial judgments prompted active feelings such as anger are showed vocally by high pitch. On the contrary, less active emotions like incompetence are represented by low pitch, impeded pace, and deep sound. Furthermore, stress is frequently expressed by upper pitch and words pronounced at greater rate than normal. During depression, it is possibly not the case as there is more inclination to the lower pitch and slower word pace (p. 17). Additionally, it is stated that the multipurpose message-transmitting feature of voice is pitch. Moreover, pitch differences can change meanings of same words in some languages, and English is one of these languages. Thus, it is not surprising to get different meanings by pitch variations without changing the words themselves in English. In relation to this, pitch's huge role in communication is undeniable. On the other hand, the monotone pitch pattern may be associated with credibility and dominance. Therefore, in classroom settings, teachers usually use this kind of monotonous

pitch to transfer gist, give instructions or lectures in other words in communication settings being close to negotiation (Von Zoller, 2007, p. 36). Additionally, Chen (2009) mentioned some issues related to the success levels of learners L2-specific pitch contours, and said that some study tried to analyze the speech spontaneity of L2 learners using the similar pitch range to native speakers of L2 and found out they managed to notice L2 specific intonational qualities. At this perspective, Chen (2009) suggested that languages differ in pitch to transmit the meaning. Consequently, it is wise to undertake L2 teacher responsibilities to adapt pitch rate into their speaking, as they are the actors and role models in class. Thanks to this pitch adaptation, most students may have a chance to copy their teachers' pitch rate either consciously or automatically when they listen to him/her. With regard to this, it is obvious that teachers are assumed to be role models by students in the class.

2.4.1.1.4.2. Rate

Rate or tempo is another component of paralanguage that could be controlled consciously, and has some functions including grammar and functions. In speech, people emphasize certain words and sentences to make them stand out, to warn about something, to threaten or to be dominant etc. Additionally, fast tempo transfers enthusiasm, rashness, anger, annoyance, impatience etc. (Poyatos, 2002b, p. 8). Considering all these, there seems a range of clues for L2 language classroom that teachers adjust while they are lecturing to or interacting with students. Thanks to these adjustments and applications students are able to comprehend the meanings of words in a better way, in harmony with English language.

Furthermore, Simonds, Meyer, Quinlan and Hunt (2006) claimed that instructor speech rate revealed significant differences for credibility, affective learning, and nonverbal immediacy whereas no significant differences for recall or clarity. Simonds et al. (2006) showed that a slow speech rate negatively influenced students' perceptions of affective learning, instructor's nonverbal immediacy and credibility. Additionally, some research suggested that students probably become more motivated to learn as long as instructors are dynamic speakers. As mentioned above, conversational delivery is more important than general delivery (Pearce 1971, as cited in Beebe, 1980), and the dynamism in conversational delivery may have a bigger role than the dynamism in general vocal delivery.

2.4.1.1.4.3. Volume

Being another element of paralanguage, which can be controlled consciously, is volume. Poyatos asserted that volume becomes louder with stressed syllables (2002b, p. 7). In addition to this, volume is multifunctional both in daily and classroom communication. Interestingly, some study proposed that if high volume is followed instantly by a substantial decline in volume, which is also being a nonverbal pattern, it could attract the attention of students by creating a kind of shock named as auditory shock in the brain. Clearly, human brain is quite capable of differentiating the pattern shifts. Likewise, in the classroom, the brain immediately recognizes a significant shift in the level of volume, and students could pay attention to the teacher and grasp more from him/her (Von Zoller, 2007, p. 38). It is not surprising to observe quite similar benefits in L2 classroom settings as volume has an excellent way to get the attention of students. By using these kinds of volume techniques, EFL teachers can present the English language more clearly and attractively and teach it more effectively.

2.4.1.1.4.4. Pause of Vocal Fillers

The next nonverbal pattern is pause or vocal fillers, and they can be identified as sounds but not real words used to stop the silence or fill the gap while speaking. These sounds can differ among languages, and they have their own range, frequency, and intensity. Common English vocal fillers can be listed as er, um, uhh, ohh, etc. Almost everyone uses these words, but some research indicates that people are thought to be less competent and outgoing when they often use these fillers in their speech (Mobaraki, 2014, p. 40).

2.4.1.1.4.5. Silence

Signaling several messages such as control, dominance, highlighting, thinking etc. depending on the context is another nonverbal immediacy behavior (Key, 1997, cited in Mobaraki, 2014, p. 40). In relation to these, the aim of silence is often to transmit feelings and intentions. To start with, people get silent when they are not sure to answer a question, they have nothing to say and they have said enough about something. Additionally, ignorance, disdain, hate, anger can be the other underlying reasons of silence. Depending on the situation, acceptance, loyalty, honesty, confidence, and strength sometimes result in silence. All these kinds of silence is called silent treatment. Because of its multifunctional

messages, it is wise to be careful and meticulous about the use of silence in communication. What is more, the other nonverbal behaviors embracing proxemics, eye contact, touching, movements and gestures classify the underlying meaning of silence. Considering positively or negatively multifunction of silence, it is an obvious tool to improve or end the relationships (Mobaraki, 2014, p. 40).

Raymond (1973, cited in Smith, 1979) examined the influence of silence as a nonverbal behavior in a microteaching situation and saw no meaningful difference between displaying silence and not displaying silence. At its nature, the timing to examine the teachers using silence or not using silence in class may have been not long enough to spot differences

2.4.1.1.4.6. Intonation

Vocal intonation gives different meanings to the same words and phrases. When the words and phrases were analyzed, it was noted noteworthy results. For example: “Thank you.” Signaling appreciation and thankfulness, if said sarcastically, “thank you” postulates utterly a different meaning. Another example, “I am sorry,” when somebody apologizes for something, the simple words usually do not give the intentional meaning but the intonation does. If sincerity is not shown by the vocal intonation, the listener may not be satisfied completely and expects more signals to show the reality in communication (Miller, 1981).

Additionally, Wennerstorm (2000) investigated the intonation factor for second language speakers of English from Japan, Spain, and Thailand. The intonation ways of these speakers were recorded and analyzed in discourse. It was observed that non-native speakers did not regularly use pitch to transmit contrasts as much as native speakers did while they were speaking. On the other hand, first language speakers constantly used a high pitch with a starred tone to highlight the information and low pitch to transmit known information. Also, beginnings and endings of the speech had different intonations, but L2 learners did not practice intonational means to signal a particular meaning or did not use a different pitch accent or boundary tone than native speakers.

2.4.1.1.5. Proxemics

The study of the practice and perception of social personal space and personal space is called proxemics. In proxemics, the style people have and the way they respond to spatial relationships in either formal or in informal group settings including itself too is named as

small group ecology. Another term carrying importance for proxemics is called personal space orientation, and it is studied during the conversation and on the process how it varies according to gender, prestige, positions, ethnic orientation, etc. The next one is *territoriality* also a common term referring the human predisposition to limit personal space. All these terms gain more importance in groups that at least have some population. Furthermore, many professions dealing with placing and spatial arrangements related to leadership and communication success make a program launch at using proxemics in their organizations (Knapp, Hall and Horgan, 2013, p. 31). Therefore, it is evidently essential to place the proxemics in teaching.

Argyle and Dean (1965) mentioned when people speak, they are prone to keep an equilibrium level of physical distance exist between them in order to make a healthy conversation. Knapp, Hall and Horgan (2013) suggested that the distance we keep to handle our communication with another controls the response in the current environment. These distances were categorized into two sections. First one is actual physical distance such as being in an office on a different floor being in a neighborhood in the other part of the town. The next one is psychological distance in other words the blocks that part people obviously even if they were close physically. To illustrate, someone sits next to another person on bus or train, she or he may not feel close because of some other matters though. On the other hand, there are some circumstances that make people stand very close to each other as in elevators. Under these circumstances, less eye contact, body tenseness and immobility, cold silence and nervous laughter are some of the alternatives to increase the distance psychologically (p. 97). In relation to these statements, it could be benefited in EFL teaching and learning to signal the language without uttering any words as these nonverbal behaviors all have underpinning meanings by themselves under some circumstances.

Mehrabian (1968) claimed that there was an increasing literature proposing important relationships between a communicator's attitude and his distance, posture, and orientation. Therefore, the space that is kept between the teacher and the students during the communication process has an excellent force in class. By this space, teachers are able to transfer feelings of approval or refusal simply. However, students do not have a freedom of space as much as teachers have. Similar to people, teachers have a tendency to stand nearby to students they like than they like less, and this might create such speculations that teacher favoring certain students whereas not favoring the others. Therefore, it is better to keep

equal space to all students. In order to do that, walking spontaneously all over the classroom might be a remedy. On the other hand, teachers should always remember to give some privacy and independence in class either for themselves or for students to create a positive learning environment (Miller, 1988, p. 26).

Hesler (1972, cited in Smith, 1979) conducted an extensive analysis of how teachers of a university course use classroom space in their class and how their students perceive them. In this study, six different areas were spotted to evaluate teachers' use of space. These were teachers being at front whiteboard or front wall of classroom (BL), teachers being at or sitting on, beside, or behind desk (DK), teachers being in front of desk (T), teachers not being next to desks or along side walls (S), teachers being at back of classroom or behind students (BK), and teachers being among students (AM) respectively. With regard to gender comparing, outcomes showed that male teachers' use of space were diverse in distance categories, and they moved around the classrooms more frequently than female teachers, but they also inclined to be at or behind the desk (DK) more often. A similar statement to this finding was observed in another study. Males were rated as engaging more random movement, showing more relaxation, using a louder and sharper speaking voice, and using a deeper pitch than females. Females were rated higher than males on the frequency and animation of gestures; facial expressiveness /animation (Newton & Burgoon, 1991, p. 91). On the other hand, being in front of the desk, in area T, was more common in female teachers. In addition to these, three outstanding teacher positions were mentioned and linked with their teachers' interpersonal relationship by students. These teacher areas were linked with teacher affection usually noticed as warm, friendly, and effective; a kind of attachment that helps students feel that they were part of the class unit, and student affection (i.e., students felt that they were liked and accepted by the teacher). First one was DK position; it was related to teacher dislike and exclusion whereas T position was favored considering teacher bond, and the last one was AM position, it was positively associated with student affection. To sum up, a strong but moderate relationship was observed between these nearby categories and inclusion while a slight relationship existed between uses of the near categories (Smith, 1979).

As it is inferred from previous research, proximity plays a critical role in teaching. To this end, it is wise to accept its criticality in EFL teaching. Some study pointed out that effective teachers tried to communicate with students in a close personal space, entering students'

spaces (were within two feet), and gestured to students (Negi, 2009). It is not surprising to see this is the same for English language teachers, when they talk to students in class. Therefore, it is a duty for English language teachers to encourage students to speak English in class. Additionally, teachers being near the students during the conversation may make students feel affection, motivation and sincerity because of their position in class. However, Çelik (2005) claimed that EFL learners and teachers experienced a mutual problem. Although learners and teachers are always taught grammatical and lexical features of English, they are not showed an effective description of American or English culture that does not approve close proximity as much as many cultures including Turkish culture. Therefore, they find themselves in a shock when they first arrive in the United States of America (USA) although they may have a good command of verbal (linguistic) skills in English. Also, Çelik (2005) gave an example related to above statements. It was about Ayla, raised speaking English as her home language having a flawless understanding of the English language. One day she got so closer to a baby and showed her affection and favor, and then she told she was going to bite her toes. After hearing this, her mother went insane. There may seem no direct link to proximity in this example, but it confirms the significance of socio-linguistic knowledge of language, additionally the significance of integration of nonverbal behavior (proximity), grammaticality and linguistic correctness of our message. With regard to this, it is clear that cultures differ in interpersonal space patterns. At that point, there comes such a necessity for English language learners to be aware of these differences while grasping the language. Thanks to this awareness, they may minimize the misinterpretations and ineffectiveness of communication by adjusting their nonlinguistic features according to the features of target language (Çelik, 2005). On the other hand, McCroskey argued that proxemics sometimes does not interfere with affective learning as much as effective vocal variety, eye contact, and humor does, especially in higher education such as college and postgraduate study (Özmen, 2010).

2.4.1.1.6. Touch

The analysis of touching behavior and the sense after touching in nonverbal communication is called haptic. A study shows that touch is not only a sense but also a necessity for human beings survival. Additionally, when five senses analyzed, (sight, smell, sound, taste, and touch), the sense of touch starts to emerge initially way before people are born. If put it

different words, it can be said that it is more reactive and older than other senses. Additionally, it is very basic and natural at its disposal as human body reflexively responds to touch. Taking the significance of touching in infancy and early childhood into consideration, it is not surprising to observe a great deal of research conducted related to the this sense (Mobaraki, 2014, p. 42). To be more specific, some scholar did some research and underscored the eminence of touching by categorizing the infants into two groups who were touched and massaged and who were not touched and massaged (Mobaraki, 2014, p. 42). Interestingly, he came up with such a result that babies having physical contact put on weight a lot faster. Additionally, it is seen that they managed to bear noise more easily; they seemed more controllable, more energetic, watchful, and reactive. Looking at this finding from the instructional perspective, it can be benefited for better classroom outcomes if used wisely and appropriately. For example, students who are comfortable being touched by their teachers may feel more secure, more valuable, more watchful and energetic and more willing to participate in the class.

Similarly, Hertenstein, Keltner, Bulleit and Jaskolka (2006) indicated in their research that touch shows distinctive emotions including anger, distress, happiness, kindness, love, and appreciation. Therefore, its effect on people is overwhelming, influential and persuasive. What is more, it symbolizes authority, prestige, and power, and people touching initially are usually assumed to hold the authority. For example, the teacher touches the student, the employer touches the employee, and the doctor touches the patient. They also declared that some research showed that people who favor touching and being touched by others are often assumed to be more communicative, and apt to be more self-confident.

In accordance with its power in nonverbal communication, touching behavior, a very powerful nonverbal behavior, could be benefited in instructional communication because it enriches students' emotional, social, physical, and intellectual development. However, teachers should be careful about touching students suitably.

Accordingly, Mobaraki (2014) recommended teachers to ask for students' permission before touching them. Furthermore, he underscored the importance of decision as to whether or when to use touching students while communicating with them. Touch plays a key role in the classroom (p. 42). Graham and Heyhood (1975) asserted touch behavior can take place consciously in ways such as patting, slapping, punching, pinching, stroking, shaking, kissing, licking, holding, guiding, embracing, linking, laying-on, kicking,

grooming, and tickling. Touch is often useful for warmth, love, affection, intimacy, sympathy, comfort, support, consolation, protection, understanding, involvement, reassurance, anger, frustration, etc.

Apparently, Richmond (2002) implied that touch behaviour is one of the most important tools for establishing an effective teacher-student relationship in class. Reinforcing students for well done actions, the instructor or teacher can touch students. Unless the teacher prefers saying even a word to reprimand or control, touching can substitute words or sentences. To be precise, if a student misbehaves in class, he may be noticed and warned by the instructor who strolls up and touches the student on the shoulder. Thanks to this touch behaviour, the child could understand that he or she should end or change their actions. Clearly, touch behaviour in class between the teacher and student during the communication is vital as much as functional. Touching a student on the arm, hand, or shoulder should be tolerable, effective, and communicative without using verbal messages. Richmond (2002) also highlighted that not all students like touching behaviour and feel very happy when touched, and for that reason teachers had better keep it in their mind. In order not to face any problems, instructors should leave touch-avoidant students and not try to relax them by touching. On the other hand, there exist some teachers who are touch-avoidant and dislike being touched. He suggested these type of teachers not to teach at the elementary schools or levels.

In brief, either student or teacher who do not prefer or like touching behaviour is likely to be perceived as non-immediate or touch-avoidant. Under these circumstances, it is better to prefer other nonverbal cues for creating immediacy and establishing a successful student-teacher relationship. It is highly recommended for not only teachers but also students to be mindful about touch norms in schools and communities and be careful about following them. Teachers should use touch as a form of reinforcement not a punishment (Richmond, 2002).

As for EFL classrooms, touch is one of the channels to reinforce teacher verbal messages, and both touching and not touching have profound effects in class (Stevick, 1982, p. 6). However, it is not possible to separate culture from language in language teaching and learning. Therefore, considering English and American cultures differences, teachers had better to adjust teacher touching behaviour while teaching English. EFL teachers should use touching behaviour as a supporter or conveyor of verbal communication. At this point,

there come out two important points to bear in mind, early one is how to use touch behaviour as a supporter of verbal messages given by teachers while teaching English, and the latter one is how to use touch behaviour while communicating via English. In the study you are reading, main concern is on the early one for it is quite helpful in English language teaching process.

As teachers speak English to teach English, it is sure to accept vitality of nonverbal behaviours to support verbal messages. Similarly, teachers can show their professionalism, care, affectionate, power and control via touching. Furthermore, vocabulary teaching may be facilitated in some ways, and the meaning of some words such as patting may be more comprehensible if teacher shows 'patting' action by patting a student who is not touch-avoidant. Also, this might indicate teacher professionalism. Teachers also display their care or affection to catch their students' attention or to create a warm EFL class to encourage students' interaction by touching them in EFL. On the other hand, Stevick (1982) claimed that teacher touching style or abstain style transmitting significant signs are unseen issues in class communication. These signs, moreover, affect students' feelings of welcome and comfort with teacher (p. 6). Through this comfort and welcome, students may feel more motivated to talk English or comfortable enough to initiate the conversation or vice versa.

In a reference mentioned earlier, touch and smiling were used together as symbols of warmth, but these elements were not examined separately (Kleinfeld, 1973). It is possible that touch plays a supporting role in classroom communication, although, as Kleinfeld pointed out, it should be used only when the teacher feels comfortable doing so and when students do not feel discomfort.

2.4.1.1.7. Clothing

Clothing and accessories have been analysed and benefited in several areas for years, but primary research has claimed that the effect of dress seems minimal; therefore, it does not deserve much value in instructional settings. Hence, educational researchers may have not put the work in this element of nonverbal behaviour. However, some research claimed that clothes and jewellery could be only conveyor of messages by overestimating or underestimating them coming after the interpretation of facial expressions, gestures, vocalic, proxemics and other nonverbal behaviours (Smith, 1979).

Nevertheless, appearance via clothes could be taken as an advantage in situations when it is tried to make an intended impression, mostly for first impressions. Clothes, jewellery and the other aids (makeup, jewellery, glasses) signal people's identities and predispositions, sex, class, mood, personality (Stafford, 1976, p. 38).

Miller (1981) mentioned a study done to examine the female subjects' descriptions of the features of "popular women." It was seen that clothing and other clothing aids took place as a second feature in importance after personality seemingly leaving behind physical appearance. As the current research aims to analyse clothing impact on teacher nonverbal immediacy in instructional communication, it is tried to focus on education in general and teaching in particular.

Some valuable study indicated that formally dressed instructors are perceived as well-organized and competent whereas sloppy dressed or informally dressed instructors are likely to be perceived as friendly, flexible, fair, open to communication, and sociable (Thomas & Maddox, 2003). On the other hand, it was found that when teachers always get dressed formally, students are more likely to accept their instructors as ignorant of their needs and less approachable and less communicative. Although formally teachers are perceived as more competent, it is not positively correlated with approachability, openness and willingness to interact. However, teachers who get dressed casually are assumed to be approachable, accessible, and immediate, but not as competent as formally dressed ones (Richmond, 2002). To this end, Richmond (2002) advised teachers to follow a balanced line in their clothing styles in class, and get dressed formally for one week or two weeks to deserve being credible. After forming the credibility in class, teachers may dress more casually to transmit that they are approachable, accessible, and open to classroom interaction. Additionally, another study underlined that regardless of teachers' intention, clothing signals messages and creates perceptions that are not easy to change afterwards. In relation to these findings, it can be asserted that forming nonverbal teacher immediacy entails appropriate clothing (Thomas & Maddow).

2.4.1.1.8. Scent

It is certain that eyes and voice are the prominent and permanent sensors in communication. Despite not playing the main role like these nonverbal immediacy senses, smell plays an important role as well. Thus, it is not surprising to witness such a huge budget on smell

industry all over the world not to just deodorize people but the environments. Conversely, the initial aim of scent or odour is to attract people, especially, some cultures likewise some people value wearing odour much more than others as the idea that scent conveys messages such as openness, happiness, and rage is popular for them (Duke, 1974). With regard to these, odour or scent people adorn also communicates, and they transmit messages such as friendliness and avoidance. If odour communicates in general, it is likely to communicate in instructional communication as well. Therefore, it is recommended to teachers avoid giving any distractions by wearing intense scents as they may hinder students' learning, health and participation to the class. Additionally, some students may be allergic to these strong odours, and teachers need to be aware of it (Richmond, 2002).

Furthermore, teacher is a dominant figure in the classroom so a great amount of attention is on analysing teacher behaviour both verbally and nonverbally. Similar to clothing and jewellery, odour that teachers wear gives messages about how teachers see themselves and want students to see them (Stafford, 1975, pp. 43).

2.5. Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy

Several studies approve the existing relationship between instructor immediacy and many learning styles (Andersen & Andersen, 1982; Christensen & Menzel, 1998; Christophel, 1990; Comstock, Gorham, 1988; Gorham & Zakahi, 1990; Richmond, Gorham, & McCroskey, 1987; Rowell, & Bowers, 1995; Sanders & Wiseman, 1990, cited in Menzel & Carrell, 1999). In addition to this, many studies have used similar, modified measurements to measure the relationship between immediacy and learning outcomes. However, these modified measurement instruments that have been used all the history were mostly based on two scales originally introduced by Andersen (1979) using the nonverbal literature by Mehrabian (1968a, 1968b, 1971, 1972) and others (Witt, Wheelless & Allen, 2004). Although underestimated in many colleges, affective learning is one issue that needs to be addressed. It is not reasonable to undervalue affective learning, as teachers and schools' primary aim is to create lifelong passionate learners. To be more specific, it is aimed to create students who think about the class after the class itself. Therefore, every discipline needs cognitive, psychomotor and affective skills at the same time. Firstly, Andersen (1979) showed the existing relationship between nonverbal immediacy and affective learning although she did not establish a direct association with teacher nonverbal

immediacy and cognitive learning. Chesebro (2003) also supported the second result and concluded that nonverbal immediacy does not influence cognitive learning. However, Gorham (1988) demonstrated that both immediacy types –verbal and nonverbal served to students' perceptions of teacher immediacy, and positively correlated with affective learning and cognitive learning. Additionally, Richmond, Gorham and McCroskey (1987) indicated a similar positive relationship between nonverbal immediacy and cognitive learning. They showed this similar relationship in a controlled setting in which affect factor was diminished, and student reports of teacher immediacy were conducted to distinguish learning levels of students. By this study, the correlation between teacher nonverbal immediacy and cognitive learning has risen suddenly.

Teacher nonverbal immediacy being a unit term of teacher communication behavior has a valuable connection with affective learning. Although studies have accumulated some disagreements about the link between nonverbal immediacy and cognitive learning, this has not been the case for affective learning. Some study found that nonverbal behavior played a role almost %25 in liking for the content and taking another class including previous content (Andersen, 1986).

Frymier and Thompson (1992) posited in their research that nonverbal immediacy is positively related to teacher character, competence, and student motivation. A great deal of research has indicated that affective learning (McCroskey, Fayer, Richmond, Sallinen, & Barraclough, 1996), cognitive learning (McCroskey, Sallinen, Fayer, Richmond, & Barraclough, 1996), motivation to content area and course, and also affect for teacher (McCroskey & Richmond, 1992; McCroskey, Richmond, Sallinen, Fayer, & Barraclough, 1995) are all related to nonverbal immediacy. As seen from numerous research, it is clear that teacher nonverbal immediacy has come up several benefits both in the short and long span (Baringer & McCroskey, 2000). Besides, McCroskey et al. (1995) suggested that cognitive and affective learning of students had a substantial connection to the teacher nonverbal immediacy. They concluded that teacher communication behaviors enhanced student learning and also increased positive evaluations of teachers by students in their study. Richmond (2002) also claimed that there were a lot of scholars regarded immediacy as a term not only in communication but also in teaching and named it as a means of classroom control, a means of enhancing affect, a means of increasing student learning, and facilitating student retention.

Some research also found that appropriate use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors yielded several outcomes such as high motivation including its basic elements, which are attention, confidence, satisfaction and relevance (Frymier, 1993). What is more, it was stated that the opposition acts and disagreements by students were less than general if teachers use immediacy in their classes (Richmond, 2002).

Upcoming years there were also studies focusing on the variables such as culture, gender, and setting. Some study showed that no matter it was encouraged to use nonverbal immediacy behaviors or not, a positive attitude was observed not only for the course and content but also for the instructor (Christophel, 1990; Richmond, 1990).

Also, there is a thin line between teacher clarity and teacher immediacy for they are extremely related and collinear in their nature and typically go together, and when one of them is missing there could be less benefits in class. Chesebro and McCroskey (2001) mentioned this certain ambiguity in their research. Conversely, they found that student apprehension decreases in terms of its negative outcomes when teachers use immediacy and clarity simultaneously. However, they underlined that this research is limited to identify which one profoundly plays a role for each student preference. To be more specific, another research to examine the effects of teacher clarity, teacher immediacy and teacher caring was conducted and revealed that significant main effects for each independent variable and several significant two-way interactions existed. When they were measured one by one, small amounts of variance in their measures were found respectively. Immediate teachers increased student motivation ($ES=.74$) and student affective evaluation of the course and instructor ($ES=.56$) more than caring teachers accounting for student motivation ($ES=.39$), and student affective learning ($ES=.42$). As to teacher clarity, it was identified as an important determinant of all three students measures and yielded moderate effect sizes for student motivation ($ES=.53$), cognitive learning ($ES=.54$), affective learning ($ES=.48$) (Comadena, Hunt, & Simonds, 2007). On the other hand, Richmond (2002) stated that another important factor has become student traits as students may differ in their judgments and attitudes toward nonverbal immediacy behaviors. Hence, teachers may need to consider these differences while using nonverbal immediacy behaviors and tailoring their actions for different students.

Student immediacy was also focused and examined on its relationship with teacher affect for students and motivation to teaching these students. It was found that nonverbally

immediate students increase their teachers' affect for them and motivation level for teaching those students. It appears that student immediacy may influence teacher motivation and affect just the way teacher immediacy does, and at that point they are obviously mediators of each other. This is the very evidence of getting positive results for both sides (Baringer & McCroskey, 2002).

The initial attempt to analyze motivation between teacher immediacy and student learning had remarkable results (Christophel, 1990; Richmond, 1990). Firstly, Richmond (1990) stated that immediacy and motivation are positively correlated, and motivation contributed a lot to both affective and cognitive learning. What is more, Christophel (1990) claimed that motivation was the first step to trigger learning with the help of teachers being immediate in the class in another research.

Additionally, some immediacy research analyzed student communicative characteristics and student tendencies/trends in class communication. Firstly, willingness to talk during the class sessions was observed to be more associated with verbal immediacy rather than nonverbal immediacy (Menzel and Carrell, 1999). Besides, students who have verbally immediate teachers disregard their apprehension to interact in class instead act courageously, and maintain their motivation high to study (Frymier and Weser, 2001). Additionally, Chesebro & McCroskey (2001) stated that students who have both clear and immediate teachers commonly feel less anxiety in achieving class aims.

Interpersonal communication motives identified by its theoretical framework – pleasure, control, relaxation, escape, inclusion, and affection were also researched as another viewpoint in instructional settings. It was found that instructors do not use nonverbal behaviors wholly even though there were spotted positive correlations with perceived instructor nonverbal immediacy behavior and other instruction communication behaviors. A study showed that some nonverbal immediacy behaviors such as paralinguistic (tone, pitch, volume), gestures were highly related to assertiveness whereas other nonverbal behaviors such as body movements and facial expressions were mostly indicators of responsiveness, and this was observed similarly in coach-athlete interactions (Myers & Ferry, 2001).

2.6. Motivation and Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy

Motivation has been defined in many ways for many years, and people come up with many similar definitions, however, the concept of motivation in class is usually about student interest either permanent or temporary. Frymier (1993) claimed that most of the time students are interested in something during the class whether it is approved by the teacher or not. Additionally, Lumsden (1994) underscored that the source of motivation differs mainly into two parts as extrinsic or intrinsic motivation. The early one is usually resulted from situational resources such as getting a reward, avoiding some punishment etc. while the latter one stems from the pure joy, achievement sense it triggers itself. Extrinsic motivation is not stable and can be influenced by teacher, as teacher is one of the situational factors in class. To this end, there arises a discussion about how teachers effect state motivation of students. With regard to it, some studies proposed that teacher's communication behaviors and instructional behaviors have effects on student motivation (Frymier, 1993). In other words, how teachers behave and communicate is assumed to influence students' motivation. Frymier (1993) also suggested that teacher enthusiasm plays a key role in student motivation besides teacher immediacy. In this study, teacher immediacy is focused in its nature. Additionally, Wdlokowski (1978) mentioned some policies including nonverbal behaviors for stimulating students' interest and enthusiasm as they lead to motivation. These nonverbal behaviors can be summarized as appropriate movements, vocalics, eye behaviors, touch behaviors, gestures etc. In addition to these, there are a lot more indirect approaches to be immediate nonverbally. Using humor, simulations, and role-plays are just the prominent ones mentioned in this study (p. 27). As understood from these statements, these strategies mingled with nonverbal immediacy behaviors at some point.

Frymier (1993) found that as long as average students consist the class, it is probable that appropriate nonverbal and verbal behaviors effect students' state motivation positively. Another study by Menzel and Carrell (1999) showed that although teacher nonverbal immediacy transmits being open to interaction, verbal behaviors actually ask for students' contribution. On the other hand, Gendrin and Rucker (2007) found that nonverbally immediate instructors are perceived to be more caring and sensitive to students' needs. Therefore, it is observed that students feel free to make excuses when their work is incomplete or late. Regarding this, it can lower motivation to some extent under some

circumstances. Comadena et al. (2007) examined the effects of teacher clarity, teacher immediacy, and teacher caring on student motivation and affective and cognitive learning. As a result, Comadena et al. (2007) found that when teacher immediacy is added to either teacher caring or teacher clarity, it is observed greater effects on student motivation and affective learning. Similarly, Allen, Witt and Wheelless (2006) suggested that high levels of teacher immediacy increase the student motivation, and indirectly cognitive learning. Besides, there were observed isomorphic relationships between student motivation and affective learning as higher levels of affect for the course and the instructor showed positive motivational outcomes resulting from immediacy behaviors (Rodriguez et al., 1996). Hence, according to this researcher, the theoretical framework reasons that affective learning and student motivation are directly influenced by immediacy while cognitive learning is influenced subtly.

Gorham and Christophel (1992) tried to indicate motivating and demotivating factors for university students that teacher behavior influence, and they have found that %44 of either motivating or demotivating factors in colleges were about teacher behaviors. Before this study, Gorham and Christophel (1990) investigated something relevantly important, and posited that if effective teacher behaviors such as humor and immediacy are used effectively and simultaneously teachers make the best use of them.

Similarly, Christenzen and Menzel (1998) demonstrated that there is a direct and practical relationship between teacher verbal and nonverbal immediacy and student state motivation, perceived cognitive learning, affective and behavioural learning. As the initial aim of education systems is to increase existing student learning, the reliance on immediacy behaviours either verbal or nonverbal is inevitable. To this end, it is not surprising to place nonverbal immediacy to keep students motivated in their organizations.

What is more, Collins (1978) conceptualized teacher enthusiasm as one of eight teacher nonverbal communication behaviors. Additionally, she claimed that an enthusiastic teacher displays a fully energetic, cheerful, excited teaching style requiring a wide range of nonverbal immediacy behaviors. To illustrate, these are varied vocal delivery, qualified eye contact, frequent use of all gestures, movements, and facial expressions, overall energy, and effective use of proximity. What is more, there was also verbal immediacy behavior such as highly descriptive word selection. According to her, praising and encouraging students, accepting their feelings and being willing to accept the ideas of students were some of the

indicators of teacher enthusiasm. As it is understood from these statements, there is a meaningful likeness between these two concepts, teacher immediacy and teacher enthusiasm. Furthermore, Keller, Hoy, Goetz and Frenzel (2015) stated there were a great number of studies that followed a similar conceptualization to Colin's.

In brief, many studies related to teacher enthusiasm explain enthusiasm term from the perspective of nonverbal immediacy behaviors. Although teacher enthusiasm and teacher nonverbal immediacy are assumed as interconnected constructs, it seems vital to inspect them in two different areas, as nonverbal immediacy is another extensive construct (Keller et al., 2015).

In this chapter, the potential different roles of nonverbal immediacy in different cultures and settings have been mentioned. They are more or less related to affective learning styles. This indicates that even though different cultures and settings take advantage of affective learning and nonverbal immediacy behaviors in different ways and amounts, they have something in common, and that is their valuable effect in teaching.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This part includes an in-depth description of the research methodology, reliability and validity of data instruments, research design, universe and sampling, participants, data collection, instruments and descriptive results for data collection instruments, data analysis and limitations. In terms of its aims, quantitative research design was followed and quantitative data collection was implemented in this study. The subject group of the study consists of 455 students and 28 instructors at prep schools of two different universities. Additionally, convenience sampling was conducted during the implementation of instruments. As to data collection and data analysis, two instruments including NIS-S for instructors and its translated version of Turkish NIS-O for students were used. The data analysis was conducted with the help of statistical package program for social sciences (SPSS) 20 and was transformed into statistical results by means of it.

3.1. Reference to the Problem Statement and Aims of the Study

Nowadays, teacher nonverbal immediacy in teaching is such an outstanding area that much time and investment have been put in this field. From this standpoint, the last-few-decade EFL teaching studies have tried to find out what the underlying points of this issue in real. However, Turkish education system truly seems not prioritizing this field enough though some studies have analyzed the field so far. Therefore, this study you are reading aimed to find out the significant differences between students' perceptions of their instructors' nonverbal immediacy and instructors' stated perceptions of their own nonverbal immediacy, and how they differed between these two in terms of instructors' gender in their nonverbal immediacy levels and the strong and the weak aspects of instructors' nonverbal behaviors from both perspectives. In accordance with this aim, it targeted to

present which nonverbal immediacy skills of instructors are strong enough or in need of enhancing from both instructor perspective and student perspective. Correspondingly, the study planned to investigate students' observations of instructor nonverbal immediacy, and how instructors' nonverbal immediacy impacts on their motivation. Finally, and perhaps the most importantly, this study attempted to show how aware teachers are of their nonverbal immediacy behaviors, and its direct impact on student motivation. In relation to these aims, to be able to draw the borders of the study the following research questions are directed to find answers to

1. Does instructors' nonverbal immediacy impact Ss' motivation?
2. Are there any differences between students' perceptions of their instructors' nonverbal immediacy and instructors' stated perceptions of their own nonverbal immediacy?
3. Which aspects of instructors' nonverbal immediacy are weak and need to be enhanced and which aspects of their nonverbal immediacy are strong according to students' perceptions of their instructors' nonverbal immediacy?
4. Which aspects of instructors' nonverbal immediacy are weak and need to be enhanced and which aspects of their own nonverbal immediacy are strong according to instructors' perceptions of their own nonverbal immediacy?
5. Is there a significant difference between students' perceptions of their instructors' nonverbal immediacy and instructors' stated perceptions of their own nonverbal immediacy in terms of gender?

Hopefully, the results of the study will have added a different dimension to the discussions about teacher nonverbal immediacy, teachers' perceptions of their own nonverbal immediacy and students' perceptions of teachers' nonverbal immediacy in terms of teacher gender as a variable.

3.2. Research Design

Research design of this study was implemented in quantitative research method. Dornyei (2007) described quantitative research as including data collection steps, generally resulting in numerical data and analysing numerical data via statistical methods. Similar to the current study that you are reading now, quantitative research may consist of a questionnaire or a scale and analysis of this data using of statistical software such as SPSS 20 program. The benefits of quantitative research style are mostly about its practicality,

quickness and handy data analysis (p. 30, p. 32). Related to these, quantitative methodology was followed in the phases of conducting NIS-S for instructors and its Turkish version of NIS-O for students. Firstly, these two scales were applied to instructors and students of each class at prep schools of two different universities in Ankara.

3.3. Universe and Sampling

In this study, university instructors and university students in Ankara consisted of the universe. To be able to create the sampling, 28 instructors and 455 students at two different universities, Gazi University and Atılım University (one is state one is private) in Ankara were involved in the study. Selecting one state university and one private university aimed to give the general atmosphere of prep schools of universities in Ankara. In addition to being the capital of Turkey, Ankara is also a very big and cosmopolitan city. Similarly, Gazi University is one of the biggest and the most cosmopolitan university amongst the universities in Ankara since there are a lot of departments including plenty of students who come from different areas with different backgrounds around Turkey at Gazi University. 75% of the instructors ($N = 21$) were female and 25% of the instructors ($N= 7$) were male. These participants were reached by using convenience sampling as it makes the researchers to reach the subject group more reasonably. Convenience or opportunity sampling is the most common type of sampling in L2 studies because these kinds of studies take convenience of the researcher the only criterion according to Dörnyei (2007, p. 95). Because gender was important for the instructors, information about instructor gender was collected for the study.

3.4. Participants

As mentioned before, 28 English language instructors and 455 students participated in the study as two major subject groups. 8 of these instructors were from Atılım University and 20 of them were from Gazi University, 21 of them were female and 7 of the instructors were male, and 163 students from Atılım University and 292 students from Gazi University participated in the study.

Regarding the aims of this study, as gender was important for the instructors, information about instructor gender was collected for the study. According to this demographic

information, 21 female (%75) and 7 (%25) male instructors with 455 students participated. There was not any information related to the student age or student department because neither research questions nor the aims of the study require them. However, as this study was conducted at prep schools of universities, ages of students are not mostly wide-ranging.

3.5. Data Collection

The data collection of this study was managed in the steps of quantitative data collection procedure. A survey research was considered to be the preferred type of data collection for this study regarding the nature of it. Additionally, survey design of this study was cross-sectional which means data is handed out and collected at a specific time. In relation to this statement, the data of this study was conducted in three days. As to form of data collection, two scales including self-report and observation report were administered in the custody of researcher within the class hour. The data was collected during the first, second and last 15 minutes of class hours by the permission of course instructors. The instructors and students were asked to report a total of 26 items, and the students were also asked to report a post section about the impact of instructors' nonverbal immediacy on their motivation in EFL classes. Therefore, it is acceptable to claim that data collection was controlled in a practical way. Dornyei (2007) mentioned some advantages and limitations of questionnaires. Looking at the advantages of survey design, it is sure to mention economy of the design and the rapid turnaround of data, collection of large numbers of information in less than an hour. What is more, well-constructed questionnaires make processing the data quite fast with the help of some computer software programs (p. 33). In terms of limitations, questionnaires are usually accepted as superficial data, extremely simple and short of contextualization to some point (Brannen, 2005).

As stated above, there were two scales in this study, and they were administered simultaneously during the class hour. To be specific, both instructors and students fulfilled the scales in the eye of researcher, so it is obvious that data collection procedure had only one part. All the necessary information was specified to the both groups by the researcher during the administration of scales. Then, the scales were administered and quantitative data were collected in a short time of period. As the scale for students was translated into Turkish, it was rather explicit to them. This scale investigated the judgments or opinions of

students and instructors about instructor nonverbal immediacy during English language class and gathered quantitative data. The available data was analyzed with the help of SPSS program.

3.6. Instruments

3.6.1. Nonverbal Immediacy Scale Self-Report

Nonverbal immediacy Scale Self-Report (NIS-S) is the latest measure of nonverbal immediacy as a self-report. It is assumed to have more face validity than previous instruments for having more various items. Additionally, this scale has excellent predictive validity. As another important point of this scale, it is vital to recognize that the difference in these self-reports between females and males may be statistically and socially significant. However, the question is whether these differences are genuine or a role of social desirability or function of actual behavior. In other words, females may actually be more nonverbally immediate than males or they think that they should be more immediate than males think they should be in many cultures. Not many studies were done related to this until 2003 (Richmond, McCroskey and Johnson, 2003).

Table 2

Nonverbal Immediacy Scale-Self Report (NIS-S)

DIRECTIONS: The following statements describe the ways some people behave while talking with or to others. Please indicate in the space at the left of each item the degree to which you believe the statement applies **TO YOU**. Please use the following 5-point scale: **1 = Never; 2 = Rarely; 3 = Occasionally; 4 = Often; 5 = Very Often**

_____ 1.	I use my hands and arms to gesture while talking to people.
_____ 2.	I touch others on the shoulder or arm while talking to them.
_____ 3.	I use a monotone or dull voice while talking to people.
_____ 4.	I look over or away from others while talking to them.
_____ 5.	I move away from others when they touch me while we are talking.
_____ 6.	I have a relaxed body position when I talk to people.
_____ 7.	I frown while talking to people.
_____ 8.	I avoid eye contact while talking to people.
_____ 9.	I have a tense body position while talking to people.
_____ 10.	I sit close or stand close to people while talking with them.
_____ 11.	My voice is monotonous or dull when I talk to people.
_____ 12.	I use a variety of vocal expressions when I talk to people.
_____ 13.	I gesture when I talk to people.
_____ 14.	I am animated when I talk to people.
_____ 15.	I have a bland facial expression when I talk to people.
_____ 16.	I move closer to people when I talk to them.

_____17.	I look directly at people while talking to them.
_____18.	I am stiff when I talk to people.
_____19.	I have a lot of vocal variety when I talk to people.
_____20.	I avoid gesturing while I am talking to people.
_____21.	I lean toward people when I talk to them.
_____22.	I maintain eye contact with people when I talk to them.
_____23.	I try not to sit or stand close to people when I talk with them.
_____24.	I lean away from people when I talk to them.
_____25.	I smile when I talk to people.
_____26.	I avoid touching people when I talk to them.

3.6.2. Nonverbal Immediacy Scale Observation Report

3.6.2.1. Validity and Reliability of Scale

In order to ensure the reliability and validity of the instrument (NIS-O) used in this study, firstly related literature was reviewed, and commonly acceptable scale was taken into consideration. To ensure the face validity and content validity experts in the field were consulted in the process of the translation of the scale. After that, to ensure the quality of the translated instrument, the process of translating the NIS-O was ended with a pilot study that was applied to 74 students in Preparatory School at Gazi University except the main sample of the study. Also, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted with the data gathered from the pilot study. After conducting the EFA, analysis of the gathered data was done by the help of the package program of SPSS 20. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was .74 implying that the data were appropriate for factor analysis. In addition to KMO measurement, Barlett's test of sphericity was applied and found to be statistically significant, $\chi^2 (325) = 958.32, p < .00$. It was also found that the correlation matrix was not an identity matrix and it was meant to be suitable for factor analysis.

Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, and Strahans (1999) suggested that principal axis factoring technique is a more robust factor extraction technique against the violation of the assumption of multivariate normality so it was used for the elimination of the factors. Since it allows for factor correlation, Oblique rotation (direct oblimin) is usually selected as a rotational method (Preacher & MacCallum, 2003). Oblique rotation was applied as a rotational method to interpret the analysis much easier.

As to be able to decide the number of factors, firstly, the criteria of eigenvalue of greater than 1 and then scree tests were followed. Based on these tests, there was only one factor

explaining the 29 % of the variance. Therefore, the factor loadings were reviewed with the criteria of .30 (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998, p. 1, p. 12), and the factor loadings greater than .30 were accepted. The original scale of this translated version of scale is a single dimensional scale, so the results of the EFA of the scale proved it well matched with the original scale.

Finally, Cronbach value was checked which construct related evidence. The value of Cronbach's alpha is equal to .866, in other words, greater than .60 showing the scale is reliable. In addition to these, additivity should be checked because the total score computed by the sum of item scores. So Tukey's Additivity Test was conducted and the results showed that the scale was additive ($p < .05$).

This scale was translated into Turkish and also the students fulfilled it in Turkish in order not to have any misunderstandings. The Turkish version of it is added in Appendix 3. The English version of the scale for the students is the following one.

Table 3

Nonverbal Immediacy Scale-Observation Report—NIS-O

DIRECTIONS: The following statements describe the ways some people behave while talking with or to others. Please indicate in the space at the left of each item the degree to which you believe the statement applies to you.

Please use the following 5-point scale

1 = Never; 2 = Rarely; 3 = Occasionally; 4 = Often; 5 = Very Often

...1. Our teacher uses his/her hands and arms to gesture while talking to us..

...3. Our teacher uses a monotone or dull voice while talking to us.

...4. Our teacher looks over or away from us while talking to us.

...5. Our teacher moves away from us when we touch him/her while talking to us .

...6. Our teacher has a relaxed body position when she/he talks to us.

...7. Our teacher frowns while talking to us.

...8. Our teacher avoids eye contact while talking to us.

...9. Our teacher has a tense body position while talking to us.

...10. Our teacher sits close or stands close to us while talking with us.

...11. Our teacher's voice is monotonous or dull when she/he talks to us.

...12. Our teacher uses a variety of vocal expressions when she/he talks to us.

...13. Our teacher gestures when she/he talks to us.

...14. Our teacher is animated when she/he talks to us.

...15. Our teacher has a bland facial expression when she/he talks to us.

...16. Our teacher moves closer to us when she/he talks to us.

...17. Our teacher looks directly at us while talking to us.

...18. Our teacher is stiff when she/he talks to us.

...19. Our teacher has a lot of vocal variety when she/he talks to us.

...20. Our teacher avoids gesturing while she/he is talking to us.

...21. Our teacher leans toward us when she/he talks to us.

...22. Our teacher maintains eye contact with us when she/he talks to us.

...23. Our teacher tries not to sit or stand close to us when she/he talks with us.

...24. Our teacher leans away from us when she/he talks to us.

...25. Our teacher smiles when she/he talks to us.

...26. Our teacher avoids touching us when she/he talks to us.

Please answer the following question according to the observations you made for the above scale.

- How does your instructor's nonverbal immediacy skills impact your motivation in your English classes?

Positively impacts

Negatively impacts

No impacts

3.7. Data Analysis

In the present study, the data were collected through two different instruments quantitatively during the collection process, and these data were also analyzed by using quantitative data collection tools. To be more specific, the quantitative data was collected by means of an observer report scale for students and a self-report scale for instructors. The statistical package SPSS 20 program was used to analyze the data obtained from the scales. Additionally, the analysis was conducted especially to be able to enlighten research questions in detail. The data from the NIS-O and NIS-S were analyzed by using descriptive techniques and all necessary results were shown as tables or figures in other words it was summarized and clarified according to the tables obtained from SPSS.

3.8. Limitations

This study used two Likert-type scales; one of them is a questionnaire that collected self-reported data. The collected data is limited with what the participants say or believe. There may be potential sources of bias contained in the data because the use of self-report measures may lead to inflation of common method variance. What is more, the other instrument administered to students is a self-observation scale which means carrying some sources of bias. Another limitation of this study may be the number of the participants and universities chosen for it. Therefore, the limited number of the participants in this study constraints the ability to generate the results to other universities in both the city and the country.

In this chapter, the general information about the research design of the study, participants, setting and data collection instruments were presented. The results of the data collection are presented in the next chapter.





CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF THE RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the questionnaires administered in the academic year of 2015-2016 at Gazi University and Atilm University in Ankara. It shows the results of the quantitative analysis obtained from the quantitative data collection tools in detail, and these results are described and discussed in harmony with research questions. The chapter begins with the descriptive analysis about the participants, and then presents the descriptive results of the scales corresponding to five main research questions.

The quantitative data were transformed into statistical results by means of SPSS 20. The study you are reading now has aims more than one. To start with, the main aim of this study is to determine whether there are any significant differences between the students' perceptions of their instructors' nonverbal immediacy and instructors' perceptions of their own nonverbal immediacy. In addition to this, it aims to find out what outcomes instructors' nonverbal immediacy have on students' motivation. The strongest and weakest aspects of instructors' nonverbal immediacy from both the students' and instructors' perspectives are targeted to find out and discuss. Also, instructor gender variance was scrutinized whether it created a change on students' perceptions about their instructors' nonverbal immediacy and instructors' perceptions about their own nonverbal immediacy in preparatory classes at two universities in Ankara.

4.1. Descriptive Results about the Participants

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of the Participants

Participants	Frequency	Percent
Instructor	28	5,8
Student	455	94,2
Instructors' Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	21	75
Male	7	25
Instructors' University	Frequency	Percent
Gazi University	20	71,43
Atılım University	8	28,57

According to the descriptive results put in Table 4, there were 28 instructors and 455 students who attended the study. 75% of the instructors ($N = 21$) are female and 25% of the instructors ($N = 7$) are male. 20 of them are from Gazi University and 8 of them are from Atılım University. Approximately 72% of the instructors from Gazi University and 28% of them from Atılım University participated in the study.

4.2. Descriptive Results of the Scale

Descriptive results for the total scores of NIS are given in Table 5.

Table 5

Descriptive Results for the Total Scores of NIS

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation	p
Instructor's total score	28	64	89	77,36	6,68	,000
Student's total score	455	52	92	71,16	6,31	,000

The minimum value is 64 and maximum value is 89 that the instructors get from the scale. The mean value is about 77,36 with a standard deviation of 6,68. One sample t-test shows that instructor's total scores are significantly below the norms ($94,2 \pm 15,6$), $t = -13,333$, $p < ,05$. It is obvious that instructors do not act nonverbally as much as norms suggest, and they need some support, improvement and practice on their nonverbal immediacy skills.

The minimum value is 52 and maximum value is 92 that the students get from the scale. The mean value is about 71,16 with a standard deviation of 6,31. One sample t-test shows that, student's total scores are significantly below the norms (94,2±15,6), $t = -77,917$, $p < ,05$. From these results, it can be concluded that students also assess their instructors' nonverbal immediacy behaviors below the norms. With regard to these scale results, it can be stated that both students and instructors agree on the idea that instructors need some improvement and support on their nonverbal immediacy skills during their EFL classes.

4.3. Results Related to the First Research Question

The first research question of this study is “*Does instructors' nonverbal immediacy impact students' motivation level?*” In order to gather data related to this question, a post section was formed at the end of the questionnaire that was administered to the students. To make it clearer, this section included a question for the students to answer in order to show the very link between their instructors' nonverbal immediacy and their motivation in English language classes.

Table 6

Distribution of the Students' Perceptions about Instructors' Nonverbal Immediacy Effect on Their Motivation toward English Language Classes

	Frequency	Percent
Positive	397	87,3
Negative	22	4,8
No effect	36	7,9

For answering this question thoroughly, distribution of the students' answers were categorized and analyzed accordingly. Observing the data, it could be stated that most of the students' beliefs related to qualified instructor nonverbal immediacy has a positive inclination considering motivation. Table 6 illustrates the distribution of students' perception about the effect of their instructors' nonverbal immediacy on their motivation. As the results show, 87,3 % of the students ($N = 397$) think that instructors' nonverbal immediacy affects their motivation positively, on the contrary, 4,8% of the students ($N = 22$) think they have a negative effect on their motivation, and 36 students (7,9%) think that there is not any effect of these variables on their motivation level. With regard to these percentages, it is explicable that students desire qualified instructors' nonverbal immediacy

during their English language classes as well as favors its positive effect on their motivation to English class. Nevertheless, a small quantity of students claims that instructors' nonverbal immediacy has no effect or negative effect on their motivation during their English language class. This finding indicates that some students' motivation does not have any relationship with instructors' nonverbal immediacy, or they might not pay attention to their instructors' nonverbal language at all. On the other hand, some students' statements are impartial which means they do not mind. There might be diverse underlying reasons for this impartiality.

4.4. Results Related to the Second Research Question

The second research question of this study is “*Are there any differences between students' perceptions of their instructors' nonverbal immediacy and instructors' stated perceptions of their nonverbal immediacy?*” Independent samples T-Test was conducted to collect the data from the scales. In addition to this, descriptive analysis was conducted to interpret the data related to this question. Obviously, this section was attempted to show whether there are any differences between students' perceptions of their instructors' nonverbal immediacy and instructors' perceptions of their own nonverbal immediacy or not.

Table 7

Independent Samples T-Test for Differences in Nonverbal Immediacy Perceptions

	Nonverbal Immediacy	N	Mean	SD	T	p
Class 1	Instructor	1	80	-	1,274	,219
	Student	19	72	6,12		
Class 2	Instructor	1	78	-	1,065	,303
	Student	17	70,29	7,03		
Class 3	Instructor	1	87	-	3,177	,005
	Student	19	71,26	4,83		
Class 4	Instructor	1	88	-	2,876	,010
	Student	19	69,74	6,19		
Class 5	Instructor	1	70	-	,521	,610
	Student	15	67,20	5,20		
Class 6	Instructor	1	67	-	-2,155	,048
	Student	16	73	2,79		
Class 7	Instructor	1	66	-	-1,732	,109
	Student	13	74,38	4,66		
Class 8	Instructor	1	76	-	1,215	,246
	Student	14	68	6,36		
Class 9	Instructor	1	85	-	1,409	,193
	Student	10	76,3	5,89		
Class 10	Instructor	1	83	-	2,426	,029
	Student	15	73,4	3,83		
Class 11	Instructor	1	81	-	1,104	,284
	Student	19	71,79	8,13		
Class 12	Instructor	1	83	-	2,343	,039
	Student	12	72,75	4,20		
Class 13	Instructor	1	64	-	-1,387	,189
	Student	14	70,93	4,83		
Class 14	Instructor	1	82	-	2,670	,019
	Student	14	70,71	4,08		
Class 15	Instructor	1	89	-	3,710	,002
	Student	19	69,10	5,23		
Class 16	Instructor	1	74	-	1,118	,278
	Student	19	69,16	4,22		
Class 17	Instructor	1	71	-	,000	1,000
	Student	14	71	4,69		
Class 18	Instructor	1	72	-	,300	,767
	Student	20	70,10	6,17		
Class 19	Instructor	1	80	-	1,784	,092
	Student	18	70,94	4,94		
Class 20	Instructor	1	73	-	,329	,746
	Student	19	71,16	5,45		
Class 21	Instructor	1	81	-	1,712	,103
	Student	20	71,70	5,30		
Class 22	Instructor	1	81	-	,947	,356
	Student	19	70,68	10,61		
Class 23	Instructor	1	75	-	1,467	,181
	Student	9	68,78	4,02		
Class 24	Instructor	1	70	-	,203	,844
	Student	10	68,30	8,00		
Class 25	Instructor	1	75	-	,977	,344
	Student	16	67,75	7,20		
Class 26	Instructor	1	80	-	,657	,519
	Student	19	74	8,90		
Class 27	Instructor	1	81	-	1,312	,207
	Student	18	74,33	4,95		
Class 28	Instructor	1	74	-	,064	,950
	Student	19	73,47	8,00		

By administering two different versions of the same scale, NIS-O for students and NIS-S for instructors, it was attempted to show the differences between students' perceptions and instructors' stated perceptions of their nonverbal immediacy during their EFL classes. In purpose of comparing their perceptions, all related information of the scale was illustrated in Table 7. The results in Table 7 show that there are significant differences between students' perceptions of their instructors' nonverbal immediacy and instructors' stated perceptions of their nonverbal immediacy in classes 3, 4, 6, 10, 12, 14, 15, respectively, $t = 3,177; 2,876; -2,155; 2,426; 2,343; 2,670; 3,710$; $p < ,05$. In these classes, instructors' stated perceptions of their nonverbal immediacy are significantly higher than students' perceptions of their instructors' nonverbal immediacy except class 6. Accordingly, instructors state that their nonverbal immediacy mostly higher than students do. According to students, their instructors do not use their nonverbal immediacy behaviors during EFL classes as much as they believe. This finding might be consistent with the general idea of social desirability bias as participants often answer in a way to describe themselves in a good way (Richmond, McCroskey and Johnson 2003).

Table 8

Independent Samples T-Test for Differences in Nonverbal Immediacy Scale Items

Nonverbal Immediacy Scale Items	Nonverbal Immediacy	N	Mean	S.D.	t	p
1- Our instructor uses his/her hands and arms to gesture walking talking to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	4,43 4,16	,88 ,88	1,576	,116
2- Our instructor touches us on the shoulder or arm while talking to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	2,64 2,19	1,03 1,20	1,945	,052
3- *Our instructor uses monotone or dull voice while talking to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	4,43 4,12	,63 1,14	1,422	,156
4- *Our instructor looks over or away from us while talking to us	Instructor Student	28 455	4,11 4,55	,83 ,80	-2,818	,005
5- *Our instructor moves away from us when we touch her/him while we are talking.	Instructor Student	28 455	3,32 4,66	1,12 ,77	-8,629	,000
6- Our instructor has a relaxed body position when he/she talks to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	4,00 4,24	,77 ,99	-1,254	,210
7- *Our instructor frowns while talking to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	4,04 4,13	,84 1,01	-,482	,630
8- *Our instructor avoids eye contact while talking to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	4,57 4,70	,63 ,65	-1,027	,305
9- *Our instructor has a tense body position while talking to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	4,21 4,49	,83 ,90	-1,597	,111
10- Our instructor sits close or stands close to us while talking with us.	Instructor Student	28 455	3,36 3,69	,95 1,13	-1,539	,124
11- *Our instructor's voice is monotonous or dull when he/she talks to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	4,43 4,18	,69 1,13	1,150	,251
12- Our instructor uses a variety of vocal expressions when he/she talks to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	4,11 4,17	,74 ,93	-,370	,712
13- Our instructor gestures when he/she talks to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	4,39 4,21	,69 ,91	1,061	,289
14- Our instructor is animated when he/she talks to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	3,82 4,08	,94 1,09	-1,227	,220
15- *Our instructor has a bland facial expression when he/she talks to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	3,32 3,98	1,33 1,34	-2,512	,012
16- Our instructor moves closer to us when he/she talks to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	3,36 3,43	,95 1,13	-,338	,736
17- Our instructor looks directly at us while talking to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	4,00 4,27	,77 ,90	-1,531	,126
18- *Our instructor is stiff when he/she talks to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	4,07 4,15	,72 1,07	-,369	,713
19- Our instructor has a lot of vocal variety when he/she talks to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	4,14 3,67	,76 1,14	2,182	,030
20- *Our instructor avoids gesturing while he/she is talking to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	4,46 4,50	,69 ,85	-,211	,833
21- Our instructor leans toward us when he/she talks to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	2,79 2,92	1,03 1,27	-,561	,575
22- Our instructor maintains eye contact with us when he/she talks to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	4,57 4,20	,63 ,92	2,103	,036
23- *Our instructor tries not to sit or stand close to us when he/she talks with us.	Instructor Student	28 455	3,25 4,24	1,17 1,07	-4,735	,000
24- *Our instructor leans away from us when he/she talks to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	3,46 4,55	,92 ,78	-7,054	,000
25- Our instructor smiles when he/she talks to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	4,46 4,07	,74 1,03	2,013	,045
26- *Our instructor avoids touching us when he/she talks to us.	Instructor Student	28 455	3,04 3,89	1,20 1,30	-3,379	,001

* Negative items

The results in Table 8 show that there are significant differences between students' perceptions of their instructors' nonverbal immediacy and instructors' stated perceptions of their nonverbal immediacy in scale items 4, 5, 15, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, respectively, $t = -2,818, -8,629, -2,512, 2,182, 2,103, -4,735, -7,054, 2,013, -3,379$; $p < ,05$. Both positive and negative results show that instructors' stated perceptions of their nonverbal immediacy are significantly higher than students' perceptions of their instructors' nonverbal immediacy. According to the results, instructors and students mostly differ in the scale items related to proximity; touching, eye contact, facial expressions and vocalics aspects of nonverbal immediacy much more than the other aspects including scale items. Considering the scale items related to the proximity and touching, it can be inferred that these two nonverbal immediacy behaviors aspects are very controversial since they need to be utilized appropriately and only if desired by both parties.

4.5. Results Related to the Third Research Question

The third research question of this study is *“Which aspects of instructors' nonverbal immediacy are weak and need to be enhanced and which aspects of their nonverbal immediacy are strong according to students' perceptions of their instructors' nonverbal immediacy?”* Looking at the differences between students' perceptions and instructors' perceptions and seeing that instructors often assess themselves superior to students do, the investigation of strong and weak point of instructors according to students' perceptions was intended to enlighten deeply. Descriptive statistics of nonverbal immediacy scale items according to students' perceptions were listed and sorted. With regard to this, descriptive analysis was conducted to show the weakest and strongest aspects of instructors' nonverbal immediacy from the students' perceptions.

Table 9

Aspects of Instructors' Nonverbal Immediacy According to Students' Perceptions

<i>Nonverbal Immediacy Scale Items</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
1- *Our instructor avoids eye contact while talking to us.	455	4,70	,65
2- *Our instructor moves away from us when we touch her/him while we are talking.	455	4,66	,77
3- *Our instructor looks over or away from us while talking to us.	455	4,55	,80
4- *Our instructor leans away from us when he/she talks to us.	455	4,55	,78
5- *Our instructor avoids gesturing while he/she is talking to us.	455	4,50	,85
6- *Our instructor has a tense body position while talking to us.	455	4,49	,90
7- Our instructor looks directly at us while talking to us.	455	4,27	,90
8- Our instructor has a relaxed body position when he/she talks to us.	455	4,24	,99
9- *Our instructor tries not to sit or stand close to us when he/she talks with us.	455	4,24	1,07
10- Our instructor gestures when he/she talks to us.	455	4,21	,91
11- Our instructor maintains eye contact with us when he/she talks to us.	455	4,20	,92
12- *Our instructor's voice is monotonous or dull when he/she talks to us.	455	4,18	1,13
13- Our instructor uses a variety of vocal expressions when he/she talks to us.	455	4,17	,93
14- Our instructor uses his/her hands and arms to gesture walking talking to us.	455	4,16	,88
15- *Our instructor is stiff when he/she talks to us.	455	4,15	1,07
16- *Our instructor frowns while talking to us.	455	4,13	1,01
17- *Our instructor uses monotone or dull voice while talking to us.	455	4,12	1,14
18- Our instructor is animated when he/she talks to us.	455	4,08	1,09
19- Our instructor smiles when he/she talks to us.	455	4,07	1,03
20- *Our instructor has a bland facial expression when he/she talks to us.	455	3,98	1,34
21- *Our instructor avoids touching us when he/she talks to us.	455	3,89	1,30
22- Our instructor sits close or stands close to us while talking with us.	455	3,69	1,13
23- Our instructor has a lot of vocal variety when he/she talks to us.	455	3,67	1,14
24- Our instructor moves closer to us when he/she talks to us.	455	3,43	1,13
25- Our instructor leans toward us when he/she talks to us.	455	2,92	1,27
26- Our instructor touches us on the shoulder or arm while talking to us.	455	2,19	1,20

* Negative items

According to these descriptive statistics of nonverbal immediacy scale items, students perceive some points as weaker than the rest whereas some points stronger than others do. Seen above, some of the items were negative in order to check student answer credibility (Richmond, McCroskey and Johnson 2003). In line with the results, first three items with highest scores were “Our instructor avoids eye contact while talking to us.” “Our instructor moves away from us when we touch her/him while we are talking.” “Our instructor looks

over or away from us while talking to us”. These findings show that instructors are not using eye contact appropriately and cannot establish a balanced space between them and students. Therefore, they need to increase their awareness and practice these skills consciously. Last three items with lowest scores were “Our instructor moves closer to us when he/she talks to us.” “Our instructor leans toward us when he/she talks to us” “Our instructor touches us on the shoulder or arm while talking to us.” According to these results, it can be deduced that there is a correspondence between items proving students’ perceptions are consistent about their instructors’ weak nonverbal immediacy skills. Consequently, instructors are perceived as low nonverbally immediate especially in proximity and touching aspects. With regard to this, they need a decent amount of practice related to proximity and touching nonverbal immediacy skills. Except for eye contacting, touching and proximity skills of instructors, students do not perceive their instructors as nonverbally weak.

4.6. Results Related to the Fourth Research Question

The fourth research question of this study is *“Which aspects of instructors’ nonverbal immediacy are weak and need to be enhanced and which aspects of their nonverbal immediacy are strong according to instructors’ perceptions of their instructors’ nonverbal immediacy?”* After looking at the differences between students’ perceptions and instructors’ perceptions and seeing instructors often assess themselves higher than students do, it seemed reasonable to examine weak and strong points of instructors according to instructors’ perceptions. Descriptive statistics of nonverbal immediacy scale items according to instructors’ perceptions were listed and classified. With regard to this, descriptive analysis was conducted to show the strongest and weakest aspects of instructors’ nonverbal immediacy from the instructors’ angles.

Table 10

Aspects of Instructors' Nonverbal Immediacy According to Instructors' Perceptions

<i>Nonverbal Immediacy Scale Items</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
1- *I avoid eye contact while talking to students.	28	4,57	,63
2- I maintain eye contact with students when I talk to them.	28	4,57	,63
3- *I avoid gesturing while I am talking to students.	28	4,46	,69
4- I smile when I talk to students.	28	4,46	,74
5- I use my hands and arms to gesture while talking to students.	28	4,43	,88
6- *I use a monotone or dull voice while talking to students.	28	4,43	,63
7- *My voice is monotonous or dull when I talk to students.	28	4,43	,69
8- I gesture when I talk to students.	28	4,39	,69
9- *I have a tense body position while talking to students.	28	4,21	,83
10- I have a lot of vocal variety when I talk to students.	28	4,14	,76
11- *I look over or away from students while talking to them.	28	4,11	,83
12- I use a variety of vocal expressions when I talk to students.	28	4,11	,74
13- *I am stiff when I talk to students.	28	4,07	,72
14- *I frown while talking to students.	28	4,04	,84
15- I have a relaxed body position when I talk to students.	28	4,00	,77
16- I look directly at students while talking to them.	28	4,00	,77
17- I am animated when I talk to students.	28	3,82	,94
18- *I lean away from students when I talk to them.	28	3,46	,92
19- I sit close or stand close to students while talking with them.	28	3,36	,95
20- I move closer to students when I talk to them.	28	3,36	,95
21- *I move away from students when they touch me while we are talking.	28	3,32	1,12
22- *I have a bland facial expression when I talk to students.	28	3,32	1,33
23- *I try not to sit or stand close to students when I talk with them.	28	3,25	1,17
24- *I avoid touching students when I talk to them.	28	3,04	1,20
25- I lean toward students when I talk to them.	28	2,79	1,03
26- I touch students on the shoulder or arm while talking to them.	28	2,64	1,03

* Negative items

Descriptive statistics of nonverbal immediacy scale items according to instructors' perceptions were listed and sorted. Some of the items were negative. The data put in Table 10 presented the highest and lowest frequently stated items. First three items with the highest scores are "I avoid eye contact while talking to students." "I maintain eye contact with students when I talk to them." "I avoid gesturing while I am talking to students." With regard to these findings, it can be deduced that eye contact is a bit controversial for half of the instructors' statements propose that they utilize it whereas the rest state they do not. Gesturing during talking is stated to be something avoided by instructors as a nonverbal

behavior in EFL classes. In relation to this, it can be inferred that instructors either see it as a bad thing or do not know how to use it appropriately. The first three items with the lowest scores are “I avoid touching students when I talk to them.” “I lean toward students when I talk to them.” “I touch students on the shoulder or arm while talking to them.” In relation to these, it can be inferred that instructors do not prefer touching and proximity nonverbal immediacy behaviors. On the other hand, half of them favor touching while half of them do not. This shows touching aspect is controversial similar to eye contact, and instructors do not agree on this behavior. There might be various reasons for these disagreements, for example, they may not want to be labelled as intimate teachers who love touching students or it is not accepted culturally.

4.7. Results Related to the Fifth Research Question

The fifth research question of this study is *“Is there a significant difference between students’ perceptions of their instructors’ nonverbal immediacy and instructors’ perceptions of their nonverbal immediacy in terms of gender?”*

Table 11

Nonverbal Immediacy Observer-Report According to Gender of the Students’ Instructor

Gender of the students’ instructor	N	Mean	S.D.	t	p
Female	333	71,18	6,10	,098	,922
Male	122	71,11	6,87		

In order to understand whether there is a significant difference between the perceptions of students who have a female or male instructor or not, the Independent Samples T-Test was conducted. The results of this test indicates that there is no significant difference between students studying with female instructors and male instructors, $t = ,098$, $p > ,05$. It can also be interpreted that female instructors’ nonverbal immediacy observer level scores are considered low according to the norms ($96,7 \pm 16,1$; $< 81 = \text{Low}$). Also, male instructors’ nonverbal immediacy observer level scores are considered low according to the norms ($91,6 \pm 15,0$; $< 77 = \text{Low}$).

Table 12

Nonverbal Immediacy Self-Report According to Gender of the Instructor

Gender of the instructor	N	Mean	S.D.	t	p
Female	21	77,71	6,80	,483	,633
Male	7	76,28	6,70		

In order to understand whether there is a significant difference between the perceptions of the female and male instructors, the Independent Samples T-Test was conducted. The results of this test indicates that there is no significant difference between female and male instructors, $t = ,483$, $p > ,05$. However, It can also be interpreted that female instructors' nonverbal immediacy self-report level scores are considered low according to the norms ($102 \pm 10,9$; $< 92 = \text{Low}$). Additionally, male instructors' nonverbal immediacy observer level scores are considered low according to the norms ($93,8 \pm 10,8$; $< 83 = \text{Low}$). According to the data put in Table 11 and Table 12, it can be concluded that neither females nor males act nonverbally immediate as much as norms suggest. Regarding this similarity, it can be stated that both genders do need some improvement put aside gender difference.



CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1. Summary of the Research Study

In this study, main aim was to emphasise the importance of nonverbal immediacy behaviours in English language teaching, to point out that self-assessment is not enough that is why it is important to show significant differences between both parties and suggest that the issue of nonverbal immediacy should be included in the syllables of the methodology courses at ELT teacher training programs of universities. Not only in pre-service programs but also in in-service programs the issue of nonverbal immediacy should take part. During semesters colleagues should observe each other's classes and assess each other's nonverbal immediacy via nonverbal immediacy assessment forms and should give each other feedback about each other's nonverbal immediacy performances besides colleagues should use a video camera to assess their own nonverbal immediacy performances in order to increase their own awareness about their own nonverbal immediacy performances. For this reason, it is crucial to describe the existing nonverbal immediacy behaviours that is performed by instructors and observed by students during EFL classes. Related to these aims, it was attempted to find out whether there are any misunderstandings or discrepancies between students and instructors' perceptions. Additionally, scrutinizing the strongest and weakest aspects of instructors' nonverbal immediacy behaviours from both instructors and students' perspective was involved as aims. It was also attempted to measure the effectiveness of instructors' nonverbal immediacy on student motivation. In order to suggest a well-structured nonverbal immediacy program for instructors in in-service and place this program into many levels of English language teachers training, identifying these available conditions is necessary and valuable.

To achieve these aims, quantitative data were collected from the English prep school students and English prep school instructors at two different universities in Ankara. As data collection tools, two different forms of the same Likert-type scale; one self-report for instructors and a Turkish version of observation report for students were used. Quantitative data were analysed via SPSS 20 program and descriptive analyses were employed for the details. All results obtained from these analyses were reported and discussed concerning research questions to produce a better understanding of the study findings with regards to research questions.

Accordingly, this study shows that instructors' nonverbal immediacy has effects mostly positive effects on motivation of the students at prep schools of universities. Additionally, there are significant differences between students' perceptions and instructors' stated perceptions of their nonverbal immediacy during EFL classes. However, significant differences in terms of instructor gender were not found neither according to the data gathered from the students, nor the data gathered from the instructors. Another thing to observe is the strong and weak aspects of instructors' nonverbal immediacy behaviours from both perspectives. It is found that there are corresponding results giving meaningful messages.

Regarding perceptions of both parties, perceptions of both parties in terms of instructor gender, effects of instructors' nonverbal immediacy on students' motivation, strong and weak aspects of instructors' nonverbal immediacy behaviours, it is strongly suggested to plan nonverbal immediacy behaviours seminars, classes, workshops, booklets, checklists not only at ELT departments but also at in-service training programs, job interviews, training centres of English language instructors. Additionally, integrating nonverbal immediacy behaviours to methodological classes of trainee teachers of ELT can be recommended as a priceless guidance.

5.2. Conclusion

Primary conclusions drawn from this study are presented in reference with the results related to the research questions. Respectively, the first question of the study is about the effect of instructors' nonverbal immediacy on students' motivation at prep schools of universities. In order to answer this question, a post section including a single question is

added to NIS-O for students to fulfil. It is aimed to find out whether the effect of instructors' nonverbal immediacy behaviours is positive, negative or neutral.

According to the post section analysis of the NIS-O, it is realised that students often think their instructors' nonverbal immediacy positively affect their motivation to EFL class. Following that, prep school students consider instructors' nonverbal immediacy as something that can direct motivation. While most students say its effect is positive, a small number of students claim it does not impact or it impacts negatively. Considering these results, it is obvious that not every student is on the same path about this effect. However, it is required to take this huge number of students into account and concluded that instructors should apply a decent amount of Nonverbal Immediacy Behaviours (NVB) in their EFL classes for motivating and encouraging students. Instructors using of eye contacting, proxemics, facial expressions, gestures, touching, prevocalic and other nonverbal immediacy behaviours are also suggested to create motivated and encouraged students during EFL classes.

In terms of second question, it is attempted to examine the differences between students' perceptions and instructors' stated perceptions of their nonverbal immediacy in classrooms. Subsequently, it can be deduced that instructors measure themselves pretty much higher than students do especially in some occasions and in some classrooms. Some instructors and some classrooms differ much more than others. Thus, it demonstrated that individual differences also take roles in assessment. Independent samples T-Test for differences in nonverbal immediacy showed the classes 3, 4, 6, 10, 12, 14, 15, respectively the classes where the differences are relatively higher except for class 6, $t = 3,177; 2,876; -2,155; 2,426; 2,343; 2,670; 3,710; p < ,05$. These results indicate that there is a discrepancy between students and instructors' perceptions in terms of nonverbal immediacy behaviors. Reasonably, it is obvious that self-reports can be sometimes overstating, and it is not sure to say all students observe objectively. In other words, participants may not be objective and meticulous about assessing process. The data showed that instructors' awareness of their Nonverbal Immediacy (NI) skills is a necessity. Instructors should use these skills more often and consciously for the benefits of two parties. Instructors are also advised to video tape themselves from time to time to check their NI awareness and level, and to be observed by their peers and superiors to gain perspectives about their NI skills.

With regard to third and fourth research questions, it is aimed to define the strong and weak aspects of instructors' nonverbal immediacy from both students and instructors' perspectives. According to descriptive statistics, it can be inferred that the most frequently stated aspects of instructors from students' perspectives are the items referring to eye contact and proximity aspects of nonverbal immediacy behaviors whereas the least frequently stated items are related to touching and proximity aspects. Students think their instructors avoid eye contact while talking to them, move away from them when they touch them, look away from them when they talk to them. Remarkably, the rate of the instructors who state that they avoid eye contact while talking to students and maintain eye contact with students when they talk to them is equal. As a result, it can be deduced that although there is a significant congruence between students and instructors for this item, half of the instructors do not agree. Second and third most frequently stated items from students' perspectives are related to proximity aspect while instructors' second and third most frequently stated items are related to eye contact and gesturing aspects. This ascertains that instructors and students are in conflict in some occasions. The possible reasons for this could be instructors' unawareness of their NI during their EFL classes, and also the rarity of NI practices in EFL classes. Instructors favorably score the items that they avoid eye contact and gesturing but as it is said before half of them state that they maintain eye contact while talking to students. The lowest scores from students' observation list are the aspects referring to proximity and touching aspects similar to the instructors' self-report list as they state the items about proximity and touching aspects of NVB. This shows that instructors are very careful with touching and proxemics NVB aspects for the cultural and ethical circumstances in Turkey do limit them. Touching students on the arm, on the shoulder or at the back and leaning towards them could be troublesome and not be welcomed especially by some students like adults and adolescents. With regard to these findings, touching and proximity can be considered as delicate nonverbal behavior aspects because both parties act considerately about them.

As to fifth research question, it is attempted to find out whether there are any significant differences between the perceptions of the students who have a female or male instructor. With respect to this question, Independent Samples T-Test shows that no significant differences exist between students studying with female instructors and male instructors. In addition to this, the Independent Samples T-Test indicates that female and male instructors do not differ significantly when they complete their NIS-S. The findings shows that gender

is not a very important variable in nonverbal immediacy behaviors so its effect is controversial as few studies oppose. However, observing both tests it can be interpreted that both female and male instructors are considered nonverbally low according to the norms. Therefore, instructors should not be ignorant of these results and take some initiations to polish their nonverbal communications skills and be more immediate nonverbally. What is more, they are suggested to think thoroughly about their NI skills, learn from experience, excellence their NI skills during EFL classes.

In sum, this study detects and describes the available instructor nonverbal immediacy behaviors from both students' perspectives and instructors' perspectives, uncovers the differences of perceptions between these two parties and tries to find out instructors' nonverbal immediacy behaviors' effect on students' motivation. It can be stated that nonverbal immediacy behaviors are very important in EFL and in sustaining students' motivation to EFL. Nevertheless, significant differences between perceptions of two parties in nonverbal immediacy behaviors were found. Following that, obviously instructors report themselves a bit higher than students do. Another point to mention is the gender variable factor, this study tries to find out whether females and males differ significantly in their nonverbal immediacy behaviors, but no significant differences were discovered. It can be inferred that although some studies claim instructor gender differs somewhat in NIS, in this study, no significant differences were observed. Finally, it can be concluded that nonverbal immediacy behaviors facilitate students' EFL learning and enable instructors and students communicate more efficiently and clearly as it promotes motivation in EFL classes. On the other hand, there are some flaws and shortcomings related to nonverbal immediacy behaviors of instructors. All things considered, it demands more awareness, support and practice in terms of these shortcomings and flaws.

5.3. Implications and Suggestions

Immediacy is extremely effective on communication and also on learning and teaching processes both verbally and nonverbally. Since communication is one of the essentials of effective teaching and learning processes, it is clear that nonverbal immediacy is multidimensional and noticeable in language teaching processes. Seeing its function in every kind of language teaching likewise ELT, it is wise to define it in detail, improve it as much as possible and share information about it. These endeavors give not only the general

picture of topic but also need to be focused on the field. Therefore, researchers, ELT instructors, institutions are advised to learn, study, improve, teach and share quite a lot of things related to the topic.

In relation to the results of the study, the effect of instructors' nonverbal immediacy on students' motivation, the significant differences between students and instructors' perceptions of instructor nonverbal immediacy, the effect of gender factor, strong and weak aspects of instructors' nonverbal immediacy were classified. Thanks to this classification, the general picture of the available conditions is reviewed and the current problems are understood better.

Regarding these useful findings, there are a lot of spotted implications and suggestions related to the topic. To start with, being an essential issue in ELT, nonverbal immediacy should be given more importance in language teaching departments of universities. It is a good idea to appreciate its eminence and place it as a subcategory in the methodological classes of ELT departments. Following that, it should be assessed systematically during the presentations of the students at ELT departments. There can be composed a checklist similar to NIS-S and NIS-O or they can be used as checklists to fill while teacher trainees are presenting their micro teaching classes. Similarly, role-playing activities can be helpful for students to polish up their nonverbal immediacy skills. If the department can provide a video camera to the methodology lecturers, teacher trainees' micro teaching demos should be videotaped and the video record should be given to them to self-assess their own nonverbal immediacy performances during their micro teaching demos.

One of the components of immediacy, body language associates with meaning, supports meaning, and therefore it is very effective on learning a foreign language especially when teaching new vocabulary, for this reason foreign language teachers should use their body language effectively. Additionally, this issue should take part in the syllabuses of methodology courses and should be given importance. This is extremely important when teaching a foreign language to young learners because young learners' visual perceptions and kinaesthetic perceptions are rather active at that age. Using body language when teaching vocabulary to adults and young learners especially at early levels is very useful because mimics and gestures associates meaning and appeals to adults' visual and kinaesthetic perceptions and facilitates learning. It is also suggested that instructors should be aware that nonverbal communication behaviours are always stronger than verbal ones.

Subsequently, when instructors' nonverbal communication and verbal communication do not correspond, students can ignore the verbal messages of instructors. Finally, instructors are also advised to pay attention to the both verbal and nonverbal communication and immediacy and to increase their awareness and availability to these issues during EFL classes. All in all, nonverbal immediacy should be an important part of methodology courses and in-service training programs.

With regard to the researcher's observations, review of literature, and data analysis, tips to be nonverbally immediate for instructors as follows:

5.3.1. Tips to Create Nonverbally Immediate Instructors

Display a straight body and facial orientation

Keep a positive, open and relaxed attitude

Keep your gaze at eye level, try not to look down or up

Lean forward toward students, but not too much

Move around the classroom, try not to be in a disturbing way

Keep a good balance of eye contact with all students

Use proper facial expressions that are tailored to the needs and circumstances of the classroom

Circulates around the student work areas and monitor their work

Utilize silence occasionally

Vary voice stress, volume, pitch, rate, tone

Use gestures when making points, but make them flat, easy-going, and not inconsistent

Touch students only on the arm, or the shoulder appropriately unless students detest it

Establish a comfortable amount of personal space between you and the students However, sometimes keep a close distance to comfort them

Use your hands more confidently in a controlled way

Use your hands to support your sayings or elaborate your sayings but do not exaggerate as they might become distracting.

Wear a suit for the first two or three weeks to establish your credibility

Wear casual clothes from time to time to create a warm atmosphere and be approachable

Make sure your hair, nails, teeth, jewellery clean and conservative

Wear fresh and soft perfumes sparingly or no odours as students may have allergies



REFERENCES

- Ackerman, D. (1990). The power of touch. *Parade Magazine*, 4-6.
- Allen, L. Q. (1999). Functions of nonverbal communication in teaching and learning a foreign language. *French Review*, 72(3), 469-480.
- Allen, M., Witt, P. L., & Wheelless, L. R. (2006). The role of teacher immediacy as a motivational factor in student learning: Using meta-analysis to test a causal model. *Communication Education*, 55(1), 21-31.
- Andersen, J. F. (1979). The relationship between teacher immediacy and teaching effectiveness. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation*, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV.
- Andersen, J. F. (1986). Instructor nonverbal communication: Listening to our silent messages. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, (26), 41-49.
- Argyle, M., & Dean, J. (1965). Eye-contact, distance and affiliation. *Sociometry*, 28(3), 289-304.
- Baringer, D. K., & McCroskey, J. C. (2000). Immediacy in the classroom: Student immediacy. *Communication Education*, 49(2), 178-186.
- Beebe, S. A. (1980). The Role of Nonverbal Communication in Education: Research and Theoretical perspectives. *The Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association*, New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED196063)
- Brannen, J. (2005). Mixing methods: The entry of qualitative and quantitative approaches into the research process. *International journal of social research methodology*, 8(3), 173-184.
- Canfield, A. (2002). *Body, Identity and Interaction: Interpreting Nonverbal Communication*.

- Çelik, S. (2005). Get your face out of mine: culture-oriented distance in EFL context. A helpful guide for Turkish EFL teachers. *TOMER Language Journal*, 28, 37-50.
- Chen, A. (2009). Perception of paralinguistic intonational meaning in a second language. *Language Learning*, 59(2), 367-409.
- Chesebro, J. L. (2003). Effects of teacher clarity and nonverbal immediacy on student learning, receiver apprehension, and affect. *Communication Education*, 52(2), 135-147.
- Chesebro, J. L., & McCroskey, J. C. (2001). The relationship of teacher clarity and immediacy with student state receiver apprehension, affect, and cognitive learning. *Communication Education*, 50(1), 59-68.
- Christensen, L. J., & Menzel, K. E. (1998). The linear relationship between student reports of teacher immediacy behaviors and perceptions of state motivation, and of cognitive, affective, and behavioral learning. *Communication Education*, 47(1), 82-90.
- Christophel, D. M. (1990). The relationships among teacher immediacy behaviors, student motivation, and learning. *Communication education*, 39(4), 323-340.
- Collins, M. L. (1978). Effects of enthusiasm training on preservice elementary teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 29(1), 53-57.
- Comadena, M. E., Hunt, S. K., & Simonds, C. J. (2007). The effects of teacher clarity, nonverbal immediacy, and caring on student motivation, affective and cognitive learning. *Communication Research Reports*, 24(3), 241-248.
- Darn, S. (2005). Aspects of nonverbal communication. *The internet TESL journal*, 11(2), 1-4. Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Darn-Nonverbal/>
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). Research methods in applied linguistics.
- Duncan, S. (1972). Some signals and rules for taking speaking turns in conversations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 23(2), 283.
- Duke, C. R. (1974). Nonverbal behavior and the communication process. *College composition and communication*, 25(5), 397-404.

- Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological methods*, 4(3), 272-299.
- Fetsco, T., & McClure, J. (2005). *Educational psychology: An integrated approach to classroom decisions*. Virginia: Allyn & Bacon.
- Frymier, A. B., & Thompson, C. A. (1992). Perceived teacher affinity-seeking in relation to perceived teacher credibility. *Communication Education*, 41(4), 388-399.
- Frymier, A. B. (1993). The impact of teacher immediacy on students' motivation: Is it the same for all students? *Communication Quarterly*, 41(4), 454-464.
- Frymier, A. B., & Weser, B. (2001). The role of student predispositions on student expectations for instructor communication behavior. *Communication Education*, 50(4), 314-326.
- Gendrin, D. M., & Rucker, M. L. (2007). Student motive for communicating and instructor immediacy: A matched-race institutional comparison. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 15(1), 41-60.
- Gorham, J. (1988). The relationship between verbal teacher immediacy behaviors and student learning. *Communication education*, 37(1), 40-53.
- Gorham, J., & Christophel, D. M. (1990). The relationship of teachers' use of humor in the classroom to immediacy and student learning. *Communication education*, 39(1), 46-62.
- Gorham, J., & Christophel, D. M. (1992). Students' perceptions of teacher behaviors as motivating and demotivating factors in college classes. *Communication Quarterly*, 40(3), 239-252.
- Gorham, J., & Zakahi, W. R. (1990). A comparison of teacher and student perceptions of immediacy and learning: Monitoring process and product. *Communication Education*, 39(4), 354-368.
- Goodboy, A. K., & McCroskey, J. C. (2008). Toward a theoretical model of the role of organizational orientations and Machiavellianism on nonverbal immediacy behavior and job satisfaction. *Human Communication*, 11(3), 293-307.

- Graham, J. A., & Heywood, S. (1975). The effects of elimination of hand gestures and of verbal codability on speech performance. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 5(2), 189-195.
- Gregersen, T. S. (2007). Language learning beyond words: Incorporating body language into classroom activities. *Reflections on English language teaching*, 6(1), 51-64.
- Guerrero, L. K., & Floyd, K. (2006). *Nonverbal communication in close relationships*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Hair, J. E., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*. New York: Prentice Hall International.
- Hall, J. A., & Knapp, M. L. (Eds.). (2013). *Nonverbal communication* (Vol. 2). Boston: Walter de Gruyter
- Harmer, J. (1991). *The practice of English language teaching*. London/New York: Pearson Longman Harlow.
- Hertenstein, M. J., Keltner, D., App, B., Bulleit, B. A., & Jaskolka, A. R. (2006). Touch communicates distinct emotions. *Emotion*, 6(3), 528.
- Hinkle, L. L. (2011). Perceptions of Supervisor Nonverbal Immediacy, Vocalics, and Subordinate Liking Communication Research Reports, 18(2), 128-136
- Huang, L. (2011). Nonverbal communication in college english classroom teaching. *Journal of language Teaching and Research*, 2(4), 903-908.
- Keller, M. M., Hoy, A. W., Goetz, T., & Frenzel, A. C. (2015). Teacher Enthusiasm: Reviewing and Redefining a Complex Construct. *Educational Psychology Review*, 1-27. doi:10.1007/s10648-015-9354-y
- Khan, A. A. (2001). Non-verbal communication: Fact and fiction. Retrieved from <http://www.strangehorizons.com/2001/20010226/nonverbal.shtml#top>.
- Kleinfeld, J. S. (1973). Effects of nonverbally communicated personal warmth on the intelligence test performance of Indian and Eskimo adolescents. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 91(1), 149-150.
- Knapp, M. L. (1971). The role of nonverbal communication in the classroom. *Theory into practice*, 10(4), 243-249.

- Knapp, M. L., Hall, J. A., & Horgan, T. G. (2013). *Nonverbal communication in human interaction*. Cengage Learning.
- Krashen, S. D. (1987). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press Inc
- Lumsden, L. S. (1994). Student Motivation To Learn. ERIC Digest, Number 92.
- McCroskey, J. C., Fayer, J. M., Richmond, V. P., Sallinen, A., & Barraclough, R. A. (1996). A multi-cultural examination of the relationship between nonverbal immediacy and affective learning. *Communication Quarterly*, 44(3), 297-307.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1992). Increasing teacher influence through immediacy. *Power in the classroom: Communication, control, and concern*, 45, 200-211.
- McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., & Bennett, V. E. (2006). The relationships of student end-of-class motivation with teacher communication behaviors and instructional outcomes. *Communication Education*, 55(4), 403-414.
- McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., Sallinen, A., Fayer, J. M., & Barraclough, R. A. (1995). A cross-cultural and multi-behavioral analysis of the relationship between nonverbal immediacy and teacher evaluation. *Communication Education*, 44(4), 281-291.
- McCroskey, J. C., Sallinen, A., Fayer, J. M., Richmond, V. P., & Barraclough, R. A. (1996). Nonverbal immediacy and cognitive learning: A cross-cultural investigation. *Communication Education*, 45(3), 200-211
- McDonald, J. D. (2008). Measuring personality constructs: The advantages and disadvantages of self-reports, informant reports and behavioural assessments. *Enquire*, 1(1), 1-19.
- Mehrabian, A. (1968). Relationship of attitude to seated posture, orientation, and distance. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 10(1), 26.
- Mehrabian, A. (1968). Some referents and measures of nonverbal behavior. *Behavior Research Methods*, 1(6), 203-207.
- Mehrabian, A. (1969). Significance of posture and position in the communication of attitude and status relationships. *Psychological Bulletin*, 71(5), 359.

- Mehrabian, A. (1971). *Silent messages* (Vol. 8). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Mehrabian, A. (1972). *Nonverbal communication*. London: Transaction.
- Mehrabian, A. (1981). *Silent messages: Implicit communication of emotions and attitudes*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Menzel, K. E., & Carrell, L. J. (1999). The impact of gender and immediacy on willingness to talk and perceived learning. *Communication Education, 48*(1), 31-40.
- Miller, P. W. (1981). *Nonverbal Communication. What Research Says to the Teacher*. National Education Association, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED293190)
- Miller, P. W. (1988). *Nonverbal Communication. What Research Says to the Teacher*. NEA Professional Library, PO Box 509, West Haven, CT 06516.
- Mobaraki, M. (2014). *English Language Teachers' methods Of Using Nonverbal Communication* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents>
- Mottet, T. P., & Beebe, S. A. (2006). The relationships between student responsive behaviors, student socio-communicative style, and instructors' subjective and objective assessments of student work. *Communication Education, 55*(3), 295-312.
- Myers, S. A., & Ferry, M. F. (2001). Interpersonal communication motives and nonverbal immediacy behaviors. *Communication Research Reports, 18*(2), 182-191.
- Negi, J. S. (2009). The role of teachers' non-verbal communication in ELT classroom. *Journal of NELTA, 14*(1), 101-110.
- Newton, D. A., & Burgoon, J. K. (1990). Nonverbal conflict behaviors: Functions, strategies, and tactics. *Intimates in conflict: A communication perspective, 77-104*. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com.tr>
- Özmen, K. S. (2010). Fostering Nonverbal Immediacy and Teacher Identity through an Acting Course in English Teacher Education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(6), 1-23.
- Parkinson, B., & Colman, AM (Eds.). (1995). *Duygu ve motivasyon*. California: Longman.

- Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1986). Power in the classroom VI: Verbal control strategies, nonverbal immediacy and affective learning. *Communication Education*, 35(1), 43-55.
- Poyatos, F. (2002). *Nonverbal Communication Across Disciplines: Paralanguage, kinesics, silence, personal and environmental interaction* (Vol. 2). John Benjamins.
- Preacher, K. J., & MacCallum, R. C. (2003). Repairing Tom Swift's electric factor analysis machine. *Understanding statistics: Statistical issues in psychology, education, and the social sciences*, 2(1), 13-43.
- Rester, C. H., & Edwards, R. (2007). Effects of sex and setting on students' interpretation of teachers' excessive use of immediacy. *Communication Education*, 56(1), 34-53.
- Richmond, V. P. (1990). Communication in the classroom: Power and motivation. *Communication Education*, 39(3), 181-195.
- Richmond, V. P. (2002). Teacher nonverbal immediacy: In J. L. Chesebro (Ed.) & J. C. McCroskey, *Communication for teachers*, (pp. 65-82). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Richmond, V. P., Gorham, J. S., & McCroskey, J. C. (1987). The relationship between selected immediacy behaviors and cognitive learning. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 10(1), 574-590.
- Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., & Johnson, A. D. (2003). Development of the nonverbal immediacy scale (NIS): Measures of self-and other-perceived nonverbal immediacy. *Communication Quarterly*, 51(4), 504-517.
- Rodríguez, J. I., Plax, T. G., & Kearney, P. (1996). Clarifying the relationship between teacher nonverbal immediacy and student cognitive learning: Affective learning as the central causal mediator. *Communication education*, 45(4), 293-305.
- Simonds, B. K., Meyer, K. R., Quinlan, M. M., & Hunt, S. K. (2006). Effects of instructor speech rate on student affective learning, recall, and perceptions of nonverbal immediacy, credibility, and clarity. *Communication Research Reports*, 23(3), 187-197.
- Smith, H. A. (1979). Nonverbal communication in teaching. *Review of Educational Research*, 49(4), 631-672.

- Stafford, D. J. (1976). *An exploratory study of nonverbal communication training in a student-teaching program*. (Doctoral Dissertation) Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas.
- Stamatis, P. J. (2011). Nonverbal communication in classroom interactions: A pedagogical perspective of touch. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 9(3), 1427-1442. Retrieved from http://www.investigacion-psicopedagogica.com/revista/articulos/25/english/Art_25_617.pdf
- Stevick, E.W. (1982). *Teaching and learning languages*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Sueyoshi, A., & Hardison, D. M. (2005). The role of gestures and facial cues in second language listening comprehension. *Language Learning*, 55(4), 661-699.
- Thomas-Maddox, C. (2003). Creating perceptions of closeness in the classroom: Exploring the concept of nonverbal immediacy. *Communication Teacher*, 17(2), 3-15.
- Von Zoller, K. (2007). *Nonverbal patterns of teachers from five countries: Results from the TIMSS-R video study*. California State University, Fresno and University of California, Davis.
- Wennerstrom, A. (2000). The role of intonation in second language fluency. *Perspectives on fluency*, 102-127.
- Witt, P. L., & Wheelless, L. R. (2001). An experimental study of teachers' verbal and nonverbal immediacy and students' affective and cognitive learning. *Communication Education*, 50(4), 327-342.
- Witt, P. L., Wheelless, L. R., & Allen, M. (2004). A meta-analytical review of the relationship between teacher immediacy and student learning. *Communication Monographs*, 71(2), 184-207.
- Wlodkowski, R. J. (1978). *Motivation and teaching: A practical guide*. Washington: National Education Association (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 159 173)



APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Nonverbal Immediacy Scale-Self Report (NIS-S)

Nonverbal Immediacy Scale-Self Report (NIS-S)

DIRECTIONS: The following statements describe the ways some people behave while talking with or to others. Please indicate in the space at the left of each item the degree to which you believe the statement applies **TO YOU**. Please use the following 5-point scale: **1 = Never; 2 = Rarely; 3 = Occasionally; 4 = Often; 5 = Very Often**

- _____ 1. I use my hands and arms to gesture while talking to students.
- _____ 2. I touch students on the shoulder or arm while talking to them.
- _____ 3. I use a monotone or dull voice while talking to students.
- _____ 4. I look over or away from students while talking to them.
- _____ 5. I move away from students when they touch me while we are talking.
- _____ 6. I have a relaxed body position when I talk to students.
- _____ 7. I frown while talking to students.
- _____ 8. I avoid eye contact while talking to students.
- _____ 9. I have a tense body position while talking to students.
- _____ 10. I sit close or stand close to students while talking with them.
- _____ 11. My voice is monotonous or dull when I talk to students.
- _____ 12. I use a variety of vocal expressions when I talk to students.
- _____ 13. I gesture when I talk to students.
- _____ 14. I am animated when I talk to students.
- _____ 15. I have a bland facial expression when I talk to students.
- _____ 16. I move closer to when I talk to them.
- _____ 17. I look directly at students while talking to them.
- _____ 18. I am stiff when I talk to students.
- _____ 19. I have a lot of vocal variety when I talk to students.
- _____ 20. I avoid gesturing while I am talking to students.
- _____ 21. I lean toward students when I talk to them.
- _____ 22. I maintain eye contact with students when I talk to them.
- _____ 23. I try not to sit or stand close to students when I talk with them.
- _____ 24. I lean away from students when I talk to them.
- _____ 25. I smile when I talk to students.
- _____ 26. I avoid touching students when I talk to them.

Appendix 2. Nonverbal Immediacy Scale-Observer Report (NIS-O)

Nonverbal Immediacy Scale-Observation Report (NIS-O)

DIRECTIONS: The following statements describe the ways some people behave while talking with or to others. Please indicate in the space at the left of each item the degree to which you believe the statement applies to you.

Please use the following 5-point scale

1 = Never; 2 = Rarely; 3 = Occasionally; 4 = Often; 5 = Very Often

- ...1. Our teacher uses his/her hands and arms to gesture while talking to us.
- ...3. Our teacher uses a monotone or dull voice while talking to us.
- ...4. Our teacher looks over or away from us while talking to us.
- ...5. Our teacher moves away from us when we touch him/her while talking to him/her.
- ...6. Our teacher has a relaxed body position when she/he talks to us.
- ...7. Our teacher frowns while talking to us.
- ...8. Our teacher avoids eye contact while talking to us.
- ...9. Our teacher has a tense body position while talking to us.
- ...10. Our teacher sits close or stands close to us while talking with us.
- ...11. Our teacher's voice is monotonous or dull when she/he talks to us.
- ...12. Our teacher uses a variety of vocal expressions when she/he talks to us.
- ...13. Our teacher gestures when she/he talks to us.
- ...14. Our teacher is animated when she/he talks to us.
- ...15. Our teacher has a bland facial expression when she/he talks us.
- ...16. Our teacher moves closer to us when she/he talks to us.
- ...17. Our teacher looks directly at us while talking to us.
- ...18. Our teacher is stiff when she/he talks to us.
- ...19. Our teacher has a lot of vocal variety when she/he talks to us.
- ...20. Our teacher avoids gesturing while she/he is talking to us.
- ...21. Our teacher leans toward us when she/he talks to us.
- ...22. Our teacher maintains eye contact with us when she/he talks to us.
- ...23. Our teacher tries not to sit or stand close to us when she/he talks with us.
- ...24. Our teacher leans away from us when she/he talks to us.
- ...25. Our teacher smiles when she/he talks to us.
- ...26. Our teacher avoids touching us when she/he talks to us.

Please answer the following question according to the observations you made for the above scale.

- How does your instructor's nonverbal immediacy skills impact your motivation in your EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classes?

Positively impacts

Negatively impacts

No impacts

Appendix 3. Sözsüz İletişim Düzeyi Ölçeği'nin Türkçe Versiyonu

Sözsüz İletişim Düzeyi Ölçeği-Gözlemci Bildirim

YÖNERGE: Aşağıdaki ifadeler insanların başkalarıyla konuşurken kullandıkları tarzları tanımlar. Lütfen size hitap ettiğine inandığınız ifadenin derecesini her bir maddenin solunda işaretleyerek gösteriniz.

Lütfen aşağıdaki 5'li ölçeği kullanın.

1= Hiçbir Zaman; 2= Nadiren; 3= Ara sıra; 4= Sık Sık; 5= Çok Sık

- ...1. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken el, kol ve baş hareketleri kullanır.
- ...2. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken omzumuza ya da kolumuza dokunur.
- ...3. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken sıkıcı ve monoton bir ses tonu kullanır.
- ...4. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken bizden uzak başka yerlere bakar.
- ...5. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken ona dokunduğumuzda bizden uzaklaşır.
- ...6. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken rahat bir vücut pozisyonuna sahiptir.
- ...7. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken kaşlarını çatar.
- ...8. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken göz teması kurmaktan kaçınır.
- ...9. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken gergin bir vücut pozisyonuna sahiptir.
- ...10. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken yakınımıza oturur ya da yakınımızda durur.
- ...11. Bizimle konuşurken öğretmenimizin sesi sıkıcı veya monotondur.
- ...12. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken (vurgu ve tonlama gibi) ses ifade çeşitliliği kullanır.
- ...13. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken mimik ve jestler kullanır.
- ...14. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken canlı ve neşelidir.
- ...15. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken sıkıcı /yavan bir yüz ifadesine sahiptir.
- ...16. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken bize yaklaşır.
- ...17. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken doğrudan bize bakar.
- ...18. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken serttir.
- ...19. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken birçok ses çeşitliliğine sahiptir.
- ...20. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken jest ve mimik kullanmaktan kaçınır.
- ...21. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken bize doğru eğilir.
- ...22. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken göz temasını sürdürür.
- ...23. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken yakınımıza oturmamaya ya da yakınımızda durmamaya çalışır.
- ...24. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken geriye doğru eğilir.
- ...25. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken gülümser.
- ...26. Öğretmenimiz bizimle konuşurken bize dokunmaktan kaçınır.

Yukarıdaki gözlem formundaki ifadelere yaptığınız değerlendirmeleri göz önünde bulundurarak aşağıda motivasyonla ilgili ifadede size uygun olanı işaretleyiniz.

- Öğretmeninizin vücut dili ve sözsüz iletişim becerileri İngilizce dersi motivasyonunuzu nasıl etkilemektedir?

Olumlu etkiler

Olumsuz etkiler

Etkilemez

Appendix 4. Permission to Use NIS-O Questionnaire

2 Ekim 2017 7:46 Pazartesi tarihinde Lynda McCroskey <Lynda.McCroskey@csulb.edu> şöyle yazdı:

Dear Merve Erdogan:

We are happy to grant you permission to uuse the NIS measure! We wish you success in your research!

best--

Dr. Lynda L. McCroskey

Associate Professor of Communication Studies

California State University, Long Beach, USA

[805.550.9654](tel:805.550.9654) (text messaging okay)

[562.985.4111](tel:562.985.4111) (Campus operator)

A/S 347 - office

From: MERVE ERDOGAN [erdogan_merve@yahoo.com]

Sent: Saturday, September 30, 2017 5:36 AM

To: Lynda McCroskey

Subject: ASKING FOR NIS

Hello,

I am studying at MA program of ELT department in Gazi University in Ankara, Turkey. I am really sorry to hear that Mr McCroskey passed away. I want to use Richmond, McCroskey & Johnson, 2003 NIS. I know that the scale is open to public, but if it is possible I would like to have a permission paper from you.

Regards





GAZİ GELECEKTİR..