AN INVESTIGATION ON TEACHER NONVERBAL IMMEDIACY IN TEACHING TURKISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
TÜRKÇENİN YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRETİMİNDE ÖĞRETMENİN SÖZSÜZ YAKINLIĞI ÜZERİNE BİR ARAŞTIRMA

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Gülden TÜM
Çukurova University

Abstract

Teacher nonverbal immediacy and student learning in foreign languages have always been the focus of several researches, whose results indicate that teacher immediacy is an effective strategy to enhance learning. These studies are generally based on functions, effects, cognitive and effective learning, and confidence testing; however, no research has been encountered on teacher nonverbal immediacy in Turkish as a Foreign Language (TFL) classrooms and also in different institutions where students learn TFL. Therefore, this study aims to investigate teachers' nonverbal immediacy behaviours that affect student motivation in TFL classes in three different universities: Çukurova University, Fatih University-TÖMER, Turkey, and London University, England. The study was conducted with 55 participants who learned Turkish as a foreign language, and the ten-item Nonverbal Immediacy Behaviour Scale by Thomas, Richmond and McCroskey (1994) was utilized. The findings reveal that student motivation increases when the teacher uses certain nonverbal behaviours such as smiling and eye contact.

Key Words: Turkish as a foreign language, teacher nonverbal immediacy, student motivation, language learning.

Öz

Yabancı dil öğreniminin gerçekleşmesinde, öğretmenin öğrenciye söz içermeyen yakınlığı stratejisinin etkili olduğunu gösteren birçok araştırma yapılmıştır. Bu çalışmalar genellikle işlevler, etkiler, bilişim ve etkili öğrenme ile güvenirlik testleri üzerinedir. Ancak yabancı dil Türkçe öğretiminin gerçekleştiği sınıflarda ya da Türkçeyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin bulunduğu farklı kurumlarda bu alanda yapılmış çalışmalarla karşılaşılmamıştır. Bu yüzden bu çalışma üç farklı üniversitede (Çukurova Üniversitesi, Fatih Üniversitesi, TÖMER, Londra Üniversitesi) yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenen öğrencilerin öğretmenlerin sözel olmayan yakınlık davranışlarından nasıl etkilendiklerini araştırmak için yapılmıştır. Çalışma Türkçe öğrenen 55 denekle yapılmış olup Thomas, Richmond ve McCroskey (1994)'in on maddelik Sözel Olmayan Yakınlık Tutum Ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Sonuçlar öğrenci isteklendirmesinin gülümseme ve göz teması gibi belirli sözsüz davranışlarla artış gösterdiğini ortaya çıkarmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe, öğretmenin söz içermeyen yakınlığı, öğrenci isteklendirilmesi, dil öğrenme

Introduction

Communication is 'the exchange and negotiation of information between at least two individuals through the use of verbal and nonverbal symbols' (Canale, 1983: 4). In communication, it is possible to convey information verbally or nonverbally in different behaviors or actions. In this study, the focus is on nonverbal behaviors including actions since 'actions as distinct from speech' is considered nonverbal behaviour and illustrated as facial expressions, hand and arm gestures, postures, positions and various movements of the body or legs or feet and vocal phenomena (Mehrabian, 2009: 1). In several studies carried out in this field, behaviors are defined within different meanings, for instance, Powell (2010) defines behaviours such as smiling, eye contact, a relaxed body posture, and movement which are examples of nonverbal immediacy to facilitate communication and faster comprehension between two or more partners. Mehrabian (1971: cited in Baringer and McCroskey, 2000) claims these immediacy behaviours reduce the physical and/or psychological distance between individuals in communications within a perception of closeness, directness and connectedness. That's why, students indicate increased perceptions during their learning process. In their studies, Witt and Wheeless (2001) state that Kelley and Gorham examined the relationship between nonverbal immediacy and cognitive learning task, and they concluded that students' recall was significantly enhanced when teachers utilized nonverbally immediate behaviors (p.329). Sime (2006) also found in her study that the contribution of teachers' gestures influenced a clearer understanding of the learners' active engagement in the processes of learning and their autonomy (p.228). Additionally, Allen (1999) emphasized nonverbal in foreign language classroom can facilitate comprehension by activating concepts already stored as mental representations in the students' memories (p.472). These studies indicate that teachers should focus on the nonverbal behaviors in order to improve motivation which empowers students to develop their communication and to function competently in English as a second language classroom.

Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy and Learner Outcomes

Teacher nonverbal immediacy may facilitate students' attention during lessons since nonverbal behaviors help facilitate selective attention to the teacher's message, which enables teacher's other messages to be processed or interpreted by students (Schonwetter, 1993: cited in Chesebro, 2003:136). In this respect, when they gain students' attention-as provided in *approach-avoidance theory*, that is based on the idea "people approach what they like and avoid what they don't like" -motivation to approach the other and reduction of the physical or psychological distance between students and teachers is likely to be succeeded (Mehrabian, 1981: cited in Witt and Wheeless, 2003). Thus, the positive outcomes associated with teacher immediacy nonverbal become numerous, increase students' awareness, increase motivation to learn, perceptions of self-control, and higher ratings of instruction, finally increase perceptions of cognitive learning.

Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy, Affective and Cognitive Learning

Witt and Wheeless (2001) investigate several researches, in which teachers' verbal and/or nonverbal immediacy behaviors are examined in relation to student learning outcomes and presented that the effects of teachers' nonverbal immediacy on students' affective learning are invariably positive. In some studies it is found that cognitive learning and nonverbal immediacy are correlated positively, and students' recall is significantly enhanced when teachers use nonverbally immediate behaviors to accompany information transfer (p.329). As stated by Sime (2006) above, the recognition of the contribution of teachers' nonverbal immediacy is promoted for a clearer understanding of the learners' active engagement which would be coded as encoding and decoding.

Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy in Language Encoding

Allen (1999) explains *encoding* as nonverbals in language. There is no doubt, in daily conversations or communication, people produce (encode) nonverbals, which are identified in two ways: a) to mark units in which utterances are produced, and b) to help the speaker activate and recall words, thoughts, images, and ideas that become part of the utterance (Burgoon, Buller, and Woodall,1989: cited in Allen 1999: 470). These coincide with matching body movements with which instruction in the intonation patterns of the foreign language facilitates learners' acquisition and enhances language encoding. As Allen summarizes, even nonverbals would be perceived as an increased desire to communicate without hearing the words (p. 471).

Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy in Language Decoding

People not only encode language nonverbals but also decode/comprehend messages during communication. According to Allen (1999), nonverbals contribute to the comprehension of messages in three ways: a) heightening attention, b) providing additional context, and content based) facilitating recall. Nonverbals in the foreign language classroom can facilitate comprehension by activating concepts already stored as mental representations in the students' memories. Wong-Fillmore (1985) emphasizes that language learning is facilitated when students are provided with nonverbal, and it maintains that teachers should use whatever they would do in the classrooms: pictures, demonstrations, gestures, enactment, pantomime, or chalkboard drawings. Nonverbal materials can supplement, reinforce, or modify the communicative message.

Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy in Communicative Competence

Communicative competence is also defined as nonverbal competence, which is knowledge of all the varying nonverbal semantics of culture, and an ability both to send and receive nonverbal signals unambiguously (Allen, 1999: 473). The importance of nonverbal communication in foreign language learning and in conversational analysis is hard to underestimate. Nonverbal competence is especially used by replacing the word to illustrate the idea foreign learners wished to communicate, especially, when they face a breakdown in communication.

Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy in the Target Culture

Nonverbals are part of culture and should be expressed by teachers in the classrooms considering 'meaning of specific emblems can vary among different cultures'. Thus, misunderstanding or failure to communicate might occur when learners interpret emblems according to their own culture. A full appreciation or understanding of another culture requires learners to become aware of all kind of linguistic and cultural knowledge, in which learners might explore ways in target culture.

Even though there have been studies on foreign language teaching related to teacher attitudes, scholars come to a conclusion of evidence that retention of information from course content is related neither to perceived learning nor to teacher nonverbal immediacy or behavior. They argue on many studies that emphasize student engagement, encourage research to increase involvement in classroom or possible problems related to linguistic patterns of learners in different foreign languages. They also provide that little effort has been made to investigate teachers' classroom management techniques or behaviors in which teacher

immediacy is fundamental to classroom management (Burroughs, 2007). There have been many research into how these behaviours affect learning and/or nonverbal immediacy positively, influence student affect, their feelings about the teacher and the course; and additionally, how teacher immediacy might be an effective instructional strategy that enhances cognitive and affective learning (Baringer and McCroskey, 2000; Burroughs, 2007; Chesebro, 2003; Hess and Smythe, 2001; Powell, 2010; Witt and Wheeless, 2001). However, researchers have not systematically examined how combinations of verbal and nonverbal immediacy function together to enhance learning. In light of studies and the hypothesis by Chesebro (2003:138) emphasizing that nonverbal immediacy facilitates the impact of teacher clarity on actual learning and skills' outcomes; it is yet to be tested. Therefore, they suggest that future research should focus on capturing the reciprocal interdependence within teacher and student communication transactions. However, it seems necessary to do some research regarding teacher nonverbal immediacy, how frequently teachers in teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language (TFL) classes use nonverbal behavior, and learner outcomes in cognitive and learning, to what extent nonverbal behaviours motivate students to learn, what the three most common nonverbal behaviours to motivate students in TFL classes; and finally, if there is any difference with teacher nonverbal immediacy regarding different institutions, especially, where Turkish is taught as a Foreign Language.

Consequently, the purpose of this study is to answer the questions of how frequently teachers in TFL classes use nonverbal behaviors; to what extent the nonverbal behaviors motivate students to learn; what the three nonverbal behaviors that motivate students most in TFL classes; and if there are any differences among nonverbal teacher immediacy in different institutions.

Method

Participants

Participants in this study were 55 foreign students who had been learning Turkish as a Foreign Language (TFL). Participants came from a variety of cultural backgrounds. Their majors were different at various universities and they also learnt Turkish language in three different institutions: Çukurova University, Adana, Turkey (N.17); Fatih University TÖMER, İstanbul, Turkey (N.28); and London University, London, England (N.10). All their Turkish instructos were native speakers of Turkish and taught Turkish as a foreign language for several years. The sample included 25 females, 28 males, two of whose sexes were not indicated, and ages ranged from 19 to 25 as summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Information about the participants

	Çukurova University (N=17)	Fatih University, TÖMER (N=28)	London University (N=10)
Female participants (N)	14	8*	3
Male participants (N)	3	18*	7
Average age	22	19	25
Home countries of the participants and their numbers at each institution (N)	Czech Republic–3 Germany–1 Hungary–1 Lithuania–3 Not stated–1 Poland–3 Romania–3	Bosnia–1 India–1 Indonesia–11 Jordan–1 Kazakhstan–1 Madagascar–2 Mongolia–1	Canada–2 Germany–1 Iran–1 Netherlands–1 Romania–1 Syria–2 The USA–1

	Sweden–1 The USA–1	Morocco–2 Nigeria–2 Not stated–4 Russia–1 Uganda–1	Tunisia–1

*Two participants didn't state their gender.

Procedures and Instrumentation

After completion of the academic term, which lasted 14 weeks, participants completed the questionnaire based on their teacher's nonverbal immediacy behaviours. Some participants from Çukurova University completed the questionnaire via e-mail since they were already in their own countries. The participants at London University were contacted and asked to fill in the questionnaires, which were scanned and sent by e-mail by their Turkish teacher. Finally, the participants at Fatih University-TÖMER were asked to fill in the questionnaire and the questionnaires were sent by mail by the Turkish teacher. The frequency of the nonverbal behaviours was evaluated on a 5-point Likert-type instrument (1-never; 2-seldom; 3-sometimes; 4-often; 5-very often), and reliability estimate in this study (Chronbach's alpha) was .85.

Teacher nonverbal immediacy was measured by the 14-item Immediacy Behavior Scale developed originally by Anderson (1978) and modified by Thomas, Richmond and McCroskey (1994) as the ten-item *nonverbal immediacy behaviour scale* (Burroughs, 2007:458). This scale is sensitive to motivation produced by nonverbal behaviors and used to access the extent to which participants feel satisfied on immediacy when learning from the teacher using nonverbal behaviors. The questionnaire consisted of four parts first one of which determines how frequently the Turkish teacher used nonverbal immediacy behaviour. Part 2 aims to have an idea about to what extent these nonverbal behaviours motivated participants to learn. The same instrument was used by turning the nonverbal behaviour items into noun phrases, and participants were asked to report to what extent these behaviours motivated them on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1-not at all; 2-a little; 3-quite; 4-to some extent; 5-to a great extent). 'Others' was also added so that participants could feel free to add any other nonverbal behaviors that they could observe but not listed above. Part 3 aims to find out which three nonverbal behaviours, regarding the scale utilized in Part 2, that motivated participants most according to their preference between high and low perceived immediacy. Finally, Part 4 is prepared for participants to add any general or personal comments about nonverbal teacher immediacy in Turkish as a Foreign Language classes.

Results and Discussion

The first question asked how frequently teachers in TFL classes use nonverbal behaviors. From 55 participants, 18 (37%) indicated that they could observe the teacher used gestures, 24 (43%) stated the teacher never used monotone voice, 39 (44.5%) said they caught the teachers' looking at class, 28 (51.8%) indicated that the teachers smiled at class, 26 (52%) indicated the teacher never has a very tense body position, 9 (17%) stated the teacher moved around, 3 (27%) they observed that the teacher never looked at board or notes, 24 (47%) indicated that the teacher had a relaxed body position, 14 (30%) stated the teacher smiled at individual students, and finally 16 (38%) stated the teacher used a variety of vocal expression. The second question focused on to what extent the nonverbal behaviors motivate students to learn. 20 (37%) out of 55 participants indicated that gestures motivated them, 18 (38.8%)

indicated monotone voice never motivated, 25 (50%) had motivation from eye contact, 26 (59.6%) believed smiling at class accelerated their learning, 12 (22%) indicated tense body position had an effective factor on their learning, 8 (17.4%) specified their teachers' moving around motivated them, 3 (37.6%) showed that the teacher's looking at board or notes helped them feel motivated, 16 (30.8%) seemed pleased to see relaxed teacher, 20 (33.5%) believed smiling at individual students was motivating factor, and 18 (32%) stated using a variety of vocal expression influenced their comprehension. The third question addressed what the three nonverbal behaviors that motivate students most in TFL classes. Participants reported that the most motivating three nonverbal behaviors were eye contact (55%), gestures (32%), and smiling (33%). The last question examined if there are any differences among nonverbal teacher immediacy in different institutions. The result of this study revealed that there are similarity on eye contact, gestures, smiling, and relaxed body positions whereas dissimilarities on tense body, looking at class, looking at board or notes, and using a variety of vocal expressions. All the data gathered and analysed using SPSS computer programme will be presented in the tables below. The first one regarding the frequency of teacher nonverbal immediacy behaviours observed by TFL students at Çukurova University is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: *Nonverbal teacher behaviour at Çukurova University (N=17)*

	1 Never		2 Seldom		3 Sometimes		4 Often		5 Very often		Missing value	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Uses gestures	0	0	1	5.8	5	29.4	7	41.1	4	23.5	0	0
Uses monotone/dull (nonthreatening) voice	8	47	4	23.5	3	17.6	0	0	2	11.7	0	0
Looks at class	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	23.5	13	76.4	0	0
Smiles at class	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	23.5	13	76.4	0	0
Has a very tense body position	8	47	2	11.7	5	29.4	0	0	2	11.7	0	0
Moves around	0	0	3	17.6	4	23.5	6	35.2	4	23.5	0	0
Looks at board or notes	2	11.7	9	52.9	4	23.5	1	5.8	1	5.8	0	0
Has a relaxed body position	0	0	0	0	2	11.7	7	41.1	8	47	0	0
Smiles at individual students	0	0	0	0	3	17.6	8	47	6	35.2	0	0
Uses a variety of vocal expression	0	0	1	5.8	3	17.6	7	41.1	6	35.2	0	0

Table 2 indicates the results of the most observable nonverbal teacher immediacy in TFL classes at Çukurova University. According to the results, it is seen that *looking at class* (76.4%) and *smiling at class* (76.4%) during lessons are the most observable actions carried out by the teacher. Upon considering *using monotone/dull (nonthreatening) voice*, there seems to be a misunderstanding with the meaning. Almost half of participants (47%) stated that their teacher never used a monotone/dull (nonthreatening) voice in the classroom whereas some of them (35.2%) stated it didn't motivate them at all (see Table 3). Therefore, it is presumed that monotone or dull in this study means calm and non-angry; hence, the presumed meaning was included in brackets as nonthreatening. Nevertheless, participants seem to have been puzzled about the meaning. This may limit the study in terms of teachers' using their voice. Differences in cultural interpretations of the item could have been taken into consideration and the presumed meaning could have been left to the participants. Hsu (2010) also found that

monotone/dull voice to be predictor of student motivation but that the outcome seemed to be puzzling when she applied the same scale to a group of Taiwanese students who may interpret the item as having a 'gentle' or 'non-angry' voice. She concludes by saying that 'a monotone/dull voice has still its impact on helping students' motivation'. Table 3 displays how much the nonverbal teacher behaviour affects TFL students' learning and motivation at Çukurova University.

Table 3: *Students' Learning and Motivation by Nonverbal Teacher Behaviour at Çukurova University (N=17)*

	1 Not at all		2 A little		3 quite		4 To some extent		5 To a great extent		Missing value	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Using gestures	1	5.8	1	5.8	3	17.6	5	29.4	7	41.1	0	0
Monotone/dull (nonthreatening) voice	6	35.2	3	17.6	3	17.6	3	17.6	3	17.6	0	0
Eye contact with each student	0	0	1	5.8	1	5.8	4	23.5	11	64.7	0	0
Smiling at class	0	0	0	0	1	5.8	5	29.4	10	58.8	0	0
Tense body position	5	29.4	1	5.8	3	17.6	4	23.5	2	11.7	1	5.8
Moving around	0	0	3	17.6	4	23.5	8	47	2	11.7	0	0
Looking at board or notes	10	58.8	1	5.8	2	11.7	3	17.6	1	5.8	0	0
Relaxed body position	0	0	0	0	4	23.5	6	35.2	7	41.1	0	0
Smiling at individual students	0	0	1	5.8	2	11.7	4	23.5	10	58.8	0	0
Using various vocal expressions	0	0	0	0	1	5.8	9	52.9	7	41.1	0	0

As seen in Table 3, *eye contact* is rated the most motivating nonverbal behaviour (64.7%) for the participants. *Smiling at class* and *smiling at each student* (58.8%) take the second most motivating part, and the next one is observed as *relaxed body position, using gestures,* and *using various vocal expressions* (41.1%). These results provide additional evidence that the correlation between immediacy and learning is strong as found significantly correlated in the study by King and Witt (2009). These results supported findings from previous studies which indicated that students' learning were positively associated with teacher nonverbal immediacy (Burroughs, 2007). Table 4 shows the frequency of teacher nonverbal immediacy behaviours observed by TFL students at Fatih University, TÖMER.

Table 4: *Nonverbal teacher behaviour at Fatih University, TÖMER (N=28)*

	1 never		2 seldom		3 sometimes		4 often		5 very often		Missing value	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Uses gestures	1	3.5	0	0	8	28.5	9	32.1	10	35.7	0	0

	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Uses monotone/dull (nonthreatening) voice	12	42.8	4	14.2	7	25	3	10.7	1	3.5	1	3.5
Looks at class	0	0	1	3.5	4	14.2	6	21.4	16	57.1	1	3.5
Smiles at class	2	7.1	0	0	2	7.1	12	42.8	11	39.2	1	3.5
Has a very tense body position	11	39.2	1	3.5	3	10.7	5	17.8	7	25	1	3.5
Moves around	2	7.1	4	14.2	8	28.5	11	39.2	3	10.7	0	0
Looks at board or notes	7	25	11	39.2	4	14.2	2	7.1	2	7.1	1	3.5
Has a relaxed body position	0	0	3	10.7	1	3.5	12	42.8	10	35.7	0	0
Smiles at individual students	6	21.4	1	3.5	8	28.5	8	28.5	4	14.2	1	3.5
Uses a variety of vocal expression	2	7.1	5	17.8	8	28.5	9	32.1	2	7.1	0	0

According to the data given in Table 4, participants at Fatih University stated that the most motivating nonverbal behaviour is *look at class* (57.1%) and *smiles at class* while talking (39.2 %). Considering the *monotone/dull voice*, participants stated that their teacher never used a monotone/dull voice while teaching (42.8%). Participants also emphasize *has a relaxed body* as an important nonverbal behaviour (42.8%) as well as moves around the classroom (39.2). Table 5 displays how much the nonverbal teacher behaviour affects TFL students' learning motivation at Fatih University-TÖMER.

Table 5: *Students' Learning and Motivation by Nonverbal Teacher Behaviour at Fatih University (N=28)*

	1 Not at all		2 A little		3 Quite		4 To some extent		5 To a great extent		Missing value	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Using gestures	1	3.5	2	7.1	7	25	9	32.1	9	32.1	0	0
Using monotone/dull (nonthreatening) voice	6	21.4	9	32.1	5	17.8	2	7.1	3	10.7	3	10.7
Eye contact with each student	1	3.5	2	7.1	6	21.4	12	42.8	7	25	0	0
Smiling at class	1	3.5	0	0	4	14.2	8	28.5	14	50	1	3.5
Tense body position	5	17.8	12	42.8	3	10.7	2	7.1	5	17.8	0	0
Moving around the classroom	2	7.1	3	10.7	9	32.1	11	39.2	3	10.7	0	0
Looking at board or notes	9	32.1	10	35.7	6	21.4	2	7.1	1	3.5	0	0
Relaxed body	2	7.1	2	7.1	8	28.5	9	32.1	6	21.4	0	0

position											
Smiling at individual students	1	3.5	0	0	7	25	9	32.1	9	32.1	0	0
Using various vocal expressions	0	0	4	14.2	8	28.5	6	21.4	8	28.5	0	0

Table 5 indicates that participants posited *smiling at class* is the most appreciated and motivating nonverbal behaviour (50%) and also smiling at each student (32.1%). Following this item, *using gestures* is observed as considerably high (32.1%). When *eye contact* is taken into account to the table, it seems to take part as motivating behaviour to some extent (42.8%). As also found in the studies by Witt and Wheeles (2001), the communication behaviors employed by teachers play a strategic role in student learning outcomes. For example, nonverbal immediacy behaviors such as eye contact, smiles, and gestures have the effect reducing physical and /or psychological distance between teacher and students. Table 6 displays the frequency of teacher nonverbal immediacy behaviours observed by TFL students at London University.

__Table 6:__ Nonverbal teacher behaviour at London University (N=10)

	1 Never		2 Seldom		3 Sometimes		4 Often		5 Very often		Missing value	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Gestures	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	60	4	40	0	0
Uses monotone/dull (nonthreatening) voice	4	40	4	40	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Looks at class	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	100	0	0
Smiles at class	0	0	0	0	1	10	5	50	4	40	0	0
Has a very tense body position	7	70	0	0	2	20	1	10	0	0	0	0
Moves around	0	0	2	20	3	30	3	30	2	20	0	0
Looks at board or notes	1	10	6	60	2	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
Has a relaxed body position	0	0	0	0	2	20	1	10	6	60	0	0
Smiles at individual students	0	0	2	20	3	30	1	10	4	40	0	0
Uses a variety of vocal expression	0	0	1	10	0	0	4	40	5	50	0	0

Table 6 indicated that *looks at class* has the highest rate among the others (100%) while this is followed by *has a relaxed body* (60%). The next nonverbal behaviour is *uses a variety of vocal expression* (50%) and followed by *uses gestures, smiles at class,* and *smiles at individual students* (40%). The participants also state that their teacher had a relaxed bdy position which is also affective factor to increase their motivation (%60). However, in the table it is observed that moving around does not take a high rank (%20). The most interesting part is observed looking at board or notes in the table above (%0). Table 7 shows how much the nonverbal teacher behaviour affects TFL students' learning motivation at London University.

Table 7: *Students' Learning and Motivation by Nonverbal Teacher Behaviour at London University (N=10)*

	1 Not at all		2 A little		3 Quite		4 To some extent		5 To a great extent		Missing value	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Gestures while talking to the class	0	0	1	10	1	10	3	30	4	40	1	10
Monotone/dull (nonthreatening) voice	6	60	1	10	0	0	1	10	1	10	1	10
Eye contact with each student	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	30	7	70	0	0
Smiling at the class	0	0	0	0	2	20	6	60	2	20	0	0
Tense body position	7	70	1	10	1	10	0	0	0	0	1	10
Moving around the classroom	1	10	1	10	2	20	3	30	3	30	0	0
Looking at board or notes while teaching	4	40	0	0	1	10	3	30	2	20	0	0
Relaxed body position	1	10	1	10	0	0	5	50	3	30	0	0
Smiling at individual students	1	10	2	20	1	10	5	50	1	10	0	0
Using various vocal expressions	0	0	0	0	1	10	6	60	3	30	0	0

As observed in Table 7, the participants rated *eye contact* as the most motivating nonverbal teacher immediacy (70%). For *gestures*, 40% of the participants rated that their teacher used them while talking to the class. The results in Table 6 and 7 show harmony with the study carried out by Allan et al. (2006) in consideration that teachers' nonverbal immediacy behaviors are significantly associated with student motivation. In part 3, the participants chose the three most motivating nonverbal behaviours. The results for the three universities are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8: *Three Most Motivating Nonverbal Teacher Behaviours at Three Different Institutions*

	Çukurova University			Fatih University, TÖMER			London University		
	Nonverbal behaviour	N	%	Nonverbal behaviour	N	%	Nonverbal behaviour	N	%
1	Eye contact	9	52.9	Gestures and smiling at class	14	50.0	Eye contact	7	70
2	Gestures and smiling at class	8	47.0	Eye contact	9	32.1	Moving around class	5	50
3	Various vocal expressions	5	29.04	Smiling at each student	7	25.0	Smiling at class and relaxed body position	4	40

Correlations in terms of the highest and most motivating nonverbal behaviours at each university are reported in Table 8. In Table 3, for instance, TFL participants (64.7%) at Çukurova University stated that eye contact motivated them to a great extent in learning. Similarly, both smiling at class and smiling at each student have a value of 58.8% as the second most motivating factor whereas only smiling at class takes its place in the list. Participants (52.9%) at Çukurova University rated using various vocal expressions as motivating to a certain extent, but it is in the third rank in Table 8.

Considering Fatih University-TÖMER, *gestures* and *smiling at class* are seen to be the most motivating nonverbal behaviours. In Table 5, it could be observed that gestures motivated participants (32.1%) to some extent, and (32.1%) to a great extent. However, half of participants stated they were motivated to a great extent when the teacher smiles at class. In table 8, participants rated eye contact as the second most motivating nonverbal behaviour. It would be observed in Table 5 that 42.8 of them stated that eye contact motivated them to some extent. Finally, the TFL students at Fatih University-TÖMER rated the teacher's smiling at each student motivating to some extent (32.1%) and to a great extent (32.1%), as in the third order in Table 8.

All of participants at London University rated eye contact as motivating to a great extent and 70% chose it as the most motivating nonverbal behaviour, putting it on the top of the list. Moving around the classroom is the second most rated nonverbal behaviour in part 3; however, in Table 7, it could be detected that participants (30%) rated it motivating to some extent and (30%) to a great extent. Smiling at class and relaxed body position has different rates in Table 7. While 60% rated smiling at class as motivating to some extent, 50% rated relaxed body position as motivating to some extent.

In conclusion, the results provide evidence that between nonverbal teacher immediacy and student learning are correlated. Even though teacher factor can be slightly different at the three different institutions, and TFL students at the these institutions seem to have different observations of nonverbal teacher immediacy, the analysis done in this study may give instructors a clue about how and to what extent students are affected by the nonverbal behaviours that teachers demonstrate in the classroom. Accordingly, factors that hinder or help student motivation in learning a foreign language can be reinvestigated.

REFERENCES

ALLEN, L. Q. (1999). Functions of Nonverbal Communication in Teaching and Learning a Foreign Language. The French Review. 72, 3, 469-489.

BARINGER, K. D., and McCroskey, J. C., (2000) Immediacy in the Classroom: Student Immediacy. *Communication Education*. 49, 2. 178-186.

BURGOON, J. K., Buller, D. B., and Woodall, W. G. (1989). Nonverbal Communication: The Unspoken Dialogue. New York: Harper and Row.

CANALE, M. (1983). From Communicative Competence to Communicative Language Pedagogy. Language and Communication. Eds. Jack C. Richards and Richard W. Schmidt. London: Longman, 2-27.

CHESEBRO, J. L. (2003). Effects of Teacher Clarity and Nonverbal Immediacy on Student Learning, Receiver Apprehension, and Affect. *Communication Education*. 52, 2, 135-147.

COMSTOCK, J. E. (1995). Food for Thought: Teacher Nonverbal İmmediacy, Student Learning, and Curvilinearity. *Communication Education* 44:3, 251-266.

HESS, J. A., and Smythe, M. J. (2001). Is Teacher Immediacy Actually Related to Student Cognitive Learning? *Communication Studies*. 52, 197-219.

HSU, L. (2010). The Impact of Perceived Teachers' Nonverbal Immediacy on Students' Motivation for Learning English. *Asian EFL 12:4*.

MCCROSKEY, J. E. (1996). A Multi-cultural Examination of the Relationship Between Nonverbal Immediacy and Affective Learning. *Communication Quarterly. 44:3* , 297-307.

MEHRABIAN, A. (2009). *Nonverbal Communication*. USA.

PLAX, T. E. (1986). Power in the Classroom VI: Verbal Control Strategies, Nonverbal Immediacy and Affective Learning. *Communication Education 35:1*, 43-55.

POWELL, R. A. (2010). *Classroom Communication and Diversity: Enhancing Instructional Practice*. UK: Routledge.

RICHMOND, V. E. (2003). Development of the Nonverbal Immediacy Scale (NIS): Measures of Self-and Other-perceived Nonverbal Immediacy. Retrieved at. http://business.highbeam.com

RODRIGUEZ, J. (1996). Clarifying the Relationship Between Teacher Nonverbal İmmediacy and Student Learning: Affective Learning as the Central Causal Mediator. *Communication Education 45:4*, 293-305.

WITT, P. L., and Wheeless, L. R. (2001). An Experiment Study of Teachers' Verbal and Nonverbal Immediacy and Students' Affective and Cognitive Learning. *Communication Education*. Vol. 50, No.4. pp. 327-342.

WONG-FILLMORE, L. (1985). When does teacher talk work as input? Input in Second Language Acquisition (Eds. S. M. Gass and C. G. Madden). Rowley: Newbury, 17-50.