ISSN: 2147-2971

Volume 3/1

The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies

JASSS

Editor
Esengül KARADAYI

The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies



International Journal of Social Science

Academic Social Science Studies *Dergisi yılda iki defa yayın yapan uluslararası hakemli bir dergidir.*
Academic Social Science Studies *Dergisi'nde yayınlanan tüm yazıların, dil, bilim ve hukûki açıdan bütün sorumluluğu yazarlarına, yayın hakları* **www.jasss.com**'a *aittir.*
Yayınlanan yazılar yayıncının yazılı izni olmaksızın kısmen veya tamamen herhangi bir şekilde basılamaz, çoğaltılamaz.
Yayın Kurulu dergiye gönderilen yazıları yayınlayıp yayınlamamakta serbesttir.
Gönderilen yazılar iade edilmez.

The Academic Social Science Studies *is an international, twice-reviewed in a year journal.*
Authors bear the sole legal responsibility for their published works in **www.jasss.com.**

The Academic Social Science Studies *has the sole ownership of copyright to all published works. No part of this publication shall be produced in any form without the written consent of* ***the Academic Social Science Studies****.*
The Editorial Board makes the final decision to publish articles.
No article is returned to authors.

ISSN: **2147-2971**

Volume 3/1 2010

Academic Social Science Studies
International Journal of Social Science

The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies



International Journal of Social Science

Editor
Esengül KARADAYI

E-mail: esengulkaradayi@gmail.com
Web: http://www.jasstudies.com/

JASS Studies
Volume 3 / 1 2010

ACADEMIC SOCIAL SCIENCE STUDIES
Uluslararası Hakemli Dergi / International Journal of Academic Social Science Studies

Editör / Editor
Esengül KARADAYI

Yayın Kurulu / Editorial Board
Prof. Dr. Tahir BALCI - Prof. Dr. Şuayip ÖZDEMİR
Prof. Dr. Esra MACAROĞLU AKGÜL - Prof. Dr. H. İbrahim DELİCE
Prof. Dr. Suna Timur AĞILDERE - Prof. Dr. İbrahim TELLİOĞLU
Prof. Dr. Hidayet AYDAR - Doç. Dr. Soyalp TAMÇELİK
Doç. Dr. Yavuz BAYRAM -Doç. Dr. Mehmet D. ERDEM

Danışma Kurulu/Board of Advisory
Prof. Dr. İsmail TAŞ - Prof. Dr. Hüseyin GÜMÜŞ - Doç. Dr. Perihan YALÇIN
Doç. Dr. Beyhan ASMA - Doç. Dr. Sami KILIÇ - Doç. Dr. Fuat BOYACIOĞLU
Doç. Dr. Mustafa ERTÜRK - Doç. Dr. Mustafa YAVUZ

ACADEMIC SOCIAL SCIENCE STUDIES
Uluslararası Hakemli Dergi / International Journal of Academic Social Science Studies
Volume 3 / 1 2010

Hakemler / Referees

Prof. Dr. Esra MACAROĞLU AKGÜL	Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. H. İbrahim DELİCE	Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Hidayet AYDAR	İstanbul Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Hüseyin GÜMÜŞ	Marmara Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. İbrahim TELLİOĞLU	Ondokuzmayıs Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. İsmail TAŞ	Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Suna Timur AĞILDERE	Gazi Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Şaban SAĞLIK	Ondokuzmayıs Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Şuayip ÖZDEMİR	Fırat Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Tahir BALCI	Çukurova Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ahmet MUTLU	Ondokuzmayıs Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Ahmet YİĞİT	Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Beyhan ASMA	Erciyes Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Bünyamin KOCAOĞLU	Ondokuzmayıs Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Cüneyt EREN	Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. D. Yelda KAĞNICI	Ege Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Eyüp AKMAN	Kastamonu Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Fuat BOYACIOĞLU	Selçuk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Gökhan DEMİRCİOĞLU	Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Halil İbrahim SAĞLAM	Sakarya Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Koray ÖZCAN	Selçuk Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Kürşat YILMAZ	Dumlupınar Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. M. Dursun ERDEM	Ondokuzmayıs Üniversitesi

Doç. Dr. Mustafa ERTÜRK	Muğla Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Mustafa YAVUZ	Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Perihan YALÇIN	Gazi Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Sami KILIÇ	Fırat Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Serkan ŞEN	Ondokuzmayıs Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Soyalp TAMÇELİK	Gazi Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Şahin KÖKTÜRK	Ondokuzmayıs Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Yavuz BAYRAM	Ondokuzmayıs Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ayşe Derya IŞIK	Bartın Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Adem ÇATAK	Gümüşhane Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Adem SAĞIR	Karabük Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ahmet ÇOBAN	Dicle Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ahmet DEMİRTAŞ	Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Akın TEMUR	Ondokuz Mayıs Ü.
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ali ERBAŞI	Selçuk Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ali KUZUDİŞLİ	Gümüşhane Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Celal GÜLŞEN	Nevşehir Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Dr. Murat ÇİFTÇİ	Trakya Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Elif İNCE	İstanbul Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Emin Erdem KAYA	Nevşehir Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Emine Altunay ŞAM	Amasya Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Erol DURAN	Uşak Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Etem YEŞİLYURT	Mevlana Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Fatih DEMİR	Celal Bayar Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Fatih ÖZKAFA	Selçuk Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ferdi KOÇ	Sakarya Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Filiz VAROL	Fırat Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Funda MASDAR	Batman Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. H. Basri MEMDUHOĞLU	Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Halil TOKCAN	Niğde Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hasan Güner BERKANT	Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Ü.
Yrd. Doç. Dr. HURİYE ALTUNER	Niğde Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. İbrahim YENEN	Karabük Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. İlker AYDIN	Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. İsmail YÜKSEL	Eskişehir Osmangazi Ü.
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Kasım TATILLIOĞLU	Bingöl Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Kenan MERMER	Sakarya Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Kerami ÜNAL	Fatih Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mehmet EKİZ	Niğde Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mehmet Sait ŞAHİNALP	Harran Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Muhammet BAHADIR	Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Murat Başar	Uşak Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Murat TUNCER	Fırat Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mustafa DURMUŞÇELEBİ	Erciyes Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mustafa YİĞİTOĞLU	Karabük Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Münteha GÜL	Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Özcan GÜNGÖR	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Pınar ŞAFAK	Gazi Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sibel KILIÇ	Marmara Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sibel ÜST	Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Sinan YÖRÜK	Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Şafak ÜNÜVAR	Selçuk Üniversitesi

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Şeyma B. KURAN	Ondokuzmayıs Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Tayfun DOĞAN	Niğde Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Zehra YİĞİT	Akdeniz Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Zülfü DEMİRTAŞ	Fırat Üniversitesi
Dr. Abdullah ÖZBOLAT	Fırat Üniversitesi
Dr. Betül DUMAN	Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi
Dr. Fikri SOYSAL	Dicle Üniversitesi
Dr. Murat TAŞTAN	Kafkas Üniversitesi
Dr. Oğuz ÇETİN	Niğde Üniversitesi
Dr. Polat TUNÇER	Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi
Dr. Rıfat Vedat YILDIRIM	Başkent Üniversitesi
Dr. Timur VURAL	Necmettin Erbakan Ü.

CONTENTS / İÇİNDEKİLER

Ayten ATAY **1-11**
Anlam Kötülenmesine Uğramış Güzel Bir Kelime: Don
An Excellent Word that Received to be Disparaged Meaning: Don

Mehmet Emin BARS **13-22**
Kerem ile Aslı Hikâyesinde Olağanüstülük Motifleri
The Motifs of Extraordinariness in The Story of Kerem and Aslı

Mustafa ŞANAL **23-47**
Kayseri-Pazarören Köy Eğitmen Kursu
Alienation of Aysel in the "Ölmeye Yatmak"

Gülden TÜM **49-60**
An Investigation on Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy in Turkish as a Foreign Language
Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretiminde Öğretmenin Sözlü Olmayan Yakınlığı Üzerine Bir Araştırma

Onur BALCI **61-75**
Kazak Türkçesinin Ses ve Şekil Bilgisi Terimleri
Terms of Phonetic and Morphology of Kazakh Turkish

The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies

International Journal of Social Science
Volume 3 Issue 1, p. 49-60, Summer 2010

AN INVESTIGATION ON TEACHER NONVERBAL IMMEDIACY IN TURKISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

TÜRKÇENİN YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRETİMİNDE ÖĞRETMENİN SÖZLÜ OLMAYAN 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 research, 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 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 realized with 55 participants who were learning 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, learning.*

Öz

Yabancı dil öğreniminde, öğretmenin sözel olmayan yakınlığı ile öğrenci öğreniminin gerçekleşmesinde öğretmen yakınlığının etkili bir strateji 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 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 ve Thomas, Richmond ve McCroskey (1994)'in on maddelik sözel olmayan yakınlık tutum ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Sonuçlar öğrenci isteklendirmesinin gülümseme ve göz teması gibi belirli sözel olmayan davranışlarla artış gösterdiğini ortaya çıkarmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe, öğretmenin sözel olmayan yakınlığı, öğrenci motivasyonu, 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 as '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: p.1). Behaviors are defined differently, 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. 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). Allen (1999) emphasized nonverbal in the FL classroom can facilitate comprehension by activating concepts already stored as mental representations in the students' memories (p.472).

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*, which 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 are 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 present the effects of teachers' nonverbal immediacy on students' affective learning are invariably positive. As stated above, 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). Sime (2006) states recognition of the contribution of teachers' nonverbal immediacy should contribute to 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* and *decoding* as nonverbals in language. There is no doubt, in daily conversations or communication, people produce (encode)nonverbals, which are identified in two ways: to mark units in which utterances are produced, and 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 FL facilitates learners' acquisition and enhances language encoding. As Allen summarizes, even nonverbal 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. According to Allen (1999), nonverbals contribute to the comprehension of messages in three ways: heightening attention, providing additional context, and facilitating recall. Nonverbals in the FL classroom can facilitate comprehension by activating concepts already stored as mental representations in the students' memories. Wong-Fillmore (1985) states that language learning is facilitated when students are provided with nonverbals and maintains that teachers should use whatever they would do in the classrooms: pictures, demonstrations, gestures, enactment, pantomime, or chalkboard drawings. Nonverbal material can supplement, reinforce, or modify the communicative message.

Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy in Communicative Competence

Communicative competence is 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. It is used when foreign learners face a breakdown in communication, they replace the word by nonverbal behaviors to illustrate the idea they wished to communicate.

Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy in the Target Culture

Nonverbals are part of the 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 may 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 the knowledge. Thus, learners explore ways in target culture.

Even though there have been studies on FL 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 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 teacher 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 faculties 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). The sample included 25 females, 28 males, two of whose sexes were not indicated; 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)
No of female students	14	8*	3
No of male students	3	18*	7
Average age	22	19	25
Country – No. of students	Czech Republic–3 Germany–1 Hungary–1 Lithuania–3 Not stated–1 Poland–3 Romania–3 Sweden–1 The USA–1	Bosnia–1 India–1 Indonesia–11 Jordan–1 Kazakhstan–1 Madagascar–2 Mongolia–1 Morocco–2 Nigeria–2 Not stated–4 Russia–1 Uganda–1	Canada–2 Germany–1 Iran – 1 Netherlands–1 Romania–1 Syria–2 The USA – 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 teacher 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 most observable nonverbal teacher immediacy in TFL classes at Çukurova University is *looking at class* (76.4%) and *smiling at class* (76.4%) during lessons. 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 *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
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 *look 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 *using gestures, smiles at class,* and *smiles at individual students* (40%). 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	2 A	3 quite	4 To	some	5 To a great	Missi

	all		little				extent		extent		ng 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 suggest in Table 7, the participants rated *eye contact* as the most motivating nonverbal teacher immediacy (70%). As 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, 1989.

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 immediacy, 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 immediacy 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. Susan m. Gass and Carolyn G. Madden). Rowley: Newbury, 17-50.