

INTRODUCTION

A considerable amount of research has been conducted on what “students” do to increase learning outcome for learning English, but considerably less has been done on what “teachers” do, much less focusing on “teachers nonverbal immediacy behaviors.” Teachers are identified as a key factor in making learning effective (Nasr, Booth & Gillett, 1996), even more so in an English classroom where students learning relies so much on teachers’ teaching (Wen & Clément, 2003). As those of us who have learned a foreign language know well, learning the target language effectively requires a supportive atmosphere. In order to facilitate learning, a learning environment in which the students do not feel threatened or intimidated is needed (Boyle, 2000). In a supportive classroom climate where a teacher creates an atmosphere of warmth, safety, acceptance, and genuineness with his or her students, the student becomes a more self-initiated, self-confident, self-directed, and less anxious learner (Rogers, 1983), as a result, students experience the comfort and enjoyment of learning and much more, positive instructional outcomes are likely to occur (Sorensen & Christophel, 1992; Banfield, Richmond & McCroskey, 2006).

Numerous studies suggest that teacher immediacy behaviors and student learning are correlated at a significant level, but few researches investigate how immediate teachers cause students to increase affect for the subject. Much of the research into the effects of teacher immediacy on students’ learning were based on immediacy as a whole, instead of individually examining the effects of verbal or nonverbal immediacy. The research has shown a positive correlation between the use of immediacy behaviors and the overall learning of the students (Christophel, 1990; Menzel & Carrell, 1999; Rodriguez, Plax & Kearney, 1996; Witt & Wheelless, 2001). However, many of these articles fail to agree on exactly how the immediacy behaviors impact students’ learning. Neither did they examine each individual

behavior and its contribution to students' affect for learning, and in particular as they apply to learning English as a subject.

The rationale of this study to examine teacher nonverbal immediacy behaviors in relation to students' affect for learning English is due to the following presumption: First, immediacy originally was constructed as behaviors which "enhance closeness to and nonverbal interaction with another" (Mehrabian, 1969, p. 203). Second, a wealth of evidence indicate that teachers' verbal immediacy seems to have an impact on students' learning for English (Hsu & Roso, 2007; Lin, 2003; Menzel & Carrell, 1999), but no significant link was found between teachers' nonverbal immediacy and students' affect for English subject in other studies (Hsu, Lin & Watson, 2007; Menzel & Carrell, 1999). Lastly, teachers' nonverbal immediacy impact on students' affective learning varied from culture to culture (Johnson & Miller, 2002; McCroskey, Richmond, Sallinen, Fayer & Barraclough, 1995; Myers, Zhong & Guan, 1998; Neuliep, 1997; Roach & Byrne, 2001). This addresses the primary purpose of this study: why student's affect for learning must be understood in dealing with language teaching and learning. A particular interest the author has in the affective domain is that any language teacher can provide in his or her classroom, an atmosphere that is comfortable, positive, and supportive.

Therefore, this study explores the relationship between teachers' nonverbal immediacy behaviors and students' affect for English subject. This study also attempts to discover how confidently predictions can be made when teachers employ certain nonverbal immediacy behaviors. This present study limits its focus to the examination of Taiwanese college teachers' nonverbal immediacy behaviors in relation to students' affect for English subject.

LITERATURE REVIEW

While many other factors could contribute to students' affect for learning English, teachers' immediacy behaviors are found to have a significant correlation with students' affective learning. When teachers demonstrate an immediate attitude through verbal and nonverbal forms of communication behaviors; a supportive classroom climate is established (Frymier, 1994; Frymier & Weser, 2001; Witt & Wheelless, 2001) where students feel encouraged and accepted (Li, 2003). Students' affect for learning reflects on their initiative to participation in classroom when teachers are responsive and caring (Myers, Martin & Mottet, 2002). Research implies that students' reluctance to communicate or participate in the classroom is not only from speaking anxiety, communication incompetence, low self-confidence and lack of motivation, but can also be caused by a fearful environment that a teacher unknowingly creates (Rocca, 2001). Tension in the classroom gradually increases the students' fear of losing face, consequently, an unwillingness to participate in the classroom arises (Wen & Clément, 2003). To put it another way, when students are not affectively prepared, their learning will not bring a positive or productive learning outcome due to the affective filter being high (Krashen, 1982, 1997).

Liu's (2001) study indicates those Asian students' (including Taiwanese and Mainland Chinese) oral classroom participation modes are strongly affected by the teachers' communication behaviors and teaching styles. English teachers in Taiwan tend to teach in an authoritative way (much as they were taught), thus, the learning environment is centered on the teacher and the lecture (Li, 2003). These teachers tend to avoid conveying liking, warmth, and closeness in their teacher-student relationships (Gao, 1997). That is to say, teachers in Taiwan communicate greater detachment in the classroom due to lack of expressiveness. A great number of English teachers have experienced academic success in learning environments that

were typically teacher-centered and relied heavily on lectures; it is understandable that teachers' preferred teaching styles would be to repeat the techniques they had experienced as students. Research supports this concept and states that those teachers who have a tendency to reflect the way they learn in their teaching styles (Li, 2003; Stitt-Gohdes, 2001; Savignon & Wang, 2003) usually favor less student involvement and prefer a formal teaching method (Pithers, 2001). These formal teaching methods will not stimulate student affect for learning in the classroom (Menzel & Carrell, 1999).

Nonverbal Immediacy Construct

Immediacy was formerly conceptualized as a nonverbal variable (Mehrabian, 1981). The concept of immediacy is grounded in approach-avoidance theory that suggests, "people approach what they like and avoid what they don't like" (Mehrabian, 1981, p. 22). According to Mehrabian (1981), immediate communicators generally convey a message through their behaviors that they like the individual with whom they are interacting and that a positive relationship exists between the two individuals. Teachers convey immediacy in the classroom to contribute to interpersonal attraction through proximity and reinforcement (Richmond & McCroskey, 1995). Immediacy behaviors, such as appropriate eye contact, the use of gestures, movement about the classroom, smiling, vocal varieties, and the use of humor, are considered to be highly effective teaching behaviors. Early research conducted in the field of education labeled these behaviors as "teacher enthusiasm" or "teacher expressiveness" (Abrami, Leventhal & Perry, 1982; Coats & Smidchens, 1966), while communication researchers have chosen to label them as "immediacy behaviors" (Andersen, 1979). Conversely, non-immediacy behaviors convey lack of enthusiasm and expressiveness, such as "low eye contact, a distal position, backward body lean, and the absence of smiling

and touch, communicated greater detachment” (Sanders & Wiseman, 1990, p. 342).

Teacher nonverbal immediacy is defined as an approachable behavior, which results in the perception of interpersonal closeness, warmth, and friendliness (Rodriguez et al., 1996), thus reducing students' communication anxiety and increasing their affect for learning English (Hsu, 2009; Wen & Clément, 2003). Teacher support, embodied as teacher involvement and teacher immediacy, is regarded as the most effective factor in the English classes (Wen & Clément, 2003). Teacher involvement refers to the quality of the interpersonal relationship between teachers and students (Reeve, 1996). Teachers' willingness to dedicate psychological resources to students is seen as a critical component to enhance students' affect for learning.

Affective Learning

Affective learning refers to students' attitudes, beliefs, and values toward the content or subject matter and the learning experience (Bloom, 1956). Affect ranges from selective attention and emotional response to behavioral commitment and internalization of ideas (Krathwohl, Bloom, & Masia, 1964). Bloom's taxonomy has been used and interpreted for a general understanding of the affective domain in human behavior and communication (Krathwohl et al., 1964). The fundamental notions of receiving, responding, and valuing underlined in Bloom's taxonomy are universal. Brown (2000) finds this can be applied to second language acquisition and further states that affect refers to emotion or feeling, both about ourselves and others with whom we come into contact. Krashen's affective filter hypothesis (Krashen, 1982, 1997) claims that the best second language and/or foreign language acquisition occurs in environments where anxiety is low and defensiveness absent, in Krashen's term, in contexts where the affective filter is low. Krashen (1981) notes that the most critical component for acquiring language is to provide a learning environment that is relaxed with a low affective filter, resulting

in relaxed learners who are receptive to the learning process; hence, greater language acquisition occurs.

Affective factors, such as feeling and emotion, have its effect and role to play in English classes. Language learning can occur at a much faster rate when students' feel respected (Celce-Murcia, 1991) as well as apprehensive feelings being eliminated (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Students tend to perform better, or at least want to do better, in a class where the teacher gives encouragement or conveys friendliness through body language according to the interview the author conducted in 2007 (Hsu, 2008). It is important to understand how students feel, respond, and make value judgments in the entire process of language learning. To date, many studies have found that teacher immediacy can generate students' involvement and enthusiasm for the content, and yet few have examined the impact particularly in English as a subject. Many researchers considered the teacher immediacy as one construct (Christophel, 1990; Frymier, 1994; Gorham, 1988; Gorham & Zakahi, 1990; Powell & Harville, 1990; Sanders & Wiseman, 1990; Witt & Wheelless, 2001) while Robinson and Richmond (1995) argued that teacher verbal and nonverbal immediacy represents two distinct constructs. Therefore, teacher nonverbal immediacy is treated as one effective instructional strategy in this study.

To examine whether a relationship exists between teachers' nonverbal immediacy behaviors and students' affect for English subject, the following research questions are formulated:

RQ 1: What relationship exists between teachers' nonverbal immediacy behaviors and students' affect for English subject?

RQ 2: What is the relative contribution of teachers' nonverbal immediacy behaviors to the prediction of students' affect for English subject?

METHODOLOGY

Participants

A total of 303 students who enrolled in English courses in a central Taiwan technology institution participated in this study, including 77 freshmen, 87 sophomores, 103 juniors, and 36 seniors. English majors made up 85% (259) whereas 15% (44) were non-English majors. The sample included 44 male students and 259 female students. Participants' age mainly was in the range of 19 to 21 (76%), followed by age of 22 to 30 (23%), and age above 30 (1%). There were 2 whose age was not indicated. Seventy-nine students reported having male teachers, and 224 reported having female teachers. Participants represented 17 different English subjects which included Business English, Business Correspondence, News English, Speech, Meeting and Presentation, English Literature, Reading, Writing, General English, Principles in Teaching English as a Foreign Language, Curriculum Design, Translation, Conversational English for Business, Conversational English for Travelers, Research Methods, Linguistics and TOEFL.

Procedures

Data was collected in the last week of the semester to ensure that students had been very well acquainted with the class and the teacher nonverbal immediacy behaviors. Participants were recruited from English courses, and participation was confidential and anonymous. No extra credit was granted for participation. The questionnaire was sent to three teachers whose students were recruited. Participants were asked to complete a Liker-type scale, measuring their perception of the teacher nonverbal immediacy behaviors and their affect for English subject. The questionnaire took approximately 15 minutes to complete. In order to avoid data collection problems or potential bias, the English major students were asked *not* to rate the teacher in the class in which they received the questionnaire; rather, they were requested to rate the behaviors of another English teacher they had had just

prior to the one in which they received the questionnaire. Non-English major students were asked to answer the questions based upon their general English classes in the previous school term.

Instruments

Students completed two instruments. The first instrument measured students' perceptions of their teacher's nonverbal immediacy behaviors in the classroom. The second instrument assessed students' affective learning. The instruments were translated into Chinese and back translated into English by three bilingual scholars to ensure linguistic and conceptual equivalence (see Appendix).

Nonverbal Immediacy Behavior Scale

Teacher nonverbal immediacy was measured by utilizing the Nonverbal Immediacy Behavior Scale, including 14 items of nonverbal communication behavior (Richmond, Gorham & McCroskey, 1987). Some studies omitted 4 items (item 1, 7, 9, and 11) in this scale that related to sitting, standing, and touching while teaching, with an explanation that these behaviors were poor items to predict teacher immediacy in the western educational setting (McCroskey, Sallinen, Fayer, Richmond & Barraclough, 1996). However, previous research indicated that body position and distance between seating were extremely informative and had significant impact on interpersonal relationship (Egan, 2002). For this reason, all 14 items of this scale were administered for this present study. The researcher accepted the suggestion from the panel of experts (comprised of two native Chinese speakers, one bilingual English teaching expert, and another professional ESL teaching expert) to add an explanation to item 7, "Touch students in the class." The addition read "such as patting on the shoulder, shaking hands, etc.." Item 6 was reworded in the Chinese translation after employing back-translation. Items 1, 3, 6, 9, 10, and 11 were presumed to be non-immediate. They were reversely coded before summing. Students were asked to report the frequency of which their

teachers exhibit these behaviors on a 5-point Likert-type scale, from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). In this study, an alpha reliability of .88 ($M=50.35$, $SD=10.22$) was obtained for the 14-item measure.

Affective Learning Scale

Affective learning was assessed via the measures of affect developed by Andersen (1979). Student affective learning was operationalized as student affect toward (1) behaviors recommended in the course, (2) course content, (3) the teacher, (4) engagement in practices taught in class in their real life, and (5) enrollment with related content. Each specific affect was assessed by four, seven-step bi-polar scales: good/bad, worthless/valuable, fair/unfair, and positive/negative. The Chronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .93 was estimated for the 20-item measure ($M=104.63$, $SD=21.87$). Each specific affect showed in this study was: .84 for behaviors recommended in the course; .84 for course content; .85 for teacher; .93 for likelihood of engaging in course practice; .96 for likelihood of enrolling in another related content. A detailed report for the instruments is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 *Alpha Reliability, Mean, and Standard Deviations*

Instruments	r_1	M	SD
Nonverbal Immediacy	.88	50.35	10.22
Affective	.93	104.63	21.87
1. Behaviors in class	.84	22.42	5.23
2. Content	.84	21.25	5.43
3. Teacher	.85	22.47	5.41
4. Engagement in practices	.93	20.43	5.70
5. Enrollment with related content	.96	18.06	6.81

RESULTS

To answer research question one, the Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) was computed to examine the relationship between teachers' nonverbal immediacy behaviors and students' affect for English subject. The results indicated the relationship between teachers' nonverbal immediacy behaviors and students' affect for English subject was significantly and positively correlated ($r=.50$; $p < .01$). In this positive relationship, student's affect for English subject was likely increased when teachers frequently utilized nonverbal immediacy behaviors. A correlation coefficient of .50 indicating teachers' nonverbal immediacy behaviors accounted for 25% of the variance in student's affect for English subject. Table 2 presented the details. Meanwhile, the author took another closer look at students' affect for English subject demonstrated respectively on the (1) behaviors recommended in the course, (2) course content, (3) the teacher, (4) engagement in practices taught in class in their real life, and (5) enrollment with related content, correlation coefficient ranging from .25 to .51, $p < .01$. Approximately 6% to 26% of variance of affect for English subject was accounted for by each individual affect variable. Table 3 presented the details.

Table 2 *Correlations between Nonverbal Immediacy and Affective Learning*

No	Nonverbal Immediacy	Correlation	r^2
1	Sit behind desk	.20**	.04
2	Gestures	.42**	.18
3	Monotone/dull voice	.37**	.14
4	Look at the class	.36**	.13
5	Smile at the class	.44**	.19
6	Tense body position	.35**	.12
7	Touches students	.31**	.10
8	Move around the class	.31**	.10

The Effect of Teachers' Nonverbal Immediacy Behaviors on Students' Affect for English Subject

9	Sit on a desk or in a chair	.22**	.05
10	Look at board or notes	.19**	.04
11	Stand behind podium/desk	.21**	.04
12	Relaxed body position	.43**	.18
13	Smile at individual students	.35**	.12
14	A variety of vocal expressions	.41**	.17
Total		.50**	.25

** $p < .01$, (two-tailed)

Table 3 Intercorrelations between Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy and Students' Affective Learning Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Nonverbal Immediacy	--	.41***	.43***	.51***	.36***	.25***
2. Affect Toward Behaviors		--	.64***	.69***	.44***	.31***
3. Affect Toward Content			--	.70***	.49***	.38***
4. Affective Toward Teacher				--	.49***	.36***
5. Affect Engagement					--	.45***
6. Affect Enrollment						--

Notes. *** $p < .01$

To answer research question two, multiple regression was conducted to examine the relative contribution of each teachers' nonverbal immediacy behavior to the prediction of students' affect for English subject. The dependent variable was students' affect for English subject, and the independent variables were teachers' nonverbal immediacy behaviors, which were entered individually into a linear

regression equation in a stepwise manner. The regression models revealed that the four teachers' nonverbal immediacy behaviors were significant predictors of students' affect for English subject. "Teacher smiles at the class while talking" accounted for 19% of the variance in students' affect for English subject (adjusted $R^2 = .19$; $p < .001$). In model 2, the prediction increased if teacher adds one other nonverbal immediacy behavior to teaching, "has a very relaxed body position while talking to the class" (adjusted $R^2 = .27$; $p < .001$); and higher prediction can be expected when teacher "gestures while talking to the class" (adjusted $R^2 = .31$; $p < .001$). In model 4, it contributed the most to students' affect for English subject when teachers employed these three aforementioned immediacy behaviors, plus "uses a variety of vocal expressions when talking to the class" (adjusted $R^2 = .32$; $p < .05$). Overall, the formula had a R^2 of .33 and adjusted R^2 of .32. Thus this explained 32% of the variance in predicting students' affect for English subject in the present study. The results of the linear multiple regression analyses are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 Regression Model for Students' Affect for English Subject

Nonverbal Items	Dependent variable = Affect for English Subject			
	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 2</i>	<i>Model 3</i>	<i>Model 4</i>
Smiles	.44***	.32***	.25***	.21**
Relaxed body position		.30***	.25***	.23***
Gestures			.24***	.21***
Vocal expressions				.12*
R	.44	.52	.57	.57
F ratio	73.71	56.43	47.14	36.69
R-square	.20	.27	.32	.33
Adj. R-square	.19	.27	.31	.32

Notes. *** denote the coefficient is significant at $p < .001$; ** denote the coefficient is significant at $p < .01$; * denote the coefficient is significant at $p < .05$

DISCUSSION

The primary purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between teachers' nonverbal immediacy behaviors and students' affect for English subject. The results of this study suggest that teacher nonverbal immediacy behaviors are associated positively and significantly with students' affect for English subject ($r = .50$). Student attitudes toward practices suggested in the course, course content, and the teacher are positively correlated with teacher nonverbal immediacy behaviors, and so are the student's likelihood of engaging in practices suggested in the course and enrolling in related course content, correlation coefficient ranging from .25 to .51, $p < .01$ (see Table 3). Teacher's smile is an effective predictor of students' affect for English subject in this study. Students' affect for English becomes more likely when teachers demonstrate a relaxed body position, use gestures and a variety of vocal expression while teaching English in the classroom. The findings contribute to the knowledge of students' affect toward English learning in a number of ways.

First, this study introduces the concept of employing nonverbal immediacy behaviors in English classes and its significance to increase students' affect for English subject. The findings confirm that teachers' nonverbal immediacy impacts students' affect for learning English. Teachers' nonverbal immediacy contributes to students' affect on different affective domain to differing degrees. When comparing impact on these affective aspects, some interesting points were revealed. For instance, students' affect toward the teacher is correlated the most with teachers' nonverbal immediacy in this current study ($r = .51$, $p < .01$). In other words, when students perceive that their teacher employs more nonverbal immediacy behaviors, they tend to like their teacher more. Students' fondness of teacher not only

contributes to their affect for English learning but also influences rating for the teacher as well as teaching effectiveness. Students' language learning tends to progress faster and perform better when students like their teacher (Celce-Murcia, 1991). While teachers are striving for teaching effectiveness, they should be aware of the following immediacy behaviors: smile, a relaxed body position, use gestures, and uses of variety of vocal expression, all which contribute to students' affect for English.

Second, the value of affective learning is to motivate students' learning, encourage them to use what they have been taught as well as create a desire for continuous learning after they leave the classroom (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). This study confirms that in real-life situations, students' likelihood of actually attempting to engage in behaviors recommended (or content they learned) in the course was correlated significantly with teachers' nonverbal immediacy behaviors ($r=.36, p < .01$). When teachers utilize frequent nonverbal immediacy, students' affect toward this particular affective domain is likely increased. English proficiency hardly progressed if students only practiced in the classroom. A more productive way of English acquisition is using it in real life (Hashimoto, 2002). The result of this study provides a concept for English teachers, that is, their nonverbal immediacy behaviors contribute to students' affect for English learning, and further result in the development of English proficiency.

Third, all 6 non-immediate behaviors (item 1, 3, 6, 9, 10, 11) contribute to students' affect to some degrees. The outcome seems puzzling. One plausible explanation is that students may feel more comfortable when teachers are teaching from a distance, for example, sitting behind a desk (item 1), sitting on a desk or in a chair (item 9), and standing behind a podium (item 11). The students won't feel an immediate threat, such as being asked by the teacher to answer a question or participate in a classroom activity. Their anxiety level for communication may

lessen and further increase their affect. However, teachers “move around the classroom while teaching” actually contributes more variance in students' affect for English ($r=.31, p < .01$). This can be interpreted that an effective English teacher should utilize varied teaching postures in the classroom. Another two non-immediate behaviors, use monotone (item 3) or has a tense body position (item 6), also positively associated with students' affect for English in this study. The result could be understood due to the variable we are examining in this study that is students' affect for English. One possible interpretation is that each individual student is unique with different backgrounds that develop their different personalities resulting in the demands on different style of lecturers. Another probable reason could be the participants represented 17 different English subjects; their preference on teachers' nonverbal immediacy behavior can be very different between a speaking subject (which tends to be more communicative) and reading subject (which tends to be more lecturing). However, a relaxed body position and a variety of vocal expression still accounts for more variance in students' affect than these two non-immediacy behaviors. It's fair to conclude that an effective English teacher would be wise to utilize nonverbal behaviors while teaching.

The item 10, “Looking at board or notes while talking to the class” is found to be correlated positively with students' affect for English subject. A probable explanation is that direct eye contact given by the teacher may increase students' nervousness while learning English. Therefore, when teachers use an indirect approach, by looking at the board or notes, this may enhance students' affect, in Krashen's term, the affective filter is low and defensiveness absent (Krashen, 1982, 1997). Another explanation is that students growing up in the Taiwanese educational system are used to and comfortable with teachers who “look at board or notes while talking to the class.”

This study also represents an exploratory attempt to establish a link between

touching behaviors and students' affective learning. Touching students is sensitive and may be interpreted very differently from culture to culture. Therefore, touching should be used with caution. By adding the phrase "patting them on the shoulder or shaking hands with them" to the original question "touching students in the class" seems to more appropriately fit Taiwanese culture. The finding confirms what the literature has supported, derived from counseling and psychology perspectives; touch can be extremely important in communicating care and support to a patient (Egan, 2002). Touching students in a positive and appropriate way conveys care and encouragement, is significant to reduce tension, and further enhances students' affect for learning English. As expected, this nonverbal immediacy behavior was correlated positively and significantly with students' affect for English subject and accounted for 10% of variance among all variables ($r = .31; p < .01$).

An important implication gleaned from this study is that teachers should be aware that their nonverbal immediacy behaviors effectively and powerfully enhance students' affect for English subject. Therefore, teachers should be more sensitive in their English classrooms, knowing that their nonverbal immediacy behaviors could bring a positive influence—lessen students' anxiety on English learning—resulting in an effective outcome, enhancing students' affect for English subject.

Limitations and Suggestions

Some limitations to this study need to be addressed. Although two instruments confirmed satisfactory reliabilities, whether or not each student's report precisely indicated the facts may not be independently discernible in this data.

Another limitation that may occur in this study is the participant's potential loss of recall or confusion because of the short time given to recall information while completing the scales, causing a further bias of the result. The third possible limitation involves the fact that student perception of teacher immediacy may not

indicate actual teacher immediacy behaviors, so the validity of these instruments could be problematic. The last limitation is that the result can only generalize the current population in central Taiwanese college classrooms due to the sample size and geographic distribution.

Future research should consider a larger sample size to increase its statistical power and generalizability. Additionally, it needs to be investigated if gender makes a difference on affective learning. According to Kitano (2001), male students tend to have a higher anxiety level when learning L2 than females and are less active in class participation. Teacher gender may also affect their communication behaviors because characteristically male teachers tend to be stricter and less expressive (Fwu & Wang, 2002; Wen & Clément, 2003). Therefore, future research should further identify and contrast the impact of teachers' gender on their nonverbal immediacy as well as its impact on students' affective learning. A replication study is also needed in the future so that the impact of teacher nonverbal immediacy behaviors on students' affective learning can be clearly and confidently established.

REFERENCES

- Abrami, P. C., Leventhal, L., & Perry, R. P. (1982). Educational seduction. *Review of Education Research*, 52, 446-464.
- Andersen, J. F. (1979). Teacher immediacy as a predictor of teaching effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 3* (pp. 543-559). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Banfield, S.R., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (2006). The effect of teacher misbehaviors on teacher credibility and affect for the teacher. *Communication Education* 55, 63-72.
- Bloom, B. S. (Ed.) (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive Domain New York: McKay.
- Boyle, J. (2000). Education for teachers of English in China. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 26, 147-155.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (Ed.) (1991). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (2nd). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Christophel, D. M. (1990). The relationships among teacher immediacy behaviors, student motivation, and learning. *Communication Education*, 39, 323-340.
- Coats, W. D., & Smidchens, U. (1966). Audience recall as a function of speaker dynamism. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 57, 189-191.
- Egan, G. (2002). *The Skilled Helper: A problem-management and opportunity-development approach to helping* (7th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Frymier, A. B. (1994). A model of immediacy in the classroom. *Communication Quarterly*, 42, 133-144.
- Frymier, A. B., & Weser, B. (2001). The role of student predispositions on student expectations for instructor communication behavior. *Communication Education*, 50, 314-326.
- Fwu, B. J., & Wang, H. H. (2002). The social status of teachers in Taiwan. *Comparative Education*, 38, 211-224.
- Gao, G. (1997). Self and OTHER: A Chinese perspective on interpersonal relationships. In W. B. Gudykunst, S. Ting-Toomey, & T. Nishida (Eds.), *Communication in personal relationships across cultures* (pp. 81-101). Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage.
- Gorham, J. (1988). The relationship between verbal teacher immediacy behaviors and student learning. *Communication Education*, 37, 40-53.
- Gorham, J., & Zakahi, W. R. (1990). A comparison of teacher and student perceptions of immediacy and learning: Monitoring process and product. *Communication Education*, 39, 354-368.
- Hashimoto, Y. (2002). Motivation and willingness to communicate as predictors of reported L2 use: The Japanese ESL context. *Second Language Studies*, 20,

29-70.

- Hsu, L., & Roso, C. (2007). The relationship between teachers' verbal and nonverbal immediacy behaviors and students' willingness to speak in English in central Taiwanese college classrooms. *The proceeding of 2007 TESOL Conference, Department of Applied English, National Taichung Institute of Technology*, 26-42.
- Hsu, L.L., Lin, C.H., & Watson, T. (2007). Teachers' verbal and nonverbal communication behaviors in relation to students' classroom participation: The impacts of traditional students vs. nontraditional Students. *Journal of National United University*, 4, 59-76.
- Hsu, L. (2009). The relationship between teachers' verbal immediacy behaviors and students' affective learning for English. *Hwa Kang Journal of English Language & Literature*, 15, 109-128.
- Johnson, S. C., & Miller, A. N. (2002). A cross-cultural study of immediacy, credibility, and learning in the U. S. and Kenya. *Communication Education*, 51, 280-292.
- Kitano, K. (2001). Anxiety in the college Japanese language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 85, 549-566.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practices in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (1997). *Foreign language education: The easy way*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.
- Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Masia, B. B. (1964). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook II: Affective Domain*. New York: McKay.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Li, L.T. (2003). Carl Rogers and me: Revisiting Teaching. *Thinking Classroom*, 4, 34-42.
- Lin, S.C. (2003). *The relationship between teacher immediacy and students' willingness to communicate in English: An EFL context in Taiwan*. Unpublished master's thesis, National Normal University, Taipei, Taiwan.
- Liu, J. (2001). *Asian students' classroom communication patterns in U. S. Universities: An emic perspective*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- 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, 281-291.
- McCroskey, J. C., Sallinen, A., Fayer, J. M., Richmond, V. R., & Barraclough R. A. (1996). Nonverbal immediacy and cognitive learning: A cross-cultural

- investigation. *Communication Education*, 45, 200-211.
- Mehrabian, A. (1969). Some referents and measures of nonverbal behavior. *Behavioral Research Methods and Instrumentation*, 1, 203-217.
- Mehrabian, A. (1969). Some referents and measures of nonverbal behavior. *Behavioral Research Methods and Instrumentation*, 1, 203-217.
- Mehrabian, A. (1981). *Silent messages: Implicit communication of emotions and attitude* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Menzel, K. E., & Carrell, L. J. (1999). The impact of gender and immediacy on willingness to talk and perceive learning. *Communication Education*, 48, 31-40.
- Myers, S. A., Martin, M. M., & Mottet, T. P. (2002). Students' motives for communicating with their instructors: Considering instructor socio-communicative style, student socio-communicative orientation, and student gender. *Communication Education*, 51, 121-133.
- Myers, S. A., Zhong, M., & Guan, S. (1998). Instructor immediacy in the Chinese college classroom. *Communication Studies*, 49, 240-255.
- Nasr, A. R., Booth, E., & Gillett, M. (1996). *Relationship between lecturers' language background and their teaching performance*. Retrieved August 11, 2005, from University of Wollongong, Australia, Faculty of Education Web site: <http://www.aare.edu.au/96pap/nasra96151.txt>
- Neuliep, J. W. (1997). A cross-cultural comparison of teacher immediacy in American and Japanese college classrooms. *Communication Research*, 24, 431-451.
- Pithers, B. (2001). An aspect of vocational teachers' cognitive style: Field dependence-field independence. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Vocational Education Research*, 9, 47-60.
- Powell, R. G., & Harville, B. (1990). The effects of teacher immediacy and clarity on instructional outcomes: An intercultural assessment. *Communication Education*, 39, 369-379.
- Reeve, J. (1996). *Motivating others: Nurturing inner motivational resources*. New York: Allyn and Bacon.
- Richmond, V. P., Gorham, J. S., & McCroskey, J. C. (1987). The relationship between selected immediacy behaviors and cognitive learning. In M. L. McLaughlin (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 10* (pp. 574-590). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1995). *Nonverbal behavior in interpersonal relations*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Robinson, R. Y., & Richmond, V. P. (1995). Validity of the verbal immediacy scale. *Communication Research Reports*, 12, 80-84.
- Roach, K. D., & Byrne, P. R. (2001). A cross-cultural comparison of instructor communication in American and German classrooms. *Communication Education*, 50, 1-14.

- Rodriguez, 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, 293-305.
- Rogers, C. R. (1983). *Freedom to learn for the 80's*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Sanders, J. A., & Wiseman, R. L. (1990). The effects of verbal and nonverbal teacher immediacy on perceived cognitive, affective, and behavioral learning in the multicultural classroom. *Communication Education*, 39, 341-353.
- Savignon, S. J., & Wang, C. C. (2003). Communicative language teaching in EFL contexts: Learner attitudes and perceptions. *IRAL*, 41, 223-249.
- Sorensen, G. A. & Christophel, D. M. (1992). The communication perspective. In V.P. Richmond & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Power in the classroom: communication, control, and concern*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Stitt-Gohdes, W. L. (2001). Business education students' preferred learning styles and their teacher' preferred instructional styles: Do they match? *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, 43, 137-151.
- Wen, W. P., & Clément, R. (2003). A Chinese conceptualization of willingness to communicate in ESL. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 16, 18-38.
- 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, 327-342.

Appendix

Nonverbal Immediacy Behavior Scales

¹Instructions: Below are a series of descriptions of things some teachers have been observed doing in some classes. Please respond to the items in terms of the class you are accessing now. For each item, indicate how often your teacher engages in those behaviors when teaching. Use the scale: 1=never; 2=rarely; 3=occasionally; 4=often; and 5=very often

1. Sits behind desk while teaching.
2. Gestures while talking to the class.
3. Uses monotone/dull voice when talking to the class.
4. Looks at the class while talking.
5. Smiles at the class while talking.
6. Has a very tense body position while talking to the class.
7. Touches students in the class.
8. Moves around the classroom while teaching.
9. Sits on a desk or in a chair while teaching.
10. Looks at board or notes while talking to the class.
11. Stands behind podium or desk while teaching.
12. Has a very relaxed body position while talking to the class.
13. Smiles at individual students in the class.
14. Uses a variety of vocal expressions when talking to the class.

¹ Note. From “The relationship between selected immediacy behaviors and cognitive learning,” by V. P. Richmond, J. S. Gorham, and J. C. McCroskey, 1987, *Communication Research Measures: A Sourcebook*, p.240. Copyright 1987 by Sage Publications, Inc. Reprinted with permission.

Affective Learning Scale

²Instructions: Please respond to the following scales. Circle one number on each set of bipolar scales to indicate your judgment or evaluation of the concept/idea about that particular class. Note that in some cases the most positive number is a "1" while in other cases it is at "7".

1. Behaviors recommended in the course:

Good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Bad
Worthless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Valuable
Fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unfair
Positive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Negative
2. Content/subject matter of the course:

Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
Valuable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Worthless
Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Fair
Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
3. Course instructor:

Good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Bad
Worthless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Valuable
Fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unfair
Positive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Negative
4. In "real life" situations, your likelihood of actually attempting to engage in behaviors recommended in the course:

Likely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unlikely
Impossible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Possible
Probable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Improbable
Would Not	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Would
5. Your likelihood of actually enrolling in another course of related content if your schedule so permits:

Unlikely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Likely
Possible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Impossible
Improbable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Probable
Would	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Would Not

² Note. From "Teacher immediacy as a predictor of teaching effectiveness" by J.F. Andersen, 1979. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 3*, (pp.543-559). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.