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Abstract
This study investigated teachers’ nonverbal immediacy behaviors in relation to students’ willingness to speak English in class. A sample of 235 students was drawn from two large technology institutions in central Taiwan. The participants were asked to respond to instruments designed to measure the frequency of teachers’ nonverbal immediacy behaviors influencing students’ willingness to speak English in class. The results of the Pearson correlation indicated that teachers’ nonverbal immediacy behaviors were correlated positively and significantly with students’ willingness to talk. Multiple regression analyses revealed that four nonverbal teacher immediacy behaviors—touching, relaxed body position, looking at the board or notes, and gestures—were significant predictors of students’ willingness to talk. Limitations, implications, and suggestions for future research are addressed.
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INTRODUCTION

Students’ willingness to talk (WTT) in the classroom is believed to be one of the most critical components in second language (L2) or foreign language (FL) acquisition (Hashimoto, 2002). Students’ oral proficiency in the target language is found to be positively associated with their willingness to talk (MacIntyre & Charos, 1996). While many other factors could contribute to students’ participation, teachers’ immediacy behaviors are found to have a significant correlation with students’ willingness to participate in the class (Frymier & Weser, 2001; Hsu, Lin & Watson, 2006; Martin, Valencick, & Heisel, 2001). Immediacy behaviors are defined as “nonverbal and verbal behaviors which reduce physical and/or psychological distance between teachers and students” (Christophel & Gorham, 1995, p.292). 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 merely on teachers’ teaching (Wen & Clément, 2003).

Much of the research into the effects of immediacy on students’ learning were based on immediacy as a whole and not broken apart into verbal and 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 & Wheeless, 2001). However, many of these articles fail to agree on exactly how the immediacy behaviors (verbal or nonverbal) affect the learning of the students in the classroom. Neither did they examine each individual behavior and its contribution to students’ learning in the classroom.
The rationale of this study to examine teacher nonverbal immediacy in relations to students’ willingness to talk in English classes 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 indicates that teachers’ verbal immediacy seems to have an impact on students’ willingness to talk (Hsu, 2006; Lin, 2003; Menzel & Carrell, 1999), but no significant link was found between teachers’ nonverbal immediacy and students’ willingness to talk in other studies (Hsu, Lin & Watson, 2006; 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, 1998; Neuliep, 1997; Roach & Byrne, 2001).

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

LITERATURE REVIEW

Willingness to Talk in Relation to English Learning

Students’ willingness to talk (WTT) is connected to teacher support and teacher immediacy behaviors (Hsu, 2006; Wen &
Clément, 2003). Literature supports the idea that students’ WTT in the English classroom is positively associated with their proficiency at oral communication (Hashimoto, 2002). Teacher involvement and immediacy behaviors impact students’ willingness toward classroom participation (Frymier & Weser, 2001; Lin, 2003). However, Taiwanese college students tend to be unwilling to speak in the classroom (Diller & Moule, 2004; Li, 2003; Savignon & Wang, 2003) and many Taiwanese teachers exhibit little or no immediacy behaviors in the classroom (Andersen, 2000; Gao, 1997; Lin, 2003).

As Wen and Clément (2003) indicated, students may have the desire to communicate in English, yet the desire does not necessarily imply their WTT due to the following variables students are encountering when learning English: speaking anxiety, tension in the classroom, fear of risk-taking, and losing face. That is to say, when students are not affectively and effectively prepared, their desire to communicate will not produce WTT, but will result in an unwillingness to talk (UTT). A number of researchers stress that a teacher is of great significance in developing students’ affective learning (Kristmanson, 2000; Levine, 2003; Li, 2003; Martin, Valencick, & Heisel, 2001; Myers, Martin, & Mottet, 2002). Myers et al. (2002) claimed that students are motivated to talk and participate when teachers are responsive and caring. When teachers demonstrate an immediate attitude through nonverbal forms of communication behaviors, such as tonality, vocal pace, eye contact, smiling, body tenseness, and trunk and limb movement (Burgoon, Birk, & Pfau, 1990), a supportive classroom climate is established (Frymier, 1994; Frymier & Weser, 2001; Witt & Wheeless, 2001) where students feel encouraged and accepted (Li, 2003). 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).

**Nonverbal Immediacy Construct**

Mehrabian (1969, 1971) originally advanced the immediacy concept in his study of interpersonal communication. 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 around 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 Immediacy and WTT

Research implies that students’ UTT in the classroom is not only from speaking anxiety, communication incompetence, low self-confidence and lack of motivation, but also can be caused by a fearful environment that a teacher unknowingly creates (Rocca, 2001). Students’ willingness to participate in oral classroom discussion is strongly affected by the teachers’ immediacy, verbal and nonverbal communication behaviors (Liu, 2001). English teachers apparently have a positive and influential effect on both students’ linguistic performance and emotional perception. Up to this point, enhancing a more positive learning climate and active participation has been conducive to students’ WTT. Researchers suggest this must be considered by looking at teachers’ immediacy behaviors in the classroom (Chesebro & McCroskey, 2001; Rocca, 2001; Wade, 1994).

Teacher support, embodied as teacher involvement and teacher immediacy, is regarded as the most effective factor in 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’ willingness toward classroom involvement. Teacher immediacy is defined as an approachable behavior, which results in the perception of interpersonal closeness, warmth, and friendliness (Rodriguez, Plax, & Kearney, 1996), thus reducing students’ communication anxiety and increasing their willingness to engage in classroom activities (Wen & Clément, 2003).

To examine whether a relationship exists between teachers’ nonverbal immediacy and students’ willingness to talk in English in English classes, the following research questions are formulated:
RQ1: What relationship exists between teachers’ nonverbal immediacy behaviors and students’ willingness to speak English in class?

RQ2: What is the relative contribution of teachers’ nonverbal immediacy behaviors to the prediction of students’ willingness to talk in English in the classroom?

METHOD

Participants
A total of 235 undergraduate students from two large technology institutions in central Taiwan voluntarily participated in the present study. Four majors were reported by the respondents. Applied Foreign Language was the most common major, 134 out of 235 (57%), followed by Nursing, 46 (19.6%), International Trade, 37 (15.7%), and Accounting, 18 (7.7%). There were 203 female students and 32 male students. Their age ranged from 19 to 22, with an average age of 20.15 (SD = .735). One hundred and thirty were juniors and 105 sophomores. Fifty-nine students reported having male teachers, and 176 reported having female teachers.

Instruments
Students’ WTT was measured with the Willingness to Talk in Class Scale (Menzel & Carrell, 1999), consisting of 19 items, first constructed by Christensen, Curley, Marquez, and Menzel (1995), and later utilized by Menzel and Carrell (1999) with satisfactory reliability, .92 for Cronbach’s alpha. The questions directly related
to students’ willingness to participate in the classroom, e.g., individual variables, such as interest in class or topic, motivation, similarity to other classmates’ viewpoints, similarity to the teacher, and classroom variables, such as seating arrangement. The items were scored on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). It yielded an alpha of .926 in the present study.

Teachers’ nonverbal immediacy, developed by Richmond, Gorham, and McCroskey (1987), consisted of 14 items, with an estimated reliability ranging from .73 to .89. This instrument is a five-point Likert-type scale assessing students’ perceptions of their English teachers’ nonverbal immediacy behaviors. Some studies omitted 4 items (item 1, 7, 9, and 11) 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 communicative and had significant impacts on interpersonal relationships (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 reads “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. The Cronbach’s alpha value shown in this
study was .841. A detailed report for the instruments is presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>$r_1$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to Talk</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>12.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal Immediacy</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>9.319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1**  
**Alpha Reliability, Mean, and Standard Deviations Estimate for Instruments**

**Procedures**

To avoid any misinterpretation due to the lack of English proficiency in the participants, both instruments were translated into Chinese by utilizing the following three techniques to validate the translation of the instruments. First, consultation with other experts, who are bilingual, during the process of translation involved discussion and decisions about the best terms to use in Chinese translations (Birbili, 2000). Second, back translation (Werner & Campbell, 1970) was used to look for equivalents through the translation of items from English to Chinese, and then an independent translation from Chinese back into English was utilized. The final stage of back translation was to compare the two versions eliminating ambiguities or discrepancies in meaning (Ercikan, 1998). Third, a pilot study (pre-test) of the research instruments was administered to a small group, 12 volunteers who share similar characteristics with the target population (Teijlingen van & Hundley, 2001). Volunteer participants were asked not only to give their answers but also their interpretation of
each item’s meaning to advance the clarity of the Chinese translation. The instruments are presented in Appendices A and B.

In order to avoid data collection problems or potential bias, the researcher used the technique introduced by Plax, Kearney, McCroskey and Richmond (1986). This technique surveyed the students’ input regarding the teacher of the most recent course they have completed. Participants were asked to answer the measurement questions based upon one of their English classes in the previous school term. Since freshmen did not fit in this category, they were excluded. The questionnaire was self-administered, and required approximately 15 minutes to complete. The participants were assured of confidentiality; code numbers were employed to guarantee anonymity.

RESULTS

To answer research question one, Pearson correlation was utilized to examine the relationship between teachers’ nonverbal immediacy behaviors and students’ willingness to talk in English in class. The results indicated the relationship between teachers’ nonverbal immediacy and students’ WTT was significantly and positively correlated ($r = .398; p < .01$). Sixteen percent, (.398), of the variance in students’ WTT was linked with teachers’ nonverbal immediacy behaviors. This positive relationship indicated that students’ WTT was likely to increase when they observed their teachers demonstrating these nonverbal immediacy behaviors while teaching English. Table 2 presents a detailed correlation.
Table 2

Correlations Between Nonverbal Immediacy and WTT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Nonverbal Immediacy</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>$r$ square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sit behind desk</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gestures</td>
<td>.319**</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Monotone/dull voice</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Look at the class</td>
<td>.302**</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Smile at the class</td>
<td>.308**</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tense body position</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Touches students</td>
<td>.344**</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Move around the class</td>
<td>.312**</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sit on a desk or in a chair</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Look at board or notes</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Stand behind podium/desk</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Relaxed body position</td>
<td>.343**</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Smile at individual students</td>
<td>.321**</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A variety of vocal expressions</td>
<td>.263**</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.398**</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

To answer research question two, multiple regression was conducted to examine the relative contribution of each teacher’s nonverbal immediacy behaviors to the prediction of students’ WTT. The dependent variable was students’ WTT, 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’ WTT. “Teacher touches students in the class, such as patting on the shoulder, shaking hands, etc.” accounted for 12% of the variance in WTT (adjusted $R^2 = .115; p < .001$). In model 2, the
prediction increased if teacher added one other nonverbal immediacy behavior to teaching, “has a very relaxed body position while talking to the class.” (adjusted $R^2 = .174; p < .001$), and a higher prediction can be expected when teacher “gestures while talking to the class” (adjusted $R^2 = .188; p < .001$). In model 4, it contributed the most to students’ WTT when teachers employed these three aforementioned immediacy behaviors, plus “looks at board or notes while talking to the class.” (adjusted $R^2 = .202; p < .001$). Overall, the formula had a $R^2$ of .216 and adjusted $R^2$ of .202. Thus this explained 20% of the variance in predicting students’ WTT in the present study. The results of the linear multiple regression analyses are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3**

Regression Model for Students’ Willingness to Talk (WTT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonverbal Items</th>
<th>Dependent variable = WTT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touch students</td>
<td>.344***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed body position</td>
<td>.263***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestures</td>
<td>.147*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at board or notes</td>
<td>.137*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F ratio</td>
<td>31.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:*** denotes the coefficient is significant at $p < .001$; ** denotes the coefficient is significant at $p < .01$; * denotes the coefficient is significant at $p < .05$
DISCUSSION

The objective of this study is to explore how teachers’ nonverbal immediacy behaviors influence students’ WTT in the English classroom. The results of this study suggest that teachers’ nonverbal immediacy behaviors are associated positively and significantly with students’ WTT. Teachers’ touching, such as patting student on the shoulder or shaking hands with them, is an effective predictor of students’ WTT in this study. WTT became more likely when teachers demonstrate a relaxed body position, use gestures, and look at the board or notes while teaching English. The findings contribute to the knowledge of students’ WTT in a number of ways.

First, this study introduces the concept of employing nonverbal immediacy behaviors in the classroom and its significance to students’ WTT. The findings suggest that students’ WTT is likely to increase when teachers demonstrate nonverbal immediacy while teaching. Teachers’ nonverbal immediacy behaviors contribute to positive interpersonal relationships with students. The result is consistent with the literature review, that is, students are less anxious and more self-confident in the learning process where they feel that they are supported and accepted; concurrently, students’ WTT is increased (Frymier, 1994; Li, 2003; Richmond & McCroskey, 1995; Rogers, 1983; Witt & Wheeless, 2001).

Second, this study represents an exploratory attempt to establish a link between touching behaviors and students’ WTT. 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 fit the Taiwanese culture appropriately. The finding confirms what researchers in the fields of counseling and psychology have noted, that 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 in reducing tension, and further enhances students’ WTT in English classes. As expected, this nonverbal immediacy behavior was correlated positively and significantly with students’ WTT and accounted for the most variance in WTT among all variables ($r = .344; p < .01$).

Third, one non-immediate behavior, “looking at board or notes while talking to the class” is found to be a predictor of WTT. The outcome seems puzzling; one plausible explanation is that direct eye contact given by the teacher may increase students’ nervousness while talking in English. Therefore, when teachers use an indirect approach, by looking at the board or notes while waiting for the students’ answers, it may enhance students’ WTT. 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.” The reasons for this non-immediate behavior predicting WTT deserve further study.

However, the description, “looks at the class while talking,” is significant and positively correlated with students’ WTT ($r = .302; p < .01$). On the other hand, the impact of teachers’ giving direct eye contact on students’ WTT tends to be small in the present study, and multiple regression analysis excluded it as a predictor of WTT. Instead, a non-immediate behavior, “looks at board or notes while talking to the class,” reveals a positive relationship and is found to be
an effective predictor of students’ WTT.

Lastly, the results indicate teachers’ teaching posture is not associated with students’ WTT. Sitting behind a desk in a chair or standing behind a podium while teaching does not impact students’ WTT. This may explain why some previous studies eliminated these items from measurement. However, while “moving around the classroom while teaching” is positively and significantly associated with students’ WTT \( (r = .312; p < .01) \), it would be necessary to examine the impact of teachers’ body position and distance between students and its influence on students’ WTT in future studies.

An important implication gleaned from this study is that teachers should be aware that their nonverbal immediacy behaviors effectively and powerfully enhance students’ WTT. Therefore, teachers should be more sensitive in their English classrooms, knowing that their nonverbal immediacy behaviors can have a positive influence—reducing students’ anxiety in English learning—and result in an effective outcome, enhancing students’ WTT.

**Limitations and Suggestions**

Some limitations to this study should be considered. First, there was a disproportionate ratio of female students (86%) to male students (14%). However, this ratio reflects the reality of the make-up of participants involved in this study in two majors—Nursing and Applied Foreign Language, which are mainly comprised of female students. This gender difference could be problematic if gender makes a difference in WTT.

A second limitation involved the degree of validity of the instruments utilized in this study. Although both scales yielded
satisfactory reliabilities in this study, their applicability in Taiwan culture should be accepted with caution because of divergent expectations and interpretation of teachers’ nonverbal immediacy behaviors in Taiwanese context. The findings of this study and some previous investigations (Myers & Zhong, 1998) indicate that some immediate nonverbal behaviors in North American classrooms turned out to be non-immediate or vice versa in Taiwan classrooms. This lends substantial credence to the concern. Therefore, future research should consider developing more culturally-related nonverbal immediacy behaviors measurement while investigating the impact of teachers’ nonverbal immediacy behaviors in relation to students’ WTT. Future research should further identify and contrast the impact of teachers’ gender on their nonverbal immediacy as well as its impact on students’ WTT. Researchers should also consider what factors contribute to Taiwanese students’ WTT so that teachers can avoid these behaviors.
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APPENDIX A

Willingness to Talk in Class Scale

Instructions: Listed below are several situations that might affect whether or not you choose to talk in the last class you attended. For each item, circle the number 1-5 which indicates how often you would choose to talk in class.

Use the scale: 1=never; 2=rarely; 3=occasionally; 4=often; and 5=very often

1. When the class is engaged in an open discussion. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
2. When I am in a small group in class. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
3. When the professor asks for a response from the class. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
4. When the topic is interesting. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
5. When my views differ from my classmates’ views. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
6. When I am sitting in the back of the class. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
7. When I am prepared for class. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
8. When everyone is talking. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
9. When I am graded on participation. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
10. When the class is engaged in a heated debate. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
11. When I am comfortable with the subject matter.

12. When an assignment is being discussed.

13. When no one else is talking.

14. When I am sitting in the front of the class.

15. When my views differ from the professor’s views.

16. When I am angry about a topic.

17. When I know the correct answer.

18. When I can really help clarify the discussion.

19. When I dislike my classmates.
## Nonverbal Immediacy Behavior Scale

Instructions: Below is a series of descriptions of things some teachers have been observed doing in some classes. Please respond to the items in terms of the English classes you took last semester (freshman, sophomore, or junior). For each item, please indicate on a scale of 1-5 how often your teacher in that class engages in those behaviors.

Use this scale: 1=never; 2=rarely; 3=occasionally; 4=often; and 5=very often

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sits behind desk while teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gestures while talking to the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Uses monotone/dull voice when talking to the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Looks at the class while talking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Smiles at the class while talking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Has a very tense body position while talking to the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Touches students in the class, such as patting on the shoulder, shaking hands, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Moves around the classroom while teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sits on a desk or in a chair while teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Looks at board or notes while talking to the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Stands behind podium or desk while teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
教師非口語即時行為與學生用英語表達意願關係之探討

摘要
本研究旨在探討教師非口語即時行為與學生在英語課堂上用英語表達意願的關係。235名中台灣科技大學的學生參與本研究。相關分析結果顯示教師非口語即時行為與學生課堂參與的頻率呈現顯著正相關。迴歸分析顯示四項教師非口語即時行為，例如：碰觸、輕鬆的姿勢、目視黑板或講義，和手勢的應用，對學生英語表達意願的解釋力達到顯著水準。文末針對研究結果的限制、教學實務意涵，及未來研究方向提出建議。

關鍵詞：即時性 非口語即時行為 表達意願