A Comparison between Native and Non-Native English Language Teachers Regarding Immediacy Behaviors in English Classrooms

Lisa Li-I Hsu

Associate Professor, Department of Applied English, National Taichung University of Science and Technology

Abstract

This study aimed to examine and compare the frequency of native English speaking teachers and non-native English speaking teachers and their communicative immediacy behaviors while teaching. There were 6 native English speaking teachers and 6 non-native English speaking teachers participating in this study. They were observed twice a week, and each time for an hour. The observation time for this study was about 2 months. Four trained observers were taking notes and marking teachers' immediacy communicative behaviors on a prepared sheet. The result revealed that native English speaking teachers not only do not excel in all aspects but non-native English speaking teachers showed more communicative skills than most people had predicted. Overall, native English speaking teachers displayed more verbal immediacy behaviors than non-native English speaking teachers, whereas non-native English speaking teachers expressed more nonverbal communicative behaviors than native English speaking teachers. Both types of teachers also demonstrated some non-immediacy behaviors while teaching. The findings of this study could provide parents, students, and English teaching industries' administrators a brand new concept to reevaluate whether native English speaking teachers excel over non-native English speaking teachers, by specifically examining their immediacy behaviors in English classroom. Detailed discussions and comparisons are addressed in this paper.

Keywords: immediacy behaviors, English language teaching, native English speaking teacher, non-native English speaking teacher

英語為母語的教師及英語非為母語的教師其即時行為

在英語課堂上的比較研究

徐琍沂

國立臺中科技大學應用英語系副教授

摘要

本研究旨在檢視與比較英語為母語的教師及英語非為母語的教師其即時溝通行為在英語課堂上出現之頻率。共有十二位老師 (六位英語為母語的教師和六位英語非為母語的教師) 參與此研究。他們接受課室觀察，一週兩次，每次一小時，此研究觀查時間有兩個月之久。四位訓練有素的觀察員做筆記，關察中在事先準備好的表格，標誌著他們所觀察到的教師即時溝通行為。結果顯示以英語為母語的教師並沒有在各個方面表現突出，反而超出大多數人的預期，英語非為母語的教師表現出更多的即時溝通行為。總體來說，以英語為母語的教師比英語非為母語的教師顯示更多的語言即時行為，而英語非為母語的教師比英語為母語的教師顯示更多的非言語即時行為。這兩種類型的教師在課堂上都表現出一些的非即時行為。這項研究的發現提供家長、學生及英語補教業經營者，能重新審視英語為母語的教師是否一定優於英語非為母語的本土教師。從他們在課室中所表現出的即時行為可以參考做為評量的依據。詳細的討論和比較將在本文中詳細說明。

關鍵詞：即時行為、英語語言教學、英語為母語的教師、英語非為母語的教師

I. Introduction

Although the low birth rate phenomenon in Taiwan has caused a crisis of recruitment for many schools, English education still receives much attention, and English is still the most popular subject. English was the first major filled in 2015 NTCUST, 5-year program recruitment. English as a major was by far the most popular major (NTCUST, 2015). As English educators, this phenomenon makes all English educators proud; in the meantime, the author feels much more responsible for providing good quality teaching and/or establishing a lower affective filter learning environment for English language learners so their language acquisition could be more productive. There are many ways to improve English education, for instance, enhancing student's motivation, improving teaching strategies, providing cutting-edge learning facilities etc. However, the teacher himself/herself can play a significant role and make a difference in the classroom (Larsen-Freeman, 2011; Henning, 2012). Specifically, teacher verbal and nonverbal immediacy, studies have repeatedly confirmed the significance this could bring to students' learning (Allen, Witt & Wheeless, 2006; Ballester, 2015; Hsu, 2011).

The English language teaching industry in Taiwan tends to assume that native English speaking teachers (NESTs) are the standard of spoken English language and they are more vibrant while teaching, whereas non-native English speaking teachers (non-NESTs) are inferior educators because they lack this distinctive linguistic skill to demonstrate communicative teaching approaches. The English learning industry believes that NESTs are more suitable and qualified to teach English, especially oral English. NESTs are viewed as the model speakers and the ideal teachers when it comes to teaching English (Clark & Paran, 2007). It might be reasonable to say that the English teaching-and-learning industry believes that students would benefit more from NESTs with their perfect knowledge of the language and pronunciation. This mentality results in many universities and bilingual or English language centers focusing much effort on hiring NESTs, and even paying much higher hourly fee to those native English speaking teachers than non-NESTs. However, language teaching and learning is complex (Larsen-Freeman, 2011); it is more than presenting a standard pronunciation. This study is to investigate and compare if NESTs are putting more stress on immediacy than non-NESTs; particularly, this study places an emphasis on teacher immediacy while teaching in the classroom, both verbal and nonverbal. The rational argument in this focus of study is that there are abundant studies indicating that teacher immediacy impacts significantly on lowering students' learning apprehension (Chesebro, 2003), increasing their classroom participation (Frymier & Houser, 2000; Hsu, 2010), and enhancing their learning motivation (Allen et al., 2006; Hsu, 2014), and above all, making students' English learning to be more effective.

II. Literature Review

1. What is Teacher Immediacy?

Immediacy is an important component of communication and separated into two types: verbal and nonverbal. Immediacy could increase rapport between teachers and students. According to Anderson (2000), immediacy behaviors are actions that express positive feelings to another person. It simultaneously communicates warmth, involvement, psychological closeness, availability for communication and positive affect. Henning (2012) stated that teacher immediacy behaviors are beneficial in the classroom setting. Immediacy is a powerful tool for teachers to promote a great classroom climate (Kelly, Rice, Wyatt, Ducking & Denton, 2015; Myers & Knox, 2001). If a teacher is perceived as immediate, the students likely feel more comfortable to ask questions, interact with teachers, engage in learning more outside of class, and have the tendency to be fond of the teacher, the course, and even understand better the learning material (Christophel, 1990; Jaasma & Koper, 1999; Mottet, Parker-Raley, Cunningham, Beebe & Raffeld, 2006). As an English language teacher, communication is a key to assist students to become a better English language learner. Anxiety is often to be seen as the most crucial factor to hamper the language learners' outcome (Ballester, 2015; Liu & Jackson, 2008). A positive and peaceful classroom climate tends to lower students' anxiety level (Larsen-Freeman, 2011; Kelly et al., 2015). Krashen's affective filter hypothesis (1982, 1997) claims that the best language acquisition occurs in environments where anxiety is reduced. In other words, to build up and provide a learning environment where the affective filter is low is essential for a successful L2/FL learning. Moreover, immediacy often signals a positive desire and willingness to communicate. Teacher immediacy has been treated as an important component while learning the L2/FL, English, specifically in this study. Just imagine a group of students who have a high anxiety level sitting in a classroom where the teacher demonstrates these positive immediacy behaviors. What significant impact can be expected? It can be predicated that anxious students would lower their apprehension; therefore they will be more likely to seek out communication with their English teachers. Studies showed that Asian students have a higher anxiety level when using English in the classroom, and are much less willing to participate in the classroom (Cheng, Horwitz & Schallert, 1999; Liu, 2001). Moreover, students who have a higher level of anxiety tend to perceive themselves as less competent and have lower self-confidence as language learners (Cheng et al., 1999; Messman & Jones-Corley, 2001). Teachers who demonstrate immediacy behaviors could effectively decrease students' anxiety for a more fruitful learning outcome (Ballester, 2015; Kelly & Westerman, 2014). Put another way, no matter a NEST or non-NEST, it is vital to create a comfortable learning climate in the classroom for decreasing students' anxiety by presenting more immediacy behaviors.

2. Verbal Immediacy and Nonverbal Immediacy

Verbal immediacy refers to behaviors such as using humor, giving praise, willingness to give self-disclosure, providing feedback, calling students by name, engaging in conversation with students before and after class, and using collective pronouns (e.g., "we" and "our") (Gorham, 1988; Rocca, 2007). Nonverbal immediacy includes volume, movement, smiling, time, forward leaning, facial expression, touch, environment, vocal expressiveness, and eye contact (Richmond, Lane & McCroskey, 2006; Thomas-Maddox, 2003). Both immediacy behaviors are seen as a powerful tool for creating and enhancing a positive classroom climate. Wilson (2015) in "Promoting Peaceful Classrooms," provided many other research finding links to confirm that teacher immediacy has been related to student motivation, cognitive learning, and perception of the learning process. Also, students have a more positive attitude and give a better evaluation to their teachers who exhibit immediacy behaviors.

3. NESTs versus non-NESTs

Medgyes (1994) described the differences between NESTs and non-NESTs from four aspects: 1) own use of English, 2) general attitude, 3) attitude to teaching the language, and 4) attitude to teaching culture. In other words, NESTs and non-NESTs differ in terms of language proficiency and teaching behaviors. However, they can be equally good English language teachers on their own terms (Arva & Medgyes, 2000). Generally speaking, Braine (1999) stated NESTs tend to use English more confidently while non-NESTs use English less confidently. NESTs are less empathetic, less committed but more casual; on the contrary, non-NESTs are more empathetic, stricter, and more committed. On the aspect of teaching attitude, NESTs are less insightful whereas non-NESTs are more insightful. NESTs focus on fluency and oral skills, but non-NESTs focus on accuracy and grammar rules. NESTs tend to supply more cultural information but non-NESTs provide less cultural input while teaching. In summation, NESTs are seen to be the ideal model for language production and they are appreciated as repositories of cultural information. Conversely, non-NESTs are seen to have poor pronunciation, imperfect pragmatic comprehension, and inferior knowledge about foreign cultures (Walkinshaw & Oanh, 2014). Being different is not wrong or shameful, but there can be no argument that NESTs and non-NESTs do have many differences regarding their teaching approaches and interaction with students.

4. Relationship between Immediacy and Culture

Culture is a critical element of teachers' communication because the way they communicate is a product of their culture and culture is the primary source of interpersonal behavior (Andersen, 2000; Andersen, Andersen & Lustig, 1987; Nasr, Booth, & Gillett, 1996). Teachers' levels of immediacy differ according to their culture (Nasr et al., 1996).

Communication style is formed and influenced by the philosophical foundations and value systems in each different culture (Yum, 2000). In other words, teacher classroom communication behaviors and styles are affected by the culture they embrace. Alston and He (1997) state vital differences in communication styles exist between Asian and American cultures and these differences extend into the classroom (Hofstede, 1980, 1986). While there has been a great amount of literature and studies assessing the factors that could enhance students' English acquisition, not much has been written regarding the teachers' immediacy that places an emphasis on teacher's cultural background. Unquestionably, fewer studies particularly examine these two types of English teachers, NESTs and non-NESTs, in the English industry in Taiwan. With these perspectives in mind, this present study aimed to explore NESTs and non-NESTs and their immediacy while teaching. Since assumptions are often made, that is, NESTs tend to be more vivid and confident while teaching, is it indisputable that NESTs demonstrate more immediacy than non-NESTs? This study was conducted by giving many hours of classroom observation on both types of English teachers, hoping to clarify and answer the questions in many English educators, administrators, and parents' mind. Also, this study results may provide the English teaching-and-learning industry another viewpoint, especially on teacher immediacy. The findings may interpret NESTs and non-NESTs and their immediacy behavior in the classroom from a brand-new perspective. This present study tried to explore whether NESTs demonstrate more immediacy behaviors than non-NESTs or vice versa.

III. Methodology

1. Participants

Twelve participants participated in this study. Six NESTs (4 males, 2 females) and six non-NESTs (2 males, 4 females) voluntarily allowed the researcher to observe their immediacy behaviors while teaching. Eight out of twelve participants, 67%, were from the Department of Applied English in a central Taiwan University, and the other four participants, 33%, were from a Bu Shi Ban (local private English language school). Two out of six non-NESTs were from a Bu Shi Ban and both were female. One male and one female NEST were from a Bu Shi Ban. In order to avoid any bias, only Bu Shi Ban teachers teaching college level students were observed. This study didn't require the participants to provide their age. Their age range was around 25 to 45, according to the researcher's understanding. All participants had at least five years of teaching experience. Subjects they were teaching included: Linguistics, English Composition, Western Literature, English Conversation, English Reading, Meeting Presentation, Tourism English, and English-Chinese Interpretation.

2. Procedure

Before the researcher conducted the classroom observation, a bilingual invitation letter was sent to all twenty-four potential participants. In the end, only twelve, or 50%, were willing to be observed. All participants were fully aware of this study's main purpose— to observe their classroom immediacy behaviors, both verbal and nonverbal behaviors while teaching. There were four senior students who were trained to observe these participants' immediacy behaviors. As it was part of their senior project, this was the reason why senior students did this classroom observation and note-taking.   Second, taking into consideration the classroom culture in Taiwan, the researcher concluded it would be more comfortable for teachers to be observed by students rather than the researcher herself. It took a little longer than two weeks to get teachers' permission to enter their classroom to observe their classes. In order to observe the frequency of demonstrating immediacy behaviors accurately and effectively, a detailed observation form was designed by the author. The participant was given a code number: F1-F6 for NESTs and C1-C6 for non-NESTs. Each time they observed the participant demonstrate the listed immediacy behavior (verbal and/or nonverbal), they would make a check on the sheet prepared. Observation was done on all of the twelve participating teachers over a period of 2 months by 2 or 3 different observers at different times. Each observation time lasted an hour by one single observer. So, each participant was being observed twice or three times by two to three observers for approximately 2 to 3 hours. Then, the number of times each participant demonstrated a certain behavior was tabulated; the data was organized and interpreted. Finally, the data was computed by using Excel to examine the frequency of each immediacy behavior demonstrated by each participant.

3. Advantages of Classroom Observation

As Merriam (1988) stated, classroom observation is the most desirable technique for carrying out a research. Using this method, a researcher can obtain first-hand information effectively. Three features need to be taken into consideration when using classroom observation to collect data. First, watch what people do. Then, listen to what they say. Third, ask them questions if something needs to be clarified (Gillham, 2000). Additionally, Cohn, Kottkamp, and Provenzo (1987, p.81) described that classrooms are "dynamic and complex physical, social, intellectual and personal environments characterized by innumerable interactions and multiple layers of meaning." Also, they put emphasis on a researcher looking for as many different sources of information as possible in order to gain insight into the nature of setting and the phenomenon being observed (Cohn et al., 1987).

4. Observation Detailed Items

Teacher verbal immediacy behaviors were adopted from Gorham's study (1988). There

are 17 items, and for the purpose of making an accurate and efficient observation, the author divided these 17 behaviors into 4 categories: Teaching pattern, wording pattern, class interactive pattern, and extracurricular interaction with students. Teacher nonverbal immediacy behaviors were adopted from Richmond, Gorhan and McCroskey's study (1987). Fourteen items were divided into 4 categories for precise classroom observation purposes. They are: Intonation, movement, posture, and facial expressions. Immediacy verbal and nonverbal behaviors measurement scales have shown a consistent high reliability, ranging from .89 to .94, from previous studies (Christophel, 1990; Hsu, 2008; Rocca; 2001). The validity was also confirmed to be strong and solid (Rubin, Palmgreen & Sypher, 1994). This study aimed to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: What are the differences between NESTs and non-NESTs regarding verbal immediacy behaviors ?

RQ2: What are the differences between NESTs and non-NESTs regarding nonverbal immediacy behaviors ?

IV. Findings

The purpose of the study is to explore whether NESTs demonstrate more verbal and/or nonverbal immediacy behaviors than non-NESTs. After making a well-designed classroom observation, the data indicated that both types of English teachers have their unique strength and potential weakness. The outcome of this research is divided into four sections to discuss the frequency of teachers' verbal and nonverbal immediacy behaviors and their influence on four aspects. In order to answer research question one, "What are the differences between NESTs and non-NESTs regarding verbal immediacy behaviors?" Table 1 and 2 give the details.

In the first two categories, "teaching pattern" and "wording pattern", both types of English teachers demonstrate the same degree of "use humor in class", 50%. Though the frequency of calling teachers' first name in this observation was not high, 6 times only, still, students tend to call NESTs first names more than non- NESTs. In the remaining items non-NESTS actually demonstrated more verbal behaviors of "teaching pattern and wording pattern." The details were shown in the Table 1.

Table 1. NESTs versus non-NESTs Regarding Teaching and Wording Pattern

Verbal Behaviors	NESTs	non-NESTs
A. Teaching Pattern		
/Uses humor in class	59 (50%)	59 (50%)
/Praises students' work, actions or comments	42 (37%)	72 (63%)
B. Wording Pattern		
/Addresses students by name	42 (34%)	83 (66%)
/Addresses me by name	16 (70%)	7 (30%)
/Is addressed by his/her first name by the students	6 (100%)	0 (0%)
/Refers to class as "our" class or what "we" are doing	30 (48%)	32 (52%)

The frequency of verbal immediacy behaviors appeared in two other categories, "class interactive pattern and extracurricular interaction with students," while NESTs put more emphasis on most of them. But non-NESTs gave more attention on "asking questions to encourage students to talk," "getting into discussions based on students' questions," and demonstrated fewer times on one particular non-immediate verbal behavior, "calls on students to answer question even if they are not ready." In the category of "extracurricular interaction with students," NESTs excelled non-NESTs in all aspects. Table 2 presented the results.

Table 2. NESTs versus non-NESTs Regarding Class Interactive Pattern, and Extracurricular Interaction with Students

Verbal Behaviors	NESTs	non-NESTs
C. Class Interactive Pattern		
/Uses personal examples or talks about experiences.	32 (60%)	21 (40%)
/Asks questions or encourages students to talk.	59 (34%)	115 (66%)
/Provides feedback on students' individual work.	36 (51%)	34 (49%)
/Gets into discussions based on students' questions.	12 (28%)	31 (72%)
/Calls on students to answer question even if they are not ready. (R)	50 (62%)	30 (38%)
/Asks how students feel about an assignment and due date.	27 (53%)	24 (47%)
/Asks questions that solicit viewpoints.	40 (55%)	33 (45%)
D. Extracurricular Interaction with Students		
/Gets into conversations with individual students before or after class.	19 (86%)	3 (14%)
/Initiates conversations with me before, after or outside of class.	12 (75%)	4 (25%)
/Has discussions about things unrelated to class with individual students or with the class as a whole.	22 (92%)	2 (8%)

/Invites students to telephone or meet outside of class if they have questions.	6 (100%)	0 (0%)

Note. (R) indicates reverse coding as non-immediate behavior

To answer research question two, "What are the differences between NESTs and non-NESTs regarding nonverbal immediacy behaviors?", four categories of teachers' nonverbal behaviors were observed.   As for nonverbal teacher immediacy behaviors, the first two categories, "intonation and movement," both types of teachers have their strengths and weaknesses. In the "intonation" category, non-NESTs actually demonstrated two contradicting behaviors; they demonstrated more non-immediate behaviors "uses monotone/dull voice," but meanwhile they also provided more emphasis on giving "variety of focal expression, " (86% and 61%). In the "movement" category, "moves around the classroom" is the only item to be seen as an immediate behavior, but the other three items are non-immediate behaviors. Both NESTs and non-NESTs shared the same degree or frequency of "standing behind podium or desk while teaching." NESTs showed more frequency on "sits behind desk," 87% whereas non-NESTs showed more on "sits on a desk or in a chair while teaching" 75%. Table 3 and 4 displayed the results.

Table 3. NESTs versus non-NESTs Regarding Intonation and Movement

Nonverbal Behaviors	NESTs	non-NESTs
A. Intonation		
/Uses monotone/dull voice when talking to the class(R)	8 (14%)	49 (86%)
/Uses a variety of vocal expression when talking to the class	57 (39%)	89 (61%)
B. Movement		
/Sits behind desk while teaching(R)	7 (87%)	1(13%)
/Sits on a desk or in a chair while teaching(R)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)
/Stands behind podium or desk while teaching(R)	48 (50%)	48 (50%)
/Moves around the classroom while teaching	55 (54%)	46 (46%)

Note. (R) indicates reverse coding as non-immediate behavior

Regarding two other nonverbal teacher immediacy behaviors, "posture and facial expression," non-NESTs made more gestures and tended to have a relaxed body position. Ninety-five percent of NESTs tend to have tense body position while teaching; however, they demonstrated more friendly interactions, 90%, such as patting students' shoulder or shaking hands with students. In the category of "facial expressions", non-NESTs tend to "look at board or notes while talking to the class" (80%) more than NESTs, (20 %). The non-NESTs give many more nonverbal immediacy behaviors while talking to the class, such as "looking at the students, smiling to the class, and smiling at individual students." Details are indicated in Table 4.

Table 4. NESTs versus non-NESTs on Posture and Facial Expressions

Nonverbal Behaviors	NESTs	non-NESTs
C. Posture		
/Gestures while talking to the class	52 (39%)	80 (61%)
/Has a very tense body position while talking to the class(R)	9 (95%)	1 (5%)
/Touches students in the class (such as patting on the shoulder, shaking hands etc.)	18 (90%)	1 (10%)
/Has a relaxed body position while talking to the class	60 (39%)	95 (61%)
D. Facial Expressions		
/Looks at board or notes while talking to the class (R)	17 (20%)	67 (80%)
/Looks at the class while talking	75 (33%)	152 (67%)
/Smiles at the class while talking	55 (26%)	153 (74%)
/Smiles at individual students in the class	44 (41%)	64 (59%)

Note. (R) indicates reverse coding as non-immediate behavior

V. Discussions

Surprisingly, the findings of this study didn't show that non-NESTs presented poorly in utilizing immediacy while teaching, on the other hand, NESTs didn't thoroughly cover all aspects of demonstrating immediacy, verbal and nonverbal. Educators and administrators in the Taiwan English-teaching-learning industry, could consider reevaluating NESTs and non-NESTs teaching demonstration and productivity from this study's results.

As expected, on the aspect of verbal immediacy, NESTs, without doubt, perform better than non-NESTs due to their superior language proficiency. NESTs tend to more frequently ask questions to students to solicit viewpoints, (55% vs. 45%). NESTs take the initiative to interact with students before or after class in the category of "extracurricular interaction with students." Four particular behaviors all surpass non-NESTs (75%-100%). A rational deduction can be made that most NESTs teach oral classes or non-conversational classes; so therefore, students may approach them before or after class in order to practice their oral skills. Another possible reason is, believe it or not, most students see their NESTs as an authority figure, and therefore don't feel that comfortable to talk to them before or after class. There are many more interesting features that caught the author's attention. In addition, these results just are consistent with related literature review support. For instance, NESTs would "address me by name" compare to non-NESTs (70% vs. 30%) and "refers to class as 'our' or 'we'," less than non-NESTs (48% vs. 52%). Unraveling the reason for this phenomenon is not hard. NESTs embraced a culture that places more emphasis on individualism whereas non-NESTs tend to focus on collectivism (Hsu, 2012; Skow & Stephan, 2000). This mentality extends to classroom interaction, and therefore, "wording pattern" has different implications to NESTs. Meanwhile, the data indicated that non-NESTs would "address students by name," twice as

much as NESTs (66% vs. 34%). This result could be interpreted that non-NESTs pay more attention to memorizing students' name so they could demonstrate verbal immediacy behaviors and further impact students' affective learning. One other interesting phenomenon shows that students would address teachers' by their first name, 100% (NESTs) vs. 0% (non-NESTs). Clearly, this is also influenced by cultural differences. Western culture, where most NESTs are from, would encourage students to address them by their first name to enhance closeness, but not in Asian culture. In most Asia countries, students usually address teachers by their surnames with their professional titles to show respect. Lastly, non-NESTs "praise student's work, actions or comments" more than NESTs (63% vs. 37%). They also "ask questions or encourage students to talk," and "gets into discussion based on students' question" (66% & 72%). This highlights a key point that non-NESTs thoroughly understand the struggle of learning a foreign language. Furthermore, non-NESTs seem to be more observant if students are ready to answer a question or not, they tend to be less non-immediate when it comes to asking questions while teaching. Therefore, it could be concluded that non-NESTs demonstrated more empathy than NESTs. It is crucial that parents and administrators should not overlook these features demonstrated by non-NESTs.

In this current study, non-NESTS seem to pay more emphasis on nonverbal immediacy. In the category of "intonation", unexpectedly, NESTs didn't seem to present any more professionally than non-NESTs. The observers' perspective may be due to individual personality, a gender issue, or the course they were teaching. On the other hand, many non-NESTs in Taiwan have received their graduate studies or professional training overseas, so their intonation of speaking English isn't as poor as before. Another possible reason to cause this outcome might be more foreign participants are males, and males usually speak lowly, so it isn't that clear to the students. Also, students were observing and evaluating native speakers, but they were more used to listening to non-NESTs speaking English than NEST, therefore the result turned out to be this way. However, regarding movement, as expected, NESTs did a little more moving around while teaching, 55% vs. 46% (non-NESTs). Both type of teachers shared the same degree of "standing behind podium or desk while teaching," 50%. Non-NESTs would "sit behind desk while teaching," 87% and non-NESTs would "sit on a desk or in a chair while teaching," 75%. In addition, in a clear description of these two behaviors by the classroom observer on "sits behind a desk", NESTs were observed coming forward to the front row or empty desk and leaning or sitting there to demonstrate a more approachable nonverbal behavior to the students. However, "sit on a desk or in a chair", they have observed non-NESTs mainly sitting "in a chair" while teaching, and seldom observed non-NESTs "sit on a desk." This phenomenon can be explained that the cultural impact is still very evident in the classroom teaching approach. Non-NESTs may feel it is too casual to sit on a desk. They may also see this particular behavior as inappropriate or lacking seriousness. Both types of teachers interpret approachable behaviors in a different way.

110

However, it is essential to remind all English teachers that all these behaviors are considered as non-immediacy behaviors (Sanders & Wiseman, 1990). As Sanders and Wiseman (1990) stated a non-immediacy behavior conveys lack of enthusiasm and expressiveness, teachers who demonstrated so-called non-immediacy behaviors might provide low eye contact, a tense body position, inappropriate posture, leaning forward or backward on the podium, and the absence of smiling and lack of interaction with the students.

Except for "sitting behind desk," "moving around the classroom," and "touching students, such as patting them on the shoulder, shaking hands," NESTs overtake non-NESTs in one other behavior, "has a very tense body position," (95% vs. 5%). This result did confuse the author. Why do NESTs demonstrate a tense body position? Shouldn't they be more confident in speaking their native language? After thinking this over, the author came up with a sound interpretation, that is, the four male foreigners who participated in this study are more introverted persons. While being observed they may not feel that comfortable, therefore, the observers perceived them as more tense. In contrast, non-NESTs demonstrated "a relaxed body position," (61% vs. 39%). Moreover, they provided more facial expression, such as, looked at the class or smiled at the class. All in all, this tells us that non-NESTs in Taiwan actually give an adequate immediacy while teaching. This approach surely has a great impact on students' learning. Non-NESTs certainly have no reason to feel inferior while teaching English. The reason is, a good English teacher requires much more than simply speaking native English (or so-called standard English). Though the result of this study NESTs seemed to perform better on verbal immediacy whereas non-NESTs excelled in many more nonverbal immediacy behaviors. It would be biased to conclude that one group is better than another. English educators, both NESTs and non-NESTs should learn together, grow together, and continue striving to become a better English teacher.

VI. Limitations and Suggestions

This study investigated teacher immediacy behaviors of both NESTs and non-NESTs. The findings of this study provide English education a great new insight especially for non-English speaking countries' English teachers, in particular Taiwan. Four limitations in this study should not be neglected. First, though four observers received a fair amount of training, their objectivity could be questionable. Their own culture may affect their interpretation of these teachers' immediacy behaviors. Their sensitivity during classroom observation and note-taking could have caused them to omit key points; therefore possible misinterpretations might be included in the findings. Another limitation could be found in the length of observation time being too short to conclude completely accurate results, and furthermore result in an unfair explanation. If participants could be observed for a longer period of time, it might result in a more accurate assessment of their immediacy behaviors. Third, the sample size of twelve teachers being observed may not be enough and skew the

study's outcome. Also, different subjects may require different teaching approaches and further affect the observation outcome, not to mention, participants were teaching at two different classroom settings—regular classrooms and Bu Shi Ban. Last, participants who participated in this study, particularly, NESTs are not extroverted people; therefore this study results can't generalize all NESTs in Taiwan.

Future research should pay special attention to allotting adequate time for classroom observation. Another consideration could be to use only one well-trained researcher or an expert to do all observation. Video-taping and recording should be considered while doing classroom observation if this type of research is to be duplicated elsewhere. Lastly, future research should consider using another immediacy behaviors questionnaire that was constructed from a Chinese perspective and it may be more appropriate for Taiwanese who shared similar culture (Zhang & Oetzel, 2006).

References

Allen, M., Witt, P. L., & Wheeless, L. R. (2006). The role of teacher immediacy as a motivational factor in student learning: Using meta-analysis to test a causal model. *Communication Education, 55*, 21-31. doi: 10.1080/03634520500343368

Alston, J. P., & He, S. Y. (1997). *Business guide to modern China*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Andersen, P. (2000). *Cues of culture: The basis of intercultural differences in nonverbal communication*. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader, (9th ed., pp. 258-270). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Andersen, J. F., Andersen, P.A., & Lustig, M. W. (1987). Opposite-sex touch avoidance: A national replication and extension. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, II*, 89-109.

Arva, V., & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System, 28*, 355-372.

Ballester, E. P. (2015). Verbal and nonverbal teacher immediacy and foreign language anxiety in an EFL university course. *Porta Linguarum 23*, enero 2015, 9-24.

Braine, G. (Ed.) (1999). *Non-native Educator in English Language Teaching*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cheng, Y.S., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning, 49*, 417-446.

Chesebro, J. L. (2003). Effects of teacher clarity and nonverbal immediacy on student learning, receiver apprehension, and affect. *Communication Education, 52*, 135-147. DOI: 10.1080/03634520302471

Christophel, D. M. (1990). The relationships among teacher immediacy behaviors, student motivation, and learning. *Communication Education, 39*, 323-340.

Clark, E., & Paran, A. (2007). The employability of non-native-speaker teachers of EFL: A UK survey. *System, 35*, 407-430.

Cohn, M.M., Kottkamp, R.B., & Provenzo, E.F. (1987). *To be a teacher: Cases, concepts, observation guides*. New York, NY: Random House.

Frymier, A. B., & Houser, M. L. (2000). The teacher-student relationship as an interpersonal relationship. *Communication Education, 49*, 207-219.

Gillham, B. (2000). *Case study research methods*. Oxford, UK: Bloomsbury Academic.

Gorham, J. (1988). The relationship between verbal teacher immediacy behaviors and student learning. *Communication Education, 37*, 40-53.

Henning, Z. T. (2012). From barnyards to learning communities: Student perceptions of teachers' immediacy behaviors. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication, 13 (1)*, 37-43.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequence: International differences in work-related values.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1986). Cultural differences in teaching and learning. International *Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10*, 301-320.

Hsu, L. (2008). The impact of teacher immediacy on students' affective learning in English classes. *Journal of General Education, National Taichung Institute of Technology, 2*, 141-158.

Hsu, L. (2010). The impact of perceived teachers' nonverbal immediacy on students' motivation for learning English. *Asian EFL Journal, Special Issue, 12 (4)*, 189-205.

Hsu, L. (2011). Similarities and Differences between Traditional and Nontraditional Students in Regard to Demand for Teacher Immediacy. *Languages, Literary Studies and International Studies: An International Journal,8*, 129-150.

Hsu, L. (2012). Causes of student unwillingness to talk in English classes. *Journal of the National Taichung Institute of Technology, 16*, 99-112.

Hsu, L. (2014). English teachers' misbehaviors in relation to students' classroom participation. *Proceedings of 2014 Humanities and Creativity Practical Applied Academic Conference*, Hsiuping University of Science and Technology, 85-94.

Jaasma, M. A. & Koper, R. J. (1999). The relationship of student-faculty out-of-class communication to teacher immediacy and trust and to student motivation. *Communication Education, 48*, 1, 41-48.

Kelly, S., Rice, C., Wyatt, B., Ducking, J., & Denton, Z. (2015). Teacher Immediacy and Decreased Student Quantitative Reasoning Anxiety: The Mediating Effect of Perception. *Communication Education, 64 (2)*, 171-186, doi:10.1080/03634523.2015.1014383

Kelly, S., & Westerman, C. Y. K. (2014) Immediacy as an influence on supervisor-subordinate communication. *Communication Research Reports, 31*, 252-261. doi:10.1080/08824096.2014.924335

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.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd edition). Oxford University Press.

Liu, M., & Jackson, J. (2008). An exploration of Chinese EFL learners' unwillingness to communicate and foreign language anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal, 92*, 71-86.

Liu, J. (2001). *Asian students' classroom communication patterns in U. S. Universities: An emic perspective.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Medgyes, P. (1994). *The Non-Native Teacher*. London: Macmillan Publishers.

Merriam, R.E. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San

Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Messman, S. J., & Jones-Corley, J. (2001). Effects of communication environment, immediacy, and communication apprehension on cognitive and affective learning. *Communication Monographs, 68*, 184-200.

Mottet, T. P., Parker-Raley, J., Cunningham, C., Beebe, S. A., & Raffeld, P. C. (2006). Testing the neutralizing effect of teacher immediacy on student course workload expectancy violations and tolerance for teacher unavailability. *Communication Education, 55*, 147-166.

Myers, S. A., & Knox, R. L. (2001). The relationship between college student information-seeking behaviors and perceived teacher verbal behaviors. *Communication Education, 50*, 343-356.

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

NTCUST (2015, July). *Sources of Application Division*. Taiwan: Taichung City.

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., Lane, D. R., & McCroskey, J. C. (2006). *Teacher immediacy and the teacher-student relationship*. In T. Mottet, V. Richmond & J. McCroskey (Eds.), Handbook of instructional communication: Rhetorical and relational perspectives (pp. 167-193). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Rocca, K. (2007). Immediacy in the classroom: Research and practical implications. *Communication Education, 50*, 283-297.

Rocca, K.A. (2001, November). *Participation in the college classroom: The impact of instructor immediacy and verbal aggression*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 461899)

Rubin, R. B., Palmgreen, P., & Sypher, H. E. (1994). *Communication Research Measures: A sourcebook*. New York: The Guilford Press.

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, 3*9, 341-353.

Skow, L. M., & Stephan, L. (2000). *Intercultural communication in the university classroom*. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader, (9th ed., pp.355-370). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Thomas-Maddox, C. (2003). Creating perceptions of closeness in the classroom: Exploring the concept of nonverbal immediacy. *Communication Teacher, 17,* 3-15.

Wilson, J. (2015). *Promoting Peaceful Classrooms—Teacher Immediacy*. Retrieved July 31, 2015, from http://www2.webster.edu/~woolflm/PPCteacherimmed.html

Walkinshaw, I., & Oanh, D. H. (2014). Native and non-native English language teachers: Student perception in Vietnam and Japan. *SAGE Open*, 1-9.

Yum, J. O. (2000). *The impact of Confucianism on interpersonal relationship and communication pattern in East Asia*. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader, (9th ed., pp.63-73). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Zhang, Q., & Oetzel, J. (2006). Constructing and Validating a TeacherImmediacy Scale: A Chinese Perspective. *Communication Education, 55(2)*, 218-241, doi: 10.1080/03634520600566231