

2018

THE STUDY OF MULTICULTURAL STUDENTS PERCEPTION OF PROFESSORS' NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR IN THE CLASSROOM

Jacqueline Britto
University of Rhode Island, JacquieBritto@yahoo.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Britto, Jacqueline, "THE STUDY OF MULTICULTURAL STUDENTS PERCEPTION OF PROFESSORS' NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR IN THE CLASSROOM" (2018). *Open Access Master's Theses*. Paper 1433.
<https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses/1433>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

THE STUDY OF MULTICULTURAL STUDENTS PERCEPTION OF
PROFESSORS' NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR IN THE CLASSROOM

BY

JACQUELINE BRITTO

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

COMMUNICATION STUDIES

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

2018

MASTER OF ARTS
THESIS
OF
JACQUELINE BRITTO

APPROVED:

Thesis Committee:

Major Professor Rachel L. DiCioccio

Guo-Ming Chen

John McCray, Jr.

Nasser H. Zawia
DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
2018

ABSTRACT

This study examined Nonverbal communication which consists of construction of meaning via non-word codes that are comprised of various forms such as intrinsic, iconic, and arbitrary. Intercultural communication occurs when there is communication within cultures. When considering environment, culture can have an influence. However, culture is not principally geographical, political, or racial. Culture is behaviors, perceptions and values that are learned and passed on from one group to another. Higher education is essential when it comes to producing economic growth and stability. In the US, the multicultural student population in higher education has been challenged with student affective learning and immediacy as a result of professors' nonverbal behavior. Diversity within US colleges and universities is not reflective of the community around it. This problem is large and deep, and research can help to discover some of the important issues as well as possible solutions. Identifying which non-verbal behaviors juxtaposed with intercultural communication impact student desire to learn will help professors and students to build their communication skills. All students are impacted by professors' nonverbal behaviors such as prima facial expressions, kinesics, haptics, vocalics, proxemics, physical appearance and chronemics. The study was to find which nonverbal behaviors professors exhibit and and how they impact multicultural students learning in the classroom. Data collected from 157 undergraduate students at the University of Rhode Island was quantitatively and qualitatively analyzed. The research survey instrument was distributed in person to a diverse student population. It contained behavioral questions that address "how we say what we say" as well as

“what is done while teaching” within a Likert scale survey. Over 40% of students indicated that nonverbal behaviors that a professor exhibits that can be considered positive are from the facial primacy and kinesics area. Whereas 41.7% of students indicated that they experienced both nonverbal behaviors from the facial primacy and kinesics area. Student perception of nonverbal behaviors scale had 24 questions with a reliability statistic that is considered reliable. Student’s perception of professors’ nonverbal behavior had a reliability statistic of .816

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis was successfully completed because of unreserved support, firm dedication, prudent guidance, and tenacious patience of my major professor, thesis committee, husband, family and friends.

First and foremost, I must thank my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ for being my guiding light throughout this journey.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my major professor Dr. Rachel DiCioccio for her expertise, support, and guidance with this research. As well as her delightful timely humor that always brightened by day and put a smile on my face. I am thankful for my committee members Dr. Guo Ming Chen, for inspiration and guidance with identifying my interest in nonverbal communication and Dr. John McCray Jr. for his support and confidence in me with writing this thesis. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Ye and Dr. Leatham for guiding me with the quantitative analysis for this thesis. I am indebted to both of them for their time and expertise in data analysis and SPSS. I would not have been able to complete any analysis without their help. Words can not express my gratitude for their time and help.

I am thankful for my prayer partners from Canada who encouraged me at the times I needed it most.

Finally, I must thank my mother Jean Duckworth for the determination and encouragement she has instilled in me through the years to get my education. Next, my wonderful husband David Britto who stood by me through this journey, and because of his proposal, I have had the opportunity to attend URI. Lastly, my sisters

Donna Dickson and Sabrina Duckworth, who always supported me as no one else could.

My thesis is dedicated to my mother, Jean Duckworth, my motivator. I love you mom! My mother has always encouraged me to get my education, starting from when I was a young child. Thanks mom, because of you, I continue to push towards my spiritual and educational goals. You have taught me to never give up and to never let anyone intimidate me. I am grateful that you have infused in me such high standards of achievement. I will always love and appreciate you. Without the help of each person that has been mentioned I would not have been able to learn, grow and complete my thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2	4
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
CHAPTER 3	23
METHODOLOGY	23
CHAPTER 4	29
FINDINGS	29
CHAPTER 5	35
CONCLUSION	35
APPENDICES	42
BIBLIOGRAPHY	47

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
Table 1. Nonverbal Behavior Recoded	27
Table 2. Positive Nonverbal Behavior	31
Table 3. Negative Non-verbal Behavior	31
Table 4. Descriptive Statistics	32
Table 5. Learning Loss.....	33
Table 6. Correlations	33
Table 7. Ethnicity Descriptive.....	34

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Communication is an essential component for all areas of life and business. Nonverbal communication consists of construction of meaning via non-word codes which are comprised of various forms such as intrinsic, iconic, and arbitrary. Intrinsic prompts consist of behaviors that have a relationship to naturally common signals. Iconic prompts are behaviors that originate from a natural foundation but are exercised with purpose. Last, arbitrary prompts originate from a social or cultural unit to provide meaning specifically for that group. This study will most likely be affected by arbitrary cues which can be considered as symbols that are created within a social or cultural group that provide meaning to said group.

Interpersonal nonverbal communication behavior prompts/cues exhibit seven forms which are **facial expressions, kinesics, haptics, vocalics, proxemics, physical appearance and chronemics**. *Facial primacy* also considered *facial expressions* is the most influential form of communication it consists of levels of expressiveness which indicate what an individual may be communicating as well as aid in evaluating what that person may be like. *Kinesics* deals with any actions that are done with the body such as the way an individual may sit, walk, gesture, shake hands, and/or positions' the body when communicating with others. Using the body to communicate a message instead of words is referred to as emblems ex. Waving hello. An emblems' meaning is constructed by a culture such as greetings or profanity.

Gestures can also be used as illustrators or regulators. Within the kinesics behavior there is a special area called *haptics* that deals with touch, both its meaning and influence. The meaning that individuals assign to touch is based on duration, location and strength. The next means that is utilized to perform interpersonal communication is *vocalics* and/or paralanguage which includes rate, pitch, character, volume and quantity of variation used in speaking. This also includes the use of silence and/or non-word sound such as grunts, groans, and laughter which could be considered as an alternative for words. Some scholars believe this is important because understanding vocal cues can aid in determining if a message's meaning should be viewed as literal or something else. Such as when one says "I'm sorry".

The next four cues are different in nature than the previous. The usage of personal space is called *proxemics*. Cultures and ethnic groups have varying perspectives about power and relationships based on the use of distance/zones which consists of four sizes. Communication with others can be affected by differing areas of *physical features* such as skin/hair color, body form, clothing selection, and unique physical characteristics which also influence perception and/or personal judgements. Perception of physical features may not always be correct, but they are influential. *Chronemics*/time consists of time rules (how late to arrive), rhythms (body cycles) and activity performance (quantity) this can also indicate preference as a result of time expended with someone or frequency of interaction. *Physical environment* is similar yet different to the previous cues when considering communication. Noise level, physical structure, temperature and color of environment could affect communication. Rules for talk are governed by an individual's knowledge of their environment.

Intercultural communication occurs when there is communication within cultures. When considering environment, culture can have some influence. However, culture is not principally geographical, political, or racial. Griffin indicates that “a socially constructed and historically transmitted pattern of symbols, meanings, premises, and rule, at root, culture is a code” (Griffin, 2009). According to Geert Hofstede, cultures can be compared by four crucial dimensions: 1) Power distance — deals with how power distribution is accepted within society; 2) Masculinity — how sex roles are defined based on male values of success, money and other dominant society factors; 3) Uncertainty avoidance — the degree to which people believe a threat due to ambiguity; 4) Individualism — the degree to which one looks out for them-self versus group loyalty. This distinction between individualism and collectivism according to Hofstede is considered a crucial dimension of cultural variability and is based on message interpretation due to coding. Therefore, it is believed that “meaning is embedded in the setting and the nonverbal code” (Griffin, 2009). This study considers the relationship between nonverbal, interpersonal and intercultural communication as well as the code’s message interpretation and meaning’s effect on students learning.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter reviews intercultural and nonverbal communication and its relationship with immediacy and students cognitive learning in the classroom. Immediacy and intercultural communication consists of both verbal and nonverbal, however, nonverbal will be the central focus of this section. Nonverbal communication is one of the key areas of communication and therefore this section will emphasize its impact on immediacy, interpersonal and intercultural communication.

Nonverbal Communication

Judee Bergoon is one of the scholars who believes that nonverbal communication is always present and as a result, one cannot not communicate. Whereas, Woolfolk and Brooks, 1983 provide an equitable assumption that nonverbal behavior does not require “intentional sending or conscious receiving”. Additionally, they suggest that most individuals’ who observe nonverbal behavior are able to and often do make deductions about the behavior.

In this study the terms ‘nonverbal behavior’ and nonverbal communication’ will be used interchangeably due to our agreement with the definition “Nonverbal communication, then, could include all nonverbal behaviors that are involved in the transmission of experience or information from one person to another” provided by (Woolfolk & Brooks, 1983). It is necessary to take this notion into consideration with current cultural diversity within America and education. There are certain behaviors

that may or may not occur with student teacher interactions.

Woolfolk and Galloway, 1985 identified two methods for categorizing nonverbal communication research as “studies of individuals or studies of interactions”. The studying of individuals requires emphasis on the individual when in a non-educational setting and therefore tends to restrict to one “channel” of communication. Whereas, studying interactions takes into consideration the exchange of behaviors between two people, however, this requires the major assumption that it is impossible to understand one individuals’ behavior without considering the previous action and reaction of the other individual. Consideration of nonverbal behavior is imperative regardless of cue spontaneity. Galloway, 1968 purports both students and instructors' express behaviors that effect perception, and causes them to take the expressive state of the other as a valid exhibit of inner feelings and attitudes. This perception is important to consider because to misinterpret cues could promote incorrect interpretations which could inadvertently promote positive or negative outcomes. These behavioral exchanges could serve more than one function simultaneously.

Further Galloway, 1985 proposes that when considering gestures, every instructor irrespective of topic has the characteristic of relaying and receiving messages and said messages are conveyed to students via nonverbal behavior. A key point and oversight of instructors is that students receive unintentional information through their nonverbal behavior. Because it is typical for people to be unconscious of their awareness.

Additional contributions to nonverbal communication research is imperative to

enhance common vocabulary and to further enhance concepts that promote cue comparison across “empirical investigations and theoretical formulations” (Woolfolk & Galloway, 1985).

Non-Verbal Communication Misconceptions

Two nonverbal misconceptions that may affect this study state. According to Canary, Cody and Manusov, 2003 the following misconceptions exists:

1. “Nonverbal cues are largely natural, unintentional, and out of our control and awareness.
2. “Nonverbal cues make up a universal language and have cross-cultural consistency.”

There are numerous nonverbal behaviors that unconscious yet connected to uncontrollable, innate, intrinsic systems, and there are some nonverbal cues that controlled without difficulty. Situations arise where nonverbal cues are used intentionally such as nodding to show agreement. Many individuals attempt to send a consistent message with their body, this is called channel consistency which provides a credible message. However, channel discrepancy can occur when there appears to be different or conflicting messages as a result of language saying one thing and behavior or other things say something different.

The background for this research consisted of reviewing scholarly research articles that had various techniques and areas of focus similar to this thesis. However, though each article had some similarities with terminology, definitions, perspectives and results such as does immediacy affect cognitive learning, yet each provided some unique characteristic or approach to similar topics. This section of the thesis will first

review and sketch out the background on each article, then it will critically evaluate the current knowledge provided by the articles, and then it will identify the gaps.

Immediacy and Interpersonal vs Intercultural Communication

The term “immediacy” was indicated as the degree in which specific communication conduct enriches physical and psychological nearness. The nonverbal behaviors construct for immediacy consists of “forward body lean, eye contact, smiling, vocal expressiveness” (Rodriguez, Plax & Kearney, 1996, p. 294) and they signify and approach perception which indicates interpersonal closeness, approachability, they also give the impression of liking whereas non-immediacy behaviors give the impression of disliking.

Further the motivational learning model contends that students’ assert motivation is a contributory facilitator linking immediacy and learning. Therefore, according to this definition immediate teachers are the motivational factor in students studying and thus they cause students to learn. The affective learning model is the most stringent of the three models. It states that nonverbally immediate teachers are the cause of students heightened affirmative approach towards the subject and/or the teacher and as a result this promotes students cognitive learning ability.

The method section indicated that a correlational design was utilized to verify both affective learning and motivational models. Interactions were required to assess their instructor at the end of the class in which they were completing the survey components. Students were required to give standard demographic information, indicate teacher nonverbal immediacy, identify motivation, and affective and cognitive learning after midterm tests.

The literature review revealed that all articles believed that the basic concept of interpersonal communication in the classroom taking into consideration verbal, nonverbal and intercultural communication affects the classroom and students, specifically multicultural students. Within the notion of intercultural, the idea of multicultural consists of a non-white ethnicity or of mixing ethnicities such as White (Caucasian), Black, Hispanic and Asian. Furthermore, the literature revealed that the notion of immediacy is a prominent factor, because “immediacy” deals with the degree in which specific communication conduct enriches physical and psychological nearness. The articles discussed the relevance of immediacy within the classroom. As such the following information was indicated in each article.

Rodriguez, Plax, & Kearney (2009) contended for a teaching model that encouraged affective learning rather than indicating motivation as the focal factor linking teacher immediacy and student’s cognitive learning. To verify the validity of this relationship the surveys that were utilized measured teachers’ nonverbal immediacy and students stated motivation to both affective and cognitive learning.; Whereas, Neuliep (1995) proposed that immediacy was a positive factor on recognized cognitive learning by indicating that teacher immediacy consists of both verbal and nonverbal communication conveyed in a way to lower both physical and psychological gaps between teachers and students. Normal verbal immediacy behaviors consists’ of calling students by their names, using humor, beginning conversations with students prior to and after class, promoting questioning and class discussions. Normal nonverbal immediacy habits consist of smiling at the students, gesturing while teaching, utilizing classroom space by moving around as well as

utilizing various vocal expressions during conversations with the class;

Mottet, Parker-Raley, Beebe, and Cunningham (2007) focuses on nonverbal immediacy behaviors. However, it juxtaposed course-workload demands' and students views of professors' credibility. Specifically, this research assesses how professors' nonverbal immediacy behaviors can nullify a student's view of their professors' credibility as well as their higher-order affective learning when school assignment loads outweigh students' expectations.

Gendrin and Rucker (2004) attests that though communication scholars have researched cultural diversity within their learning environment understanding of the affect of teacher immediacy on student learning is not clear and not much is known about the influence of teacher immediacy in the African American college class; While Comstock, Rowell and Bowers (1995) research agrees that effective teachers are "warm, friendly, immediate, approachable, affiliative..." (Comstock, Rowell, & Bowers, 1995, p. 251) and they do encourage student learning which entails cognitive and affective behavioral changes.

However, Neuliep's 'call response' notion purports that this type of verbal and nonverbal language from African-Americans' develops and sustains the sense of community. Unrestrained interaction is crucial to the teaching-learning progression. Williams, Garza, Hodge & Breaux (1999) described the type of educators that have the greatest impact on students, which are they that are viewed as fascinating and dedicated to undergraduate education. Many communication theories that associate elevated stimulation with refraining patterns propose that high immediacy and high arousal are associated. Furthermore, some researchers suggested that substantially

immediate professors may mitigate instead of arouse learning.

Discussion on the arousal-valence model and discrepancy arousal model suggested that increased arousal would cause discomfort and compensatory reaction. Such as, lowered learners' participation in their own education which would result in a depressing effect on cognitive learning. Therefore, it was suggested that too much arousal hinders the learners' capacity to focus and sort out information. Consequently, a modest amount of stimulation is paramount. When considering teacher immediacy and affective learning, authors were doubtful with regards to express linear connections when comparing nonverbal immediacy, affective learning and student motivation

Sanders and Wiseman (1990) highlighted the importance of both verbal and nonverbal teacher immediacy, conversely, they somewhat distinguished themselves, by including students' cultural diversity/ethnicity. Booth-Butterfield and Noguchi (2000) confirmed three main ideas. The first two dealt with immediacy while the third injected an interesting component for consideration. The ideas are as follows: 1) professor nonverbal immediacy is viewed more as normal by American students than by international students. 2) American and International students have variations in their assessment of certain nonverbal immediacy behaviors, and 3) student gender was a factor in how students perceive certain behaviors. A review of cultural differences in nonverbal expectations proposed that depending on the positioning of cultural norm preferences, high or low immediacy, affective learning could be heightened due to professor performance.

Nevertheless, cultural diversity in communication behavior has been confirmed

by various research that has been conducted, a few examples are: when comparing Black, White and Hispanics and the type of communication that either considered fulfilling they are all drastically different. Each race had different perspectives of communication, Hispanic interactions see it as a bonded relationship with internal rewards, White interactions see it as self-oriented with external rewards, whereas Black interactions appeared to need deeper with more detailed topical participation. Studies have also recognized variations in nonverbal behaviors and expression amid Asian-Americans and Caucasian-Americans.

Some articles discussed the intercultural/multicultural communication factors in the classroom. The articles agreed that teacher student relationships are affected somewhat, however, it is not clear the level of impact. According to Neuliep (1995) the main purpose of the research was an intra-cultural assessment of teacher immediacy concerning African-American and Euro-American college students and professors. Furthermore, it highlighted the difference between Euro-American and African-American's methods of expression when discussing a topic. The Euro-American utilizes a composed type of dialogue while the African-American utilizes a passionate connecting discourse, in the form of a "call and response" interaction that requires interaction between the speaker and audience.

While Williams, Garza, Hodge & Breaux (1999), point out the obvious when they stated "an area noticeably absent from the literature is the impact of race and ethnicity on students' perceptions of faculty members" (Williams, Garza, Hodge, & Breaux, 1999, p. 234). Furthermore, Williams, Garza, Hodge, and Breaux, (1999) contended that "black instructors are seen as more than instructors. They are also role

models, seen as someone in front of the class that students of color can identify with,” (p. 234). In the article by Gendrin and Rucker (2004), the authors indicate that culture gives perceptual and organizational structure, which in turn affects people’s conduct and understanding of others conduct. Therefore, culture and communication are considered indivisible. Sanders and Wiseman (1990), purported that it is natural if varying ethnicities assess communication behaviors differently, then it is probable that teacher immediacy behaviors will probably have similar effects.

When researchers reviewed Anglos, Hispanics, Black and Asian students’ views of professor immediacy or effectiveness they found all evaluated the professors similarly. But, immediacy cues were performed differently for the various ethnic groups. Meaning for Anglos, professor’s body posture based on its degree toward the student considerably affected teaching effectiveness. With Latinos, when considering teaching effectiveness, it was strongly affected by professors smiling, speech expressiveness, and body position. With Blacks, teaching effectiveness was considerably affected by professors relaxed nature and smiling. Whereas with Asians, teaching effectiveness was considerably affected by professors, speech expressiveness smiling and relaxedness.

Sanders and Wiseman (1990) believed that additional research was essential for the exploration of immediacy effects within the multicultural classroom. They recognized two noteworthy research questions “1. Does teacher immediacy positively contribute to affective, cognitive and behavioral learning for White, Asian, Hispanic, and Black students? 2. Do immediacy cues function differently for White, Asian, Hispanic, and Black students?” (p. 345). Three noteworthy differences between the

ethnic groups were identified in the results. First, for the White, Asian, and Hispanic student teacher immediacy for these groups are more predictable for affective learning. Second, professor immediacy was more predictable with affective learning for Hispanic learners over the Asian and Black learners. Lastly, Hispanic learners, teacher immediacy and affective learning had greater correlation than cognitive learning, therefore, an emerging concept is that teacher immediacy has a significant link with affective learning in Hispanic learners.

A key yet obvious concept proposed by Sanders & Wiseman (1990) is that though immediacy appears to be positively correlated with learning for all ethnicities, the degree of said correlation varies. Additionally, pancultural effects are visible with a few immediacy prompts, but others are predominantly significant to certain cultures.

The article by Rodriguez, Plax & Kearney, (2009) contended for a teaching model that encouraged affective learning rather than indicating motivation as the focal factor. Consideration of this notion is very important because for many years and still to this day some people believe that motivation is one of the key factors to learning and developing a desire to learn. It has been taught that if an individual is motivated they will go far in their education. However, this concept is inferring that motivation is not the key factor. But rather, immediacy comes from a professors' nonverbal behavior and it is the catapult for driving individuals in their educational quest and success. Meaning that high immediacy professors can influence their students' affective learning and in turn it can aid in their cognitive learning. This notion has a subtle implication which suggests that professors can develop their nonverbal behaviors furthermore they can control the level of immediacy behavior that they

provide.

Another interesting concept conveyed by Neuliep (2009) highlighted cultural communication differences between Euro-American and African-American's methods of expression when discussing a topic. This concept provides support with promoting the notion of a need for cultural competences. The idea that African-Americans utilize a passionate connecting discourse, in the form of a "call and response" interactions that require interaction between the speaker and audience suggests that this form of communication is productive and may even be a necessary form of communication for many African-Americans. Further study would be useful to determine if this behavior is truly necessary.

The idea that "black instructors are seen as more than instructors, but instead, they are also role models" provided by Williams, Garza, Hodge & Breaux, (1999) could be argued. This statement could be interpreted or perceived in two manners. The first could be interpreted as black students view black professors as role models. This implies that perhaps if there were more black professors it might promote the idea that more black students could enroll and seeing a professor of similar ethnicity, it may help them to believe that they too can succeed.

This idea leads to the second perspective, which is a literal meaning of the word viewed. In fact, what is viewed on campuses today, meaning the lack of such professors, is an argument that is currently winning. This is not to say that there are no black professors as indeed there are many, however, the number is limited on each campus within each department. This is not an argument about race, yet it is just that. It is possible to increase influences by increasing numbers, but another question can be

posed. And that is how important is it to increase the numbers? and does a University need to lower its standards to promote this type of diversity? Additionally, the notion of lowering standards could imply that non-Euro Americans are somewhat deficient and therefore need help to become par with Euro American. When considering one race or ethnicity to another it is common knowledge that all people are equal though some may have a higher IQ. Similarly, some are more interculturally or interpersonally competent, or are more proficient at reading nonverbal behavior, but there is no such thing as one is less than another.

The suggestion of lowering standards to increase diversity implies that Afro-American professors are not as skilled at teaching as other professors. The matter of professor campus diversity is important. Yet the programs that have black professors do not necessarily have more students than other programs. Therefore, the notion of black professors as role models needs to be more clearly defined, explained and supported with data.

It is important to take into consideration ideas or concepts that do not agree 100% with ones research. Therefore, in this research proposal consideration must be given to Comstock, Rowell & Bowers, (1995) because they suggested that too much arousal hinders learner's capacity to focus and sort out information, which is why they propose that a modest amount of stimulation is paramount. Though this notion goes against what the author of this proposal is hoping to accomplish, this idea must be considered as a possibility. There may be individuals that over stimulation would hinder their learning experience rather than increasing it. But there are those individuals that under stimulation could have the same effect in that it would hinder

their learning experience. Learning is a concept that is individualized and though there may be techniques that exist to increase students learning ability, not all students learn in the same manner.

The gaps that this research is intended to address could be seen in the historical review are: The first, was indicated by Williams, Garza, Hodge & Breaux, (1999), it “is the impact of race and ethnicity on students’ perceptions of faculty members” (p. 234). The second, was highlighted by Gendrin & Rucker (2004) considering that communication scholars have researched cultural diversity within their learning environment and there is an understanding of the affect of teacher immediacy on student learning. The gap concerns the idea that it is not clear and not much is known about the influence of teacher immediacy as such this is another area that the research should focus on gaining information. Meaning the gap would be clarification of the influence of teacher immediacy. The last gap is “call and response” which was proposed by Neuliep (1995). Would the “call and response” idea work for all Afro-American students and if so why?

Nonverbal Communication and Cultural Diversity

This section will critically evaluate current knowledge that has been provided in the articles. As such the critical analysis will provide both strengths and weaknesses within literature that has been garnered. Most of the articles indicated that professors’ nonverbal behavior had some effect on students learning. However, some research provided clearer relationships between the nonverbal behavior and nonverbally immediate teachers being the cause of students heightened affirmative approach towards the subject and/or the teacher. As a result, this promotes students

cognitive learning ability. It is clear, that further research is required to clearly define consistent behavior parameters that may identify nonverbal behaviors and immediacy relationship.

Consider that early researchers asserted that a considerable amount of communication is nonverbal, and it continually follows cultural and linguistic models similar to verbal and written communication. Gendrin & Rucker (2004) attest that although communication scholars have researched cultural diversity within their learning environment. Understanding regarding the affect of teacher immediacy on student learning is not clear, and not much is known about the influence of teacher immediacy in the African American college class. Whereas, Booth-Butterfield & Noguchi, (2000) indicated that depending on the cultural background of the student and whether the educational environment has a strong hierarchical setup could determine the type of structure the student would be used to performing in. This idea is reasonable and is important to consider because culture does affect learning and changes in culture also affects learning.

According to Booth-Butterfield and Noguchi, (2000) depending on the cultural background of the student, whether the educational environment has a strong hierarchical setup determines the type of structure the student may be used to performing in. When the students' background is formalized, and if they are placed with a high immediacy professor that behavior may be viewed as a negative violation of expectancy. However, Cooper & Allen (1998) focused their research on classroom interaction of African-American and Latino students and the notion of "separate but equal" concepts. A major interest takes into account whether or not equitable

treatment of learners is present. “This review examines whether the race of a student is associated with differential student/teacher interaction” (p. 151). The authors took into consideration that the possibility of racial inequality did not require for professors to be consciously biased. Lastly, Bolls, Tan & Austin (1997) reviewed the perspective of two racial groups and their perception of teacher interaction as well as attitude towards school due to interpersonal interactions with educational personnel.

Consideration of repeated interaction patterns with students of the same ethnicity create a strong basis for the interaction between the student and the instructor. The research was focused on empirical student/teacher interaction data that was directed at the ethnicity of the student. The findings of showed that student ethnicity plays a role within the concept of classroom interaction patterns.

When discussing communication within an African-American classroom, authors refer to the concept of “call and response”, which points to the “*nommo*” concept of interactions between the speaker and the audience and the power of words when it comes to drawing interactants together as one unit.

Additionally, Gendrin & Rucker (2004) believed that African American students views of European American professors’ immediacy behaviors could be problematic due to perception of their behavior as being standoffish and thus not as involved in their learning as African American instructors, this type of violation of high immediacy could affect the overall assessment of student affective learning. The findings in this research did succeed in replicating and extending Neuliep (1995), which indicated that students’ ratings of African American instructors’ immediacy would be greater than European American instructors.

Although, cultural diversity in communication behavior has been confirmed by diverse research such as when comparing Black, White, and Hispanics and communication techniques that are deemed fulfilling, yet, they are still drastically different. Each race has different perspectives about communication. Hispanic exchanges perceive core rewards for bonded relationships, White exchanges perceive external rewards in relation to self-orientation, whereas Black exchanges required depth with more detailed topical participation. Variations in nonverbal behaviors and expression for Asian-Americans and Euro-Americans were documented identified through research.

Another area that many equate with culture is gender. Booth-Butterfield & Noguchi, (2000) have indicated that gender differences affect understanding of nonverbal prompts as well as cross-sex variations with regards to touch being considered as connected to power and status. Research has also supported the notion that women have exceptional nonverbal recognition skills over various ethnicities. A fascinating finding concerning professor and learner gender and interaction effects showed that both male and female respondents denoted that they gained more learning from professors that are the same gender as themselves.

Additionally, immediacy behaviors are deemed positive, regardless of the gender of the professor performing the behavior, therefore, professors should utilize nonverbal immediacy behaviors as a part of their teaching techniques. Furthermore, they revealed that the quantity of international students and age range of international and American learners were the two limitations within their study. Larger sample population could aid in investigations that are geared to cultural specificities.

Research is limited when it comes to the research question of what is the impact of professors' nonverbal behavior on students learning in a multicultural setting? The goal of this study is to contribute to the literature on interpersonal communication more specifically, nonverbal immediacy behaviors.

Statement of the Problem

Higher Education is essential when it comes to producing economic growth and stability. Within the US the student population in higher education is challenged. The problem that exist in the US is diversity within colleges and universities is not reflective of the community it is in. Meaning, the multicultural population of faculty and staff in Colleges and Universities does not reflect the population of their state, area, region, or city that the University is located. Additionally, multicultural students are challenged with seeing faculty and staff that work in the areas they aspire to work in.

The problem is large and deep and research can help to discover some of the important issues as well as possible solutions. Another example of the problem occurs when considering education, students, and faculty. When walking on some campuses one can see the disparity in the ethnic student population as well as in the professor ethnicity ratio. Neither group is reflective of the State's multicultural population. What is the reason for this problem? Is it due to poor selection of student applicants by the University? Is it because there aren't enough qualified students available? Or is it reflective of another type of problem that is not obvious?

This issue of the state's professional population and student population not reflecting the state's multicultural population needs change. There are diverse reasons

for individuals not finishing their degree at a Higher Education institute, one of which is more than likely related to faculty immediacy. If there are issues within any educational environment that area will be challenged in its ability to grow. If education professionals or anyone dealing with people in a professional manner do not realize that their behavior whether it be verbal or nonverbal affects people from another culture then they cannot change their behavior, when change is needed.

This current situation is somewhat understated, and some may consider that it is not a problem. However, education is paramount, and the professor's style and method of teaching is equally important. Currently within certain Universities in certain regions the student population is not reflective of cultural populations in the same area. Cost could be one reason for this disparity, however it is not clear why this problem exists. Another important factor is the nonverbal cues that each student views when the professor is teaching. The other thing to consider is students learning and nonverbal behavior's impact on each students' learning.

What is not known is how important is the cultural background of the professor, and what nonverbal behaviors students receive from professors that they perceive is important. Meaning what nonverbal behaviors influence their learning in the classroom. As such the research question that will be addressed in this paper is: What is the impact of professors' nonverbal behavior on multicultural students learning in the classroom? Woolfolk and Galloway, (1985) provide a clear example for studying this subject matter when they stated "Attention to nonverbal behavior in teaching can increase educational researchers' sensitivity to the 'more subtle behavioral manifestation' of social process". Lastly, a variety of lenses for viewing

classroom phenomena is needed to further contribute to the education area.

This study endeavored to find out what nonverbal behavior professors' exhibit that impacts multicultural students learning in the classroom? Professor immediacy has been measured via Andersen's Behavioral Indicators of Immediacy Scale (BII). Instrument questions were from Richmond, Gorham, & McCroskey, (1987), Neuliep, (1995), Bolls, Tan & Austin (1997), and Booth-Butterfield & Noguchi, (2000) assisted in establishing the foundation for this study.

This study will investigate and answer the following research question:

RQ1: What are the three most prominent positive and negative nonverbal behaviors that multicultural students see professors exhibit in the classroom?

Also, this study has 2 hypothesizes.

H1: Student perception of professors' nonverbal behaviors' will be positively associated with their perception of professor immediacy.

H2: Student perception of professors perceived immediacy will be positively associated with affective learning in the classroom.

Hypothesis 1 addresses the "immediacy" component of the thesis question, and Andersen's Behavioral Indicators of Immediacy Scale (BII) (Richmond, Gorham, McCroskey, 1987) will be used to calculate this measurement. H2 addresses the "perceived learning" or "cognitive learning" component of the thesis question, and the measurement tool called "learning loss" from Richmond, Gorham, and McCroskey (1987) will be used to calculate this measurement.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The most suitable method for this research was a survey instrument which was constructed to utilize a Likert scale and both a quantitative and qualitative analysis. Participants perception was conveyed via self-report. Characteristics for respondents in this research were 18 years of age or older from all race, gender and ethnicity and no individual was excluded based on any of the previously mentioned categories. The methodology that was developed for conducting this research contained two main types of questions. The first consisted of the MA Communication Study Investigator creating her own and the second was the duplication of previous research by compiling questions from (Bolls, 1997), (Booth-Butterfield, Noguchi, 2000), (Richmond, Gorham, & McCroskey, 1987), (Andersen, 1979), & (Neuliep, 1995) to create the survey instrument.

Questions designed by the MA Communication Study Investigator were qualitatively analyzed and operationally categorized based on the seven forms of nonverbal communication behavior prompts/cues that were identified by students. Student perception was quantitatively measured based on the self-report of respondents as measured through (Neuliep, 1995) 15 item immediacy scale using a 5-point Likert scale. The immediacy scale reflects respondents both perceived and experienced nonverbal immediacy behavior from professors.

Participants

This study employed convenience sampling. The term participant and respondent were used in reference to undergraduate students from the University of Rhode Island (URI) who chose to take part in this study. A total of 160 survey packets were distributed, 157 questionnaires were returned completed. Students were asked to use a check mark to self-identify demographic information. The response population consisted of 67 males, 88 females, 1 transgender and 1 other nonbinary female.

The demographic distribution for the respondent population's race/ethnicity are as follows: 85% White/Caucasian or Euro American, and approximately 15% comprised the rest of the population. Distribution was 3.8% Hispanic or Latino, 0.6% American Indian or Alaska Native, 0.6% Asian, 6.3% Black or African American, 1.9% both Black & White, 0.6% both White & Middle Eastern, 1.2% selected all of the above meaning a mixture of all of the races/ethnicities that were identified on the questionnaire. The population's age ranged from 18 through 25 years old.

Instruments

Teacher Nonverbal Immediacy

The instrument used for measuring "immediacy" recognized nonverbal cues such as 'smiling, eye contact, vocal expressiveness, proximity, touches, gestures, body movements, and body positioning' were a part of Andersen's Behavioral Indicators of Immediacy Scale (BII) (Richmond, Gorham, McCroskey, 1987). The instrument that was created for this research, provided 24 "my teacher" immediacy statements (see Appendix B). Participants were required to rank each immediacy statement as one of

the following behaviors: 5 = not very frequently, 4 = occasionally, 3 = uncertain, 2 = often, 1 = very frequently. An immediacy score was calculated by summing frequency scores, the reliability statistic is .816.

Perceived Learning

Another portion of this research considered cognitive learning and its relationship with immediacy. Even though standardized test exists they could not be used in this study, therefore a subjective measurement for cognitive learning was utilized. This method was employed with the understanding that cognitive learning measurement tools such as attendance, participation, writing skills, grades and so forth may be influenced by other factors that are not always easily replicated.

Therefore, using the cognitive learning measurement tool called “learning loss” from Richmond, Gorham, and McCroskey (1987), two questions surrounding students’ perception of learning were asked and ranked accordingly: 1) *How much did you learn in the class?* (5 = you learned more than in any other class, 4 = you learned a significant amount, 3 = uncertain, 2 = you learned something, 1 = you learned nothing), and 2) *How much do you think you could have learned in the class had you had the ideal instructor?* (5 = you learned more than in any other class, 4 = you learned a significant amount, 3 = uncertain, 2 = you learned something, 1 = you learned nothing). The learning loss variable is calculated by subtracting the first score from the second score.

Procedures

Material Distribution and Data Collection

Students within the URI community were offered an opportunity to participate in this study. Respondents were recruited from URI classes in collaboration with faculty as an extra credit option for all students. The research package that students received consisted of the consent form with survey completion instructions, survey and alternate extra credit item. Students were advised in writing and orally about the extra credit opportunity. The alternate extra credit assignment was explained verbally to all students. The MA Student Investigator advised all students that participation was voluntary and anonymous, therefore, participants did not need to sign the consent form prior to participating, and completion of the survey indicated consent. They were also advised about the approximate time it should take to complete the survey, and that they were not required to place their name or ID number on the survey. Students were provided contact information for the student investigator and major professor. Lastly, the MA Student Investigator stayed in each class until all survey instruments were completed, to answer questions and collect the survey. A 3 digit number coding system was used to code each instrument in case of data entry errors, the numbering started at 001.

Although an alternate but equal extra credit item was provided, which was not to be used in the research, students chose to participate and therefore, no alternate extra credit item was collected. The population consisted of diverse students. After collection of the survey instrument the data was entered into an excel spreadsheet and stored.

Data Analysis

This study utilized both qualitative and quantitative data analysis in the form of recoding and correlation analysis to assess three areas of the thesis question: “What is the impact of professors’ nonverbal behavior on multicultural students learning in the class room”. Meaning, the qualitative analysis was recoded so that a quantitative value could be assessed to validate findings. Recoding of questions where students used terms to provide their answers required a numerical code for each word. Thereby providing a number such as 1 thru 10, to represent the words that describe the emblem area that performed the nonverbal behavior. Thus, the data could be quantified and then analyzed for comparison when needed. The three main components of the question that were assessed consisted of finding the top 3 positive and negative behaviors, calculating immediacy scores and calculating learning loss scores. See Table 1 below:

Nonverbal Behavior Recoded
1 = Facial Expressions
2 = Kinesics
3 = Haptics
4 = Vocalics
5 = Proxemics
6 = Physical Appearance
7 = Chronemics
8 = Other

Table 1

Recoding of qualitative data was used to analyze and identify the top three positive and negative nonverbal behaviors that students indicated; and identify the top three nonverbal behaviors students experienced from a professor that they believe are positive and negative. Third, quantitative analysis was employed via correlation analysis to identify students' perception of professors' nonverbal behaviors impact on their learning. Using both qualitative and quantitative analysis was best since a large majority of the survey required participants self-reflective content and participants provided their own explanation for each behavior that they perceived as important.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Research Question

Top 3 Nonverbal Behaviors

RQ1 asked what are the three most prominent positive and negative nonverbal behaviors that multicultural students see professors exhibit in the classroom? The top three positive nonverbal behaviors that multicultural students identified were distributed in two areas/emblems as follows: 15.8% from facial primacy and 15.1% from kinesics. Due to the low multicultural population student responses were juxtaposed against the Euro-American population. The comparison for White/Euro-Americans yielded as follows: Facial Primacy – 84.2% and Kinesics – 84.9%.

For the perception of immediacy result comparison of multicultural student population verses the Euro-American population so as to get an overall student population. The overall percentages yield for the top three positive nonverbal behaviors that students identified were 44.4% from facial primacy and 44.4% from kinesics. The top three nonverbal behaviors in order of occurrence were smiling, eye contact and hand gestures/thumbs up. A total of 100 students identified smiling, 89 indicated eye contact and 84 specified hand gestures as positive nonverbal behaviors. Whereas, the top three negative nonverbal behaviors that students identified were facial expressions, no eye contact and eye rolling, which all belong in the most influential nonverbal area of facial primacy.

Self-Report responses from students for the negative nonverbal behavior question showed decreased response rates and more diversified qualitative responses which also include not providing an answer for this question on the instrument. Meaning the highest number of responses for anyone group was, 61 students indicating facial expressions such as frowning, glaring, looks of disapproval or anger which were all considered negative. Next, 41 identified no eye contact or lack of eye contact was consider negative, while 34 stated that rolling of eye's, raised eye brows or other eye behavior was deemed negative.

The correlation analysis revealed that the top three nonverbal behaviors that students experienced from a professor that they identified as both positive or negative were in the facial primacy and kinesics areas. Meaning, the correlation analysis showed that the top three positive nonverbal behaviors that students experienced from a professor were in the same areas as the top three negative nonverbal behaviors experienced from a professor. Seventy students confirmed that they experienced professors smiling, 39 experienced non-offensive eye contact and 20 specified experiencing hand gestures that was entertaining or engaging.

Positive Nonverbal Behavior

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Facial Expressions	201	42.7	44.4	44.4
	Kinesics	200	42.5	44.2	88.5
	Haptics	4	.8	.9	89.4
	Vocalics	12	2.5	2.6	92.1
	Proxemics	4	.8	.9	92.9
	Physical Appearance	2	.4	.4	93.4
	Chronemics	3	.6	.7	94.0
	Other	27	5.7	6.0	100.0
	Total	453	96.2	100.0	
Missing	System	18	3.8		
Total		471	100.0		

Table 2

Negative Non-verbal Behavior-Code

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Facial Expressions	175	37.2	41.4	41.4
	Kinesics	176	37.4	41.6	83.0
	Haptics	1	.2	.2	83.2
	Vocalics	27	5.7	6.4	89.6
	Proxemics	2	.4	.5	90.1
	Physical Appearance	2	.4	.5	90.5
	Chronemics	4	.8	.9	91.5
	Other	36	7.6	8.5	100.0
	Total	423	89.8	100.0	
Missing	System	48	10.2		
Total		471	100.0		

Table 3

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 anticipated that student perception of professors' nonverbal behavior would be positively associated with their perception of professor immediacy.

The perception of nonverbal behaviors scale consisted of the 24 questions regarding students' perception of professors' nonverbal behaviors, and it had a reliability statistic of .816 therefore hypothesis 1 was supported. The scale's mean was 3.41 with a standard deviation of 13.83.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 expected that student perception of professors perceived immediacy would be positively associated with affective learning in the classroom. Hypothesis 2 was supported with the correlation test for students' perception of professors' nonverbal behaviors impact on their learning showing significant correlation, where $r = .526$ ($p < .001$), and the correlation between nonverbal perception summary and how much students perceived that they learned was $r = .521$ ($p < .001$). Professors nonverbal behaviors' correlation to learning in class $r = .419$ ($p < .001$). However, there was no statistically significant relationship between professor nonverbal behavior and students perceived probability of possible learning, $r = -.001$ ($p > .05$).

Perceived Learning

Teacher immediacy was computed by using 24 questions and then summing frequency scores and compared to learning loss. Some questions had to be reversed coded to conduct effective calculation.

	Descriptive Statistics				
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Learning Loss	154	-3.00	3.00	.2662	1.29374
Teacher Immediacy Behaviors	150	1.71	5.00	3.8206	.75859
Valid N (listwise)	149				

Table 4

To generate a “Learning Loss” variable, it is necessary to subtract the first score from the second score. Therefore, the learning received from the actual professor was subtracted from the learning received from the ideal professor.

		Learning Loss			Cumulative
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Percent
Valid	-3.00	1	.6	.6	.6
	-2.00	12	7.6	7.8	8.4
	-1.00	22	14.0	14.3	22.7
	.00	67	42.7	43.5	66.2
	1.00	25	15.9	16.2	82.5
	2.00	16	10.2	10.4	92.9
	3.00	11	7.0	7.1	100.0
	Total	154	98.1	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.9		
Total		157	100.0		

Table 5

Recalculation of learning loss required exclusion of cases where learning loss was negative. Calculation of the correlation between the recalculated learning loss and teacher immediacy, yielded significant correlation at 0.01 level (2-tailed) at -.47.

		Correlations	
		Learning Loss	Teacher Immediacy Behaviors
Learning Loss	Pearson Correlation	1	-.470**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	119	116
Teacher Immediacy Behaviors	Pearson Correlation	-.470**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	116	116

Table 6

****.** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Data from the ethnic group was not enough to report any statistical significance.

Ethnicity Descriptives			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Hispanic/Latino	5	.6000	.89443
Amer Indian or Alaska Native	1	3.0000	.
Black or African American	9	.5556	1.01379
White/Caucasian	101	.7822	1.00602
Other	1	.0000	.
Black and white	2	.0000	.00000
Total	119	.7563	1.00816

Table 7

The last area that produced unrequired results was the nonsense data from 22.7 = 14% of participants. Meaning, 14% of student responses were not trust worthy – too big of a problem (could be nonsense for any reason).

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Scholars from previous research agrees that nonverbal behavior influences perceived immediacy and professor immediacy does influence student learning. It is also normal and even expected that individuals from different cultures would measure communication behaviors in a different way. Nevertheless, the relationship between professor nonverbal behavior, immediacy and cognitive learning versus affective learning needs more research. This study endeavored to study the relationship between culture and the classroom, in so doing, detecting the top 3 key nonverbal behaviors and how students perceived professors' nonverbal immediacy behaviors' impact on their learning in the classroom. Implications of the results will be discussed, along with limitations and possible future direction for research will be revealed.1203

This research utilized surveys that required students to self-report about their perception of professors' nonverbal behavior and it's affect on their learning in the classroom. It applied quantitative and qualitative analysis operationally by using correlation analysis, correlation test, Neuliep's immediacy scale, Andersen's Behavioral Indicators of Immediacy Scale (BII), and calculated "learning loss" as set out by Richmond, Gorham, and McCroskey (1987). Results from the data identified facial primacy and kinesics emblems to contain the 3 key positive and negative nonverbal behaviors that students highlighted in their self-report. More specifically,

facial primacy cues involving the eyes, and mouth can influence perceived immediacy. Two hypotheses were positively supported, which confirmed an important relationship between professor nonverbal behavior and immediacy.

Scholarly research has provided varying positions about nonverbal communication, however, this research endeavored to understand student perception and its relationship with professor immediacy. More specifically, the relationship between professor nonverbal behavior and the multicultural students' perception of said behavior. The analysis of this data intimates additional research would be beneficial.

Both Hypothesis 1 & 2 analyzed students perception of professors' nonverbal behavior and its relationship with professor immediacy. Hypothesis 1 stated "that student perception of professors' nonverbal behaviors' will be positively associated with their perception of professor immediacy." Next, hypothesis 2 stated that student perception of professors perceived immediacy will be positively associated with affective learning in the classroom. Examination of the data for both variables revealed that there was substantial correlation. The findings from this study supported research from Sanders & Wisman (1990), and Plax, Kearney, McCroskey and Richmond (1986) which found that nonverbal behavior and perceived immediacy were more positively perceived than distant nonverbal behavior. Affective learning was positively related to students' perception of teachers' nonverbal immediacy.

The learning loss variable was created by subtracting the learning received from the actual professor from the learning received from an ideal professor. The results from the research were not promising, because there should have been no

numbers less than 0, yet some of the data yielded negative variables. This type of result would imply that the professor that is teaching them is better than the ideal professor, which is not possible. Nevertheless, to better understand the results in this study, additional analysis was employed for the “Learning Loss” variable. First, all cases that provided negative learning loss data were excluded. Thereby, providing calculation of the correlation between the recalculated learning loss and teacher immediacy, which yielded significant correlation at 0.01 level (2-tailed) at -.47.

Even though this study provided interesting data, the relationship between nonverbal behavior and multicultural students perception of professor immediacy relationship could not be validated because not enough data was gathered. However, the data for the student population did show an overall relationship with student perception of professor nonverbal behavior and immediacy. Limitations and directions for future research will be covered in the next section.

Limitations & Directions for Future Research

The use of the self-reporting instrument is the first limitation that will be addressed. This method of data collection can yield unreliable or nonsense information for several reasons. One reason for nonsense data is triggered by students who only want to get the extra credit mark but, they might not take their role in self-reporting seriously. Therefore, they do not enter any information on the form thereby returning a blank form, they enter nonsense on the instrument, meaning non-pertinent information. They also do not answer questions accurately or use erroneous information. They use any combination of the previous, meaning, they do not answer all questions on the forms and only provide answers for a few questions to give the

impression that they self-reported on the instrument. Using any of these methods will produce untrustworthy, unusable data also called nonsense data.

The second item within the self-reporting instrument that provides limitations concerns, participants self-reported perception. Normally, an individuals' reality and self-reporting can be valuable. However, not all participants are able to think objectively and/or critically, to address the questions in a self-aware manner. Meaning, students may believe that they are reporting accurately from their perception, but they sometimes lack the ability to understand their role and therefore, they mis-judge themselves and their professors because they do not know how their nonverbal behavior is being interpreted by the professor.

The studying of interactions has indicated, the exchange of behaviors between two people, requires assumptions which can be hard and sometimes impossible to understand. Understanding one individuals' behavior without considering the previous action or reaction of the other individual is very challenging. Similar to what Galloway, 1968 contends, both students and instructors, express behaviors that effect perception, and causes them to take the expressive state of the other as a valid exhibit of inner feelings and attitudes. Yet they might not be aware of what they did to promote said response.

The third aspect of the self-reporting instrument that provides limitations was concerning the sample selection. Respondents were recruited via convenience sampling. The sample consisted of students between the ages of 18 thru 25 years old. The young age range may have been a factor in the self-reporting of perception and its lack of critical self-awareness, which in turn contributed to possible skewing of

results. Contribution from an older and more mature student population could have provided students who better understand student versus teacher roles and responsibilities. A stratified sampling method might be the most flexible method to use to gain various subgroups of a population, thereby creating a more diverse population. Another issue with the sample selection was concerning the multicultural student sample size. The statistical power of the sample size was questionable since only 25 self-reported instruments were collected and not all were fully completed. The ethnic group data result was not enough to report any statistical significance.

The last aspect of using the self-reporting instrument provoked limitations due to the wording of the instrument. The writing caused response and results limitations. Two Likert scale questions, 38 & 39 were misunderstood by some students. Therefore, not all students provided responses in the same manner which made these questions invalid, therefore no analysis could be completed to assess student's perception of their professors' nonverbal behavior. This resulted in not having a question that addresses students perception of professors' nonverbal behavior.

To enhance possible future research of the relationship between professor nonverbal behavior, immediacy, and learning loss should consider addressing four main areas: multicultural student sample size, immediacy scale relationship to Likert point scale (using 9 point scale), consideration of confederate and types of nonverbal behaviors that are to be tested, and respondent age/program level versus maturity. The first, consideration is for multicultural student sample size to be increased so that it can provide statistical significance. The multicultural student population size in this

analysis was very small and therefore did not produce any statistically significant information.

Second, the survey instrument used a 5-point Likert scale range for questions 9 thru 37. This enabled students to enumerate behavior range for professor immediacy. The range represented the following scale: 5 = not very frequently, 4 = occasionally, 3 = uncertain, 2 = often, 1 = very frequently. Unfortunately, due to the low numerical value, this range provided lower immediacy scores. When the range is larger, it promotes more flexibility for accuracy. Meaning, 9 points would allow for a more accurate assessment of participants opinions. An example can be seen if someone had chosen 4 on the 5-point scale they can now select 6, 7, or 8 to represent their opinion for a more accurate measurement.

Third, altering the study to include confederates that display the same nonverbal behaviors that are to be measured provides for a larger quantity of students measuring the exact same behaviors. This scenario could provide a study that is less biased. The last possible way to enhance this type of research could be to modify the data collection method, since respondent age/program level is not necessarily synonymous with their maturity. Consideration to data collection by using a stratified sampling method might be the most flexible method to use to gain a broader population with more diverse student maturity. Thereby, creating a more robust population.

Conclusion

The main purpose of this study was to measure professors' nonverbal communication in the class room and its impact on multicultural students affective learning. The next purpose was to gain knowledge about which nonverbal behaviors promote student perceived immediacy. This research assessed multicultural and Euro-American college students' perception of their instructor's immediacy. The results confirmed that there were two forms of nonverbal prompts that were used most, which were facial primacy and kinesics. Although students identified both positive and negative nonverbal behaviors identification of said nonverbal behaviors that promoted learning loss could not be ascertained due to limitations which are rooted within the results which could not be garnered from data due to the low multicultural population.

Even though a clear solution has not been confirmed, this research has been successful in testing, duplicating and confirming previous literature research. It has also found key positive and negative nonverbal behaviors that students related as influencing their perception of instructor immediacy. Positive nonverbal cues such as smiling, eye contact, and hand gestures such as thumbs up, help to promote perception of immediacy. Likewise, negative nonverbal behaviors were in the facial primacy area, the diverse cues involved facial expressions and various eye behaviors. With the development of perceived immediacy nonverbal cues, instructors can increase their perceived immediacy behavior which can influence students' affective learning and in turn it can aid in their cognitive learning.

APPENDICES

Appendix A (Instruments and Tools for Data Collection)

The measures of each key concept will be via survey questions be as follows:

Please indicate the following information about yourself.

1. What is your?

A) Gender:

- a. Male _____
- b. Female _____
- c. Transgender _____
- d. Other _____

B) Age _____:

C) Education:

College/Program: _____

Grade: Freshman _____ Sophomore _____ Junior _____ Senior _____

Postgraduate _____ Non-matriculated _____ or other (not officially admitted to URI or other college/university; graduate student; etc.) _____

D) Race/Ethnicity:

- e. Hispanic or Latino _____
- f. American Indian or Alaska Native _____
- g. Asian _____
- h. Black or African American _____
- i. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander _____
- j. White/Caucasian or Euro American _____
- k. Other please indicate: _____

2. Name 3 nonverbal behaviors that a professor uses that you think are positive?

- a. _____
- b. _____
- c. _____

3. Name 3 nonverbal behaviors that a professor uses that you think are negative?

- a. _____
- b. _____
- c. _____

Think about your interaction with various professors and answer the following questions about your perception and/or experience:

4. Does your professors' nonverbal behavior affect your learning?

_____ Yes

_____ No

5. What nonverbal behavior can a professor exhibit towards you that would affect your learning in a positive manner?

6. What nonverbal behavior can a professor exhibit towards you that would affect your learning in a negative manner?

7. A) Think of a professor that affects you positively. From your observation, what is their ethnicity?

a. Hispanic or Latino _____ American Indian or Alaska Native _____

b. Asian _____ Black or African American _____

c. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander _____

d. White/Caucasian or Euro American _____

e. Other please indicate: _____

f. Don't Know _____

B) What nonverbal behavior does he or she do to create this positive experience?

8. A) Think of a professor that affects you negatively. From your observation, what is their ethnicity?

a. Hispanic or Latino _____ American Indian or Alaska Native _____

b. Asian _____ Black or African American _____

c. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander _____

d. White/Caucasian or Euro American _____

e. Other please indicate: _____

f. Don't Know _____

B) What nonverbal behavior does he or she do to create this negative experience?

Please think about **the class immediately preceding the one in which you complete this survey** and respond to each question about your perception of that professors use of nonverbal behavior by indicating in the blank space, 1 thru 5, how much each of the following occurred:

- 5 = not very frequently
- 4 = occasionally
- 3 = uncertain
- 2 = often
- 1 = very frequently

Please put the number corresponding to your answer in the blank before the statement

9. ___ My teacher uses a monotone or dull voice when talking to the class.
10. ___ My teacher was moving around the classroom.
11. ___ My teacher uses gestures.
12. ___ My teacher had tensed body.
13. ___ My teacher was frowning.
14. ___ My teacher uses a variety of vocal expressions while talking to me and/or the class.
15. ___ My teacher uses eye contact.
16. ___ My teacher smiles at class.
17. ___ My teacher smiles at me.
18. ___ My teacher looks at the board too much.
19. ___ My teacher's body is relaxed.
20. ___ My teacher uses personal examples or talks about experiences she/he has had outside of class.

Please think about **the class immediately preceding the one in which you complete this survey** and respond to each question about your perception of that professors' willingness to be available to you by indicating in the blank space, 1 thru 5, how much each of the following occurred:

- 5 = not very frequently
- 4 = occasionally
- 3 = uncertain
- 2 = often
- 1 = very frequently

Please put the number corresponding to your answer in the blank before the statement

21. ___ My teacher asks questions or encourages students to talk.
22. ___ My teacher uses humor in class.
23. ___ My teacher calls on students by name.
24. ___ My teacher has initiated a conversation with you personally before or after class.
25. ___ My teacher refers to class as "our" class or what "we" are doing.
26. ___ My teacher provides feedback on your individual work through comments on papers, quizzes, oral discussions, etc.
27. ___ My teacher invites students to telephone or meet with him/her outside of class if they have questions or want to discuss something.
28. ___ My teacher praises students' work, actions, or comments.
29. ___ My teacher looks at class while talking.
30. ___ My teacher smiles at class as a whole, not just individual students.
31. ___ My teacher has a very tense body position while talking to the class.
32. ___ My teacher has a very relaxed body position while talking to the class.

Please think about **the class immediately preceding the one in which you complete this survey** and respond to each question about your perception of your learning by indicating in the blank space, 1 thru 5:

- | |
|--|
| <p>5 = you learned more than in any other class
 4 = you learned a significant amount
 3 = uncertain
 2 = you learned something
 1 = you learned nothing</p> <p>Please put the number corresponding to your answer in the blank before the statement</p> |
|--|

33. ___ How much did you learn in the class?
34. ___ How much do you think you could have learned in the class had you had the ideal instructor?
35. Does your professors' nonverbal behavior influence your learning?
_____ Yes
_____ No

Please think about **the class immediately preceding the one in which you complete this survey** and respond to each question about your perception of your learning by indicating in the blank space 1 thru 5:

- 5 = not at all likely
- 4 = very unlikely
- 3 = uncertain
- 2 = very likely
- 1 = definitely

Please put the number corresponding to your answer in the blank before the statement

- 36. ____ Would you take another class from this teacher if you had the opportunity.
- 37. ____ Would you take another class in this subject if you have the opportunity.

Please think about **the class immediately preceding the one in which you complete this survey** and respond to each question about your attitude towards your teacher and class content.

- 5 = Negative
- 1 = Positive

Please put the number corresponding to your answer in the blank before the statement

- 38. ____ Your attitude about the teacher of this course is (1-5 positive to negative).
- 39. ____ Your attitude about the content of this course is (1-5 positive to negative).

Appendix B (Immediacy Behavioral Questions)

1	My teacher uses a monotone or dull voice when talking to the class.
2	My teacher was moving around the classroom.
3	My teacher uses gestures.
4	My teacher had tensed body.
5	My teacher was frowning.
6	My teacher uses a variety of vocal expressions while talking to me and/or the class.
7	My teacher uses eye contact.
8	My teacher smiles at class.
9	My teacher smiles at me.
10	My teacher looks at the board too much.
11	My teacher's body is relaxed.
12	My teacher uses personal examples or talks about experiences she/he has had outside of class.

13	My teacher asks questions or encourages students to talk.
14	My teacher uses humor in class.
15	My teacher calls on students by name.
16	My teacher has initiated a conversation with you personally before or after class.
17	My teacher refers to class as "our" class or what "we" are doing.
18	My teacher provides feedback on your individual work through comments on papers, quizzes, oral discussions, etc.
19	My teacher invites students to telephone or meet with him/her outside of class if they have questions or want to discuss something.
20	My teacher praises students' work, actions, or comments.
21	My teacher looks at class while talking.
22	My teacher smiles at class as a whole, not just individual students.
23	My teacher has a very tense body position while talking to the class.
24	My teacher has a very relaxed body position while talking to the class.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, N. J. (2008). *International dimensions of organizational behavior* (5th ed.).
Mason, OH: South-Western
- Bolls, P. D., Tan, A., & Austin, E. (1997). An exploratory comparison of native
american and caucasian students' attitudes toward teacher communicative
behavior and toward school. *Communication Education*, *46*(3), 198-202. doi:
10.1080/03634529709379091
- Booth-Butterfield, M., & Noguchi, T. (2000). Students' perceptions of teachers'
Nonverbal behavior: Comparison of american and international students'
classroom response. *Communication Research Reports*, *17*(3), 288-298. doi:
10.1080/08824090009388776
- Canary, D. J., Cody, M. J., & Manusov, V. L. (2003). *Interpersonal communication:
Fundamentals of nonverbal communication* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Bedford/St.
Martin's.
- Comstock, J., Rowell, E., & Bowers, J. (1995). Food for thought: Teacher nonverbal
immediacy, student learning, and curvilinearity. *Communication Education*,
44(3), 251-266. doi: 10.1080/03634529509379015
- Cooper, E., & Allen, M. (1998). A meta-analytic examination of the impact of student
race on classroom interaction. *Communication Research Reports*, *15*(2), 151-
161. doi: 10.1080/08824099809362109
- Galloway, C. (1968). Nonverbal communication. *Theory into Practice*, *7*(5), 172-175.
Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1475983>

- Gendrin, D. M., & Rucker, M. L. (2004). Revisiting the relation between teacher immediacy and student learning in african american college classrooms. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 12(2), 77-92. doi: 10.1207/s15456889ajc1202_2
- Griffin, E. A. (2009). A first look at communication theory (7th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- McCroskey, J. C., Sallinen, A., Fayer, J. M., Richmond, V. P., & Barraclough, R. A. (1996). Nonverbal immediacy and cognitive learning: A Cross-Cultural Investigation. *Communication Education*, 45, 200-211.
- Mottet, T. P., Parker-Raley, J., Beebe, S. A., & Cunningham, C. (2007). Instructors Who resist “college lite” the neutralizing effect of instructor immediacy on students’ course-workload violations and perceptions of instructor credibility and affective learning. *Communication Education*, 56(2), 145-167. doi: 10.1080/03634520601164259
- Neuliep, J. W. (1995). A comparison of teacher immediacy in african-american and euro-american college classrooms. *Communication Education*, 44(3), 267-277. doi: 10.1080/03634529509379016
- Richmond, V. P., Gorham, J. S., & McCroskey, J. C. (1987). The relationship between selected immediacy behaviors and cognitive learning. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 10(1), 574-590. doi: org/10.1080/23808985.1987.11678663

- Rodríguez, 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*(4), 293-305. doi: 10.1080/03634529609379059
- 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*(4), 341-353. doi: 10.1080/03634529009378814
- Smith, M. J. (1988). *Contemporary communication research methods*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Williams, J. E., Garza, L., Hodge, A. A., & Breaux, A. (1999). The color of teachers, the color of students: The multicultural classroom experience. *American Sociological Association, 27*(3), 233-251. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1319324>
- Woolfolk, A. E., & Galloway, C. M. (1985). Nonverbal communication and the study of teaching. *Theory into Practice, 24*(1), 77-84. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1477128>
- Woolfolk, A. E., & Brooks, D. B. (1983). Nonverbal communication in teaching. *Review of Research in Education, 10*, 103-149. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1167137>