Theses, Dissertations and Capstones

1-1-2012

Assessing the Presence and Use of Nonverbal Communication in Primary Reading Instruction

Amelia C. Ferrell
ferrell56@marshall.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://mds.marshall.edu/etd

Part of the Curriculum and Instruction Commons, Other Communication Commons, and the Other Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

ASSESSING THE PRESENCE AND USE OF
NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION IN PRIMARY READING
INSTRUCTION

A Thesis submitted to
The Graduate College of
Marshall University

In partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Communication Studies

by
Amelia C. Ferrell
Approved by
Stephen D. Cooper, Ph.D., Committee Chairperson
Cynthia B. Torppa, Ph.D.,
Joshua M. Averbeck, Ph.D.

Marshall University
May 2012

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank the faculty of the Department of Communication Studies at Marshall University for their contributions, direct or indirect, to this project. I am especially grateful for the guidance of Dr. Stephen Cooper, who provided me with support and encouragement throughout this process. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Cynthia Torppa and Dr. Joshua Averbeck for their guidance. I would like to thank Dr. Camilla Brammer for her support during my graduate studies.

I would like to thank my fellow graduate assistants, Cassie, Erica, Whitney, Mark, Evan, and Nik, for their support and laughter along the way.

I wish to thank my family, friends, roommates, and Benji for encouragement – and snacks.

Last, I wish to thank the public elementary schools of Cabell County, West Virginia, for their participation in this project.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abstract

This research examined the presence and types of nonverbal communication presented in primary reading instruction. Primary instructors were surveyed about their use and types of nonverbal communication employed during reading instruction. Nonverbal communication variables studied were determined from relevant literature regarding nonverbal immediacy, primary education, and reading instruction. Findings revealed that almost all nonverbal communication variables studied were employed frequently and most respondents had no prior training. Findings suggest how future studies can better evaluate the role of nonverbal communication in reading instruction and provide education for primary teachers in hopes of improving literacy education.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Nonverbal communication (NVC) has been found to be a vital element within the total communication process, and its presence often supersedes the spoken word (Griffin, 1985). NVC is often thought to occur naturally, but NVC can be learned and unlearned.

Educators of children rely on communication to accomplish the majority of their tasks and goals. Collective research has found teacher immediacy, both verbal and nonverbal, to be an effective instructional strategy that enhances cognitive and affective learning (e.g., Kelley & Gorham, 1988; Menzel & Carrell, 1999; Richmond, Gorham, & McCroskey, 1987). Because of teacher's reliance and need of appropriate communication, primary teachers may benefit from effective use of NVC. However, effective use of NVC is often left up to educators' natural instincts and guesses of what may or may not be e.

Research has found that teachers are often unaware of the presence or power of NVC (Boliean, 1981). Primary educators, who deal with impressionable young children, often leave their NVC up to chance. Their lack of awareness may mean a different message is being communicated than intended. If a teacher does use NVC effectively, it is usually because he or she imitated someone else or has learned NVC by trial and error (Griffin, 1985). Although effective NVC can occur naturally or through imitation, often times imitated NVC fails to meet the specific needs of the communication context (Boliean, 1981). In the classroom, this means the NVC can fail to meet the individual communication needs of students.

Little research exists explaining the role or existence of teachers' NVC during reading instruction in primary classrooms. Literacy is of great concern because the ability to read is essential to children's future. Lack of basic literacy skills is linked with

academic failure, substance abuse, teen pregnancy, delinquency, unemployment, low productivity, and welfare dependence (McKie, Manswell-Butty & Green, 2012). The ability to read is the basis for all other education; literacy is necessary for an individual to understand information that is out of context, whether written or verbal. Without literacy skills, children will struggle to take part in the world around them and fail to reach their full potential as community members and employees.

Current research indicates the existence and importance of certain types of NVC in the primary education experience, and these NVC variables can also be effective within primary reading instruction. However, little research exists validating the actual presence of these NVC variables within reading instruction. The lack of research regarding the existence of NVC in reading instruction leaves reading instructors to assume NVC is unimportant or can be employed with little thought regarding its role in literacy education. Further research is needed to assess what types of NVC exist within reading instruction communication, and if teachers make strategic choices regarding the use of these NVC variables.

NVC can be used in reading instruction to convey enthusiasm, interest, and motivation. Effective NVC during reading instruction is correlated with higher literacy rates and retention of material (Griffin, 1985).

The purpose of this thesis is to indicate the importance of NVC in primary reading instruction and assess the types of NVC that exist during reading instruction through quantitative methods. The study is guided by the premise that teachers' verbal communication and NVC have the potential to greatly affect student learning outcomes. The study will examine role of NVC in reading instruction and determine what types of

NVC exist during reading instruction. The study will also examine what prior training or education reading instructors have in the use of NVC in literacy education. This study seeks to lay a scholarly foundation regarding the presence of NVC in reading instruction and to promote an overall improvement in literacy.

The following literature review addresses the importance of literacy, the role of NVC in reading instruction, and the specific types of NVC found to be effective in primary reading instruction.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Literacy in the United States has become one of the biggest concerns for the country's level of education. The United States' literacy rate has declined over the last decade, and literacy rates are down 25% since 1992 (United Nations Development Programme, 2012). The National Assessment of Adult Literacy (NAAL, 2012) revealed 14% of United States' adults have extreme difficulty with reading and writing abilities and are defined as functionally illiterate. Many United States adults reporting illiteracy had some type of reading education as a child (NAAL, 2012). This inability leads to substantial problems for both children and adults.

The absence of proficient reading skills is associated with academic failure, increased dropout rates, unemployment and involvement with the judicial system (Cornwall & Bawden, 1992). Low literacy rates result in people being uninformed or misinformed about issues such as government, health, and safety. Illiteracy can lead to crime, miseducation, and failure to live life properly.

Although several factors contribute to the United States' declining literacy rates, research indicates three factors to be the major contributing forces:

1) Due to national public education testing mandates, less time and focus are put on the individual student's reading needs. Rather, group instruction is utilized to propel each child to the literacy level needed to pass testing. Although some students achieve literacy with this method, the lack of individualized teaching can result in a lack of proficient reading skills.

2) Family circumstances play a significant role in shaping the literacy goals and

needs of an individual. Families with just one illiterate parent are 43% more likely to have a child struggle with literacy (NAAL, 2012). A lack of attention at home on quality time spent reading, developing reading skills, and developing interest in reading can result in a child already behind before ever entering the classroom. Current educational reports show the majority of families regard the majority of education should occur in the classroom setting, thus making the role of teachers vastly important in teaching literacy (NAAL, 2012).

3) Teachers, parents, and peers have failed to communicate the joy reading can bring about. Although the importance can be stressed, children seek to have an emotion attached to desired outcome. When a student sees a teacher enjoying the reading experience, or hears a parent communicate the happiness reading can bring about, children are more likely to internalize a need for reading.

With the proper research and adjustments, teachers can better these rates from what they are now and educate students further to prevent adult literacy problems. The elementary school years are crucial in creating and shaping reading motivation and interest and achievement (Gambrell, 1996). During these years, children must be supported in every cognitive aspect of the reading education process. Several aspects of influential support exist, including creating a classroom culture that fosters reading interest and motivation. Components of effective reading education classroom culture include a book-rich classroom environment, opportunities for choice of reading material by students, and a teacher who models interest and motivation for reading material (Gambrell, 1996). A teacher must value the role of reading education and demonstrate enthusiasm and genuine interest in the material. Enthusiasm and interest can be

conveyed both verbally and nonverbally. A lack of research exists regarding the use of

nonverbal communication (NVC) during reading instruction, however NVC plays a role

in the delivery of literacy instruction and skill development.

Literacy instruction involves an immense amount of content. For literacy

instructors, the content involves *what* they are teaching and *how* they are teaching it.

Prior research suggests how teachers convey literacy skills and the importance of literacy

has a larger effect than the content itself. Nonverbal communication (NVC) is considered

to be "an inherent and essential part of message creation" (Burgoon, 1994, p.239). Only

7% of human communication is considered to be verbal, and nonverbal communication is

often more frequently employed when communicating with young children. (Sleep,

2011). NVC plays an important role in shaping the education transpiring from teacher to

students.

Since the 1950s, scholars have dedicated extensive time to studying the existence

and variations of NVC in the communication process (Paylor, 2009). Since the

beginning of NVC research, it has been difficult for scholars to determine one definitive

definition of NVC. As a result, categories of NVC have been developed to help people

understand the presence and use of NVC. Nine categories of NVC exist: facial

expression, gaze, gestures, postures, bodily contact, spatial behavior, clothes, non-verbal

vocalizations (Navaro, 2008). The nine broad categories have been closely linked with

immediacy, which is perceived as one of the most powerful aspects of NVC.

The use of NVC by teachers is especially of interest because children begin

recognizing, processing and employing NVC during the early elementary school years.

During this time, teachers serve as models for NVC. When the teacher's NVC is

different from his or her verbal communication, children may have difficulty processing the true intention of the communication.

The construct of teacher immediacy has evolved over the past two decades. At first, communication researchers focused on the relationship between teacher NVC and student learning (Andersen, 1979; Richmond, Gorham, & McCroskey, 1987). Collective findings from these early studies support a positive relationship between teacher nonverbal immediacy and affective student learning.

NVC plays a key role in pedagogy. Children in the classroom will recognize NVC in the classroom setting. The quality of children's learning relies heavily upon the quality of interaction between themselves and the instructor, and NVC shapes much of this interaction as children' vocabulary and level of knowing is limited. Body language can be an effective tool portraying attitude and reinforcements (Wolfgang, 1977). Competent teachers will employ NVC regularly to keep the classroom under control and portray the importance of material (Sleep, 2011).

Several rewards can arise from the use of NVC in the classroom. NVC is shown to contribute to positive changes in the emotional state of receivers (Griffin, 1985). These changes are not always positive; NVC can be problematic in delivery. Unintended consequences and meanings are often conveyed due to differences in NVC perception and reception. No matter what the outcome is, its effect will undoubtedly be some type of change in the receiver's emotional state.

The communication behaviors employed by primary teachers play a strategic role in desired learning outcomes (Allen, Witt & Wheeless, 2006). NVC immediacy behaviors such as eye contact, smile, body posture, gestures and use of physical space have the

effect of increasing learning and interest (Andersen, 1979). When teachers seek to employ affective nonverbal immediacy strategies, students indicate greater enjoyment of the class and increased perceptions of having learned from the teacher (Griffin, 1985).

Communication research has provided consistent support for a positive relationship between teacher NVC and student affective learning (Andersen, 1979). When teachers seek to utilize appropriate NVC, students respond with increased interest in the teacher and increased interesting the subject matter (McCroskey & Richmond, 1996). Appropriate NVC communicates the teachers' desired output of emotion and conveys a sense of meaning with the verbal communication (Navaro, 2009)

The effects of NVC immediacy have also shown to be positively correlated with higher levels of motivation in students and increased interest in subject matter. Increased motivation in subject matter is valuable to primary reading instructors and plays a critical role in students' learning. Motivation often decides if learning will be superficial and short-term or deep and internalized (Griffin, 1985). Respect, concern, warmth, willingness to listen, and excitement about the material are all desired NVC cues for motivation (Griffin, 1985). Due to the increased awareness of the prominent role of motivation in reading, teachers are now more aware of the need to bring it about in classrooms.

NVC may also help instructors generate interest in subject matter. Teachers are often solely left to create a genuine interest in reading within students especially when parents and peers are not conveying interest to the students. Teachers indicate interest in the material and in the development of reading skills to be the number one contributor to successful reading development (O'Flahavan, Gambrell, Guthrie, Stahl, & Alvermann,

1992).

Primary teachers' use of enthusiasm can convey a genuine interest and enjoyment for reading materials, which can translate to students. Enthusiasm for material is correlated with positive attitudes toward the material, recall of information, and desire for continued learning (Natof & Romanczyk, 2009). Teacher's displayed enthusiasm is often one of the most cited reasons for student enthusiasm regarding reading (Bromley & Winters, 1994).

NVC can play a strategic role in bringing about desired learning outcomes, increased motivation, and interest during reading instruction. NVC appears in many variations within the classroom. After reviewing relevant scholarly literature regarding the use of nonverbal communication in primary education and reviewing the limited scholarly literature regarding the use of NVC in reading instruction, the following NVC codes consistently emerged. These types of NVC include classroom environment, use of space, gestures, eye contact, tone, touch, smiling, and dress.

Primary reading instructors should seek to create a classroom environment that excites students about reading. Research linking excitement to effective reading instruction indicates the classroom delivers NVC to primary students (Sommer, 1977). Everything in the classroom communicates – time systems, physical spaces, and material objects (Hall & Hall, 1971). The learning environment must support the teacher's curriculum. If the classroom environment supports its given material, the easier it is for teachers to begin and sustain the desired activity there (Griffin, 1985).

Prior research suggests that informal classroom arrangements are more conducive to reading instruction (Rosenfeld, 1977). Informal classrooms often include student seat

selection and alternative seating such as rugs or mats. The instructor's teaching philosophy will be reflected in the layout of the classroom (Sommer, 1977). The teacher should be able to justify his or her classroom arrangement in accordance with his or her educational goals – specifically space that is intended to enhance reading education. Physical and social systems are intertwined; therefore, physical environments have an impact on behavior (Griffin, 1985).

Besides elements within the classroom, teachers should also use the construct of space between themselves and students to aid in their instruction. Space communicates to children – in a very real sense it tells students how to act (Rosenfeld, 1977). During reading instruction, it is important for teachers to minimize space between students to make reading instruction seem less like instruction and more like a shared time of reading. Space is reduced by arranging the classroom to minimize area between themselves and students, which may include seating, podium, desk or teaching arrangements. Space may also be reduced when teachers move around the classroom and reduce the physical space between themselves and students. The correct use of proxemic techniques in the classroom aids in effective classroom management. A well-managed classroom of children sets up a learning environment more conducive to group and one-on-one instruction. Effective management techniques can establish a productive learning environment that promotes literacy and encourages student independence (The Annenberg Foundation, 2012). Reducing space also helps the teacher in reinforcing material and making other forms of NVC clearer.

Gestures are especially important when communicating with children. In the field of teaching, teaching gestures are different from the everyday communicative gesture.

Gestures often aid teachers in communicating new material to children, which is in contrast to adult conversation where the gestures may merely be an addition to the words being spoken. When the learning audience is children, the linguistic relationship is highly asymmetric. Children rely on gestures to understand what the teacher is saying. The gestures must convey enough of meaning to be understood alone (without verbal expression), acting as cues for children about material (Marion, 2005). Previous research indicates that teaching gestures are produced more strategically because teachers view them as specifically addressed to learners. These gestures seek to explain new material and are particularly utilized when teaching new vocabulary and syntax – a foundation of reading education. These gestures can appear in forms such as hand gestures, pantomime, and body movements. These gestures may symbolize something and help children truly understanding meaning of the verbal (Marion, 2005).

Eye contact is a significant function within the classroom. In the primary classroom setting, eye contact of the teacher, as non-verbal cue, is vital and directly affects the learning of the students and aides in classroom management. The level of credibility and honesty demonstrated to students from the instructor has been found to relate to the amount of eye contact exhibited by the teacher (Miller, 1998).

Eye contact is specifically valuable during reading instruction as eye contact can display interest and enthusiasm while a teacher is reading to the students. The teacher's excitement over reading is strongly correlated with inciting excitement over material for students (Rosenfeld, 1977). Eye contact encouragement for students to continue listening or reading aloud if applicable. It is also helpful in assessing deviance, which is distracting the student exhibiting deviant behavior as well as other students around him or

her.

The teacher's use of eye contact is also linked to increasing motivation. Eye contact increases motivation by conveying the teacher's interest in students; primary students often see the loss of teacher's interest as a negative experience. Therefore, frequent eye contact conveys can serve as a motivator for both a positive student-teacher relationship and keeping interest in material (Wainwright, 2003). Motivation plays a critical role in the teacher's ability to continuously develop students' literacy skills (Wainwright, 2003).

Tone is also an NVC variable that plays an important role during any adult-child communication experience. It is especially effective in the primary student-teacher relationship (Nicholson, 2005). Calm, warm, and assertive tones help give clear directions, where aggressive and harsh tones convolute the message and cause children to disengage (Honig, 2007). A teacher's reliance on his or her voice, especially the use of voice during reading and reading instruction, makes tone an important skill to consider. Tone can convey interest or motivation, both of which are important in reading instruction.

Touch plays an important role in the primary classroom experience and also during reading instruction. Touch can indicate encouragement, concern, care, and sincerity (Rosenfeld, 1977). Touch should be brief and understood to be in a non-threatening way (Barnhouse, 2009). Touch can occur more frequently with students in kindergarten – third grade, which touch for students in fourth and fifth grade is discouraged. During reading instruction, continues to exemplify encouragement, which in turn may increase a primary student's motivation to learn (Harvey, 2011).

Smiling plays has an effective role during reading instruction due to its natural

conveyance of encouragement, interest, and happiness (Check, 1997). Scholars have found it difficult to directly link educators' smiling with effective learning, but it has been linked to increased motivation interest in subject matter within primary education (Miller, 1998). Children's lack of vocabulary makes NVC cues much more salient, and smiling emerges as one of the most effective means of communication with children. Smiling is valuable to the reading instructor when seeking to convey interest and encouragement to students (Miller, 1998).

Last, dress as a form of NVC plays a strategic role in the primary classroom and may have an effect on reading instruction. Little literature exists regarding the role of dress in reading instruction; previous studies indicate the dress plays a role in the primary education (Rosenfeld, 1977). The teacher's dress is directly correlated with the way he or she exerts influence and retains attention in the classroom. Dress communicates concern and respect for the students, and students as young as kindergarten can interpret certain meanings behind dress (Rosenfeld, 1977).   Although research needs to be conducted to understand the direct effects of dress during reading instruction, dress plays a role in communicating respect and care. Respect and care are beneficial during reading education.

NVC in the classroom includes the overall classroom environment as well as the teacher's display of NVC. Effective use of NVC in the classroom, especially in regard to enhancing reading education, is an important and ever-present element that must be evaluated.   Effective classroom NVC should support the learning curriculum and add to the over-all quality of the reading education.

It is important to recognize ineffective or inappropriate NVC can have as much of a

negative impact on the classroom experience as appropriate NVC can bring about positive results. Prior research suggests that many newly qualified teachers often display a characteristic of ineffective teaching regarding appropriate body language. These teachers are often unaware of what they are displaying and how students are perceiving their NVC. Ineffective or inappropriate NVC can affect the quality and salience of reading instruction.

Scholarly research support NVC's existence within the primary classroom setting.. The undeniable presence of NVC during the communication process during education leads one to believe it is indeed present during reading instruction. However, limited research exists confirming the specified important types of NVC in primary education and reading education actually exist within the classroom. Validating their existence will aid in assessing what types play a strategic role in reading instruction. Evaluating their presence and roles may also help in educating future primary reading instructors.

In order to affirm research-indicated important types of NVC within reading instruction, primary instructor's use of NVC during reading instruction must be evaluated. In order to assess what types of NVC occur during reading instruction, the following research questions were developed:

RQ$_1$: Do teachers strategically use NVC during reading instruction? If not, are they aware of the NVC they are employing?

RQ$_2$: To what extent do the NVC codes consistently identified as important in primary education actually appear in the classroom during reading instruction?

RQ$_3$: Do teachers have any prior training or education in the use of NVC during reading instruction?

Chapter Three: Methods

The researcher distributed two-hundred thirty questionnaires to kindergarten-fifth grade teachers in Cabell County Elementary Schools in West Virginia in the spring of 2012. Fifty-seven completed questionnaires were returned. Of this sample, 49 (86%) were female and 2 (4%) were male. Six (10%) did not indicate their gender. Of the total sample, six (11%) fell into the 21-25 age group, 7 (12%) into the 26-30 group, 7 (12%) into the 31-35 group, 3 (5%) into the 36-40 group, 9 (16%) into the 41-45 group, 3 (5%) into 46-50 group, 8 (14%) into the 51-55 group, 3 (5%) into the 56-60 group, 3 (5%) into the 61-65 group, and 2 (4%) into the 66 and over group. Six (11%) respondents did not provide their age. Thirty-three (39%) respondents held a Master's degree, 22 (57%) respondents held a Bachelor's degree, one respondent (2%) did not hold a degree, and one respondent (2%) did not indicate a degree held.

Respondents indicated the grade he or she was teaching at the time of data collection. Twenty-six respondents (46%) taught kindergarten or first grade, 14 (25%) taught second or third grade, 11 (19%) taught fourth or fifth grade, and 5 (9%) indicated other. One respondent (1%) did not indicate.

Out of the 57 respondents, the majority of respondents (n=40, 70%) indicated 2-3 hours a day were spent solely focused on reading instruction. Eight respondents (14%) indicated 1 hour or less, 7 respondents (12%) indicated 3-4 hours, and 2 respondents (4%) indicated 4 hours or more were spent on reading instruction.

The purpose of this research was to discover descriptive statistics and frequencies regarding the presence, use and types of NVC during reading instruction. Questions were formed after reading relevant literature regarding the forms of NVC that were most prominent during primary education and/or reading instruction. Although many different

types and demonstrations of NVC exist within the classroom at any given time, the types of NVC included in the survey were those prior research demonstrated as particularly useful during reading instruction. In order to assess the presence and types of teachers' NVC during reading instruction, self-reporting paper-copy questionnaires were utilized.

The questionnaire included 57 close-ended questions. The degree was measured with a five point, Likert numerical rating scale. A response of "1" indicated "Almost Always," and a response of "5" indicated "Almost Never."

All nineteen Cabell County public elementary schools were eligible to participate in the research; four schools declined the invitation. This county was chosen based on location convenience to the researcher's institution. Participation was voluntary for both principals and teachers.

Primary teachers grades kindergarten through fifth grade were selected for this study. The West Virginia Department of Education website indicates reading education goals for each grade from kindergarten to fifth; therefore, teachers from each grade were include in the sample. Participants were at least 18 years of age. The study population will be further distinguished by age, grade level, education level, and teaching experience.

After the researcher received permission from Marshall University's Institutional Review Board, permission to distribute surveys on the grounds of Cabell County elementary schools was obtained from the Cabell County Superintendent. Principals' participation consent was obtained before distribution of the questionnaires. The surveys were distributed to in-class teachers in each participating school utilizing individual teacher's school mailboxes. Participants were given anonymous consent forms before

participating in the survey. A drop-box method was used to collect the surveys after

seven days. The principals indicated seven days would be standard time for collecting

data within in their schools based on their prior experiences.

Chapter 4: Data Analysis

<u>**RQ₁:**</u> <u>"Do teachers strategically use NVC during reading instruction? If not, are they</u>
<u>aware of the NVC they are employing?"</u>

Table 1: Naturally Use NVC and Specific Choices of NVC

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Naturally use NVC	57	1.3509	.66792
Specific choices of NVC	57	2.2982	1.19470
Valid N	57		

Respondents were asked if they made specific choices when employing NVC during reading instruction. Specific choices entail a strategic choice about which nonverbal communication action to employ. Table 1 indicates a mean score of 1.4 was produced, indicating that respondents "Almost Always" make specific choices of NVC during reading instruction. Respondents were also asked if they naturally used NVC during reading instruction. Table 1 assesses whether teachers believe they naturally use NVC while teaching reading. Even though prior research indicates NVC is a naturally occurring phenomenon within the classroom, teachers were asked to indicated their own acknowledgment of NVC. Table 1 indicates a mean score of 2.3 was produced, showing the majority of respondents indicated "2," which shows most felt NVC naturally occurs during reading instruction.

Table 1.2 Instructors Aware of NVC Variables

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Aware of facial expression	57	2.2807	1.08157
Aware of gestures	57	2.0702	1.03267
Aware of tone	57	1.5965	.72849
Valid N	57		

Table 1.2 indicates that majority of respondents are aware of their use of facial expression, gestures, and tone during reading instruction. Tone had the most frequent response rate of "Almost Always", indicating teachers were more commonly aware of their tone over facial expression and gestures.

RQ$_2$: To what extent do the NVC codes consistently identified as important in primary education actually appear in the classroom during reading instruction?

Table 2: NVC Variables Employed During Reading Instruction

	N	Sum	Std. Deviation
Eye contact	57	56.00	.13245
Movement around classroom	57	46.00	.39815
Touching students' arm/back	57	42.00	.44426
Smiling	57	52.00	.28540
Pitch/tone	57	55.00	.18564
Hand gestures	57	55.00	.18564
Use of space	57	51.00	.45056
Valid N	57		

Table 2 indicates that, of 57 respondents, the majority indicated the use of eye contact, movement around classroom, touching students' arms and backs, smiling, specific pitch and tone, gestures, and strategic use of space during reading instruction. Eye contact, pitch and tone, and hand gestures were indicated most frequently.

Crosstabulations were used to assess if respondents were aware of their use of gestures and tone.

Table 2.2: Crosstabulation – Use of Gestures & Aware of Gestures

		Aware of gestures					Total
		Almost Always	2	3	4	Almost Never	
Hand gestures	No	1	0	0	1	0	2
	Yes	19	20	11	4	1	55
Total		20	20	11	5	1	57

Because a majority of the respondents (n=55, 97%) indicated they used gestures during reading instruction, a crosstabulation was used to determine how many how many of the percentage indicating use of gestures also indicated they "Almost Always" were aware of the gestures they were using. Table 2.2 indicates 19 (35%) respondents who indicated the use of gestures also indicated they are "Almost Always" aware of the gestures they are using. This data indicates that most of the gestures occurring during reading instruction occur naturally.

Table 2.3: Crosstabulation - Use of Pitch/Tone & Aware of Pitch/Tone

		Aware of tone				Total
		Almost Always	2	3	4	
Pitch/tone to convey emotions	No	2	0	0	0	2
	Yes	28	21	5	1	55
Total		30	21	5	1	57

Because a majority of the respondents (n=55, 97%) indicated they used tone during reading instruction, a crosstabulation was used to determine how many how many of the percentage indicating use of gestures also indicated they "Almost Always" were

aware of the gestures they were using. Table 2.3 indicates 28 (43%) respondents who

indicated the use of pitch/tone also indicated they are "Almost Always" aware of the

pitch/tone they are using.

The majority of respondents reported the use of the NVC codes identified. Next,

the extent to which NVC codes were employed was assessed.

Table 2.4: Descriptive Statistics of NVC Variables

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Utilize silence during teaching	57	2.5965	1.08331
Go to student	57	2.0526	.98961
Moving around	57	1.5088	.88888
Smiling	57	2.1053	.93892
Strategic eye contact	57	1.8246	.73492
Alternative seating	57	1.9825	1.02628
Students gather around	57	1.6842	.86928
Dress affects instruction	57	3.2632	1.18813
Valid N	57		

Table 2.4 indicates instructors' frequency of use the variables listed. Moving

around the classroom, strategic eye contact, use of alternative seating, and having

students gather around during time of reading instruction emerged as the most frequently

employed variables. Utilizing silence, going to students when they are in need of help,

and smiling were also used rather frequently. The use of dress in effecting reading

instruction was met with a relatively neutral response.

Table 2.5: Correlations of NVC Variables (n=57)

Variables	Utilize silence	Moving around	Go to student	Smiling	Strategic eye contact	Alternative seating	Students gather around	Dress
Moving around classroom	.03							
Go to student	.19	.23						
Smiling	.17	.08	.11					
Strategic Eye Contact	.25	.14	.04	.44**				
Alternative seating	-.04	.38**	.32*	.24	.21			
Students gather around	.15	.17	.19	.13	-.03	.29*		
Dress	-.07	.38**	-.06	.18	.14	.09	-.14	

Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**
Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)*

Table 2.5 indicates the amount of correlation. Dress has a significant relationship (r=.38, p<.01) with moving around the classroom, indicating the type of dress may affect the teacher's desire to move about the classroom during reading instruction. Alternative seating also has a significant relationship with moving around the classroom (r=.38, p <.01) as teachers would be more apt to move around the classroom and go to students when alternative seating is employed during reading instruction. Alternative seating also has a significant relationship with teachers having student gather around him

or her during reading instruction (r=.29, *p* <.05); this is a natural relationship based upon

alternative seating would have to be utilized in order to have students gather around.

Smiling and strategic eye contact have a significant relationship (r=.44, *p* <.01),

demonstrating they often occur together.

RQ₃: Do teachers have any prior training or education in the use of NVC during reading
instruction?

The lack of existing literature regarding the use of NVC in reading instruction, as

well of a lack of its presence in educational resources, indicates teachers may not have

received any prior training or education regarding the use of NVC in reading instruction.

Table 3: Training in Use of NVC in Reading Instruction

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Training	35	22.7	61.4	61.4
	Some Training	21	13.6	36.8	98.2
	A lot of Training	1	.6	1.8	100.0
	Total	57	37.0	100.0	
Total			100.0		

Table 3 indicates that of the 57 respondents, 35 respondents (61%) indicates "No

Training", 21 respondents (37%) indicated "Some Training", and only 1 respondent (2%)

indicated "A Lot of Training." The one respondent who did indicated "A Lot of

Training" held a Bachelor's Degree.

Table 3.2: Self-research of NVC During Reading Instruction

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	46	80.7	80.7	80.7
	Some	8	14.0	14.0	94.7
	Often	3	5.3	5.3	100.0
	Total	57	100.0	100.0	

Due the lack of literature regarding the training of primary instructors in the use of NVC during reading instruction, it was assumed that many respondents would not have received formal training in the use of NVC during reading instruction. Therefore, the instrument included a question regarding self-research.

Table 3.1 indicates of the 57 respondents, 46 (81%) indicated they had not conducted any self-research of NVC use during reading instruction. Eight respondents (14%) indicated "Some," and 3 respondents indicated "Often." A crosstabulation was used to assess how many respondents who indicated no prior training also had not conducted any self-research.

Table 3.3: Crosstabulation –Training in use of NVC & Self-research of NVC

		Self-research of NVC			Total
		No	Some	Often	
Training in use of NVC	No Training	30	2	3	35
	Some Training	16	5	0	21
	A lot of Training	0	1	0	1
Total		46	8	3	57

Table 3.3 indicates 30 respondents (53%) had no training in the use of NVC during

reading instruction nor had conducted any self-research.   Only 3 respondents (5%) who

indicated they had no training indicated they engaged in self-research.

Last, respondents were asked to evaluate the importance of NVC during reading

instruction and if they would like to implement more strategic NVC into their reading

instruction. These questions were included on the instrument in hopes of providing

knowledge regarding the respondents' feelings toward NVC and directions for future

research, education, and training regarding the use of NVC in reading instruction.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics of NVC's Importance

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
NVC important during teach	57	1.00	3.00	1.5263	.73449
NVC important during instruction	57	1.00	3.00	1.5614	.77960
Valid N	57				

The instrument asked whether teachers if they found the use of NVC important

during reading instruction ($\alpha = .816$). Table 2 indicates the results produced a mean of

1.5 and 1.6, indicating teachers "Almost Always" found the use of NVC important during

reading instruction.

Table 4.2: Implement More Strategic Nonverbal Communication during Reading Instruction

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	8	14.0	14.0	14.0
	Somewhat	26	45.6	45.6	59.6
	Yes	10	17.5	17.5	77.2
	Unsure	13	22.8	22.8	100.0
	Total	57	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.2 indicates the majority of respondents (n=26, 46%) were "Somewhat" interested in implementing more strategic use of NVC during reading instruction. Ten respondents (17%) indicated "Yes," and 8 respondents (14%) indicated "No." Thirteen respondents (23%) indicated they were "Unsure."

Table 4.3: Crosstabulation – Implement more NVC & NVC Important During Reading Instruction

		NVC important during instruction			Total
		Almost Always	2	3	
Implement more NVC	No	4	1	3	8
	Somewhat	13	10	3	26
	Yes	7	0	3	10
	Unsure	11	1	1	13
Total		35	12	10	57

Because the majority of respondents somewhat interested in implementing more NVC during reading instruction, a crosstabulation was used to assess which respondents were somewhat interested and believed that NVC was important during reading instruction. Table 14.2 indicates that 13 respondents (23%) were found that NVC was "Almost Always" important during reading instruction but were only somewhat interested in implementing more. Four respondents (7%) indicated they "Almost

Always" believe NVC is important during reading instruction, but were not interested in implementing more strategic NVC during reading instruction. Eleven respondents (19%) indicated they "Almost Always" believe NVC is important during reading instruction, but were unsure if they wanted to implement more strategic NVC.

Table 4.4: Crosstabulation – Implement More NVC During Reading Instruction & Self-research of NVC during Reading Instruction

| | | Self-research of NVC | | | Total |
		No	Some	Often	
	No	7	1	0	8
Implement more	Somewhat	20	3	3	26
NVC	Yes	8	2	0	10
	Unsure	11	2	0	13
Total		46	8	3	57

A crosstabulation was used to assess if those who wanted to implement more strategic NVC during reading instruction had conducted any self-research of NVC during reading instruction. Twenty respondents (35%) who indicated they "Somewhat" wanted to implement more NVC during reading instruction had not conducted any self-research. Eight respondents (14%) who indicated "Yes" had not conducted any self-research. Six respondents (11%) who indicated they had conducted self-research "Some" or "Often" were of the 20 respondents who were somewhat interested in implementing more NVC during reading instruction. Two respondents (4%) who indicated "Yes" regarding implementing more NVC during reading instruction indicated they had conducted "Some" self-research.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine some descriptive statistics regarding the presence and types of NVC existent in primary reading instruction. A lack of research exists validating the existence of NVC codes that scholarly researched indicated as important during primary education and reading instruction. This study sought to determine NVC variables consistently present during primary reading instruction and analyze the implications of the frequencies at which they occur.

First, Research Question 1 evaluated the strategic use of NVC during reading instruction. Scholarly research indicates NVC is a naturally recurring phenomenon in the communication process, and this is true of its presence in primary education (Burgoon, 1994; Rosenfeld, 1977). Due to NVC's organic presence within primary education and reading instruction, the knowledge of the strategic employment of NVC during reading instruction would be helpful in assessing if instructors are actually thinking about the NVC they employ. The majority of respondents indicated they strategically use NVC. This find was encouraging because the strategic use of NVC indicated teachers were both aware of NVC's existence and that strategic NVC had some type of effect on reading instruction. The natural use of NVC during reading instruction produced a more frequent response than strategic use, indicating instructors felt NVC occurred naturally more frequently than strategic use of NVC was employed. Research Question 1 was answered by the majority of respondents employing strategic use of NVC during reading instruction. Because respondents felt more strongly that NVC was naturally occurring, instructors may not have had prior knowledge that strategic NVC can be used or useful in reading instruction.

The instrument specifically assessed whether instructors were aware of their facial

expressions, gestures, and tone during reading instruction. Tone emerged as the NVC variable instructors were most commonly aware of. Primary teachers are often aware that their words and tone communicate to children, and this research indicates that instructors were indeed aware of the tone they utilize during reading instruction. Instructors were also aware of facial expressions and gestures, which was more surprising as the literature review indicated these tend to occur more naturally. Instructors' awareness of tone, facial expression, and gestures indicates some level of awareness of their effectiveness in reading instruction. The use and awareness of their use further validates research hypothesizing their presence and beneficial use within primary reading instruction.

Overall, the data provided relatively consistent findings regarding the presence of NVC codes scholarly research deemed as important NVC variables during primary education and reading instruction. Research Question 2 addressed the presence of certain NVC codes present during reading instruction. These codes were identified in the literature review as useful during primary reading instruction. Eye contact, movement around the classroom, touching students' arm and back, smiling, pitch and tone, hand gestures, and use of space were all indicated to frequently occur during reading instruction. Given the high frequency with which these NVC codes (eye contact, movement around the classroom, touching students' arm and back, smiling, pitch and tone, hand gestures, moving around classroom, and use of space) were reported as present during reading instruction, their utility and effect within literacy education should be evaluated. Although the instrument and utilization of self-reports limits assessing the implications of the NVC variables, some relationships and effects can be established. The NVC codes present in this study will be further evaluated.

Eye contact, pitch and tone, and hand gestures were indicated most frequently. Although this study limits the interpretation of their specific effects within the reading instruction process, their frequency of use does lead to assume they are both utilized and effective in some manner during reading instruction. Because teachers spend the majority of the class time in front of students speaking, these three would be most visible from students to teacher. Eye contact, pitch, and tone have been correlated to increasing interest and motivation in primary students, therefore these variables' consistent use within the classroom can be, and should be, utilized to increase these variables in students.

Touching students' arm and back, movement around the classroom, and use of space were indicated least frequently. There is a natural correlation between these variables, and teachers would most likely need to move around the classroom and reduce space between themselves and students to touch the student. However, these three variables still appeared with relative frequency, indicating they are indeed present but teachers may not use them as naturally or frequently as eye contact, pitch, tone, or gestures. Table 2.5 revealed a significant relationship between moving around the classroom and going to students, and the natural functions of these together may help in integrating touch.

It was expected that touch would not occur as frequently as other NVC variables, as the majority of literature regarding the use of touch was often communicating what not to do in the primary setting. Literature existed regarding the use of touch to display support and encouragement, but the abundance of literature regulating the use of touch pollutes teachers' understanding of the effectiveness of appropriate use.

The instrument allowed for the frequency at which gestures, tone, and pitch occurred to be compared with whether instructors were aware of their use of these NVC variables. The results indicated that the majority of respondents were aware of their use of these variables, and were more strongly aware of their use of pitch and tone. Limited research exists regarding what types of pitches and tones are most useful during reading instruction, and the use of pitch and tone is strongly tied with eliciting enthusiasm from students during primary instruction (Rosenfeld, 1977). The salience of reading instruction depends on enthusiasm, therefore pitch and tone should be utilized to convey enthusiasm about the subject and materials to students. The strong relationship between the use of pitch and tone, and the awareness of use of pitch and tone, allows further research to focus on using pitch and tone to bring about enthusiasm, as well as examine what other types of pitch and tone are affective in reading instruction.

The instrument revealed a frequent presence of strategic eye contact during reading instruction. Table 2.5 revealed that eye contact had a significant relationship with the use of smiling. Therefore, one may evaluate that eye contact coupled with smiling play a significant role in reading instruction. Eye contact and smiling are each shown to increase interest and motivation in children during education, so together they would have an undeniable effect on learning outcomes. This study did not allow for the measurement of their coupled effect, but it can by hypothesized that their strategic simultaneous use would bring about interest and motivation from students. Their coupled use may increase the salience of reading instruction.

Interestingly, eye contact had a low correlation with having students gather around. It seems that if students were gathered around the instructor and space was reduced, eye

contact would happen easier and more naturally due to the reduced distance between teacher and students' faces. This low correlation may indicate that teachers are less likely to engage in eye contact due to the students being close to them and feeling as they do not need to look at them to engage them. Also, as reading instruction often involves the holding of materials, instructors may focus more on the material when students are close by than the actual students. Eye contact plays such a strategic role in reading instruction that it will be beneficial to instructors to continue employing its use even when students are in close proximity. The ability to sit closer to the teacher during reading instruction undoubtedly helps in fostering the relationship between the student and teacher, and use of eye contact in this setting may help make this relationship more salient and effective. A more salient relationship may help the teacher communicate the emotions of support, motivation, and enthusiasm.

It may also be pertinent for the instructor to recognize that eye contact is of use in developing individual relationships with students. Likewise, alternative seating and reducing space between students has been found to foster more salient teacher-student relationships (Griffin, 1985). If bringing students around the instructor is correlated with reduced eye contact, teachers must remember that individual eye contact should be utilized during alternative seating and reduced space. The use of these NVC variables together will produce effective literacy training focused on the individual relational needs of the student.

A significant relationship existed between moving around the classroom and the use of alternative seating. The use of alternative seating allows teachers to increase the comfortableness of students within the classroom, which can increase willingness to learn

(Sommer, 1977). Teachers' use of alternative seating will allow teachers greater options for moving about the classroom; teachers will not be confined to the patterns of the classroom layout, but rather can make strategic choices in going to students for communication. The use of alternative seating also produced a significant relationship with going to students. Teachers approaching students in alternative seating may allow them to grow their relationship due to the student feeling more comfortable. Approaching a student outside of desk arrangement may communicate the potential development of a relationship, rather than just the teacher assisting the student. This relationship may allow the instructor to communicate easier with students, and increase the salience of motivation and encouragement.

Dress was one of the least frequently reported NVC variables, and only 53% of respondents indicated they believed dress showed respect during reading instruction. Dress showing respect was one of the more frequent reported uses of dress in primary education.

Interestingly, dress did provide a significant relationship with moving around the classroom, which indicates some variable about the type of dress affects the teacher's use of moving around the room. The comfortableness of the instructor's dress may affect their willingness to move about the classroom. It was not found that teachers used dress to communicate during reading instruction, or that dress showed students respect during reading instruction. However, dress' relationship with moving around the classroom gives it merit as an NVC code within the classroom. Because moving around the classroom correlates to increasing salience within literacy education, dress plays some role in determining if teachers will be likely to move around the room during reading

instruction. Dress also produced a significant relationship with having students gather around during reading instruction. Once again, the comfortableness of the teachers' dress may affect their decision to have students gather around and their comfort level with having students closer to them.

Respondents indicated a high frequency of the use of smiling, but smiling had a very low relationship of significance with moving around the classroom. When teachers are moving around the classroom, they may be focused on assessing students, acknowledging deviancy, or looking for students' needs. However, it important for teachers to recognize their facial expressions, including smiling, will be communicating to students at all time and may affect the possible student-teacher interaction. For example, a student may be working on a literacy activity at their desk as the teacher moves around the room. If the student needs help, they may look up to signal the teacher. If the teacher is not smiling, the child may interpret that as disinterest in the material or in helping the student. Smiling's significant relationship with eye contact may indicate that when eye contact is made, a smile occurs. However, if the student looks at the teacher before eye contact is made, a lack of smiling may affect their decision to ask for help.

Overall, the NVC variables evaluated as important were demonstrated in high frequencies in reading instruction. These findings increase the validity of literature pointing to the presence of these variables in primary education and add to the limited knowledge of NVC in reading instruction. The validation of NVC's presence in reading instruction, as well as the identification of the types that exist, provides a foundation for exploring what specific effects NVC variables have on reading instruction.

Finally, Research Question 3 assessed what prior training and education primary

instructors had experienced regarding the use of NVC in reading instruction. Due to the lack of research regarding the use of NVC in primary reading education, it was assumed most of the primary teachers surveyed would have received little education or training regarding their strategic use in reading education. Research showed 61% of respondents indicated "No Training."

Because training or education of NVC in reading instruction was utilized, respondents were left to self-research in order to determine effective NVC in reading instruction. Results indicated 81% of respondents had not conducted any self-research of NVC during reading instruction. A crosstabulation revealed 80% of respondents had received no training or had conducted no self-research.   A lack of education, training, and self-research does not mean a lack of or incorrect use of NVC during reading education, but it does bring about the question of how education and training can bring allow NVC to play a more productive role during reading education.

Respondents indicated NVC was important during reading instruction. This was an encouraging find, as the more likely instructors were to feel NVC was important, the more likely they would be to engage in training, self-research, or evaluate their own use of NVC in reading education.

Although respondents indicated NVC was important during reading instruction, the majority of respondents were only somewhat willing to implement more strategic NVC use during reading instruction. The majority of respondents indicated they "Almost Always" felt NVC was important during reading instruction, but were only somewhat interested in implementing more. Respondents indicated they did indeed recognize NVC's natural presence and importance within reading instruction, but this did not

necessarily affect their willingness to implement more NVC into reading instruction. Respondents may have only been somewhat willing to implement NVC into reading instruction based on a lack of knowledge regarding strategic use of NVC, the specific use of NVC in reading instruction, or tactics for implementing more NVC. Whatever the cause, instructor's indication of NVC's presence and importance has not convinced instructors that strategic NVC should be implemented into reading instruction. Low amounts of prior training and self-research regarding the use of NVC in reading instruction may also have affected the willingness of participants to implement more NVC.

Several limitations were presented in this study. First, self-reporting surveys reduce internal validity by asking individuals to recall experiences, which is particularly difficult when asking respondents to recall NVC, most of which occurs naturally. Second, the size of the study reduces generalizability. Adequate preparatory measures were taken to evaluate the elementary school's desire to participant in the survey but a low percentage of questionnaires were returned. However, the respondents provide a snapshot current NVC present during reading instruction. Third, the instrument itself greatly limited the knowledge that could be acquired. Ideally, observation would yield more accurate results for this study, yet the time needed to access such episodic, sporadic, and unpredictable behavior as NVC was beyond the realms of this study and questionnaire. Finally, the instrument itself needed to be expanded to include more questions regarding the frequency of use of certain NVC codes. Data analysis revealed not all variables could be adequately assessed and correlated to determine the frequency at which they occurred with other variables, which limited the analysis of data.

The limitations provide excellent starting points for future research. First, self-reports greatly limit the ability to verify the accuracy of the respondent's reports. Future research could hopefully incorporate the use of both self-reports and observation to increase accuracy and validity. Second, future research could focus on evaluating what effect the study's indicated NVC codes has on reading instruction. This study provided validation of the NVC's codes (Eye contact, movement around the classroom, touching students' arm and back, smiling, pitch and tone, hand gestures, moving around classroom, and use of space) existence writhing reading instruction and provided some analysis of their use within reading instruction. Future research could focus on these individual variables and utilize by self-reports and observations to greater assess their individual functions within reading instruction. Third, more research should be conducted to demonstrate a more concrete relationship between the indicated NVC codes and their fostering of motivation and enthusiasm. Motivation and enthusiasm emerged as variables increasing reading instruction's saliency, and these NVC codes were indicated to increase motivation and enthusiasm. Future research could evaluate how these NVC codes bring about motivation and enthusiasm and what strategic choices of NVC need to be made in order to bring about the results. Last, future research should focus on the role of dress within the reading instruction process. Dress emerged as significantly less utilized than other NVC variables, and future research could indicate its role within reading instruction, as well as how it can be effectively incorporated into primary reading instruction.

Future research will hopefully allow for the development of education and training programs to provide instructors with advice on what types of NVC should be

incorporated into the classroom. This knowledge will also hopefully be available for those instructors hoping to conduct self-research. Because of the frequency at which respondents indicated no prior training in the use of NVC in reading instruction and self-research, mandatory training by elementary schools may be the most successful way for instructing teachers' on the use of NVC in reading instruction. Training may want to first focus on NVC variables that occurred frequently (eye contact, gestures, pitch, and tone), and provide more depth of knowledge and how and why these NVC variable should be used to bring about enthusiasm, motivation, and literacy. Next, training should focus on the less frequently used NVC variables (dress, moving around, use of space), and indicate their place and importance within primary reading instruction. Strategic implementation plans should be developed to help teachers employ effective NVC.

The purpose of this study was to provide descriptive statistics of the types of NVC occurring during reading instruction. The data revealed that the majority of effective NVC types indicated in the literature review were also frequent among the respondents. Recognizing that through research the presence and types of NVC are of great use during reading instruction, and now affirming their presence in the respondents' reading instruction, future research can determine what specific role each of these variable plays in the reading instruction process. Future research will allow for training programs to implement NVC education as well encourage teachers to utilize strategic NVC for enhanced reading education.

Appendix A: Survey Instrument

Nonverbal communication is the act of giving or exchanging information without using any spoken words.

Examples of Nonverbal Communication:

- Gestures
- Eye contact
- Glances
- Facial expressions
- Use of space between you and students
- Posture
- Touch
- Walking around your classroom

Almost Always				Almost Never
1	2	3	4	5

_____1. You naturally use nonverbal gestures such as hand motions, facial expressions and use of space when teaching reading.

_____2. You find the use of nonverbal communication important when teaching reading.

_____3. You often make specific choices in which forms of nonverbal communication to use when teaching reading.

_____4. You find students responsive to the use of your nonverbal communication when teaching reading.

_____5. You find the use of nonverbal communication important during reading instruction.

_____6. You find that minimizing the space between you and students is an important teaching tool when teaching reading.

_____7. You use role-playing as a teaching technique in your classroom when teaching reading.

_____8. You utilize silence as a teaching tool when teaching reading

_____9. Long pauses or silence indicate a student is thinking about the material you have just covered.

_____10. Long pauses or silence indicate the students are confused and in need of more instruction.

_____11. You find the need to convey enthusiasm during reading instruction.

_____12. You utilize pitch and tone of your voice to convey enthusiasm during reading instruction.

_____13. You find touching the student on the back or arm as a helpful teaching tool during reading instruction.

_____14. In the classroom, you finding moving around with the students, sitting on the floor with them, and going to them when they need help is an effective teaching tool during reading instruction.

_____15. You prefer to go to your students when they need help rather than them coming to you.

_____16. You arrange your seating during reading instruction so that you can see all students at all times.

_____17. You find the use of eye contact during reading instruction important.

_____18. When a student is confused during reading instruction, you find it important to kneel beside them when explaining the concept.

_____19. When a student is confused during reading instruction, you find it important to smile when explaining the concept.

_____20. You tend to be aware of the expression on your face during reading instruction.

_____21. You tend to be aware of your gestures during reading instruction.

_____22. You tend to be aware of your tone of voice during reading instruction.

_____23. You tend to make strategic choices of eye contact during reading instruction.

_____24. You find your own excitement over reading instruction material often incites excitement from the students.

_____25. When teaching reading, you strive to be animated and excited.

_____26. You find touching the students during reading instruction to be a valuable teaching tool.

_____27. You believe eye contact is valuable in building relationships with your students.

_____28. You may use alternative seating during reading instruction, such as sitting on the floor, rugs or pillows.

_____29. You like to have the students gather around you when reading to them.

_____30. Nonverbal communication during reading instruction rarely has an effect on your students.

_____31. You often look for nonverbal communication from your students during reading instruction.

_____32. You believe you are successful at using appropriate and effective nonverbal communication in your classroom during reading instruction.

_____33. My students are aware of and respond to nonverbal communication during reading instruction.

_____34. Nonverbal communication is especially effective in building relationships with my students.

_____35. You believe your dress plays a part in effective reading instruction.

_____36. Nonverbal communication allows you to communicate to a student easier than verbal communication.

_____37. It is your goal to build a relationship with each student in your classroom.

_____38. You seek to build open communication between you and your students.

_____39. Nonverbal communication is more effective than verbal communication to your students during reading instruction.

_____40. Your students respond better to nonverbal feedback than verbal during reading instruction.

_____41. You prefer nonverbal communication than verbal to indicate an incorrect response or action during reading instruction.

_____42. You find nonverbal cues of incorrect answers/responses are more effective than verbal cues during reading instruction.

_____43. You find students can be confused by your use of nonverbal communication during reading instruction.

_____44. You believe your dress during reading instruction shows children they are respected.

_____45. You allow your students to make suggestions about where to sit during reading instruction time.

46. Which of the following nonverbal communication actions do you utilize? (Circle all that apply.)

A. Use of space

B. Hand gestures

C. Pitch and tone to convey emotions

D. Smiling

F. Touching the student's arm or back

G. Pointing

H. Movement around the classroom

I. Eye contact

47. Which of the following nonverbal communication actions do you utilize during reading instruction? (Circle all that apply.)

A. Use of space

B. Hand gestures

C. Pitch and tone to convey emotions

D. Smiling

F. Touching the student's arm or back

G. Pointing

H. Movement around the classroom

I. Eye contact

48. Did you receive any training on the use of nonverbal communalization while teaching reading during your education or training?

A. No training

B. Some training

C. A lot of training

49. Have you performed any self-conducted research on the use of nonverbal communication in teaching reading (i.e. looking online, reading books or seeking the advice from other teachers)?

A. No

B. Some

C. Often

50. Would you like to implement more strategic use of nonverbal communication during reading instruction?

A. No

B. Somewhat

C. Yes

D. Unsure

51. How many hours a day do you spend solely focused on reading instruction?

A. 1 hour or less

B. 2-3 hours

C. 3-4 hours

D. 4 hours or more

52. At the end of this school year, you will have completed _____ year of teaching.

A. First

B. Second to fourth

C. Fifth to tenth

D. Eleventh or higher

53. Degree held

A. Do not hold a degree

B. Bachelor's degree

C. Master's degree

D. Specialist

E. Doctoral

F. Other _____

54. The grade you teach: (circle one)

A. Kindergarten or First grade

B. Second or Third grade

C. Fourth or Fifth grade

D. Other: _____

55. Number of years you have taught at the following levels:

Kindergarten _____

1st _____

2nd _____

3rd _____

4th _____

5th _____

Other (grade and years) _____

56. Your age

A. 21-25

B. 26-30

C. 31-35

D. 36-40

E. 41-45

F. 46-50

G. 51-55

H. 56-60

I. 61- 65

J. 66 and over

57. Your sex

A. Female

B. Male

Appendix B: Institutional Review Board Approval Letter

Office of Research Integrity
Institutional Review Board
401 11th St., Suite 1300
Huntington, WV 25701

FWA 00002704

IRB1 #00002205
IRB2 #00003206

March 21, 2012

Stephen Cooper
Communication Studies

RE: IRBNet ID# 317702-1
At: Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/Behavioral)

Dear Dr. Cooper:

Protocol Title:	[317702-1] Assessing the Presence and Use of Nonverbal Communication in Reading Instruction
Expiration Date:	March 21, 2013
Site Location:	MU
Submission Type:	New Project APPROVED
Review Type:	Exempt Review

In accordance with 45CFR46.101(b)(2), the above study and informed consent were granted Exempted approval today by the Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/Behavioral) Designee for the period of 12 months. The approval will expire March 21, 2013. A continuing review request for this study must be submitted no later than 30 days prior to the expiration date.

This study is for student Amelia Ferrell.

If you have any questions, please contact the Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/Behavioral/Educational) Coordinator Michelle Woomer, B.A., M.S at (304) 696-4308 or woomer3@marshall.edu. Please include your study title and reference number in all correspondence with this office.

References

Allen, M., Witt P., & Wheeless, L. (2006). The role of teacher immediacy as a
motivational factor in student learning: Using meta-analysis to test a causal
model. *Communication Education, 55*(1), 21-31.

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

The Annenberg Foundation. (2012). Elements of classroom environment.
http://www.learner.org/libraries/readingk2/front/elements.html

Argyle, M. (1988). *Bodily communication*. London: Routledge.

Barnhouse, T. (2009). A study on the effects of touch and impression forming. National
Undergraduate Research Clearinghouse Site. Retrieved from:
http://clearinghouse.missouriwestern.edu/manuscripts/41.php

Bremme, D. W. & Erickson, F. (1977). Teachers, students, and classroom
organizations. *Research in the Teaching of English (16)*, 131-148.

Bromley, K., & Winters, D. (1994). Book buddies: Creating enthusiasm for literacy
learning. *Reading Teacher, 47*(5), 392-393.

Boilean, D M. (1981). Nonverbal communication: Classroom influence and topic.
Communication Education, 30, 305-306.

Burgoon, J.K. (1994). Nonverbal signals. In M. L. Knapp & G. R. Miller (Eds.),
Handbook of interpersonal communication (2nd ed., pp.229-285). Thousand
Oaks, CA: Sage.

Check, J. F. (1997). Humor in education. *Physical Educator, 54*(3), 165.

Cornwall, A., & Bawden, H. (1992). Reading disabilities and aggression: A critical
review. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 25*(5).

Gambrell, L. (1996). Creating classroom cultures that foster reading motivation.
The Reading Teacher, *54*(1).

Ghaddar, S. F., Valerio, M. A., Garcia, C. M., & Hansen, L. (2012). Adolescent health
literacy: The importance of credible sources for online health information.
Journal Of School Health, *82*(1), 28-36.

Griffin, V. (1985). A survey of use of nonverbal communication by primary teachers in
class management. UNF Digital Commons. Retrieved from:
http://digitalcommons.unf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?articles=1043&contex=etd

Guerrero, L. & Floyd, K. (2006) <u>Nonverbal Communication in Close Relationships</u>.
Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hall, E. T. & Hall, M. R. (1971). Nonverbal communication for educators. *Theory into Practice, 16*, 141-144.

Harvey, E. D. (2011). The portal of touch. *American Historical Review, 116*(2), 385-400.

Hansen, J. (2010). Teaching without talking. *Phi Delta Kappan, 92*(1), 35-40.

Hendy, L. (2005). How a teacher's voice affects pupils' behavior. *Teaching Expertise, 9*(1).

Honig, A. (2007). Helping happiness along. *Early Childhood Today, 21*(7), 29-30.

Kelley, D. H., Gorham, J. (1988). Effects of immediacy on recall of information. *Communication Education (37),* 198-207.

Kraus, A., Hahley, G. P., Cesana L. L., Eisenberg, D., & Javie, A. C. (2012). An evaluation of strengthening precursors to increase preschooler compliance. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 45*(1), 131-136.

Marion, T. (2005). How do teacher's gestures help young children in second language acquisition? <u>Deposit Publications</u>. Retrieved from: http://gesture-lyon2005.ens yon.fr/IMG/pdf/TellierFINAL.pdf

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1996). *Fundamentals of human communication: An interpersonal perspective.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

McKie, B., Manswell-Butty, J., & Green, R. (2012). Reading, reasoning and literacy, strategies for early childhood education from the analysis of classroom observations. *Early Childhood Education Journal, (40)*1, 55-61.

Mehrabian, A. (1972) <u>Nonverbal Communication</u>. Piscataway, NJ: Aldine Transaction.

Menzel, K. E., & Carrell, L. J. (1999). The impact of gender and immediacy on willingness to talk and perceived learning. *Communication Education (48),* 31-40.

Miller, P. W. (1998). <u>Nonverbal communication: what a researcher says to the teachers</u> (3rd Ed.). Washington, DC: Nea.

National Assessment of Adult Literacy. (2010). What is NAAL? *National Assessment of Adult Literacy.* Retrieved April 25, 2012 from http://nces.ed.gov/naal/.

Natof, T., & Romancyzk, R. G. (2009). Teaching students with ASD: Does teacher enthusiasm make a difference? *Behavioral Interventions, 24*(1), 55-72.

Navarro, J. (2008). What Every Body is Saying. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers

Nicholson, H. (2005). More than words. *Times Educational Supplement,46*(1), 31-32.

O'Flahavan, J., Gambrell, L.B., Guthrie, J., Stahl, S., & Alvermann, D. (1992). Poll results guide of activities of research center. *Reading Today* (1), 12.

Otrosky, M. & Jung, E. (2012). Building positive-teacher relationships. <u>Center on the Social and Emotional Foundations for Early Learning</u>. Retrieved from: http://csefel.vanderbilt.edu/briefs/wwb12.pdf.

Paylor, J. (2009). Co-constructing meaning: ways of supporting learning. *Relational Pedagogy* (pg.120-138)*.*   Oxon: Routledge.

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.

Riggio, R. & Feldman, R. (2005). <u>Applications of Nonverbal Communication</u>. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rosenfeld, L. B. (1977). Setting the stage for learning. *Theory into Practice, 16,* 167-173.

Sleep, K. (2011). An exploration of how adults use of non-verbal communication skills affects children's responses to them in the classroom. *The Plymouth Student Educator, (3)*1, 36-54.

Sommer, R. (1977). Classroom layout. *Theory into Practice, 16,* 174-175.

United Nations Development Programme. (2012). Statistical literacy. *United Nations Development Programme.* Retrieved April 25, 2012, from http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/ourwork/povertyreduction/focus_areas/focus_poverty_assessment/statistical_literacy.html.

Wainwright, R. G. (2003). <u>Teach yourself body language</u>. London: Hodder Headline.

Wolfgang, A. (1977). The silent language in the multicultural classroom. *Theory into Practice, 16,* 145-152.