An Evaluation of the University Staff's Skill of Using Body Language in the Process of Teaching

[1]Engin Karadağ and [2]Canan Çetin
[1]Department of Education Science, Faculty of Education, University of Yeditepe,
26th August Campus Kayısdagı Street Kadıkoy, Istanbul, Turkey
[2]Department of Management and Organization, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences,
Marmara University, Ressam Namık Ismail Street No. 1 Bahçelievler, Istanbul, Turkey

Abstract: The teaching staff of the universities, who constantly communicate and interact with students, play a part in planning and application of the educational activities in universities. The qualified lecturers will cause the students to gain ideal behavior and to be educated more effectively. The formation of a good teaching and learning process depends on the lecturers' competent and knowledge accumulation. Lecturer training programs performed in accordance with scientific criteria are very important because they help them become well-qualified and well-informed. Facts, which must be learnt by a member of the information society, can be listed as: -competing, -obtaining the knowledge, competence and attitude which will provide improvement. The students gain these necessary attitudes by realizing appropriate and perpetual changes in way of behaving such as execution, creativity and communication. This study has been performed for the first time in the world in order to determine how much university lecturers, who play a part in an individual's future and her or his social life, use the body language during teaching process.

Key words: Body language, university staff, process of teaching, communication, students

INTRODUCTION

When the language development of a person is examined, it is seen that the first step can be realized through the body movements. For instance, while babies' making faces a sign of a problem, their smiling indicates satisfaction. The body language has a special place in the history of mankind. Long before the persons developed communication by speaking, they communicated making use of the body language. Body language is the first language and means of communication. Through the language of their bodies, people shared their feelings, ideas, demands, needs and spiritual richness with others (Baltaş and Baltaş, 2000).

The body reactions are spontaneous. They are not variable unlike the words used (Malcho, 2000). They can reflect the inner world directly. For this reason, it is hard to control them. Every person has an effect through his or her stance, actions, reactions or reflexes. In essence, a person primarily communicates through his or her body language. Afterwards, she or he uses this language to support the verbal language. This language helps him or her emphasizes the expressions and makes them concrete.

In education, which is a process of communication, the affective use of the body language has an important role. This language is an indispensable process of interaction. In every level of the higher education from the instructors' point of view. For this reason, academicians, as instructors, can decipher the students' body language signals and they need to use this language effectively. In addition, nonverbal messages form a crucial part of communication. It is because there is a finding that in communication, nonverbal part forms 7-15%, intonation 30%, facial expressions 55% (Selçuk, 2000) and our body is, in a sense, the gloves of our spirit. And it never tells a lie (Malcho, 2000). Individuals are usually not aware of their nonverbal [body language] behaviour. It is because such behavior is realized at a low awareness level. Nonverbal behavior provides details of attitude and emotion about the level of a relationship. It is considered more reliable and credible compared to verbal behavior (Selçuk, 2000).

The communication of the teaching staff with their students plays an important role in both the increase in the quality of teaching-learning process and in the development of the behavior of the students. In this

Corresponding Author: Engin Karadağ, Department of Education Science, Faculty of Education, University of Yeditepe,
26th August Campus Kayısdagı Street Kadıkoy, Istanbul, Turkey

process, the teaching staff should make use of the body language as well as the verbal language. In nonverbal communication, people exchange various messages without the help of spoken or written language. In such a communication, it is not what people say, but what they do matters (Dökmen, 2001). In order the teaching process to succeed in the end, the teaching staff should make use of both of the languages efficiently. For the teaching staff to be able to form a positive relationship with other people-especially with the students-, they should be able to see how they perceive themselves and the student reactions together with their own behavior. It is because the body language of the teaching staff plays an important role in attracting the attention of the students, in making abstract expressions concrete, in emphasizing and raising the comprehensibility of various messages.

Today people are on the brink of a great change. As information, which becomes a basic input in production, has gradually replaced other factors of production, the transformation will occur from today's industrial society into a different, information society, which founds its basis on knowledge and communication (Masuda, 1990).

All characteristics, which distinguish the information society from the former social structures, can be signified as a folding increment of the speed of changes in each area (Avcı *et al.*, 1992). This speed is related to not only the provision of the educated, qualified work power, which is needed by the country, but also working of the country's education system in a productive and effective way. The rapidly changing and developing world necessitates the country's education system to be continuously renewed and improved. Universities have a key role in educating these qualified people and therefore, it is essential for them to develop. All authorities must directly contribute to this development process.

The teaching staff of the universities, who constantly communicate and interact with students, play a part in planning and application of the educational activities in universities. The qualified lecturers will cause the students to gain ideal behavior and to be educated more effectively. The formation of a good teaching and learning process depends on the lecturers' competent and knowledge accumulation (Gökçe, 1999).

Lecturer training programs performed in accordance with scientific criteria are very important because they help them become well-qualified and well-informed. Facts, which must be learnt by a member of the information society, can be listed as; -competing, -obtaining the knowledge, competence and attitude which will provide improvement. The students gain these necessary attitudes by realizing appropriate and perpetual changes in way of behaving such as execution, creativity and communication (Özdemir and Yalın, 2000).

Teaching is an area that requires competence in social, cultural, scientific, artistic, economic and technological aspects of education, high level of knowledge and skill, academic study and professional performance (Alkan, 2000).

This study has been performed for the first time in the world in order to determine how much university lecturers, who play a part in an individual's future and her or his social life, use the body language during teaching process.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research model: This research through which the university staff's skill of being able to make effective use of body language in the process of education is evaluated aims to describe the current situation depending on the staff's gender. The research has been conducted using the scanning model.

Universe and sampling: The universe of this research is the university staff of the 77 Turkish universities. The research sampling is the university staff of the 8 universities of the various regions in Turkey.

Preparation of the data collection device: In order to evaluate the university staff's of being able to use the body language in the process of education, "the observation forms", which have been prepared for the students of the staff (observers), have been examined by experts and class teachers. On the basis of their criticism, these observation forms have been redesigned, consisting of 34 items and 12 sub dimensions. They cover the staff's bodily communication behavior of these levels have been specified as Always, Sometimes and Never.

Validity and reliability studies of the data collection device: In order to determine the construct validity and reliability of the observation forms, 51 staff of the various faculties of the Gazi University has been observed by 503 randomly chosen students regardless of their gender. The forms have undergone the factor analysis. As a result of the analysis, the 34 items whose factor value is above 40 and below 85, yielding 12 factors have been developed as the data gathering device of the research. The Cronbach alpha coefficient of the observation forms used in the study has been calculated as 75,07.

Data collection: For the 314 university staff of the various departments of eight universities, at least there of their students chosen randomly from every class regardless of the gender have been given 1207 observation froms. Thus, the data collections have been realized.

Table 1: T-test results of the university staff's skill of being abe to use body language in education (on the basis of gender)

Subdimensions	Famele ($\overline{x}$)±ss	Male ($\overline{x}$)±ss	t	p
Non-verbal behavior after walking into the class	5.14±0.71	5.18±0.91	0.46	>0.05
Non-verbal behavior about maintaining attention and silence	6.15±1.12	7.10±1.02	2.34	<0.05
Non-verbal behavior about physical appearance	13.01±1.45	7.03±2.19	1.19	<0.05
Non-verbal behavior about course presentation	5.89±1.24	5.79±1.56	0.06	>0.05
Non-verbal behavior about mimics	10.25±1.76	8.12±1.08	2.56	<0.05
Non-verbal behavior about having a good command of the field	2.41±0.97	4.10±0.93	2.12	<0.05
Non-verbal behavior about using the signs	4.08±1.06	4.14±0.89	1.19	>0.05
Non-verbal behavior about using other stimuli	8.92±1.94	5.59±1.45	4.67	<0.05
Non-verbal behavior about means-message	2.97±0.82	5.87±0.77	3.66	<0.05
Non-verbal behavior about physical punishment	2.27±0.79	2.41±0.54	0.89	>0.05
Non-verbal behavior affection the motivation negatively	4.91±0.93	6.19±0.69	2.87	<0.05
Non-verbal behavior about using the gestures	2.03±0.74	1.07±0.85	2.98	<0.05
Total	68.03±5.42	62.55±6.46	4.37	<0.05

Data analysis: The analysis of the data collected has been done through the SPSS for windows Release 11,5. In order to determine the levels of the university staff's behavior demonstration in the education process, the triple Likert scale as Always (3), Sometimes (2), Never (1) has been employed. The response codes of each question vary between 1.00 and 3.00. In the research for the countable data, the frequency (n) and percentage values and for the measurable data the arithmetic mean ($\overline{x}$) and the Standard Deviation (SD) have been used. In the analyses one-samplae t test and Independent t-test nhave been employed. Whether there is a significart difference in the analyses done has been specified as $\alpha = 0.05$ level.

RESULTS

The data about the comparison of the female and male university staff's skill of using body language while teaching is seen is chart 4. According to the observers' view, in relation to the staff's using the non-verbal communication behavior after walking into the class, while the mean of the observers' views about the female staff is 5.14 and the standard deviation is 0.71, the mean of their views about the male staff is 5.18 and the standard deviation is 0.91. Whether the difference between the staff's genders is examined through t-test, no significant difference is seen. In relation to the staff's maintaining attention and silence, while the mean of the observers' views about the female staff is 6.15 and the standard deviation is 1.12, the mean of their views about the male staff is 7.10 and the standard deviation is 1.02. Whether the difference between the staff's gender is examined through t-test, a significant difference is seen. On the basis of this, it can be concluded that observers have found the male staff better than the female in maintaining attention and silence as part of non-verbal communication behavior. In relation to the staff's physical appearance, while the mean of the observers' views about the female staff is 13.01 and the standard deviation is 1.45, the mean of their views about the male staff is 7.03 and the standard

deviation is 2.19, whether the difference between the staff's genders is examined through t-test, a significant difference is seen. As for the staff's course presentation as part of the non-verbal communication behavior, while the mean of the observers' views about the female staff is 5.89 and the standard deviation is 1.24, the mean of their views about the male staff is 5.89 and the standard deviation 1.56. Whether, the difference between the staff's genders is examined through t-test, no meaningful difference is seen. Regarding the staff's using mimics, while the mean of the observers' views about the female staff is 10.25 and the standard deviation is 1.76, the mean of their views about the male staff is 8.12 and the standard deviation is 1.08. Whether the difference between the staff's genders is examined through t-test, a meaningful difference is noticed. In relation to the staff's having a good command of the field to teach as part of the non-verbal communication behavior, while the mean of the observers' views about the female staff is 2.41 and the standard deviation is 0.97, the mean of their views about the male staff is 4.10 and the standard deviation is 0.93. Whether, the difference between the staff's genders, examined through t-test, a significant difference is noticed. As for the staff's using signs, while the mean of the observers' views about the female staff is 4.08 and the standard deviation is 1.06, the mean of their views about the male staff is 4.14 and the standard deviation is 1.08. Whether, the difference between the staff's genders is examined through t-test, no meaningful difference is seen. In relation to the staff's using other stimuli as part of non-verbal communication behavior, while the mean of the observers' views about the female staff is 9.92 and the standard deviation is 1.94, the mean of their c-views about the male staff is 5.59 and the standard deviation is 1.45. Whether the difference between the staff's genders is examined through t-test, a significant difference is seen. As for the staff's means-message using non-verbal communication behavior, while the mean of the observers' views about the female staff is 2.97 and the standard deviation is 0.82, the mean of their views about the male

staff is 5.87 and the standard deviation is 0.77. Whether the difference between the staff's genders is examined through t-test, a meaningful difference is noticed. Regarding the staff's non-verbal communication behavior about physical punishment, while the mean of the observers' views about the female staff is 2.27 and the standard deviation is 0.79, the mean of their views about the male staff is 2.41 and the standard deviation is 0.54. Whether the difference between the staff's genders is examined through t-test, nu significant difference is seen. In relation to the staff's non-verbal behavior affecting the motivation negatively, while the mean of the observers' views about the female staff is 4.91 and the standard deviation is 0.93, the mean of their views about the male staff is 6.19 and the standard deviation is 0.69. Whether, the difference between the staff's genders is examined through t-test, a meaningful difference is noticed. As for the staff's non-verbal behavior about using the gestures, while the mean of the observers' views about the female staff is 2.03 and the standard deviation is 0.74, the mean of their views about the male staff is 1.07 and the standard deviation is 0.85. Whether, the difference between the staff's gender is examined through t-test, a meaningful difference is seen. In relation to the staff's using non-verbal communication behavior, as the mean of the observers' views about the female staff is 68.03 and the standard deviation is 5.42, the mean of their views about the male staff is 62.55 and the standard deviation is 6.46. Upon the examination of the genders by t-test, a significant difference is noticed.

DISCUSSION

The research has been done with the help of 1207 observers for 314 university staff. 35% the staff is female (476) and 65% of them (731) is male. It has been found that the staff's greeting student and having a smiling face after entering the classroom as part of their non-verbal communication skill is satisfactory. Also, no discrepancies have been found between the female and male staff regarding this item. It has been found that the staffs have been adequate in using the non-verbal communication skill in the form of walking around in the classroom, looking at the students, knocking on the table and blackboard. Besides, it has been seen that the male staff. According to Öztürk (2000), as soon as the teacher walks into the classroom, the students face a new stimulus and direct their attention on her or him. However, their attention is still on more attractive and newer stimulus. By knocking on the blackboard, remaining silent, etc, the teacher may have the students focus their attention on her or himself.

It has been found that despite the fact that the university staff do not care about their physical appearance, the female staff are more careful than the male regarding this issue. According to Ertuğrul (2002), a teacher who has a high self-esteem dresses accordingly. It has been found that the university staffs have not used the non-verbal communication sources sufficiently while teaching and that they prefer sitting while teaching, seeing that no differences have been noticed between the genders. Another finding is that although the staffs do not use mimics a lot, the female use mimics more than the male; these findings are parallel to the research by Dağlı and Öner (2002) about the second grade primary school teachers' perceptions about their in-class communication behavior. Also, it has been found that while the staffs do not approach the students a lot, the male staffs prefer keeping a close distance with the students during the communication process. Besides, it has been seen that generally the staff, regardless of their gender, nod their heads while answering the student' questions. No differences have been found between the female and male staff regarding this issue. Another finding is that the staffs wear perfume as stimuli. Yet, the female staffs wear it more than the male. James (1999) says that:

> Good perfume and choice of dress give information about the person's personality and attitude; Pleasures and ability are formed at young ages. We should wear well and comfortably.

It has been found that the majority of the staffs have beads, mascots and key holders. However, the male staffs use means-message non-verbal communication behavior more with respect to the female staff. Another finding is that the staffs use the behavior affecting motivation negatively a lot. Also, no differences between the genders have been noticed regarding this issue. It has been found that the staffs have been inadequate to use the gestures, but the female staffs have been noted as more successful than the male staff. These findings are parallel to the findings of Dağlı and Öner (2002). In general terms, the level of the university staff's using non-verbal communication behavior has been found low. Also, the female staffs have been found more successful than the male staff. This finding is parallel to research by Sönmez (1992) about the teacher' in-class communication skills. According to Pektaş (1998), there are no significant differences between teachers are more effective than the male teacher is non-verbal communication behavior.

REFERENCES

Alkan, C., 2000. Türkiye-Almanya ve Kbrıs'ta öğretmen yetiştirme [teacher education in Turkey, Germany and Cyprus]. Ankara: CBT Yayınları.

Avcı, N. *et al.*, 1992. Enformasyon toplumu [Information society]. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Baltaş, Z. and A. Batlaş, 2000. Bedenin dili [Body language]. Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Dağlı, A. and M. Öner, 2002. Ilköğretim okullarının ikinci kademesinde okuyan öğrencilerin fen bilgisi öğretmenlerinin sınıf içi iletişim davranışlarına ilişkin algıları. Çağdaş Eğitim, 292: 23-30.

Dökmen, Ü., 2001. Iletişim çatışmaları ve empati [Communication, conflict and empathy]. Istanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık ve Mat. San. Tic. A.Ş.

Ertuğrul, H., 2002. Öğretmenlikte yeni teknikler. Istanbul: Timas Yayınları.

Gökçe, E., 1999. Ilköğretim öğretmenlerinin yeterlikleri [The competencies of primary school teachers]. Ankara: A.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi.

James, J., 1999. Bedenin dili [Body language]. Istanbul: Alfa Basım Yayın Dağıtım Ltd. Şti.

Masuda, Y., 1990. Manging in the Information Society. Mass: Basil Blackwell.

Malcho, S., 2000. Beden dili [Body language]. Istanbul: Gün Yayıncılık.

Özdemir, S. and H.I. Yalın, 2000. Öğretmenlik mesleğine giriş [Introduction to teaching profession]. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.

Öztürk, B., 2000. Öğrenme ve öğretmede dikkat. Milli Eğitim Dergisi, 144: 22-35.

Pektaş, S., 1998. Sözel olmayan öğretmen davranışlarının öğretime etkisinin değerlendirilmesi. Ankara: A. Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi.

Selçuk, Z., 2000. Okul deneyimi ve uygulama [School experience and practice]. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Sönmez, V., 1992. Öğretmenlerin sınıfiçi etkinlikleri [Classroom activities of teachers]. H.Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2 (8): 32-39.