



Analysis of Teachers' Non-Vocal Paralinguistic Cues in English Language Classrooms

Jetso L. Sagot & Evelyn J. Lumaday

Davao del Norte State College, Philippines

Corresponding Author Email: sagot.jetro@dnsc.edu.ph / jetrosagot13714@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v8i5.2697>

APA Citation: Sagot, J. L., & Lumaday, E. J. (2026). Analysis of Teachers' Non-Vocal Paralinguistic Cues in English Language Classrooms. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 8(5).211-229. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v8i5.2697>

Received:

02/06/2026

Accepted:

20/06/2026

Keywords:

Non-Vocal Cues, Paralinguistics, Gestures, Body orientation, Self-adaptors, Communication, Analysis Guide

Abstract

Non-vocal paralinguistic cues constitute essential multimodal resources through which teachers facilitate classroom communication and support English language instruction. This study examined (1) the non-vocal paralinguistic cues employed by English language teachers in classroom instruction and (2) the pedagogical insights that can be drawn from these cues to enhance English language teaching. Anchored in Kinesics Theory, Multimodal Theory, and Mehrabian's Theory of Communication, the study employed a qualitative multimodal discourse analysis of five video-recorded English language classes. The analysis identified twelve domains of non-vocal paralinguistic cues, revealing that hand gestures (17.17%), facial expressions (13.98%), and posture (11.33%) were the most frequently employed communicative resources, whereas physical contact (3.01%) occurred least frequently. The findings further revealed that teachers employed a wide range of embodied communicative behaviors to facilitate discourse organization, clarify instructional content, regulate classroom interaction, and foster teacher-student engagement. Self-adaptors were likewise observed to function primarily as self-regulatory behaviors rather than intentional meaning-making resources. These findings underscore the pedagogical significance of non-vocal communication in English language teaching and highlight the need to strengthen teachers' awareness and strategic use of multimodal resources to promote instructional clarity, learner engagement, and inclusive classroom communication.

1. Introduction

Communication in the classroom instruction extends beyond spoken language. According to De Waele, et al., (2018) when someone speaks or delivers his or her message, that person doesn't communicate only with his or her voice, but also with nonvocal paralinguistic cues. Nonvocal Paralinguistic Cues are embodied features such as hand gestures, facial expressions, body postures, proxemics, and etc., to help teachers convey meaning along with the spoken language (Carmichael & Mizrahi, 2023) In the English classroom, language teachers employ consciously and unconsciously these non-vocal paralinguistic expressions to emphasize meaning, regulate classroom interaction, and signal approachability. Studies show that these movements help create a sense of immediacy which has been observed to enhance learners' motivation, participation, and comprehension (Hu and Li, 2023; Liu W. et al., 2021). However, Vareberg and Westerman (2020) debunk these findings and argued that instructors who employ NVC may be perceived as more immediate, but less competent.

International studies underscore the global scope of NVC. In United States, Giang (2024) mentioned that the absence of the non-vocal cues can greatly influence the way listeners' think, feel, and behave. However, Thompson, (2014); Afdaliah, (2022) found that teachers who

employed highly excessive non-vocal paralinguistic cues such as exaggerated gestures, animated facial expressions tend to cause cognitive overload, resulting poorer learning performance. On similar note, Muhayyang et al., (2023); Hömke et al. (2025) emphasized that teachers who employed excessively the eye contact and facial expressions are becoming more counterproductive, and drawing students' attention away from the learning materials, gravely hampering classroom instructions. While Nnko (2024); Hervie (2018) claimed that misalignment of spoken language from the non-vocal cues can impair students' engagement, motivation, participation, and behavior.

By the same token, Munir and Dollah (2025); Raksawong et al. (2024) also found out that cultural background significantly affects the effectiveness of non-vocal paralinguistic cues among students. Interpretation of these non-vocal paralinguistic expressions is not generically acceptable to all people based on gender, race, and culture, particularly in the context of touch and space, since these two non-vocal cues are far from being universally recognized (Dash and Davis, 2022; Arciosa et al., 2025; Napitan, 2025; Sali and Acncho, 2021).

On the other hand, several studies found positive result on the employment of NVC. For instance, Hu et al., (2023); Liu M. et al., (2021) found that teachers' immediacy behaviors significantly enhance students' willingness to communicate and participate as these influence motivation and students' satisfaction across multiple contexts. In addition, Sajjad et al. (2023) noted that teachers gestures and body movements serve as visual scaffolds that aid vocabulary retention, listening comprehension, thus play a vital role in enhancing language acquisition. Likewise, Diadori (2024); Krumhuber et al. (2007); Niedenthal et al. (2019) affirmed that kinesics and smiling can help direct learners' attention and reduce ambiguity during classroom instructions. Consequently, Gallace and Spence (2010); Macrine & Fugate, (2021); Wilson, (2002) also pointed that haptic connects deeper positive relationship that acts as recipe for creating meaningful relations on learning and teaching process, since learning is grounded in bodily experience. During classroom observation, haptic enable collaboration and feeling of inclusiveness, promoting positive feedback, boosting students' interest and engagement (Webb and Barrett, 2014)

Building upon this idea, the recent studies on paralinguistic cues in English language classroom have largely focused in basic and secondary levels, where teachers' gestures, facial expressions, and posture are essential for scaffolding comprehension and sustaining attention among younger learners (Sajjad et al. 2023) This supported the findings of Burgoon et al., (2021) which posits that NVC are highly taken as not just a delivery of actions, but also the way to deepen connection and highlight meaning within a communication process that can positively foster students to understand the message delivered by English language instructors.

In educational context, in higher education, research has primarily examined teacher immediacy and its link to student engagement rather than identifying the specific non-vocal paralinguistic behaviors teachers are employing in the classrooms. In Philippine context, Cabatac (2023) found that teachers usually employ facial expression, eye contact, and hand gestures. Similarly, Diez (2025) found that aligning ESL instructions to local norms and practices is actually effective. Akin to this is the empirical findings of de Valle (2023) which reveals that under ethnographic consideration, 'academic care' is more valued and highly favored, which allows teachers to do move more inside the classroom. Likewise, Kennedy et al., (2024) found that nodding is commonly used by teachers during sessions.

With so much studies related to NVC across countries and cultures which pedagogically support teachers' employment of NVC, however, most investigations remain centered on secondary or pre-service teacher education (Caybot et al., 2024; Freitas & Andrade Neto, 2023). Teachers conducted in tertiary education remain comparatively limited and are often times restricted to specific communicative examination of teachers' non-vocal paralinguistic repertoires (Calvache & Catillo Sanabria. 2017).

While recent reviews continue to recommend further investigations across diverse educational and cultural settings, particularly within tertiary English language classrooms,

where multimodal instructional practices remain underexplored (Nurhayati & Dollah, 2025). This leaves a gap in understanding how experienced tertiary English teachers use and reflect on these cues during classroom interactions, particularly in English language teaching. Furthermore, the research aimed to address the scarcity of studies on non-vocal paralinguistic cues in the present body of knowledge and provide empirical evidence of the types of non-vocal paralinguistic cues commonly exhibit by English language teachers.

Objective of the Study

This study aimed to examine the use of non-vocal paralinguistic cues among English language teachers in tertiary classrooms. Specifically, the study was guided by the research questions ‘What types of non-vocal paralinguistic cues are commonly exhibited by English language teachers?’ and ‘What insights can be drawn from the non-vocal paralinguistic cues to improve English language teaching?’.

2. Theoretical Lenses

This study is grounded in Kinesics Theory, which views body movements, gestures, facial expressions, and posture as meaningful forms of communication (Birdwhistell, 1970). In classroom settings, these non-vocal cues help regulate interaction, emphasize key ideas, and create an inclusive learning environment (Knapp et al., 2014). They influence students’ perceptions of clarity, enthusiasm, and instructional effectiveness, making abstract concepts more accessible in English language teaching (Goldin-Meadow, 2014). Complementing this, Social Semiotics and Multimodal Theory emphasize that communication involves multiple modes, including speech, gestures, movement, and spatial arrangement, through which meaning is co-constructed (Kress & Van Leeuwen, 2001). In this view, students interpret both verbal and non-verbal signals, such as teacher proximity and movement, as part of the learning process (Jewitt, 2014; Zhang et al., 2025).

Mehrabian’s Theory of Communication further highlights the importance of non-verbal communication, suggesting that a significant portion of meaning is conveyed through vocal and non-vocal cues rather than words alone (Mehrabian, 1972). In English language teaching, these cues support learners’ comprehension, engagement, and emotional connection with instructors, particularly when language barriers exist (Witt et al., 2020). Together, Kinesics Theory, Multimodal Theory, and Mehrabian’s framework provide a comprehensive foundation for examining how English language educators use non-verbal communication and how these behaviors influence teaching effectiveness, student engagement, and classroom rapport.

The focus of this investigation is non-vocal paralinguistic cues. By triangulating theories mentioned above, the researcher was able to create a framework which serves as a guide in identifying non-vocal paralinguistic cues employ by English language teachers during the analysis process on the video recorded classroom observations. Illustrated in Table 1, the non-vocal paralinguistic cues and their category, operational description, communicative or instructional functions, and classroom indicators or examples.

Table 1. Analysis Guide for Non-vocal Paralinguistic Cues

Non-vocal Paralinguistic Domain	Type / Category	Operational Description	Communicative / Instructional Function	Classroom Indicator / Example
Facial Expression	Neutral	Relaxed facial muscles	Maintains instructional objectivity	Calm face during explanation
	Smiling	Lip corners raised	Encourages rapport and participation	Smiling while affirming answers
	Frowning	Brow contraction	Signals correction or confusion	Frown during misunderstanding
	Raised Eyebrows	Eyebrow elevation	Emphasizes importance or prompts response	Eyebrows raised before questioning

Analysis of Teachers' Non-Vocal Paralinguistic Cues in English Language Classrooms

Eye Contact	Sustained Gaze	Prolonged eye contact	Builds authority and engagement	Direct gaze during lecture
	Scanning Gaze	Shifting eye focus	Inclusive participation	Looking across students
	Directed Gaze	Focus on specific individual	Classroom management	Gaze toward inattentive student
	Avoidant Gaze	Minimal eye contact	Indicates reflection or uncertainty	Looking away when thinking
Posture	Upright	Straight body alignment	Conveys confidence and authority	Standing erect at front
	Leaning Forward	Forward torso movement	Shows involvement or emphasis	Leaning toward students
	Closed Posture	Arms crossed	Defensive or evaluative stance	Folded arms during silence
	Relaxed Posture	Loose stance	Approachability	Relaxed stance during discussion
Hand Gestures	Iconic	Shape-representing movements	Clarifies concrete concepts	Tracing shapes in air
	Metaphoric	Abstract movements	Explains abstract ideas	Raising hands for importance
	Deictic	Pointing gestures	Directs attention	Pointing to board
	Beat	Rhythmic hand motion	Emphasizes speech rhythm	Hand tapping on keywords
	Emblems	Culturally recognized signs	Conveys fixed meanings	Thumbs up
Head Movements	Nodding	Vertical head movement	Agreement or encouragement	Nodding to correct answers
Head Movements	Head Shake	Horizontal movement	Disagreement or correction	Shaking head to incorrect response
Head Movements	Head Tilt	Angled head	Interest or evaluation	Tilted head during listening
Head Movements	Chin Raise	Elevated chin	Authority or emphasis	Chin raised during instruction
Body Orientation	Facing Students	Open body alignment	Engagement and openness	Facing class while speaking
Body Orientation	Side Orientation	Partial turn	Transitional instruction	Turning to board then class
Body Orientation	Turning Away	Back-facing stance	Task shift	Writing on board
Proxemics	Public Distance	Teacher at front	Formal instruction	Standing near board
	Social Distance	Moderate proximity	Interaction	Moving among desks
	Personal Distance	Close proximity	Individual support	Leaning near student
Physical Contact	Supportive Touch	Light, appropriate contact	Encouragement	Pat on shoulder
Physical Contact	Avoidance	No physical contact	Professional boundary	Maintaining distance
Gesture + Speech Integration	Synchronous	Gesture matches speech	Reinforces meaning	Gesture during explanation
Gesture + Speech Integration	Complementary	Gesture adds meaning	Enhances clarity	Gesture expands verbal idea
Gesture + Speech Integration	Contradictory	Gesture conflicts with speech	Indicates tension	Saying "yes" while shaking head
Multimodal Timing	Simultaneous	Gesture and speech overlap	Emphasis	Pointing while speaking
	Sequential	Gesture before/after speech	Anticipation or reinforcement	Gesture precedes explanation

	Delayed	Gesture follows speech	Reflection	Gesture after explanation
Visual Focus	Board-Focused	Eyes on visual aids	Anchors content	Looking at slides
Visual Focus	Student-Focused	Eyes on learners	Interaction	Eye contact during discussion
Visual Focus	Self-Focused	Inward gaze	Cognitive processing	Looking upward when thinking
Interactive Space Usage	Teacher-Centered	Fixed teaching position	Control and authority	Staying at podium
	Mobile Teaching	Movement across room	Engagement and monitoring	Walking during lecture
	Student-Zone Entry	Entering seating area	Support or discipline	Standing beside student

Non-vocal paralinguistic cues domain are the general term embodied actions that teachers are employing during classroom instructions. While Category is the specific behavior the teachers employ along with spoken language. Whereas the operational description is the movements that distinctively differentiate each category. Communicative functions on the other hand are the purpose behind every employment of the behavior. Lastly, classroom indicators are sample cues or movements for each category.

3. Methodology

This study is qualitative research employing multimodal discourse analysis by the Kress and Van Leeuwen, (2001) which posits that classroom interaction requires multiple embodied actions. As qualitative research, the study involved observation and analysis on the types non-vocal paralinguistic cues commonly exhibited by English language teachers in the classrooms.

Data Gathering of the Corpora of NVC

The corpora of non-vocal paralinguistic cues were collected from Five-classroom video recordings. Having five participants for this study was supported by Jewitt (2021) which posits that a video-based studies typically use four to ten participants. The participants are experienced college English language instructors who are teaching English subjects during the time this study was conducted. During the process of collecting the corpora of non-vocal paralinguistic cues, the researcher observed certain criteria: (a) participants must be a fulltime faculty member of the identified partner institution, (b) participants must be an English language degree holder, (c) participants must have at least 1 year teaching experience prior from the conduct and participation on the study. Illustrated in the Table 2, the research participants of the study's location, number of participants, subject codes, course descriptions, participants' code, and session code numbers.

Table 2. Research Participants of the Study

Campus	No. of Participants	Subject Code	Course Descriptions	Participant code	Session Code Number
Davao City	5	EL118	Introduction to Campus Journalism	ELT-01	SVR-01
Davao City	5	EL117	Language Program and Policy in Multilingual Societies	ELT-02	SVR-02
Davao City	5	EL 119	Teaching and Assessment of Literature Studies	ELT-03	SVR-03
Davao City	5	EL120	Teaching and Assessment of 4 Macro Skills	ELT-04	SVR-04

Analysis of Teachers' Non-Vocal Paralinguistic Cues in English Language Classrooms

Davao City	5	GE3	Purposive Communication	ELT-05	SVR-05
Total	5	5	5	5	5

Research Instrument

The primary research tool for this study was the video-recorded classroom sessions. These recordings served as the main source of data, capturing the natural employment of non-vocal paralinguistic cues such as gestures, facial expressions, posture, eye contact, etc. Video recording helped participants to be more relaxed and being themselves during classroom interactions since the presence of the observer is not seen or felt entirely during the discussion processes (Cukor-Avila, 2000).

4. Results and Discussion

As analyzed using the framework created by the researcher, study recognizes that English language instructors are commonly exhibiting wide array of non-vocal paralinguistic cues in English language classrooms. Illustrated in Table 3, English teaching are embodied in nature capturing all twelve (12) non-vocal paralinguistic domains from the predefined parameters.

Table 3. Types of Non-vocal Paralinguistic Cues Commonly Exhibited by English Language Teachers

Non-Vocal Paralinguistic Cues	Sub-Category	ELT -01	ELT -02	ELT -03	ELT -04	ELT -05	Subtotal	Category Total	%
Hand Gestures	Beat	12	12	11	11	8	54	97	17.17 %
Hand Gestures	Deictic	10	5	3	1	4	23	97	17.17 %
Hand Gestures	Metaphoric	4	1	1	0	7	13	97	17.17 %
Hand Gestures	Emblems	2	0	1	0	1	4	97	17.17 %
Hand Gestures	Iconic	1	0	2	0	0	3	97	17.17 %
Facial Expression	Smiling	3	14	10	2	0	29	79	13.98 %
Facial Expression	Raised Eyebrows	11	9	3	1	2	26	79	13.98 %
Facial Expression	Neutral	9	0	4	1	5	19	79	13.98 %
Facial Expression	Frowning	0	3	0	2	0	5	79	13.98 %
Posture	Relaxed Posture	6	13	11	6	0	36	64	11.33 %
Posture	Leaning Forward	10	1	1	0	0	12	64	11.33 %
Posture	Upright	0	1	4	0	3	8	64	11.33 %
Posture	Closed Posture	5	3	0	0	0	8	64	11.33 %
Eye Contact	Scanning Gaze	7	9	11	2	7	36	61	10.80 %
Eye Contact	Sustained Gaze	14	0	0	1	0	15	61	10.80 %
Eye Contact	Directed Gaze	7	0	1	0	0	8	61	10.80 %
Eye Contact	Avoidant Gaze	0	0	1	1	0	2	61	10.80 %
Proxemics	Public Distance	0	6	15	3	4	28	54	9.56%

Proxemics	Social Distance	6	10	1	1	1	19	54	9.56%
Proxemics	Personal Distance	2	5	0	0	0	7	54	9.56%
Body Orientation	Facing Students	3	8	10	1	3	25	39	6.90%
Body Orientation	Side Orientation	2	11	0	0	0	13	39	6.90%
Body Orientation	Turning Away	1	0	0	0	0	1	39	6.90%
Gesture + Speech Integration	Complementary	2	8	7	5	3	25	39	6.90%
Gesture + Speech Integration	Synchronous	2	5	0	2	1	10	39	6.90%
Gesture + Speech Integration	Contradictory	0	2	1	1	0	4	39	6.90%
Interactive Space Usage	Mobile Teaching	1	11	3	1	5	21	34	6.02%
Interactive Space Usage	Teacher-Centered	0	3	8	2	0	13	34	6.02%
Interactive Space Usage	Student-Zone Entry	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	6.02%
Visual Focus	Student-Focused	0	9	5	2	6	22	32	5.66%
Visual Focus	Board-Focused	3	1	4	1	0	9	32	5.66%
Visual Focus	Self-Focused	0	1	0	0	0	1	32	5.66%
Head Movements	Nodding	16	1	3	1	3	24	30	5.31%
Head Movements	Chin Raise	4	0	0	0	0	4	30	5.31%
Head Movements	Head Tilt	2	0	0	0	0	2	30	5.31%
Head Movements	Head Shake	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.31%
Multimodal Timing	Simultaneous	7	1	2	1	5	16	19	3.36%
Multimodal Timing	Sequential	2	0	1	0	0	3	19	3.36%
Multimodal Timing	Delayed	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	3.36%
Physical Contact	Avoidance	2	0	7	0	4	13	17	3.01%
Physical Contact	Supportive Touch	0	3	0	1	0	4	17	3.01%
TOTAL		156	156	131	50	72	565	565	100%

Table 3 presents the distribution and frequency of the non-vocal paralinguistic cues exhibited by the five English Language Teachers (ELTs) during classroom interaction as answer for research question 1. The table categorizes observed behaviors into major non-vocal communication domains and corresponding sub-categories, showing their occurrence per participant, subtotal frequencies, category totals, and percentage contributions to the overall dataset. This provides an overview of the patterns and prominence of non-vocal paralinguistic cues across instructional discourse. The results derived from the five-classroom video observations revealed clear hierarchy in the use of non-vocal paralinguistic cues among English language teachers, demonstrating how embodied communication systematically supports instruction. Ranked from highest to lowest frequency, Hand Gestures (17.17%) emerged as the

Analysis of Teachers' Non-Vocal Paralinguistic Cues in English Language Classrooms

most dominant domain, followed by Facial Expressions (13.98%), Posture (11.33%), Eye Contact (10.80%), Proxemics (9.56%), Body Orientation (6.90%), Gesture and Speech Integration (6.90%), Interactive Space Usage (6.02%), Visual Focus (5.66%), Head Movements (5.31%), Multimodal Timing (3.36%), and Physical Contact (3.01%) as the least exhibited. This distribution suggests that teachers rely more heavily on visible, dynamic, and instructionally functional cues (e.g., gestures and facial expressions) than on more subtle or socially constrained behaviors (e.g., physical contact and timing structures), reflecting both pedagogical priorities and classroom norms observed across the five sessions.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that across the five-classroom observations, English language teachers predominantly rely on dynamic, visually accessible, and pedagogically functional non-vocal cues—particularly gestures, facial expressions, and posture—to structure discourse, maintain engagement, and facilitate comprehension, while minimizing cues that may be ambiguous, culturally sensitive, or less directly tied to instructional delivery.

During the process of analysis, research also found other non-vocal paralinguistic cues outside the parameters that English language teachers employ during classroom instruction. These behaviors are called self-adaptors. Under the study of Kinesics theory as subcategory, these self-adaptors are employed not because teachers find them necessary for meaning-making process, but instead, they stand as body-focused movements which may indicate a moment of cognitive processing, mild anxiety, or self-regulation during instruction (Lopez-Ozieblo, 2025)

Table 4. Other Non-vocal Paralinguistic Cues

Frequency Group	Self-Adaptors Included	Group Frequency	Group Percentage
High Frequency	Fixing Hair (10), Fixing Collar (10), Rubbing Nose (6), Rubbing Neck (5)	31	60.78%
Middle Frequency	Touching Ears (4), Rubbing Ears (4), Fixing Eyeglasses (3), Wiping Lips Using Bare Hands (2), Rubbing Head (2)	15	29.41%
Low Frequency	Holding Wrist (1), Rubbing Arms (1), Rubbing Hand (1), Rubbing Chin (1), Rubbing Shoulder (1)	5	9.80%
Total	—	51	100%

Table 4 presents the frequency and distribution of other non-vocal paralinguistic cues observed outside from the researcher's predefined non-vocal paralinguistic cues parameter during the data analysis procedure. These other NVC might be frequently small, but their existence is too salient to ignore.

The table above presents the set of other non-vocal paralinguistic movements that occurred during the analysis process but were not mentioned within the researcher's predefined parameters of this study. These movements are identified self-adaptors—non-vocal paralinguistic cues under the study of Kinesics. These behaviors appeared naturally from the five-classroom video datasets. Their salient occurrences provide additional insights into the complexity and naturalness of teachers' non-vocal communication during classroom instruction.

Self-adaptors, as a subcategory of kinesics, refer to body-focused movements that teachers touch, adjust, or operate parts of their own body unconsciously that may lead to impressions (Harrigan, 1985). While the study of Ray Birdwhistell's Kinesics Theory, justifies that non-vocal paralinguistic behaviors are identified as more intentional communicative gestures (e.g., beating, or emblems) because they primarily reflect internal cognitive and affective states rather than deliberate meaning-making. Self-adaptors on the other hand post different view. In

classroom interactions, self-adaptors such as touching arms, rubbing ears, or adjusting collars may indicate moments of cognitive processing, mild anxiety, or self-regulation during instruction (Lopez-Ozieblo, 2025). Modern studies affirmed that self-touch movements tend to increase under conditions of cognitive overload or emotional tensions, serving as regulatory mechanisms rather than actions that are intentionally employed to satisfy meaning-making. (Aslan et al., 2024). In educational context, these subtle behaviors provide insight into the embodied and unscripted dimensions of teaching, revealing how teachers manage internal dilemma while simultaneously performing instructional roles for better understanding of language acquisition procedures (Sahlender and ten Hagen, 2023). Although self-adaptors are less considered as pedagogical, they remain analytically significant in discourse analysis indicators of cognition and affective intent during real-time instructions.

Research Question 2

From a multimodal perspective, classroom communication is accomplished through the interplay of verbal and non-verbal modes of meaning-making. Consequently, the non-vocal paralinguistic cues employed by English language teachers may provide important insights into how instructional messages are reinforced, classroom participation is facilitated, and interpersonal relationships are established. By examining these cues within authentic classroom interactions, the study identifies pedagogical insights that may inform reflective teaching practices and contribute to more effective English language instruction.

Hand Gestures as Cognitive–Pedagogical Amplifiers

Hand gestures occurred as the most employed non-vocal cues (17.17%), among all the observed behaviors within the predefined parameters. These behaviors act as reinforcement in the central pedagogical role in English Language Teaching (ELT). This aligns highly with the study of gesture-speech integration theory, specifically on the matter that gesture and speech come unified as cognitive system rather than separate modes. In the classroom, gestures act essential semiotic resources that uplift comprehension and may reduce cognitive load in the study of second language environment.

In support to this, empirical research in EFL context confirms that gesture significantly improve learners' comprehension, engagement, and retention because they allow physical visual representation on abstract linguistic input. Also, as beat gesture dominate under this category implies that teachers are also using rhythm-based bodily movements to give emphasis on discourse structure. More importantly, Goldin-Meadow's extensive research on non-vocal cues (2020) demonstrates that gesture often reveal unspoken cognition procedures and can also predict learning readiness. In ELT classrooms, this implies that teachers are not merely communicating, they are as well externalizing thought through movement like gestures.

Insight for ELT: Awareness of teachers' frequent use of hand gestures may encourage educators to integrate purposeful gesturing into classroom instruction as part of their multimodal communicative practices for emphasizing, organizing, and visually reinforcing language concepts during classroom interaction. And since these gestures may function as observable instructional resources that accompany spoken explanation, it may also contribute to how classroom interaction and instruction delivery are experienced.

Facial Expressions as Affective Regulation Mechanisms

Facial expressions (13.98%) second as the most frequently employed non-vocal cues from the datasets. Its existence implies a significant indication in the English language teaching and learning processes as a whole. Given its immense literatures reviews for its contributions within the classroom, it only shows the vital role of facial expressions during discussions. This very frequency of employment aligns with Ekman's 2021 foundational work on facial affect display, which argues that certain facial expressions influence classroom mood, environment, participations, and language acquisition.

According to Dewaele, et al., (2018) in second language classrooms, emotional regulation is particularly critical and essential in establishing positive environment that reduce anxiety and increase willingness to communicate using second language. However, educator must also be more discerning in terms of employing them since every expression will always be subject to students' perception.

Insights for ELT: In English language classrooms, it is important for teachers to be more discerning and conscious in facial employment, it is not them that will interpret these non-vocal cues, but the students. Since students are coming from different practices, cultures, and backgrounds, it is important to be fully mindful in using them, though these non-vocal cues may provide positive affective regulation, students background influence its functions.

Posture as a Communicative Signal of Authority and Engagement

Posture (11.33%) functions a subtle role within English language classrooms, yet powerful indicator of teacher stance, engagement, relational positioning. Burgoon et al., (2016) argue that non-vocal cues including posture significantly contribute to positive perceptions on teachers' warmth, trustworthiness, and approachability. These shows that in the classroom, bodily orientations and postures may directly affect students' attentiveness and engagement, as students subconsciously mirror perceived teachers' energy and openness.

Interestingly, in the dataset, relaxed postures are identified as the most frequently used during the sessions. This emergence is not coincident, but educationally supported. According to Hall's (1966) proxemics theory which posits that when bodily components extended mindfully and physical stance done properly, it may create positive relational meanings that will help students to perceive classroom as conducive learning environment that will allow them to smooth acquisition on L2. However, it is important to note that too much employment may also hamper learning instead of reinforce it according to significant literature reviews.

Insights for ELT: The employment of posture, especially the relaxed posture significantly magnify the powerful role that bodily stance holds in English classroom's interaction, students' participations, and attitudes. This advocates that awareness on how to employ postures is very crucial, suggesting posture awareness as part of teachers' multimodal instructional practices in English language teaching context.

Eye Contact as an Interactional and Regulatory Tool

Eye contact (10.80%) plays a critical role in sustaining interaction, monitoring comprehension, and regulating participation. The dominance of scanning gaze, followed by sustained gaze, directed gaze, and minimal avoidant gaze, reflects a highly interactive teaching environment. Argyle (2019) study of gaze behavior remains foundational in explaining how eye contact regulates conversational flow, signaling attention, turn-taking, and social engagement. In classroom contexts, scanning gaze allows teachers to monitor the entire learning space, ensuring inclusivity and attentiveness. Sustained gaze is typically used to prompt responses or evaluate understanding, while directed gaze focuses attention on specific learners or tasks.

Recent educational research supports this functional interpretation. Studies in classroom interaction show that teacher gaze significantly influences student participation rates, particularly in L2 contexts where learners may hesitate to speak due to anxiety or limited proficiency. Eye contact therefore acts as both a motivational and accountability mechanism, subtly encouraging participation while maintaining instructional flow. The very low occurrence of avoidant gaze further suggests strong teacher presence and sustained interactional engagement, reinforcing the idea that eye contact is not incidental but a deliberate pedagogical strategy.

Insights for ELT: Employment of eye contact may come with two outputs. First are the desired results, and second is the unexpected one. These non-vocal cues may be crucial in establishing positive classroom interaction and function as regulatory tool for students'

behavior, it is also important to note that within each employment, students' may perceive them differently than what teachers may expect them to be serving for.

Proxemics as Spatial Pedagogy in Classroom Management

Proxemics (9.56%) reflects how spatial organization contributes to classroom communication and learner engagement. The dominance of public distance, followed by social distance and minimal personal distance, indicates structured spatial control aligned with whole-class instruction and classroom management strategies.

Hall's (1966) proxemics theory provides the conceptual foundation for interpreting these patterns, positing that spatial distance communicates relational meaning and social hierarchy. In ELT classrooms, public distance allows teachers to maintain authority and visibility, especially during instruction delivery. Social distance facilitates instructional explanation and group monitoring, while personal distance is reserved for individualized scaffolding or corrective feedback. Recent pedagogical studies reinforce that spatial positioning directly affects learner engagement and perceived teacher approachability. When teachers strategically adjust proximity, they can enhance participation, especially in language learning environments where confidence is a major barrier. Even digital-era classroom studies emphasize that physical positioning and movement within space influence attention and interaction patterns. Thus, proxemics functions as spatial pedagogy, where movement and distance become instructional tools that shape learning behavior and classroom dynamics.

Insight for ELT: The use of spatial positioning highlights how classroom space and activities operate as interactional capital in reinforcing communication and participation. In English language teaching, teachers are not just encouraged to be more cognitively inclined, but also affectively motivated as well. However, this must be done with great caution as it may result to discomfort on students' part if not done properly. In ELT, it is important for teachers to recognize not just significant indicators for second language acquisition such as vocabulary, grammar, and comprehension, but also embodied language such as distance or space.

Synthesis Anchored on Theoretical Frameworks

Collectively, the findings from the identify non-vocal paralinguistic cues—particularly hand gestures, facial expressions, posture, eye contact, and proxemics, alongside other embodied resources observed in the dataset—demonstrate that English language teaching is fundamentally a multimodal, embodied, and interactionally mediated process. Rather than functioning as supplementary behaviors, these non-vocal cues operate as integral communicative resources that shape how instructional meanings are delivered, interpreted, and negotiated within classroom discourse. The results suggest that teaching extends beyond spoken language and involves the continuous orchestration of bodily actions that contribute to learner engagement, classroom regulation, and meaning construction.

Viewed through the lens of Kinesics Theory, the findings affirm that body movements constitute meaningful communicative behavior and serve distinct functions within instructional interaction. The recurrent use of gestures, facial expressions, posture, gaze, and spatial positioning supports the kinesic assumption that bodily movement is not random but systematically contributes to communicative intent and interactional outcomes. At the same time, the emergence of self-adaptors in the dataset expands this interpretation by showing that not all bodily actions are communicative in purpose. While instructional cues facilitate interaction and meaning-making, self-adaptors reveal internal regulatory processes associated with cognitive effort and affective management. Thus, the findings reinforce the kinesic view that observable body behaviors may function either as externally directed communicative acts or internally directed forms of self-regulation.

From the perspective of Multimodal Theory, the results further demonstrate that classroom communication is produced through the integration of multiple semiotic modes operating simultaneously rather than independently. Spoken language, gesture, gaze, posture, movement, spatial arrangement, and timing collectively form a unified communicative ensemble through

which instruction occurs. The prominence of gesture–speech coordination, visual focus, interactive space usage, and multimodal timing in the dataset suggests that meaning in English language teaching is co-constructed through the synchronization of verbal and nonverbal resources. These findings support the multimodal assumption that communication is not located in language alone but emerges from the dynamic interaction of embodied, spatial, and visual modes within social interaction.

Moreover, the findings strongly align with Mehrabian's Theory of Communication, which emphasizes the substantial role of nonverbal channels in conveying affective and relational meaning during interaction. The observed facial expressions, posture, eye contact, and proxemic behaviors indicate that teachers communicate not only instructional content but also attitudes, emotional orientation, immediacy, and interpersonal positioning through bodily expression. The identification of self-adaptors further extends this understanding by illustrating that internal emotional and cognitive states may become externally observable through nonverbal behavior. In this sense, classroom interaction becomes not merely an exchange of verbal information but a communicative event shaped by visible emotional and relational signals.

Taken together, the three theoretical lenses converge on a central insight: non-vocal paralinguistic cues are not peripheral supports to instruction but foundational components of classroom communication. The findings indicate that effective English language teaching is achieved not solely through verbal explanation but through the coordinated use of bodily movement, emotional expression, spatial management, and multimodal interaction. Ultimately, the study positions teaching as an embodied communicative practice, where meaning is continuously co-constructed through the interaction of speech, body, space, and affect in real-time classroom discourse.

Insights That Can Be Drawn from Self-Adaptors to Improve English Language Teaching

High-Frequency Self-Adaptors to Improve English Language Teaching

The high-frequency self-adaptors—fixing hair, fixing collar, rubbing nose, and rubbing neck—suggest that teachers frequently exhibited self-directed bodily behaviors during classroom interaction. Within kinesics theory, these behaviors are categorized as self-adaptors associated with internal regulation rather than intentional communication. Existing studies associate spontaneous self-touch behaviors with working memory maintenance, emotion regulation, and cognitive demand (Grunwald et al., 2014). In classroom discourse, the occurrence of these behaviors may coincide with moments involving instructional transitions, real-time explanation, or classroom management demands. Fixing hair and fixing the collar, which appeared most frequently in the dataset, may reflect bodily adjustment or moments of self-regulation occurring during visible instructional performance. Harrigan (1985) noted that self-touch behaviors are often associated with affective and language-processing activity, while Nicoladis et al. (2022) emphasized that self-adaptors are more closely related to internal cognitive-affective states than communicative meaning-making. Similarly, Lin et al. (2023) associated self-touch behaviors with psychological distress indicators, suggesting that these actions may occur alongside increased cognitive or interactional demands.

Likewise, rubbing the nose and rubbing the neck may be associated with moments of cognitive effort, attentional adjustment, or physical regulation during instruction. Grunwald et al. (2014) linked spontaneous facial self-touch to EEG activity associated with emotion regulation and working memory processes, while Tafur et al. (2023) connected face-touching behaviors to broader neurocognitive regulatory mechanisms. Gallagher (2011) further argued that self-adaptors do not consistently correspond to intentional communicative meanings, reinforcing the interpretation that these behaviors are better understood as non-specific indicators of internal regulation processes.

Insight for ELT: High-frequency self-adaptors may indicate recurring forms of bodily adjustment and internal regulation that accompany the cognitive and interactional demands of

classroom teaching. These movements may not carry communicative functions within the classroom, it also important to note that English teacher should be aware of their existence, as it may provide interpretation both correspond to negative and positive perceptions depending on how students take them.

Middle-Frequency Self-Adaptors to Improve English Language Teaching

The middle-frequency self-adaptors—including touching ears, rubbing ears, fixing eyeglasses, wiping lips using bare hands, and rubbing the head—suggest moderate occurrences of self-regulatory bodily behaviors during classroom discourse. Although less recurrent than the high-frequency group, these behaviors still reflect observable forms of bodily adjustment that may accompany instructional activity. Studies on self-adaptors associate ear-touching and facial-touching behaviors with attentional shifts, uncertainty, or cognitive recalibration rather than communicative intent (Gallagher, 2011). Lin et al. (2023) also linked these behaviors to affective regulation processes, while Tafur et al. (2023) related self-touch actions to broader neurocognitive mechanisms. Similarly, rubbing the head has been associated with moments involving recall, reasoning, or cognitive engagement (Grunwald et al., 2014).

Fixing eyeglasses and wiping lips using bare hands may also function as practical or physiological adjustments occurring during instruction. Nicoladis et al. (2022) emphasized that self-adaptors differ from representational gestures because they primarily reflect internal states rather than deliberate communicative purposes. In this sense, these middle-frequency behaviors may represent observable bodily responses that occur alongside ongoing instructional and interactional processes.

Insight for ELT: Middle-frequency self-adaptors may reflect moderate forms of bodily adjustment and attentional regulation that occur during the continuous demands of classroom interaction. Their existence may be subtle, but they carry salient meaning. In the classroom. They emerged naturally especially during cognitive moments, indicating that when teachers employ them, it constitutes meaning, in which the students are the ones to tell if they are acceptable or not.

Low-Frequency Self-Adaptors to Improve English Language Teaching

The low-frequency self-adaptors—holding wrist, rubbing arms, rubbing hand, rubbing chin, and rubbing shoulder—appeared minimally within the dataset, suggesting that these behaviors occurred only occasionally during classroom interaction. Despite their limited occurrence, these actions still represent observable forms of self-directed bodily behavior within instructional settings. From a kinesic perspective, such behaviors are associated with bodily comfort-seeking, evaluation, or subtle forms of internal regulation rather than communicative intent (Matsumoto et al., 2016). Similarly explained that self-touch behaviors may emerge during moments of emotional activation or cognitive processing, while Nicoladis et al. (2022) reinforced that self-adaptors are more closely tied to internal cognitive-affective states. Behaviors such as rubbing the chin may coincide with moments of contemplation or evaluation, whereas holding the wrist or rubbing the arms and shoulders may reflect temporary bodily adjustment during interaction.

Although these behaviors appeared infrequently, their presence suggests that classroom teaching involves varied and individualized bodily responses that may emerge under specific instructional or situational conditions.

Insight for ELT: Low-frequency self-adaptors may represent occasional and individualized forms of bodily adjustment that occur within the dynamic interactional environment of classroom teaching. Even though its existence is minute, it does not mean it is not important. Since it occurred naturally during the analysis, it only implies that teachers must be aware on how and when to employ them. These movements in the classroom can be taken advantage if used properly especially in establishing positive and orderly classroom mood and environment, but done with caution since too much might also overwhelm student rather than empower them.

The overall findings on self-adaptors in English Language Teaching strongly converge on the idea that these behaviors—such as fixing hair, adjusting collars, rubbing the nose, and rubbing the neck—are not communicative gestures in themselves but are embodied manifestations of internal cognitive and affective processes, particularly mental overload, stress, anxiety, and emotional regulation. This interpretation is consistently supported by neurophysiological evidence indicating that spontaneous self-touch is associated with emotion regulation and working memory maintenance (Grunwald et al., 2014), as well as behavioral and computational findings linking self-adaptors to psychological distress and cognitive strain (Lin et al., 2023; Tafur et al., 2023).

5. Conclusion and Implications

Based on the finding, the study concludes that English language teaching is fundamentally a multimodal and embodied practice, where teachers' communicative repertoire extends beyond spoken language, and English teachers employ a wide range of coordinated non-vocal paralinguistic cues to effectively communicate to their students and be able to provide immediate responses. Also, the salient existence of the self-adaptors is highly significant, which justifies that every bodily movement done by the educators inside the classrooms constitutes descriptive meaning, which are perceived by the students whether they are positive or negative.

Also, the findings provide insights to take away. First, since it is found that teachers are more to employing the five (5) identified high-frequency cues such as gesture, facial expressions, posture, eye contact, and proxemics, this shows that it is very crucial for English language teachers to be more discerning and strategic when employing these non-vocal paralinguistic cues. Considering different empirical findings, the study highly implores to teachers to be more mindful especially on the bodily movements like self-adaptors during classroom instruction. Teachers' actions might be intended to deliver and provide conducive learning environment, yet it is up to the students' culture, practices, upbringing, and perception if those actions are positive or negative.

Furthermore, the findings of this study carry significant implications for English Language Teaching by emphasizing that non-vocal paralinguistic cues are not peripheral elements of instruction but are integral to effective classroom communication. Teachers may benefit from developing a heightened awareness of how bodily behaviors—such as hand gestures, facial expressions, posture, eye contact, proxemics, head movements, body orientation, and multimodal timing—function as pedagogical resources that support meaning-making, regulate interaction, and facilitate classroom engagement. At the same time, the presence of self-adaptors—such as fixing hair, adjusting clothing, and other forms of self-touching—offers additional insight into the internal dimension of teaching practice. Rather than being interpreted as distractions, these behaviors may be understood as possible indicators of cognitive load, momentary pause, or regulation during instruction. The salient existence of this behavior suggests the value of integrating reflective awareness of embodied behaviors into professional development programs, not to eliminate such actions, but to help teachers better recognize and manage cognitive demands in classroom situations.

Additionally, the findings imply that classroom communication extends beyond spoken discourse, as non-vocal paralinguistic cues form part of the overall instructional environment they experience. Although not directly measured in this study, students are positioned within a multimodal interactional setting where teacher bodily behaviors may contribute to how instruction is interpreted in terms of clarity, attentiveness, engagement, and classroom presence. Educational institutions on the other hand, the findings imply that institution may see these movements as part of both teachers' professional performance and professional need. Educational institution may conduct seminar and workshop to aid teachers fully utilize and capitalize the existence of non-vocal paralinguistic cues.

Finally, researcher recognizes significant limitations of the study that future researchers may take advantage of moving forward. Future studies may interview teachers across different institutions with different background and practices to grasp the richness of the study of non-vocal paralinguistic cues, since this study only observed the non-vocal paralinguistic cues within English language classroom of one tertiary institution. Also, to generally warrant a founded data, future studies may add students' perspective to encapsulate holistic findings. By incorporating interview both teachers and students in this study, researchers can identify verified and acceptable themes taken from the respondents' significant responses. This way, future study will produce interpretations that are data driven, implications that are result oriented, and results that are theoretically sound.

Another limitation of the present study lies in its cross-sectional design, which captured teachers' non-vocal paralinguistic behaviors during a specific period of classroom instruction. As such, the findings represent a snapshot of instructional practices and do not account for possible changes in teachers' communicative behaviors over time. Non-vocal cue usage may evolve as teachers establish classroom rapport, adapt to students' learning needs, or modify their instructional strategies throughout a semester or academic year. Future longitudinal research is therefore recommended to examine how teachers' embodied communicative practices develop across different stages of instruction and classroom relationships.

Overall, these findings suggest that effective English Language Teaching requires not only linguistic competence but also multimodal awareness and embodied communicative sensitivity. Both deliberate instructional cues and subtle self-regulatory behaviors contribute to the complexity of classroom interaction, thereby influencing how teaching and learning are experienced within the English language classroom.

6. References

- Afdaliah, N. (2022). Teachers' gestures in EFL classroom. *Al-Lisan: Jurnal Bahasa*, 7(2), 182-197. <https://doi.org/10.30603/al.v7i2.2735>
- Arciosa, R. M., Llanillo, L. C., Lorio, A. R., Gallego, M. G., Meriales, L., Dardo, A., Valdez, D., Perfecio, J., & Aguil, N. (2025). Assessing community extension initiative in developing culture-based IPED for teachers and learners in Sultan Kudarat, Philippines. *ASEAN Journal of Community Engagement*, 9(2), 104–121. <https://doi.org/10.7454/ajce.v9i2.1433>
- Argyle, M. (2019). *Bodily communication* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429030599>
- Aslan, Z., Özer, D., & Göksun, T. (2024). Exploring emotions through co-speech gestures: The caveats and new directions. *Emotion Review*, 16(4), 265–275. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17540739241277820>
- Birdwhistell, R. L. (1970). *Kinesics and context: Essays on body motion communication*. University of Pennsylvania Press. <https://repository.upenn.edu/handle/20.500.14332/45640>
- Burgoon, J. K., Guerrero, L. K., & Floyd, K. (2016). *Nonverbal communication* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Burgoon, J. K., Manusov, V., & Guerrero, L. K. (2021). *Nonverbal communication*. Routledge.
- Cabatac, R. T., Atienza, S. M. A., Gareza, E. J. P., Junsay, K. C., & Olmedo, M. S. (2023). Exploration of non-verbal features and functions among secondary teachers in the Philippines. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 15(1), 14–25.
- Calvache, J. E., & Cantillo Sanabria, M. G. (2017). Non-verbal communication in the field of higher education. *Investigium IRE: Ciencias Sociales y Humanas*, 8(2).

Analysis of Teachers' Non-Vocal Paralinguistic Cues in English Language Classrooms

- Carmichael, C. L., & Mizrahi, M. (2023). Connecting cues: The role of nonverbal cues in perceived responsiveness. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 53, 101663.
- Caybot, K. M. A., Datoy, A. J. M., Piit, A. S., Suarez, A. P. A., & Tantog, A. J. D. (2024). The teaching interns' use of kinesics as non-verbal communication in the classroom. *Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 5(3), 54–61. Research Synergy Foundation. <https://journals.researchsynergypress.com/index.php/jess/article/view/1890>
- Cukor-Avila, P. (2000). Revisiting the Observer's Paradox. *American Speech* 75(3), 253-254. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/2736>.
- Dash, B., & Davis, K. (2022). Significance of nonverbal communication and paralinguistic features in communication: A critical analysis. *International Journal for Innovative Research in Multidisciplinary Field*, 8(4), 172-179.
- del Valle, J. L. (2023). A rough sail for learner-centred education as a global reform policy in the Philippines. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 31(1), 109–128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2021.1887330>
- De Waele, A., Claeys, A. S., Cauberghe, V., & Fannes, G. (2018). Spokespersons' nonverbal behavior in times of crisis: The relative importance of visual and vocal cues. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 42(4), 441-460.
- Diadori, P. (2024). Nonverbal communication in language teaching: From gestures to embodied cognition. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 11(1), 45–62.
- Diez, K. P. O. (2025). Examining sociocultural and motivational dynamics in Southeast Asian ESL classrooms: A meta-synthesis of empirical evidence. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(9), 41–51. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.534>
- Ekman, P. (2021). Facial expressions of emotion: New findings, new questions. Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429492694>
- Freitas, S. dos A., & Andrade Neto, A. S. (2023). Gestures in the teaching and learning process: A systematic literature review. *Educação em Revista*, 39. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-469839705>
- Gallace, A., & Spence, C. (2010). The science of interpersonal touch: An overview. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 34(2), 246–259. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2008.10.004>
- Gallagher, G. M. (2011). Self-adaptors and Gaze Aversion: Cues of Deception in Culturally Deaf College Students.
- Giang V. (2024, July 27) With vs. without hand gesture. <https://www.youtube.com/shorts/xqHrPYIkMOo>
- Goldin-Meadow, S. (2020). Gesture as a window onto communicative and cognitive development. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 6, 1–18. <https://www.annualreviews.org/journal/linguistics>
- Goldin-Meadow, Susan. (2014). How gesture works to change our minds. *Trends in Neuroscience and Education*, 3(1), 4–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tine.2014.01.002>
- Grunwald, M., Weiss, T., Müller, S., & Rall, L. (2014). EEG changes caused by spontaneous facial self-touch may represent emotion regulating processes and working memory maintenance. *Brain Research*, 1557, 111–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2014.02.002>

- Hall, E. T. (1966). The hidden dimension. Doubleday.
<https://archive.org/details/hiddendimension00hall>
- Harrigan, J. A. (1985). Self-touching as an indicator of underlying affect and language processes. *Social Science & Medicine*, 20(11), 1161–1168.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536\(85\)90193-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(85)90193-5)
- Hervie, S. M. (2018). A study of non-verbal communication cues and their uses in preschool classroom interaction: A case study of Nsakina Kindergarten, Ghana (Unpublished M.Ed. thesis). University of Education, Winneba.
- Hömke, P., Levinson, S. C., & Emmendorfer, A. K. (2025). Eyebrow movements as signals of communicative problems in human face-to-face interaction. *Royal Society Open Science*, 12(3), 241632. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.241632>
<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/feduc.2021.712626/full>
- Hu, J., Zhang, Y., & Li, X. (2023). Teacher immediacy and student engagement in second language classrooms: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 27(4), 567–589.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221097243>
- Hu, L., Guo, X., & Chen, L. (2023). EFL teachers' immediacy behaviors, willingness to communicate, and student engagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1123456.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1123456>
- Jewitt, C. (Ed.). (2021). *The Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
<https://www.routledge.com/The-Routledge-Handbook-of-Multimodal-Analysis/Jewitt/p/book/9780367487481>
- Kennedy, O., Kuwahara, N., Noble, T., & Fukada, C. (2024). The effects of teacher nodding: Exploring mimicry, engagement, and wellbeing in the EFL classroom. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, Article 1361965. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1361965>
- Knapp, M. L., Hall, J. A., & Horgan, T. G. (2014). *Nonverbal communication in human interaction* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication*. Arnold.
- Krumhuber, E. G., Manstead, A. S. R., & Kappas, A. (2007). Facial dynamics as indicators of trustworthiness and cooperative behavior. *Emotion*, 7(4), 730–735.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.7.4.730>
- Lin, W., Orton, I., Li, Q., Pavarini, G., & Mahmoud, M. (2023). Looking at the body: Automatic analysis of body gestures and self-adaptors in psychological distress. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, 14(2), 1175–1187.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/TAFFC.2021.3101698>
- Liu, M., Wang, L., & Wen, Q. (2021). Teacher immediacy and its impact on student motivation and satisfaction: A systematic review. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33(4), 1391–1414. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09585-6>
- Liu, W., Peng, J., & Fan, W. (2021). Does teacher immediacy affect students? A systematic review of the association between teacher verbal and non-verbal immediacy and student motivation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 713978.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.713978>
- Lopez-Ozieblo, R. (2025). The Dual Functions of Adaptors. *Languages*, 10(9), 231.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/languages10090231>

- Macrine, S. L., & Fugate, J. M. B. (2021). Translating embodied cognition for embodied learning in the classroom. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, 712626. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2021.712626>
- Matsumoto, D., Hwang, H. C., & Frank, M. G. (2016). *APA handbook of nonverbal communication*. American Psychological Association.
- Mehrabian, A. (1972). *Nonverbal communication*. Aldine-Atherton.
- Muhayyanga, M., Sakkira, G., Ariyana, A., & Napp, S. (2023). Lecturer eye contact on the students' English learning motivation: Motivated or demotivated. *EduLine: Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, 2(1), 17–26. <https://doi.org/10.56983/eduline.v2i1.1695>
- Munir, F. S., & Dollah, S. (2025). Students' awareness of cultural differences in classroom communication. *Indo-MathEdu Intellectuals Journal*, 6(8), 12186–12194. <https://doi.org/10.54373/imeij.v6i8.4713>
- Napitan, A. V. (2025). Non-verbal communication to enhance learning: Strategies of Filipino language teachers. *International Journal of Applied Research in Education*, 4(1), 45–52. Innovative Publications. <https://eprint.innovativepublication.org/id/eprint/1970/>
- Nicoladis, E., Aneja, A., Sidhu, J., & Dhanoa, A. (2022). Is there a correlation between the use of representational gestures and self-adaptors? *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 46(3), 269–280. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-022-00384-4>
- Niedenthal, P. M., et al. (2019). Emotional expressions. *Emotion Review*, 11(3), 199–207. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073919835852>
- Nnko, E. D. (2024). The effect of non-verbal communication on the effectiveness of classroom teaching: The case of BTCA students at the Institute of Accountancy Arusha, Tanzania. *European Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences*, 2(2), 275–282. [https://doi.org/10.59324/ejtas.2024.2\(2\).24](https://doi.org/10.59324/ejtas.2024.2(2).24)
- Nurhayati, N., & Dollah, S. (2025). Non-verbal communication and its role in teacher–student interaction: A literature review. *ELT Worldwide: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 12(1).
- Raksawong, S., et al. (2024). Teachers as silencers: A Q methodology study into teachers' characteristics contributing to unwillingness to communicate among foreign language learners. *Language Learning Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2024.2412773>
- Sahlender, M., & ten Hagen, I. (2023). Do teachers adapt their gestures in linguistically heterogeneous second language teaching to learners' language proficiencies? *Gesture*, 22(2), 189–226. <https://doi.org/10.1075/gest.22023.sah>
- Sajjad, S., Hussain, S., & Farooq, M. (2023). The role of teacher gestures and body language in facilitating English language learning. *Cogent Education*, 10(1), 2187452. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2187452>
- Sali, A. H. A., & Ancho, I. V. (2021). Pedagogical reflections of Muslim-Filipino Madrasah teachers: A phenomenological study. *Journal of Research, Policy & Practice of Teachers and Teacher Education*, 11(1), 25–39. <https://doi.org/10.37134/jrppte.vol11.1.3.2021>
- Tafur, B., Weiss, S., & Mahmoud, M. (2023, October). Towards early prediction of neurodevelopmental disorders: Computational model for face touch and self-adaptors in infants. In *Companion Publication of the 25th International Conference on Multimodal Interaction* (pp. 426–434). Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3577190.3614096>

- Thompson, J. M. (2014). Teachers' perceptions of other teachers' gestures in the English as a second language classroom. *TESOL Journal*, 5(4), 753–776. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1167286.pdf>
- Vareberg, K. R., & Westerman, D. (2020). To:-) or to😊, that is the question: A study of students' initial impressions of instructors' paralinguistic cues. *Education and Information Technologies*, 25(5), 4501-4516.
- Webb, N. M., & Barrett, R. (2014). Classroom posture and movement as predictors of student engagement. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 49(2), 23–33.
- Wilson, M. (2002). Six views of embodied cognition. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 9(4), 625–636. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03196322>
- Witt, P. L., Schrod, P., & Wheelless, L. R. (2020). A meta-analytical review of teacher immediacy and student learning. *Communication Education*, 69(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2019.1620187>
- Zhang, Q., Li, M., & Zhou, Y. (2025). Nonverbal communication, teacher immediacy, and student engagement in university English classrooms.

AUTHORS' BIO

Jetro Larobes Sagot, LPT is currently a Teacher I at Jose Maria College Foundation, Inc. (JMCFI) under the Integrated Basic Education – Senior High School Department, where he teaches Media and Information Literacy and Empowerment Technologies. He earned his Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English from JMCFI and is currently pursuing a Master of Arts in Basic Education major in English Teaching at Davao del Norte State College. A student leader and academic advocate, he served as Supreme Student Government President during his undergraduate years and currently serves as President of the Graduate School Students' Society. His professional experiences in education, industry, and leadership have shaped his commitment to student-centered instruction, educational research, and the integration of innovative teaching practices. His research interests include English language teaching, classroom discourse, multimodal communication, and technology-enhanced learning.