JoLaCE

Journal of Language and Cultural Education, 2022, 10(3)
ISSN 1339-4584

sciendo

DOI: 10.2478/jolace-2022-0013

Effectiveness of Kinesics among Saudi undergraduate EFL Students: How do Paralinguistics Impact the Pedagogical Practices in an ESOL Classroom?

Mohammed Hafizur Rahman[1] & Demah Aamer Alqahtani[2]
[1] Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University in Dammam, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
[2] Shaqra University in Al-Muzahimiyah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
mhrahman@iau.edu.sa, dalqhtani@su.edu.sa

Abstract
Kinesics is a paralinguistic feature that helps convey a message quickly, especially in a TESOL environment. Kinesics is one of the main features of paralinguistics, which comprises various nonverbal fundamental elements. In this study, researchers collected the data regarding the effectiveness of kinesics for ESOL learners using a questionnaire with a sample of 385 instructors and learners from Saudi Arabian universities. Two hypotheses were tested: integrated kinesics significantly impacts learner-oriented proximity, and integrated kinesics features have a substantial effect on instructor-oriented proximity. SPSS was used to scrutinize the collected data. Regression analysis and descriptive statistic methods were used to check the frequency and reliability of the data and the variation of the results. The study's findings indicate a significant impact of integrated kinesics features on learner-oriented proximity and instructor-oriented proximity. Using kinesics features in TESOL is very effective. It is concluded that kinesics is an inseparable part of the lecture room's learning and teaching process. It is an integral part of teaching ESOL that should not be neglected.
Keywords: Kinesics, Proximity, Instructors, Learners, English, ESOL, EFL, ESL

Introduction

From the perspective that language and language usage consist of both speech and kinesics, over the past three decades, several studies have scrutinized kinesics' role in the second language (L2) acquisition. More frequently than their general foreign language counterparts, proficient ESOL instructors use the specific paralinguistic features, kinesics seldom knowingly and oft-times naively. They are also more likely to use the English language throughout their EFL/ESL instruction than the average English teacher (Moskowitz, 1976). As a result, this study will evaluate the effective implementation and use of kinesics in a TESOL environment. This research seeks to measure the use of kinesics during the L2 acquisition of EFL students at Saudi Arabian Government Universities. ESOL instructors conducted quantitative empirical research by distributing a survey questionnaire to the Saudi EFL learners to determine whether kinesics positively influences language acquisition among the students. Also, this study seeks to find a suitable outline for best practices for implementing kinesics in the EFL/ESL classroom.

Paralinguistics

There are numerous definitions related to paralinguistics depending on the researchers' theoretical background, their level of attention to detail, and the study's area of focus.

Kinesics is one of the primary features of paralinguistics, making it essential to first have an operational understanding of its parameters and definitions pertaining to the current research. The term *paralinguistic* literally means "nonverbal" (Gregersen &

MacIntyre, 2019). *ESOL paralinguistics* is the study of paralinguistic features of an ESOL classroom and concomitant communication (Andrew, 2016). *Paralinguistic feature* is a distinctive attribute or aspect of paralinguistic communication, a typical quality or an essential part of the non-verbal behavior of an ESOL instructor and ESOL learner. Paralinguistic features are kinesics, proxemics, oculesics, vocalics, chronemics, haptics, olfactics, and artifactics. A paralinguistic feature is a typical quality or an essential part of the paralinguistic immediacy of an ESOL instructor and ESOL learner (Beeman, 2019).

Paralanguage means "vocalic" (Guerrero, 2015) and *paralinguistic variable* is a paralinguistic feature that is inconsistent or does not have a fixed pattern; it is liable to change (Lipatova, 2015). *Paralinguistic indicator* is a paralinguistic variable that indicates the physical or psychological state or level of ESOL instructors and learners (Onan, 2015). *Paralinguistic cue* is a paralinguistic indicator that serves as a signal to ESOL instructors and ESOL learners (Owens, 2016). *Paralinguistic immediacy* is the quality of bringing one into direct and instant involvement with the communicator and also gives rise to a sense of urgency or excitement during an ESOL pedagogical (teaching, assessment, and development) process (Witt et al., 2006). It is the proximity where both paralinguistic communication and paralinguistic behavior are expressions being used interchangeably. As cited in Wolfgang (1979), Harrison describes paralinguistic immediacy as the behavior surpassing spoken or written words. Gallois and Callan (1997) view paralinguistic communication as the multi-channel source of feelings such as identity, emotion, and outlook through the body, face, and voice.

Paralinguistic attitude is a settled way of thinking or feeling about the use of paralinguistic features or an understanding of paralinguistic features (Hamzah, 2019). *Paralinguistic awareness* is knowledge or perception of a situation or fact related to paralinguistics (Yang, 2018). *Paralinguistic exposition* is a comprehensive description and explanation of an ESOL approach to using paralinguistic immediacy and awareness (Hernández-Guerra, 2018). And finally, *paralinguistic eloquence* is a fluent, effortless, and persuasive paralinguistic feature and effective determination of paralinguistic immediacy of an ESOL instructor (Önal, 2019). As cited in Lynch (1996), Schneller mentions that since the 1950s, there has been a considerable focus on paralinguistic interaction because verbal language is just one among the many different human communication channels. Birdwhistell, as cited in Condon and Yousef (1981), assumed that above 60% of human interaction is done through paralinguistic language and thus, considered quite significant in the field of communication.

Kinesics

Many people do not fully understand what others hope to convey when communicating verbally (Sutrisna, 2020). Kinesics is another form of paralinguistic communication, derived from the Greek word 'kines,' which means movements. Birdwhistell (1952) defined the concept as "the systematic study of how human beings communicate through gesture and body movements." Several researchers (Ahmad & Zani, 2012; Fabrigas & Maniagom, 2018) have tried to explain the elements of kinesics in diverse ways. Although, all types of body movements that can be used to communicate are not necessarily kinesics. As per Malandro's (1989) definition, kinesics assists instruction in six ways: accenting, complementing, contradicting, substituting, regulating, and repeating verbal messages. Identified types include facial expressions, gestures, and body language. It is kinesics that expresses emotions better than words. Fabrigas and Maniago (2018) also found out that paralinguistic features have a more substantial meaning than verbal expressions when used as a science teaching strategy for indigenous learners. Meanwhile, Ahmad & Zani

(2012) found out that the most meaningful conversational messages in students' points of view came from kinesics or paralinguistic eloquence.

Facial expression

Facial expression plays a vital role in communication. Regardless of whether an individual communicates verbally, their facial expressions convey just as much information, if not more, to the receiver, which might lead to positive or negative consequences. Lahiff and Penrose (1991) identified ten facial expressions: happiness, sadness, surprise, fear, anger, content, disgust, interest, determination, and confusion. According to Cooper and Simonds (2014), "kinesics is the study of facial expressions and gestures."

Gestures

Gestures explain that individuals use their body parts and body movements to communicate a message to the receives. Ekman and Friesen (1969) have identified five types of gestures: emblems, illustrators, regulators, displays, and adapters. These gestures are considered "helping features" because they help express emotions and body language while simultaneously communicating verbally and paralinguistically to the audience.

Body language

Body language is a combination of posture and gesture and indicates how an individual stands, talks, positions their body, and the movements they use to communicate and deliver a compelling message to the receiver. Body language significantly impacts the person or a group with whom the individual is interacting.

Education simplifies the learning process of acquiring knowledge, skills, beliefs, values, and habits. A significant element of how one articulates emotions is through paralinguistic behaviors. To effectively teach English to speakers of other languages, it is necessary to utilize kinesics effectively while delivering lectures or teaching the English language to the learners. According to Greenspan and Benderly (1997), "paralinguistic actions in communication, including postures, gestures and other facial expressions, and body language have a stronger meaning than verbal expressions."

According to Young (2006), "communication with actions speaks more than words. Your body language expresses to the audience through visual elements, such as physical distance between the speaker and the listener, eye contact, postures, gestures, and body orientation. Body language is a key fragment of casual communication as it is of official demonstrations." According to Miller (1988, p. 28), "body movements and postures are often indicators of energy, self-confidence, status or fatigue. In the lecture hall, learners are intense to get body messages of boredom and enthusiasm about the topic under discussion or teaching can sense self-confidence or hindrance from the instructors' insensible behavior. Attentive instructors can also state when learners understand the content delivered or when they have issues grasping the key concepts. A receiver slouching sends a very different message from one leaning forward or sitting erect. Postures and body movements alone have no exact meaning, but they can seriously reject or support the words that are being spoken. If these two resources of communicating message are dichotomized and contradict each other, then the outcome will be a one-sided image, and more frequently the paralinguistic features will dominate".

Paralinguistics in instruction

English language instructors have developed new strategies that have led to language modification among learners. The four changes include using idioms carefully, speaking short and straightforward present tense messages, speaking clearly and slowly, and increasing the use of facial expressions and gestures (Chaudron, 1988). The changes are

intended to ensure that the teacher and learner understand each other well (Lynch, 1996). The teachers are expected to take the leading role while guiding the students in their work.

English is the most spoken and used language across the world today. It is adopted as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) in higher learning institutions globally. In addition, there are more than a billion English learners spread across all world regions (Crystal, 2004). Colonization is considered the most plausible reason why English has become the most spoken language worldwide. More than fifty countries colonized by the British incorporated the English language (Laycock, 2012). After World War II, the American and the British government deliberately enriched English through linguism, which is also improved by modern policies (Phillipson, 2017).

Teaching English to speakers of other languages increases the chance of their growth in the future. Lack of fluency in speaking the English language may be a significant hindrance to the youth ambitions across the world. They may lose many opportunities due to a lack of confidence in speaking English. According to Ebad (2014), the English language is becoming common in higher-level institutions teaching in Saudi Arabia. However, the primary level institutions use the Arabic language, which underscores that the English language is not a threat to the native language. The efforts to implement the English language in Saudi Arabia's educational system need more dedication (Ebad, 2014). Most Saudi learners (96%) consider English as a superior language since it is used in most countries around the globe.

In contrast, Arabic is only used in one region. There is consensus among 82% of the learners that the Arabic language is more appropriate for teaching Islamic studies, history, and Arabic education. Simultaneously, English fits more in teaching medicine, nursing, pharmacy, engineering, science, and computer science (Al-Jarf, 2008).

The Saudi government has taken education seriously, as underscored by free learning from kindergarten to graduate level. As Al-Nasser (2015) has it, the mother tongue is a significant problem in teaching the English language in Saudi Arabia. Many Saudi people comfortably understand Arabic due to its everyday use at home. The lack of exposure until the fourth grade makes it a challenge for many individuals to learn the English language comprehensively (Al-Abdan, 1993; Nation, 2003; Al-Nofaie, 2010; Jdetawy, 2011). If Saudi people had been aware of the English language earlier, they would be more competent. Even then, the strategies used to teach English in Saudi Arabia are limited. In addition, most of the teaching is in the Arabic language, which further reduces the learners' exposure (Fareh, 2010).

Many theses and research studies on the English teaching subject (Mahdi & El-Naim, 2012; Moskovsky, 2018) focus on the potential of using Facebook interactions. Alwehaibi (2015) is researching the possible use of YouTube for English language learners. Ben Duhaish (2014) has found that some practical teaching methods constitute politeness, indirect speech, and kinesics exposition. However, it is crucial to understand that the learners' systematic development determines whether they make the expected progress or not (Pica, 2003). The instructors also need to ensure that the learning environment is comfortable for the learners.

Research objectives

The main objective of this research is to evaluate the kinesics techniques while teaching English to speakers of another language. However, the research objectives of the study are:

1. to highlight the impact of kinesics on ESOL students.

2. to understand various kinesics features and their effects on the pedagogical practices in an ESOL classroom.
3. to expose how to use kinesics in conjunction with paralinguistic eloquence to reduce errors while teaching English to the speakers of other languages in classroom sessions.
4. to identify the kinesics features that directly and quickly impact the motivation, positive emotions, and better understanding in the English language lecture room. The identification can be based on assessing the kinesics awareness of students in an ESOL environment.

Research hypothesis

To achieve the study's objective, several hypotheses have been designed to check the effect of Kinesics on Teaching English to Speakers of Other Language pedagogy. The current research looks to test the following hypothesis:

*H*01= Integrated kinesics features have no significant impact on instructor-oriented proximity

*H*02= Integrated kinesics features have no considerable effect on learner-oriented proximity

Significance of the study

In this study, the researcher aims to elevate the awareness among teachers or instructors towards the significance of kinesics and positive body language, which positively affects the process of teaching and learning. It is essential to focus on kinesics teachers' positive body language and their diverse meanings, enhancing speakers of other language learners' motivation in the lecture room.

The researcher aims to understand the effect of Kinesics in teaching English to speakers of another language to increase the level of motivation of English language learners. This study is likely to assist in bridging the difference between practical traditions and different hypotheses of English for speakers of other language pedagogy, as well as generating concrete, pragmatic/realistic recommendations for learners pursuing higher education in universities and for instructors that are giving lectures as the English language teachers to these learners. As per the expectations, this study will successfully assist the instructors and other persons in teaching English to speakers of other languages. This research will enable using the most crucial and essential hypothetical features for improving language learners' fluency in the English language and increasing instructors' kinesics efficiency and overall paralinguistic eloquence and awareness (PLEA).

Problem statement

In recent years, successful learning and teaching started considering the paralinguistics allied to the language. Inside the lecture rooms, instructors use different gestures and body language messages in various forms; for example, using gestures, facial expressions, and other body movements as per the scenario, which is the primary attention of this study. Instructors can use their positive body language to make the learning and teaching process exciting and valuable for the audience. It can be a tool that stimulates ESOL learners to boost their motivation level in the lecture room.

Speakers or other language learners are entirely influenced by the lecture room's setting, the program's content, and precisely the way they are presented. This means that the more unprofessional learning conditions result in more boring learning, and the learners will be more unmotivated. This leads the researcher to study the effect of kinesics in teaching English to speakers of another language on the motivation level of learners.

The study suggests using kinesics as a helpful teaching tool in the lecture room that enriches the speakers of other language learners' motivation because the teaching is psychological rather than pedagogical. Hence, the students need to get the information in an inspired way that leads to improving the learning process of the audience and creating an effective lecture room atmosphere.

Methodology

The following section addresses the methodological paradigm of the study, theories underpinning the inquiry, research design, sampling procedures, target population, quantifiable measurement, data collection instruments, validity and reliability of the instruments, data collection, and data analysis procedures. The quantitative survey research evaluates kinesics effectiveness in teaching EFL/to test the proposed research hypotheses. Likert scale questions were used to measure the responses. The study focuses on government universities in Saudi Arabia to assess ESOL instructor performance, foreign language student learning process, and foreign language student language acquisition when kinesics is utilized.

Research philosophy

The study seeks to develop an effective system that positively utilizes kinesics in Teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) environments. To achieve this goal, the data and information were collected from the instructors and learners at Saudi Arabian Universities to better understand their experiences as relevant to the topic.

Sample

The researcher examined a subset of the instructor and learner populations in Saudi Arabia to forecast the larger population's performance. ESOL instructors and ESOL students in Saudi Arabian universities served as the population for the study. The sample of instructors and learners are from different government Universities in Saudi Arabia.

The study used probability sampling, and the survey sample size was 385, comprised of 50 instructors and 335 learners. Cluster sampling was used for data collection. This study uses descriptive research and quantitative data to contextualize the concepts and statistical interpretation of the results.

Microsoft Excel software was used in data analysis, and Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software assisted in further analysis of data and results. The descriptive analysis method was used for primary and secondary data collection. Descriptive measures such as mean and standard deviation were used to summarize the data. Also, the parametric test, ANOVA, was used to test the accuracy of the research hypothesis.

Limitations of the study

Certain limitations of every research alternatively affect the study's results, accuracy, and effectiveness. Hence, while researching the effects of kinesics in teaching ESOL, the research faces some limitations. These limitations put the study's results into context and provide insight into future or additional research.

The study faced a time constraint during the data collection phase. Questionnaires were completed on an individual basis. More responses may have been gathered if the responses had been distributed in group settings. Also, the number of respondents was limited because of the size of the desired population, which indirectly affected the accuracy of the data. If the sample size had a more significant confidence level, the results would be more representative. Finally, the research was confined only to universities in Saudi Arabia. Future research should additionally consider other colleges and secondary schools in Saudi Arabia.

Results

The questionnaire on the effect of kinesics in a TESOL environment garnered responses from 400 total instructors and learners at Saudi Arabian universities. However, only 385 surveys were filled out entirely regarding the effectiveness of kinesics in teaching ESOL. IBM SPSS software was used to perform statistical analysis on the data.

Out of 385 responses, 335 were from learners and 50 instructors from different Universities in Saudi Arabia. All were either enrolled in or teaching an ESOL course.

As seen in Table 1, the average learner response on the effectiveness of kinesics in a TESOL environment is 3.962. This indicates that the learners perceive a positive effect of kinesics on the English as a second language learning process and acquisition. The range value is also 4, which supports this argument. The standard deviation value is 0.046, which means a 4.6% variation between the learners' responses.

	N	Range	Min.	Max.	Sum	Mean		Variance	Skewness	Kurtosis
	Statistic						Std. Error	Statistic		
Kinesics 1	335	4.0	1.0	5.0	1268.0	3.785	.0561	1.055	-1.009	.435
Kinesics2	335	4.0	1.0	5.0	1324.0	3.952	.0584	1.141	-1.149	.791
Kinesics3	335	4.0	1.0	5.0	1399.0	4.176	.0518	.900	-1.523	2.643
Kinesics4	335	4.0	1.0	5.0	1361.0	4.063	.0533	.951	-1.392	1.902
Kinesics5	335	4.0	1.0	5.0	1401.0	4.182	.0505	.856	-1.785	3.786
Kinesics6	335	4.0	1.0	5.0	1377.0	4.110	.0492	.811	-1.679	3.714
Kinesics7	335	4.0	1.0	5.0	1212.0	3.618	.0726	1.764	-.754	-.570
Kinesics8	335	4.0	1.0	5.0	1286.0	3.839	.0568	1.082	-1.263	1.405

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of learners

Indicated in Table 2, the ANOVA shows $F(12,373)= 139.23$, $P< 0.05$, which suggests that integrated kinesics features significantly affected learner-oriented proximity.

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between People		1369.080	334	4.099		
Within People	Between Items	5080.092	39	130.259	139.233	.000
	Residual	12186.383	13026	.936		
	Total	**17266.475**	**13065**	**1.322**	**(total of between items and residual**	
Grand Total (**between people +between items+ residual**)		18635.555	13399	1.391		
Grand Mean = 3.962						

Table 2: ANOVA and Scale Statistic Results of Learner Questionnaire

In addition, Table 3 shows that out of 335 learner respondents, 224 respondents shared that they agreed with the positive effect of kinesics in a TESOL environment, 60

strongly agreed, two disagreed, and 48 were unsure. In contrast, only one respondent shared that they strongly disagreed with the effectiveness of kinesics.

Category of response	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
agree	224	66.9	66.9	66.9
disagree	2	0.6	0.6	67.5
not sure	48	14.3	14.3	81.8
strongly agree	60	17.9	17.9	99.7
strongly disagree	1	0.3	0.3	100.0
Total	335	100.0	100.0	

Table 3: ESOL learner response on Kinesics

Table 4 shows that since the p-value is 0.005, which is highly significant, the T-score explains that the group is more inquisitive. We can conclude that the instructors and learners find kinesics very effective in a TESOL environment.

Predictor	Coef	SE Coef	T (for t-test)	P
Kinesics	-0.2244	0.1398	-1.60	0.005
S = 0.769593 R-Sq = 50.4% R-Sq(adj) = 47.2%				

Table 4: Learner t-test results

English as a second language instructors' profile

As seen in Table 5, the average instructor response to the effectiveness of kinesics in a TESOL environment is 3.91, which means that the instructors saw a positive impact of kinesics on ESOL learners. The range value is also 4, which supports this argument. The standard deviation value is 1.57, which means there is a 15.7% variation between instructor responses.

	N	Range	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Kinesics 1	50	4.0	1.0	5.0	4.176	1.7935	.763	-1.397
Kinesics 2	50	4.0	1.0	5.0	4.063	1.6056	.621	-1.268
Kinesics 3	50	4.0	1.0	5.0	4.182	1.4032	.643	-.744
Kinesics 4	50	4.0	1.0	5.0	4.110	1.7961	.286	-1.769
Kinesics 5	50	4.0	1.0	5.0	3.618	1.2216	.917	.029
Kinesics 6	50	4.0	1.0	5.0	3.839	1.7815	-.713	-1.391
Kinesics 7	50	4.0	1.0	5.0	4.134	1.8753	.600	-1.648
Kinesics 8	50	4.0	1.0	5.0	3.973	1.7567	-.311	-1.703

Table 5: Descriptive statistics of instructors

As indicated in Table 6, the ANOVA shows $F(1,49) = 7.703$, $P < 0.05$, thus, H0 is rejected, and H1 is accepted at a 5% level of significance.

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between People		372.002	49	7.592		
Within People	Between Items	746.512	39	19.141	7.703	0.000
	Residual	4748.438	1911	2.485		
	Total	5494.950	1950	2.818		
Total		5866.952	1999	2.935		
Grand Mean = 2.782						

Table 6: ANOVA and scale statistics results of instructor questionnaire

As seen in Table 7, out of 50 instructor respondents, 19 agreed with the positive effect of kinesics while teaching ESOL, 17 strongly agreed, one disagreed, and eight were unsure. In contrast, only five respondents indicated they strongly disagreed.

Category of response	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
agree	19	38.0	38.0	38.0
disagree	1	2.0	2.0	40.0
not sure	8	16.0	16.0	56.0
strongly agree	17	34.0	34.0	90.0
strongly disagree	5	10.0	10.0	100.0
total	50	100.0	100.0	

Table 7: Frequency and percentage of instructor responses

Table 8 shows that Integrated kinesics features have a significant impact on instructor-oriented proximity. And the T-score explains that the instructors find kinesics very effective in a TESOL environment.

Predictor	Coef	SE Coef	T(for t-test)	P
Kinesics	-0.2164	0.1417	-1.53	0.134
S = 0.775678 R-Sq = 50.8% R-Sq(adj) = 46.4%				

Table 8: Instructor t-test results

Testing the hypothesis

In testing the first hypothesis, the researcher used a simple linear regression to predict the perceived learner effectiveness of integrated kinesics on oriented proximity.

*H*1= There is a significant effect of integrated kinesics on learner-oriented proximity.

*H*0= There is no significant effect of integrated kinesics on learner-oriented proximity

As indicated in Table 9, the ANOVA shows F(3,332) =15.61, P< 0.05, which indicates that integrated kinesics significantly effects learners-oriented proximity.

In testing the second hypothesis, the researcher used a simple linear regression to predict the perceived instructor effectiveness of integrated kinesics on learner-oriented proximity.

*H*1= There is a significant effect of integrated kinesics on instructor-oriented proximity.

*H*0= There is no significant effect of integrated kinesics on instructor-oriented proximity.

As noted in Table 10, the ANOVA shows F(4,49) =11.59, P< 0.05, which indicates that integrated kinesics significantly effects instructor-oriented proximity.

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Regression	3	27.7354	9.2451	15.61	0.000
Residual Error	332	27.2446	0.5923		
Total	335	54.9800			

Table 9: Learner ANOVA Results

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	P
Regression	4	27.9046	6.9761	11.59	0.000
Residual Error	45	27.0754	0.6017		
Total	49	54.9800			

Table 10: Instructor ANOVA Results

Discussion

Regression analysis indicates a significant effect of integrated kinesics on learner-oriented proximity and instructor-oriented proximity. If kinesics is utilized efficiently while teaching ESOL, the audience will enjoy their learning with enthusiasm. Statistically, kinesics' effect on teaching English to the speakers of different language pedagogy has been significant at a 95% confidence level. The study specifies the importance of Kinesics' implication by the instructors to motivate and improve learners' learning process.

Effective communication behavior by the instructor builds a good learning atmosphere and creates a harmonious relationship between instructors and the students, thus enlightening the quality of education (Zhao, 2019). Excellent and effective learning needs time and patience. Wolk (2001) stated that English learners for speakers of other languages need time and space 'to own their learning.'

The first hypothesis showed a significant impact of integrated kinesics on learner-oriented proximity, indicating a positive outcome of integrated kinesics on learner-oriented proximity. Some researchers state that language instructors should not impose language learning on the students. In contrast, the student's role should not be passive as one might not receive or speak of these learning aspects of kinesics in teaching, but if it gets undetected, it might make the whole pedagogy washed out.

The second hypothesis has a significant impact of integrated kinesics on instructor-oriented proximity, indicating a positive relationship between the instructors and students regarding the effects of Kinesics. In his research, Magrath (2015) stated that the teachers could be successful professional instructors by developing their skills, expertise, and awareness in Kinesics and implementing this skillset during the lectures, resulting in a successful and motivational environment for the learners. Pennycook (1985) highlighted paralinguistic communication as the only portion of socio-linguistic or grammatical competence.

The leading association between kinesics and linguistic aspects is not what we deliver but what is received. Getting the message in its required method is the critical point that should be considered. McCafferty (1998) stated that the gestures and other paralinguistic features of communication should have been considered possibly significant; however, their connection to second language learning mostly remains elucidated.

Conclusion

When teaching ESOL, the instructor must be aware of the learners' Paralinguistic Indicators and react appropriately. If the Instructors don't answer promptly, they may be seen as having misunderstood ESOL students. Similarly, learners who cannot decipher their teacher's paralinguistic cues may respond in ways that demonstrate a breakdown in communication. Additionally, this will lead to a lack of required learning output. The research intends to assess the kinesics strategies while teaching English to speakers of another language. Results also demonstrate that kinesics has a substantially good influence on ESOL students learning; Kinesics plays a crucial function for the instructors as well when presenting An ESOL lecture to create an efficient learning environment and assist students in absorbing language competence fast and adeptly. It was noticed from the data that the kinesics elements are an inseparable component of the learning and teaching process in the ESOL classroom, and it is a pivotal part of ESOL pedagogy that should not be disregarded by the instructors of the EFL/ESL Speakers.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author.

Conflicts of interest

The corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest on behalf of all authors.

References

Ahmad, S. S. & Zani, R. D. (2012). Impact of kinesics on students' learning satisfaction. *Elixir Management Arts*, 48, 9672-9675. Available on: https://www.elixirpublishers.com/articles/1351250783_48%20(2012)%209672-9675.pdf

Al-Abdan, AA (1993). A study on using Arabic in teaching English in Saudi intermediate schools. *King Saud University Magazine*, 50(2), 396–426.

Al-Jarf, R. (2008). The impact of English as an international language (EIL) upon Arabic in Saudi Arabia. *Asian EFL Journal, 10*(4), 193–210.

Al-Nasser, A. S. (2015). Problems of English language acquisition in Saudi Arabia: An exploratory-cum-remedial study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 5*(8), 1612–1619. Available on: http://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0508.10.

Alwehaibi, H. O. (2015). The impact of using YouTube in EFL classrooms on enhancing EFL students' content learning. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning, 12*(2), 121–126. Available on: https://doi.org/10.19030/tlc.v12i2.9182.

Beeman, W. O. (2019). *Paralinguistic and performative dimensions*. The Routledge Handbook of Language and Emotion. Routledge.

Ben Duhaish, F. A. (2014). *When English is performed rather than spoken: The narrative inquiry of Saudi MA students' experiences with pragmatic competence* [Doctoral thesis]. The Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Birdwhistell, R. (1952). *Introduction to kinesics: An Annotation System for Analysis of Body Motion and Gesture*. Washington, DC: Department of State, Foreign Service Institute.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *ESL / EFL classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Condon, J. & Yousef, F. (1981). *An introduction to intercultural communication*. Bobbs Merrill Educational Publishing.

Crystal, D. (2004). The past, present, and future of World English. In A. Gardt & B. Huppauf (Eds.), *Globalization and the future of German* (pp. 27–46). Moutonde Gruyter.

Ebad, R. (2014). The role and impact of English as a language and a medium of instruction in Saudi higher education institutions: Learners-instructors perspective. *Studies in English Language Teaching*, 2(2), 140-148.

Fabrigas, Y. & Maniago, J. (2018). Kinesics as a science teaching strategy for indigenous learners. *International Journal of Contemporary Research and Review, 9*(1). DOI: 10.15520/ijcrr/2018/9/01/409.

Fareh, S. (2010). Challenges of teaching English in the Arab world: Why can't EFL programs deliver as expected? *Procedia - Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 3600–3604. Available on: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.559.

Gallois, C., & Callan, V. J. (1997). *Communication and culture: A guide for practice* (pp. 44-61). Chichester: Wiley.

Greenspan, S. I., & Benderly, B. L. (1997). *The growth of the mind and the endangered origins of intelligence.* Perseus Publishing.

Gregersen, T. S., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2019). Teaching and researching nonverbal communication skills. In N. Polat, T. S. Gregersen, & P. D. MacIntyre (Eds.), *Research-driven pedagogy: Implications of L2A theory and research for the teaching of language skills.* Routledge.

Guerrero, L. K. (2015). Paralanguage. In C. R. Berger, M. E. Roloff, S. R. Wilson, J. P. Dillard, J. Caughlin, & D. Solomon (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of interpersonal communication* (pp. 1–5). Available on: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118540190.wbeic062.

Gurney, P. (2007). Five factors for effective teaching. *New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work, 4*(2), 89–98.

Hamzah, S. A. S. (2019). *Teacher talk modification in EFL classroom interaction* [Doctoral dissertation]. Universitas Negeri, Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia.

Hernández-Guerra, C. (2018). A revision of the methodology used for oral expositions. *Journal of Advances in Linguistics, 9*(1), 1414–1425. Available on: https://doi.org/10.24297/jal.v9i1.7671.

Huseman, R. C., Lahiff, J. M., & Penrose, J. M. (1991). *Business communication: Strategies and skills*. Chicago: Dryden Press.

Laycock, S. (2012). *All the Countries: And the Few We Never Got Round To*. The History Press.

Lipatova, T. V. (2015). Verbal and nonverbal components in the language system. *RUDN Journal of Philosophy, 4*, 115–123.

Longman advanced American dictionary. (2013). Longman. Harlow, England.

Lynch, T. (1996). *Communication in the language classroom*. Oxford University Press.

Magrath, D. (2015b). *Paralinguistic concerns for ESL instructors*. MultiBriefs. Available on: http://exclusive.multibriefs.com/content/paralinguistic-concerns-foreslinstructors/education

Malandro, L. A., Barker, L. L., & Barker, D. A. (1989). *Non-verbal communication* (2nd ed.). New York: Random House.

McCafferty, S. G. (1998). Nonverbal expression and L2 private speech. *Applied Linguistics, 19*(1), 73–96. Available on: https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.1.73.

Miller, P. W. (1988). *Nonverbal Communication. What Research Says to the Teacher*. NEA Professional Library.

Moskovsky, C. (2018). ESOL teaching and learning in Saudi Arabia: 25 years of research. In C. Moskovksy & M. Picard (Eds.), *English as a Foreign Language in Saudi Arabia: New Insights into Teaching and Learning English* (pp. 12–77). Routledge.

Moskowitz, G. (1976). The classroom interaction of outstanding foreign language teachers. *Foreign Language Annals, 9*(2), 135–143. Available on: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1976.tb02639.x.

Onan, B. (2015). Metalinguistic units and paralinguistic indicators used in language teaching. *Mustafa Kemal ÜniversitesiSosyalBilimlerEnstitüsüDergisi*, 12(29).

Owens, R. E. (2016). *Language development: An introduction* (9th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.

Pennycook, A. (1985). Actions speak louder than words: Paralanguage, communication, and education. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(2), 259–282. Available on: https://doi.org/10.2307/3586829.

Phillipson, R. (2017). Myths and realities of 'global' English. *Language Policy, 16*(3), 313-331.

Pica, T. (2003). Second Language Acquisition: Research and Applied Linguistics. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 18*(2), 1-26.

Simonds, C., & Cooper, P. (2014). *Communication for the Classroom Teacher* (9th ed.). Beaufort: Pearson.

Sutrisna, I. P. E. (2020). Kinesics in EFL language teaching. *Yavana Bhasha: Journal of English Language Education*, *3*(2), 27-35.

Wolk, S. (2001). The benefits of exploratory time. *Educational Leadership*, 59(2), 56–59.

Young, S. (2006, December). Using POMDPs for dialog management. In *2006 IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop* (pp. 8-13). IEEE.

Zhao, Y. (2019). Achievement emotions as mediators of teacher communication behavior and Student participation—A model construction. In *3rd International Seminar on Education Innovation and Economic Management (SEIEM 2018).* Atlantis Press.

Contacts

Mohammed Hafizur Rahman
(corresponding author)
Deanship of Preparatory Year
Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University
Dammam
Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
mhrahman@iau.edu.sa

Demah Aamer Alqahtani
Department of English Language
College of Education,
Shaqra University
Al-Muzahimiyah
Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
dalqhtani@su.edu.sa