

Forms and functions of nonverbal communication in native and non-native French lecturers' classrooms

Rohali*, Roswita Lumban Tobing, Siti Perdi Rahayu, Tika Zuleika

Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: rohali@uny.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study explores the categories and pedagogic functions of nonverbal communication used by native-speaker and non-native-speaker French teachers teaching French as a Foreign Language (FLE). This study used descriptive qualitative method through room-talk analysis to be observed in Yogyakarta State University. There were two non-native lecturers, a man and a woman, the participants. The data were collected from non-participating classes by means of observations, field notes, and audio-visual recordings. The discussion was limited to the following are nine forms of nonverbal communications: body language, facial expressions, eye contact, posture, proxemics, silence, touch, paralinguistic, visual-aids and demonstrations. The results argue that these nine lecture delivery modes are key pedagogic resources through which lecturers shape meaning-making, manage class interaction, and develop lecturer-student relational intimacy. The non-native lecturer displays an increased desire for instruction clarity manifested in a more controlled body language, strategically employed silences, and minimized paralinguistic. Conversely, the native speaker prefers interactional dynamism, readily employing hand gestures, spatial dynamics, engaging friendly facial expressions and a variety of paralinguistic signals. Overall, the findings highlight the importance of nonverbal communication and its role in the co-construction of a multimodal, interactional-based pedagogic context in teaching French at university. Eye contact, posture, touch and visual illustrations are other communicative resources that help to reinforce the dynamics of the classroom interactions.

Keywords: Nonverbal communication, teaching the French language, NL lecturer, NNL lecturer, multimodality

Article history

Submitted:
30 December 2025

Accepted:
29 March 2026

Published:
31 March 2026

Citation (APA Style):

Rohali, R., Tobing, R. L., Rahayu, S. P., & Zuleika, T. (2026). Forms and functions of nonverbal communication in native and non-native French lecturers' classrooms. *LITERA*, 25(1), 29-41. <https://doi.org/10.21831/ltr.v25i1.94342>

INTRODUCTION

Nonverbal communication has an important role in teaching and learning within classroom. It influences what is made meaningful, how meaning is negotiated, and how meaning is interpreted throughout instructional interaction (Burgoon et al., 2021; Hall & Knapp, 2013). In the class, people do not communicate only with their words but also through non-verbal signals that accompany and complement the oral messages. These signals serve not only as indicators of additional information, but also as teaching methodologies components (Burgoon et al., 2021; Patterson, 2016). Therefore, the quality of classroom teaching is influenced by not just the comprehensibility of verbal explanation, but also the interaction between verbal and nonverbal cues in leading students to comprehension.

Previous research has found that the use of multimodal communication, including both verbal and nonverbal modes, positively influences learning. Like body language, facial expression, eye contact, posture, distance, silence, and paralinguistic features such as speech act also play the role of non-verbal signals ensuring understanding and supporting interaction in class (Abaya et al., 2023; Bihari, 2022; Hsiao et al., 2025; Kaushal, 2013). At university, multimodal communication enables lecturers to more effectively facilitate classroom interaction to nurture student learning cognitively and effectively (Gunawan et al., 2024; Karman & Nurchalis, 2024).

In higher education contexts, nonverbal communication also functions to clarify instructional messages, regulate interactional flow, and strengthen relationships between lecturers and students (Gunawan et al., 2024; Karman & Nurchalis, 2024). Moreover, nonverbal interaction contributes to effective classroom management, supports lecturers' professional image, and reinforces teaching

authority (Setianti et al., 2024; Munir et al., 2024). Consequently, the success of the teaching and learning process depends not only on lecturers' linguistic competence but also on their ability to employ nonverbal communication strategically (Khuman, 2024; Munir et al., 2024).

The importance of nonverbal communication becomes particularly evident in foreign language learning contexts. Students who are still developing linguistic competence often experience limitations in vocabulary, grammar, and pragmatic knowledge. In such situations, both lecturers and students frequently rely on nonverbal communication to facilitate understanding and maintain interaction (Diadori, 2024; Muchemwa, 2013; Nigussie, 2015). This role becomes even more significant when teaching is conducted by native-speaker lecturers whose explanations may involve spontaneous gestures and culturally embedded communicative practices.

Research in French as a Foreign Language (FLE) learning shows that the strategic use of body language, facial expressions, eye contact, posture, visual aids, and other semiotic resources helps connect linguistic forms with conceptual and sociocultural understanding while reducing cognitive load during learning (Bouyssi & Marquet, 2017; Hess, 2023; Indah et al., 2018). Therefore, nonverbal communication should not be considered a peripheral element but rather an essential component of classroom communication pedagogy.

In the higher education setting, nonverbal communication is used to enhance the clarity of instructional message and flow of communication as well as to promote the relationship between students and lecturers (Gunawan et al., 2024; Karman & Nurchalis, 2024). In addition, nonverbal interaction has been found to associate efficient class management, maintain the professional image of the lecturers, and enhance the authority of the lecturers (Setianti et al., 2024; Munir et al., 2024). Hence, the effectiveness of teaching and learning activities relies on not only lecturers' declarative knowledge of the target language but a clear understanding of the nonverbal aspect of communication in teaching (Khuman, 2024; Munir et al., 2024).

The domain of nonverbal communication is crucial in the field of foreign language learning. Students in the process of language acquisition are likely to have limited vocabulary, grammar and pragmatic knowledge. Lecturers and students tend to revert to nonverbal communications to get by and continue communication in this type of situation (Diadori, 2024; Muchemwa, 2013; Nigussie, 2015). This function is especially important when lectures are delivered by native-speaker lecturers, whose explanations may be accompanied by spontaneous gestures and culturally embedded communicative acts. Studies in FLE learning highlight that the orchestration of body language, facial expression, eye contact, posture, visual materials and other semiotic resources enables the linking of linguistic forms to conceptual and sociocultural knowledge as well as to the reduction of cognitive load in the process of learning (Bouyssi & Marquet, 2017; Hess, 2023; Indah et al., 2018). As such, gestures and other nonverbal codes need not be relegated to a peripheral level of importance but can instead be integrated as core elements in classroom communicative pedagogy.

An example of such multimodal communication can be observed when a lecturer introduces vocabulary related to jewelry. Instead of providing a direct translation, the lecturer may combine verbal explanation with gestures and demonstrations.

(1) *Les bijoux, c'est par exemple: une bague, c'est un bijou; des boucles d'oreilles, ce sont des bijoux; un collier, c'est un bijou; un bracelet.*

Jewelry, for example: a ring is jewelry; earrings are jewelry; a necklace is jewelry; a bracelet.

During the explanation, the lecturer may accompany the verbal description with gestures touching the ears, neck, and fingers to indicate the locations where jewelry is typically worn. Such gestures function as iconic and deictic signs that link linguistic input with visual and kinesthetic modalities, thereby facilitating vocabulary acquisition (Bouyssi & Marquet, 2017; Diadori, 2024; Hsiao et al., 2025).

From a theoretical perspective, nonverbal communication in classroom interaction includes body language, facial expressions, eye contact, posture, spatial distance, silence, tone of voice, touch, and visual aids (Anderson, 2023; Rosati-Peterson & DeNardo, 2021; Burgoon et al., 2021; Hall & Knapp, 2013). Within multimodal theory, language learning is understood as a process of meaning-making that involves multiple semiotic resources such as bodily movement, gaze, posture, material objects, and visual demonstrations (Annadurai et al., 2024; Fei & Tan-Chia, 2023).

Empirical evidence suggests that integrating verbal explanations with nonverbal modalities leads to classroom explanations that are clearer, more contextualized, and more memorable for learners. In this perspective, lecturers' use of facial expressions, proxemics, paralanguage, silence, touch, and other embodied communicative strategies becomes an essential part of teaching discourse (Burgoon et al., 2021; Hsiao et al., 2025).

In the Indonesian higher education context, previous studies have demonstrated that nonverbal communication plays a crucial role. Lecturers' nonverbal expressions can positively influence students' motivation, classroom engagement, and relational dynamics (Maisarah et al., 2023; Munir et al., 2024; Nathir Ghafar & Ali, 2023). Furthermore, lecturers can use nonverbal communication to regulate participation, signal evaluation, maintain academic authority, and create a supportive learning environment (Bihari, 2022; Hsiao et al., 2025; Yuan, 2024).

Despite these contributions, the use of nonverbal communication in classroom discourse remains diverse and context dependent. Teaching interaction is not formed solely through verbal language but through the integration of multiple semiotic modes such as gestures, facial expressions, eye contact, posture, proxemics, silence, paralanguage, and visual resources (Burgoon et al., 2021; Hall & Knapp, 2013).

Within this multimodal framework, differences in the use of nonverbal communication between native and non-native lecturers may emerge due to variations in linguistic background, cultural socialization, and pedagogical experience. Previous studies indicate that nonverbal communication reflects culturally embedded patterns of interaction, particularly in the use of eye contact, posture, and proxemics to manage classroom interaction and build interpersonal relationships (Abaya et al., 2023; Yuan, 2024).

Non-native lecturers usually perform more intentional and organized body language to achieve clearer teaching. They may also use banded gestures, timed pauses or visual explanations to work around language barriers and aid students' understanding (Gunawan et al., 2024; Muchemwa, 2013; Nathir Ghafar & Ali, 2023). On the other hand, native lecturer's use paralanguage more instinctively and naturally, as their gestures, facial expressions and paralanguage constitute that are considered in culturally internalized racial communicative norms (Rosati-Peterson & DeNardo, 2021; Diadori, 2024; Jasuli et al., 2024; Kshetree, 2023).

While there has been broad attention to nonverbal communication in education research, numerous studies are still confined to considering verbal interaction, or to commenting on nonverbal communication without analyzing its pedagogic function in much detail in comparative environments (Diadori, 2024; Hall & Knapp, 2013; Muchemwa, 2013). In addition, much of the research and application in language education has been mainly on the English language (Karman & Nurchalis, 2024; Maisarah et al., 2023; Nnko, 2024). There is a scarcity of studies that explicitly focus on contrasting the types and instructional roles of nonverbal communication utilized by both native and nonnative educators in the French L2 classroom specifically within the context of Indonesian higher education. Hence, this research will focus on investigating and comparing types and pedagogical functions of nonverbal communication used by native and non-native lecturers throughout the interactions in the French language classroom.

METHOD

A qualitative descriptive design is employed for the study to identify types and pedagogical roles of instructors' and students' NVC cues during class sessions. Due to the nature of the design, the present study assists in revealing the performance and interpretation of body language, facial expressions, eye contact, posture, proxemics, silence, touch, paralanguage, and visual aids in real teaching environments (Creswell, 2009; Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Heigham & Croker, 2009). A qualitative methodology is well suited to this study as teaching is a multifaceted activity that takes place in a variety of environments. The communication of instructional meaning is a function of verbal and nonverbal communications, and therefore, instructional communication cannot be completely quantified (Burgoon et al., 2021; Khuman, 2024; Paul & Soukup, 2019).

The study's analytical concern focuses on (re)production of meaning through vocal and kinesic practice in actual lecture and classroom settings (Paul & Soukup, 2019; Sadeghi et al., 2012). Interactional sequences and the joint production and interpretation of communicative actions during

their development are analyzed in a series of instructional activities using the tools of conversation analysis.

The analytical lens of this study is framed by multimodality. In this context, gestures, facial expressions, gaze, posture and movements are treated as semiotic resources which serve pedagogical and interactional functions very much like speech (Burgoon et al., 2021; Diadori, 2024; Fei, 2018). It is based upon multiple semiotic modes and the interaction of semiotic modes in the process of meaning making this view allows for a composite study of classroom interaction.

The two lecturers were from Yogyakarta State University, and both taught in French: one at *Hôtellerie et Restauration* (semester six) as a native-speaker (NS), the other at *Production Orale Niveau Seuil* (semester four) as a non-native-speaker (NNS). Based on (1) linguistic background as native- and non-native speaker of French, (2) teaching experience, and (3) the type and level of courses offered, the participants were chosen by purposive-sampling. Purposive sampling enables researchers to intentionally select participants who can provide rich and relevant information to the research topic (Patton, 2015; Creswell & Creswell, 2018). It also facilitates the recruitment of individuals with diverging views on the phenomenon under study (Campbell et al., 2020; Nyimbili & Nyimbili, 2024).

Data for the study were collected via field observations, videography, and comprehensive field notes capturing the nonverbal communication as it unfolded naturally among the participants (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Sudaryanto, 2015; Moleong, 2018). Video recording was selected as the dominant source of data because of the visual, kinetic and temporal nature of nonverbal communication. The use of video data enables researchers to systematically revisit the classroom interaction, with which the trustworthiness of the analysis is strengthened (Heath, Hindmarsh, & Luff, 2010; Zoltán, 2007; Heath et al., 2007). For contextual interpretation this analysis considered the teaching context including the classroom environment, the teaching purposes, and the lecturer–student relationship (Burgoon et al., 2021), in which nonverbal behaviors were performed. The observation grid applied in this survey is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Observation grid of nonverbal communication in classroom interaction

No	Category	Observed Indicators
1	Body Language	hand movements, pointing, illustrative gestures
2	Facial Expressions	smiling, frowning, raising eyebrows
3	Eye Contact	looking at individual students or the whole class
4	Posture	leaning forward/backward, standing position
5	Proxemics	distance from students, movement around the classroom
6	Silence	pauses during speech, waiting for student responses
7	Touch	tapping a desk, light contact when guiding students
8	Paralanguage	tone, pitch, volume, speech rhythm
9	Visual Aids & Demonstrations	use of objects, board work, physical demonstration

The transcribed data were then organized into categories based on pre-established types of nonverbal communication such as kinesics (gestures, posture, and facial expressions), gaze, proxemics, silence, paralanguage, touch, as well as visual exhibits (Rosati-Peterson & DeNardo, 2021; Burgoon et al., 2021; Gunawan, et al, 2024). The analysis run according to the line of Miles and Huberman (1994), that includes the elements of data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing. These stages guide a systematic qualitative analysis and contribute to the strengthening of study quality in terms of trustworthiness, dependability, and confirmability of the findings (Creswell, 2009; Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Moleong, 2018).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter reports the results concerning the use of nonverbal communication by native speakers (NS) and nonnative speakers (NNS) teachers in the language classroom. Although many types of nonverbal communication have been identified in previous studies, this one concentrates on those that appeared during the observations in the classrooms and the interaction transcription in this research. Nine different nonverbal communications were found in the data analysis; they played different roles in the class interaction. Each subcategory is analyzed on a comparative basis to draw out the pedagogical implications of these behaviors. This allows for a more detailed analysis of what native and non-native lecturers have in common and how they differ. The contrast also demonstrates the ways

in which various aspects of nonverbal behavior in the management of interaction in the classroom, in supporting the students' understanding of the instructional material, and in motivating them to join active participation.

Results

This subsection summarizes the quantitative and qualitative findings comparing non-native speaker (NNS) and native speaker (NS) lecturers within the dataset. The results are organized according to the frequency and variation of the nine identified types of nonverbal communication. Table 2 presents the distribution, frequencies, and percentages of nonverbal communication used by both groups of lecturers. Table 3 provides a comparative overview of how these forms are manifested in classroom practice. These tables highlight both the similarities and differences in the ways native and non-native lecturers employ nonverbal communication during classroom interaction.

Table 2. Comparison of the use of nonverbal communication

No	Nonverbal Types	Number (Nonnative)	Percentage (Nonnative)	Number (Native)	Percentage (Native)
1	Body Language	15	12.30%	26	14.80%
2	Facial Expressions	14	11.50%	23	13.10%
3	Eye Contact	15	12.30%	24	13.60%
4	Posture	15	12.30%	22	12.50%
5	Proxemics	15	12.30%	21	11.90%
6	Silence	15	12.30%	20	11.40%
7	Touch	12	9.80%	15	8.50%
8	Paralanguage	11	9.00%	14	8.00%
9	Visual Aids & Demonstrations	10	8.20%	11	6.20%
		122	100.00%	176	100.00%

Table 3. Comparison of representation of nonverbal communication

No	Nonverbal Types	Non-Native Speaker	Native Speaker
1	Body Language	Preparing the class, appointing students, demonstrating objects.	Opening gestures, pointing, body demonstrations, student gestural responses.
2	Facial Expressions	Neutral, evaluative, and supportive smile expressions.	Interactive smile, serious expression, student focus.
3	Eye Contact	Gaze at the answerer and back row.	Interactive gaze, screen-class switching, on-task avoidance.
4	Posture	Stand up straight when giving instructions, lean back when explaining.	Upright, relaxed when waiting, leaning when engaged.
5	Proxemics	Front of class, approaching during demonstration.	Near the media, close to the students, back distance.
6	Silence	Thinking pauses and transition markers.	Cognitive pauses and response expectation signals.
7	Touch	Holds reflective objects and touches.	Demonstrative light touch and student attitude.
8	Paralanguage	Question intonation, emphasis on terms, class closing.	Inviting intonation, emphasis on keywords, friendly tone.
9	Visual Aids & Demonstrations	Projectors, real objects, posters.	Projector, whiteboard, body as media.

Discussion

The section on discussion is the process of explaining the result of qualitative observation in the classroom. To the purposes of this study, the focus is on native and nonnative French as a second language (L2) instructors and their use of nonverbal communication in the FSL classroom and on the trends or functions of nonverbal communication in FSL as well as its contrast with NW to see whether there exist cultural differences. The goal of the following analysis is not to compare teaching strategies as taught in Methodology but to bring about a better understanding of how these differences affect teaching practices and the process of meaning making within classroom discourse.

Body Language

Among the nonverbal forms of communication, body language was the most observed in classroom communication throughout this study. As a significant part of nonverbal communication, body language refers to the physical signals of communicating through body parts, such as hands, head, and face which has become a promising media with broad application in people's daily life recently (Zhou et al., 2018). In the educational sphere, bodily expression serves as a strong mezzo-instrument bridging between cognitive modelling and the social instrument of (face to face) interaction in social-institutional arrangements as found within classrooms (Manusov, 2016; Patterson, 2016).

Body language has multiple aims in the methodology of L2 French. These have the potential to direct the attention of the listener, facilitate the exchange of speaker roles, and serve as a symbol for cultural and frozen concepts (Burgoon et al., 2021; Hall & Knapp, 2013; Manusov, 2016). Prior research has also outlined that teachers' gestures play pivotal role in enhancing clarity of instruction within foreign language classrooms (Muchemwa, 2013; Wahyuni, 2017; Yuan, 2024).

The findings reveal notable differences between NNS and NS lecturers in their use of body language. Non-native lecturers more frequently rely on object-based gestures, using physical objects as external referential anchors during explanations. In contrast, native lecturers tend to employ auto-deictic gestures in which the body itself functions as the primary reference point aligned with verbal expressions. These differences may reflect variations in lecturers' perceptions of their own linguistic competence and communicative confidence (Simon & Mishra, 2025; Wahyu et al., 2021; Wahyuni, 2017). This phenomenon can be observed in the following examples.

- (1) NNS: The lecturer lifted and pointed to the wine bottle while explaining the material.
- (2) NNS: When asking for answers, the lecturer directly pointed to students.
- (3) NS: The lecturer indicated the ears, neck, and arms while explaining the meaning of *des bijoux*.
- (4) NS: The lecturer gestured toward the student who raised his hand when granting a speaking turn.

Dara (2) and (3) illustrate that physical objects and the presence of these participants act as perceptual anchors in discourse in the classroom. These two types of gestures serve as iconic and indexical means to ground the abstract linguistic categories in the previous knowledge of the learners. Object-related gestures offer visual support that help students associate the linguistic constructions with real life elements (Grillo & Enesi, 2022; Gunawan et al., 2024). This approach is consistent with the findings relating to principles of visual representation found in language learning processes which facilitate grounding of cognitive schemas (Gunawan et al., 2024; Hsiao et al., 2025). Therefore, instructors who are not native speakers tend to use such techniques to minimize confusion and enhance clarity of instruction (Muchemwa, 2013; Nigussie, 2015).

By way of contrast, (4) and (5) contribute to illustrating how co-verbal gesturing is also formed by auto-deictic gestures. In this respect, the lecturer's body is the central semiotic tool to produce meaning (body becomes the sign system). Studies have proven that they help with learning new words and establishing connections between words and learners' sensorimotor experiences (Bouyssi & Marquet, 2017; Diadori, 2024; Hess, 2023). In general, both NNS and NS lecturers use body language to help in managing the class and communicating with the students. NNS tend to use more explicit and directive gestures to control participation and turn-taking, which suggests the more clarity-oriented, authoritative stance. In contrast, NS lecturers are more likely to display more responsive or facilitative postures and gestures, encouraging its open-ended nature and teaching strategies that rely heavily on student participation (Burgoon et al., 2021; Hall & Knapp, 2013).

These distinctions demonstrate how body language in the classroom has a double function: as a sign to transmit information and as an instrument for interaction and social management (Burgoon et al., 2021). Instead of indicating superiority, these differences correspond to diverse yet complementing pedagogical priorities influenced by lecturers' identities, experience, and contexts of delivery (Diadori, 2024; Karman & Nurchalis, 2024). Facial Expressions

Facial expressions

Facial expressions are very important in classroom communication because facial expressions can be used as an emotional signal and as an emotional cue that influences students' participation in learning activities. In instructional communication, facial expressions are one of the channels through which teachers express their affective expectation of students, judge students' performance, and manage interactional orientation in the classroom. Previous research indicates that the emotional contact in terms of teacher facial expression is not only a matter of emotional communication but also a cognitive engagement, since it affects how students make sense of classroom contents and their willingness to engage in class discussion.

The results of this study demonstrated, however, marked usage of facial expressions by NNS and NS speakers. NON-native teaching staff generally seem to display more overt and evaluative facial expressions in their management of the classroom. These are often the cultivation of clarity, accuracy, and mastery in instruction. On the other hand, native participants seem to be characterized by a higher degree of reactive and supportive facial expression which significantly contributes to a more relaxed interactional ambience enhancing elicited student involvement.

The variations saw that the role of facial expression can be as a representational tool conveying meaning, as well as an interactional instrument for managing classroom talks and configuring the social atmosphere in the learning context. The subsequent examples should demonstrate these differences.

- (5) NNS: The lecturer looked puzzled and slightly disappointed when the student replied, “don’t know.”
- (6) NNS: The lecturer maintained a serious facial expression while waiting for the student’s answer.
- (7) NS: The lecturer smiled frequently during friendly moments in the class while asking open questions.
- (8) NS: The lecturer raised an eyebrow and smiled slightly as the student attempted to answer.

The examples (6) and (7) show conclusions on the topic of what could be called evaluative facial expressions, which act as an indirect form of feedback. Such signals indicate what degree of accuracy or completeness the lecturer expects in the answers of the students. In its own way, this facial expression communicates that the student should take one more look at his answer and perhaps make a modification to it, all without a spoken verbal correction. It has been established that a series of evaluative facial expressions can guide and control a group exchange, such as the one in class, by means of the behavioral management of students with the use of gentle nonverbal expressions.

In contrast, (8) and (9) show effectual facial hints that offer emotional support to participants while attending school. Smiling and little or no facial expression may be considered forms of positive reinforcement to keep students answering even if their answers are not complete. Studies in FLE education show that supportive and encouraging facial expressions can alleviate students’ anxiety levels and motivate them to take part in oral communication tasks.

Eye Contact

Eye contact is also a significant facet of nonverbal communication in the classroom. It serves to direct attention, create interpersonal connection, and facilitate student participation in learning and teaching activities. Studies on educational communication have always indicated that a lecturer looking at their students reflects that he/she is active, involved, and present, which in turn affects students’ impression of presence and engagement.

The findings of (French) language classroom observation at YSU indicate that there are differences both between NS and NNS lecturers. Close to this, NNS lecturers usually pursue longer eye contact with individual students in a exchanges of questions and answers. Such conduct signals a pedagogical orientation which centers upon a particular student's involvement and immediate evaluation of that student's response.

Native lecturers, in contrast, more often sweep visually across the classroom. Instead of fixing an extended gaze on one single student, they appear keener to follow the conduct of several students at

once. This dispersion of looking allows lecturers to gauge general classroom participation as well as to locate potential speakers. The following examples highlight such distinctions.

- (9) NNS: The lecturer responds to the student while maintaining direct eye contact.
- (10) NNS: During the explanation, the lecturer directs students' gaze toward the object being discussed.
- (11) NS: The lecturer moves his gaze across different areas of the classroom to identify students who wish to speak.
- (12) NS: The lecturer maintains eye contact while nodding as the student speaks.

Eye contact is also an important element of nonverbal communication within the classroom. It is used to focus attention, build interpersonal connections, and manage student participation in learning and teaching. Research on educational communication has indicated that a lecturer who looks at his/her students is perceived as active, in touch and available and it has the potential to influence students' perception of presence and engagement.

The results of (French) language classroom observations at YSU reveal that there are contrasts at once between NS and NNS lecturers. Close to this, NNS lecturers tend to hold longer eye contact with individual students in a exchanges of questions and answers. Such conduct signals a pedagogical orientation which centers upon a particular student's involvement and immediate evaluation of that student's response.

Native lecturers, on the other hand, tend to scan more visually around the room. Rather than locking their gaze on a single student, they show more interest in observing the behaviors of multiple students simultaneously. Such diffusion of the glance enables professors to ascertain overall class involvement and to identify potential discussants. The following examples illustrate such separations.

Posture

Posture is a nonverbal element of communication that has been relatively neglected in EFL teaching and learning. In educational communication, posture is a kinesics expression (del Hoyo-Hurtado, 2018) in which lecturers' psychological state, relational positioning and classroom interaction involvement are manifested (Carroll & Ickes, 2009; Sitzmann & Ely, 2010). As a means of communication, posturing expresses a way of viewing the world, as a life philosophy, and demonstrates how people find space among others and create group and individual identity (Emery, 2016).

The bodily stances of university teachers during their class sessions tacitly embody their knowledge of the teacher-student relationship, and their authority and enthusiasm. As such, posture the students' conception of the lecturer's teaching and professional ability. These differences are demonstrated via scenes from typical classroom interactions videotaped, which are then turned into scripts.

- (13) NNS: The lecturer stands upright while listening to students' responses.
- (14) NNS: The lecturer leans slightly forward while explaining the material in detail.
- (15) NS: The lecturer sits comfortably on the table while waiting for students' answers.
- (16) NS: The lecturer stands upright but leans forward slightly during discussion.

Posture adopted by NNS lecturer at once suggests a certain formality, alertness and authoritarianism. Standing straight and leaning forward when explaining are gestures of seriousness and knowledge of the process of learning. It is suggested from previous research that such postural steadiness is in some instances an embodiment of a well-organized pedagogical style and that it assists in preserving class discipline and students' academic concentration.

On the other hand, NS tends to have a more variable posture. Perching on the corner of the desk, or assuming informal postures during conversations could potentially minimize a perceived hierarchy between lecturers and students. The postural adjustments are those which are interpreted as openness and invite pupils to be more at ease in classroom interaction.

These distinctions point to the use of posture as relational labelling within the subject of teaching communication. Non-native speaking (NNS) instructors usually assume poses that convey their

institutional power and the structured nature of the interaction, while native speaking (NS) instructors tend to utilize their bodies in more fluid ways that invite dialogic and collaborative pedagogy.

Proxemics

Proxemics is a study of how physical space and distance between people affect communication. In classrooms, educators adapt their spatial arrangements to manage interaction, direct visual attention, and sustain involvement. Observations show that NNS lecturers tend to adopt a more structured use of spatial positioning. They often stay at the front of the class when explaining and go to students only when showing a particular object or teaching materials. Including but not limited to the following data.

- (17) NNS: The lecturer approaches students while holding a wine bottle so that the label can be clearly read.
- (18) NNS: The lecturer remains at the front of the classroom while giving general instructions.

These practices reinforce the lecturer's role as the central source of information and maintain a structured classroom organization. In contrast, NS lecturers demonstrate more dynamic spatial movement during instructional activities.

- (19) NS: The lecturer approaches a student's desk to examine homework.
- (20) NS: The lecturer moves between the front and back areas of the classroom during the lesson.

Such mobility creates opportunities for individualized interaction and closer monitoring of students' learning progress. This spatial flexibility also contributes to a more interactive classroom atmosphere in which students perceive the lecturer as approachable and engaged. Overall, proxemic differences reflect two complementary teaching orientations: structured spatial control in NNS instruction and interactional mobility in NS teaching practices.

Silence

Another nonverbal communication is silence. It is an important aspect of classroom communication and is not to be considered as the mere absence of speech. In the classroom, silence can be a strategic pause in which students are given time to think, to collect their ideas and to get ready to answer. Observations indicate a dual purpose of silence in classroom talk.

- (21) NNS: The lecturer remains silent after students read the wine bottle label.
- (22) NNS: The lecturer waits silently for students' responses.

In such instances silence acts as a transition signal between phases in an instructional sequence: one phase of an instructional sequence ends with silence, and the next one begins after it. Contributes to the classroom organization and pace. And by way of contrast, NS lecturer regularly views silence as a reflective space for student participation.

- (23) NS: The lecturer remains silent while observing students completing exercises.
- (24) NS: The lecturer pauses to allow students to continue their responses.

In this way, this reflective silence prompts students to assume more responsibility in the process of constructing their answers and leads them to engage more deeply with the learning materials. So, silence becomes not only the intentional pedagogical tool but also only such a tool. whereas NNS lecturers typically use silence to pace the rhythm and to demarcate sequences in their teaching, NS lecturers employ silence to open space for reflection and dialogical activity on the part of students.

Touch

In this study, touch occurs when interacting with objects, when gesturing with self-touch or when in contact with instructional materials during explanations. For example, the following data.

- (25) NNS: The lecturer touches his forehead while evaluating a student's response.
- (26) NNS: The lecturer holds an object while explaining vocabulary.

These gestures sometimes represent mentally based evaluations. Self-touch signals like touching the forehead) may indicate that the lecturer is thinking about or evaluating a student's answer. On the contrary, it is common for NS speakers to employ show touch in the explanations.

- (27) NS: The lecturer touches parts of the body when explaining vocabulary.
- (28) NS: The lecturer taps the board to emphasize key points.

These are gestures that turn abstract linguistic concepts into concrete visual metaphors, and this should aid in understanding. From a multimodal perspective, demonstrative touch is a combination of body movement, verbal explanation, and visual representation, outlined by the body and communication parts.

Paralanguage

Vocalic properties coincide with speech, including intonation, loudness, rate of speaking and multiple types of disfluencies collectively act as operators on the variables of verbal communication. These prosodic signals are also essential instruments in meaning making process in the classroom. In this research, NNS and NS lecturers utilize a wide range of paralanguage features in their lecturing. The cases found in this study are as follows.

- (29) NNS: The lecturer says that we can hear the intonation of the *pain de mie*.
- (30) NNS: The instructor drops the tone as he finishes the class.
- (31) NS: The lecturer accents the word *pendant* with invitational intonation.
- (32) NS: The lecturer modulates intonation to captivate students' attention.

The findings indicate that many NNS instructors use paralanguage to draw attention to linguistic forms, as well as to signal precision in the pronunciation and the organization of the language. This method focuses on phonological precision and facilitates students' understanding of target language structures. On the other hand, NS lecturers are more prone to fluctuate in their prosody. Variations in pitch and tempo and rhythm help in ensuring students' attention and creating a more interactive communications atmosphere.

Visuals and Demonstrations

There also appeared to be more visual aids and demonstrations for the protocollary. Subject is translations of the semiotic system of visual aids and demonstrations in games and Consciousness of rhythm complements that of the speech or compares with whichever other factor you need to follow up or instead take account of. These devices combine verbal explanation with visual aids to help you make sense of difficult ideas. The examples include.

- (33) NNS: The lecturer holds a real wine glass then compares it with the image on a poster.
- (34) NNS: The lecturer employs bottles and glasses as demonstration objects.

These samples show how NNS lecturers draw on tangible materials to give real anchors for lexical and conceptual elucidations. By contrast, bodily gestures are often embedded within visual media for NS lecturers.

- (35) NS: the lecturer gestures towards objects on the screen that have been projected when he poses questions.
- (36) NS: the lecturer uses gestures and movements as supplementary teaching materials.

This operant-interactive method of teaching allows lecturers to refine explanations in situ and direct their students' attention with greater precision. In general, both NNS and NS instructors use

visual aids to facilitate understanding. Yet NNS lecturers draw the boundary of clarity more around objects, NS lecturers visually complement that by gesturing and incorporating digital media to bring about a more dynamic learning environment.

CONCLUSION

This is the first study to examine how nonverbal communication is used as a tool in university-level French language teaching by both NS and NNS instructors. A total of nine categories of non-verbal communication were classified: body language, use of space, paralanguage, silence, physical contact, visual aids and demonstrations. Such policies function to specify meaning, to prescribe time in the classroom, and to govern the interactions and relationships in the learning space.

There were distinct differences during the teaching. NNS instructors generally use nonverbal communication to enhance educational clarity, classroom stability, and organized methodology of content delivery (particularly during object demonstrations in class, lecturing silently, well-defined use of space, and structured paralanguage). By comparison, NS instructors focus on building interpersonal intimacy and connecting with students, creating opportunities for students to voice their perspectives and be engaged learners by making use of energetic hand movements and greater movement around the room, smiling more frequently, keeping an adaptable posture and consistently utilizing a variety of vocal tones.

Such contrasts should be understood not as binary oppositions (the first model versus the second) but as complementary trends for a multimodal approach to French language teaching. Both the former and the latter perspective function significantly for developing productive learning environments. Moreover, reflective and context-sensitive modification of nonverbal communication, especially embodied and multimodal gestures, can result in French language teaching with increased effectiveness such as attainment of higher degree of students' motivation and understanding as well as the large number of students' involvement therein.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to the Dean of the Faculty of Languages, Arts and Culture (FBSB) for funding and institutional support for this study. The authors also thank the lecturers and students who participated in this study on a voluntary basis and who made it possible by contributing valuable data. Moreover, the authors express their gratitude to all research team members for their dedicated collaboration during the investigation culminating in the present article.

REFERENCES

- Abaya, R., Ongarora, D., & Magonya, L. (2023). Politeness in nonverbal communication: A commentary on non-verbal communication in a linguistics classroom context in a selected Kenyan university. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies*, 6(2), 84–96. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejals.v6i2.452>
- Anderson, K. A. (2023). Nonverbal communication as a mediator of intercultural communication in English as a second language classrooms. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2262422>
- Annadurai, V., Kavipriya, J., & Vasuki, A. (2024). The effectiveness of verbal and non-verbal communication in extension. *AgriCos E-Newsletter*, 5(12), 37–40
- Bihari, B. D. (2022). Significance of nonverbal communication and paralinguistic features in communication: A critical analysis. *International Journal for Innovative Research*, 4(4), 172–179.
- Bouyssi, C., & Marquet, P. (2017). Les signes expressifs corporels de la conversation par vidéoconférence. *ALSIC*, 20(2). <https://doi.org/10.4000/alsic.3098>
- Burgoon, J. K., Manusov, V., & Guerrero, L. K. (2021). *Nonverbal communication* (2nd ed.). Routledge
- Campbell, J. L., Quincy, C., Osserman, J., & Pedersen, O. K. (2013). Coding in-depth semi-structured interviews: Problems of unitization and intercoder reliability. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 42(3), 294–320. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124113500475>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications

- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications
- Diadori, P. (2024). Nonverbal communication in classroom interaction and its role in Italian foreign language teaching and learning. *Languages*, 9(5), Article 164. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages9050164>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press
- Fei, V. L. (2018). Developing a systemic functional approach to teach multimodal literacy. *Functional Linguistics*, 5(1), Article 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40554-018-0066-8>
- Fei, V. L., & Tan-Chia, L. (2023). *Designing learning for multimodal literacy*. Routledge
- Ghafar, Z. N., & Ali, H. M. (2023). Nonverbal communication in the classroom and its role in the teaching and learning process. *Journal of Social Science*, 2(6), 712–719
- Grillo, H. M., & Enesi, M. (2022). Impact, importance, types, and use of non-verbal communication in social relations. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 6(S3), 291–307
- Gunawan, G., Dollah, S., & Sakkir, G. (2024). The use of kinesics as nonverbal communication in the classroom at University of Muhammadiyah Bone. *EduLine: Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, 4(2), 209–215
- Hall, J. A., & Knapp, M. L. (2013). *Nonverbal communication*. De Gruyter Mouton
- Heath, C., Hindmarsh, J., & Luff, P. (2010). *Video in qualitative research: Analysing social interaction in everyday life*. SAGE Publications
- Heath, C., Luff, P., & Svensson, M. S. (2007). Video and qualitative research: Analysing medical practice and interaction. *Medical Education*, 41(1), 109–116
- Heigham, J., & Croker, R. A. (2009). *Qualitative research in applied linguistics: A practical introduction*. Palgrave Macmillan
- Hess, U. (2023). Nonverbal communication. In *Encyclopedia of Mental Health* (3rd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 647–659). Elsevier
- Hsiao, H. S., Chang, I. H., Chen, Y. H., & Chen, J. C. (2025). Using gesture recognition with the memory strategy to improve preschoolers' learning performance. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 73(3), 1791–1809
- Indah, O. D., Crestiani, J., & Ramadhana, M. A. (2018). Nonverbal communication used by students in studying English. *Jurnal Studi Guru dan Pembelajaran*, 1(1), 42–48
- Jasuli, J., Hartatik, S. F., & Astuti, E. S. (2024). The impact of nonverbal communication on effective public speaking in English. *Journey: Journal of English Language and Pedagogy*, 7(2), 226–232
- Karman, K., & Nurchalis, N. (2024). Lecturers' non-verbal communication during English lessons. *Eduvelop: Journal of English Education and Development*, 7(2), 86–98
- Kaushal, S. (2013). Contribution of non-verbal language in communication. *Asian Journal of Advanced Basic Sciences*, 2(1), 15–21
- Kshetree, A. K. (2023). Effect of nonverbal communication in English classes. *Vox Batauli*, 8(1), 1–18
- Maisarah, M., Putri, T. H., Fauziyah, N., Saifuddin, M., Nurcahyani, D., Najih, A., & Bakri, B. (2023). Teachers' non-verbal communication in teaching English to young learners. *Formosa Journal of Science and Technology*, 2(8), 1939–1959
- Manusov, V. (2016). Nonverbal communication. In *The International Encyclopedia of Communication Theory and Philosophy* (pp. 1–19). Wiley
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications
- Moleong, L. J. (2018). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif* (edisi revisi). PT Remaja Rosdakarya
- Muchemwa, S. (2013). Use of nonverbal communication in the classroom. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 103, 1279–1287
- Munir, H., Khan, A., & Munawar, U. (2024). Role of non-verbal communication skills of teachers. *Qlantia Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 5(2), 58–69
- Nigussie, M. (2015). An insight into non-verbal communication for EFL teachers. *International Journal of Innovations in TESOL and Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–8
- Nnko, E. D. (2024). The effect of non-verbal communication on classroom teaching. *European Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences*, 2(2), 247–258

- Nyimbili, F., & Nyimbili, L. (2024). Types of purposive sampling techniques. *Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education*, 8(1), 99–104
- Patterson, M. L. (2016). Nonverbal interpersonal communication. In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Communication*. Oxford University Press
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications
- Paul, A., & Soukup, S. J. (2019). Nonverbal communication. *Communication Research Trends*, 38(1), 3–27
- Rosati-Peterson, G. L., & DeNardo, T. (2021). A nonverbal immediacy treatment with pre-service teachers. *Cogent Education*, 8(1)
- Sadeghi, S., Ketabi, S., Tavakoli, M., & Sadeghi, M. (2012). Application of critical classroom discourse analysis. *English Language Teaching*, 5(1), 166–173
- Setianti, Y., Tolaki, S., Sartika, E., & Al-Jbour, R. H. (2024). Nonverbal communication and first impression formation. *International Journal of Society Reviews*, 2(4), 882–894
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan aneka teknik analisis bahasa*. USD Press
- Wahyu, K., Riang, A. D., & Irfan, M. (2021). Analysis of class teacher social competence. *International Journal of Elementary School Teacher*, 1(1), 18–26
- Wahyuni, S. (2017). The role of nonverbal communication in EFL classroom interaction. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 2(2), 179–190. <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v2i2.70>
- Yuan, L. (2024). Teacher–student interaction and student engagement. *Acta Psychologica*, 244, 104185
- Zhou, J., Chen, S., & Chen, H. (2018). Teachers’ nonverbal immediacy and student learning. *Communication Education*, 67(2), 231–247