

## **The Influence of Teacher Aggressive Communication on Student Affective Learning and Strategy Use**

### **Öğretmenlerin Saldırgan İletişiminin Öğrencilerin Duyuşsal Öğrenmelerine ve Strateji Kullanımlarına Etkisi**

*(Received November 11, 2015 - Approved February 18, 2016)*

Alexandra Bekiari<sup>1</sup> and Polyxeni Manoli<sup>2</sup>

#### **Abstract**

The aim of the present study was to investigate the relationships among perceived English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' aggressive communication and students' affective learning and strategy use. 148 Greek-speaking EFL undergraduate students (39 males and 109 females), 18-23 years old ( $M=20.3\pm.68$ ) participated in the study. According to the results of the study, perceived EFL teachers' verbal aggressiveness was negatively related to their argumentativeness and students' social and affective strategy use and affective learning. Simultaneously, the results of the regression analysis revealed that perceived teachers' verbal aggressiveness and argumentativeness could significantly predict the variables of students' affective learning, social and affective strategy use. In the light of the aforementioned findings, it can be concluded that teachers' verbal aggressiveness can have a negative impact on students' feelings, which can, in turn, affect their learning process.

**Keywords:** EFL learning and teaching, aggressive behavior, social and affective strategy use

#### **Öz**

Bu araştırmanın amacı, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce (YDİ) öğretmenlerinin saldırgan iletişim biçimleri ve öğrencilerin duyuşsal öğrenme ve strateji kullanımları arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Araştırmaya Yunanca konuşan ve YDİ lisans öğrencisi olan, 18-23 yaşları arasında ( $\bar{x}=20.3\pm.68$ ) 148 öğrenci (39 erkek ve 109 kadın) katılmıştır. Araştırmanın bulgularına göre YDİ öğretmenlerinin sözlü saldırganlıkları, tartışmacı olma durumları ile negatif yönlü ilişkilidir. Aynı zamanda regresyon analizi sonuçlarına göre öğretmenlerin algılanan sözlü saldırganlıkları ve tartışmacı olma durumları, öğrencilerin duyuşsal öğrenmeleri, sosyal ve duyuşsal strateji kullanımları değişkenlerini anlamlı düzeyde yordayabilmektedir. Bahsedilen bulgular ışığında, öğretmenlerin sözlü saldırganlıklarının öğrencilerin duygularına, dolayısıyla öğrenme süreçlerine, olumsuz etkilerinin olabileceği sonucuna ulaşılabılır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** YDİ öğrenme ve öğretme, saldırgan davranış, sosyal ve duyuşsal strateji kullanımı

<sup>1</sup>Assistant Prof. Alexandra Bekiari, Department of PE and Sport Science, University of Thessaly, Karyes, 42100, Trikala, Greece

<sup>2</sup>Dr. Polyxeni Manoli, School of Humanities, Master's in education (M.Ed.) in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), Hellenic Open University, Parodos Aristotelous 18, 26335, Patra, Greece

## **Introduction**

### ***Verbal aggressiveness and argumentativeness***

The communication between people can sometimes be expressed in an aggressive way. Based on Costa and MacCrae's (1980) study, Infante (1987) held that verbal aggressiveness and argumentativeness are two of the four communication traits (others are assertiveness and hostility), which form the core of aggressive behavior. The distinguishing characteristic of these two personality traits is the target of the aggression. Argumentativeness aims at interlocutors' opinions of a subject matter, whereas verbal aggressiveness primarily aims at interlocutors' self-concept and secondary at his/her perceptions (Infante & Rancer, 1996; Rancer & Avtgis, 2014). Johnson, Becker, Wigley, Haigh and Craig (2007) indicated that reported argumentativeness levels were higher in public discussions, while reported verbal aggressiveness levels were higher in personal discussions. It is held that verbal aggressiveness, which takes various forms including character attacks, competence attacks, physical appearance attacks, teasing, threats and swearing, is a destructive communication feature having a negative impact on human relationships, while argumentativeness, which focuses on people's ability to use arguments to support their opinions, is a constructive form of communication boosting learning (Guerrero & Gross, 2014; Mercier & Sperber, 2011; Mikhaleva et al., 2015; Myers et al., 2013; Rancer & Avtgis, 2014).

Research showed that classroom activities, which promote argumentativeness, help students express themselves freely without any fear for mistakes and improve their self-confidence and learning (Çelik & Kılıç, 2014; Dawson & Venville, 2010; Evagorou & Osborne, 2013; Hamilton & Hample, 2011; Knight & McNeill, 2012). On the contrary, it was revealed that students who perceive their teachers as verbally aggressive report lower levels of support and motivation than those who perceive their teachers as less verbally aggressive (Bekiari, 2014; Mazer & Stowe, 2015; Myers & Knox, 2000; Myers & Rocca, 2001). Thus, it is understood that aggressive communication between teachers and students can significantly affect learning, behavior, thinking and motivation (Bekiari, 2012; Bekiari & Hasanagas, 2015; Bekiari et al., 2005; 2006; Bekiari et al., 2015; Bekiari & Syrmipas, 2015; Hasanagas & Bekiari, 2015; Manoli & Bekiari, 2015; Mazer & Stowe, 2015; Richmond & Gorham, 1992).

### ***Affective learning***

Affective learning is considered to be the positive attitudes, beliefs, and values towards a topic, concept or person (Mottet & Beebe, 2006; Thweatt & McCroskey, 1998; Waldeck, 2007). In the school setting, particularly, affective learning is seen as the positive attitudes students hold towards the course content, instructor, and the recommended course behaviors (McCroskey, 1994). Students' affective learning helps them become more positively predisposed to learning, use relevant to the course content information or adopt behaviors suggested by their teachers (Mottet et al., 2008; Richmond & Gorham, 1992). Many factors increase student affective learning, such as teacher's caring (Teven, 2007), humor (Wrench & Punyanunt-Carter, 2005), competence (Pogue & Ahyun, 2006), character (Teven, 2007), affinity-seeking strategy use

(Dolin, 1995; Frymier, 1994), and functional communication skill use (Frymier & Houser, 1998).

At the same time, some studies have reported a negative relationship between an educator's perceived use of verbal aggression and students' affect toward the teacher, course content, the recommended course behaviors and student satisfaction (Bekiari, 2012; Myers, 2002; Myers & Knox, 2000; Wrench & Punyanunt-Carter, 2005). Another study (Myers, 2002) has shown that when teachers were perceived by students as low in verbal aggressiveness, students' motivation, affective learning, cognitive learning, and satisfaction increased. Moreover, Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, and Richmond (1986) reported a negative relationship between perceived student affective learning and teacher use of antisocial behavior.

### *Social and affective strategies*

Current language learning is based on the strategy use and development of metacognition to boost student autonomy, who is no longer viewed as a passive subject but as an active participant in the language learning process (Macaro, 2006; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Psaltou-Joycey, 2010). At the same time, the Common European Framework of References (CE, 2001) supports the use of learning strategies in the context of language learning, which promote the individual's autonomy. Learning strategies are regarded as conscious processes which are intentionally chosen to promote the learning or use of a second or foreign language, through the storage, retention, recall, and application of information about that language (Cohen, 1998).

Though there are a number of strategy classifications throughout the literature (e.g., Cohen, 1998; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990), this study adopts Oxford's classification (1990), who distinguished strategies into: a) memory strategies (e.g., using mental linkages to help learners retain information more efficiently), b) cognitive strategies (e.g., summarizing or taking notes to help learners understand or produce language), c) compensation strategies (e.g., guessing to compensate for gaps in knowledge), d) metacognitive strategies (e.g., evaluating their learning to control their cognition), e) affective strategies (e.g., lowering your anxiety to help learners manage their emotions), and f) social strategies (e.g., cooperating with others to enable students to learn with others).

More specifically, social and affective strategies, which constitute the focus of the present study, promote message delivery for teachers through social interactions while decreasing students' affective filter through establishing a positive emotional atmosphere in the classroom and, thus, contributing to language learning (Oxford, 1990). Social strategies, particularly, involve three subcategories: asking questions, cooperating and empathizing with others; each subcategory consists of two specific strategies respectively: asking for correction and asking for clarification or verification, cooperating with peers and cooperating with proficient users of the new language, developing cultural understanding and becoming aware of others' feelings and thoughts (Oxford, 1990).

Affective strategies assist learners in regulating their emotions and attitudes, boosting, in this way, their learning, since affect, particularly, positive emotions and attitudes, contribute to L2 learning (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995). According to Ox-

ford (1990), affective strategies comprise three subcategories: encouraging yourself, lowering your anxiety, and taking your emotional temperature. The encouragement subcategory includes the strategies of making positive statements, the anxiety-reducing subcategory involves the strategies of using progressive relaxation, deep breathing or mediation, taking risks wisely, rewarding yourself, using music and laughter, while the third subcategory includes the strategies of listening to your body, using a check list, discussing your feelings with others, and writing a language learning diary.

Based on the literature review, there is limited research on social and affective strategy use, since these strategies are often neglected when compared to cognitive and metacognitive strategies (Chamot & Kupper, 1989; Goh & Kwah, 1997; Oxford, 2002; Sheorey, 1999). In particular, Oxbrow (2005) explored the impact of metacognitive, social and affective strategy instruction on EFL students' writing skills showing that the training improved students' written performance. Fandiño (2010), who applied explicit social and affective strategy training to EFL beginners in Colombia, found that EFL students' interest in language learning increased by paying greater attention to their own feelings and social relationships. Simultaneously, Shamshiri, Noordin, and Sahandari (2010) investigated the effectiveness of social and affective strategy training on EFL Malaysian students' strategy use in listening comprehension tasks indicating that the experimental group outperformed the control group on specific categories of strategies. Further studies that explored EFL teachers' affective and social strategy use demonstrated student improvement (Saeidi & Jabbarpour, 2011; Tajzadeh et al., 2013). Harish (2014) who investigated only the reported social strategy use among India's Malayalee undergraduate students showed a greater use of social strategies.

Despite the contribution of social and affective strategy use and teachers' behavior to the learning process, there is a lack of research exploring the relations of these variables, particularly, in the context of L2 learning, which entails even greater demands allowing for dual language involvement, language deficiencies, and inappropriate strategy use rendering learning less efficient (Grabe, 2009). A recent study (Manoli & Bekiari, 2015) investigated the relations between perceived EFL teachers' verbal aggression and students' intrinsic motivation, social and affective strategy use indicating a negative relation between teachers' aggressive behavior and students' enjoyment, competence, effort, social and affective strategy use. Allowing for the above literature review, the present study aimed to investigate the relations among perceived EFL teachers' verbal aggressiveness and argumentativeness and students' affective learning, social and affective strategy use.

To this aim, the following research hypotheses were formulated to direct the course of the study:

- a) EFL teachers' verbal aggressiveness would be negatively correlated with students' affective learning, social and affective strategy use.
- b) EFL teachers' argumentativeness would be positively related to students' affective learning, social and affective strategy use.

c) EFL teachers' verbal aggressiveness and argumentativeness could predict students' affective learning, social and affective strategy use.

## **Method**

### ***Participants***

The participants of the study were 148 Greek undergraduate students (39 males and 109 females), 18-23 years old, ( $M=20.3$ ,  $SD=.68$ ) who came from the University of Thessaly located in central in Greece. In particular, the sample was composed of undergraduate students of the Physical Education Faculty, the Department of Early Childhood Education, and the Department of Primary Education. All the participants were attending EFL courses at tertiary education. Their mother tongue was Greek. The participants' socio-economic status varied, as they came from different regions of Greece.

### ***Procedure***

The participants answered questionnaires referring to the EFL teachers' verbal aggressiveness, argumentativeness and students' affective learning, social and affective strategy use. The completion of questionnaires took 20-30 minutes approximately; the whole process flowed smoothly. The researchers ensured the participants' anonymity. Last but not least, it should be mentioned that the student participation in the process was voluntary.

### ***Instruments***

*Verbal aggressiveness scale.* EFL teacher verbal aggressiveness was assessed through the Infante and Wigley's (1986) questionnaire, which was adapted in Greek population by Bekiari and Digelidis (2015). Preliminary examination supported the psychometric properties of the instrument (Bekiari & Digelidis, 2015). More specifically, confirmatory factor analysis showed satisfactory fit indices (confirmatory factor analysis: .97, SRMR: .02), and internal consistency of the scale ( $\alpha = .96$ ). The scale included eight items (e.g., 'the teacher is rude,' 'the teacher makes students feel uncomfortable'). A 5-point Likert-type scale was used ranging from 1, Strongly disagree, to 5, Strongly agree.

*Argumentativeness scale.* To assess EFL teacher argumentativeness Sympas and Bekiari's questionnaire (2015) was used, which was based on Infante and Rancer's Argumentativeness Measure (1982) and a later revision by Myers and Rocca (2000). Preliminary examination supported the psychometric properties of the instrument (Sympas & Bekiari, 2015). In particular, confirmatory factor analysis indicated satisfactory fit indices (confirmatory factor analysis: .98, SRMR: .05) and internal consistency of the scale ( $\alpha = .90$ ). The scale consisted of ten items (e.g., 'the teacher enjoys a discussion with arguments on a controversial topic with their students', 'the teacher tries to avoid discussing with arguments when he disagrees with their students'). Participants were asked to respond on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1, Strongly disagree, to 5, Strongly agree.

*Affective learning scale.* The Greek version (Bekiari, 2012), which was used to assess students' affective learning, was based on McCroskey's Affective Learning Measure (1994) and a later revision by Mottet and Richmond (1998). Preliminary

examination supported the psychometric properties of the instrument (Bekiari, 2012). In particular, confirmatory factor analysis indicated satisfactory fit indices (confirmatory factor analysis: .96, SRMR: .06). The scale assesses three general dimensions of affect: affect towards the content, affect towards the course behaviour, and affect towards the teacher behavior. All subscales had high internal consistency (Cronbach's alphas ranged from .80 to .96). The administered scale comprised 14 items, four describing affect towards the content of the class (e.g., 'I believe that the module is useful'), five describing affect towards the teacher (e.g., 'I have a positive opinion of the teacher of this module'), and five describing behaviour (e.g., 'In my daily life I can use information obtained by the module'). Participants were asked to indicate their agreement upon the statements based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1, Strongly disagree, to 5, Strongly agree.

*Social and affective strategy inventory.* In order to assess students' social and affective strategy use, an adaptation of Oxford's SILL (1990), 7.0 version for speakers of other languages learning English was used. The SILL, translated and adapted in the Greek population by Vrettou (2011), was used for the purpose of the study. Internal consistency or reliability regarding the social strategies subscale was .64, which is quite satisfactory, while the affective strategies subscale was .55, which is seen as marginal reliability. As it was mentioned earlier, the instrument was divided into six factors: memory, cognitive, compensation, metacognitive, social and affective strategies. Only the factors of social and affective strategies were used in the present study. Each factor consisted of 6 items: social strategies (e.g., 'I ask questions in English', 'I practice English with my fellow students') and affective strategies (e.g., 'I encourage myself to speak English even when I am afraid of making a mistake', 'I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English'). Participants responded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never or almost never) to 5 (almost or almost always).

### **Data analysis**

Data analysis included the use of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 21.0). Cronbach  $\alpha$  reliability analysis was used to examine the internal consistency of the factors of each questionnaire. The Pearson correlation coefficient was used to measure the correlation between the subscales of the questionnaires. Moreover, regression analysis was computed to explore the extent to which the factors of perceived teachers' verbal aggressiveness and argumentativeness could predict the variables of students' affective learning, social and affective strategy use. The level of statistical significance was set at .05.

### **Results**

Cronbach's  $\alpha$  reliability analysis was .91 for the 8-item verbal aggressiveness scale (Bekiari & Digelidis, 2015), and .89 for the argumentativeness scale (Syrmpas & Bekiari, 2015). The factors of social strategies ( $\alpha = .94$ ) and affective strategies ( $\alpha = .95$ ) were high too (see Table 1). The factors of affect towards the content ( $\alpha = .91$ ), affect towards the course behavior ( $\alpha = .89$ ), and affect towards the teacher behavior ( $\alpha = .93$ ) for the affective learning scale (Bekiari, 2012) showed a high degree of reli-

ability (see Table 1). At the same time, Table 1 presents the mean scores and standard deviations of the variables.

**Table 1.** Descriptive statistics and Cronbach's alpha

	M (SD)	Cronbach's $\alpha$
Verbal aggressiveness	3.07 (1.06)	.91
Argumentativeness	2.77 (1.01)	.89
Social strategies	2.84 (1.17)	.94
Affective strategies	2.92 (1.14)	.95
Affect towards content	2.69 (1.05)	.91
Affect towards course behavior	3.01 (1.06)	.89
Affect towards teacher behavior	2.67 (1.16)	.93

In addition, a correlation analysis was conducted, the results of which are presented in Table 2. As it can be seen, teachers' verbal aggressiveness and argumentativeness ( $r=-.89$ ) were negatively related to student social strategies ( $r=-.87$ ), affective strategies ( $r=-.89$ ), affect towards content ( $r=-.69$ ), affect towards course behavior ( $r=-.82$ ), and affect towards teacher behavior ( $r=-.86$ ).

**Table 2.** Correlation analysis results

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Verbal aggression	1.00						
2. Argumentativeness	-.89**	1.00					
3. Social strategies	-.87**	.88**	1.00				
4. Affective strategies	-.89**	.90**	.91**	1.00			
5. Affect towards content	-.69**	.72**	.74**	.79**	1.00		
6. Affect towards course	-.82**	.83**	.81**	.81**	.74**	1.00	
7. Affect towards teacher behavior	-.86**	.89**	.87**	.91**	.71**	.93**	1.00

\*\*  $p < .001$

Moreover, a series of simple regression analyses were conducted to examine the extent to which students' affective learning, social and affective strategies could be predicted from the ratings of teachers' verbal aggressiveness. The results indicated that perceived EFL teacher verbal aggressiveness could predict significant variance in affective learning ( $F_{(3,144)}=411.82$ ,  $p<.001$ ) with an  $R^2$  of 89%. Perceived verbal aggressiveness explained 14% of the variance in students' affect towards content ( $\beta=-.42$ ,  $t_{(141)}=-4.94$ ,  $p<.001$ ), 8% of the variance in students' affect towards course ( $\beta=-.35$ ,  $t_{(141)}=-3.68$ ,  $p<.001$ ), 8% of the variance in students' affect towards teacher ( $\beta=-.19$ ,  $t_{(141)}=-2.18$ ,  $p<.001$ ). Another linear regression analysis was conducted to predict student social and affective strategies based on teacher verbal aggressiveness. The results indicated that perceived EFL teacher verbal aggressiveness could predict significant variance in social and affective strategies ( $F_{(2,145)}=562.72$ ,  $p<.001$ ) with an  $R^2$  of 90%. Verbal aggressiveness explained 22% of the variance in students' social strategy use ( $\beta=-.66$ ,  $t_{(143)}=-6.33$ ,  $p<.001$ ) and 6% of the variance in students' affective strategy use ( $\beta=-.29$ ,  $t_{(143)}=-2.79$ ,  $p<.001$ ). The results of the regression analyses are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Regression analysis results according to verbal aggressiveness

	B	95% CI B	SE	b	t
Affect-content	-.43	-.60, -.26	.09	-.42	-4.94**
Affect-course	-.35	-.54, -.16	.10	-.35	-3.68**
Affect- teacher	-.18	-.34, -.02	.08	-.19	-2.18**
Social strategies	-.60	-.79, -.41	.09	-.66	-6.33**
Affective strategies	-.27	-.46, -.08	.09	-.29	-2.79**

\*\* $p < .001$

Concurrently, a regression analysis conducted to explore the extent to which perceived EFL teachers' argumentativeness could predict students' affect towards content, course and teacher behavior. A significant regression equation was found ( $F_{(3,144)}=691.75$ ,  $p<.001$ ) with an  $R_2$  of 91%. More specifically, perceived EFL teachers' argumentativeness explained 14% ( $\beta=.32$ ,  $t_{(141)}=4.70$ ,  $p<.001$ ) of the variance in students' affect towards content, 8% ( $\beta=.20$ ,  $t_{(141)}=2.59$ ,  $p<.001$ ) of the variance in students' affect towards course, and 25% ( $\beta=.48$ ,  $t_{(141)}=6.83$ ,  $p<.001$ ) of the variance in students' affect towards teacher behavior. Another regression analysis was conducted to investigate the extent to which perceived teachers' argumentativeness could predict social and affective strategy use. A significant regression equation was found ( $F_{(2,145)}=769.05$ ,  $p<.001$ ) with an  $R_2$  of 94%. More specifically, perceived teachers' argumentativeness explained 11% ( $\beta=.59$ ,  $t_{(143)}=6.53$ ,  $p<.001$ ) of the variance in students' social strategies and 21% of the variance in students' affective strategies ( $\beta=.38$ ,  $t_{(143)}=4.15$ ,  $p<.001$ ). The results of both regression analyses are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4.** Regression analysis results according to argumentativeness

	B	95% CI B	SE	b	t
Affect-content	.30	.18, .43	.06	.32	4.70**
Affect-course	.19	.04, .33	.07	.20	2.59**
Affect- teacher	.42	.30, .54	.06	.48	6.83**
Social strategies	.51	.36, .67	.08	.59	6.53**
Affective strategies	.33	.18, .49	.08	.38	4.15**

\*\* $p < .001$

### Discussion

The aim of the present study was twofold: a) to explore the relationship between perceived teacher verbal aggression and argumentativeness and student affective learning, social and affective strategy use and b) to investigate the influence of teacher verbal aggressiveness and argumentativeness on student affective learning, social and affective strategies. The results of the study indicated that perceived EFL teachers' verbal aggressiveness was negatively related to their argumentativeness and students' social, affective strategy use and affect towards the content of the lesson, the course behavior and teacher behavior. In addition, it was revealed that perceived teachers' verbal aggressiveness and argumentativeness could significantly predict the variables of students' affective learning, social and affective strategy use.



The findings of the study are concurrent with the tenor of previous research indicating that teachers' verbal aggressiveness was negatively related to students' motivation, learning, behavior, thinking and satisfaction, while argumentativeness helped students express themselves freely improving their self-confidence and learning (Bekiari, 2012; 2014; Çelik & Kılıç, 2014; Evagorou & Osborne, 2013; Hamilton & Hample, 2011; Myers, 2002; Myers & Rocca, 2001). Further research suggested that teachers' personality plays a determinant role in the relationship with their students and influences their emotions and attitudes (Horn, 2002; Infante & Rancer, 1996; Rancer & Avtgis, 2014). This study, particularly, revealed that perceived EFL teacher verbal aggressiveness and argumentativeness emerged as the most important predictor of students' affective learning, which is in accordance with previous findings showing that teachers' verbal aggressiveness is negatively related to undergraduate students' affect towards content, course and teacher, while teachers' argumentativeness is positively related to students' affective learning (Bekiari, 2012; Myers, 2002; Myers & Knox, 2001).

Concurrently, the study indicated that perceived EFL teachers' aggressive behavior affects not only student affective learning but also social and affective strategy use, which concurs with previous research revealing that affective factors can exert great influence on language learning and strategy use (e.g., Lan & Oxford, 2003; Vrettou, 2011; Yamamori et al., 2003). A reasonable explanation of this finding could be the fact that when L2 students experience a positive relationship with their teachers and receive encouraging feedback they are more likely to become more interested in the content of the lesson and more motivated to participate in the learning process, express their feelings freely and use more social and affective strategies allowing for the affective filter hypothesis; namely, positive affect contributes to L2 learning (Krashen 1982; 1997).

The present study, which constitutes an attempt to examine the relationships between teacher verbal aggressiveness and argumentativeness and student affective learning, social and affective strategy use, contributes to L2 research, since there is a dearth of L2 research on exploring the correlations of these variables. In other words, there is a lack of L2 studies investigating the relation between teacher verbal aggression and student social and affective strategy use; a few studies showed that learners rarely used social and affective strategies (e.g., Shamshiri et al., 2010; Sheorey, 1999), while other studies pointed out that the specific strategies are frequently neglected in relation to other categories of strategies, such as the cognitive ones (Oxbrow, 2005; Oxford, 2002). The results of the study are also in line with the tenor of a recent study (Manoli & Bekiari, 2015) that revealed a negative relation between teachers' aggressive behavior and students' enjoyment, competence, effort, social and affective strategy use. In this way, the findings of the study extend L2 research and address the contribution of teacher behavior and affective factors to L2 learning and strategy use. The associations of these variables become more vital for L2 contexts, as learners face greater difficulties in L2 learning because of language deficiencies and inappropriate strategy use (Grabe, 2009).

Overall, the findings of the study suggest that EFL teachers should avoid adopting verbal aggressive behaviour, since it raises student affective filter and creates a 'mental block' that impedes language learning (Krashen, 1997). By contrast, EFL teachers should adopt an argumentative behavior, which creates a supportive classroom climate where students feel more self-confident and more motivated to participate in the learning process and interact with their teachers and peers (Çelik & Kılıç, 2014; Dawson & Venville, 2010; Evagorou & Osborne, 2013; Hamilton & Hample, 2011; Knight & McNeill, 2012). In addition, EFL teachers should use a variety of teaching activities to cater for student needs and, above all, create a relaxing and comfortable classroom atmosphere in which students can develop personal interactions and a deeper understanding of the nature of EFL learning. In this way, the findings of the study highlight the demand for improvement in teacher education and training (both pre-service and in-service educators) in order to respond to a challenging and constantly changing field (Celani, 2006).

### **Conclusion**

Taking everything into account, the study showed that perceived EFL teacher's verbal aggression could influence student affective learning, social and affective strategy use. The results of the study address not only the critical role of social and affective strategy use, which help learners lower anxiety about EFL learning and promote their social skills, but also the impact of teacher behavior on student feelings, attitudes to the lesson and strategy use. In essence, language learning, which is seen as a form of social behavior involving interaction with others, is person-dependent rather than task-oriented (Oxford, 1990). Therefore, it seems that the type of interaction between teachers and students emerges as a determinant of student motivation, behavior and strategy use, which, eventually, affects the learning process, since affect, particularly, positive emotions and attitudes, contribute to L2 learning (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995).

### **Özet**

#### **Giriş**

Bu araştırmanın amacı Yabancı Dil olarak İngilizce (YDİ) öğreten öğretmenlerin sözlü saldırganlıkları ve tartışmacı olmaları ile öğrencilerin duyuşsal öğrenmeleri, sosyal ve duyuşsal strateji kullanımları arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesidir. Sözlü saldırganlık ve tartışmacı olma, saldırgan davranışın temelini oluşturan dört iletişim özelliğinden (diğer ikisi dayatma ve düşmanlık) ikisini oluşturmaktadır (Costa & MacRae, 1980; Infante, 1987). Sözlü saldırganlık kişiliğe saldırı, yeterliğe saldırı, fiziksel görünüşe saldırı, kışkırtma, tehdit ve küfretme şeklinde birçok farklı biçimde ortaya çıkabilir ve insan ilişkilerine olumsuz etkileri olan yıkıcı bir iletişim şeklidir. Öte yandan tartışmacı olma, insanların düşüncelerini savunmak için tartışmaları kullanma becerilerine odaklanır ve öğrenmeyi destekleyen yapıcı bir iletişim biçimidir (Guerrero & Gross, 2014; Mercier & Sperber, 2011; Mikhaleva vd., 2015; Myers, Bramm, & Martin, 2013; Rancer & Avtgis, 2014). Johnson, Becker, Wigley, Haigh ve Craig (2007) kamuya açık alanlarda tartışmacı olmaya ilişkin rapor edilen şikâyetlerin, kişisel tartışmalarda ise sözlü saldırganlığa ilişkin şikâyetlerin fazla olduğunu belirt-

mektedir. Araştırmalar öğretmenler ve öğrenciler arasındaki saldırgan bir iletişimin öğrenme, davranış, düşünme ve güdülenmeye önemli derecede etkisi olduğunu göstermektedir (Bekiari, 2012; Bekiari & Hasanagas, 2015; Bekiari vd., 2005; 2006; Bekiari vd., 2015; Bekiari & Sympas, 2015; Hasanagas & Bekiari, 2015; Manoli & Bekiari, 2015; Mazer & Stowe, 2015; Richmond & Gorham, 1992). Bazı araştırmalar öğretmenlerin kişilik özelliklerinin öğrencilerle iletişimde belirleyici bir rol oynadığını ve öğrencilerin duygularını ve tutumlarını etkilediğini öne sürmektedir (Horn, 2002; Infante & Rancer, 1996; Rancer & Avtgis, 2014).

Duyuşsal öğrenme bir konu, kavram veya kişiye ilişkin olumlu tutum, inanç ve değerler olarak görülmektedir (Mottet & Beebe, 2006; Mottet et al., 2008; Thweatt & McCroskey, 1998; Waldeck, 2007). Öğrencinin duyuşsal öğrenmesini; öğretmenin ilgisi (Teven, 2007), mizah (Wrench & Punyanunt-Carter, 2005), yeterlik (Pogue & Ahyun, 2006), kişilik özellikleri (Teven, 2007), yakınlık arayan strateji kullanımı (Dolin, 1995; Frymier, 1994) ve işlevsel iletişim becerisi kullanımı (Frymier & Houser, 1998) gibi birçok etken artırmaktadır. Özellikle okul ortamında duyuşsal öğrenme öğrencinin ders içeriği, öğretici ve dersin davranışsal kazanımlarına yönelik olumlu tutumları olarak görülmektedir (McCroskey, 1994). Araştırmalar öğretmenin algılanan sözlü saldırganlık kullanımı ile öğrencilerin duyuşsal öğrenmesi arasında negatif yönlü bir ilişkinin olduğunu göstermektedir (Plax vd., 1986; Wrench & Punyanunt-Carter, 2005).

Günümüzde dil öğrenme öğrenci özerkliğini destekleyen üst-bilişin gelişimine ve strateji kullanımına dayanmaktadır. Bu bakış açısına göre öğrenci dil öğrenme sürecinde artık pasif bir özne değil, aktif bir katılımcı olarak görülmektedir (Macaro, 2006; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Psaltou-Joycey, 2010). Öğrenme stratejileri, öğrenilen dile yönelik bilginin kaydedilmesi, muhafaza edilmesi, hatırlanması ve uygulanmasıyla, ikinci dil ya da yabancı dil kullanımını veya öğrenmeyi ön plana çıkarmak için kasıtlı olarak seçilmiş bilinçli süreçler olarak kabul edilmektedir (Cohen, 1998).

Daha ayrıntılı bir şekilde, bu araştırmanın odak noktasını oluşturan sosyal ve duyuşsal öğrenme stratejileri sosyal etkileşimler yoluyla öğretmenlerin mesaj iletimini ön plana çıkarırken, sınıfta olumlu duygusal bir atmosfer yaratarak öğrencilerin duyuşsal filtrelerini azaltmaktadır. Bu da dilin öğrenilmesine katkıda bulunmaktadır (Oxford, 1990). Alan yazına bakıldığında, sosyal ve duyuşsal strateji kullanımına ilişkin sınırlı sayıda araştırma olduğu görülmektedir çünkü bilişsel ve üst-bilişsel stratejilerle karşılaştırıldığında bu stratejiler göz ardı edilmektedir (Chamot & Kupper, 1989; Goh & Kwah, 1997; Oxford, 2002; Sheorey, 1999). Özellikle bazı araştırmalarda sosyal ve duyuşsal strateji öğretiminin, YDİ öğrenenlerin performansını (Oxbrow, 2005; Saeidi & Jabbarpour, 2011; Tajzadeh vd., 2013), dinleme stratejilerini kullanımlarını (Shamshiri vd., 2010), sosyal strateji kullanımlarını (Harish, 2014) ve dil öğrenmeye yönelik ilgilerini artırdığı (Fandiño, 2010) belirtilmektedir.

### **Yöntem**

Araştırmaya Yunanca konuşan ve YDİ lisans öğrencisi olan, 18-23 yaşları arasında ( $\bar{x}=20.3\pm.68$ ) 148 öğrenci (39 erkek ve 109 kadın) katılmıştır. Araştırmanın örnek-

lemi, orta Yunanistan'da bulunan Thessaly Üniversitesi'nin Beden Eğitimi Fakültesi, Erken Çocukluk Eğitimi Bölümü ve Temel Eğitim Bölümü öğrencilerinden oluşmaktadır. Tüm katılımcılar yükseköğretim düzeyinde verilen YDİ derslerin katılmaktadır ve anadilleri Yunancadır. Katılımcılar YDİ öğretmenlerinin sözlü saldırganlıkları ve tartışmacı olmaları ile öğrencilerin duyuşsal öğrenmesi ve sosyal ve duyuşsal strateji kullanımlarına yönelik ölçekleri cevaplandırmıştır.

Veriler dört ölçek aracılığıyla toplanmıştır: (a) Bekiari ve Digelidis (2015) tarafından Yunan örneklemeine uyarlanan sözlü saldırganlık ölçeği (Infante & Wigley, 1986), (b) Sympas ve Bekiari (2015) tarafından Yunan örneklemeine uyarlanan tartışmacı olma ölçeği (Myers & Rocca, 2000), (c) Bekiari (2012) tarafından Yunan örneklemeine uyarlanan duyuşsal öğrenme ölçeği (Mottet & Richmond, 1998) ve (d) Vrettou (2011) tarafından Yunan örneklemeine uyarlanan dil öğrenme stratejisi envanteri (Oxford, 1990). Sözlü saldırganlık ölçeği tek boyut ve sekiz maddeden, tartışmacı olma ölçeği tek boyut ve on maddeden, duyuşsal öğrenme ölçeği üç boyut ve on dört maddeden (dersin içeriğine yönelik duyguları içeren dört madde, öğretmene yönelik duyguları içeren beş madde ve davranışları betimleyen beş madde), sosyal ve duyuşsal dil öğrenme stratejisi ölçeği ise her biri altı maddeden oluşan iki boyuttan oluşmaktadır.

### **Bulgular**

Bulgular ölçme araçlarının iç tutarlılığını desteklemiştir. Cronbach  $\alpha$  güvenilirlik katsayıları, 8 maddelik sözlü saldırganlık ölçeği (Bekiari & Digelidis, 2015) için .91 ve tartışmacı olma ölçeği (Sympas & Bekiari, 2015) için .89 olarak belirlemiştir. Sosyal stratejiler ( $\alpha = .94$ ) ve duyuşsal stratejiler ( $\alpha = .95$ ) boyutları için de yüksek belirlenmiştir. Duyuşsal öğrenme ölçeğine bakıldığında, içeriğe yönelik duygular boyutu ( $\alpha = .91$ ), ders davranışlarına yönelik duygular boyutu ( $\alpha = .89$ ) ve öğretmen davranışlarına yönelik duygular boyutu ( $\alpha = .93$ ) için güvenilirlik düzeyi yüksek çıkmıştır.

Bunlara ek olarak korelasyon analizlerine bakıldığında, öğretmenlerin sözlü saldırganlık ve tartışmacı olma durumları ( $r=.89$ ) ile sosyal stratejiler ( $r=.87$ ), duyuşsal stratejiler ( $r=.89$ ), içeriğe yönelik duygular ( $r=.69$ ), ders davranışlarına yönelik duygular ( $r=.82$ ) ve öğretmen davranışlarına yönelik duygular ( $r=.86$ ) arasında negatif yönlü bir ilişki belirlenmiştir. Bu bulguya göre, YDİ öğretmenlerinin algılanan sözlü saldırganlıkları, tartışmacı olmaları ve öğrencilerin sosyal, duyuşsal strateji kullanımları, dersin içeriğine yönelik duyguları, ders davranışlarına yönelik duyguları ve son olarak öğretmen davranışları ile negatif yönlü olarak ilişkilidir.

Öğretmenlerin sözlü saldırganlıklarının öğrencilerin sosyal ve duyuşsal stratejilerini ve duyuşsal öğrenmelerini ne düzeyde yordadığını belirlemek için basit regresyon analizleri yapılmıştır. Bulgulara göre YDİ öğretmenlerinin algılanan sözlü saldırganlıklarının, duyuşsal öğrenmenin %89'luk ( $R_2$ ) bir varyansını açıklayarak anlamlı düzeyde yordayabileceği tespit edilmiştir ( $F_{(3,144)}=411.82, p<.001$ ). Öğrencilerin sosyal ve duyuşsal stratejilerinin, öğretmenlerin sözlü saldırganlıkları tarafından ne düzeyde yordandığını belirlemek için bir başka doğrusal regresyon analizi yapılmıştır. Bulgulara göre YDİ öğretmenlerinin algılanan sözlü saldırganlıklarının sosyal ve duyuşsal

stratejilerin %90'lık ( $R_2$ ) bir varyansını açıklayarak anlamlı düzeyde yordayabileceği belirlenmiştir ( $F_{(2,145)}=562.72, p<.001$ ).

Aynı zamanda YDİ öğretmenlerinin algılanan tartışmacı olma durumlarının, öğrencilerin derse yönelik, ders davranışlarına yönelik ve öğretmen davranışlarına yönelik duygularını ne düzeyde yordadığını belirlemek için de regresyon analizi yapılmıştır. Burada %91'lik bir  $R_2$  oranı ile anlamlı bir regresyon eşitliği ( $F_{(3,144)}=691.75, p<.001$ ) elde edilmiştir. YDİ öğretmenlerinin algılanan tartışmacı olma durumlarının, öğrencilerin sosyal ve duyuşsal strateji kullanımlarını ne düzeyde yordadığını belirlemek için de başka bir regresyon analizi yapılmıştır. Burada da %94'lük bir  $R_2$  oranı ile anlamlı bir regresyon eşitliği ( $F_{(2,145)}=769.05, p<.001$ ) elde edilmiştir. Böylece regresyon analizi sonuçları öğretmenlerin algılanan sözlü saldırganlıkları ve tartışmacı olma durumlarının, öğrencilerin duyuşsal öğrenme, sosyal ve duyuşsal strateji kullanımlarını anlamlı düzeyde yordayabileceği belirlenmiştir.

### **Tartışma**

Genel olarak bu araştırmanın bulguları YDİ öğretmenlerinin algılanan sözlü saldırganlıklarının, tartışmacı olmaları ve öğrencilerin sosyal, duyuşsal strateji kullanımları ve duyuşsal öğrenmeleri ile negatif yönde ilişki olduğunu göstermiştir. Buna ek olarak öğretmenlerin algılanan sözlü saldırganlıkları ve tartışmacı olma durumlarının öğrencilerin duyuşsal öğrenme, sosyal ve duyuşsal strateji kullanımları değişkenlerini anlamlı düzeyde yordayabileceği ortaya çıkmıştır.

Araştırmanın bulguları geçmiş araştırmalarda elde edilenlerle aynı görünmektedir. Öğretmenlerin sözlü saldırganlıkları, öğrencilerin güdülenme, öğrenme, davranış, düşünme ve tatmin olmaları ile negatif yönlü ilişkilidir. Öğretmenlerin tartışmacı olma durumları ise öğrencilerin kendilerini özgürce ifade etmelerini sağlayarak özgüvenlerini ve öğrenmelerini geliştirmelerini yardımcı olmuştur (Bekiari, 2012; 2014; Çelik & Kılıç, 2014; Evagorou & Osborne, 2013; Hamilton & Hample, 2011; Myers, 2002; Myers & Rocca, 2001). Bulgular aynı zamanda güncel bir araştırmanın bulgularıyla aynıdır. Bu araştırmaya göre öğretmenlerin saldırgan davranışları ve öğrencilerin beğenmeleri, yeterlikleri, çabaları, sosyal ve duyuşsal strateji kullanımları arasında negatif yönlü bir ilişki bulunmaktadır (Manoli & Bekiari, 2015). Bu araştırma özellikle YDİ öğretmenlerinin algılanan sözlü saldırganlıklarının ve tartışmacı olma durumlarının, öğrencilerin duyuşsal öğrenmesinin en önemli yordayıcıları olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır. Farklı araştırmalara göre öğretmenlerin sözlü saldırganlıkları, lisans öğrencilerinin duyuşsal öğrenmeleri ile negatif yönlü ilişkilidir. Öte yandan öğretmenlerin tartışmacı olma durumları öğrencilerin duyuşsal öğrenmeleri ile pozitif yönlü ilişkilidir (Bekiari, 2012; Myers, 2002; Myers & Knox, 2001). Aynı zamanda araştırmada, YDİ öğretmenlerinin algılanan saldırganlık davranışlarının yalnızca öğrencilerin duyuşsal öğrenmelerini değil, öğrencilerin sosyal ve duyuşsal strateji kullanımlarını da etkilediği ortaya çıkmıştır. Geçmiş araştırmalarda duyuşsal etkenlerin dil öğrenmeyi ve strateji kullanımını etkileyebileceğinden bahsedilmektedir (Bkz. Lan & Oxford, 2003; Vrettou, 2011; Yamamori et al., 2003).

Öğretmenlerin sözlü saldırganlıkları ve tartışmacı olma durumları ile öğrencilerin duyuşsal öğrenmeleri, sosyal ve duyuşsal strateji kullanımları arasındaki ilişkileri inceleme girişiminde bulunan bu araştırma, ikinci dil (*Second Language-L2*) araştırma-

larına da katkı sağlamaktadır çünkü ikinci dil arařtırmalarında bu deęiřkenler arasındaki iliřkileri inceleyen arařtırmaların eksik olduęu grlmektedir. ğretmenlerin szli saldırganlıkları ve ğrencilerin sosyal, duyuřsal strateji kullanımları arasındaki iliřkiyi inceleyen ikinci dil arařtırmaları yetersizdir. Sadece birkaç alıřma dil ğrenenlerin sosyal ve duyuřsal stratejileri kullandıęını gsterirken (Bkz. Shamshiri vd., 2010; Sheorey, 1999), dięer arařtırmalar sosyal ve duyuřsal stratejilerin, biliřsel ve st-biliřsel olanlara kıyasla, gz ardı edildięinin altını izmektedir (Chamot & Kupper, 1989; Oxbrow, 2005; Oxford, 2002). Bu nedenle arařtırmanın bulguları ikinci dil arařtırmalarına katkıda bulunmaktadır ve ikinci dil ğrenmede ve strateji kullanımında, ğretmen davranıřları ve duyuřsal etkenlere vurgu yapmaktadır. YDİ ğretmenleri tartıřmacı bir davranıř benimsemelidir. Bylece ğrencilerin birbirleriyle etkileřime girdięi ve ğrenme srecine katılarak daha zgvenli hissettięi destekleyici bir sınıf ortamı yaratılır (elik & Kılı, 2014; Evagorou & Osborne, 2013; Knight & McNeill, 2012; Dawson & Venville, 2010). Dil ğrenenlerin, ikinci dil ğrenmelerinde dil eksikliklerinin ve uygun olmayan strateji kullanımlarının yarattıęı zorluklar ile karřılařmaları dikkate alındıęında, bu deęiřkenlerin bir arada incelenmesi ikinci dil arařtırmaları iin daha da nemli hale gelmektedir (Grabe, 2009).

### **Sonuç**

Daha nce bahsedilen bulgular ıřıęında, ğretmenlerin szli saldırganlıklarının ğrencilerin dil ğrenmesine ket vuran “zihinsel engel” yaratarak, ğrencilerin duygularını etkiledięi sonucuna varılabilir (Krashen, 1982, 1997). ğretmenler ve ğrenciler arasındaki etkileřimin tr, ğrencinin gdlenme, davranıř ve strateji kullanımlarında bir belirleyici olduęu grlmektedir. Bu da zamanla ğrenme srecini, hatta ikinci dil ğrenmeye katkı saęlayan olumlu duygu ve tutumları etkilemektedir (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995). Bu nedenle arařtırma sonuları, srekli ve daha zorlayıcı bir řekilde deęiřen bir alanın ihtiyalarına karřılık verebilmek iin, ğretmen (hem hizmet ncesi, hem hizmet ii ğretmenler) eęitimi ve yetiřtirmede gerekli olan geliřtirmele-  
rin altını izmektedir (Celani, 2006).

### **References/ Kaynaklar**

- Bekiari, A. (2012). Perceptions of instructors' verbal aggressiveness and physical education students' affective learning. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 115, 325-335.
- Bekiari, A. (2014). Verbal Aggressiveness and Leadership Style of Sports Instructors and Their Relationshipd with Athletes' Intrinsic Motivation. *Creative Education*, 5(2), 114-121.
- Bekiari, A., Digelidis, N. (2015). Measuring verbal aggressiveness in sport and education. *International Journal of Physical Education*, 52(4), 112-121.
- Bekiari, A., Hasanagas, N. (2015). Verbal aggressiveness exploration through complete social network analysis: using physical education students' class as an illustration. *International Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(3), 30-49.
- Bekiari, A., Kokaridas, D., Sakellariou, K. (2005). Verbal aggressiveness of physical education teachers and students' self-reports of behaviour. *Psychological Reports*, 96, 493-498.

- Bekiari, A., Kokaridas, D., Sakellariou, K. (2006). Associations of students' self-reports of their teacher's verbal aggression, intrinsic motivation, and perceptions of reasons for discipline in Greek physical education classes. *Psychological Reports*, 98, 451-461.
- Bekiari A., Perkos S., Gerodimos V. (2015). Verbal aggression in basketball: perceived coach use and athlete intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport*, 15 (1), 16, 96 – 102.
- Bekiari, A., Sympas, I. (2015). The influence of motivational climate and coaches' verbal aggression on athletes' satisfaction. *British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science*, 9, 318-329.
- Celani, M. A. A. (2008). When myth and reality meet: Reflections on ESP in Brazil. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27(4), 412-423.
- Çelik, A. Y., & Kılıç, Z. (2014). The Impact of Argumentation on High School Chemistry Students' Conceptual Understanding, Attitude towards Chemistry and Argumentativeness. *Eurasian Journal of Physics and Chemistry Education*, 6(1).
- Chamot, A.U., & Kupper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22(1), 13-24.
- Cohen, A.D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. London and New York: Longman.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1980). Still stable after all these years: Personality as a key to some issues to adulthood and old age. In P. B. Baltes & O. G. Brim (Eds). *Life-span development and behavior*. New York: Academic Press.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dawson, V. M., & Venville, G. (2010). Teaching strategies for developing students' argumentation skills about socioscientific issues in high school genetics. *Research in Science Education*, 40(2), 133-148.
- Dolin, D. J. (1995). An alternative form of teacher affinity-seeking measurement. *Communication Research Reports*, 12(2), 220-226.
- Evagorou, M., & Osborne, J. (2013). Exploring young students' collaborative argumentation within a socioscientific issue. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 50(2), 209-237.
- Fandiño, Y. (2010). Explicit teaching of socio-affective language learning strategies to beginner EFL students. *Íkala, revista de lenguaje y cultura*, 15(24), 145-169.
- Frymier, A. B. (1994). A model of immediacy in the classroom. *Communication Quarterly*, 42(2), 133-144.
- Frymier, A. B., & Houser, M. L. (1998). Does making content relevant make a difference in learning?. *Communication Research Reports*, 15(2), 121-129.
- Goh, C., & Kwah, P.F. (1997). Chinese ESL students' learning strategies: A look at frequency, proficiency and gender. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2, 39-53.
- Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving from theory to practice*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- Guerrero, L. K., & Gross, M. A. (2014). Argumentativeness, Avoidance, Verbal

- Aggressiveness, and Verbal Benevolence as Predictors of Partner Perceptions of an Individual's Conflict Style. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 7(2), 99-120.
- Hamilton, M., & Hample, D. (2011). Testing hierarchical models of argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 5(3), 250-273.
- Harish, S. (2014). Social strategy use and language learning contexts: A case study of Malayalee undergraduate students in India. *System*, 43, 64-73.
- Hasanagas, N., & Bekiari, A. (2015). Depicting Determinants and Effects of Intimacy and Verbal Aggressiveness Target through Social Network Analysis. *Sociology Mind*, 5(3), 162.
- Horn, R. (2002). Coupled movements in voltage-gated ion channels. *The Journal of general physiology*, 120(4), 449-453.
- Infante, D. A. (1987). Aggressiveness. In J. C. McCroskey & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Personality and interpersonal communication* (pp. 157-192). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Infante, D. A., & Rancer, A. S. (1996). Argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness: A review of recent theory and research. In B.R. Burleson (Ed.) *Communication yearbook*, 19 (pp.319-351). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Infante, D.A., & Wigley, C.J. (1986) Verbal aggressiveness: an interpersonal model and measure. *Communication Monographs*, 53, 61-69.
- Johnson, A. J., Becker, J. A., Wigley, S., Haigh, M. M., & Craig, E. A. (2007). Reported argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness levels: The influence of type of argument. *Communication Studies*, 58(2), 189-205.
- Knight, A. M., & McNeill, K. L. (2012). Comparing students' written and verbal scientific arguments. In *annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Indianapolis, IN*.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practices in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (1997). *Foreign language education: The easy way*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.
- Lan, R., & Oxford, R.L. (2003). Language learning strategy profiles of elementary school students in Taiwan. *IRAL*, 41(4), 339-379.
- Macaro, E. (2006). Strategies for language learning and for language use: Revising the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(3), 320-337.
- Manoli, P., Bekiari, A. (2015). EFL teachers' verbal aggressiveness and students' intrinsic motivation and social-affective strategy use: investigating possible relations. *Advances in Research*, 5(6), 1-13.
- Mazer, J. P., & Stowe, S. A. (2015). Can Teacher Immediacy Reduce the Impact of Verbal Aggressiveness? Examining Effects on Student Outcomes and Perceptions of Teacher Credibility. *Western Journal of Communication*, (ahead-of-print), 1-17.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1994). Assessment of affect toward communication and affect toward instruction in communication. In S. Morreale, & M. Brooks (Eds.), *1994 SCA summer conference proceedings and prepared remarks: Assessing college stu-*



- dent competence in speech communication. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.*
- Mercier, H., & Sperber, D. (2011). Why do humans reason? Arguments for an argumentative theory. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 34(02), 57-74.
- Mikhaleva, A. B., Dyakonova, N. A., & Ivanova, N. A. (2015). Psychology of aggressive behavior and will. *SWorld Journal Pedagogy, Psychology and Sociology*, 11(1508), 120-198.
- Mottet, T. P., & Beebe, S. A. (2006). The relationships between student responsive behaviors, student socio-communicative style, and instructors' subjective and objective assessments of student work. *Communication Education*, 55(3), 295-312.
- Mottet, T. P., Garza, R., Beebe, S. A., Houser, M. L., Jurrells, S., & Furler, L. (2008). Instructional communication predictors of ninth-grade students' affective learning in math and science. *Communication Education*, 57(3), 333-355.
- Mottet, T. P., & Richmond, V. P. (1998). An inductive analysis of verbal immediacy: Alternative conceptualization of relational verbal approach/avoidance strategies. *Communication Quarterly*, 46(1), 25-40.
- Myers, S. A. (2002). Perceived aggressive instructor communication and student state motivation, learning, and satisfaction. *Communication Reports*, 15, 113-121.
- Myers, S. A., Bramm, M., & Martin, M. M. (2013). Identifying the content and topics of instructor use of verbally aggressive messages. *Communication Research Reports*, 30(3), 252-258.
- Myers, S. A., & Knox, R. L. (2000). Perceived instructor argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness and student outcomes. *Communication Research Reports*, 17(3), 299-309.
- Myers S. A., & Rocca K.A. (2000). The relationship between perceived Instructor Communicator style argumentativeness, and verbal aggressiveness. *Communication Research Reports*, 17, 1-12.
- Myers, S. A., & Rocca, K. A. (2001). Perceived instructor argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness in the college classroom: Effects on student perceptions of climate, apprehension, and state motivation. *Western Journal of Communication (includes Communication Reports)*, 65(2), 113-137.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oxbrow, G. (2005). Writing, reflection and learning- an interactive approach. *Journal of PORTA LINGUARUM*, 4, 167-184.
- Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Oxford, R.L. (2002). Language learning strategies in nutshell: Update and ESL suggestions. In J.C. Richards & W.A. Renandya (Eds), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp.123-132). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R.L., & Burry-Stock, J.A. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the strategy inventory for language learning (SILL). *System*, 23(1), 1-23.

- Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1986). Power in the classroom VI: Verbal control strategies, nonverbal immediacy and affective learning. *Communication Education*, 35(1), 43-55.
- Pogue, L. L., & AhYun, K. (2006). The effect of teacher nonverbal immediacy and credibility on student motivation and affective learning. *Communication Education*, 55(3), 331-344.
- Psaltou-Joycey A. (2010). *Language learning strategies in the foreign language classroom*. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press.
- Rancer, A. S., & Avtgis, T. A. (2014). *Argumentative and aggressive communication*, 2d ed. New York: Peter Lang.
- Richmond, V. P., & Gorham, J. (1992). *Communication, learning, and affect in instruction*. Burgess International Group.
- Saeidi, M., & Jabbarpour, N. (2011). EFL teachers' socio-affective strategy use in relation to students' academic achievement. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 3(3), 746-750.
- Shamshiri, K., Noordin, N., & Sahandari, M. (2010). Effects of socio-affective strategy training on employing other strategies for listening comprehension tasks. In *IABR & ITLC Conference Proceedings* (pp. 1-11). Orlando, FL, USA.
- Sheorey, R. (1999). An examination of language learning strategy use in the setting of an indigenized variety of English. *System*, 27, 173-190.
- Syrmpas, I., & Bekiari, A. (2015). The Relationship between Perceived Physical Education Teacher's Verbal Aggressiveness and Argumentativeness with Students' Interpersonal Attraction. *Inquiries in Sport & Physical Education*, 13 (2), 21-32.
- Tajzadeh, P., Khodabandehlou, M., Jahandar, S., & Najafi, M. (2013). The impact of socio-affective strategies on Iranian intermediate EFL learner's speaking ability. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences*, 3(3), 670-674.
- Teven, J.J. (2007). Teacher caring and classroom behavior: Relationship with student affect and perceptions of teacher competence and trustworthiness. *Communication Quarterly*, 55, 433-450.
- Thweatt, K.S., & McCroskey, J.C. (1998). The impact of teacher immediacy and misbehaviors on teacher credibility. *Communication Education*, 47, 348-358.
- Vrettou, A. (2011). Patterns of language learning strategy use by Greek-speaking young learners of English. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Aristotle university of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki.
- Waldeck, J. H. (2007). Answering the question: Student perceptions of personalized education and the construct's relationship to learning outcomes. *Communication Education*, 56(4), 409-432.
- Wrench, J. S., & Punyanunt-Carter, N. M. (2005). Advisor-advisee communication two: the influence of verbal aggression and humor assessment on advisee perceptions of advisor credibility and affective learning. *Communication Research Reports*, 22(1), 303-313.
- Yamamori, K., Isoda, T., Hiromori, T., & Oxford, R.L. (2003). Using cluster analysis to uncover L2 learner differences in strategy use, will to learn, and achievement over time. *IRAL*, 41, 381-409.