



GROUP RAPPORT BUILDING IN AN INSTITUTIONAIZED FACE-TO-FACE INTERACTION: A CASE STUDY

Anna Hyun-Joo Do, Ph.D.¹

¹New York City College of Technology, City University of New York

Abstract

When people are engaged in any interaction, they are likely to respond to each other's verbal and nonverbal cues. This responsiveness is a critical factor in the notion of rapport. In this paper, the author argues that the same human dynamics that govern everyday conversations are at play between participants in institutionalized conversations such as classroom discourse. The purpose of this study is to develop critical aspects of "conversational involvement" (Duranti, 1986; Goodwin, 1986; Gumperz, 1982; Tannen, 1985) as rapport-building devices and to provide observable phenomena that characterize rapport with participants' verbal and nonverbal cues in informal and formal conversation. In this study, nine people participated: a Korean professor of an elementary Korean language class at a major US university and eight undergraduate students whose first language is English. Three fifty-minute classroom sessions were videotaped, and segments that illustrated the teacher's and students' behaviors that facilitated rapport were transcribed and qualitatively analyzed. The author recorded the frequency of the teacher's verbal and nonverbal cues that appeared to foster rapport. This study found that the teacher shared small talk in informal before-class conversations by bringing up insignificant details about daily life. The teacher played the role of teacher during class by directing a lesson. However, she continued to utilize various rapport-building devices through selected verbal and nonverbal cues to engage her students in the conversation. In this classroom, as in everyday conversation, the participants demonstrated their desire to listen to, be responsive to, and be influenced by individuals in a certain way. The participants were part and parcel of achieving their goals in the classroom. The participants created a certain alignment to achieve their goals and signal that they were involved in the interaction. Then, the students would be able to learn the target language more through the involvement of the classroom activity, which is one of the outcomes of good rapport.

Keywords

Group Rapport, Conversational Involvement, Verbal Immediacy Behavior, Nonverbal Immediacy Behavior, Interpersonal Coordination, Co-participants, Posture Mirroring

Introduction

When people are engaged in interaction, they likely listen to, be responsive to, and be influenced by individuals with whom they feel they are communicating. This responsiveness to another's influence seems to have been the critical factor in the notion of term rapport, which will be the main focus of this study. Rapport has been studied in various ways and relates to such conversational phenomena as conversational involvement, engagement, or adjustment. Over the past years, researchers such as Duranti (1986), Erickson & Schultz (1982), Goodwin (1986), and Tannen (1985) have argued for an understanding of face-to-face interaction being accomplished through joint or co-authored efforts between speakers and listeners. Gumperz (1982) claims that interlocutors typically provide cues indicating a willingness to be engaged in the interaction and value each other's contribution. He terms this affective stance "conversational involvement" (1982: 2), which has much in common with cooperation. Duranti (1986) also points out that in any human interaction, people tend to construct cooperative interaction "as the collective activity of individual social actors" (p.239). He further argues that "the form and content of talk is continuously reshaped by the co-participants, through their ability to create certain alignments and suggest or impose certain interpretations" (p.242). The effectiveness of the speaker's signaling information and the audience's collaborative interaction process seem to be critical ingredients in facilitating group rapport. The question for language teachers is whether or not we can expect the same rapport-building devices in classroom interactions

where the primary speaker (i.e., teacher) and the audience (i.e., students) jointly create affective alignments through selected verbal and nonverbal cues that have been identified as having good rapport.

Bernieri (1988) points out that rapport is likely associated with positive emotional affect or attitude. His notion of rapport relates to the Affective Filter proposed by Krashen (1982). According to Krashen, the learner's negative emotions, such as anxiety, embarrassment, and negative attitudes, prevent input from being used for language acquisition (Dulay et al., 1982). He terms these negative emotional attitudes as the learner's "Affective Filter." Krashen's Affective Filter hypothesis suggests that when a learner's negative attitudes or emotional states are raised, they block learning. Thus, the learner comprehends less input for their language acquisition. His hypothesis implies that language teachers should create an atmosphere that lowers the learners' affective filters. Language teachers should provide a relaxed environment where their interactions go smoothly in harmony, making the relationship between teachers and students less tense (Wilson & Ryan, 2012; Nguyen, 2007).

Theoretical Framework and Empirical Studies on Group Rapport

To define group rapport related to nonverbal behavior, Tickle-Degnen and Rosenthal (1987; 1990) approach rapport as an aspect of the interaction among participants engaged in a conversation. They present three essential components of rapport: (1) mutual attention and involvement, (2) positivity, and (3) coordination. Concerning the relationship between nonverbal and group rapport, they find that nonverbal behavior seems to correlate with three elements mentioned above, to function as an antecedent to feelings and ratings of rapport, and to be influenced by participants' feelings associated with rapport. They further elaborate that behaviors of mutual attention enhance feelings of mutual interest; positive behaviors are connected to feelings of friendliness and warmth, and coordinated interactional behaviors are related to feelings of balance and harmony. The concept of rapport is associated with any situation where participants communicate to achieve their goals (that includes classroom discourse). The degree of rapport affects the efficiency and quality of the progress toward goal achievement. Thus, the degree of rapport is likely to contribute to the outcome of classroom interaction.

Tickle-Degnen and Rosenthal's (1987) theoretical claim for the relationship between rapport and interpersonal coordination is examined empirically by Bernieri's (1988) study, which focuses on high school students in 19 teaching dyads measured for their degree of interpersonal coordination and rapport. To rate the degree of interpersonal coordination, judges viewed silent video clips of high school students teaching each other a list of imaginary words. There are four aspects of interpersonal coordination: (1) simultaneous movement, (2) tempo similarity, (3) coordination and dance-like smoothness, and (4) behavior matching. The results reveal that movement synchrony is strongly correlated with rapport.

One of the studies that presents the correlation between posture mirroring and rapport is employed by LaFrance (1982). LaFrance defines posture mirroring as the degree to which two or more people adopt mirror-imaged postures vis-à-vis each other in a face-to-face interaction. Her empirical study questions are as follows: (1) whether mirroring is only expressive of an underlying social psychological disposition; (2) whether it contributes to the establishing of that disposition. LaFrance employs a longitudinal design that investigates 95 students in 14 college classrooms in natural settings. This design addresses these two issues from an observer's perspective. LaFrance came to the following conclusions: (1) Posture mirroring could facilitate the subsequent establishing of rapport by creating interpersonal coordination; (2) Rapport, once created, could be manifested through the display of posture mirroring; (3) Both posture mirroring and rapport could be simultaneously caused by unknown third variables; and (4) Both variables could be affecting each other in a positive feedback loop.

Gorham (1988) specifically examined student perceptions of teacher verbal immediacy behaviors associated with learning. Forty-seven undergraduate students enrolled in primary, non-required communication courses participated in a small-group brainstorming exercise. They were asked to think of the best teachers they ever had. Then, the participants were asked to select from a list of the specific behaviors that characterize those teachers. The list included twenty verbal behaviors followed by fourteen nonverbal behaviors (adopted by Richmond, Gorham, and McCroskey (1987)), identified as immediacy behaviors. The subjects indicated that the teachers' verbal and nonverbal behaviors determined what teachers the students remembered as their best teachers. The teacher's use of humor, praise of students' work, actions, or comments, and frequency of initiating and willingness to be engaged in conversations before, after, or outside of class were particularly significant verbal immediacy cues. Students also identified the following teacher behaviors: (1) self-disclosure; (2) asking questions or encouraging students to talk; (3) asking questions that solicit viewpoints or opinions; (4) following up on student-initiated topics; (5) reference to class as "our" class; (6) asking how students feel about assignments, due dates or discussion topics; and (7) invitations for students to telephone or meet with them outside of class. Nonverbal behaviors, such as vocal expressiveness, smiling, relaxed body position, gestures, eye contact, movement around the classroom, and touch, were found to be nonverbal immediacy cues that significantly related to students' perceptions of good teachers. Both sets of behaviors are associated with notions of rapport.

In sum, many studies have suggested that immediacy behaviors, which signal approach, openness for communication, and warmth, enhance teacher-student relationships and, potentially, student learning (e.g., Frymier & Houser, 2000). This concept of immediacy behavior goes back to what linguists pose regarding normal face-to-face interaction, as I mentioned in the introduction. The elements identified by linguists as essential aspects of conversational involvement overlap with the behaviors identified by researchers in immediacy behaviors. That is, recognition of co-construction in face-to-face interaction is related to the elements associated with interaction in a classroom where we say there is good rapport. Therefore, I claim that one of the ways to analyze group rapport in classroom discourse is to incorporate the elements identified by previously mentioned conversational studies into immediacy behaviors.

The current study analyzes naturally occurring L2 discourse in the institutionalized face-to-face interactions between the teacher and the students. The discourse analysis is supplemented with the students' self-report concerning the teacher and quantitative analysis of one class. More specifically, this study intends to examine group rapport-building devices performed by a Korean language teacher and beginning-level Korean-American learners of the Korean language. This study also intends to point out different rapport-building devices in contexts, such as before and after class and formal classroom interactions.

The Present Study

Research Design

Subjects

A Korean professor in charge of a beginning Korean language class at an Asian language department at a major US university and eight students (4 males and 4 females) in her class served as subjects. The experienced Korean professor, in her forties, had lived outside of Korea for over 20 years. All eight students were undergraduates ranging from first-year to seniors, and their first language (L1) was English. This class focused on integrated skills in Korean and was a six-credit regular course that met for fifty minutes every day from Monday through Thursday.

Methodology

Two methods were conducted: (1) the self-report scale for students' teacher evaluation and (2) observational analysis supplemented with quantitative analysis. Concerning the self-report scale for the students' rating of the teacher's verbal and nonverbal behaviors, the Immediacy Behavior Scale describing teacher verbal (adopted by Gorham, 1988) and nonverbal (adopted by Richmond, Gorham & McCroskey, 1987) immediacy behaviors were adopted. Based on this particular class, items were modified and added. Thirteen behaviors were selected for verbal immediacy and sixteen for nonverbal immediacy, completing a 29-item scale. The 29 items were rated as to the frequency of the target teacher's use of these behaviors on a five-point scale: never=0, rarely =1, occasionally=2, often=3, and very often=4. As for the observational analysis, different behavior patterns that distinguish contexts and facilitate group rapport were searched. I also looked for and analyzed the differences and similarities in behaviors found in typical language classrooms in Korea. Transcription symbols and abbreviations used for grammatical terms in excerpts are in Footnote 2.¹ Moreover, I supplemented the items used for analyzing the

¹ Transcription symbols used in excerpts:

/	Rising tone
\	Falling tone
~	Fluctuating intonation
<i></i>	Korean language
	English translation
[Overlapping
()	Nonverbal cues
:	Lengthening
=	Latching
(0.3)	Pause, three tenths of a second
{ }	Reconstructed elements in translation

Abbreviations used for grammatical terms in excerpts:

TM	Topic Marker
HD	Honorific Declarative
CD	Casual Declarative
ACC	Accusative Marker
VOC	Vocative Marker
ST	Statement Ending
SM	Subject Marker

teacher's behaviors and items that Gorham (1988) noted as indicative of low rapport with the frequency of use of those items in one class to support the observational analysis. Nine verbal and eight nonverbal items were selected and counted, completing a 17-item.

Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

I videotaped three fifty-minute classroom sessions. I also took field notes of my observations. The class started a month before the first videotaping, so the participants had sufficient time to establish group rapport. From the three fifty-minute videotaped interactions, I extracted and transcribed segments that illustrate the teacher's and the student's behaviors that facilitate rapport. To support the observational analysis, I counted the frequency of the categories of the teacher's behavior that seem to enable group rapport, as well as included contrastive low rapport-building devices if possible.

Results

The students' questionnaire and the observation analysis results reveal that group rapport is built, developed, and maintained in this classroom through vocal and bodily cues among the participants. The questionnaire results will be presented first, followed by the observational data concerning the interaction between the teacher and the students will be reported.

Results of the Questionnaire: The Teacher's Verbal and Nonverbal Behaviors

By employing Gorham's (1988) verbal immediacy scale, the results of the verbal teacher immediacy items rated by the students are summarized in Table 1 and reveal the number of the students and the percentages for each item. The bold characters indicate the highest scales that the students choose. 100 % of the students chose the 'very often' (scale of 4) for items 2 (encourages students to talk) and 4 (uses students' names). 100 % of the students chose the 'very often (scale of 4)' or the 'often (scale of 3)' for items 7 (refers to 'our' class) and 11 (praises students' work). 86 % of the students choose the 'very often' for item 3 (uses humor). Interestingly, 100 % of the students chose the 'never (scale 0)' for item 13 (addresses by first name). The students did not call their teacher by her name. Instead, they addressed her by her last name, *sungsang-nim* (teacher-honorific title) or *kyoswu-nim* (professor-honorific title). The students were familiar with Korean culture and addressed the teacher with honorific titles.

Items \ Scales	0	1	2	3	4
1. Uses personal examples			2 (29%)	3 (42%)	2 (29%)
2. Encourages students to talk					7 (100%)
3. Uses humor			1 (14%)		6 (86%)
4. Uses students' names					7 (100%)
5. Has conversations before and after class		1 (14%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	4 (57%)
6. Refers to "my" class or what "I" am doing*	2 (29%)	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	
7. Refers to "our" class				3 (43%)	4 (57%)
8. Provides feedback on assignments	1 (14%)		1 (14%)	2 (29%)	3 (43%)
9. Asks about assignments		1 (14%)		2 (29%)	3 (43%)
10. Invites students for outside discussions		2 (29%)	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	2 (29%)
11. Praises students' work				1 (14%)	6 (86%)
<u>12. Criticizes students' work</u> ^{*2}		2 (29%)	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)
13. Addresses by first name	7 (100%)				

*Presumed to be nonimmediate items.

² After surveying the students, item 12 was found to be problematic. It was not clear whether the students interpreted this item as the teacher giving implicit corrective feedback or explicit corrective feedback for oral production or for assignments. One possible interpretation is that it was feedback for oral errors that the teacher provided implicitly or explicitly. Most of the time when the teacher corrected the students' responses, she did it implicitly. However, when occasion demanded explicit feedback, the teacher mitigated her action immediately by calling the student being corrected 'you rascal, you little devil' or by touching or imitating their responses or laughing. The other possible interpretation of this item is that it was to criticize the students' behavior. For example, I observed one occasion where the teacher mentioned very casually that a student had closed his eyes under his hat (i.e., suggesting he was napping in class). She brought it up the very next day rather than catching him on the spot in a very funny way with a smile saying 'he was meditating or something' which made the class laugh. The students may have interpreted this as criticizing. Table 2 shows the results of the nonverbal teacher immediacy items rated by the students and reveal the number of the students and the percentages for each item. Again, the bold characters indicate the highest scales that the students chose

As can be seen from Table 2, 100 % of the students chose the ‘very often (scale of 4)’ for item 23 (smiles at individual students). 100 % of the students chose the ‘very often (scale of 4)’ or the ‘often (scale of 3)’ for items 27 (nods to students while listening) and 28 (uses her facial expressions). 86 % of the students choose the ‘very often’ or the ‘often’ for items 16 (gestures while teaching), 18 (uses a variety of vocal expressions), 20 (maintains contact while writing), and 22 (smiles at the class as a whole). These nonverbal behaviors function as an antecedent to feelings and ratings of rapport, as Tickle-Degnen and Rosenthal (1987) mentioned. Concerning the descriptions of negative behaviors, 100 % of the students chose the ‘never (scale of 0)’ or the ‘rarely (scale of 1)’ for items 17 (uses monotone/dull voice) and 24 (has a very tense body position). As I suspected, 100 % of the students chose the ‘very often’ or the ‘often’ for item 14 (sits on a desk while teaching).³

Items \ Scales	0	1	2	3	4
14. Sits on a desk while teaching*				3 (42%)	4 (57%)
15. Moves around while teaching		2 (29%)	4 (57%)	1 (14%)	
16. Gestures while teaching			1 (14%)	2 (29%)	4 (57%)
17. Uses monotones/dull voice*	6 (86%)	1 (14%)			
18. Uses a variety of vocal expressions			1 (14%)	1 (14%)	5 (71%)
19. Maintain eye contact while writing	1 (14%)		3 (43%)	1 (14%)	2 (29%)
20. Maintain contact while writing			1 (14%)	3 (43%)	3 (43%)
21. Looks at board/notes while teaching*	3 (43%)	2 (29%)	2 (29%)		
22. Smiles at the class as a whole			1 (14%)		6 (86%)
23. Smiles at individual students					7 (100%)
24. Has a very tense body position*	4 (57%)	3 (43%)			
25. Has a very relaxed body position			2 (29%)	2 (29%)	3 (43%)
26. Touches students in class			5 (71%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)
27. Nods to students while listening				5 (71%)	2 (29%)
28. Uses her facial expressions				4 (57%)	3 (43%)
29. Moves her mouth to help students			2 (29%)	1 (14%)	4 (57%)

* Presumed to be nonimmediate items.

TABLE 2: Students’ Views on Teacher’s Nonverbal Immediacy

Informal teacher and student interaction before and after class

Observing this class, I discovered that the teacher and students engaged in small talk before and after class. The conversational patterns found in this small talk reveal that rapport is “built,” “developed,” and “maintained” in this class.

(1) Small talk between the teacher and the students

Gorham (1988) found that self-disclosure and solidarity were positively related, and meaningfully higher levels of self-disclosure were associated with high solidarity relations. The following exchange demonstrates how the participants of the talk are in tune with one another:

<Exchange 1>

(Alex waved her hand to the teacher when she made eye contact with the teacher)

1. T: (laughing and holding Alex’s hand simultaneously) You look so sick!

2. Alex: (smile)

3. Matt: Hey! (extending his arm toward Alex and about to touch Alex)

4. T: You know I missed you anyhow that was =

5. Alex: =I slept all day yesterday =

6. Matt: = GOO:D.

7. T: You are lucky. You know what I am thinking? **You’re a student. You are a head. You can be sick but me? I cannot be sick.**

8. Alex: You can’t be sick?

9. T: (Nodding her head) **No, and also at home, I’m sick nobody cooks** (sticking her tongue out)

10. Alex: (laughing and taking her coat off)

11. T: You understand? Then carry out [inaudible]

Immediately after Alex came in, the teacher acknowledged that Alex was absent from class the other day because she had been ill. Matt also acknowledged Alex’s presence. In lines 6 (“good”) and 7 (“you are lucky”), the participants demonstrated how the process of assessment can be analyzed as a collaborative interactive activity.

³ This is due to the fact that all participants sit in a circle on two big attached desks which results in physical closeness in a small classroom.

These assessments show empathy, and mark a certain kind of relationship, indicating that the participants are close and thus are well attuned to one other's behavior. Through collaborative assessment, the participants created a state of heightened mutual involvement (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1989,1992). At the same time, in line 7, the teacher tried to show sympathy and concern and recognized the student as a person. By revealing her personal experience, the teacher demonstrated a willingness to relate to the student. This sends a message to the student that the teacher is a person and a teacher, and thus, the students become interested in her as a person. All three interactants' fast rate of speech, latching, and body coordination show high engagement and interest in the participants and the conversation.

The following exchange of relatively insignificant details about daily life is valued for its metamessage of rapport of caring (Tannen, 1989: 149).

<Exchange 2>

1. T: Did you get a reply from your: this no What is it? (tapping the table) This scholarship

2. Chris: Not yet =

3. T: =Not yet? When do they give you?

4. Matt: [inaudible]

5. Chris: I know\ I wish I can [inaudible].

In line 1, by tapping the table, the teacher demonstrated that she was searching for a word (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1986). Then, in line 2, Chris understood the gesture as an appropriate time to interact by cooperatively overlapping. In line 3, the teacher clarifies Chris' utterance by repeating it, indicating that the teacher valued his involvement in a conversation. Hence, rapport is established by showing an interest in the student's matter and their enthusiasm for co-participating in the conversation.

Formal teacher and student interaction during Class

During class, the teacher takes a leadership role by directing a lesson. In this section, which is a more formal context, we will look into various rapport-building devices the participants use to achieve their goals.

(2) Eliciting information from the students

The teacher asked the students a question and waited for 5 seconds before pursuing the answer with further questions. As Mora (1995) noted, silence can create opportunities for the students to articulate ideas and express them clearly by engaging the students in sustained interactions:

<Exchange 3>

1. T: ah *nalshi-ga dawa-suh*\ I don't like to study because the weather is hot. How do you weather-SM hot- because ah because the weather is hot, I don't like to study. Because the weather is hot.

How do you say/ I don't like to study (0.2) (looking around, making eye contact with the students, and tapping her fingers together)

2. Matt: go shipoyo/=

would like to/

3. T: =**That's right. That's what I want =**

4. Matt: = *nalshi-ga dawa-suh\ hankookmal-ul an an kongbu-hago shipo-yo?*
weather-SM hot-because Korean - ACC not not study-want like - HD

Because the weather is hot\ I don't like to study Korean.

The teacher opens the floor by asking an explicit question, and then she looks around, making eye contact with the students and tapping her fingers together while she waits to hear from them. Then, Matt bids for the floor. Immediately and enthusiastically, in line 3, the teacher responds to his answer by giving him positive feedback. The teacher's positive, energetic response to the student's first utterance signals to the whole class that she values what the students say and wants them to get involved in the conversation (Wolfson, N. & Manes, J., 1980). Furthermore, with increased wait time, Matt responds using more advanced language and logic (e.g., in line 4, Matt utters a complete sentence without interruption). This implies that by leaving longer pauses, the teacher provides the opportunity for students to respond (Mercer, 1995: 28). By uttering the whole sentence without any interruption, the student would feel good about what he accomplished, and also gives meaningful opportunities for the student to produce more complicated syntax orally. This would seem to encourage the student to contribute more to the class.

The following exchange shows how the teacher replaces her talk with a nonverbal message:

<Exchange 4>

1. T: Doris, *Nah-n gikum pikonhae-suh/*

I - TM now tired-because

Doris, Because I'm tired now/

2. Doris: *sukje - rul ah hae-yo.*

homework-ACC not doing-HD

- {I am} not doing {my} homework.
 3. T: Ung? (**leans forward to Doris, showing her ear**)
 huh?
 4. Doris: *sukje - rul ah hae-yo.*
 homework-ACC not doing-HD
 {I am} not doing {my} homework.

The teacher cupped her hand behind her ear to indicate that she did not hear what a student had said. This non-lexical contextualization cue (i.e., gesture), which co-occurred with a verbal cue, helps not only to elaborate and shape the teacher's message but also to provide the student with the interpretation of what is being said within the talk. Doris received a signal that the teacher wanted her to repeat her utterance clearly and louder. This kind of nonverbal behavior also seems to soften the teacher's imposition on her students. Consequently, the teacher successfully got the students to fully cooperate in the classroom activity and achieved her lesson goals. These kinds of nonverbal cues also create a warm, friendly environment where the teacher and the students can enjoy both teaching and learning.

(3) *Mirrors each other's behavior*

The following posture mirroring started when the students were preparing for their performance in the group. When the teacher was talking to one group, a student asked about the next day's test, and then the teacher responded:

<Exchange 5>

1. T: Don't worry. You don't worry, right?
2. Alex: (nodding)
3. Chris: I'm ready! (banging the desk) I'm ready! (**banging the desk harder**)
4. T: (**looking at Chris and banging the desk**) So, you ready? O.K.

The student sent a message that he was ready and used banging the desk in an attempt to get the teacher's attention. After the teacher noticed Chris's action, the teacher banged the desk. The teacher mirroring the students' behavior indicates that she is constantly monitoring the students' behavior and shows an interest in the students' behavior or progress. Then, it is fair to say that position mirroring is a cue to the presence of interpersonal involvement, or it is an interactional device whose purpose is to establish communality. This co-occurrence of movement is interpreted as the smoothness of a conversational stream and a kind of rhythmic togetherness between the participants in the focused interaction (Bernieri, 1988).

(4) *Students helping their classmates*

The students in this class often initiate and respond to the teacher and their classmates. When they get signals that their classmates do not understand and ask for help, they voluntarily help each other:

<Exchange 6>

1. T: *go daume\ na-nun gibasuh/*
 next I - TM happy
 next \ because I'm happy
2. Matt: ah:
3. T: ah ah ah~
4. Matt: wha wha
5. Wily: **Happy**
6. Matt: huh?
7. Wily: Happy? (looking at the teacher)
8. T: uh happy *gibasuh* Happy
 happy

After Wily noticed that Matt was having trouble looking for the meaning of 'gibasuh' in English, he involved himself in an exchange by simply uttering 'happy,' which shows that Wily supports his classmates who was holding the floor. In addition, line 7 demonstrates that Wily was willing to help his classmate out even though he was unsure about the word. This three-way exchange also illustrates that the students are co-participants, and the interaction is cooperatively achieved.

So far, we have seen how the teacher and the students engage verbally and nonverbally in informal and formal interactions before/after and during class to accomplish the task that they are involved in. The information in Tables 3 and 4 shows the frequency of the teacher's verbal and nonverbal cues.

	High Rapport	Low Rapport	Total
Forms:			
Casual	28		30
*Honorific		2	
Addresses students:			
By their first name	41		41
*By their full name		0	
Comments on students' behavior			
Praises	31		31
*Criticizes		0	
*Complains		0	
Mimics students' non-lexicon	10		10
Friendly teasing	7		7
Total	117	2	119

*Indicates low rapport.

Table 3: Frequency Distribution of Teacher Verbal Cues

	High Rapport	Low Rapport
Touches students	25	
*Has tense body position		0
Uses gestures to encourage students	69	
*Uses a monotone/dull voice		0
Nods to students	81	
*Looks at board or notes		6
Smile at individuals	69	
Moves her mouth to help the students	43	
Total	287	6

*Indicates low rapport

Table 4: Frequency Distribution of Teacher Nonverbal Cues

Discussion

The present study of group rapport is carried out under two assumptions (1) the elements identified by linguists such as Duranti (1986), Goodwin & Goodwin (1986,1989,1992), Gumperz (1982), and Tannen (1985,1989) are important aspects of conversational involvement that seem to be connected to behaviors identified by researchers such as Gorham (1988) and Richmond, Gorham, and McCroskey (1987) in immediacy behaviors; (2) Even if the participants consist of the teacher who has authority and talks more than listens and the students who listen more and talk less, they tend to construct a cooperative interaction and create certain interactional rhythmicity. Thus, I attempted to incorporate aspects of conversational involvement into the classroom rapport where the teacher and the students behave like ordinary people involved in face-to-face interaction.

Before class, while the teacher and the students waited for more students to come to class, she often shared small talk with the students and acted as if she was a friend of her students by being funny and friendly. She was very open and attempted to approach her students like peers. This attitude creates a cheerful, relaxed classroom environment and lifts students' spirits (Frisby & Housley Gaffney, 2015; Frisby & Martin, 2010). The teacher also showed concern for the students who missed previous classes, and she readily welcomed latecomers. The teacher's concern for each student sends the whole class a metamessage that she is not only willing to know every student well but also values each student as an important member of this community.

Among the students, they share a small talk by bringing up the topics that they are mutually interested in before the class starts. DePaulo & Bell (1990) approach the tone of rapport as how warm, friendly, comfortable, interested, involved, and "in sync" the participants feel in a particular interaction. This classroom atmosphere implies that group rapport is built, developed, and maintained through a high degree of verbal and nonverbal immediacy behaviors. These elements help interactions go smoothly, thus moving forward to the rhythmic "togetherness" between the teacher and the students.

During class when the teacher is more in control, she created a warm, friendly, comfortable, positive and easy-going atmosphere that encourages student participation. In addition, she used very casual, informal words by

calling the students' first names and nicknames frequently and using inclusive pronouns (our +students' name). These are the words that include the speaker and the listener in the same category and that increases communicator solidarity rather than distancing the speaker from the listener (Gorham, 1988). Furthermore, the teacher's way of giving instructions was effective in building a friendly and warm relationship. By virtue of using casual forms of Korean, the teacher downgraded her power and status so that she could stand on a more equal footing with her students. Therefore, the teacher succeeded in creating a non-threatening environment where the students could make mistakes. In other words, her way of giving instructions yielded a feeling of togetherness.

The teacher's smile and laughter increase warmth or "class cohesiveness" (Gorham, 1988). In order to have the students interact more, the teacher uses a high degree of "immediacy" behavior, for example, a cheerful voice, forward leaning, touch, direct body orientation, dancing eyes, eye brow raising, lip movement, head nodding, openness of arms, and hand movement. These nonverbal behaviors serve to focus the attention of the group and contribute to the participants' perceptions of interactional involvement and attentiveness (Tickle-Degnen and Rosenthal, 1987; 1990). As Goodwin & Goodwin (1992: 88) note, "when talk and gesture occur together they typically function as mutually contextualizing phenomena with the talk providing resources for the interpretation of the gesture, while for its part the gesture elaborates and further guides the interpretation of what is being said within the talk."

In terms of the students' behavior during class, they acted as active participants. Through selected verbal and nonverbal cues the students proposed a certain alignment towards the information being presented and towards the teacher. By being responsive to the teacher and by maintaining regular eye contact with their teacher, the students exhibited interest and enthusiasm in the material being presented. They nodded their heads and made facial expressions to show understanding of the activity and looked straight towards the teacher when they were called on. The students not only mimicked the teacher's verbal expressions but also mirrored her postures. The students also voluntarily helped their classmates, when they hesitated in answering, as well as using humor. They collaboratively constructed their utterances and therefore shared responsibility. All these students' affective alignments signal to the teacher that they pay attention to and they are involved in the classroom interaction.

After class, the teacher invited her students to ask questions. This sends a message to the students that she cares about her students' progress and personally takes interest in the students' matters. The students also asked about the next day's quiz which indicates that they were concerned about their progress and the class. The atmosphere at the end of the class was very relaxed and warm. All these ingredients combined are the key to maintaining group rapport. Interaction represents a two-way communication. As Tickle-Degnen and Rosenthal (1987) note, "both" interactants must feel rapport, and experience nonverbal expressions along with verbal ones of positivity, attentiveness, and coordination.

Conclusion

In the current study, I have shown verbal and nonverbal behaviors which appear to facilitate group rapport in terms of three different contexts: teacher-student informal conversation before and after class and formal classroom conversation. First, the relationship between the teacher and the students seems to be near-equal status in making small talk before and after class. Second, the teacher is more in control when tasks are given during class. Although the teacher assumes more power inviting the role of teacher, she continues to use a number of rapport-building devices through verbal and nonverbal cues. The students, as active participants, demonstrate their responsiveness through selected verbal and nonverbal cues. Hence, the students' affective alignment gives a message to the teacher that they are involved in the interaction. Toward the end of the class, the teacher gives positive feedback to the whole class in Korean as a signal that the class is finished. This sends a positive feeling to the students so the students leave the class with a feeling of achievement that they learned something that day.

The present study on rapport in terms of how it is applied is limited due to the fact that it is conducted within the U.S.A. The classroom environment, teachers and students' personalities outside of the U. S. A. may be different from those in the U.S.A. For instance, typical Korean teachers in Korea may seem more distant and have different ways of dealing with their students which are appropriate and effective within that culture norm. Furthermore, as far as students are concerned, some students may prefer a relaxed, comfortable environment, whereas others may prefer a more disciplined environment depending on their needs and subject matter even though Krashen (1982) claims that the Affective Filter is universal. It is obvious, however, students in this particular language classroom prefer having an enjoyable learning experience where they are able to participate in the class activities. If Krashen is right, even in countries like Korea may find more interactive, good rapport language classes effective, if this is the case, these L2 teachers are likely to need pre-service and in-service instructions on developing group rapport devices within the classroom

References

- Bernieri, F. (1988). "Coordinated movement and rapport in teacher-student interactions." *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 12: 120-138. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00986930>
- DePaulo, B. M. & Bell, K. L. (1990). "Rapport is not so soft anymore." *Psychological Inquiry*, 1, 305-8.
- Duranti, A. (1986). "The audience as co-author: an introduction." *Text* 6:3 239-47. Erickson, F. & Shultz, J. (1982). *The counselor as gatekeeper: social interaction in interviews*. New York: Academic Press.
- Frisby, B. N., & Housley Gaffney, A. L. (2015). Understanding the Role of Instructor Rapport in the College Classroom. *Communication Research Reports*, 32(4), 340-346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2015.1089847>
- Frisby B. N., Martin M. (2010). Instructor-student and student-student rapport in the classroom. *Communication Education*, 59, 146-164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520903564362>
- Frymier A. B., Houser M. L. (2000). The teacher-student relationship as an interpersonal relationship. *Communication Education*, 49, 207-219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520009379209>
- Goodwin, C. (1986). Audience diversity, participation and interpretation. *Text* 6:3 283-316. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1986.6.3.283>
- Goodwin, C & Goodwin, M., (1989). "Context, Activity and participation." In Auer, P., & Luzio, A. D. (Eds.) *The contextualization of language*. 77-99. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- _____ (1992). "Assessments and the construction of context" In Duranti, A., & Goodwin, C. (Eds.) *Rethinking Context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*. 147-90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gorham, J. (1988). "The relationship between verbal teacher immediacy behaviors and student learning." *Communication Education*, 37, 40-53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634528809378702>
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hills, P. (1979). *Teaching and learning as a communication process*. New York: John Wiley and sons.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- LaFrance, M. (1982). "Posture Mirroring and Rapport." In Davis, M. (Eds.) *Interaction rhythm: Periodicity in communicative behavior*. 279-297. New York: Human Science Press.
- Mercer, N. (1995). *The guided construction of knowledge: talk amongst teachers and learners*. Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Mora, R. (1995). Silence, interruptions, and discourse domains: The opportunities to speak." *Applied Language Learning*, 6: 27-39.
- Nguyen, H. thi. (2007). Rapport Building in Language Instruction: A Microanalysis of the Multiple Resources in Teacher Talk. *Language and Education*, 21(4), 284-303. <https://doi.org/10.2167/le658.0>
- Richmond, V. P., Gorham, J. S. & McCroskey, J. C. (1987). "The relationship between selected immediacy behaviors and cognitive learning." In McLaughlin, M. L. (Eds.) *Communication Yearbook*, 10, pp. 574-90. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Tannen, D. (1985). "Relative focus on involvement in oral and written discourse." *Literacy, language, and learning: The nature and consequences of reading and writing*. (Eds.) Olson, D., Torrance, N., and Hillyard, A., 124-47. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____ (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tickle-Degnon, L. & Rosenthal, R. (1987). "Group rapport and nonverbal behavior." In Hendrick, C (Eds.) *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations: Review of Personality and social Psychology*. 9: 113-136. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- _____ (1990). The Nature of Rapport and Its Nonverbal Correlates. *Psychological Inquiry*, 1(4), 285-293. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0104_1
- Wilson, J. & Rebecca G. (2012). "Developing Student-Teacher Rapport in the Undergraduate Classroom." *Effective College and University Teaching: Strategies and Tactics for the New Professoriate*, William Buskist & Victor A. Benassi (Ed.): 81-90 Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452244006.n9> source:
- Wolfson, N. & Manes, J. (1980). "The compliment as a social strategy." *Papers in linguistics: international Journal of Human Communication*. 13, 3: 391-410. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351818009370503>