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The quality of teacher-student relationships greatly affects students’ academic life. Students need to be recognized by their teacher. One way through which such need may be fulfilled is receiving strokes (teacher attention). In a broad sense, stroke is known to be a unit of human recognition (Berne, 1988). Accordingly, the current mixed-methods study aims to investigate the differences among English, Persian, and Arabic school teachers in Iran pertaining to their stroking behavior and and see how the three groups of teachers differ in this regard. To fulfill the first aim, 300 eighth-grade female students completed an 18-item questionnaire and the questionnaire data were analyzed through one-way ANOVA. The results revealed that Arabic teachers stroke students more than English and Persian teachers. As for the second aim, nine English, Persian and Arabic teachers were each observed for three sessions. The analysis of the observations demonstrated that English teachers outstroke students. Finally, these findings have been discussed in the context of language instruction.
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INTRODUCTION

Learning occurs best in contexts where students receive emotional support and experience enjoyable learning (Schutz & Pekrun, 2007). Since teacher interaction with students is integral to the fulfillment of students’ emotional needs, researchers have paid increasing attention to the nature and quality of this interaction. Over the years, several scholars have investigated factors contributing to teacher-student relations. Among these factors are teacher care (e.g., McBee, 2007; Mercado, 1993; O’Connor, 2008; Wentzel, 1997), teacher immediacy (e.g., Barclay, 2012; Mehrabian, 1967), emotional
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intelligence (Hashemi, 2008), and teacher effectiveness (e.g., Black & Howard-Jones, 2000; Cheung et al., 2008).

However, there is a missing piece which has received little attention thus far. The missing piece in teacher-student interactions is stroke. It is an important component of teacher care (Pishghadam et al., 2015) and is defined as every action a human being does to recognize another human being (Berne, 1988). A teacher (stroker) can stroke students (strokees) in many ways such as providing them with feedback, recalling their names, having eye contact with them, encouraging them to think about their academic abilities positively, etc. As stated by Freedman (1993), individuals perform better in stroke-rich settings. Therefore, stroking may contribute to student achievement and success.

The concept of stroke has been silently incorporated into the classroom culture. However, on the whole, it has not been given a place among the great theories of motivation. Therefore, inquiry on stroke, outside of a few exceptions (e.g., Pishghadam & Khajavy, 2014; Yazdan Pour, 2015; Rajabnejad Namaghi, 2016; Hosseini, 2016), has been slow to emerge. Researchers have noticed that student recognition is fundamental in cultivating engaged learners (Goldstein, 1999; Goldstein & Lake, 2000). Despite their significance, strokes are scarce and this is due to an economy of strokes which prevents people from freely stroking each other (Steiner, 1997). Both teachers and students are in a continuous state of stroke hunger resulting from a restrictive economy of strokes. Therefore, the researchers abandoned other motivational theories in favor of a theory of stroke which is centered on recognition.

The motivation for focusing on language teachers emerged from the researchers’ concerns about the role that language courses play in the amount and types of strokes provided by teachers. Three languages are taught in the educational system of Iran, namely Persian (national language), Arabic (religious language), and English (international language). Considering the role of language teaching in identity construction (Clarke, 2008), it seems that these three languages have an impact on the identity (e.g., gender identity) of teachers, and therefore on their stroking behavior. Gender identity refers to an individual’s perception of his/her own degree of maleness and femaleness regardless of his/her biological sex (Bem, 1974). According to Pishghadam, et al. (2016), the concept of masculinity and femininity of teachers has an impact on the quality of teacher-student relationships. According to them, feminine teachers tend to be more caring and friendly, and put a higher emphasis on their relationship with students. In contrast, masculine teachers are more assertive and corrective. Considering the fact that language teachers are strongly influenced by practices within their field, Pishghadam, et al. (2016) concluded that teachers of Persian, Arabic, and English are affected by national, religious, and western influences in the process of gender identity construction. The results of their study provide evidence for the femininity of English teachers and masculinity of Arabic and Persian teachers in the students’ perceptions. The distinct role of each of the three languages (i.e., English, Persian, and Arabic) in the curriculum has prompted researchers to compare corresponding teachers in different respects including status (Pishghadam & Saboori,
2014) and gender identity (Pishghadam et al., 2016). Since teachers’ stroking behavior stems out of their habitus and identity, investigation of this issue in the Iranian educational context is of particular significance. Accordingly, this research is designed to address two key questions: (1) Do Iranian students perceive any significant differences among their English, Persian, and Arabic school teachers regarding stroke? (2) How do English, Persian, and Arabic school teachers differ in providing strokes?

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Students experience a wide range of positive and negative emotions in the classroom. The kind of relationship teachers have with their students is closely intertwined with student emotions in the educational environment (Frenzel et al., 2009). Accordingly, teachers have a significant role in shaping a positive relationship with students, thereby enhancing their motivation and assisting them in building the necessary interpersonal skills (Pierson, 2003). These interpersonal relationships could be examined by a theory proposed by Eric Berne known as Transactional Analysis (TA) theory (Pishghadam & Khajavy, 2014). “TA is a theory of personality and systematic psychotherapy for personal growth and personal change” (Stewart & Joines, 1987, p. 3). The six basic components of TA theory include: ego states, life positions, life scenario, transactions, time structures, and strokes (Berne, 1988). This method has been extensively used in psychology, communication, education, and counseling (Barrow, 2007; Solomon, 2003). The application of TA in the educational field provides a solid basis for a better perception of the ties between human behaviors, education, and learning (Barrow & Newton, 2015). Moreover, it has the potential to bring about positive changes in the education process and result in a learning procedure which is more interesting and natural (Stuart & Agar, 2011). TA is used in educational settings to help teachers and learners have a clear communication and avoid setting up unproductive confrontations (Stewart & Joines, 1987). As a matter of fact, teachers who are highly aware of the TA method have better chances of fulfilling the needs of their students. Since communication is an inseparable part of language classes, TA may facilitate this process through making conversations more open and straightforward. In this vein, several studies have explored the use of TA in educational settings (e.g., Barrow, Bradshaw & Newton, 2001; Hellaby, 2004). In their study, Barrow, Bradshaw and, Newton (2001) list the advantages of utilizing the TA method in the classroom in particular and the school as a whole. In another study, Hellaby (2004) found that the use of TA in the classroom results in a more favorable learning environment which raises the self-esteem and academic performance of the learners.

Stroke is one of the components of TA theory and an important component of teacher care (Pishghadam et al., 2015). According to Berne (1988), all human beings need to be acknowledged by others and this need is fulfilled through receiving strokes. Therefore, every action taken by a human being to recognize another human being is considered a stroke (Berne, 1988). Strokes may be verbal/non-verbal, positive/negative, conditional/unconditional (Stewart & Joines, 1987). Verbal strokes (e.g., having a conversation, saying hello) involve an exchange of spoken words, while non-verbal strokes involve nodding, smiling, and so forth; positive strokes (e.g., I love you) make
the receiver feel good and satisfied, whereas negative strokes (e.g., *I hate you*) make the receiver feel dissatisfied; conditional strokes (e.g., *I like your dress; you are not a good singer*) relate to what we do, and unconditional strokes (e.g., *I love you; I hate you*) are given for what we are (Stewart & Joines, 1987). Since the unconditional negative stroke is all about criticizing a person for who she is, it can be very destructive. Hence, teachers should avoid giving this kind of stroke in the classroom. Yet, it is believed that “... negative strokes are better than no strokes at all” (Solomon, 2003, p.19). People seek strokes everywhere to satisfy their need for being recognized. They make their best effort to receive positive ones; if they cannot receive positive strokes, they go for the negative ones (Pishghadam & Khajavy, 2014). Francis and Woodcock (1996) claimed that motivating others may be achieved by two methods. The first one is positive reinforcement which is the act of providing positive strokes to reinforce positive behavior; the other one is negative reinforcement which is based on giving negative strokes to reduce errors and encourage better performance. In this view, motivation is directly related to stroke. As Stewart and Joines (1987) have suggested, “stroking reinforces the behavior which is stroked” (p. 74). Accordingly, stroke is closely related to the notion of feedback, especially that which provides positive and negative evaluations directed at the students (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Brophy (1986) argued that since some students may not know that the answer of a student is correct, teachers should acknowledge students’ correct responses because even if the respondent knows that the answer is correct, some onlookers may not.

Attempting to find out the correlation between stroke and student motivation, Pishghadam and Khajavi (2014) found that students who receive more strokes are more motivated than those who receive less or no strokes. In another study, Yazdan Pour (2015) constructed and validated a teacher stroke scale (TSS) and examined the relationship between the amounts of strokes received by teachers and teacher burnout. She reported that the more the teachers receive strokes, the less their level of burnout seems to be. Also, Hosseini (2016) conducted a qualitative study to explore English language teachers’ conceptions of stroke. The results of her study revealed that teachers are aware of different types of strokes, but fail to stroke appropriately. In another study, Rajabnejad Namaghi (2016) investigated the role of teacher stroke in the willingness of students to attend the classes and found that two of the subcomponents of stroke, namely nonverbal and valuing, significantly predict students’ willingness to attend the classes.

**METHOD**

**Participants**

The current study employs both quantitative and qualitative research methods.

The quantitative section was conducted with 300 eighth-grade female students at six high schools of Mashhad, Iran. After going through the administrative process and receiving permission to collect data from six female high schools, the researchers started the process of data collection. Since the education department allows researchers to have access only to a limited number of schools, convenience sampling was used.
In the qualitative section, the researchers planned to observe the ways through which eighth-grade female teachers of English, Persian, and Arabic languages stroke their students. In order to comply with the sampling rules of the qualitative paradigm, the researchers continued the observations until saturation was reached. Nine English, Persian and Arabic teachers were each observed for three sessions before reaching saturation.

In order for the data to be as consistent as possible, the participants of the two phases were from high schools located in the middle-class district of Mashhad.

**Instrumentation**

In order to assess teacher stroke, the Student Stroke Scale (SSS) designed and validated by Pishghadam and Khajavi (2014) was used. This scale consists of 18 items which are designed to assess verbal, non-verbal, positive, and negative strokes on a 5 point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always). The SSS has four sub-components including verbal, non-verbal, valuing, and classroom strokes. Verbal stroke consists of six items. Two items refer to naming; three items refer to encouraging, blaming, and complimenting; and one item deals with asking questions. The second sub-component is called non-verbal stroke, which refers to the non-verbal recognition of students by teachers. This factor consists of four items and deals with smiling, frowning, looking, and paying attention. The third sub-component of stroke is known as valuing and it comprises four items. Two items deal with the amount of time a teacher devotes to the students and the other two items measure the amount of students’ personal experience and scientific knowledge being employed in the classroom. The last sub-component is called classroom activities and consists of four items, all of which focus on classroom activities and tasks including doing homework and exercises, participating in class discussions and asking questions. The reliability of the whole set of items is 0.88, and the reliability of the four sub-scales range from 0.75 to 0.89. This scale has been validated through Rasch Psychometric Model (RPM) and Structural Equation Model (SEM). Since the statistical procedures confirmed the validity of SSS as a measure of stroke, this scale can be used in all educational settings. The reliability of the whole set of items in the current study was 0.86.

As for the qualitative data collection, the researchers acted as non-participant observers and attended three class sessions for each teacher. Each session lasted for approximately 90 minutes.

**Procedure**

The first step in the process of quantitative data collection was to gain the teachers’ permission for distributing the questionnaires in their classes. Before handing out the questionnaires, all necessary explanations were given to the students and they were told not to write their names on the questionnaire sheets because the questionnaires were to remain anonymous. This anonymity was thought to raise the rate of honesty in student responses. In this phase, one-way ANOVA test was used to examine the impact of course on the amount and types of stroke.
In the qualitative phase, the behavior of teachers towards students was observed thoroughly and the observation records were analyzed by two independent evaluators in order to assess the data from different viewpoints. The data was then explored for themes related to the concept of stroke. A total of 22 themes were extracted from the transcribed observations. A theme table was drawn for the three groups of teachers to demonstrate the strokes they provided. The three groups of teachers were then compared according to the theme table.

**FINDINGS**

**Quantitative Phase**

In order to answer the first research question, a one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted. The descriptive statistics, displayed in Table 1, provide the information required for the analysis of all dependent variables across three levels.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. D</td>
<td>Std. E</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.1025</td>
<td>.68819</td>
<td>.06882</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.9300</td>
<td>.66764</td>
<td>.06667</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.2275</td>
<td>.56082</td>
<td>.05608</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.0867</td>
<td>.65044</td>
<td>.03755</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.0167</td>
<td>.82555</td>
<td>.08256</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.7467</td>
<td>.74063</td>
<td>.07406</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.3067</td>
<td>.60707</td>
<td>.06071</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.0233</td>
<td>.76274</td>
<td>.04404</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.8000</td>
<td>.97247</td>
<td>.09725</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.4700</td>
<td>1.09883</td>
<td>.10988</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.1500</td>
<td>.74111</td>
<td>.07411</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.8067</td>
<td>.98596</td>
<td>.05692</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.7125</td>
<td>1.04045</td>
<td>.10405</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.2475</td>
<td>1.08100</td>
<td>.10810</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.8425</td>
<td>1.01108</td>
<td>.10111</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2.6008</td>
<td>1.07205</td>
<td>.06189</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.1422</td>
<td>.72014</td>
<td>.07201</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.8372</td>
<td>.71627</td>
<td>.07163</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.3733</td>
<td>.59747</td>
<td>.05975</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3.1176</td>
<td>.71284</td>
<td>.04116</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 1, the variances for the analysis of all the dependent variables are equal in the three subgroups, except for classroom and verbal variables. Therefore, the Welch test was used to examine the second and third dependent variables, whereas one-way ANOVA was employed for the rest of the variables.

**Welch Test**

Based on the results of the Welch test, there are significant differences among the three groups of teachers in terms of verbal $F(2,194,662) = 17.273, p<0.05$, and classroom $F(2,192,329) = 13.827, p<0.05$ strokes.
ANOVA

The results of the ANOVA test indicate a significant difference at the $p < .05$ level among the three groups of teachers in terms of nonverbal ($F(2, 297) = 5.431, p < .05, \eta^2 = .03$), valuing ($F(2, 297) = 8.969, p < .05, \eta^2 = .05$), and total stroke ($F(2, 297) = 15.622, p < .05, \eta^2 = .09$).

Having found statistically significant differences, a post hoc test had to be conducted to exactly determine which subgroup means are different from the others.

Post hoc Tests

Since two of our dependent variables (verbal, and classroom) had unequal variances, the Games-Howell post hoc test was conducted. Since the other dependent variables (nonverbal, valuing and total) proved to have equal variances, the Tukey post hoc test was used.

Games-Howell Test

As for verbal variable, the results indicate that at the significance level of 0.05, the mean score for English teachers ($\bar{x} = 3.0167, SD = 0.82555$) was significantly different from that of Persian ($\bar{x} = 2.7467, SD = 0.74063$) and Arabic teachers ($\bar{x} = 3.3067, SD = 0.60707$). Also, the mean score for Persian teachers was significantly different from that of Arabic teachers (To summarize: Arabic > English > Persian).

As for classroom variable, the results reveal that the mean score for English teachers ($\bar{x} = 3.8000, SD = 0.97247$) is significantly different from that of Arabic teachers ($\bar{x} = 4.1500, SD = 0.74111$). Also, the mean score for Persian teachers ($\bar{x} = 3.4700, SD = 1.09883$) is significantly different from that of Arabic teachers ($\bar{x} = 4.1500, SD = 0.74111$). English teachers and Persian teachers did not differ significantly (To summarize: Arabic > English/ Persian).

Tukey HSD Test

As for nonverbal stroke, the results indicate that at the significance level of 0.05, the mean score for Persian teachers ($\bar{x} = 2.9300, SD = 0.66674$) is significantly different from that of Arabic teachers ($\bar{x} = 3.2275, SD = 0.56082$). The mean score for English teachers ($\bar{x} = 3.1025, SD = 0.68819$) was not significantly different from that of Persian teachers. Also, the mean scores of Arabic and English teachers did not differ significantly (To summarize: Arabic > Persian).

As for valuing stroke, the results indicate that the mean score for English teachers ($\bar{x} = 2.7125, SD = 1.04045$) is significantly different from that of Persian teachers ($\bar{x} = 2.2475, SD = 1.08100$). Also, the mean score for Arabic teachers ($\bar{x} = 2.8425, SD = 1.01108$) is significantly different from that of Persian teachers. However, the mean scores of English and Arabic teachers did not differ significantly. In other words, Arabic and English teachers value students more than Persian teachers (To summarize, Arabic/English > Persian).

As for total stroke, the results reveal that the mean score for English teachers ($\bar{x} = 3.1422, SD = 0.72014$) is significantly different from that of Persian ($\bar{x} = 2.8372, SD = .71627$) and Arabic teachers ($\bar{x} = 3.3733, SD = .59747$). Also, the mean score for Arabic
teachers is significantly different from that of Persian teachers (To summarize, Arabic > English > Persian).

**Qualitative Phase**

The themes extracted from the observation of the three groups of teachers are presented in Table 2. Since most of the extracted themes are similar to the questionnaire items, the same groupings have been applied to the qualitative phase. Ten items are classified under verbal category (2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 20, 21, and 22), the nonverbal theme includes six items (7, 8, 13, 16, 18, and 19), three items fall under the category of valuing theme (1, 5, 14) and three items fall under the category of classroom activities (4, 6, and 9). The teachers are compared with one another based on these four sub-cATEGORIES.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes regarding observation of three groups of teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Greeting students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowing students’ names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Calling students by their first names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Allowing students to ask their questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Answering students’ questions patiently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Getting students to participate in the activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Smiling in the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Having eye contact with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Checking students’ homework assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Motivating students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Complimenting students in front of their classmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Appreciating students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Punishing students (e.g., changing students’ seats, giving negative marks, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Caring about students’ opinions and suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Asking questions from students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Discriminating between students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Arguing with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Having a smile on face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Having a frown on face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Yelling at students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Insulting students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Blaming students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbal Themes:

Knowing students’ names: All the three groups of teachers knew students’ names perfectly and used their names without any effort. One of the teachers looked at the students at the beginning of the class and wrote the names of absentees without calling their names one by one. In another class, when the teacher was calling the roll, she looked at students’ faces with no hesitation.

Calling students by their first names: Most of the English teachers addressed their students by their first names. On the other hand, most of the Arabic and all of the Persian teachers addressed their students by their last names. One of the Arabic teachers
used last names, except for one student, who was apparently her favorite. One of the Persian teachers sometimes addressed her students with a formal you.

Supportiveness: Concerning items 10, 11, 12, 17, 20, 21, and 22, it was found that all the English teachers had a supportive relationship with their students. In fact, these teachers motivated the students by giving bonus marks and appreciated them for asking questions, giving presentations, and expressing their opinions. None of the English teachers argued with students, yelled at them, insulted or blamed them.

Regarding Persian teachers, most of them tried to create a supportive classroom environment. For instance, they appreciated questions raised by the students. One of the Persian teachers appreciated students for sharing their holiday stories with the class. However, another Persian teacher blamed her students for minor mistakes.

As for the Arabic teachers, most of them seemed to be supportive. For example, they appreciated students for doing their assignments and complimented them in front of their classmates. One of the Arabic teachers frequently yelled at students, blamed them over trivial matters, discriminated among them, and spoke to them disrespectfully. In a particular instance, she asked a group of students asked a group of students to shut up.

Asking questions: Most of the Arabic and Persian teachers attempted to ask questions of all students. They went around the room and asked each student one question. One of the Persian teachers only asked questions of less active students and if they could not recite the exact words of the textbook, she either insulted or laughed at them.

Most of the English teachers asked questions of volunteer students. Only one of the English teachers attempted to ask questions of all students, regardless of them being volunteer or not. In fact, she grouped students and assigned each group a number of questions. The students were supposed to practice the questions in their groups. She then asked each group to stand in front of the class and answer a question raised by the teacher.

Nonverbal Themes:

Facial expression and eye contact: Regarding items 7, 8, 18, and 19, it was observed that all the English teachers had a smile on their faces, especially when they were talking to students and answering their questions. These teachers even made one or two funny remarks during class time. Two of the English teachers attempted to maintain eye contact with almost all the students, while the other English teacher mostly maintained eye contact only with the students who were sitting in the front row.

As for the Arabic teachers, most of them maintained a normal facial expression, although they smiled from time to time. They mostly had eye contact with students at the front row.

Most of the Persian teachers, made eye contact with the majority of the students. If one of the students asked a question, these teachers tried to engage other students with the discussion by looking at them while answering. Most of the Persian teachers had a normal facial expression. Only one of them had a huge frown on her face.
Punishing students: It was realized that all of the Arabic teachers punished their students for talking in the class and not doing their assignments. They punished students by giving negative marks, changing their seats, etc. Two of the Arabic teachers warned the students that they have to leave the class if they keep talking. On the contrary, most of the English and Persian teachers did not punish their students.

Discriminating among students: Based on the observations, it was found that students were treated fairly in English language classes. Only one Persian and one Arabic teacher discriminated among their students. For instance, they answered the questions raised by certain students.

Valuing Themes:
Greeting: All of the English teachers and most of the Arabic and Persian teachers greeted students at the beginning of the class. As they entered the class, they greeted students briefly but cheerfully by saying phrases like good morning, hello, how are you doing today.

Answering students’ questions: It was realized that all of the English teachers and most of the Arabic and Persian teachers answered students’ questions patiently. For instance, in one of the English classes, the teacher went toward the students to check whether or not they had any question to ask. While answering, she maintained eye contact with the student who had raised the question and explained the answer with great patience.

Caring about students’ opinions and suggestions: All of the three English teachers valued students’ opinions and suggestions. For instance, in one of the English classes, students requested their teacher to review the grammar by playing a game. She accepted the idea and they enjoyed ten minutes of playing and practicing the grammatical rules. When the observer later asked about her original lesson plan, it was realized that she had intended to teach the grammar lesson and then do the exercises in the book. However, she ended up playing a game. In fact, she did not follow her lesson plan, but allowed room for flexibility based on the students’ needs.

During the observation sessions, it was realized that among the Persian teachers, only one of them cared about students’ opinions. Since the first observation session was the day that students had returned to school from Norooz holidays, the students suggested talking about their holidays. The teacher accepted their suggestion and she was the first to talk about an incident which happened during her vacation.

Also, among the Arabic teachers, only one of them cared about students’ opinions during observations. In her class, before the teacher distributed the quiz papers, students suggested to have a group quiz. She agreed and allowed students to complete the quiz in their groups. The teacher then walked around the class and monitored the students who were discussing the questions in groups.

Classroom Activities Themes:
Allowing students to raise their questions: All of the English teachers allowed students to ask their questions. In one of the English classes, students often raised their hands and could either ask their questions from their seats or go to the teacher’s desk. Whenever the teacher felt that the question might be of benefit to the whole class, she repeated it
louder, so that the whole class could hear the answer. She often nodded her head when listening to the students to indicate that she is paying attention, and then she responded patiently.

Most of the Arabic and Persian teachers allowed students to ask their questions in the classroom. In one of the Persian classes, some students asked repetitive questions. However, instead of getting aggressive, the teacher addressed that particular question one more time. When the same question was raised for a third time, she refused to answer and asked other students to help their classmate with the question after the class.

Getting students to participate: All of the English teachers tried to engage students in class activities. In one of the English classes, the students had voluntarily prepared power point presentations for the class and received bonus marks. They were also supposed to have one or two questions ready to ask of their classmates. The students who answered the questions received positive marks. In this way, not only did the person who presented the power point become engaged, but also the other students tried to pay attention to the presentation in order to answer the questions.

Most of the Persian teachers encouraged student participation in their classes. One of the Persian teachers asked students to comment on their classmates’ answers and build on each other’s ideas. Therefore, students were not merely passive listeners; instead, they became attentive and engaged in the learning process.

Only one of the Arabic Language teachers encouraged her students to participate in class activities. In this class, the teacher divided the students into groups of five. In each session, one group was in charge of teaching a new lesson.

Checking students’ assignments: It was found that all of the English and Persian teachers and most of the Arabic teachers checked students’ homework assignments. They either walked around the room or called out students’ names to check their assignments.

DISCUSSION

With regard to the first research question, the results indicate that Arabic teachers provide more verbal and classroom strokes than English and Persian language teachers. The fact that reading and grammar instruction have become mainstream in foreign language teaching in Iran causes teachers to place a high priority on the accuracy of learners. Moreover, the fact that Arabic is the language of Quran makes it even more important for Iranian learners to enunciate the Arabic words as accurately as possible. A study conducted by Darabad (2013) indicated the effect of corrective feedback on the accuracy of Iranian female foreign language learners. “With regard to the association between teacher feedback and teacher care, both corrective and strategic feedback are positively correlated with stroke, implying that teachers who pay more attention to their students provide more feedback to them” (Pishghadam et al., 2015, p. 74). Since feedback is closely related to the concept of stroke (Hattie & Timperley, 2007), Arabic teachers might have provided their students with more feedback; hence, more stroke.

Regarding nonverbal stroke, Arabic teachers received the highest rank, while Persian teachers ranked last. This finding implies that Arabic teachers tend to be nonverbally more active than Persian teachers. This can be due to the experience of foreign language
anxiety (FLA) among Arabic language learners. Horwitz et al., (1986) conceptualized FLA as a specific type of anxiety which causes students to show negative emotional reactions to foreign language learning situations. Thus, in order to deal with FLA, teachers employ certain strategies. Teacher immediacy is one of these strategies (Ballester, 2015). “Immediacy is a communication behavior and involves verbal and nonverbal elements” (Ballester, 2015, p.10). According to Ballester (2015), verbal teacher immediacy includes verbal messages that show empathy, praise, and willingness to engage students in communication; and nonverbal teacher immediacy includes eye contact, appropriate touching and facial expression. Richmond (2002) stated that teacher immediacy increases student motivation and teacher-student interaction, while it reduces the classroom anxiety. Therefore, since Arabic is considered as a foreign language in Iran, Arabic teachers might have provided more nonverbal strokes in order to reduce FLA among their students.

Regarding valuing, the results were slightly different. Here again, the rating of Arabic teachers was higher than those of English and Persian teachers, although the difference between Arabic and English teachers was not significant in this respect. In other words, Arabic teachers shared the first rank with English teachers, while Persian teachers remained at a lower rank. This finding implies that valuing occurs more in the context of foreign language learning. As previously mentioned, a foreign language learner faces more obstacles in the process of learning a new language and may feel demotivated; therefore, teachers need to employ certain motivational strategies and help foreign language learners adopt more positive attitudes towards language learning (Al Kaboody, 2013). According to Dornyei (1994), one teacher-related motivational component is the teacher’s authority type, that is, whether the teacher is autonomy-supporting or not. Autonomy-supporting teachers let students make choices and initiate activities (Bernard, 2010). These teachers devote enough time to students, share responsibility with them, let them have a say in the class, and involve them in decision-making processes (Dornyei, 1994). Through these strategies, a teacher values the students’ presence in the classroom, recognizes them, and consequently, increases their motivation.

In order to answer the second research question, three groups of teachers were compared with one another. While the quantitative results indicated that the ranking of Arabic teachers was higher than that of English and Persian teachers in most of the sub-components of stroke, the qualitative results demonstrated that English teachers had the first rank in almost all of the sub-components. However, Arabic teachers still had the first rank in providing negative strokes. This difference may be due to the instrument of data collection. In the quantitative section, the instrument of data collection was a questionnaire comprised of 18 items (mostly positive strokes) which addressed a limited number of teacher behaviors. The items in the questionnaire were general; therefore, the students’ answers might not have been exact. Also, the quantitative results were based on students’ perception. On the other hand, the instrument of qualitative data collection was observation. Here, all the actions and behaviors of the teachers were scrutinized and the observed behaviors were described in details. As a result of the observation, a theme table was designed which consisted of 22 items, one third of which were negative strokes.
Based on the observations, it could be said that English teachers still had more positive interaction with students. Here, we can refer to the dominant femininity of English teachers (Pishghadam, et al., 2016) and the individualistic nature of the English culture compared to the collectivistic nature of Arabic and Persian cultures. Having roots in an individualistic culture, Americans reward personal performance (Rohm, 2010). Accordingly, when Iranian teachers teach a language rooted in an individualistic culture, their habitus and identity change over time. So, they are more likely to reward the personal performance of students by giving strokes.

Also, Arabic high school textbooks have been restructured in recent years to be more communicative; as a result, Arabic teachers try to adapt a communicative approach in the classroom. Yet, it seems that the nature of their communication with students is still hierarchical. Since Arab culture is the symbol of collectivism in the world, power distance (Rohm, 2010) and assertiveness towards subordinates (Kramer, 1989) are of high priority. This could be the reason why Arabic teachers give more negative strokes than English and Persian teachers.

CONCLUSION
Since teacher-student interactions result in a productive classroom climate and individual student success, teachers should be aware of the fact that stroking should be an inseparable part of their job and it can be a helpful strategy for classroom management. In this regard, teacher educators need to develop better relationships with pre-service teachers mainly due to the fact that pre-service teachers’ understanding of the concept of teacher stroke is greatly influenced by their relationship with teacher educators. Also, textbook designers should be aware that the more life-like and communicative a textbook is, the more interaction will exist in the classroom, and the more strokes will be provided. Therefore, they need to improve the structure of the textbooks to make room for teacher flexibility. The results of this study indicate that Persian teachers rank the lowest in providing strokes. Due to the close link between language, culture, and identity (Norton, 2000), Persian teachers are obliged to establish caring relationships with students and provide the grounds for more interactions in the classroom in order to enhance national identity.
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İngiliz, İranlı ve Arap Öğretmenlerin Öğrenci Farkındalığı Davranışlarını İncelemek: Bir Karma Yöntem Çalışması
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**French Abstract**

Examiner le Comportement de Caresses d’anglais, persan et des Professeurs Scolaires arabes en Iran: une Étude de Méthodes mixtes

La qualité de relations d’étudiant-professeur affecte grandement la vie universitaire des étudiants. Les étudiants doivent être reconnus par leur professeur. Une façon par laquelle un tel besoin peut
être accompli reçoit des attaques (coups) (l'attention de professeur). Dans un large sens, on connaît que l'attaque (le coup) est une unité de reconnaissance humaine (Berne, 1988). En conséquence, le courant mixte (mélange) - l'étude de méthodes a pour but d'examiner les différences parmi l'anglais, des professeurs scolaires persans et arabes en Iran se rapportant à leur comportement de caresses et voir comment les trois groupes de professeurs diffèrent à cet égard. Pour accomplir le premier but, 300 étudiantes de quatrième ont complété un questionnaire à 18 articles et les données de questionnaire ont été analysées par ANOVA à sens unique. Les résultats ont révélé que les professeurs arabes caressent des étudiants plus que les professeurs anglais et persans. Quant au deuxième but, neuf anglais, des professeurs persans et arabes étaient chaque observés pour trois sessions. L'analyse des observations démontrées que professeurs anglais outstroke étudiants. Finalement, ces découvertes ont été discutées dans le contexte d'instruction de langue.

Mots Clés: en caressant comportement, cours, professeurs scolaires féminins, étudiantes, instruction de langue

Arabic Abstract
دراسة السلوك التمسيد لمعلمين مدارس اللغة الإنجليزية، والفارسية، واللغة العربية في إيران: دراسة الطرق المختلطة
نوعية العلاقات بين المعلم والطالب يؤثر إلى حد كبير الحياة الأكاديمية للطلاب. لذلك، ينصح بالدروس التي يكون فيها المعلم يتعاون مع الطالب. من المعلوم أن التفاعل بين المعلم والطالب يمكن أن يكون من خلال سلوكيات الطالب. في الوقت الذي يكون فيه الطالب يتعاون مع المعلم، ينفذ المعلم سلوكًا. ومن المعلوم أن السلوك المتعلق بالتعليم يمثل وحدة من إدراك الإنسان (Berne, 1988). وفقًا لذلك، تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحقيق الخلافات بين معلمي المدارس الإنجليزية، والفارسية، واللغة العربية في إيران المتعلقة بالسلوك التمسيد. ليتم ذلك خلال تحليل الأدوات واتخاذ تقرير. بكم من طلابدرس لغة إنجليزية، معلم فارسي، ومحاضر. تم تحليل النتائج باستخدام ANOVA-One Way. أظهرت النتائج أن الطلاب مع معلم اللغة العربية السكتة الدماغية أكثر من الطلاب مع المعلم الفارسي. أما المعلم الإنجليزية، لم تظهر كل تسعة معلمين إنجليزية اللغة الفارسية واللغة العربية للأبناء. خارج النتائج، تم مناقشة هذه النتائج في سياق تعليم اللغة.

كلمات رئيسية: التمسيد السلوك، السكتة الدماغية، تحليل

German Abstract
Untersuchung des Streichverhaltens von englischen, persischen und arabischen Schullehrern im Iran: Eine Mixed-Method-Studie

Schlüsselwörter: streicheln verhalten, kurs, weibliche lehrer, weibliche studenten, sprachunterricht
Examining the Stroking Behavior of English, Persian ...