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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±.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.
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Öz

Bu araştırmının amacı, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce (YDİ) öğretmenlerinin saldırgan iletişim biçimleri ve öğrencilerin duyuşsal öğrenme ve strateji kullanımları arasındaki ilişkilerin incelemesi amaçlanmıştır. Araştırmaya Yunanca konuşan ve YDİ lisans öğrencisi olan, 18-23 yaşları arasında (X=20.3±.68) 148 öğrenci (39 erkek ve 109 kadın) katılmıştır. Araştırmannın bulgularına göre YDİ öğretmenlerinin sözlü saldırganlıklarını, tartışmacı olma durumları ile negatif yönlü ilişkilidir. Aynı zamanda regresyon analizi sonuçlarına göre öğretmenlerin algılanan sözlü saldırganlıklarını ve tartışmacı olma durumlarını, öğrencilerin duyuşsal öğrenmeleri, sosyal ve duyuşsal strateji kullanımları değişiklerini anlamalı düzeyde yordayabilir. Bahsedilen bulgular üstünda, öğretmenlerin sözlü saldırganlıklarının öğrencilerin duygularına, dolayısıyla öğrenme süreçlerine, olumsuz etkilerinin olabileceği sonucuna ulaşılabilir.
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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 & Syrmpas, 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 meta-cognition 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 meditation, 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 (Saiedi & 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 Syrmpas 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 (Syrmpas & 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 α 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 α 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 (α = .94) and affective strategies (α = .95) were high too (see Table 1). The factors of affect towards the content (α = .91), affect towards the course behavior (α = .89), and affect towards the teacher behavior (α = .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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal aggressiveness</td>
<td>3.07 (1.06)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentativeness</td>
<td>2.77 (1.01)</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social strategies</td>
<td>2.84 (1.17)</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective strategies</td>
<td>2.92 (1.14)</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect towards content</td>
<td>2.69 (1.05)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect towards course behavior</td>
<td>3.01 (1.06)</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect towards teacher behavior</td>
<td>2.67 (1.16)</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**

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

** 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 R² of 89%. Perceived verbal aggressiveness explained 14% of the variance in students’ affect towards content (β=-.42, t(141)=-4.94, p<.001), 8% of the variance in students’ affect towards course (β=-.35, t(141)=-3.68, p<.001), 8% of the variance in students’ affect towards teacher (β=-.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 R² of 90%. Verbal aggressiveness explained 22% of the variance in students’ social strategy use (β=-.66, t(143)=-6.33, p<.001) and 6% of the variance in students’ affective strategy use (β=-.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

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

**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% ($β=.32, t_{(141)}=4.70, p<.001$) of the variance in students’ affect towards content, 8% ($β=.20, t_{(141)}=2.59, p<.001$) of the variance in students’ affect towards course, and 25% ($β=.48, t_{(141)}=6.83, p<.001$) 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% ($β=.59, t_{(143)}=6.53, p<.001$) of the variance in students’ social strategies and 21% of the variance in students’ affective strategies ($β=.38, t_{(143)}=4.15, p<.001$). The results of both regression analyses are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Regression analysis results according to argumentativeness

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

**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 ilişki özelliğinden (diğer ikisi dayatma ve düşmanlık) ikisini oluşturmaktadır (Costa & MacRae, 1980; Infante, 1987). Sözlü saldırganlık kişiliğe saldırdı, yeterliliğe saldırdı, fiziksel görünüşe saldırdı, kıskırtma, tehdit ve küfretme şeklinde birçok farklı biçimde ortaya çıkabilir ve insan ilişkilerine olumsuz etkileri olan yüksek bir ilişki 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 şikayetlerin, kişisel tartışmalarda ise sözlü saldırganlığa ilişkin şikayetlerin fazla olduğunu belirt-


**Yöntem**

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


Bulgular

Bulgular ölçme araçlarının iç tutarlığını desteklemiştir. Cronbach α güvenirlik katsayları, 8 maddelik sözlü saldırı ölçeği (Bekiari & Digelidis, 2015) için .91 ve tartışmacı olma ölçeği (Syrmpas & Bekiari, 2015) için .89 olarak belirlenmiştir. Sosyal stratejiler (α = .94) ve duyuşsal stratejiler (α = .95) boylarını için de yüksek belirlenmiştir. Duyuşsal öğrenme ölçeğine bakıldığında, içeriğe yönelik duygu boyu (α = .91), ders davranışlarına yönelik duygu boyu (α = .89) ve öğretmen davranışlarına yönelik duygu boyu (α = .93) için güvenirlik düzeyi yüksek çıkmıştır.

Bunlara ek olarak korelasyon analizlerine bakıldığında, öğretmenlerin sözlü saldırınlık ve tartışmacı olma durumları (r=.89) ile sosyal stratejiler (r=.87), duyuşsal stratejiler (r=.89), içeriğe yönelik duygu (r=.69), ders davranışlarına yönelik duygu (r=.82) ve öğretmen davranışlarına yönelik duygu (r=.86) arasındaki negatif yönlü bir ilişki belirlenmiştir. Bulgulara göre, YDİ öğretmenlerinin algılanan sözlü saldırınlıkları, tartışmacı olmaları ve öğrencilerin sosyal, duyuşsal strateji kullanımları, dersin içeriğine yönelik duygu düzeyleri, ders davranışlarına yönelik duygu ve son olarak öğretmen davranışları ile negatif yönlü olarak ilişkilidir.

Öğretmenlerin sözlü saldırınlıklarının öğrencilere sosyal ve duyuşsal stratejilerini ve duyuşsal öğrenmelerini de düzeyde yordadığı belirlemek için basit regresyon analizleri yapılmıştır. Bulgulara göre YDİ öğretmenlerinin algılanan sözlü saldırınlıkları, duyuşsal öğrenmenin %89’lu (R²) bir varyansını açıklayarak anlamlı düzeyde yordayabileceğini tespit edilmiştir (F(3,144)=411.82, p<.001). Öğrencilerin sosyal ve duyuşsal stratejilerinin, öğretmenlerin sözlü saldırınlıkları tarafından ne düzeyde yordandığı belirlemek için bir başka doğrusal regresyon analizi yapılmıştır. Bulgulara göre YDİ öğretmenlerinin algılanan sözlü saldırınlıklarının sosyal ve duyuşsal...
stratejilerin %90’lık (R²) bir varyansını açıklık 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 yönelliğin duyuşlarını ne düzeyde yordayacağını belirlemek için de regresyon analizi yapılmıştır. Burada %91’lik bir R² orani ile anlamlı bir regresyon eşitiği (F(3,144)=691.75, p<.001) elde edilmiştir. YDİ öğretmenlerinin algılanan tartışmacı olma durumlarının, öğrencilerin sosyal ve duyusal strateji kullanımlarını ne düzeyde yordayacağını belirlemek için de başka bir regresyon analizi yapılmıştır. Burada da %94’lik bir R² orani ile anlamlı bir regresyon eşitiği (F(2,145)=769.05, p<.001) elde edilmiştir. Böylece regresyon analizi sonuçları öğretmenlerin algılanan sözlü saldırganlıkları ve tartışmacı olma durumlarının, öğrencilerin duyusal öğrenme, sosyal ve duyusal strateji kullanımlarını anlamlandı düzeyde yordayabileceği belirlenmiştir.

Tartışma

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


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