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Abstract: The study aims to identify and describe forms and patterns of teachers’ basic behavior in teaching-learning processes based on Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation (F.I.R.O.) theory. The study is descriptive qualitative in which its sample consists of four permanent teachers of English Education Department who have at least five years of experience in teaching-learning processes. FIRO-Behavior analysis was used as the techniques of data analysis in order to investigate teachers’ basic behavior in the classroom. The results indicate that teachers’ basic behavior tends to be more dominant which is categorized in inclusion as social, control as democratic, and openness as personal in establishing interpersonal relationships with students. Teachers tend to act as clarifiers and directors so that the given input and feedback in supporting students through language exposure and learning experiences were not optimal.
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STUDI PERILAKU PEMBELAJARAN PENGAJAR DI DALAM KELAS BAHASA INGGRIS BERDASARKAN TEORI F.I.R.O
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INTRODUCTION

Learning involves acquiring and modifying knowledge, skills, strategies, beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors. Schunk (2012: p.3) states that learning is an enduring change in behavior, or in the capacity to behave in a given fashion, which results from practice or other forms of experience. In teaching-learning processes, language interaction and communication are always generated intentionally between teachers and students. It proves and confirms that language plays an important role in a learning process. Teacher talk is of crucial importance, not only for the organization of the classroom but also for the process of acquisition. It is through language that teachers either succeed or fail in implementing their plans. In terms of acquisition, teacher talk is important because it is the major source of comprehensible target language input the learner is likely to receive (Setiawati, 2012: p.35).

Meanwhile, students’ language abilities are different from one another; there are students who speak fluently, but there are also a student who have stutter speech, convoluted, and unclear. Therefore, the teachers’ role and support are needed to deliver teaching materials which have been previously analyzed, modified, or transformed into a form that is more abstract or conceptual in order to be useful in a broader context (Iskandarwassid & Sunendar, 2011: p.34). Language used by teachers, especially verbal language, functions as a means in delivering messages that refer to the contents of teaching-learning and education in the curriculum. Imagine what would happen if the language used by a teacher could not be understood by the students. The contents of the message in the form of teaching and learning will not be delivered to the students.

The role of teachers in making classroom climate conducive for learning is highly crucial. The classroom climate is built up upon the pattern of interaction between teacher and student’s verbal exchanges, asking questions, responding, and reacting. The most important factor in a classroom situation is the interactions and exchanges initiated by teacher and students. Jhonston (2003: p.4) states that teaching is not ultimately just about methods or the efficient psycholinguistic learning of the language by students. Rather, it is about teachers’ relation with their students as people, with the way we treat them. Teachers typically do not think of themselves as role models, however, inadvertently they are. Students spend a great deal of time with their teacher and therefore, the teacher becomes a role model to them. In Liu Yanfen and Zhao Yuqin’s (2010: p.85) study about teacher talk, they found out that teacher talk plays an important role in teacher-students interaction. Teachers have to use efficient language for the students in teaching and learning process so that feedback from the students would be positive. In addition, Xu Xiaohui (2010: p.49) in his study also found that most EFL students use teacher as input and model for learning where teachers should consciously improve their questioning behavior.

Teachers’ behavior is an important part in the whole process of learning that does not only help in determining how well a teacher teaches, but also in determining how well the students learn.

Learning English as a foreign language is a process that requires active teacher as resources in the classroom learning process so that the communicative interaction would
be set up along with effective and efficient atmosphere for students. As an integral part of foreign language learning, teachers’ behavior has its own features. In addition, teachers will do a lot of interaction such as the kind of questions they ask, the speech modifications they make when talking to students, or the way they react to students’ errors which will generate more interaction between teachers and students.

Deep understanding and appropriate use of teachers’ behavior in the learning process are expected to create an interactive communication in the classroom which provides opportunities and broader choice for students to know and understand the teaching materials as well as to gain positive benefit for the teachers themselves. As a result, the ongoing learning process to achieve optimal results in accordance with the purpose of learning itself would succeed.

In the framework of teaching and learning process in the classroom, Johnson (1995 in Ribas, 2010: p.11) states that teachers have tendency to control the pattern of communication. It comes from special status of teacher and from the way they use language. It means that teachers normally decide when, where, and for whom language is used in the classroom. In short, it can be said that teachers’ control behavior influences the extent to which students use the target language (English) during the lesson.


Moreover, Gustavsen (1992: pp.3-4), stated that there is a need for a concept of communication to function as the key theoretical underpinning which is called democratic dialogue. The idea of democratic dialogue played this key role. It is operationalized in the following criteria: (1) The dialogue is a process of exchange: idea and arguments move to and from between the participants. (2) It must be possible for all concerned to participate. (3) This possibility for participants is, however, not enough. Everybody should also be active. Consequently each participant has an obligation not only to put forth his or her own ideas but also to help others to contribute their ideas. (4) All participants are equal. (5) Works experience is the basis for participation. This is the only type of experience which, by definition, all participant have. (6) At least some of the experiences which each participant has when entering the dialogue must be considered legitimate. (7) It must be possible for everybody to develop an understanding of the issues at stake. (8) All arguments which pertain to the issue under discussion are legitimate. No argument should be rejected on the ground that it emerges from an illegitimate source. (9) The points, arguments, etc., which are to enter the dialogue must be made by a participant actor. Nobody can participate “on paper” only. (10) Each participant must accept that other participants may have better arguments. (11) All the participants may be
made subject to discussion – no participant is exempt in this respect. (12) The participants should be able to tolerate an increasing degree of difference of opinions. (13) The dialogue must continuously produce agreements which can provide platforms for practical action.

From a Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) perspective, it is important for teachers to monitor both the quantity and the communicative quality of teacher behavior in order to promote and maximize authentic and meaningful communication within the confines of the classroom. Nunan (1987) and Thornbury (1996) as cited in Peppard (2009: p. 309) describe features of communicative teacher as follows: (1) Referential Questions (RQ): these are genuine questions in which the teacher does not know the answer. (2) Content feedback (CF): the teacher responds to the content of student messages. (3) Increase wait time for students’ answers: waiting three to four seconds, instead of just one, has been shown to result in more student’s response, longer answer, and more students-initiated questions. (4) Student-initiated/controlled talk: this should include the right for students to decide for themselves whether or not they want to participate in a discussion. (5) Negotiation of meaning (N) exchanges e.g. requests for clarification and comprehension checks.

Interaction is the collaborative exchange of thoughts, feelings or ideas, between two or more people. Through interaction, students are able to improve their language skills and has the opportunity to understand and to use language. In this study, it is the oral form of teacher talk instead of written form that is under this investigation. It refers to the language that teachers use in language classrooms rather than in other settings.

On the other hand, Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation (FIRO) theory of needs which is proposed by William Schutz (1958 in Attri & Kaul, 2011: p.1045) claims to account for both the what and the why of an individual actions’ toward others. The theory states that all humans possess three needs in doing relationship with others. They are: needs of inclusion, needs of control, and needs of openness (formerly affection). Inclusion is about recognition, belonging, participation, contact with others, and how you relate to groups. Control is about concerns influence, leadership, responsibility, and decision making. Openness is about closeness, warmth, sensitivity, openness, and how you relate to others.

FIRO theory provides the foundation for understanding how to develop sustainable, high-trust, collaborative relationships. Behavior is motivated by self-concept, which develops at the very core of our being. Our self-concept represents how we feel about ourselves, and how we feel about ourselves informs how we feel about others. These self-feelings correspond at the interpersonal feeling level with our desire to feel significant, competent and likable. How we feel about ourselves dictate our behaviors and impact everyone around us. Being productive, creative, innovative, and ethical all evolve from the core of our being. What motivates human behavior is essential for unleashing human potential and productivity. By creating environments that invite people to feel significant, competent and likable, someone reduce the level of fear and create environments that are more conducive to honesty, collaboration, accountability and fun.

FIRO theory is one of the foundation of cognitive pragmatics which has been widely used in different areas. Teaching and
learning process in classrooms can be seen as team where teachers as leader play important role in determining students’ learning success. EFL teachers’ input and/or feedback plays critical role in language learning. There is no learning without input. The language used by the teacher affects the language produced by the learners, the interaction generated, and hence the kind of learning that takes place. The problem is what type and how much of input and/or feedback is appropriate and useful for language learners in classrooms. This is the reason why, in the following sections, empirical studies dealing with teacher talk will be discussed in the light of FIRO theory.

In accordance with the explanations above, some conditions appeared during the EFL teaching-learning processes as the results of incomprehensible input given by teachers such as: lack of students’ participation in the learning process and activities, low quality and meaningless talk in the learning process and activities, the talk does not always encourage the learning process and activities in the classroom, lack of students’ involvement in decision making, low quality and quantity of students’ contribution to the classroom talk in the learning process, teachers tend to talk more during the whole-class teaching, lack of structured and cumulative questioning and guided discussion which can engage students, stimulate and extend their thinking and advance their learning and understanding, and low proficiency among students to communicate in English.

In order to be more focused and have in-depth discussions, the object of study focused on teacher talk during various types of activities occurring within EFL teaching-learning processes. This study is designed to answer the following questions: What are teacher’s basic behavior based on FIRO theory in English Education Department of Musamus University? The major objectives of the research are to describe forms and patterns of teachers’ basic behavior based on FIRO theory in EFL teaching-learning processes at the English Education Department of Musamus University.

This study is expected to contribute to the development of science and teaching, especially relating to the selection and use of teacher talk in learning processes and activities. Students are expected to be more focused and easily understand the material that has been delivered. Teachers have to be more selective, creative, and communicative in learning processes and activities so that the material presented is to be more easily to be understood. Moreover, for the institutions, it is expected to be an input material and evaluation in teaching-learning process as well as a reference to the continuous development of competencies of teachers in the particular field of teaching-learning English as foreign language.

METHOD OF THE STUDY

This study is a descriptive qualitative which is focused on identifying and describing forms and patterns of teachers’ basic behavior shared in English classroom. Isaac & Michael (1981: p.46) state that descriptive research is used in the literal sense of describing systematically the facts, situations, or events of a given population or area of interest, factually and accurately.

Moreover, the study is also qualitative meaning that it is holistically in gathering, analyzing, and interpreting the data to gain insights into a particular phenomenon of interest (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006: p.9).

The study has been conducted in January to May 2014 in English Education Department of Musamus University in Merauke.
The purposive sampling was used in this study since it was used in order to access ‘knowledgeable people’ for instance those who have in-depth knowledge about particular issues by the virtue of their professional experiences in EFL teaching-learning (Ball as cited in Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007: p.115). That is why this study only focused on four full-time lecturers (DT) in English Education Department which has more than five years experienced in teaching and learning English.

The object of this research is teachers’ basic behavior in doing teaching and learning processes in EFL classroom.

The study used FIRO-B instrument, observation, documentation, and data card as instruments for collecting the data. Will Schutz’s FIRO-B Questionnaires was used to collect the data and find out the basic behavior of teachers. It was given to teachers of English Education Department in order to find out their basic behavior in doing interpersonal relationship. Observation sheet was used to observe and to document teacher talks and the interactions between teacher and students which occur in the teaching and learning processes based on IRF/E move. Video camera documentation was used in order to get supported data about teacher talk so that the result would be ideal. Data card was used to categorize collected data from another instruments such as observation and video camera documentation.

The study used descriptive and qualitative data analysis techniques. In descriptive technique, the FIRO-B questionnaire is analyzed using FIRO-B scoring sheet to assign teachers’ expressed and wanted behavior for each dimension: Inclusion (I), Control (C), and Openness (O).

In qualitative, Classroom Discourse Analysis was used. It focuses on the way behavior is structured by analyzing the text closely and noting patterns of interaction such as who initiates topics, how the teacher or lecturer gives task instructions, and how feedback in what Sinclair and Coulthard identified as IRF (Christie, 2002: p. 4). In addition, Classroom Discourse Analysis (CDA) was also used to look at the entire conversation discourse (encompassing all of the teacher talk, student talk, and turn-taking mechanisms) as part of the second language classroom interaction.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The FIRO-B instrument is designed to measure personality characteristics on three dimensions: Inclusion (I), Control (C), and Affection (A). Each of them has two aspects: how someone tends to express or behave toward others and how someone wants or receives other people behavior toward him/her. In short, FIRO-B instrument identifies personality characteristics on six dimensions: Expressed Affection (EA), Wanted Affection (WA), Expressed Inclusion (EI), Wanted Inclusion (WI), Expressed Control (EC), and Wanted Control (WC). Scores on the test range from 0 to 9 for each of the six sub-cells are divided into three sub-levels: Low, Medium/Moderate, and High as stated by Attr. R & D. Kaul (2011: pp.1047-1048) that: Inclusion, control, and openness from 0-2 are considered extremely low and scores from 7-9 are considered extremely high scores. The scores in the range of 3-6 are taken as moderate/medium scores.

Meanwhile, Mansfield, Winters, & Waner (2012: p.3) argued that a high “expressed” score indicates that the individual thinks he or she exhibits this behavior, while a high “wanted” score indicates that he or she wants others to act this way in relationship to him/her. Affection and Inclusion are somewhat similar, while Control is quite different. For example, someone who has great affection for others probably wants it in return;
likewise, someone who likes to include everyone also wants to be included. On the other hand, someone who prefers to exercise control usually does not like to be controlled by others.

Teacher 1 (T1)

Tabel 1. T1's FIRO-B Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>( \sum )E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>El</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \sum = 7 \) \( \sum = 1 \) \( \sum = 8 \) SII/OIN 16

It can be seen that the strongest interpersonal need of T1 is Affection, the level of Social Interaction Index (SII) or Overall Interpersonal Needs (OIN) is medium-low, and relationship between behavior is Express is the same with Wanted.

T1's Overall Interpersonal Needs score (16) falls in the medium-low range. The result shows that T1's involvement with others sometimes be a source of satisfaction, depending on the people and context. T1's likely work most effectively alone, but can enjoy working with others when the objectives are focused. He is probably most comfortable when his work involves concentration on data or ideas and occasional discussions with or presentations to others.

Meanwhile, the relationship between behavior in Expressed score (8) is the same with Wanted score (8). It means that T1 may be cautious in doing interpersonal relationship with others.

T1 Total Need scores for Inclusion, Control, and Affection (7, 1, and 8) reflect the overall strength of each need. Inclusion (7) is medium range. It means T1 is social person meaning that he sometimes want to include others in activities but only when the situation requires so while keeping his visibility and involvement appropriate to the situation at hand. Control (1) is low range. It means T1 is abdicrat meaning that he accepts control from those in authority, he is not interested in gaining influence, and he is loyal and cooperative follower.

The pattern of T1 needs fulfillment of expressed inclusion and wanted inclusion as indicated by the box above shows that he is social person meaning that he sometimes include others and like to be included. He may sometimes enjoy the opportunity to provide input and sometimes he does not like to get cut off from information and updates.

T1’s Overall Interpersonal Needs score (16) falls in the medium-low range. The result shows that T1's involvement with others sometimes be a source of satisfaction, depending on the people and context. T1’s likely work most effectively alone, but can enjoy working with others when the objectives are focused. He is probably most comfortable when his work involves concentration on data or ideas and occasional discussions with or presentations to others.

Meanwhile, the relationship between behavior in Expressed score (8) is the same with Wanted score (8). It means that T1 may be cautious in doing interpersonal relationship with others.

The pattern of T1 needs fulfillment of expressed inclusion and wanted inclusion as indicated by the box above shows that he is social person meaning that he sometimes include others and like to be included. He may sometimes enjoy the opportunity to provide input and sometimes he does not like to get cut off from information and updates.

The pattern of T1 needs fulfillment of expressed control and wanted control as indicated by the box above shows that he is abdicrat meaning that he accepts control from those in authority, he is not interested in gaining influence, and he is loyal and cooperative follower.

The pattern of T1 needs fulfillment of expressed affection and wanted affection as indicated by the box above shows that he sometimes expresses and wants to support colleagues verbally and physically, he sometimes gives gifts to show appreciation to others and wants it in return, sometimes exhibits concern about the personal lives of others and wants others do the same to him, and sometimes expresses and wants being trustworthy and loyal.
Teacher 2 (T2)

Table 3. T2’s FIRO-B Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>∑E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>EI</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>∑E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>∑W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>∑=8</td>
<td>∑=7</td>
<td>∑=8</td>
<td>SII/OIN 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that the strongest interpersonal need of T2 is both Inclusion and Affection, the level of social interaction index or overall interpersonal needs is medium-low, and relationship between behavior in Expressed is lower than Wanted.

T2 Total Need scores for Inclusion, Control, and Affection (8, 7, and 8) reflect the overall strength of each need. Inclusion (8) is medium range. It means T2 would sometimes want to include others in activities but only when the situation requires so while keeping his visibility and involvement appropriate to the situation at hand. Control (7) is medium range. It means T2 would sometimes try to exert control and influence over things and is comfortable providing structure and direction in those situations where it is sensible and expected and he would sometimes feel comfortable working in well-defined situations and tries to get clear expectations and situations. Tolerates influence from others in selected situations. Affection (8) is medium range. It means T2 would sometimes make an effort to come close to people but shows warmth and supportive side to particular people and when circumstances are appropriate and he would sometimes want people to act warm towards him and has a chosen set of circumstances when he is comfortable letting others get close and support him.

T2's Overall Interpersonal Needs score (23) falls in the medium-low range. The result shows that T2's involvement with others sometimes be a source of satisfaction, depending on the people and context. He likely work most effectively alone, but can enjoy working with others when the objectives are focused. He is probably most comfortable when his work involves concentration on data or ideas and occasional discussions with or presentations to others.

Meanwhile, the relationship between behavior in Expressed score (11) is lower than Wanted score (12). It means that T2 may feel inhibited, may be dissatisfied that others are not getting what he wants, and he could grow attached to people who give him what he wants.

Table 4. T2’s Interpersonal Pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>EC</th>
<th>EA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Underpersonal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Rebellious</td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern of T2 needs fulfillment of expressed inclusion and wanted inclusion as indicated by the box above shows that, in both expressed and wanted inclusion, he is a social person meaning that sometimes include others and like to be included. He may sometimes enjoy the opportunity to provide input and sometimes he does not like to get cut off from information and updates.

The pattern of T2 needs fulfillment of expressed control and wanted control as indicated by the box above shows that, in expressed control, he is a democrat person meaning that he may sometimes typically controlling and influencing others and situations, organizing and directing others, and assuming responsibility. While, in wanted control, he is a rebellious person meaning that he is likely not let others involve in decision making, he is likely not let others asking for permission and circulating progress details, and he is likely not let others to deffer to the wishes, needs, and requests.

The pattern of T2 needs fulfillment of expressed affection and wanted affection as indicated by the box above shows that, in expressed affection, he is an underpersonal meaning that he is likely not get being flexible and accommodating, he is likely not get listening carefully to others, he is likely
not get displaying an open body posture, and he is likely not get sharing feeling of anxiety, sadness, or loneliness. While, in wanted affection, he is personal meaning that he may sometimes wants other people to do things that he is likely not to get.

Teacher 3 (T3)

Table 5. T3’s FIRO-B Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>ΣE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>EI</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Σ=5</td>
<td>Σ=9</td>
<td>Σ=6</td>
<td>SII/OIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From those table above, it can be seen that the strongest interpersonal need of T3 is control, the level of social interaction index or overall interpersonal needs is medium-low, and relationship between behavior in Expressed is higher than Wanted.

T3’s Total Need scores for Inclusion, Control, and Affection (5, 9, and 6) reflect the overall strength of each need. Inclusion (5) is low range. It means T3 does not make an effort to include others in activities and exhibits very low interpersonal contact with people at work and she usually does not want to be included in group activities and prefers low interpersonal contact with people there. Control (9) is medium range. It means T3 would sometimes try to exert control and influence over things and she is comfortable providing structure and direction in those situations where it is sensible and expected, and she would sometimes feel comfortable working in well-defined situations and tries to get clear expectations and situations. Tolerates influence from others in selected situations. Affection (6) is medium range. It means T3 would sometimes make an effort to come close to people but shows warmth and supportive side to particular people and when circumstances are appropriate. She also would sometimes want people to act warm towards her and has a chosen set of circumstances when she is comfortable letting others get close and support her.

T3’s Overall Interpersonal Needs score (20) falls in the medium-low range. This result shows that T3’s involvement with others sometimes be a source of satisfaction, depending on the people and context. She likely work most effectively alone, but can enjoy working with others when the objectives are focused. She is probably most comfortable when her work involves concentration on data or ideas and occasional discussions with or presentations to others.

Meanwhile, the relationship between behavior in Expressed score (13) is higher than Wanted score (7). It means that T3 would keep others at a distance to avoid unwanted behaviors, she would only accept behaviors from particular people, and she mislead people making conclusion based on expressed behavior.

Table 6. T3’s Interpersonal Patter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EI</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Façade of Self Sufficiency</td>
<td>Façade of Self Sufficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern of T3 needs fulfillment of expressed inclusion and wanted inclusion as indicated by the box above shows that, in expressed inclusion, she is a social person meaning that sometimes talking and joking with others, taking a personal interest in others, involving others in projects or meetings, and recognizing the accomplishment of others. It can be said that she may sometimes enjoy having a steady amount of interpersonal contact at work.

Moreover, in her wanted inclusion, T3 is façade of self sufficiency person meaning that likely not get seeking recognition or responsibility. She is also likely not get going along with the majority opinion.

The pattern of T3 needs fulfillment of expressed control and wanted control as indicated by the box above shows that, in
expressed control, she is a democrat meaning that she may sometimes typically controlling and influencing others and situations, organizing and directing others, and assuming responsibility. While, in wanted control, she is also a democrat meaning that may sometimes asking for help on the job, involving others in decision making, asking for permission and circulating progress details.

The pattern of T3 needs fulfillment of expressed affection and wanted affection as indicated by the box above shows that, in expressed affection, she is personal meaning that she may sometimes get supporting colleagues verbally and physically, giving gift gift to show appreciation, exhibiting concern about the personal lives of others, and being trustworthy and loyal to others. While, in wanted affection, she is façade of self sufficiency meaning that she is likely not get being flexible and accomodating, listening carefully to others, displaying an open body posture, and sharing feeling of anxiety, sadness, or loneliness.

Teacher 4 (T4)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>∑E</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>∑W</th>
<th>∑=4</th>
<th>∑=5</th>
<th>∑=8</th>
<th>SII/OIN</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>EI</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>WC</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From those tables above, it can be seen that the strongest interpersonal need of T4 is affection, the level of social interaction index or overall interpersonal needs is medium-low, and relationship between behavior in Expressed is higher than Wanted.

T4 Total Need scores for Inclusion, Control, and Affection (4, 5, and 8) reflect the overall strength of each need. Inclusion (4) is low range. It means T4 does not make an effort to include others in activities and exhibits very low interpersonal contact with people at work and she usually does not want to be included in group activities and prefers low interpersonal contact with people as a facade of self-sufficiency is there. Control (5) is low range. It means T4 usually avoids exerting control and influence over things and avoids providing too much structure and direction for others and she is also rebellious that usually does not want to be controlled and directed by others around. Affection (8) is medium range. It means T4 would sometimes make an effort to come close to people but shows warmth and supportive side to particular people and when circumstances are appropriate. She also would sometimes want people to act warm towards him and has a chosen set of circumstances when he is comfortable letting others get close and support him.

T4’s Overall Interpersonal Needs score (17) falls in the medium-low range. The result shows that T4’s involvement with others sometimes be a source of satisfaction, depending on the people and context. She likely work most effectively alone, but can enjoy working with others when the objectives are focused. She is probably most comfortable when her work involves concentration on data or ideas and occasional discussions with or presentations to others.

Furthermore, the relationship between behavior is Expressed score (10) is higher than Wanted score, (7). It means that T4 would keep others at a distance to avoid unwanted behaviors, she would only accept behaviors from particular people, and she mislead people making conclusion based on expressed behavior.

The pattern of T4 needs fulfillment of expressed inclusion and wanted inclusion as indicated by the box above shows that, in
expressed inclusion, she is a social person meaning that she sometimes talking and joking with others, taking a personal interest in others, involving others in projects or meetings, and recognizing the accomplishment of others. It can be said that she may sometimes enjoy having a steady amount of interpersonal contact at work.

Meanwhile, in her wanted inclusion, T4 is façade of self sufficiency meaning that she is likely not get seeking recognition or responsibility. She is also likely not get going along with the majority opinion.

The pattern of T4 needs fulfillment of expressed control and wanted control as indicated by the box above shows that, in expressed control, she is a democrat person meaning that she may sometimes assuming position of authority, advancing ideas within the group, taking a competitive stance and making winning priority, and managing conversation. While, in wanted control, she is a rebellious person meaning that she is likely not let asking for help on the job, involving others in decision making, asking for permission and circulating progress details.

The pattern of T4 needs fulfillment of expressed affection and wanted affection as indicated by the box above shows that, in expressed affection, she is personal meaning that she may sometimes express to support colleagues verbally and physically, giving gift to show appreciation, exhibiting concern about the personal lives of others, and being trustworthy and loyal to others. While, in wanted affection, she is also personal meaning that she sometimes want to get being flexible and accommodating, listening carefully to others, displaying an open body posture, and sharing feeling of anxiety, sadness, or loneliness.

Teachers as manager and leader in the classroom play various types of roles depending on his/her interpersonal needs and the needs of members within a group. Schnell (2005: p.7) states that there are three important roles that individuals can play in a group. They are clarifier means presents issues or solutions for clarification, summarizes discussion, introduces new members to the team, keeps team members up-to-date, and provides the group with facts and data. Director means pushes for action and decision making; has lots to say and wants to say it in meetings; may be overly optimistic about what can be accomplished by the group. Encourager means builds up the egos and status of others; remains friendly, responsive, warm, and diplomatic; may also sacrifice the truth to maintain good relationships.

Language teachers, planning for learners to become communicatively competent, need to develop awareness of their own communicative strategies in linguistic exchange. After finding teachers’ behavior using FIRO-B questionnaire and classified their talks based on its functions in form of IRF/E interactional pattern, it is found that mostly teachers initiated the interaction by initiating (I), directing (D) and questioning (Q).

Walsh (2002) as cited in Faruji (2011: p.1821) stated that maximizing learners involvement seem to be beneficial to second language acquisition. Since the amount of information, given by teachers as model have to be processed by students is high in language classroom, teachers must properly use different language strategies in communicating and performing inputs and feedbacks/follows-up to the students.

The awareness of teachers to construct and to use their language influenced by their basic behavior in doing communication, which is absolutely influence the way of teaching. Being productive, creative, innovative, and ethical all evolve from the core of our being. What motivates human behavior is essential for unleashing human potential and productivity. In other words, the success of English Language Teaching (ELT) depends on how teachers as classroom leaders construct the understandable instructions to be run by the students. Students' failure to participate and learn in second language learning is often due to instructional problems rather than personality or motivational problems,
therefore calling for instructional moves by teachers rather than judgments about students’ willingness to cooperate (Diane Holt-Reynolds as cited in Li Xu, 2012: p.1399). The viewpoint of communicative teaching is that language is a communicative tool, mainly used to establish and maintain relationships among people. The way to facilitate active and communicative students’ involvement depending on teachers’ input. In other words, teachers’ classroom behaviors consciously and unconsciously tend to influence teachers’ input to EFL students’ learning experience.

In T1’s case who has overall interpersonal score falls in medium-low range, he acts as Clarifier and used both Indonesian (L1) and English (L2) in making his instructions clear by frequently questioning and criticizing the class. Mostly, the questions given is categorized as ‘display questions’ which is aimed to get students’ prior knowledge for instance: “Do we get the task?” (#1, Ln.1), “What definition of native speaker?” (#5, Ln. 4). However, display questions are considered as uncommunicative because these are not genuine and teacher already knows the answer. In relation to that, T1 also giving feedback while criticizing by echoing and translating students’ statements for instance: “Bukan berpidato..ee..berbicara bukan berpidato.” (#3, Ln. 1).

In T2’s case who also has overall interpersonal need score falls in medium-low range, he acts as director frequently and used only L1 in directing and giving instructions and explanations to students. T2 always dominates talks in classroom without giving students opportunity to promote and maximize their ability to practice L2.

Meanwhile, in T3’s case who has overall interpersonal need score categorized in medium-low range, it is seen that she also acts as clarifier frequently. She also uses both L1 and L2 in giving instructions and using display questions in her classroom for instance “So, it means that the event happen in a court right?” (#2, Ln. 3), “What about the judicial interpreting? (#4, Ln. 1), “Oh...yang d jelaskan disini pertama yang secara bersamaan itu apa?” (#5, Ln. 1), etc. The difference between T3 and T1 who acts as Clarifier in their classroom is that T3 repeatedly invited students to ask questions for instance: “Okey, another question? (#3, Ln. 9).

In T4’s case who also has overall interpersonal need score falls in medium-low range, she acts both as clarifier and director. She also uses both L1 and L2 in questioning and giving instructions. T4 repeatedly responding students statements only focus on form for instance when she correcting miss pronunciation of the word comfortable: “Not comfor-table..comfort-able.” (#2, Ln. 9), “OK. Dion please pay attention to the punctuation. Full stop itu berarti titik.” (#5, Ln. 8). The differences between T4 and T2 as director is that T4 always pointing students to do what she has been instructed and to answer the questions.

Those cases above described the classroom interaction mostly dominated by teachers which hold up and control activities in the classroom interaction. It is teachers’ decision to allow or forbid students activities and talks as can be seen in the figure 1 below.

Figure 1 Teachers as Director and Clarifier in EFL teaching-learning
CONCLUSIONS & SUGGESTIONS

Conclusion

On the basis of Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation theory, the study reveals partial views of EFL teachers’ behavior when dealing with students in their language classroom. The data findings and interpretative analysis bring the study into some conclusions.

First, EFL teachers have basic interpersonal need in the aspect of inclusion, control, and openness (formerly affection) both expressed and wanted mostly categorized as social, democrat, and personal. As social in inclusion need, teachers would sometimes want to include his/her students in the classroom activities and vice versa depends on his/her decision. As democrat in control need, teachers would sometimes exert control and influence over things and is comfortable in well-defined situation in the classroom which is providing structure and direction in classroom situation. As personal in openness need, teachers make an effort to get close to the students and vice versa again only when the situation required so. As a result, teachers interaction in the classroom will not optimal as they can not help students and provide optimal input for language exposure and learning experience due to gain communicative competence.

Second, in relation to the basic interpersonal need of EFL teachers, it is also found that they have overall interpersonal score (social interaction index) falls in the medium-low level meaning that they tends to act as clarifier and/or director in the EFL classroom which normally dominated the activities in the classroom though students become center of the learning. As a result, teaching and learning process only happened in one way and students have lack opportunity to practice the target language and to involve in the learning process since teachers become dominant and take in full control of the classroom.

Suggestions

Based on the research conclusion above and in an attempt to develop and improve EFL teachers’ quality in English Language Teaching (ELT), some suggestions are given as follows:

First, in the English Language Teaching (ELT), EFL teachers are suggested to control and to be aware of their behavior. Instructional language training and/or workshop related to teaching-learning English is required since teachers still hold important role as input provider for students in ELT.

Second, the improvement of teachers’ professionalism should also focus on creativity and awareness of the use of language in the classroom activities and interactions. In order to improve the efficiency of classroom interaction, teachers must modify their speech to be more comprehensible. The best quality of teacher talk will construct facilitative environment for students learning experience. As a result, EFL teachers hopefully bring about the successful communication of English in and out the classroom.
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