

Mood System of Teacher-Student Interpersonal Utterance in the Class: A Study in Systemic Functional Linguistics

Liesna Andriany^a, Muhammad Ali Pawiro^b, ^aFaculty of Teacher's Training and Education, Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia, ^bFaculty of Arts, Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia, Email: ^aLiesna.andriany@fkip.uisu.ac.id, ^bm.alipawiro@sastra.uisu.ac.id

This research aims to describe the form of mood system in classroom discourse. The analysis is conducted by studying the text according to the lexico-grammatical units that realise interpersonal utterances by using the discourse analysis approach under the theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics. This research is a qualitative research paper supported by quantitative data. The data are collected from six teachers and 232 students from three schools in Medan. The results of the research indicate that the representation of the interpersonal meaning of lexico-grammatical in the studied text by clause system focus indicates that the using of mood (mode of IND-DEC, IND-INT, IMP and O) on each text is realised either by teachers or the students. The teacher's pronunciation is the reflection of the ideology that the teacher is the managerial power holder in the class, as well as the knowledge authority holder.

Key words: *Modus system, Interpersonal, Systemic functional linguistic (SFL).*

Introduction

Language as a media channeling message of scientific information, means of communication, and interaction in class, is an important tool that must always be considered by those involved in education. In its function as interpersonal exchange, the language used in the classroom is one of the factors that can determine the style of the teaching-learning process in the classroom. From the style of language used in the class, the style of the process of teaching and learning in the classroom can be determined; the teaching-learning process takes place in a form that may be alive, dynamic and impressive, or tense, monotonous and boring. Interaction in teaching and learning events has a broader purpose, not simply the relationship

between teacher and student, but in the form of educational interaction. In this case it is not only the delivery of messages in the form of subject matter, but the forming of attitudes and values in students who are learning.

The ability to choose the mood system of teacher-student interpersonal utterance and in the teaching-learning process greatly helps to realise the atmosphere of a dynamic and impressive teaching and learning process. Ability to know when, where, and in what situation a particular mood system should be said, can determine the level of acceptance of the message delivered. For example, the interrogative mood, in a situation that is worthy of involvement during the teaching and learning process in the classroom, will help to determine the acceptability of the subject matter.

Well-designed interpersonal utterance, for example, a mood system designed according to context, topics, participants, etc., can stimulate the emergence of thinking processes in students. Interpersonal utterance is considered successful in carrying out its mission if in the future there will be changes in learning behaviour in students. That is why interpersonal utterance in the class is not only as a mere delivery of information messages of science, but must also be able to act as a stimulator of students' minds, attention grabbers, motivators, simplifying and clarifying abstract concepts, and providing visual experiences to students. Considering the importance of the message of knowledge that will be conveyed through the utterances of teachers and students in teaching and learning activities, it should be well remembered that the mood system of teacher-student interpersonal utterance in the class is given priority in class discourse (Nababan, 1987).

This paper is intended to interpret the semiotic behaviour of teachers and students who are represented in verbal language in the classroom. The research problem is what is the mood system of teacher-student interpersonal utterance, especially those concerning lexicographic units realising the mood system.

In general, this study aims to obtain an objective description of the realisation of the interpersonal utterance mood system in class discourse, specifically the lexico-grammatical units that realise the mood system.

Literature Review

Class Discourse

There has been a lot of discussion about class discourse and in this study what is meant by the term class discourse is associated with linguistic texts. The term class discourse is often associated with classroom language. This is because the term class discourse also indicates

the type of register, not the type of discourse, so that language in the classroom is identical to the classroom register (Halliday, 1987).

Language used in the class context is a language that has its own characteristics of languages used in other contexts. The most basic purpose of using language in class is transferring knowledge. In the study of the relationship between knowledge and language, Halliday and Martin (1992) state that language is not only a tool for expressing ideas from physical and biological processes, but more than that, through language one can interpret experiences by moving our experience into meaning.

In line with Christie's (1991) opinion that education is a process of initiation by way of discussion and order, it is a valued experience. Mackey (1967) suggests in the results of his research that in the process of classroom learning activities there are interactions between teachers and students. This conclusion is supported by Arthur (1983) who argues that in the classroom there is an exchange of actions or interactions during the teaching and learning process. Meanwhile, Flander (1970) in his observations about the language of the teacher and their influence on the success of students concludes that the style of the teacher's language has an effect on the success of students. This is similar to observations made by Barnes (1969). He points out that certain types of questions, in this case are questions of inducement, important for teachers in order to focus students' attention.

Compared to other forms of communication, language in the class has its own characteristics. First, the language of the teacher and students as a consultative variety is very functional in order to achieve learning goals. Therefore, understanding the function of the word is very necessary for the educational community (teachers and students) to achieve the ideal teaching and learning process. Second, the language of teacher and students in class discourse is typical. The language of the teacher and students in the class discourse is assumed to be the ideal 'adult' Indonesian language performance because teacher and students master the Indonesian language not only through acquisition, but also learning. The context of opposing utterances or speakers who are also speakers of Indonesian 'adults' who master Indonesian also through acquisition and learning is assumed to be ideal communication with the emergence of ideal sentences from students as context sentences. The next characteristic can be seen in the alignment of student-teachers on the one hand because they are in a scientific context, but on the other hand they are still influenced by different statuses.

Systemic Functional Linguistic Theory

The theoretical basis used is LSF, proposed by Halliday. According to the study of this theory, the linguistic role in text analysis is to distinguish functions in the context of paradigms and functions in a systematic context (Halliday, 1985). The paradigm context

functions as a system, while the systematic context is known as the language structure. With the system people can interpret the relationship paradigmatically.

Systemic Functional Linguistic Theory (SFL) views language as a system of meanings and other systems (ie systems of form and expression) to realise that meaning (Siregar, 2006). SFL is a language theory based on language functions. This theory not only examines grammatical but all semiotic systems of language contained in the context. SFL sees language as well as code and behaviour.

Language as a code is formally analysed and language as behaviour is functionally analysed. In other words, language as a code and language as a behaviour are two sides of a coin. One of them cannot be ignored and is seen as subordinate.

In the perspective of functional grammar the existence of language cannot be separated from (1) text, (2) system, and (3) forming elements of linguistic structure (Halliday, 1985). Aminuddin (2002) refers to the manifestation of concrete language usage, both in the form of oral and written utterance. As a form of language use, either oral or written utterance, its presence has a certain function in accordance with its intended use. While the system refers to the meaningful relationship of functional components, which refers to ideational, interpersonal and textual components. Because the systemic component refers to functions and is not directly related to aspects of linguistic structure, Halliday calls it a metafunction (Halliday, 1985).

Interpersonal Utterance

Interpersonal utterance is the meaning created as a result of the realisation of the lexicographic elements used to take action against other people. These elements serve to express, explain, and maintain social relations among language users. This utterance is realised mainly through the use of forms of greeting (vocative), utterance forms, modalities, etc., with prosodic structures (Martin, 1992).

Mood System

Traditional grammar clauses are interpreted as grammatical units consisting of subjects, predicates accompanied by objects, complements and circumstance, if applicable. Unlike the Systemic Functional grammar (SFL), the clause is the base unit in the expression of meaning. As stated by Bloor and Bloor (1995), the clause itself has a special place to express meaning. Interpersonal clauses are seen as lexico-grammatical sources used to organise interaction processes involving writers and speakers or readers and listeners (Halliday, 1985). In this capacity, the clause is expressed by the types of clauses (mood).

Mood Function

In the process of interaction between speakers and listeners, the clause serves as a lexicogrammatical source used to negotiate meaning. At the level of discourse, there is selection of lexicographic units. For example the type of clause (indicative, imperative) and how to negotiate (proposal-asking, giving propositions) will result in differences in the position of speakers and listeners or writers and readers. For example, if a text contains a lot of imperatives, the speaker or writer of the text positions himself as a party superior to the listener or reader, as can be seen in the fact that the indicative-imperative forms are request-proposals.

Materials and Methods

This research is qualitative, but quantitative data are also used to help analyse qualitative descriptions. The results of quantitative analysis are described in the form of simple statistics in the form of tables and percentages of the use of the elements of the problem under study, also using diagrams to see the level of visual comparison. The aim is to provide information about the level of frequency distribution of linguistic events in accordance with the aspects and characteristics summarised in each problem studied. In other words, it is done to determine the level of dominance in the context.

The locations of this study were conducted at three high schools in Medan city, with a total of six teachers and 232 students. In accordance with the data of this study, namely (1) linguistic expression units at the clause level, and (2) non-linguistic data, namely semiotic linguistic acts that complement or support linguistic expressions are related to linguistic data, then the data collection methods used in this study employed several techniques, namely recording, observing, note-taking, and interview techniques.

The data collection technique was adopted from the flow model of qualitative data analysis proposed by Miles and Huberman (1994). The data are obtained from video visuals treated as raw data. The raw data are then transcribed from visual and non-visual or represent the form of record to note form. Next it is necessary to make a code/term that is practical to facilitate analysis. First, data transcripts are classified into 'categories' discourse such as CD1 (class 1 discourse), CD2, CD3, CD4, CD5, and CD6. Second, the transcripts and classifications of data are read, observed, defined and marked for clause numbers. Third, the transcription writing is numbered according to the order of clauses seen in the data. Sounds that are not clearly socio-semantic and deemed less valuable will be eliminated.

Results and Discussion

Indicative-Declarative Mood (IND - DEC)

The clause system basically can be divided into two, namely the indicative clause and the imperative clause. The indicative clause includes declarative clauses and interrogative clauses.

Data 1

Teacher: Today we will learn about scientific writing. (IND-DEC)

Student: Last week, we did. (IND-DEC)

Today	We	Will	Learn	Writing scientific papers
Complement	Subject	Finite/Modalities	Predicate	Complement
Residue	Mood		Residue	

From the example of the teacher's utterances in data 1, it can be seen that 'we' is a plural third person pronoun and is a subject. The finite form of modality is 'will' and the predicate is 'learn'. The modality of 'will' + the predicate 'learn' shows it has not been implemented. The supplement 'is about writing scientific papers'. The residue is separated by the mood 'we will' that is today studying 'about writing scientific papers'. The pronunciation is flat intonation. Thus the teacher clause in data 1 is a declarative indicative mode.

The results of data analysis were found in the type of IND-DEC (indicative-declarative) mood used by teachers as much as 42.3% in CD1 text, 57.54% in CD2 text, 60.05% in CD3 text, 57.48% in CD4, 44, 69% in CD5, and 46.50% in CD6, while IND- DEC mood was used by students 30.02% in CD1, 21.31% in CD2, 13.93% in CD3, 23.46% in CD4, 25, 50% at CD5, and 20.85% on CD6. Based on the findings of the mood in each text dominated by declarative mood, the interpretation of the meaning, the teacher predominantly provides information (propositions-giving) on various events that occur or various knowledge through teaching and learning activities compared to students and this shows that the teacher has more roles of giving information compared to students. The prominent use of the IND-DEC mood in teachers is very common in almost all / most texts, because in general the IND-DEC mood functions as a proposition - giving information conveyed by the speaker to the interlocutor.

The fact shows that the interpersonal utterances of these clauses are to provide information in accordance with the subject matter discussed in these texts. In relation to class discourse, it can be seen here that the teacher's function as an information / knowledge provider is very dominant compared to the listener / students. But then student involvement in interaction in the classroom in the presence of declarative mood represented by students is seen. In

Curriculum 2013 in Indonesia, learning must be student-centred, in other words students must be more active than teachers, while teachers are only facilitators (Anonim, 2002).

How to negotiate (whether proposal-asking or proposition-giving) will result in differences in the position of teachers and students and speakers or listeners, as found in each text that the IND-DEC mood is dominantly used by teachers rather than students, can be interpreted by suggesting that there are differences in teacher's positions with students. It is seen that the teacher's position is higher than the students because the teacher uses more functions of the word (read: more talk) than the students. The many functions of the words indicate that the teacher tends to apply his position in the classroom, and it seems that the teacher uses his position both as a class manager and as a scientific authority.

Negative Indicative-Declarative Mood (IND – DEC)

IND-DEC mood (-) is a clause that carries a function as a proposition-giving or functioning rejecting or opposing. Negative declarative mood was found as 2.33% in CD1, 4.04% in CD2, 3.55% in CD3, 2.77% in CD4, 4.29% in CD5, and 1.65% in CD6 all of which were utterances of the teacher. While the use of interrogative declarative mood by students amounted to 1.87% on CD1, 0.62% on CD2, 1.31% on CD3, 0.82% on CD4, 1.21% on CD5, and 1.65% on CD6 .

Data 2

Teacher: This year there will be no UN exams because of covid-19.

Data clause description 2 is as follows:

This year	there	will be no UN	exams because of covid-19
Complement	Finite/Modalities	Predicate	Complement
Residue	Mood	Residue	

In data 2 above, do not use the subject, the finite is in the form of a 'no + will' modality, the predictor is 'implemented', while the complement is 'this year' + 'UN exam because of covid-19'. Data clause 2 consists of the residue 'this year is taking the UN exam because covid-19' and the mood 'will not'. It is this mood that characterises that the clause is an IND-DEC (-) clause.

The use of the IND-DEC mood (-) is used more by teachers than students. This shows that the teacher's utterances of language in the teaching-learning process gives more information with the pressures of the meaning of language. With the use of pressure, the meaning of the language is expected to give special attention and at the same time also shows more firm attitudes of teachers through their statements than students.

Indicative-Interrogative Mood (IND – INT)

Interrogative clauses include INT (interrogative) mood requiring/ demanding a yes or no answer and INT mood requires / requires answers in the form of information. IND-INT mood (indicative - interrogative) question words found in CD1 text are as many as 172 clauses from the teacher and 18 clauses from students. CD2 text found as many as 45 clauses from the teacher while students did not get clauses. In the CD3 text there were 93 clauses from the teacher and from the students as many as three clauses. CD4 text found as many as 60 clauses from the teacher and seven clauses from students. In the CD5 text, there were 79 clauses from the teacher and 13 clauses from the students; while the CD6 text found 89 clauses from the teacher and three clauses from the students.

Data 3

Teacher: How do we fight covid-19?

Student: What actually is covid-19?

How	Do	We	Fight	Covid-19?
Complement	Finite	Subjek	Predicate	Complement
Residue	Mood		Residue	

The clause in data 3 shows the complement using the question word 'how', the finite is 'way', the subject is a single third person 'we', the predicate is 'against' and the complement is 'covid-19'. The clause is pronounced with decreased intonation. The mood can be seen using 'our way' and the residue 'how to fight covid-19'. This clause is called IND-INT mode because it uses the question word and the finite precedes the subject. This clause requires an answer from the listener.

Data 4

Teacher: Is the question done?

Student: Yes

Is	The question	Done?
Predicate	Complement	Vocative
Residue		

Clause in data 4 students do not use question words, only use the predicate 'done' and complement 'the problem', as well as vocative 'bu'. The clause also does not have a mood and only has a residue 'worked out', but the delivery of utterances uses decreased intonation. Likewise, the only answer needed is 'yes' or 'no'. With decreased intonation and short answers, this clause is an IND-INT mode yes / no.

The use of IND-INT mood is yes / no by the teacher in the CD2 text appears in as many as 24 clauses, while the students only used two clauses. The IND-INT mood yes / no in the CD3 text is realised by the teacher in as many as 18 clauses, while the students do not use the IND-INT mood yes / no. CD4 text consists of 29 IND-INT mood clauses, yes / no, which the teacher and students put forward in four clauses. The teacher uses the IND-INT mood yes / no for a number of 43 clauses and students for ten clauses in the CD5 text. In CD6 text the teacher uses the IND-INT mood yes / no in as many as 44 clauses and students as many as five clauses.

Not only the IND-DEC mood is dominated by teachers, the IND-INT mood (both using the question and yes / no) is also produced more by teachers compared to that by students. The use of the IND-INT mood will make the monologue communication flow into a dialogue or a two-way communication flow.

Mood System Interpretation in Classroom Discourse

The whole variety of moods found can be interpreted as meaning that in the class power holders are teachers. This can be seen from the total overall mood (DEC, IND-DEC (-), IND-INT question word, IND-INT yes / no, IMP, and OFF) used by teachers to dominate the class with details of the total overall mood used by teachers at 76%, while the total mood used by students is 24%.

The teacher makes more functions of the word (76%.) than students (24%) because the teacher often produces more than one utterance function when getting a turn to speak. Conversely, students tend to only make one function in the form of a short response. The fact that the teacher makes more functions of words compared to those of students shows that the teacher tends to apply his power in the classroom, apparently by utilising his position both as a class manager and as a scientific authority holder. From all the texts studied, the teacher was completely dominating the class. The process of teacher-dominated teaching and learning activities is teacher-centred learning, and is the oldest learning strategy / traditional learning strategy.

From the analysis of the moods used by the teacher and students, it can be interpreted that the power of the teacher and students in the class shows that the mean mood of IND-DEC of the teacher is 51.43% and students 22.51%, mean mode INK-DEC (-) teacher 3, 1% and students 1.15%, mean mode IND-INT (question word) teacher 11.06% and students 0.86%, mean mode IND-INT (yes / no) teacher 4.24% and students 2.09 %, mean teacher IMP mood 5.07% and students 0.1%, mean teacher OFF mood 1.65% and students. All mood (IND-DEC, IND-DEC (-), IND-INT mood, question word, IND-INT mood no, IMP mood, and OFF mood) are dominated by the teacher. Comparisons between teacher and students of each

mood are very prominent. This situation can be interpreted by stating that the teacher uses more utterances than students.

The dominance of the IND-DEC mood used by the teacher can be interpreted as meaning that the teacher wants to provide information on science / knowledge with the old paradigm that the criteria for the success of the teaching process are measured by the extent to which students can master the subject matter delivered by the teacher. It seems noteworthy that the teacher, besides using many IND-DEC moods also gives a lot of questions (IND-INT mood). Through the INT mood, an atmosphere of communication that is two-way (dialogue) will be created, so that listeners will be involved in the subject matter and form an atmosphere of continuous connection between the speaker and the interlocuter / listener.

The linguistic expression by utilising the interrogative mood is deliberately delivered by the speaker especially the teacher so that the listener / student gives active participation both in attitudes or material actions, as well as mental attitude to respond to questions as explained in the text. This form of INT mood has an important meaning, namely by using a form of communication asking the teacher to invite listeners / students to pay attention to or concentrate on the information provided, as well as the INT mood for the teacher to know how far students understand the information provided. This encourages students to increase participation in teaching and learning activities, arouses the interest and curiosity of students about what is being discussed, develops patterns and ways of active learning from students, and focuses students' attention on the problems being discussed. For students, the use of the IND-INT clause is driven by the desire to request information about something stated in the text.

The clause with the IND-INT mood is more widely used by the teacher than students of the total number of clauses. In fact it seems that students do not get the opportunity to give questions because in the interaction in the classroom, the teacher is dominantly using the function of the word (both the function of giving and asking for information and the function of giving and asking for goods and services) about something that is being put forward or that uses scientific authority too. In addition, students do not have the courage to ask the teacher for fear of being wrong or because of the clumsy culture of the Indonesian.

Conclusions

From the whole process of analysis by applying aspects in interpersonal utterance analysis in classroom discourse, it was found that the representation of lexico-grammatical of interpersonal utterances in the texts studied with the focus of mood system showed that both the teacher and students used all moods (IND-DEC mode, IND -INT, IMP, and OFF) in each text. For the overall mood used, the declarative mood dominates the text. The second highest



ranking after the IND-DEC mood is the IND-INT clause; both IND-INT uses question words and IND-INT yes / no. Furthermore, the third dominant sequence used is the IMP clause. While the OFF clause is seldom used. The use of variations in the types of moods and utterance functions is motivated by the role of the teacher as the giver of information / knowledge and the desire of the teacher to increase student participation in teaching-learning activities, arouse the interest and curiosity of students about what is being discussed, develop patterns and ways of active learning from students, and motivate students to do something that causes their readiness to start a series of actions or actions in achieving certain goals. While students do not use the mood system very often, in some texts studied the IMP and OFF moods are not found.

The teacher dominantly uses IND-DEC, IND-INT, IMP, and PEN moods in classroom discourse rather than students, and this is an inaccurate style of learning in the classroom. It is recommended that teachers should realise a balanced and focused mood of learning, because each type of mood is needed and has its own interpersonal functions.



REFERENCES

- Aminuddin dkk. (2002). *Analisis wacana*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kamal.
- Anonim. (2002). Pelaksanaan Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi. *Pusat Kurikulum, Balitbang Depdiknas*.
- Barnes. J. Britton & H. Rosen. (1969). *Language the learner and the school*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Bloor, T. & Bloor, M. (1995). *The Functional Analysis of English*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Flanders, Ned A. (1970). *Analysing teaching and behavior*. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Adison-Wesley.
- Halliday. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. 1st edition, London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday. (1985). *Systemics background in J.D. Benson dan W.S. Greaves (ed.). Systemic Perspectives on Discourse*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corp.
- Halliday. (1987). *An interview with M.A.K. Halliday, 4 th September 1985* [by Thibault, P.J.], in Steele, R. & Threadgold, T. [eds.], *Language Topics, Vol. 2: Essays in Honour of Michael Halliday*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam & Philadelphia.
- Halliday & Martin, J.R. (1992). *An introduction to functional grammar 2th ed*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Mackey, W. F. (1967). *Language teaching analysis*. London: Indiana University Press.
- Martin, J.R. (1992). *English text, system and source*. Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- McArthur, T. (1983). *A foundation course for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Miles, Matthew, B & Huberman, A. Michael. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis. A Sourcebook of New Methods*. Beverly Hills California: Sage Publication.
- Nababan, P. W. J. (1987). *Pragmatik*. Jakarta: P2LPTK Depdikbud.



Siregar, Amrin. (2006). *Wacana fisika dan sejarah* (paper), seminar nasional dalam rangka pembentukan asosiasi linguistik sistemik fungsional di Indonesia. Universitas Negeri Jakarta, 9-11 November 2006.