

MOOD STRUCTURE ANALYSIS OF TEACHER TALK IN EFL CLASSROOM: A DISCOURSE STUDY BASED ON SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTIC THEORY

Fikri, Z¹, Dewi, Ni², Suarnajaya, W³

Language Education Study Program, Postgraduate Program
Ganesha University of Education
Singaraja, Indonesia

e-mail: fikrizaenul@gmail.com, nyoman.padmadewi@pasca.undiksha.ac.id,
wayan.suarnajaya@pasca.undiksha.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims at analyzing male and female teacher talk in EFL classroom. The analysis was meant to find out the realization of Mood in teacher talk, the realization of Mood in teacher's role, and the Mood realization difference between male and female teacher talk in EFL classroom. It was designed as a descriptive-qualitative research, and discourse analysis. Data were collected through observations i.e. recording and note-taking as the main source. The data were analyzed using Mood structure analysis suggested by M.A.K Halliday. To gain deeper analysis, the data were triangulated by interviewing the participants, two senior English teachers i.e. male and female teacher, and one linguist.

Based on the results of the data analysis, the findings of this research can be stated as follows: (1) Male teacher employed seven speech functions and female teacher employed eight speech functions during their classroom interaction. Those speech functions were commonly realized in two types: Typical clause Mood and Non-typical clause Mood in making interpersonal meaning among the students. (2) The dominant use of almost all speech functions in a certain role i.e. a controller role indicates that there is a relation between teacher's role and Mood realization. (3) There are some differences of male and female teacher talk in selecting Mood system in expressing interpersonal meaning to the students i.e. in giving information, in asking a question, in demanding the students to do something, and in offering something to the students. Cultural and social factor of the teachers are believed as the contributions to the differences.

Key words: Mood Structure, Teacher Talk, EFL Classroom

INTRODUCTION

Every aspect of human's life must be fulfilled by a language in undergoing their daily routines, for instance, sign, symbol, or the oral speech, etc; those belong to a language. Eggins (2004, p.1)

illustrates that in the ordinary life of human beings, they constantly use language. They chat to family members, organize children for school, read paper, speak at meeting, serve customers, follow instructions in a booklet, etc. all of these are activities involving language. The

language itself is communication practice mediated by linguistic system (Shitemi, 2009). In the instructional process, for instance, a teacher must utilize language as a means of instruction in the classroom which is called "teacher talk".

The language or teacher talk employed by the teacher in the classroom can be said a magical thing. It can probably change everything in the classroom. Some experts do not only define what teacher talk is but also they account for its importance and impact upon the teaching and learning process. Weddel (2008) reveals that the language that teachers use in class, or "teacher talk," can have a tremendous impact on the success of interactions they have with students. In addition, Yanfen & Yuqin, (2010) suggest that teacher talk is an indispensable part of foreign language teaching in organizing activities, and the way teachers talk do not only determine how well they make their lectures, but also guarantees how well students will learn. Learning English takes place mostly in classrooms and is frequently carried out under the guidance and supervision of teachers. The interaction between teachers and students constitutes the most important part in all classroom activities. Appropriate teacher talk can create harmonious atmosphere and at the same time promotes a more friendly relationship between teachers and students. Even, teacher talk is claimed as the primary source of linguistic input in a second language classroom to illustrate how important it is. Krashen (1981; in Cullen, 1998P: 179) asserts that teacher talk is now generally recognized as a potentially valuable source of comprehensible input for the learner. Since this is essential for language acquisition.

This study was conducted for the reason that the analysis of classroom discourse is in line with various important phenomena of language use, texts and conversational interactions or communicative events in the classroom (Van Dijk, 1985; Cazden, 1988; Suherdi, 1997). However, the study of classroom interaction under analysis of systemic

functional grammar (hereby SFG) which focuses on the role of communicative functions of classroom participants, has not been investigated intensively (Christie & Unsworth, 2000, Fairclough, 2003). Therefore, it will be worth conducting this research which focuses on grammatical features of teachers and students in their interaction in the classroom, particularly in their EFL classroom.

This study is concerned with the analysis of classroom interaction, focusing on the analysis of spoken language in the classroom utilizing systemic functional grammar analysis of Mood types of interpersonal metafunction, which is concerned with the analysis of communicative function what Halliday refers to as speech functions (Eggin, 1994). This analysis provides examples of teacher's roles and their communicative functions by investigating actual language employed by teacher and students (Eggin, 2000)

In relation to male and female of teacher talk of Mood realization, there is also assumption that they tend to be different in terms of teacher talk by referring to Holmes (2001) proposing a question "Do men and women speak differently?", in explaining the difference of linguistic forms used by men and women. This study also deals with male and female of teacher talk in relation to mood realization under investigation.

Based on the description above, this study was primarily intended to identify the realization of Mood in teacher talk and the realization of Mood in teacher's role and communicative functions, to identify linguistic features; micro features of interpersonal metafunction, i.e Mood used by the teacher in interacting with students in EFL class by the systemic functional grammar as the framework of the analysis, and to identify the Mood realization difference between male and female teacher talk in EFL classroom.

The result of this study is expected to be useful theoretical, practical, and methodological significance in relation to English language education in Indonesia

as well as to research in language teaching.

Theoretically, the result of this study was expected to provide beneficial information about linguistic features of classroom life, to provide information about textual analysis, particularly analysis of classroom discourse, so that this study gained many insights into this relationship, which in turn contributed, even probably in small scale, to the theories of language education, teaching and learning English as a foreign language (Riwayat, 2009, Huda, 1999; Allwright and Bailey, 1991; Van Lier, 1989; Ellis, 1986)

Practically, This study may provide information about the use of functional grammar as a tool for textual analysis in language studies. The insights gained from the investigation informed future decisions regarding effective and appropriate classroom pedagogy for teaching English practice in EFL classroom. This study of mood system was also expected to enrich research on investigation classroom behavior which was so central to improve teaching and learning practices that the findings conclusions of this study, particularly, may stimulate teachers to improve their teaching behavior in order to maximize students' learning (Riwayat, 2007; Inamullah et. al, 2008)

For profession, the results of this study is probably attracting for further research for those who are interested in conducting classroom research. It was expected that this study would provide information about the role and communicative functions of teachers in English classroom and also provide information about the linguistic features of classroom life for students and teachers. More studies on classroom interaction will of course enrich insights of teachers, EFL teacher in particular, to have more awareness and options to teach their students effectively and constructively.

METHOD OF STUDY

A descriptive-qualitative design is used in this study, particularly in the form of a case study.. Besides, this study also

used discourse analysis, a spoken discourse of teacher talk in particular.

This study was carried out in SMAN 3 Selong of East Lombok Regency in the academic year 2013/2014. The classes were selected two classes in grade eleventh. The participants of this research were two English teachers (e.g. male and female English teacher). The data collection technique was in non-participant observation study. The data was collected through audio video-recording.

This study was analyzed using an inductive analytical approach. The data gained from observation of spoken language transcript was analyzed using the four Mood types analysis such as *statement, question, offer, and command*. Those are under Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL) system from Halliday. It was, then, utilized to find out the teacher's roles which were proposed mainly by Harmer.

There are three steps employed in analyzing the data as follows: Firstly, it was analyzed the clauses of the discourses in accordance with the Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) under "the systemic functional linguistics" advocated by Halliday (Egins, 1994). Secondly, the data was categorized into Mood type analysis. Thirdly, to find out the answer of the third research question, the speech functions (statement, question, command and offer) produced by the teacher, was analyzed and differentiated in accordance with gender theory.

FINDINGS

Based on the data gained in the observation, generally both teacher employed two types of speech functions, typical Mood clause and non-typical clause Mood. The followings are the summaries of speech functions employed by both teachers during the observation.

Table 4.1 Realization of Mood Type of Male Teacher Talk

Initiation of Speech unction	Typical clause Mood	Non-typical clause Mood
Statement	▪ Declarative	▪ Tag Declarative ▪ Modulated declarative
Question	▪ Polar Interrogative ▪ Wh-interrogative	▪ Modulated interrogative
Offer	▪ Modulated Interrogative	▪ Interrogative ▪ Imperative ▪ Declarative
Commnad	▪ Imperatiave	▪ Declarative ▪ Modulated Interrogative
Responding Speech Function		
Acknowledgment	▪ Declarative	▪ Declarative Tag
Answer	▪ Declarative	
Contradiction	▪ Declarative	▪ Interrogative

Table 4.2 Realization of Mood Type of female teacher talk

Initiation of Speech Function	Typical clause Mood	Non-typical clause Mood
Statement	▪ Declarative	▪ Tag Declarative ▪ Modulated declarative
Question	▪ Interrogative	
Command	▪ Imperative	▪ Modulated Interrogative ▪ Declarative ▪ Modulated Declarative
Offer	▪ Modulated Interrogative	▪ Interrogative ▪ Wh-interrogative
Responding Speech Function		
Acknowledgment	▪ Declarative	▪ Declarative Tag
Answer	▪ Declarative	▪ Interrogative
Contradiction	▪ Declarative	▪ Interrogative

The roles performed by both male and female teacher based on the findings are the same such as controller,

Prompter/director, Tutor/manager, Facilitator, and Resource.

DISCUSSION

Mood Realization of Male Teacher Talk

During the observation, the male teacher produced 533 utterances. It indicated that the male teacher's speech functions seem to be varied. Basically, when the exchange between the teacher and the students take place, it occurs initiating and responding. As has been mentioned previously, the male teacher utilized seven types of speech function. Four types are in terms of initiating such as offering something, commanding, giving statement, and asking question. Three types are in terms of responding such as acknowledgment, answer and contradiction.

From 533 clauses, the total numbers of clauses employed by the teacher in the classroom interaction, for instance, statement is 207 clauses, question is 119 clauses, command is 113 clauses, and offer is 14 clauses. Meanwhile, in the responding speech functions are 49acknowledgments, 28 answers, and 3 contradictions.

As has been mentioned in the finding of table 4.1 above, the statement which is in terms of 'Typical clause Mood' is declarative Mood and Non-typical clause Mood is tagged declarative and modulated declarative.

In the opening session, some examples of statement realized in terms of declarative sentences were found such as in the excerpts below:

[24] T : Our today topic is related to what we learnt few weeks ago

[25] T : If I am not mistaken, We have studied about narrative

Mood analysis of clause [24] and [25] presented above indicate that those clauses grammatically consist of MOOD elements applied to make interpersonal meaning, for instance, *Our today topic(is), we learnt, I am not, We have, what*

Halliday called Subject and Finite. The MOOD elements of the clauses are structurally Subject followed by Finite. In other words, Finite is always preceded by Subject. It indicates that those are statement speech functions realized in terms of declarative Moods. Functionally the first line of the clause [24] above is, the teacher attempts to give information to his students about their topic at that day in terms of declarative sentence. It was, then, emphasized by giving information about 'narrative text' as their topic that they had learnt few weeks ago as in excerpt [25].

Non-typical clause Mood of 'statement' speech function was realized in terms of tagged declarative Mood. Now look at these excerpts!

[92] T : Any body can help me to write the question in whiteboard?

[93] T: First we try to write the question, ya (don't we?)

[94] T : And after that we try to answer the question

In the clause [93], the speaker's expression by using the word of 'right' in the clause can be categorized as minor clause. Since there is an ellipsis of MOOD TAG constituents *don't we?*. The structures of MOOD TAG of the clause [93] are Finite positions before Subject. In the initiating exchange process, the speaker did not only attempted to give information to the hearer, but he also acknowledged what he had been said previously toward the activity they would do at that time .

Another Mood realization of 'statement' in the form of Non-typical clause Mood is 'modulated declarative'. Consider these excerpts below!

[12] T: So our class is not more than forty minutes

[13] T: So to use the time effectively and efficiently

[14] T: First of all, I would like to inform you

[15] T: Our material is related to oral competence is listening

The clause [14] is a statement which is realized in terms of declarative in giving information to the students. As has been shown the Mood analysis above, the MOOD components of the clause [14] structurally contains Subject 'I' and Finite "would". It means that the declarative Mood uses modalization "would". It shows different interpersonal meaning from other common declaratives Mood without modalization. The meaning of modalization in the clause is inclination which is commonly used to express politeness (Eggins, 1994: 194-195). The teacher might say "*First or all, I want to inform you*". However, the teacher wanted to soften the force of "want" or to water down the speech or the dominance tendency in front of his students. In other words, he wanted to shorten the distance between him and the students.

The second speech function is question. Question is realized in interrogative Mood. It functions to demand information from the listeners (Eggin, 1994).

[38] T : Could you please open your book on page 126?

[39] T : Have you found on 126?

S : Yes

Mood analysis of clause [39] indicates that the MOOD elements of the clause contain grammatically Finite and Subject. The structure rule of the interrogative Mood, Finite always precedes the Subject (Eggins, 1994: 173). The second line of the excerpts above initially began when the teacher demanded his students to open their books on page 126 of the material at that time. It was, then, followed and stressed by the teacher by asking a question to ensure whether the students had found the page demanded. The question was, then, responded immediately by the students utilizing 'yes' answer.

The third type of speech function employed the man teacher in the form of initiating is command. These excerpts below belong to typical clause Mood.

[99] T : Don't tell him!

[100] T : Just keep silent!

The imperatives consist of a MOOD element of Finite only (no Subject), and only a RESIDUE (no MOOD element at all), etc (Eggins, 1994: 185-185). In clause [99] and [100], the teacher attempted to demand something realized in terms of imperative Mood. The Mood systems used by the teacher are called common imperatives. Those are commonly used in equal status. Thus, it is natural the teacher using those Mood systems. Since Tenor dimension is realized by looking at who gives? And who demand? (Eggins, 1994:193). In this case, the teacher is a leader or controller in the classroom. The students are subordinates at the community. In other words, they have different social status when they are in that situation.

The last initiating speech function is offering. In the exchange event, offering has a function to give goods or services (Martin, Matthiessen, & Painter, 1997). Offering is commonly realized in terms of modulated interrogative.

[90] T : The first question is 'where is the legend from?'

[91] T : Can anybody help me to write the question in whiteboard?

The clause [12] is typically offering speech function realized in terms of modulated interrogative. The offering grammatically borrows the structure of question or interrogative Mood, with the Finite positioned before the Subject. For instance, the MOOD components of the clause [12] is *can anybody?*, where the Finite is *can* and the Subject is *anybody*. The presence of modulation in this clause adds semantical meaning of *can*. It does not express the ability but the meaning is willingness or inclination. It began when the teacher offered to all the students to write down a question in the whiteboard.

In relation to responding speech function, if it is looked at result of analysis above, it is surprising that the teacher like repeating the student's answer. It proved that the number of acknowledgement responding, the teacher utilized 49

declaratives. Whereas 28 common answers of responding speech function were applied by the man teacher. The rest is contradiction responding. The man teacher only produced 3 clauses during the meetings.

Teacher's Role and Mood Realization of Male and Female Teacher in the classroom

There are five kinds of roles employed by the male and female teacher found in their classroom interaction during the observations. Those are: the teacher acted as controller, prompter/director, tutor/manager, facilitator/participant, and resource.

In accordance with the data gained from the observation, it seems that both teachers put themselves more on controller role in their classroom interaction. It is signed by the dominant use of almost all speech functions, for example, statement speech function; they tended to give more explanation (Harmer, 2001: 109) than attempted to facilitate the students to find out the concept themselves. Meanwhile, the speech function of question and command are mostly used that put them as more dominant controllers than other roles since both speech functions are categorized as demanding speech role. In pedagogic situations the teachers are often demanding, and the student very often giving (Eggins, 1994: 193).

Regarding with the responding speech function, besides they are fond of repeating the student's answer in terms of tagged declarative. They like responding the students by using answer speech function either in the form of declarative or tagged declarative Mood.

The Differences between Male and Female Teacher Talk

Furthermore, actually what the man teacher conducted in his classroom interaction was similar with the woman teacher conducted such as the realization of Mood types in the speech functions and the realization of Mood in teacher's role. Thus, it would not be discussed in this

section. It would be discussed the differences of male and female teacher talk with regard to gender. Now look at the summary of both teachers' speech functions.

The summary of both teachers' speech function

Speech Function	Teacher	
	Man Teacher	Woman Teacher
Statement	207	201
Question	119	172
Command	113	90
Offer	14	22
Acknowledgment	49	50
Answer	28	12
Contradiction	2	4
Compliance	-	7
Total	533	551

The first speech function which would be discussed is question. It was realized in terms of interrogative Mood. The female teacher tended to produce more questions than the male teacher as in table above. The female teacher produced 172/485 or 35,46 % questions. Meanwhile, the male teacher produced 119/453 or 26,26 % questions. It is in line with the result of a research conducted by Fishman (1978:400; in Padmadewi, 2005:603-604) that female has more tendencies to ask a question than male. Actually, he did not assert in deeper the reason why the frequency of female's question is more than male. It was merely an effort to continue a conversation.

Having interviewed the the female teacher, she actually involved her emotion in conducting the teaching learning process. She did not only ask a question as a part of teaching learning process, but also sometimes it was one of her way to approach the students. She wanted to build a good relationship with the students. She wanted to lead the

students' concentration on the material. She sometimes wanted to shorten the distance with the students. Finally, she wanted to build a good conversation with the students because of her emotion involvement.

Secondly, statement realized either in terms of declarative or modulated declarative, is mostly used by both teachers. However, it was found that there are some differences in the realization of declarative Mood. Consider this comparison of table below!

Declarative Mood	Man Teacher	Woman Teacher
MODALITY (Inclination)		
Would/Could	5	5
May	2	12
Can	5	1
INTENSIFIER		
Very/really	3	20
GRATITUDE		
Thank	-	7

The use of modality which means inclination to express the speaker's judgment or inclination about actions and events (Eggins, 1994: 189) by both teachers to respect others (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004: 148), were found in declarative clauses or Mood. The table above indicates that there is a difference between the male and female teacher in their classroom interaction. The female teacher tended to be more polite than the male teacher in conversational style (Mulac 1999; in Voegeli, 2005: 6). Although it was admitted that the numbers of modulation *Would/Could* produced by both teachers in terms of modulated declarative were equal, but the numbers of modality *May/Can* which is also to express inclination to show speaker's politeness or to soften the force of speech (Eggins, 1994: 194-195) has significant difference.

It clearly signifies that the female teacher is more polite than the male teacher. The act of the female teacher in using more modalities *May* than the male teacher is a part of semiotic process. She utilized more modalities *May* is merely to soften or temper down the speech. She might say "If you don't the guy whether man or woman, you mention name".

Secondly, the frequency of using emphatic stress *very/really* or Mood adjuncts which functionally express intensification. They provide a second chance for the speaker to add her judgments of the probability/likelihood to a proposition (Eggin, 2004: 160). It was noted that the female teacher produced emphatic stress 5 times, while the man teacher only produced once. Those were merely used as an indication that female tends to emphasize toward asserted statement and to show her judgment to anything.

The third speech function would be discussed its difference in relation to gender is command. The salient difference is in the numbers of command performed by both teachers. It clearly shows that the male teacher tended to ask more commands than the female teacher. He produced 113 clauses of 453 command speech function or 24, 94 % from the total number of other speech functions. Meanwhile, the female teacher produced 90 clauses of command speech function or 18, 55% from the total number of other speech functions. The difference between male and female teacher in producing command clauses is a bit little significant. Since from the theory of male dominance considers that male's dominance would be reflected from the language used by them. Males constitute a dominant group which attempts to maintain their control and superiority (Ayyin, 1997: 45; Dewi, 2005:76-79).

Besides, the female teacher is claimed more polite in giving command than the male teacher. It is signed by seeing the number of modulation *would/could* used by her although it was not so significant. The act of both teachers employed modulated declarative

would/could to soften the force of command in the interaction.

The last difference found in command speech function is the realization of imperative Mood followed by Comment Adjunct or commonly called modification device '*Please*'. Comment Adjunct is considered interpersonal element in the clause, since they add an expression of attitude and evaluation. The female teacher used 10 times and the male teacher used 8 times. However, it is enough to illustrate that the female teacher tended to be more polite than the male teacher. Mulac (1999; in Voegeli, 2005: 6) asserted that together with a female style of conversation that is more polite this could be categorized as an absence of dominant behavior. However, the act of the teachers in selecting Adjunct Comment '*Please*' in this case is merely to soften the force of command demanded by the teachers.

The last speech function will be discussed its distinctions dealing with gender is offering. There are two distinctions can be inferred, the numbers of offerings employed by both teachers during observations.

The female teacher produced more offerings than male teacher. It is in line with what Ayyin (1997: 25-81; Dewi, 2005: 76-82) asserted about the theory of sex social role that the difference of the way female speaks is affected by the social process that they have, for instance, it depends on the females' personality, where they tend to have less safe feeling, dependence, etc, caused by the process in which they are grown up. Furthermore, It was also probably affected by personality of female which tends to be doubtful, indirectness, weak, over correcting which indicate inferior feeling (Lakoff, 1976: 10-19; Dewi, 2005: 80). This situation or feeling probably makes the female teacher producing more offering speech functions than the male teacher. Secondly, the act of the female teacher selecting the Mood system (e.g. modulation *would* in offering something indicate her more polite than the man teacher (Mulac 1999; in Voegeli, 2005: 6).

The last distinction found on the data is compliance. The speech function is categorized as responding speech function (Eggins, 1994). The female teacher employed compliance speech function 7 times during her classroom interaction. Meanwhile, the male teacher never utilized compliance speech function during the observation. It means that sometimes the female teacher tended to express compliance or gratitude to the students after a certain student had done anything.

Recent theory posits that the emotion of gratitude uniquely functions to build a high-quality relationship between a grateful person and the target of his or her gratitude, that is, the person who performed a kind action (Algoe et al., 2008;). In that occasion, the female teacher thanked to the students and involved her emotion to build a high-quality relationship among her students. Look at the following excerpts!

- [8] T : What kind of tense that they use?
S : Simple past tense (*one of the answers*)

[9] T : Ok, thank you

it is clear-cut that the act of the female teacher in giving information of her gratitude toward the students. That is functionally to show her emotional feeling in constructing high-quality relationship among the students after the students conducted something demanded. It is in line with what was proposed by Mulac (1999; in Voegeli, 2005: 6) about female linguistic features. He asserted that female tend to display a more cooperative style of conversational interactions.

The phenomena above also can be incorporated to gender theory of sex social role legitimated by Marriyann Ayyin (1997: 45; Padmadewi, 2005:76-79) about the way of the female teacher speaks is affected by the social process that they have. Her personality at outside is brought to the classroom situation.

The Factors Influencing Differences between Male and Female Teacher Talk

As has been discussed the findings about the differences between male and female teacher talk in Mood realization in expressing the interpersonal meaning in the classroom, there are three factors which influence the differences of male and female teacher talk in Mood realization such as ideological, cultural, and social factor.

Firstly, Sasak communities are mostly Moslems, where quran and hadists are as their guidances in undergoing their life, for instance, how they behave to others (e.g. speaking to others, etc).

Regarding with gender issue, the Sasak communities, in particular those who are Moslems, put male as a superior and female as an inferior in the case of social status. In the quran, there is one statement clearly illustrating the role of male and female in the society such as "Male is a leader of woman". This teaching is hold constantly by the Sasak people. This phenomenon illustrates how male dominates female in the light Sasak community which is influenced by the religious teaching. So, male in Sasak community, those who are Moslems, feel accustomed to be a superior or dominant group.

Secondly, concerning gender issue in Sasak culture, the Sasak communities put male as a superior and female as an inferior in the case of social status. For instance, there is so much reciprocity found in Sasak culture (e.g. wife must address her husband using middle style while husband can address his wife using low or intimate style). Since the subordinate must respect to the superior. This phenomenon illustrates how male dominates female in the light Sasak culture which is influenced by the religious teaching. So, male in Sasak community feels culturally accustomed to be a superior or dominant group.

The example is the use of imperative Mood in demanding the students to do something. The male teacher used 63 of 112 commands or 56, 25 %. The female

teacher used 40 of 90 commands or 44,44 %. It also indicates that the act of the male teacher in selecting more common imperatives as a Mood system to demand the students to do something was culturally affected by his habit as a dominant group in the society.

Thirdly, Sasak community also has social stratification. The community is socially divided into noble and non-noble group. This condition then contributes on the choice of language style of the community (Mahyuni et al, 1992).

With regard to the female teacher, she is socially a noble group with the title *Baiq* and commonly speaks using middle style in her social milieu. The style is claimed more polite than low style or intimate style in the light of Sasak community. It signifies that the female teacher commonly speaks using polite or middle style in her surroundings. It directly contributes to the building of her personality, where she tended to be more polite and bland to the students. It can be proved by her act in selecting Mood system used to express the interpersonal meaning to the students such as the numbers of modality either in giving statement, the numbers of declarative and modulated declarative in demanding the students to do something, etc. Those are influenced by the social habit of the female teacher, where she commonly speaks middle or polite style based on her social status as a noble group in the society.

Thus, it is in line with what has been asserted by Mahyuni (2006). He claims that social class in the society, particularly in Sasak people, affects the way of speaking, the grammatical and language style they use.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

From the findings and the discussion elaborated previously, several conclusions can be drawn as follows: (1) The male teacher employed seven speech functions. Four speech functions were used in terms of initiation (e.g. statement, question, command and offering). Three speech functions were utilized in terms of responding (e.g. acknowledgment, answer and contradiction). Meanwhile, the female

teacher used eight speech functions. Four speech functions were realized in the form of (e.g. statement, question, command and offering). Four speech functions were realized in terms of responding (e.g. acknowledgment, answer, contradiction, compliance). Those speech functions were also realized in two types, typical clause Mood and non-typical clause Mood as has been explained previously. (2) Concerning the Mood realization in different teacher's roles in the classroom, there is relationship between both of them. It is signed by the dominant use of almost all speech functions in a certain. They tended to be strict at one role i.e. as the controller, but sometimes they changed their role into other roles even though it was in a very little portion. (3) Although classroom interaction is formal situation, where unequal status or power between a teacher and the students clearly appears, but it does not mean that there were not differences of the teacher talk used by the male and female teacher in their interaction classroom. In other words, teacher talk and gender can not be denied that those have differences, particularly the speech functions utilized by both teachers.

Based on the conclusion above, there is a suggestion that is noted namely it will be better if the study is conducted in longer time and more participants in order to give contribution in other contexts. Utilizing another instrument such as questionnaires will provide more detailed data.

REFERENCES

- Algoe, SB, et al, 2013. *The Social Functions of the Emotion of Gratitude via Expression*. Department of Psychology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA. algoe@unc.edu
- Creswell, John W, 1994. *Research Design Qualitative & Quantitative Approaches*. London: SAGE Publications.

- Cullen, Richard. 1998. *Teacher Talk and the Classroom Context*. ELT Journal Volume 52/3 July 1998 © Oxford University Press 1998
- Darong, H. C, 2012. *Discourse Semantic Analysis on the USA Presidents' Victory Speech Based on Systemic Functional Linguistics Theory*. English Education Department Post Graduate Program Ganesha University of Education. Thesis
- Duranti, A. (1985). *Sociocultural of Discourse, in Handbook of Discourse Analysis*.
<http://www.cal.org.ericcll/digest/0107demo.html>.
- Eggs, Suzanne, 1994. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London. Pinter Publisher, Ltd.
- Eggs, Suzanne, 2004. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London. Pinter Publisher, Ltd. 2nd Edition
- Eggs, Suzzane. & Slade, Diana., 1997. *Analyzing Casual Conversation*. London: Cassell
- Ellis, Rod, 1986. *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M A K , 1985. *An introduction to Functional Grammar*. London. Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd.
- Halliday, M A K & Matthiessen Christian M.I.M, 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 3rd Edition. Arnold Publisher.
- Haratyan, Farzaneh, 2011. *Halliday's SFL and Social Meaning*. University Malaya. Islamic Azad University, Garmsar Branch. 2011 2nd International Conference on Humanities, Historical and Social Sciences IPEDR vol.17 (2011) © (2011) IACSIT Press, Singapore
- Harmer, Jeremy, 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. 4rd Edition. Longman.
- Holmes, Janet, 2001. Learning about language. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Pearson Education Limited. 2nd Edition
- Lestari, Yuni Budi & Yusra, Kamaludin, 2010. *Konstruksi Jati Diri Wanita Sasak dalam Cerita Rakyat Sasak*. Mataram: FKIP Universitas Mataram
- Lier, Leo Van, 1988. *Teacher and Learners: Investigating the Language Classroom*. London and New York: Longman.
- Lock, Graham, 1999. *Functional English Grammar. An introduction for Second Language Teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Martin, J.R, Matthiesen, M., Painter, C, 1997. *Working with Functional Grammar*. London: ARNOLD
- Martinez-Flor, Alicia, 2009. *The use and Function of "Please" in Learners' Oral Requestive Behaviour: A Pragmatic Analysis*. University Jaume I. Journal of English Studies-Volume 7 (2009), 35-54.
- McCarthy, Michael, 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. New York. Cambridge University Press
- Matsumoto, Hiroshi. 2010. *Students' Perceptions about Teacher Talk in Japanese-As-A-Second-Language Classes*. Soka University of America. 53 Arizona Working Papers in SLA & Teaching, 17, 53-74(2010)
- Mahyuni, et. al, 1992. *Unggah-unggah Bahasa Sasak*. (Research Report). Mataram: Fkip Unram.
- Muhayyang, Maemuna, _____. *Teacher Talk in Classroom Interaction*. English Department. FBS UNM
- Nunan, David, 1991. *"Language Teaching Methodology" a Textbook for Teachers*. Prantice Hall
- Nunan, David, 1992. *'Research Method in Language Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Donnell, Mick, 2011. *Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics for Discourse Analysis*. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid
- Pyle, Michael A. and Munoz, Mary Ellen, 1991. *TOEFL Preparation Guide. Test of English as a Foreign Language*. Singapore: Cliifs Incorporation.
- Rugg, Deborah, 2005. *An introduction to triangulation*. UNAIDS Monitoring and Evaluation Fundamentals.

- Shitemi, Naomi L. 2009. *Language and Gender*. A Lecture to be given to IUPUI Fulbright-hays group projects abroad program July 5th - August 6th 2009 At Moi University Campuses
- Silverman, David & Marvasti, Amir, 2008. *"Doing Qualitative Research" A Comprehensive Guide*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Suarnajaya, I Wayan, 2001. *A Discourse Semantics Analysis of Particular Types of Newspaper Texts Taken From A Number of Indonesian Local Newspapers, Using Systemic Functional Linguistics Theory As A Basis of The Analysis*. Australia: La Trobe University. Dissertation
- Sugiono, 2012. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: ALFABETA
- Soenarjo, R.H.A, 1971, *Al Hadist dan Terjemahannya*. Jakarta: PT. Intermasa
- Travers, 2001. *Qualitative Research through Case Study*. London: Sage Publication
- Voegeli, Franziska, 2005. *Differences in the speech of men and women. Linguistic construction and performance of gender: the German subtitling of gender-specific English in the documentary venus boyz*. Departement Angewandte Linguistik und Kulturwissenschaften Institut für Übersetzen und Dolmetschen Studiengang Übersetzen: Dissertation
- Weddel. Kathleen Santopietro. 2008. *ESL Teacher Language (Teacher Talk) For Effective Classroom Interactions. Independent Study Course For Teachers of Adult English as a Second Language*: Northern Colorado Professional Development Center ncpdc@stvrain.k12.co.us 303 702-7912
- Yan, Xiao, 2006. *Teacher Talk and EFL in University Classrooms*. School of Foreign Languages and Literature Chongqing Normal University& Yangtze Normal University, China: Dissertation
- Yanfen. Liu & Yuqin. Zhao. 2010. *A Study of Teacher Talk in Interactions in English Classes*. Harbin Institute of Technology: Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics (Bimonthly).]Apr. 2010. Vol. 33 No. 2
- Yeasmin, Sabina & Rahman K. F, 2012. *'Triangulation' Research Method as the Tool of Social Science Research*. BUP JOURNAL, Volume 1, Issue 1, September 2012, ISSN: 2219-4851
- Yuliati, 2013. *Interpersonal Meaning Negotiation in the Teacher-Student Verbal Interaction*. The International Journal of Social Sciences. 30th May 3013. Vol. 11 No.1. www.Tijoss.com
- Zhang, Yani, 2008. *Classroom Discourse and Student Learning*. School of Foreign Languages, Qingdao University of Science and Technology. Asian Social Science. www.ccsenet.org/journal.html . Vol. 4. No. 9. September 2008
- Zhang, Facun & You Hua, 2009. *Motives of Indirectness in Daily Communication. An Asian Perspective*. Asian Culture and History. Vol. 1. No. 2 July 2009. www.ccsenet.org/journal.html