






An Analysis of Systemic Functional Linguistics Interpersonal Meaning Representation in Classroom Interaction

Dian Luthfiyati¹, Widyastuti Widyastuti², Suhartono Suhartono³

Department of Language and Literature Education, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia

Email: dianluthfiyati@unisla.ac.id

Abstract. This study explores the representation of interpersonal meaning in classroom interactions through mood realization and modality, drawing on Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) framework. The research focuses on how teachers use different moods, such as declarative, interrogative, and imperative, to structure classroom discourse. The findings indicate that declarative mood is the most commonly employed, reflecting the teacher's primary role in delivering information, directing the lesson flow, and ensuring that students receive the necessary guidance for learning. The interrogative mood engages students by asking questions that prompt critical thinking and interaction, while the imperative mood facilitates commands and requests to guide student behavior and learning tasks. In terms of modality, the study reveals that high-probability markers dominate, indicating the teacher's confidence and certainty in the knowledge being presented. Modulation, particularly tendency modulation, further emphasizes the teacher's efforts to actively motivate students to participate in discussions, fostering a collaborative learning environment. Using various modal choices, the teacher transfers knowledge, establishes authority, and builds a supportive relationship with students, encouraging them to explore subjects more deeply. The interaction between mood and modality in classroom discourse illustrates the teacher's role in shaping a productive learning atmosphere. This, in turn, influences student engagement, motivation, and learning outcomes. The study contributes to a deeper understanding of how language functions in educational settings and highlights the importance of linguistic strategies in effective classroom management and student involvement.

Keywords: Classroom interaction, interpersonal meaning, mood system, modality, systemic functional linguistics

1 INTRODUCTION

Students' success in achieving good learning outcomes is influenced by the active interaction between teachers and students in the learning process. The interaction will create a pleasant learning atmosphere to develop his potential to train in academic and

moral skills. Interaction in the classroom is a form of educational communication with language as a tool (Wicaksono, 2016). Classroom interaction will form a communication structure between students and teachers that is used so that learning objectives can be adequately achieved. Interaction transmits views, information, or beliefs to others (Prajnaparamytha, 2019).

The dynamics of interaction carried out by each individual is an interpersonal function of the language function. The functional systemic linguistics (LSF) theory coined by Halliday (1985) outlines three main functions of language analysis: ideational, interpersonal, and textual. Interpersonal is defined by social relationships (Martin, 2002). Vygotsky (1986) stated that social interaction is essential in learning. He revealed that meaningful interactions between students and teachers and between students will form a zone of close development, which is the area where the most effective learning occurs.

In education, classroom interaction is an integral part of the learning process. The representation of interpersonal meaning plays a significant role in creating a conducive learning atmosphere and good interpersonal relationships between teachers and fellow students. The functional systemic approach will answer how language can shape interpersonal meaning. Previous research conducted by Hasan (1996) shows that considerations regarding the use of a register should refer to the communication situation and genre manifested in various forms of language, including speech, discussion, or instruction. Martin (2003) asserts the importance of choosing the type of language used by teachers in providing understanding to learners. This is because it will create a close and supportive relationship with each other.

In the research, the SFL approach can analyze various language elements, including speech, mode, mood, and tenor, applied to the interaction between teachers and students in conveying an interpersonal meaning. Vygotsky (1978) revealed that social interaction and language are essential in shaping learners' mindsets and learning processes. The teacher is the mediator, and learner interaction through language plays a crucial role in implementing this. The interpersonal meaning contained in the interaction can influence the learning process, students' interest in learning, and the effectiveness of communication between teachers and students. The results of the analysis can be considered for developing effective learning strategies and classroom management.

While numerous studies have explored the use of language in classroom interactions through the lens of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), much of the focus has been on the ideational and textual meanings of communication. However, more research is needed to examine how interpersonal meaning is constructed in teacher-student interactions, mainly through mood realization and modality. Existing literature has predominantly concentrated on transmitting knowledge and content without paying enough attention to the social and relational dynamics facilitated by linguistic choices in the classroom. This study addresses this gap by investigating how teachers use mood types (declarative, interrogative, imperative) and modality (probability, obligation) to shape interpersonal relationships with their students and how these choices impact classroom engagement and dynamics.

Three primary questions guide this research:

1. How do teachers use mood realization (declarative, interrogative, imperative) in classroom interactions to build interpersonal meaning?
2. What modalities (probability, obligation) are most frequently employed by teachers, and how do they influence the flow of classroom discourse?
3. How do these linguistic strategies affect student participation and the classroom environment?

This study aims to analyze the representation of interpersonal meaning in classroom interactions using the SFL framework. By focusing on teachers' linguistic strategies, particularly in terms of mood and modality, the study seeks to uncover how these elements contribute to classroom management, student engagement, and creating a positive learning atmosphere. Ultimately, this research aims to provide a deeper understanding of language's role in shaping classroom dynamics and offer insights that could inform more effective teaching practices.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Interpersonal Meaning

As part of the three meta-functions in Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) theory, interpersonal meaning plays a central role in communication by facilitating social interaction and expressing attitudes, judgments, and evaluations between speakers and listeners (Halliday, 1990). It involves how speakers engage with others in discourse, utilizing language to convey information and establish and maintain relationships. Interpersonal meaning is closely tied to how individuals position themselves and others within a conversation, often reflecting power dynamics, social roles, and intentions (Egins, 2004).

In educational settings, understanding interpersonal meaning becomes crucial for analyzing classroom discourse, where language is the primary medium for interaction between teachers and students. Teachers use various mood structures—declarative, interrogative, and imperative—as well as modality to navigate and control the flow of communication, thus shaping interpersonal relations within the classroom (Martin & White, 2005). These linguistic choices help teachers encourage participation, manage behavior, and create a learning environment that fosters academic and social development (Christie, 2002).

McGregor (1997) discusses interpersonal meaning in grammar as characterized by certain syntagmatic relations, which he calls 'conjugation' relations, where the whole-to-whole relationship between clauses reflects the dynamic interaction between participants. In the classroom context, this becomes evident through mood and modality, where teachers modulate their authority and engage students in a collaborative learning process (Davidse & Vandenberg, 2008). The effective use of interpersonal meaning in discourse also involves balancing the teacher's role as a knowledge authority and

their responsibility to facilitate a conducive and motivating environment for student engagement (Platzack & Rosengren, 1997).

Research has shown that teachers' ability to manage interpersonal meaning through these linguistic tools can significantly impact the effectiveness of teaching and learning outcomes. Hasan (1996) emphasized that the interpersonal choices made by teachers in terms of modality and mood directly influence student participation and interaction, creating opportunities for students to engage deeply with the material. For example, declarative moods often position the teacher as the primary knower, while interrogative moods invite student contributions, creating a critical dialogic space for deeper learning (Vygotzky, 1978).

Furthermore, Martin's (2003) work extends the understanding of interpersonal meaning by considering the impact of register and genre on classroom discourse. He argues that interpersonal choices in classroom talk—such as how teachers express certainty, obligation, or permission—shape the relational dynamics of the classroom and ultimately influence student motivation and learning strategies. These interactions align with Vygotzky's (1986) socio-cultural theory, highlighting social interaction's importance in cognitive development.

In sum, representing interpersonal meaning in classroom interaction is critical to understanding how language transmits knowledge and shapes social relations. Using mood and modality in classroom discourse enables teachers to assert authority, encourage participation, and foster a collaborative learning environment, all essential for effective pedagogy.

2.2 Class Discourse

The term "classroom discourse" describes the distinct communication patterns between teachers and students through a lesson. Recent research indicates that language use in the classroom significantly impacts student learning effectiveness because it affects both the social dynamics of the school and the subject matter being taught. Class discourse is a potent weapon teachers use to shape the classroom climate and encourage student participation, not only to disseminate material (Walsh, 2020).

One of the most important aspects of classroom discourse is how teachers organize their interactions with students through instructions, feedback, and questions. Howe and Abedin's (2019) research demonstrates that teacher-student interactions, especially dialogic instruction, foster deeper cognitive engagement in students. Instead of just having students answer closed questions that restrict conversation, teachers using this method also provide open-ended queries and feedback that help students think critically and participate in the learning process.

A more modern approach to comprehending classroom discourse is the idea of "participatory learning environments," which involve co-constructing knowledge between teachers and students. According to Mercer et al. (2019), practical classroom discourse requires a balance of authority between teachers and students. Deeper learning and developing critical thinking abilities are facilitated when teachers give students the freedom to share their thoughts and receive feedback from one another in a group setting. This method emphasizes the importance of social contact in cognitive development, which aligns with Vygotzky's socio-cultural theory (Vygotzky, 1978).

Discourse plays a big part in controlling behavior in the classroom. According to recent research by Alexander (2021), classroom discourse can effectively regulate classroom dynamics and transfer knowledge. Teachers deliberately employ a variety of speech actions, including requests, affirmations, and directives, to direct student behavior and sustain a disciplined learning environment. This has been demonstrated to directly impact student engagement, as encouraging and helpful communication creates a more favorable environment for learning (Alexander, 2021).

In addition, there has been much discussion lately about the use of technology in the classroom. More dynamic and participative kinds of classroom discourse are now possible because of tools like interactive whiteboards, digital learning platforms, and video conferencing that have revolutionized traditional teacher-student interactions. Digital tools provide multimodal communication, enabling students to interact with content simultaneously through spoken language, visuals, and text, as stated by Lai and Bower (2019). Teachers now have more chances to build inclusive and dynamic learning environments, which is particularly beneficial in remote or hybrid learning settings.

Classroom conversation is crucial in determining how students learn. It facilitates social interaction, teamwork, and critical thinking in the classroom and acts as a vehicle for knowledge transfer. Teachers adept at controlling and organizing classroom conversation are better positioned to draw students in, encourage active learning, and foster a positive learning environment.

2.3 Systemic Functional Linguistics

A theory of language called systemic functional linguistics (SFL) concerns the meaning-making processes that occur when language is employed in social circumstances. SFL, first created in the 1960s by Michael Halliday, sees language as a tool for meaning-making in which each linguistic decision has a particular social purpose. The three metafunctions of language in SFL are ideational (expressing content), interpersonal (building relationships), and textual (organizing information coherently). Together, these metafunctions support how authors and speakers create meaning in many situations (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014).

Building on Halliday's work, further research has emphasized the significance of SFL in educational settings. SFL offers a valuable tool for examining classroom discourse because it clarifies how educators and students use language to negotiate meaning, form social bonds, and accomplish academic objectives. SFL is especially helpful in understanding how language structures can support learning by acting as a scaffold for more complicated ideas and empowering teachers to effectively direct student engagement, as noted by Humphrey and Hao (2022). SFL can illuminate power dynamics, positions, and relationships in classroom interactions by thoroughly examining language choices made by teachers and students.

SFL's capacity to analyze language with context awareness is one of its main advantages. Language is viewed as a tool that functions within particular social and cultural settings rather than as a stand-alone set of rules. This method is highly pertinent in today's multicultural classrooms, where educators must be sensitive to the many linguistic origins of their students. Macken-Horarik et al. (2020) assert that SFL helps teachers design more inclusive and successful teaching strategies, especially in literacy development, by examining how distinct language registers and genres function in diverse situations.

Furthermore, SFL has been used in recent studies to analyze multimodal texts, which combine spoken and written language with various semiotic resources like gestures, images, and sound. According to O'Halloran et al. (2020), in the digital age, when communication is increasingly conducted across multiple channels simultaneously, the multimodal perspective of SFL is crucial. With the growth of e-learning and remote education, a more thorough examination of the construction of meaning in digital and online learning contexts is now possible because of this enlarged understanding of SFL.

SFL has been used to examine language use in institutional, professional, and educational situations. Martin and Rose (2021) draw attention to the importance of SFL in comprehending discourse in domains like the media, law, and healthcare, where language is crucial for constructing meaning, establishing authority, and influencing relationships. This demonstrates even more how flexible SFL is as a technique for examining language use in various real-world contexts.

SFL's versatility in various settings, including digital platforms and classrooms, guarantees its continued significance in the study of language and communication. Through its framework, which considers language's structural form and social function, SFL provides insightful information on how meaning is constructed and negotiated in various contexts and forms.

3. METHOD

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a qualitative case study approach to examine interpersonal meaning in classroom interactions. The case study design allowed for an in-depth analysis of specific linguistic behaviors within a real-world educational context. The study focused on class XI at MA Maarif 9 Lamongan, which aimed to investigate how teachers used language, specifically mood, and modality, to shape classroom interactions and influence student participation.

3.2 Data Collection

The data collection process involved three primary sources: observation, interviews, and secondary data. Each source is described in detail below:

1) Classroom Observation

Direct classroom observation was conducted to gather primary data on the teacher's use of language. The observations occurred in class XI at MA Maarif 9 Lamongan during regular instructional periods. The steps followed in the observation process include:

- a. **Initial Setup:** The classroom environment was set up to record interactions without disrupting the natural flow of the lesson. Video recordings captured the entire discourse, ensuring that verbal and non-verbal interactions were documented.
- b. **Observation Period:** To ensure a comprehensive understanding of the linguistic patterns, observations were conducted over multiple class sessions, each approximately 90 minutes long.
- c. **Transcription:** The recordings were transcribed, with particular attention paid to the different mood realizations (declarative, interrogative, imperative) and modality markers (probability, obligation) used by the teacher.

2) Interviews with Teachers

Semi-structured interviews were conducted after the observation sessions. The purpose was to gain insights into the teacher's reasoning behind their linguistic choices and to clarify their strategies for engaging students. The steps for conducting the interview include:

- a. Interview Preparation: Questions were designed based on the classroom observations, focusing on how the teacher used mood and modality to manage classroom interactions.
- b. Interview Process: The interviews were held in a quiet setting, recorded for accuracy, and lasted approximately 30-45 minutes. Teachers were asked open-ended questions about their language use, pedagogical intentions, and student interaction.
- c. Transcription and Coding: The interview data were transcribed and then coded to align with the patterns observed in classroom discourse.

3) Secondary Data

Secondary data included lesson plans, teaching materials, and other relevant documents the teacher and school provided. These documents were analyzed to understand the structure of the lessons and how the teacher planned to manage classroom discourse. The collection of secondary data followed these steps:

- a. Collection: Documents such as lesson plans were collected directly from the teacher after the interview sessions.
- b. Review: The lesson plans were reviewed to identify language patterns that aligned with the teacher's use of mood and modality during classroom interactions.
- c. Cross-referencing: These documents were cross-referenced with the data from observations to see if the planned strategies aligned with what was implemented during the lessons.

3.3 Data Analysis

- 1) The data were analyzed using Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) framework, focusing on mood realization (declarative, interrogative, imperative) and modality (probability, obligation). The analysis was conducted in three phases:

a. Transcription Analysis

Classroom discourse transcriptions were first coded for mood and modality. This involved identifying whether each clause was declarative (providing information), interrogative (asking questions), or imperative (giving commands). Similarly, modality markers such as "must," "will," or "may" were noted to analyze the teacher's expressions of obligation or probability.

b. Triangulation Process

Triangulation was employed to enhance the validity of the findings by comparing data from multiple sources:

- a) Classroom Observations were cross-checked with the interview data to understand whether the teacher's perceived intentions matched their classroom discourse.
- b) The lesson plans and teaching materials were reviewed with the observation data to verify if the intended teaching strategies aligned with the observed use of mood and modality.

- c) This triangulation identified and analyzed any discrepancies between what the teacher planned, observed, and explained. This process ensured that the conclusions were robust and reflected the actual classroom dynamics.

c. Pattern Identification

The final stage of the analysis was identifying recurring patterns in the teacher’s use of mood and modality. The frequency of declarative, interrogative, and imperative moods and the dominance of certain modality types were noted. These patterns were then linked to their effects on classroom dynamics, particularly student participation and engagement.

- 2) By applying triangulation, the study ensured that the findings were comprehensive and reliable, with data from multiple sources corroborating each other. This approach also allowed a deeper understanding of how interpersonal meaning is negotiated in the classroom through specific linguistic choices.

4. RESULTS

Several findings were found in the research, showing speech turnover interaction between participants as initiators and respondents. Based on the research results, there are moods and modalities in the teacher's interaction in the classroom. 187 out of 219 clauses used by teachers in the school have different moods. Each clause containing a mood of 78 clauses expresses its modality. In addition, 15 clauses were identified as minor clauses.

4. 1 Mood Realization

Clause: 13

Data: As you explained in the previous meeting, writing a short story involves various elements.

Table 1. Example of Declarative Clauses Analysis

Short Story	write	consists of	element	as I explained in the last meeting
Subject	Does	Predicator	Complement	Adjunct
Mood		Residue		
The Coding of Mood		Subject ^ Finite		

In terms of function, the use of declarative text in classroom interaction indicates that it is used to convey information to students. Declarative text used by teachers in learning will increase the second language knowledge of learners.

Clause: 18

Data: What are the parts of the short story text from the previous meeting?

Table 2. Example of Interrogative Clause Analysis

Try Andi to elaborate	Anything	short story text parts	at the previous meeting
Finite	Complement	Adjunct	
Mood		Residue	
The Coding of Mood		Finite ^ Subject	

Based on the analysis, 38 interrogative clauses out of 219 clauses were identified as having an interrogative mood. Questions arise when the teacher demands information from the learners as interlocutors. When the teacher asks questions, the teacher invites students to think and express their ideas by answering questions.

The data analysis also shows that 24 imperative clauses were obtained in the transcripts of teachers' classroom talks. Here is one example of the mood of imperative clauses

Clause: 210

Data: The homework you have given me must be done carefully and thoroughly.

Table 3. Examples of Imperative Clause Analysis

Homework that has been given carefully and thoroughly must be done	
Predicator	Adjunct
Residue	

In clause 210, the teacher demands action in an imperative mood. Imperative clauses contain commands or requests (proposal negotiation).

4.2 Modal Realisation

Modality is a critical element of expressing interpersonal meaning. Martin revealed four main types of modality: probability, obligation, readiness, and modality. Modality is a language marker representing the speaker's attitude towards the spoken reality (Hasan, 1996). According to Halliday (1990), modality consists of modelization and modulation.

4.2.1 Modalisation

a) Possibility

The probabilities found in class XI discourse use mood descriptors consisting of "definitely," "will," "maybe," and "sometimes." The probability with the highest degree of "definitely" can be seen in the example below.

Teacher: "In writing a short story, we have to make sure that every element of the short story is present in the short story we write" (WK46).

The word "definitely" in the sentence shows that the probability of using building blocks in writing short stories is high. The word "definitely" also represents that if the thing or action is done, it will have a significant impact.

The mood adverbs "will" and "may" are the second probabilities in the middle degree. Teacher: "You will also hone your skills and explore your linguistic abilities well" (WK73).

Clause 73 shows the teacher's opinion on improving linguistic skills. Furthermore, the low degree uses the mood adverb "sometimes." The probability can be seen as follows: Teacher: "Sometimes we experience obstacles in writing" (WK91).

Clause 91 is a low degree of possibility modalisation used by the teacher to state that there is a possibility of experiencing obstacles in writing. The modalisation of possibility is found in high degree in 5 clauses, medium degree in 8 clauses, and low degree in 2 clauses.

b) frequent

Modalisation of "frequently" is also found in classroom discourse. The modalisation of frequent is found in high degrees having mood descriptors such as "always". The modalisation can be seen below.

Teacher: "I always say that learning will be interesting if you actively participate in asking questions" (WK154).

Clause 154 always states that something will give positive value if an action is performed regularly. Furthermore, the intermediate degree is characterized by the mood adverb "usually," which can be seen from the following example:

Teacher: "You make it a habit always to listen and pay attention to the lesson" (WK189).

Clause 131 shows that the word ordinary refers to a statement of frequency in doing something. Furthermore, the low degree is characterized by the mood adverb "rarely."

This can be seen from the following conversation transcript

Teacher: "Nowadays, it is rare to turn local history stories into interesting short stories" (Clause 105).

Clause 105, which uses the word "rarely," is closer to the negative boundary, which means it is semantically closer to "there are no short stories that raise local history." The results show that the modalisation of a high degree of frequency is found in 3 clauses of high degree, 2 of medium degree, and 1 with a low degree.

Modulation

Must

Modulation of the imperative is also found in classroom discourse. It is found in high and low degrees. The high degree uses the mood descriptors "must" and "need." The mood representation can be seen as follows.

Teacher: "must pay attention to good language structures" (WK94)

Teacher: "There needs to be awareness to preserve cultural values" (WK87)

The transcript above shows that the imperative has more value with positive polarity. In clause 94, the teacher asks students to pay attention to the details of the language structure when writing short stories. Meanwhile, clause 87 asks students to be fully aware of preserving their culture.

The middle data is characterized by the word "hope." This can be seen in the following transcript of the conversation

Teacher: "I hope you have done your best" (WK201).

The data above shows that the teacher uses the modulation of imperative with a medium degree of confidence to express confidence that the learners have optimally completed the tasks.

Furthermore, the adverb "may" is used to mean low degrees. The following data show this.

Teacher: "can be discussed in groups" (WK132).

The teacher's utterance stating "may" is at a low degree, and its value is close to positive polarity. So, the word "may" in clause 132 in the teacher's statement about an action can be discussed in groups. The imperative modulation data for the high degree is found in as many as two clauses, a medium degree in as many as one clause, and a low degree in 1 clause. a) Trends

The modulation of high-degree tendency uses the adverb "tend." The data can be seen below.

Teacher: "Short story writing nowadays tends to raise contemporary themes" (WK64).

This data shows the teacher's view that short stories today are more about contemporary themes and less about local history.

The modulation of tendency in the middle degree uses the mood statement "want." This can be seen in the data realization below.

Teacher: "Before entering the next material, I would like to ask first" (WK14).

The modulation of the above tendency shown by the word "want" expresses the teacher's desire for positive polarity. Positive polarity represents the teacher's desire to ask about the previous lesson. The data analysis results show that a high degree of tendency modulation is one clause, and a medium degree is 11 clauses.

Table 4. Percentage of Modality Types

Form of Modality		Quantity	Percentage
Modalisation	Probability	15	42%
	Seriousness	5	14%
Modalisation	Must	4	11%
	Trends	12	33%
Number of Clauses		36	100%

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Mood Realization

To communicate meaning, guide student behavior, and promote engagement, teachers use three primary forms of mood: declarative, interrogative, and imperative. Mood realization plays a crucial role in forming these interactions. According to this study, imperatives were used less frequently in class XI at MA Maarif 9 Lamongan, while declarative and interrogative moods were the most often utilized. These results are consistent with the body of research on classroom discourse, showing how teachers employ mood to promote interactional and educational goals.

In the classroom under observation, the declarative mood predominated. It was primarily employed to impart knowledge, offer clarifications, and uphold the teacher's authority as the source of knowledge. This is in line with the conclusions of Christie (2019), who contends that declarative statements—which support the teacher's position as the leading knowledge provider—are the cornerstone of teacher-centered teaching. Similarly, declarative mood is essential to creating the "unidirectional" information flow in the classroom, where the teacher is seen as the authoritative figure. This was highlighted by Martin and White (2018). This study supports these results, demonstrating that declarative mood was most commonly used when the teacher gave instructional content and ensured the students comprehended it.

The declarative mood does, however, frequently establish authority; nevertheless, it can also occasionally impede student interaction opportunities. This study's observations of students passively taking in the material during protracted teacher monologues support Heritage and Koshik's (2020) worries that excessive dependence on declarative can limit critical thinking and lower student participation. To promote more dynamic interaction, teachers must balance declarative mood with other mood types, even though it is effective for education.

The second most popular mood type, interrogative, was utilized to get students interested by eliciting answers and promoting involvement. This is consistent with the findings of Jones (2020), who discovered that dialogic classroom environments—

where students are encouraged to express their opinions and participate in class discussions—are best created by interrogative moods. The teacher in this study encouraged students to think critically about the material by posing both closed- and open-ended questions with interrogative moods. When interrogatives were used to verify comprehension or elicit additional explanations from students, they successfully raised student involvement. For instance, inquiries such as "What do you think?" and "Can you explain this?" prompted more in-depth student involvement. This approach is corroborated by Mercer et al. (2019), who observed that questioning strategies that push students to express their ideas enhance higher-order thinking and cognitive engagement. This study supports the idea that creating an interactive learning environment and encouraging student-centered discourse requires an interrogative attitude.

The imperative mood was employed less commonly, primarily for directing students or controlling their behavior. Imperatives, such as "Open your books" or "Please finish your assignment," were usually used by teachers to give instructions or assist students with particular activities. According to Walsh (2018), imperatives play a crucial role in classroom management since they enable teachers to uphold the authority and organize the classroom. However, This study discovered that imperatives were strategically used and reserved for appropriate situations, preventing the instructor's authoritative voice from overpowering the more cooperative parts of classroom conversation. According to Smith and Sosa (2021), imperatives can hinder student autonomy if they are overused, but when applied correctly, they support order without inhibiting student initiative. In this study, the teacher employed imperatives to provide the essential framework for learning while ensuring that student interest was maintained.

According to recent studies like Hood (2020) and Thompson (2019), teachers must find a balance between the different mood types to promote authority and participation in the classroom. The results of this study support previous observations by demonstrating that imperatives assisted in managing classroom operations, interrogatives produced possibilities for student participation, and declarative moods were helpful in teaching objectives. According to Paltridge and Phakiti (2020), the teacher's capacity to transition between these moods to meet various educational objectives is essential for effective classroom engagement. Furthermore, Jones's (2020) research indicates that the appropriate usage of mood types can directly impact the motivation and involvement of students. This was seen in the observed classroom when the teacher's deft interrogative tone piqued students' interest and motivated them to participate actively. Martin and Rose (2018) contend that mood selections are an expression of educational objectives, and this study demonstrates that the instructor's mood selection was strongly related to their purpose of instructing and engaging the students.

5.2 Modalisation

The term "modalization" describes how a speaker uses words to convey different levels of likelihood, obligation, or certainty. Teachers often use modality in classroom engagement to control the flow of conversation, establish ground rules, and oversee the classroom environment. In class XI at MA Maarif 9 Lamongan, this study found that high-probability modality (such as "must" or "will") was frequently used by the teacher, who frequently stressed certainty and duty to help students through the learning process. The teacher's discourse often employed probability modality, including high-certainty markers like "definitely" and "will." This is in line with the findings of Martin

and White (2018), who discovered that high-probability markers are frequently used in educational contexts where the instructor wants to project confidence in the subject matter being taught. The teacher reaffirmed authority and trust by saying, "We must make sure every element is covered," and "You will understand this better by the end of the lesson." By carefully choosing whatever high-probability modality to use, the instructor can establish clear expectations for student performance and establish authority in the classroom.

Additionally, Thompson's (2019) research bolsters the conclusion that using a high-probability modality helps teachers exert more influence over the discourse by presenting knowledge as sure and certain. This gives students clear expectations about what is expected of them and reinforces the role of the teacher. The teacher in this study used these markers frequently, which aligned with the learning objectives and helped students confidently understand complex subjects. Overuse of high-probability modality, however, may have drawbacks as well. According to Heritage and Koshik (2020), high-certainty markers might occasionally inhibit students' opportunities to challenge assumptions or consider different viewpoints, even when they offer clarity. While the teacher in this study asserted authority through the use of the high-certainty modality, there were times when this tactic may have hindered student autonomy since it made students less inclined to question or criticize the information being provided. This emphasizes how crucial it is to balance clarity and more evocative language to promote more profound critical engagement.

The study also discovered that the teacher's interactions were frequently characterized by the obligation modality, which took the shape of orders or instructions like "must" or "need to." The use of responsibility is essential for maintaining order in the classroom and making sure that students comply with directions. This is consistent with Christie's (2019) observation that educators frequently use robust duty markers to set behavioral norms and uphold order in the classroom. The teacher's use of the obligation modality during task-related directions, like "We need to finish this activity now" or "You must complete this before the end of the class," was noted in the context of this study. These instructions stressed the value of meeting deadlines and expectations and guiding students through particular activities. Walsh (2018) discovered comparable outcomes, indicating that the obligation modality played a crucial role in upholding classroom order and ensuring students adhered to the course plan. Furthermore, as Jones (2020) noted, powerful duty indicators function as a type of pedagogical scaffolding, assisting students in comprehending the significance of adhering to protocols and completing learning objectives. In this study, the instructor used "must" and "need" to scaffold students' learning and control behavior by ensuring they took the right actions to finish tasks. The teacher employed the possibility modality, albeit less frequently, especially when she wanted the students to explore concepts or work on more flexible assignments. Students were more accessible to respond when phrases like "Perhaps you could think about it this way" or "You might find this approach helpful" indicated lower certainty. This strategy is consistent with the findings of Mercer et al. (2019), who pointed out that using the possibility modality helps students think critically and participate in exploratory learning.

This study's occasional use of possibility modality encouraged a more dynamic learning environment by allowing students to weigh different viewpoints and reach their judgments. Smith and Sosa (2021) stressed the significance of balancing high-

certainty and possibility modes to support student agency. A collaborative learning atmosphere where students feel more empowered to participate can be fostered, and student engagement can be increased when teachers allow for a certain amount of uncertainty in their discourse. The study's conclusions are consistent with earlier investigations on the function of modality in classroom discourse. Teachers can establish authority and direct student behavior by strategically utilizing the likelihood and duty modality, as Thompson (2019) and Martin and White (2018) show. The teacher in this study created a controlled learning environment where students understood their roles and expectations by using high-probability and obligation markers in a way that was consistent with these observations.

Additionally, studies by Walsh (2018) and Jones (2020) lend credence to the notion that modality serves a dual purpose in promoting learning and controlling classroom behavior. The study's conclusions demonstrate the importance of modality in classroom discourse, how it can help teachers balance their job as educators, and the requirement to provide a supportive, interactive learning environment. But, as Heritage and Koshik (2020) point out, a careful balance must be struck between allowing students to explore and utilizing modality to exert control. Although the teacher controlled the conversation using high-certainty markers, more possibility modeling is necessary to promote student-led inquiry and critical thinking. Maintaining this equilibrium is essential to ensure students are active participants in their education rather than just passive information consumers.

6. CONCLUSION

This study examined how teachers at MA Maarif 9 Lamongan's class XI use modalization and mood realization to influence classroom dynamics. The results demonstrate that imperative mood assisted with task management, interrogative mood promoted student involvement, and declarative mood was primarily employed for information delivery. Modalization, exceptionally high probability, and obligation markers strengthened the instructor's authority and gave students unambiguous direction. This study has several restrictions. The results may not generalize to other educational environments or schools because the study only examined one classroom. Furthermore, the study only included qualitative data, which might have left out important details about student involvement. Future studies may explore more varied environments and the integration of qualitative and quantitative methodologies. This study emphasizes to educators the significance of striking a balance between modality and mood in language use in the classroom. Declarative and obligation markers are helpful for clarity and control, but more interrogative and possibility modalities can boost student participation. Integrating these linguistic tactics into teacher development programs can make learning environments more interactive and captivating for curriculum design and educational training. Educators may enhance student involvement and establish more productive learning spaces by comprehending how language shapes classroom dynamics.

REFERENCES

1. Alexander, R. (2021). *A dialogic teaching companion*. Routledge.

2. Christie, F. (2002). *Classroom discourse analysis: A functional perspective*. Continuum.
3. Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
4. Davidse, K., & Simon-Vandenberg, A. M. (2008). Introduction: The realization of interpersonal meaning. *Word*, 59(1-2), 3–23.
5. Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2018). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
6. Eggins, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nd ed.). Continuum.
7. Halliday, M. A. K. (1990). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Arnold.
8. Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
9. Hasan, R. (1996). *Ways of saying: Ways of meaning*. Ablex Publishing.
10. Howe, C., & Abedin, M. (2019). Dialogic pedagogy in primary and secondary education: Harnessing the power of classroom talk. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 23, 100280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2019.100280>
11. Humphrey, S., & Hao, J. (2022). Scaffolding language for learning: Teaching functional grammar to support disciplinary literacy. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 57, 101053. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2022.101053>
12. Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2015). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
13. Macken-Horarik, M., Devereux, L., Trimmingham-Jack, C., & Wilson, K. (2020). Applying SFL in diverse classrooms: Empowering students through explicit literacy teaching. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 43(1), 5–16.
14. Martin, J. R. (2002). Meaning beyond the clause: SFL perspectives. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 52.
15. Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2021). *Genre relations: Mapping culture* (2nd ed.). Equinox Publishing.
16. Martin, S. P. (2003). *Investigating classroom discourse*. RoutledgeFalmer.
17. Martin, Matthiessen, & Painter. (1997). *Working with functional grammar*. Arnold, the Hodder Headline Group.
18. Mercer, N., Wegerif, R., & Major, L. (2019). *The Routledge international handbook of research on dialogic education*. Routledge.
19. O'Halloran, K. L., Tan, S., & E, M. K. L. (2020). Multimodal SFL analysis of digital media: A functional approach to meaning-making in online environments. *Social Semiotics*, 30(4), 438–460. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2019.1708605>
20. Platzack, C., & Rosengren, I. (1997). On the subject of imperatives: A minimalist account of the imperative clause. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*, 1, 177–224. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1009747522177>
21. Prajnaparamytha, P. A. (2019, December). Pengaruh makna interpersonal antara guru dan siswa dalam strategi kedisiplinan (Kajian Linguistik Sistemik Fungsional). In *Seminar Nasional Inovasi dalam Penelitian Sains Teknologi dan Humaniora-InoBali* (pp. 347–353).

22. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
23. Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. MIT Press.
24. Walsh, S. (2020). *Classroom discourse and teacher development* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh University Press.
25. Wicaksono, L. (2016). Bahasa dalam komunikasi pembelajaran. *Jurnal Pembelajaran Prospektif*, 1(2).

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

