Moods Pattern on Indonesian EFL University of Riau Kepulauan Students' Classroom Interaction

Erwin Ashari[1], Shalehoddin[2]
[1,2]University of Riau Kepulauan, Batam, Indonesia
[1]*erwinashariharianja83@gmail.com*,[2] zhibond501@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigated, formulated and reasoned exchange structure used on Indonesian EFL university students' classroom interaction. Data transcriptions were taken from seven EFL classroom interaction videos between addressers and addressees, and field notes were taken to support primary data. Result shows that number of mood and residue reached 94.1 %and the rest was in elliptical moods . mood and residue domination was influenced by subject discussion and the formality of the situation matters. It was found that "move" of exchange structure was in small number (three *moves*), so did elliptical clause. Since natural conversation was dominated by elliptical moods , long "move" of exchange structure and elliptical clauses, thus, these could not be categorized as natural interaction. In line, Patterns of exchange structure coding contribute significantly toward EFL students' comprehension during classroom interaction.

Keywords; mood and residue, Elliptical Moods, Formality, Subject Matter,

INTRODUCTION

Relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used concerns as discourse analysis (McCarthy, 2000). The relationship can be clasified as three functions, they are experential, interpersonal and textual (Saragih, 2006), the three functions becomes as the basic of discourse analysis discussion. Discourse analysis as methodological approaches to the study of talk, both of which have far-reaching implications for our understanding of social interaction (Wooffitt, 2006). It indicates that classroom interaction is as the part of the discourse analysis discussion.

Discourse is a complex process involving the integration of textual (language) cues and background knowledge, it makes discourse

comprehension is about as easy to achieve as it is hard to grasp (Gurning in Ashari, 2015). It shows that a language is complex and the meaning of the text is complex. Understanding the meaning of the text is also influenced by the background knowledge. The interpretation of meaning has correlation to the linguistic behavior from the pronunciation, word choice, sentence structure, semantic, and pragmatic. So, it can be said that discourse comprehension is comprehension competence to interpret the meaning of a text either spoken, written or semiotic language. The classroom discourse structures were dominantly realized by Initiation and Response (IR) structure (Jupriaman & Murni, 2016). The relationship influences the function of a language in a clause that will influence the meaning and interpretation too (Saragih, 2006). The context of language users also has a role in transferring meaning that will be interpreted. The context covers many areas that influence the meaning of the text, such as situation, status, time, culture, condition, gender, location, etc. the other context such as conversation activity, speech activity, reading activity, listening activity and writing activity.

The participants in a conversation always follow certain principles to develop towards some general directions (Zhang, 2008). The goal of practical conversation in English class is to stimulate students' speaking skills. By giving more exercise about conversation it can enrich their experiences about conversation. In classroom interaction, it can be instructed on not just the structure of thesis introductions but also the ways in which intertextual links and author persona are created in this genre (Samraj, 2008).

The Interpersonal Level contains descriptions of all and only those properties of linguistic units that reflect, and indeed influence, their use in verbal interaction (Hengeveld & Mackenzie, 2008). It shows that it needs to nanlyzed the structure of conversation interaction. It is due to the functional approached that covers negotioantion (exchange structure), ideation (lexical string) and identification (reference chain) (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014) . Negotiation covers speech function, its mood and move (Saragih, 2006). In the level of lexico-grammar, it is called interpersonal function and it becomes negotiation in the level of discourse (Halliday, 1985). Negotiation is one of the

fields of the discourse analysis which is dealing with the conversation activity. Martin in (Saragih, 2006) defines that negotiation means shaping meaning through dialogue. In conversation, it involves two participants, they are addresser and addressee. (Wooffitt, 2006) defines that conversation examines language as social action. It means that language structure used in every conversation must be different. Saragih states in (Shalehoddin & Ashari, 2016) that conversation is structured in terms of *move*. In addition, systematically the realizations of moves are related to *Speech Functions* and *Moods*. In this way, conversations are multi-dimensionally analyzed. it means that in negotiation there are three dimension that can be analyzed, they are *move*, *speech function* and *mood*. The purposes of addressers producing language and their wants are called speech function. (M A K Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014) states that speech functions are actions or performance done by language users as: asking, commanding, and answering in order to fulfill the intention of the speakers and listeners. To exchange of addressers' experiences, speech function is used. The speech function is oriented to addressees' functional interpretation. It shows that in every daily communication, we cannot avoid the four type of speech function (statements, question, offer, and command). In addition, Martin in Saragih, 2006) states that speech function is a semantic aspect of meaning which is realized by mood at the level of lexicogrammar. In this case, all the speech functions should be coded by three moods they are (1) *declarative,* (2) *interrogative,* and (3) *imperative*. It means that the four speech function is coded by the mood in daily communication in order to exchange information and good and service.

In conversations, exchange of information occurs where addresser and addressee will conduct questions or statements dominantly. A sort of 'frame' on either side of the sequence of questions and answers is called *move* (McCarthy; 1991 ;13). It means, in conversation, it is possible to have some *moves*. One *move* means one part of the exchange, or it can be said that *move* is every clause that are uttered by the addresser and addressee.

Move is defined as the function or role played by e speaker (addresser) in a conversation in its relation to the function or role played by the hearer (addressee) and the commodity being exchanged (Saragih; 2008: 14). It means that every clause that is uttered by either addresser or addressee is called *move,* in another word one utterance is one *move*. There are two kinds of the *move* in exchange structure or conversation, they are; exchange of information and exchange of goods and services. In exchange of information, it is known with term; *knower* (Saragih; 2008 ;14). There are various structure in Exchange of information, may be either one of the following structures;

a. k2 $\wedge$ k1

b. k2 $\wedge$ k1 $\wedge$ k2f

c. k2 $\wedge$ k1 $\wedge$ k2f $\wedge$ k1f

d. dk1 $\wedge$ k2 $\wedge$ k1

e. dk1 $\wedge$ k2 $\wedge$ k1 $\wedge$ k2f

f. dk1 $\wedge$ k2 $\wedge$ k1 $\wedge$ k2f $\wedge$ k1f

g. etc...

Where;
dk1 : delayed primary knower
k1 : primary knower
k2 : secondary knower
k1f : primary knower follow up
k2f : secondary knower follow up
$\wedge$: 'followed by'

METHODOLOGY

A research designs should be limited to frequently used forms. surveys and experiments in quantitative research; narrative research, phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography, and case studies in qualitative research; and convergent, explanatory sequential, and exploratory sequential designs in mixed methods research (Creswell, 2014) . A descriptive research design will be applied in this study where descriptive research involves collecting data in order to test hypothesis or to answer questions concerning the current status of the object of the study (Gay, Millls, & Airasian, 2012). Descriptive design simply describes what is going on what data shows; because it focuses on the natural characteristics of the data. Classroom interaction on semester five (5) students of English department of Universitas Riau Kepulauan were choosen, beause they had discussed speaking 1, 2, and 3. So, it was believed that they could conduct good interaction in frequence. Since, it was qualitative research, so data were taken from lecturers and students interaction during teaching and learning process. The data were transcripted after being recorded. So the way to get the data was by recording the lecturers and students inetraction during teaching and learning process.

RESULTS

After transcripting data from the recorded video, thei they were analyze by using theory of "move" analysis. The results as follows;

Tabel 1. Mood realization of Lecturer and Students Interaction

No	Moods	Subjects								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	Declarative	137	130	82	135	138	109	132	112	98

2	Imperative	18	10	8	10	4	8	10	3	7
3	Interogative	25	10	10	25	18	23	18	15	15
	Total	**180**	**100**	**150**	**170**	**160**	**140**	**160**	**130**	**120**

Moods analysis were dominated by declarative. The domination of statement shows that the conversation refers to the explanation or lecturing methods. It can be seen from comparation between declarative and interrogative were in high numbers. It means that one question was answer by several statements, several statements refers to the explanation. The number of imperative were also in small numbers,

The moods system also has some pattern they are *Mood and Residue and Elliptical Mood. Mood and Residue* means the response uses mood (subject, finite and mood adjuncts) and residue (including predicator, complement and other adjuncts). In another word, the response uses the complete one or at least uses mood elements. While *Elliptical Mood* means that it is potentially to find the elliptical structures. It often happens in responding wh interrogatives questions.. It means that the pattern of mood in conversation can be seen as follows.

Tabel 2 . Mood Pattern on lecturer and students Interaction on Curriculum and Material Development Subject

Type	Number of Utterence	Percentage
a) Complete mood	170	94.4%
b) Elliptical moods	10	5.6%
Total	**180**	**100%**

Tabel 3. Mood Pattern on lecturer and students Interaction on Cross Culture Understanding Subject

Type	Number of Utterence	Percentage
a) Complete mood	92	92%
b) Elliptical moods	8	8%
Total	**100**	**100%**

Tabel 4. Mood Pattern on lecturer and students Interaction on Statistik Pendidikan Subject

Type	Number of Utterence	Percentage
a) Complete mood	148	98.7%
b) Elliptical moods	2	1.3%
Total	**150**	**100%**

Tabel 5. Mood Pattern on lecturer and students Interaction on Morphology Subject

Type	Number of Utterence	Percentage
a) Complete mood	165	97.1%
b) Elliptical moods	5	2.9%
Total	**170**	**100%**

Tabel 6. Mood Pattern on lecturer and students Interaction TEFL Subject

Type	Number of Utterence	Percentage
a) Complete mood	150	93.7%
b) Elliptical moods	10	6.3%
Total	**160**	**100%**

Tabel 7. Mood Pattern on lecturer and students Interaction on Language Testing Subject

Type	Number of Utterence	Percentage
a) Complete mood	138	98.6%
b) Elliptical moods	2	1.4%
Total	**140**	**100%**

Tabel 8. Mood Pattern on lecturer and students Interaction on Syntax Subject

Type	Number of Utterence	Percentage

Type	Number of Utterance	Percentage
a) Complete mood	156	97.5%
b) Elliptical moods	4	2.5%
Total	**160**	**100%**

Tabel 9 Mood Pattern on lecturer and students Interaction on English Teaching Media Subject

Type	Number of Utterence	Percentage
a) Complete mood	128	98.5%
b) Elliptical moods	2	1.5%
Total	**130**	**100%**

Tabel 10. Mood Pattern on lecturer and students Interaction on Prose Subject

Type	Number of Utterence	Percentage
a) Complete mood	100	83.3%
b) Elliptical moods	20	16.7%
Total	**120**	**100%**

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the mood and residue mood pattern is more dominant. It means that the conversation text was dominated by the complete (at least using mood) mood. It can be said that the number of the elliptical was low, where elliptical mood was often faced in daily life or in natural conversation. The usefulness of elliptical mood will help the usage of the time in conversation but it is very important to comprehend the discourse, pragmatic and context of the language being used.

DISCUSSION

Subject material and situation were the reasons of choosing complete mood on classroom interaction, and they make interactions using complete moods in order to avoid misunderstanding between addresee and addreser during teaching and learning process. If the number of elliptical moods same or slighty same as complete mood, so the interaction refers to the natural conversation. Even though actually it is good to support the

natural conversation, but on teaching and learning process can make misunderstanding between addresser and addressee. Beside it, the the number of students also influenced the various level of contextual competance. Meanwhile, on teaching and learning process, its aim is to make the students understand what the lecturers said, .

Another reason was the situation. The formal situation needs to deliver message or meaning in interaction directly. Since it was formal situation, so the lecturer had to make the simplest word to make the students understand the subject material well. eventhough it was english students class, but the main purpose of the class was to make understand material well, it would be diferent if it was a speaking class, in speaking class they were introduce the contextual conversation or natural conversation, or can be said that in speaking clas the coding must be dominated by the elliptical moods coding. complete mood interaction itself had a porpuse to make communication become easier to understand. so, it cannot be said that the interaction was natural interaction, it means that the lecturer had prepare the subject material or the direction of interaction before joining the class. so, it shows that the lecturers has prepared the material before teaching and learning process, and it was confirmed by the head of English department. Meanwhile, in natural interaction or conversation, the number of the complete moods and elliptical moods coding must be almost in the same numbers, because the natural conversation has so many context. The context can be beginning since long time ago by the both addresee and adressee. So, it can be said that the the interaction can be predicted by the others.

The problem was possible to occur when it was applied in daily life where in daily conversation are rather different, it is caused of that in daily life elliptical moods is more often used. The comprehension of discourse, pragmatic and context of the native speaker elliptical moods in aim to use time efficiently and effectively on understanding the interaction. Culture also cannot be separated from language. Classroom interaction refers to the interpersonal function. In interpersonal function is found ellipsis clause. The elliptical

clauses lead the conversation to the elliptical moods . it means that in daily life the patterns of coding in speech functions are dominated by the elliptical moods .

REFERENCES

Ashari, E. (2015). Patterns of Coding in Conversation Texts of the English Zone. *Anglo-Saxon*, *6*(8), 39–46.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1994). *Qualitative Research in Education: an introduction to the theory and methods*. *Porto: Porto Editora*.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. *Research design Qualitative quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. http://doi.org/10.1007/s13398-014-0173-7.2

Gay, L. R., Millls, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2012). *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*. *Pearson Education* (Vol. 1). http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). An introduction to functional grammar. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. . (2004). An Introduction to Functional Grammar. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 700. http://doi.org/10.4324/9780203431269

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday ' s Introduction to Functional Grammar*. New York: Routledge.

Hengeveld, K., & Mackenzie, J. L. (2008). *Functional discourse grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure. Functional Discourse Grammar: A Typologically-Based Theory of Language Structure*. New York: Oxford University Press. http://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199278107.001.0001

Jupriaman, & Murni, sri M. (2016). Classroom Discourse Structure in MTs Negeri Rantauprapat. *Linguistik Terapan*, *13*(1), 33–40.

McCarthy, M. (2000). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers* (10th ed.). London: Cambridge University Press. http://doi.org/10.2307/3587181

Mukminin, A., Noprival, Masbirorotni, Sutarno, Arif, N., & Maimunah. (2015). EFL Speaking Anxiety among Senior High School Students and Policy Recommendations. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *9*(3), 217–225.

Samraj, B. (2008). A discourse analysis of master's theses across disciplines with a focus on introductions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *7*(1), 55–67. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.02.005

Saragih, A. (2006). *Discourse Analysis*. Medan: Universitas Negeri Medan.

Shalehoddin, & Ashari, E. (2016). " MOVE " ANALYSIS IN CLASSROOM INTERACTION (An Functional Grammar Approach), *7*(1), 73–81.

Wooffitt, R. (2006). *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis*. *SAGE Publications Ltd*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. Retrieved From Http://Katalog.Suub.Uni-Bremen.De/DB=1/LNG=DU/CMD? ACT=SRCHA&IKT=8000&TRM=77336744* H1 - State And University Library Bremen %5Ct%5Ct%5Ct%5Ct H2 - A Sow 065/975 H1 - State And University Library Bremen %5Ct%5Ct%5Ct%5Ct H2 - H Sow 065/975a H1 - State A

Yulia, Y. (2013). Teaching Challenges in Indonesia: Motivating Students and Teacher"s Classroom language. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *3*(1), 1–16.

Z, F., Dewi, N., & Suarnajaya, W. (2014). Mood Structure Analysis Of Teacher Talk In Efl Classroom : A Discourse Study Based On Systemic Functional Linguistic Theory. *E-Journal Program Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris (Volume*, *2*.

Zacharias, N. T. (2012). EFL Students ' Understanding of Their Multilingual English Identities. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *9*(2), 233–244.

Zhang, Z. (2008). Discourse Analysis and Cultivation of Conversational Competence in English Class. *International Education Studies*, *1*(3), 60–62.