

Mood and Modalities Revealing Teacher's Power in EFL Classroom Discourse: Critical Discourse Analysis

Ribut Surjowati^{1*}, Bkti Wirawati², Ratu Tria Shalsadita³, Shafira Aulia Achmad⁴

English Education Department, Teacher Training Faculty,

Wijaya Kusuma Surabaya University, Indonesia

*ributurjowati_fbs@uwks.ac.id*¹, *bektiwirawati_fbs@uwks.ac.id*²,

*ratu.shalsadita@gmail.com*³, *fannyalexa62@gmail.com*⁴

*corresponding author

Article History

Received: 23 September 2024

Reviewed: 12 December 2024

Accepted: 15 December 2024

Published: 18 December 2024

Keywords: power, modality, mood, CDA

Abstract: This research aims to describe how power relation is exercised through mood and modality used by lecturers during the teaching and learning process in the classrooms. It is categorized as descriptive qualitative research, and the data were collected from the utterances of the English Education lecturers through non-participant observation. They were then analyzed by following three stages of Fairclough CDA. The analysis was done from textual to social practice analysis to reveal the relation between the utterance and power the lecturers practiced in the classrooms. The research finding reveals that the power is reflected through the use of imperative, interrogative, and declarative mood structures. Modality is realized through modal auxiliaries: will, would, can, must, could, may, should, and verbs; have to, think, had better, need to, be sure, perhaps, and be going to. Those expressions carry the meaning of volition, obligation, encouragement, permission, demand, and possibilities employed by the lecturers in the classes. The above meanings of those expressions represent the lecturers' power over the students. The built power relation represents Indonesian culture in which those in higher positions play as superiors. Examining modality and mood expressions used in education will hopefully give an insight into how to build good communication.

INTRODUCTION

Wardhaugh (2006) and Eggins (2004) state that language allows people to live, work, and play together, to tell a lie and the truth; therefore, language is used to unite society. People chat with their friends, read papers, read newspapers, and talk to their family members. All those activities require language.

When language is used in society to communicate, it will always be used in various styles depending on the users, context, and the addressee. People use different styles in different social contexts, influenced by several social factors such as relative status, formality, and social

distance between participants. Wardhaugh (2006) suggests that social structures influence linguistic behavior, meaning people adjust their speech based on their audience, such as lecturers with students or doctors with patients. It is because social structures influence behavior and linguistics structures those people use.

Language is a social semiotic system (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004), which means that language consists of exchanges of meaning in various interpersonal contexts; language does not consist of sentences but text or discourse; people act out the social structure, affirming their statuses and roles in their everyday linguistic exchanges such as in educational settings, lecturers often use language to represent power relations with students, as seen in their use of linguistic features, grammar, and intonation (Muhyiddin, 2018; Oral, 2009).

Communication between a lecturer and students in the classroom is an important part of the learning process, as it can create a comfortable atmosphere, resulting in the students' happiness in studying. Fisher et al. (1995) stressed that a supportive classroom environment influences students' academic performance and attitudes. In accordance with that, some previous research found that one of the significant predictors of students' academic achievement is students' classroom learning environment perceptions (Arisoy, 2007; Baek & Choi, 2002; Dorman, 2001; Pamuk et al., 2017). It means those students' learning environment perceptions are related to various cognitive and affective learning outcomes (Fraser, 1998) such as students' achievements, motivation, metacognition, self-regulation, and achievement goal orientation are determined by students' learning environment perceptions (Ames, 1992; Chionh & Fraser, 2009; Lau & Lee, 2008). However, it is often found that there is a circumstance in which the classroom atmosphere is not as good as expected. The interactions between the students and lecturers contain unequal relations in which lecturers show their superiority towards the students. The language the lecturer uses in the classroom unconsciously becomes a medium for the lecturer to exercise power.

This current research focused on using mood and modalities in the classrooms. Mood and modality are part of Halliday's systemic functional grammar and relate to interpersonal meaning, which reflects as a function of language to build and maintain social relationships (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). Mood is about two elements (subject and finite) of a clause that determines the form of the clause: imperative, interrogative, or declarative. Martin et al. (2011), as cited in Ilham (2019) state that mood is a grammatical resource for realizing an interactive move in dialogue. The mood is analyzed using subjects, finite, and modal adjuncts.

The residue consists of Predicator, Complement, and Adjunct (Eggins, 2004; Halliday & Matthiesen, 2004).

Modality also plays a vital role in interpersonal meaning. Modality is the speaker's judgment of what the speaker is saying. It is about those words that mark necessity, possibility or impossibility, such as "should", "probably", "maybe", etc (Halliday & Matthiessen 2004). Modality is realized in various ways, such as verbal inflections, auxiliary verbs, adverbs, and particles (Thieroff, 2010; van der Auwera & Aguilar, 2016). Three types of modalities are deontic, epistemic, and dynamic (Nuyts 2006). This research focuses on using epistemic and deontic modalities related to power relations. Deontic modality is related to the necessity or possibility of morally responsible agents in doing something, for example, obligation and permission (Lyons, 1977; Kratzer, 1981a; Palmer, 1986, 1990, as cited in Papafragou, 2000). Deontic modality indicates whether a command is obligatory, advisable, or permissible according to law, morality, convention, etc.

Some researchers discovered the use of mood and modality in different languages and newspaper articles (Devos, 2008; Qun, 2010; Araghi & Shayegh, 2011). These researches informed the readers that mood and modality have different expressions in every language and are ideationally contested. These linguistic features were found as media to project the users' hidden purpose; therefore, knowing various forms of them is worthwhile. Furthermore, this current research is significant to be carried out as it tries to link linguistic and social theory to connect language use, attitudes, and beliefs with power. Unfortunately, few studies about Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) focus on power relations in the classroom discourse.

Surjowati (2016) examined the relationship between power, ideology, and modality in mass media and found that power was expressed through modal auxiliaries, lexical verbs, adverbs, adjectives, and both epistemic and deontic multi-modal verbs. Ekawati (2019) revealed that linguistic modal verbs were used to create, sustain, and replicate fundamental inequalities. This current research is different from those previous ones as it tries to reveal the manifestation of power in the education setting, as a classroom is a potential place where inequalities are often practiced. Power is frequently demonstrated through language and may actually be achieved through language (Thomas & Wareing, 1999; Saville-Troike, 2003; Reid & Ng, 2002). For example, lecturers' power could be expressed through the language used during the teaching process.

Mood and modality are used in various contexts, whether in a political context, social context, or educational context. Classroom is one of some places where lecturers exercise their

power in interacting with the students. Finally, this research aims to reveal how power relation is exercised through linguistic features, particularly mood and modality. The results of this research are expected to give theoretical and practical contributions, especially in building good communication in the educational setting.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Mood

Mood is part of systemic functional grammar. Mood relates to the interpersonal meanings of the text (Matthiessen, 1995). The mood structure of the clauses refers to the organization of the functional constituents, including the constituent subject. The mood system in the clause encodes the relationship between the participants in an interaction and the speaker or writer's attitude and comment (Eggins, 2004).

Gerot and Wignell (1994) stated that mood in English is realized by the subject's position in the clause and by finite. Mood is realized into two indicative and imperative clauses. Declarative, interrogative, and exclamative clauses are categorized as indicative moods. Declarative clauses express statements, interrogative clauses express polar and WH questions, and exclamative clauses are used to express emotions such as upset, surprise, happy, etc. Moreover, imperative mood consists of two elements, i.e., subject and finite. Subject is a word or a group of words realized by a nominal group. In imperatives, the mood element may consist of subject and finite, subject or only finite, and it is possible if a clause does not have a mood element. Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) stated that the mood system speakers choose is determined by the social roles the speakers play in different situations. For example, the use of imperatives in the classroom indicates that those in power, the lecturers, play roles as instruction givers, but those with less power, the students, are instruction receivers.

Modality

The term "modality" refers to an expression of the speaker's attitude toward the situation or event described by the sentence or toward the proposition expressed by the sentence. Modality is noticeable in sentences that provide details about a given situation or an ongoing event. In the communication process, it serves as an essential linguistic tool for realizing the interpersonal function and expressing social roles between the speaker/writer and the hearer/reader (Halliday, 1994; Halliday & Hasan, 1985). Furthermore, Halliday (1994) classified modality expression into several different expressions, which are auxiliary verbs

(will, should), adverbs (supposedly, possibly), adjectives (probable, likely), nouns (likelihood, possibility), and verbs (wish, reckon, and regret).

Modality is an expression's content that shows the speaker's preposition knowledge or attitude (Frawley, 1992). It is the grammar of explicit comment, the way people express their level of belief in their propositions and their opinion on the desirability of the states of affairs referred to (Nuyts, 2006). Modality indicates an expression's reality, validity, or believability. Modality is typically broken down into two major subcategories by academics: epistemic and deontic. Lyons (1977) defines epistemic modality as any utterance in which the speaker explicitly qualifies his comment to the truth of the sentence he utters. It considers users' certainty and likelihood of something being or having been (Palmer, 1986). Meanwhile, the deontic modality concerns morally responsible agents' obligation and permission to act (Lyons, 1977; Kratzer, 1981a; Palmer, 1986, 1990, as cited in Papafragou, 2000).

Modality is a meaningful semantic category that captivates the interest of many academics. The concept of modality is connected to many expressions in our lives. The concepts of possibility and necessity frequently come up in discussions of modality. Modal verbs are the major driving factors through which modality is communicated. The concept of modality is considered to be an important semantic category. The phrase "language whose meaning depends on possible alternate worlds" is what this expression is referring to (Portner, 2005). It is also a category of linguistic meaning that has to do with the expression of possibility and necessity, which is another use for the term. Modality is closely connected to modal auxiliary verbs like can, must, and should, which are used to express probability, possibility, necessity, permissibility, and obligation, among other concepts. Words like "will," "can," "may," "must," "should," "ought to," "would," "could," "might," "need," "dare," "have to," "be able to," and "should" are examples of common modal verbs. To put it succinctly, modality is concerned with the possibility and necessity of the possible world. However, modality can also be expressed in different ways; for instance, epistemic modality is expressed through a number of lexical verbs such as sure, identify, and find; adjectives such as possible, impossible, and plausible; adverbs such as surely, definitely, and conceivably; and multiword units and colligations which involve lexis containing the sense of certainty, such as it is impossible, it is uncertain (Bybee et al., 1994).

Nuyts (2006) mentions three types of modality expression: deontic, epistemic, and dynamic. The first type of modality is the deontic modality (Nuyts, 2006). The term "modal system of duty" describes how a speaker feels about the level of obligation associated with

performing a given action (Simpson, 1993). Quirk et al. (1985) referred to deontic modality as “intrinsic modality,” a term also used by Lyon (1977) and Palmer (1986). It can indicate the degree to which the situation described in the utterance is morally desirable (Nuyts, 2006). Thus, deontic modal auxiliaries realize a commitment continuum from permissiveness to obligation to requirement, wherein the meaning of “permission and obligation” is derived from the idea that humans have some inherent control over events (Simpson, 1993). Expressions like the modal auxiliaries, which express (1) moral desirability and necessity, are particularly good examples of this semantic category because they convey the meaning directly and unambiguously, for instance, “You should see your supervisor; therefore, you must read some books to answer his questions correctly”, and (2) the predicative adjective, which conveys moral desirableness, for instance, “It is not wise to talk that way to your sister”. Like in modal auxiliary and speech act, deontic modality is also represented by permission and obligation for the participant in the clause’s first argument. For instance, “You may go home, and I demand that you finish your assignment today”. Combining adjectives and participles in constructions is the second way permission and obligation can be expressed through speech acts, such as “Be...that” and “be...to,” representing a comparable commitment continuum. This form of expression can be brought to life through speech acts. The following examples demonstrate different degrees of obligation and possibility (Simpson, 1993).

Epistemic modalities, also called extrinsic modalities, are the second most common modality type (Quirk et al., 1985). This modality expresses the degree of the state of affairs indicated by the modal auxiliary. It is typically used to indicate the speaker’s estimation of the probability that the situation described by the clause exists in the world, such as what we have known so far as modal auxiliaries; for instance, “Sam will receive some birthday present from his parents”, or the modal adverb “maybe”; such as “She looks worried, maybe she is waiting for someone” (Nuyts, 2006). It also expresses the speaker’s sureness or doubt about the truth of a proposition expressed, so the modality expressions of epistemic are possibility, probability, and inferred certainty (Bybee et al., 1994). Possibility shows that the proposition might be true, as “She may be sick, as I met her this morning in the clinic” (Coates, 1983). Probability reveals that the proposition seems more accurate than a possibility, as “The economic condition should be better by next year” (Bybee et al., 1994).

The term “dynamic modality” refers to modal meanings that are generally associated with “ability” or “tendency”. The English language uses modals such as “can” and “could” and semi-modals such as “be able to” (Tourinho, 2002). Dynamic modality is usually associated

with “can”, but Palmer (2003) further says it can also be identified with “will”. Dynamic modality is related to the properties and dispositions of persons, etc. (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002). Dynamic ability differs from deontic permission as it does not involve the speaker’s attitude to the factuality or actualization of the condition (Tourinho, 2002). Finally, dynamic modality is most noticeable in “can” and less in other modals.

Critical Discourse Analysis

CDA is fundamentally concerned with analyzing opaque and transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power, and control as represented in language. In other words, CDA aims to investigate social inequality critically as it is expressed, signaled, constituted, legitimized, and so on through language use (or discourse). In this context, the researchers were interested in investigating how the classroom became the place where power abuse was enacted.

Fairclough (1989) introduced three dimensions of discourse, which, conveniently, correspond to three stages of analysis: (1) Description of formal properties of the text (micro level of analysis), (2) Interpretation of the processes of production and interpretation or interaction with the text by producers and interpreters (meso level of analysis), and (3) Explanation of the interaction and the social context as well as their social effects (macro level of analysis).

METHODS

Research Design

This research was designed as descriptive qualitative research that studies mood and modalities exercised in the classrooms. It used the mood concept from Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) and Gerot and Wignell (1994), as well as the modality concept proposed by Bybee et al. (1994), Nuyts (2006), and Halliday (1994).

The data were taken from the utterances of English Department lecturers of the Faculty of Language and Science of Wijaya Kusuma Surabaya University, which consisted of mood and modalities during the even semester of 2023-2024. The researchers observed three full-time lecturers who taught different subjects. In pre-observation, the researchers saw that the lecturers used language that represented their power as superiors during the learning process in the classrooms.

To collect the data, the researchers recorded and conducted non-participant observations. The researchers got the data by recording the lecturers' interaction with the students in the classroom from different classes. Meanwhile, in the observation process, the researchers took notes on certain things that could not be recorded but were necessary to obtain sufficient data. To keep the originality of the collected data, the observation activities were done by the research students who joined the learning process in the lecturers' classrooms.

Procedure of Data Analysis

There were three stages of Critical Discourse Analysis of Fairclough's (1989) theory: description, interpretation, and explanation.

Description

The analysis was carried out based on Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) and Gerot and Wignell (1994) for the mood concept and Bybee et al. (1994), Nuyts (2006), and Halliday (1994) for the modality concept. In the description stage, the analysis focuses more on the surface meaning of the utterances.

Interpretation and Explanation

In the interpretation and explanation stages, the discussion was about the meaning of the lecturers' utterances seen from their context and the power relation between the students and lecturers. The explanation stage is related to analyzing how the members of resources are reproduced in the production of the discourse and how they either maintain or change existing power relations and ideologies in society (Fairclough, 1989). At this stage, the discourse is either viewed as part of a social struggle or as a result of uncontested power relations. The goal is to uncover the text's social, political, and ideological effects (Luckett & Chick, 1998). Social practice and discourse practice will be used to reveal the lecturers' background in practicing power in education.

FINDINGS

In this part, the researchers analyzed the data using the description stage proposed by Fairclough's (1989) theory.

Mood

Table 1. Mood

No.	Mood	Frequency	Meaning
1.	Imperative	15	Obligation
2.	Interrogative	8	Demand
3.	Declarative	5	Demand
Total		28	

Table 1 shows three types of mood used by the lecturers: imperative, interrogative, and declarative. The imperative mood was used more frequently by the lecturers in their interactive activities in the classrooms, for example, “Now, pay attention to other classifications of DM based on Fraser’s. Put your phone in your bag”. To attract the students’ attention, the lecturer instructed the students to pay attention to Fraser’s classification. This imperative mood indicates not only the lecturer’s greater power over the students but also the students’ lack of attention to the discussion in class.

Interrogatives are used to ask questions or demand information. The clause used helps to maintain interaction between the speakers and listeners. The dialogue established allowed one of the lecturers to practice her power over the students as some questions were addressed to the students.

The lecturer: “Are you finished?”

The lecturer: “Can I have the attendance list? Ok”

The lecturer: “What is the answer for no. 1?”

The lecturer: “What is metaphor? Are you sure? Any other answers?”

The example shows that the question addressed by the lecturer represents the position of the lecturer as a powerful participant in the dialogue. She wanted to be sure the students’ works were finished. This question was only asked by the dominant person in the dialogue activity. An unbalanced position between the powerful and powerless speakers was also shown in the response, which supports the move in the dialogue by showing acceptance and positive responses without negation or with a confronting response (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014).

The last mood type found is declarative, which is not used as often as interrogative. Mostly, the lecturers’ statements expressed their negative responses to the students’ work, which demanded some actions from the students. The statement below is an example from one of the lecturers.

“In Chapter 1, it is forbidden to use others’ thesis as references. You must use the original references and don’t like to see your work because it is not yours. I am sure that you use AI, and I don’t like it. Revise it, and do not use AI. You must use your own words.”

Choice of words such as “forbidden” and “don’t like” express strong objection but obligation for the students. She strongly insists that the students revise their work as she instructed.

Modality

The linguistics modalities in this context include auxiliary and lexical verbs such as will, can, be going to, must, may, would, and should.

Modal

Table 2. Modal auxiliaries representing power in the classroom

No.	Modal Auxiliaries	Frequency	Meaning
1.	Will	6	Certainty
2.	Can	9	Permission, Encouragement
3.	Be going to	1	Intention, Possibilities
4.	Must	8	Strong Obligation
5.	Could	2	Permission, Encouragement
6.	May	4	Permission
7.	Would	1	Volition
8.	Should	3	Weak Obligation, Encouragement, Demand
Total		34	

Table 2 shows that the modal auxiliary “can” was used more often instead of “could” and “may”. One lecturer stated, “What is meant by this term? You cannot just say this as the important part in discourse analysis”. The lecturer implicitly forbade a student from using a new term she had never used in her thesis because it would create a problem during the thesis examination. In this context, the lecturer controlled the student as a non-powerful participant to discover other common expressions.

The use of “may” in a statement, “You also describe the lyrics of Mahar Zein’s song, you may also talk about information of this song, their values, and messages stated implicitly”, interprets the lecturer’s permission and implied instruction given to the students related to information the student had to write in her thesis. This deontic modality coincides with the speaker’s authority, which permits the participants to engage in the state of affairs in the case of deontic necessity and possibility (van der Auwera & Plungian, 1998).

Deontic modal auxiliary “must” is found implicitly, which shows the lecturer’s superiority in class, for example, “I am sure that you use AI, and I don’t like it. Revise it, and you must use your own words”. It shows an idea that some actions are necessary to be done related to the lecturer’s instructions. While asking the students to present their work, the lecturer addressed a strong obligation to the students, and it implied that there would be some consequences if the students did not obey the lecturer’s instructions. However, the lecturer also used the modal “should,” which focuses more on weaker obligations than strong ones, as in “must”. Collins (2009) and Azar (2002) characterized the modal “should” as an expression of medium strength modality, advisability, and certainty for future expectations.

Furthermore, “will”, which focuses on volition and possibility, was identified, for example, “Ok, I will be in room 302. You can finish it now, but remember, handphones must be in your bag. You can only open your book”. The modal “will” used by the lecturer reveals the meaning of certainty of the plan that she wanted to do. The lecturer wanted to ensure the students did as instructed by monitoring them in room 302. Another example is, “The important thing next week, two groups will make presentation”. The lecturer projected her authority to the students by making them sure that the presentation about a particular topic must be done by two different groups. This also means that the students, as subordinate participants, were obligated to present their work without determining which group should present first. The point the lecturer wanted to convince is the number of groups that are obliged to start.

Verbs

Table 3. Verbs representing power in the classroom

No.	Verb	Frequency	Meaning
1.	Have to	8	External Obligation
2.	Think	6	Certainty
3.	Had better	1	Encouragement, Suggestion
4.	Need to	1	Encouragement, Suggestion
5.	Am sure	1	Certainty
Total		17	

In this research, modalities are also realized into verbs to express obligation. Table 3 shows that “have to” is used more frequently than others. In the classroom interaction, the lecturer used “have to”, which is impersonal and focuses on the external and existent obligation that happens because of external factors, for example, “Look at paragraph 3; you did not mention the problems and your references are too old. You have to describe in detail the

problems related to writing recount text". The example indicates the students' consequences when they did not mention correctly the students' and lecturer's problems in detail. With respect to the modality of expressions used by the lecturer in the example, it is undeniable that the lecturer used her power in the classroom.

Classroom interaction was filled not only with obligations that the students had to do and obey but also with suggestions that lessened their pressure as it was expressed tenderly, such as "should". "Had better" and "need to" are verbs with modality meanings that lecturers once used to remind and suggest to students, for example, "You had better use common term based on the theory you use. Now look at the next page. I think this part is correct, however, to make it better, you need to explain that term". Azar (2002) writes that "had better" is close to "should", but it is usually stronger. It often implied a warning or a threat of possible consequences.

Besides deontic modality, epistemic modality is another modality expression identified in the research. The verbs modal "think" and "be sure" are used to express speakers' degree of certainty towards the state of affairs (Quirk et al., 1985), such as:

"I am sure that you use AI and I don't like it. Revise it and do not use AI. You must use your own words. And for chapter 3, I think that you have to revise the procedure of data analysis, which is still lack of information about the way you analyze your data."

"Be sure" and "think" were used to uncover that the lecturer had a high degree of certainty about the students' competence in writing while she checked their work.

DISCUSSION

Interpretation

The findings show that every modality expression used by the lecturers during their interactions with the students in the classroom reveals some purpose and expresses their power in conducting the class. The type of modality is released in two different types, modal auxiliaries and verbs, expressing different meanings depending on the lecturers' purposes, such as volition, possibility, encouragement, permission, obligation, strong necessity, suggestion, weak obligation, external obligation and intention.

Modals Reflecting Encouragement and Obligation

Some expressions of encouragement and obligation were often heard in verbal interaction between lecturers and students, although they are released in different forms. This research finds that modal auxiliaries “can”, “should”, “had better”, and “need to” represent the lecturers’ superiority in every activity in the class, such as when a lecturer said that one of the students could go to her second advisor after finishing her revision from the first advisor. Those modality expressions imply encouragement from the lecturer to the student to give her work to the second advisor. However, this can also mean that the student is obliged to do as the lecturer asks. Another example is when a lecturer asked a student using “should” to revise the thesis’ findings. This modal auxiliary reveals the lecturer’s suggestion and weaker obligation for the students to take action regarding the student’s thesis writing system. The lecturer knew it was not easy for the student to do it; therefore, the lecturer gave encouragement and suggestions on how to do it. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) and Lyons (1977) say that deontic modality, as in the expression of “can” and “should”, enables speakers to convey their judgment or attitude towards a given situation and demonstrate their degree of obligation or necessity to perform acts. Several studies carried out by Bilbow (1997), Vine (2004), and Koester (2010) found that command by managers as powerful people in workplace interactions was realized through different forms such as imperative mood and obligation in modulation as well as through the use of modulation such as “would” and “could”.

The lecturers also used “must” and “have to” to indicate power. The lecturers have the authority and power to control the students to follow their instructions. They undoubtedly gave some instructions and suggestions to the students on the best thing for their work to accomplish. In this case, the power holder has the authority to control the students’ actions expressed through discourse, which means command, instruction, recommendations, and suggestions (van Dijk, 2008). Therefore, those expressions of obligation “must” and “have to” support the lecturers’ power through the discourse they produce.

Modals Reflecting Volition and Possibilities

Volition used in the classroom is presented through modal auxiliary “will/would”. This modal indicates that the speakers, in this case, the lecturers, exercise their power when they show their strong will towards the students. This strengthens the previous study, which says that the modal will signal the modal operator’s volition sense at the present moment (Surjowati, 2016). This modal “will” or “would” may have different meanings, depending on the context

of the situation, as found in the previous research done by Ekawati (2019). She found that “will” is used because the speaker does not have the confidence to say something directly. The speakers’ superiority is shown when this modal “will” is used. It is as if forcing the students to do as they are asked, such as when the lecturer asked two groups to make presentations. This means that the lecturer instructed and demanded that the students give presentations. Indeed, when the students do not do presentations, there will be some punishments. Furthermore, this modal “will” can also be categorized as a strong probability in which the speaker is sure about what should be done. Regarding what the lecturer said to the students, a certain day would be acceptable for submitting their work, which reflects the lecturer’s authority in determining the due date. It is a strong possibility as it also reveals the possible day for the students to submit their work.

The verbs “be sure” and “think” are other expressions revealing the degree of certainty used in the classroom. These expressions have different meanings and functions from “will”. “Be sure” and “think” represent the speakers’ belief and certainty towards a certain matter. The lecturer was disappointed with the students’ work as they did plagiarism, and the lecturer confidently said that the students used a certain application to help them finish their work. The power enacted before the students was rooted in the lecturer’s experience, who recognized the students’ writing style. The purpose of the lecturer in making that statement to the students was to warn them not to plagiarize.

Modals Reflecting Permission

One’s superiority is expressed in different forms, such as how a lecturer gives suggestions, advice, instruction, and permission. Permission is one form of a modal verb tied in with all kinds of social knowledge: the speakers’ belief systems about morality and legality, and their power and authority estimation” (Saeed, 1997). As the dominant person in the class, most interactions during the learning process are dominated by suggestions, obligations, and even permission. Such forms can be seen in the conversation between the lecturers and students about the different subjects in the class, such as when the lecturer asked a student to go to his second advisor. As the first advisor, the lecturer had authority over the student in deciding when to see the second advisor, so this permission was given after finishing every chapter in his thesis. By doing so, the lecturer exposed the power over him, where the lecturer undoubtedly has responsibility for the quality of the student’s thesis.

Mood Reflecting Demand

Interpersonal meanings in a discourse can be analyzed through the use of mood, which manifests through declarative mood, interrogative mood, imperative mood, modulated interrogative mood, and elliptical declarative mood. This research found three types of moods used by the lecturers in their interaction with the students: interrogative, declarative, and imperative. The highest frequency used was imperative mood, as instructions and prohibition dominated the classroom discourse produced by the lecturers.

The speakers in this context have an unequal relationship in which the speech functions are mostly of command and instruction from one group of speakers. In contrast, another group is just demanded to respond as necessary. The lecturers gave significant instruction to the students, in which the context of the situation at that time described the social relationship between the students and the lecturers and the setting where the conversation happened. Those data show how the imperative mood was used almost all the time to ensure everything was under control. This finding is in line with the findings of Holmes and Stubbe (2003), who explained that superiors used imperative mood structures more frequently.

The power relation is also interpreted in the declarative mood. Similar to imperative mood, this type of mood was used by the lecturers as a means to project their power to the students. Word choices such as “forbidden” and “don’t like” are only used by those who are superior to others as they implicitly mean an instruction not to do something.

The last mood type used in the classroom is an interrogative structure to ask questions. Typically, verbal activities in classroom discourse are questioning and answering in which the lecturers ask more questions than the students. However, the questions given to the students often represent the lecturers’ power in those activities, as the superiors have more freedom to ask questions. On the other hand, the students, as subordinates, often have no courage to ask questions and even give short responses to the lecturers’ questions. Though the structure is interrogative, the implied meaning is usually a strong demand, for example, to finish the exercise from the lecturer that had to be done immediately.

Explanation

These findings regarding the use of mood and modality indicate the situation between the superiors and subordinates and the power relation between them. The lecturers, as superiors, and the students, as subordinates, have played different roles according to their positions. Indonesia, a country practicing Eastern culture, stresses the use of politeness in

behaving; the youngsters respect the elders or the inferiors respect the superiors, and the less knowledgeable respect the knowledgeable, such as children to parents, students to lecturers, and patients to doctors. The Indonesians have implemented this value in their daily life in formal and informal situations, verbally and non-verbally. As Fairclough (1989) says, formality is best regarded as a property of social situation that has peculiar effects on language form. As a property of social situation, the language manifests in an accentuated form of power exercise. Therefore, teachers, consciously or not, often use language to abuse power over their students.

CONCLUSION

Modality expressions used by the lecturers were realized in two forms, namely modal auxiliaries and verbs. There are seven kinds of modals categorized as epistemic and deontic modalities, namely “will”, “would”, “can”, “could”, “may”, “must,” and “should”. These modals represent the lecturers’ power during the learning process in the classroom. They carry the meanings of volition, permission, demand, obligation and possibilities. Similar to those modal auxiliaries, the lecturers’ superiority is also represented in the use of verbs such as “have to”, “think”, “had better”, “need to”, “be sure”, and “be going to”. These verbs also carry some meaning of external obligation, strong suggestion, possibility, and belief. The power is also expressed in the use of three mood structures: imperatives, which demand the subordinators to obey the superiors; interrogatives, which direct students to do their instructions; and declaratives, which contain the superiors’ judgment and demand to the subordinators.

In summary, the effect of the tight implementation of Indonesian cultural values demands that people behave and communicate in accordance with their stratification in which the junior respects the seniors, the ill-informed people respect well-informed people, the poor respect the rich, etc. Those who are respected are usually more powerful than those who respect. Therefore, the lecturers, who are superiors, play the role of instruction-givers, while the subordinates play the role of instruction-receivers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researchers thank Wijaya Kusuma Surabaya University for providing financial support for this research.

REFERENCES

- Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(3), 261-271. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.84.3.261>
- Araghi, S. M., & Shayegh, K. (2011). *Interpersonal metafunction of gender talk in ELT classroom*. *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies*, 1(2), 25-32.
- Arisoy, N. (2007). *Examining 8th grade students' perception of learning environment of science classrooms in relation to motivational beliefs and attitudes*. [Unpublished Master Thesis]. Middle East Technical University.
- Azar, B. S. (2002). *Understanding and using English grammar* (3rd ed.). Longman.
- Baek, S. G., & Choi, H. J. (2002). The relationship between students' perception of classroom environment and their academic achievement in Korea. *Asia Pacific Education Review*. 3(1), 125-135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03024926>
- Bilbow, G. T. (1997). Spoken discourse in the multicultural workplace in Hong Kong: Applying a model of discourse as 'impression management'. In F. Bargiela-Chiappini & S. Harris (Eds.), *The Languages of Business: An International Perspective* (pp. 21-48). Edinburgh University Press.
- Bybee, J., Perkins, R., & Pagliuca, W. (1994). *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. University of Chicago Press.
- Chionh, Y. H., & Fraser, B. J. (2009). Classroom environment, achievement, attitudes and self-esteem in geography and mathematics in Singapore. *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*. 18(1), 29-44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10382040802591530>
- Coates, J. (1983). *The semantics of the modal auxiliaries*. Croom Helm.
- Collins, P. (2009). *Modals and quasi-modals in English*. Rodopi.
- Devos, M. (2008). The expression of modality in Shanghaci. *Africana Linguistica*, 14, 3-35.
- Dorman, J. P. (2001). Associations between classroom environment and academic efficacy. *Learning Environments Research*, 4(3), 243-257. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014490922622>
- Eggins, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nd ed.). Continuum.
- Ekawati, R. (2019). Power through linguistic modalities in Indonesian presidential speeches. *Discourse and Interaction*, 12(1), 5-28. <https://doi.org/10.5817/DI2019-1-5>
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.
- Fisher, D., Henderson, D., & Fraser, B. (1995). Interpersonal behaviour in senior high school biology classes. *Research in Science Education*, 25(2), 125-133. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02356447>

- Fraser, B. J. (1998). Science learning environments: Assessment, effects and determinants. In B. J. Fraser & K. G. Tobin (Eds.), *International Handbook of Science Education* (pp. 527-564). Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Frawley, W. (1992). *Linguistic semantics*. Routledge.
- Gerot, L., & Wignell, P. (1994). *Making sense of functional grammar*. Antipodean Educational Enterprise.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Deakin University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen C. M. I. M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Holmes, J., & Stubbe, M. (2003). *Power and politeness in the workplace: A sociolinguistic analysis of talk at work*. Pearson Education.
- Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ilham. (2019). Mood and modality of interpersonal meaning in research journal articles. *Eduscience: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 5(1), 30-50.
- Koester, A. (2010). *Workplace discourse*. Continuum.
- Kratzer, A. (1981a). The notional category of modality. In H. J. Eikmeyer & H. Rieser (Eds.), *Words, Worlds, and Contexts* (pp. 38-74). De Gruyter.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110842524-004>
- Lau, K. L., & Lee, J. C. K. (2008). Examining Hong Kong students' achievement goals and their relations with students' perceived classroom environment and strategy use. *Educational Psychology*, 28(4), 357-372. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410701612008>
- Luckett, K. M., & Chick, J. K. (1998). Linguistics description in the service of history. *South African Journal of Linguistics*. 16(3), 81-92.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10118063.1998.9724141>
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.
- Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (1995). *Lexicogrammatical cartography: English systems*. International Language Sciences.
- Muhyiddin, N. K. (2018). Language and power in classroom discourse. *Proceedings of The International English Language Teachers and Lecturers Conference (iNELTAL)* (pp. 208-212).

- Nuyts, J. (2006). Modality: Overview and linguistic issues. In W. Frawley (Ed.), *The Expression of Modality* (pp. 1-26). De Gruyter Mouton.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197570.1>
- Oral, Y. (2009). *Classroom power relations in an English as a foreign language setting from a critical pedagogical perspective*. [Doctoral Dissertation, Istanbul Üniversitesi].
 Istanbul Üniversitesi.
- Palmer, F. R. (2003). Modality in English: Theoretical, descriptive and typological issues. In R. Facchinetti, M. Krug, & F. R. Palmer (Eds.), *Modality in Contemporary English* (pp. 1-18). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110895339.1>
- Pamuk, S., Sungur, S., & Öztekin, C. (2017). A multilevel analysis of students' science achievements in relation to their self-regulation, epistemological beliefs, learning environment perceptions, and teachers' personal characteristics. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 15, 1423-1440.
<https://hdl.handle.net/11511/45842>
- Papafragou, A. (2000). *Modality: Issues in the semantics-pragmatics interface*. Elsevier.
- Portner, P. (2005). *Modality*. Oxford University Press.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. Longman.
- Qun, Z. (2010). Modality and generic features in Chinese EFL writings. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 33(5).
- Reid, S. A., & Ng, S. H. (2002). Language, power, and intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(1), 119-139. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00108>
- Saeed, J. I. (1997). *Semantics*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Saville-Troike, M. (2003). *The ethnography of communication: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
- Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, ideology and point of view*. Routledge.
- Surjowati, R. (2016). Revealing power and ideology through modality expressions in Australian newspaper reporting Jis's pedophilia. *Proceeding of the International Seminar Prasasti III: Current Research in Linguistics* (pp. 630-635).
<https://doi.org/10.20961/pras.v0i0.1632>
- Thieroff, R., (2010). Moods, moods, moods. In B. Rothstein & R. Thieroff (Eds.), *Mood in the Languages of Europe* (pp. 1-29). John Benjamins.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.120.01thi>
- Thomas, L., & Wareing, S. (1999). *Language, society and power: An introduction*. Routledge.

- Touriño, A. V. (2002). Dynamic modality: English and Spanish contrasted. In L. I. Rábade & S. M^a. D. Suárez, *Studies in Contrastive Linguistics: Proceedings of the 2nd International Contrastive Linguistics Conference* (pp. 1041-1050).
- van der Auwera, J., & Aguilar, A. Z. (2016). The history of modality and mood. In J. Nuyts & J. van der Auwera (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Modality and Mood* (pp. 9-27). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199591435.001.0001>
- van der Auwera, J., & Plungian, V. A. (1998). Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2(1), 79-124. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lity.1998.2.1.79>
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vine, B. (2004). *Getting things done at work: The discourse of power in workplace interaction*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.124>
- Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (5th ed.). Blackwell Publishing.