A Functional Analysis of Teacher Talk in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom at Al-Asmariya University
"A Case Study of Classroom Discourse within the Perspective of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) Notion"

Fatima M. Farahat

Department of English language, Faculty of Arts, Alasmarya Islamic

University, Zliten, Libya

E-mail: mrsfarhat2009@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study is conducted to concentrate on the analysis of classroom discourse, specifically, teaches talk in the EFL classroom at Al-Asmariya Islamic University, Zliten. It attempts to realize the interpersonal meaning built in the male and female teachers' interaction in the classroom, and the difference between the male and female roles based on the interactional MOOD ANALYSIS of Systemic Functional Grammar model which is presented by Halliday (1985, 1994, 2004 & 2014). In this study, discourse analysis and descriptive-qualitative textual analysis are applied as research methods. The data were collected through the method of observations by recording the conversation between the teachers and the students during the lectures. Questionnaire is used in the study to collect more data and support analysis. The utterances of the spoken language collected were analysed within the concept of SFG. The analysis was performed on the Mood structure of the clause in order to realize the interpersonal meaning constructed in the interaction. (Bloor and Bloor, 2013) clarify

that Functional Grammar is the study of how meanings are built up through the choices of words and other grammatical structures.

The study resulted in that the speech functions had been used differently by the male and female teachers to create the interpersonal metafunction in their interaction with the students. The female teacher tended to apply interrogative clauses of Mood dominantly while the male teacher used declarative clauses mostly. Therefore, they play different roles in the teaching process.

Keywords: Teachers talk, interpersonal meaning, SFG.

Introduction

Language is an important aspect in human's life. People use language to communicate and keep their daily routine going on. In general, people use different methods to communicate. Gesture, symbol, writing and the oral speech are lingual methods for communication. Eggins (2004:1) explains that "in our ordinary life we are constantly using language. We chat to family members, organize children for school, read the paper, speak at meeting, serve customers, follow instructions in a booklet, make appointments, surf the internet, call in a plumber, record our days' thoughts and activities in a journal, chat to our pets, send and read a few emails, sing along to CDs, read aloud to our children, and write submissions. All of these are activities involving language". Fontain (2013) illustrates that all speakers of a language do something with it; they use language, they may play with it, shape it, but ultimately they use it for particular purposes. It serves a function. The way in which people use language is always driven by the context within which people are using language, and the speakers' individual goals or objectives (conscious or unconscious). He adds that language is being used for the job of the speaker in different contexts such as (casual conversation, political speech, letter to the editor, etc.). The language itself is a communication practice mediated by linguistic system (Shitemi, 2009). In the

teaching process; for instance, a teacher must apply language as means to interact with the students in the classroom which is called teacher talk. Xiao-yan (2006) defines teacher talk (TT) as a kind of language the teacher uses for instruction in the classroom.

1.1 Discourse Analysis

Discourse in common is defined as "the way in which language is used socially to convey broad historical meanings, it is the language identified by the social conditions of its use; by who is using it and under what conditions. Language can never be neutral because it bridges our personal and social worlds" (Henry & Tator, 2002: 25). The theory of discourse by Gee (1999) which refers to the way of using language in thinking, feeling and believing that oneself can be a member of social group and playing a social meaningful role; argues that in using language, communicators do not only communicate, but they are also signal their membership in different groups. In other words, they can recognize whether other people belong to their group or not. That means Discourses are used to ensure that right people get to the right places.

Paltridge (2012) explains discourse analysis (DA) as a research method used to investigate what is beyond the form of the word, clause and sentence. "Discourse is inextricably linked to the enactment of social activities (e.g., classroom lessons), the formation and maintenance of social identities (e.g., students as capable learners), the interactions of social groups (e.g., classroom communities), and the establishment of social institutions (e.g., schools). Discourse analysis (DA), therefore, is able to meet two calls in the field of education research: first, the call for sociocultural and contextual

considerations, and second, the call for a more scientific basis for claims" (Otten, 2010: 3).

Discourse analysis (DA) is a research tradition that focuses on analyzing issues of classroom discourse in linguistic terms with the method that aims to study classroom transcripts using utterances to predetermined categories (Nunan, 1993).

Regarding classroom discourse of Mathematics for example, Otten (2010) explains that "discourse analysis could provide information about students' conceptions of what it is to do mathematics by looking at how they talk and write about it (reflecting the situation) and could also provide guidance to teachers exposing the ways in which their language use characterizes mathematics (constructing the situation)" (p.3).

The possibility of discourse analysis as a research method to bridge the divide between theory and practice, or basic and applied research is arisen from "magical property" of language as described by Gee (1999) (Otten, 2010: 3). In his description of discourse analysis, Gee (1999) states that "language reflects the situations in which we are communicating, as we modify our speech and use appropriate language for the circumstances, and simultaneously constructs that situation" (p.11).

Within the context of learning, discourse analysis "rests upon observable behavior such as speech, written text, and gestures, requiring less appeal to invisible structures and states" Otten (2010, p.4). The current study was designed for the purpose of analyzing the classroom discourse which is a basic phenomenon in language use and studies. Classroom discourse covers classroom texts, conversational communication, students- teachers' interaction, students

interaction. Classroom discourses have been investigated intensively by a lot of linguists and social scholars around the world (Van Djik, 1998; Cazden, 1988; Suherdi, 2010).

1.2. Aims of the Study

This study aims to analyse the interpersonal metafunction in the classroom discourse. The analysis is meant to explore the interpersonal metafunction in the male and female teacher talk. It also aims to investigate the teachers roles in the classroom based on some linguistic models of discourse analysis.

1.3. Statement of Research Problem

The study of interpersonal meaning and teachers roles in the EFL classroom interaction within the Hallidayan model of SFG (1985, 1994, 2004 &2014) focusing on the role of teachers communicative functions in EFL classrooms at Libyan Universities has not been given an attention yet. Therefore, it was found that conducting such study would contribute to more investigations of classroom discourse that may benefit in the academic future in Libya. The findings of the current study are limited to the participants of the research and can't be generalized.

2. Literature Review

The present study looks specifically at the interpersonal meaning structured in the classroom interaction utilizing Systemic Functional Grammar analysis of Mood types. The model of SFG works on analyzing teachers' roles and their communicative functions through the analysis of actual language employed by teacher and students in during classes (Eggins, 2000). When people communicate, they produce language and construct meaning at the same time

(Bloor and Bloor, 2013). Eggin (1994) states that Hallidayan SFG is concerned with the analysis of communicative function which Halliday refers to as speech function.

2.1 SFG as a Theoretical Framework

Systemic Functional Linguistics as a notion of linguistics (SFL) has been initiated by Halliday through his publication of an article of Chinese Language Grammar in 1960s. SFL is a linguistic work provides an introduction to English grammar description. Halliday (1994) suggests that this work can be used as an introduction to both a functional theory of the grammar of human language in general, and to a description of a particular language such as English.

The term grammar is used in a special way within the Hallidayan concept of SFL. Hallliday (2014) in his notion of SFG (Systemic Functional Grammar) which is a part of SFL, views grammar as a linguistic term which is not a book, and it is not concerned with just the form of words and sentence. Rather, it is an intricate system of knowledge that encompasses sound and meaning as well as form and structure. SFG is a principle practical concept which is crucial to language analysis, it is a system of meaning. (Bloor and Bloor, 2013). And without knowing how our grammar works, we would not be able to communicate (Fontain, 2013).

Metafunction is a term Halliday and Hassan (1985) used to describe the modes of the meaning of the clause [clause function]. In SFG, Halliday (1985, 1994, 2004 &2014) explains that making sense of peoples experience and acting out human's social relationships are language functions [Metafunctions]. In other words, "language construe human experiences, it names things and categorize them, it represents the processes of experiences, some doings

or happening, saying or sensing, being or having with its various participants and circumstances" (Halliday and Mattheissen, 2014. P. 30). The clause of language beside its function of construing experiences (experiential metafunction), there is another function is going on (enacting); enacting the personal and social relationships with the other people around us. Enacting means that the clause has the role of being a proposition or proposal. People may give information, ask questions, give an order or make an offer through the clause, and express attitudes towards whoever is addressed or being talked about. When people perform these roles, the clause used has an interactive process, thus it functions as exchange and the interpersonal metafunction is established (Halliday and Matheissen, 2014)

The principal grammatical system of the clause as exchange is that of Mood. Clause as exchange requires two parts of language users, speaker and listener or writer and reader. (Halliday, 1985, Marthin, 1992, Eggins and Slade, 2005) state that in any speech or talk, the speaker adopts a particular role for himself and gives the listener a chance to play a different role which are identified by the mood types. This means if the speaker asks a question, he/she takes the role of information seeker, and the listener becomes a supplier of the information required. Both the speaker and listener taking different roles assigning a complementary one to the other to achieve a development of a dialogue. Table (1) illustrates the roles of Language users as presented by Halliday (1985, 1994, 2004, and 2014) and Table (2) presents the roles categorization.

Table (1): particular speech roles adopted by speakers

Giving (Inviting to receive)	Demanding (Inviting to give information or action)
The speaker is giving something to the listener(piece of information)	The speaker is demanding something from the listener
Ex: Boof keeps scaring me.	Ex: Just push him off. When has Boof bit you?

(Halliday and Mattheissen, 2004: 106)

Table (2): Halliday's categorization of the most fundamental types of speech roles:

	Commodity exchanged	
Role in exchange	Goods and services	Information
'Giving'	'offer' Would you like this teapot?	'Statement' He is giving her the teapot
'Demanding'	'Command' Give me that teapot !	'Question' What is he giving her?

(Halliday and Mattheissen, 2014: 136)

The framework of Hallidayan's Functional Grammar and discourse analysis of classroom as tools of analysis provides realization of the mood of the clauses used by teachers in their teaching process in classroom. It identifies if there are statements produced by the teacher to give information to his/ her students or only questions are asked by the teacher to communicate with the students, it also answers the questions what types of questions are being asked?, and if the interaction depends mostly on declarative or interrogative expressions, or if it includes any commands,

offers or not. Functional grammar can provide answers to all these questions (Otten, 2010).

Also within the perspective of the interpersonal metafunction in the classroom, Christie (2005) who employed the functional grammar framework in educational research noted that by the role of mood, the teachers can give information to the students. And the analysis of pronouns used by the teachers in the classroom can shed light on the relationships between teacher and students. She found that teachers may use first person plural forms "we" to create solidarity.

Regarding the male and female interaction of teachers in the classroom, the realization of Mood structure and function by Holmes (2001) shows that there is an assumption provided by Fikri, Dewi, & Suarnajaya (2014) in explaining the difference of the linguistic stuctures of classroom, that both male and female teachers tend to be different in using linguistic forms in terms of teacher talk.

2.2. The Concept of Teacher Roles

According to Harmer (2007), there are 8 roles played by the teacher in the process of teaching in the classroom. Teacher can be a facilitator, a resource, a controller, a prompter or motivator, a participant, an organizer, a tutor and an assessor. And these roles have their own characteristics.

Harmer (2001) argues that the teacher role changes according to the different functions he/ she performs in practicing the learning tasks and procedures, and the classroom activities. Teacher may take the role of facilitator when he/she provides his students advice and support. Teacher functions as a resource as he/she provides their

students with the relevant materials they need for learning such as books, research papers and internet. Moreover; teacher can be a controller if he/she is taking control of the whole class. And the teacher becomes prompter or motivator when he/she encourages students to participate in the classroom and makes suggestions about how students may proceed in an activity. Harmer (2007) claims that the role of participant is the role of the teacher through which he/she takes part in the students' activities with offering suggestions. And the role of organizer refers to the teacher's ability in giving instructions to the students to know exactly what they may do and setting up activities, so the teacher is successful if he applies good organization.

Harmer (2007) adds that in the role of tutor, teacher acts as a coach while the students are involved in group work or self-study. He just provides guidance to their tasks, and the role of assessor is played by the teacher when he/she corrects students' mistakes and inappropriate performance, or providing feedback for further learning.

Some studies have investigated the teacher role in practical contexts such as Brown (1994), Noreen (2009) and Yang (2010).

3. Methodology

This study can be considered as a case study since it deals with the communicative interaction performed by the instructors in English Language classrooms, at Alasmarya University, Zliten, Libya. A descriptive-qualitative design of research (Silverman, 2002; McMillan & Schumacher, 2001; Alwasilah, 2002) is employed in the study. It is carried out on a specific context of situation (two teacher's talk). In this case, there's an analysis and comparison of the interaction presented by male and female teachers at AlAsmariya

University. This analysis may result in deep realization of the situation of classroom interaction as Merriam (1998) states that 'case study is employed to gain an in depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved'.

A discourse analysis (DA) i.e. a descriptive textual analysis is used to analyse the data (spoken discourse of classroom). The data collected by the method of observation through the audio recording of lectures introduced by 2 teachers of English Language, one female and one male in Fall 2019. The teachers and the lectures recorded were selected randomly.

A questionnaire was also used. It was distributed randomly on 10 male teachers and 10 female teachers working in Alasmariya University at Faculty of Arts, Faculty of Human Sciences, and the English Language Centre in the University. The questionnaire was just used in order to get more and deeper opinions and details regarding the classroom interaction and teacher talk. To sum up, the study is based on a qualitative research.

The transcripts of the spoken utterances of the lectures recorded were categorized into clauses according to the Mood structure system. In other words, the classifications of (statement, offer, question, and demand) as introduced by Halliday (1985, 1994, 2004, 2014). Halliday and Mathessein (2014) suggest that the analyisis of Mood types leads to the understanding of the interpersonal meaning of the interactants. Besides, the teachers' roles suggested by Harmer (2007) are realized by the mood structure.

4. Discussion of Findings

Table (3) displays the number of the clauses used by both male and female teachers in the Mood structure in their talk:

Table (3): frequency of the clauses types used by both Male and Female teachers

Speech function		Male teacher	Female teacher
Information exchange	**statement (giving information)**	initiator:176 respondent:25	initiator:30 respondent:17
	question (demanding information)	10 (at the end of lecture)	78
Goods and services exchange	**Offer**	13	0
	Command	7	32
Compliance		23	5
Total		254	total 162

From the analysis above, the male teacher uttered 254 clauses to communicate with the students. He applies 211 clauses for the purpose of giving and demanding information (information exchange) through the statements. He employed 176 clauses as initiator and 25 clauses as a respondent of students' questions. The questions for demanding information were made through 10 clauses at the end of the lecture only.

On the other hand; 20 clauses were used to give and demand goods and services. From the 20 clauses of giving and demanding goods and services, there were Only 7 clauses to express commands, and 13 for offers. Besides, he expressed compliance 23 times.

In comparison with the female interaction, the results show that she produced only 125 clauses in her interaction with the students to give and demand information. She used 47 clauses to give information; 30 of them were to express initiation of the information which appeared mostly at the opening and at the end of the lecture, whilst 17 were to answer the students' questions through which the teacher's task was as a respondent. Besides, she employed 78 clauses to ask questions (demanding information). For giving goods and services she used 32 clauses to express commands while there are no offers applied.

Some examples of Mood types realized in the data are below:

(1). DECLARATIVE CLAUSES (for giving information).

[1]: Today, I would like to explain the present perfect tense, and at the end of the lecture we will have some discussions. (A modulated declarative clause uttered by the male teacher).

[2] First of all, I am going to tell you that this lecture is the last lecture since I will be on leave for the whole next month. (A declarative clause uttered by the female teacher)

In sentence [1] and [2] presented above, the clauses: 'I would like to, explain the present perfect tense, we will have some discusions, I am going to, this lecture is the last lecture, and I will be', all have Subject and Finite as Halliday (2004) explains that "The MOOD elements of the clauses are structurally Subject followed by Finite" (p, 108). This means that the statement speech functions are realized in terms of declarative Moods. The male teacher opens the lecture by informing the students what will he do, and he gives them information about the topic of the lecture. He is initiator.

The Mood components of clause [1] structurally contains Subject "I" and Finite "would". It means that the declarative Mood includes "would" as a modalization word. It expresses different interpersonal meaning from the other common declaratives without modallization. The purpose of modalization in the clause is for inclination which is commonly used to express politeness (Eggins, 1994). The teacher might say "First of all, I want to inform you"; however, he wants to soften the power and the dominance tendency by the word 'would' instead. In clause (2) as uttered by female teacher, the direct declarative clauses are used, there are no modalities applied.

(2) INTERROGATIVE CLAUSES (Demanding information)

Question functions to demand information from the listeners in the speech and takes the form of interrogatives. (Eggins, 1994).

[3] T: Have you realized something from the recording you've already listened to? (By the female teacher)

S: Yes

[4] T: what is the main topic of the conversation? Who are the participants of the conversation, their names and jobs, and where does the conversation take place? (By the female teacher).

[5] T: Could you understand? (By the male teacher).

S: Not well

The analysis of the MOOD structure in the clauses above shows the order of Finite and Subject. The Finite precedes the Subject. According to (Eggins, 1994: 173) "In

interrogative mood the finite always comes before the subject". In the example (3) above, the teacher demands her students to answer her questions regarding the lesson of the lecture through the interrogative clauses: have you realized, what is the conversation topic, who are the participants and where does the conversation take place. In all these clauses the finite (have, is, are and does) precede the subjects (you, the conversation topic, the participants, and the conversation. in clause (5), he investigates if the students could understand the lecture contents or not. It is to ensure that they could grasp it. The students used different answers for the teachers' questions based on the context.

(3) CLAUSES OF COMMAND

The clauses of command have been implied by both the male and female to demand services from the students in the form of imperatives.

[6] You can go out, please (by the male teacher).

[7] Excuse me, give me your attention and keep silent. (By the male teacher).

[8] Write your sentence on the board, please (by the male teacher).

[9] Now I want you close the books. (By the female teacher).

[10] Be silent. (By the female teacher).

[11] Write the answer on the board. (By the female teacher)

[12] Fatima, answer question 2, please. (By the female teacher).

[13] Use the blue marker to write. (By the male teacher).

The mood element in the imperative clauses above is the Finite only. There is no Subject. Eggins (1994) explains that the imperative has only residue which is the part of the clause. In the exchange event, command has a function of demanding something from the listener. The teacher employed this type of Mood system to give orders and practice power on the students. It has been noted that the male used commands in accompany with the adjuncts 'excuse me' and 'please' severely in different contexts to express compliance. This reflects a kind of politeness.

Moreover; using modals in command may soften the force of the command language as in example (6) when the male teacher gives an order to the student to leave the classroom with the modal of permission 'can'. On the other hand, the female does not use modals and she has a little usage of adjuncts in the commands, instead she uses direct language of orders.

(4) CLAUSES OF OFFERING

From the data, offering as a speech function of initiation is used by the male teacher only. The function of offering is to give goods or services through the discourse (Halliday & Mathieson, 2014).

According to (SFL), the interactants use the offering structure in order to ask for giving goods or services through the modulated interrogative.

[14] T: can you write the lecture contents on the board, please? "

[15] T: can you read the question?

Both clauses have the speech function of offering which is realized in terms of modulated interrogative. The modulated interrogative is the case when the finite precedes the subject to express a polite offering function. In the context of the classroom clauses, it usually gives the meaning of inclination and not ability based on the notion of Modality in SFL (Halliday, 2014).

The mood structure of the clause 'can you?' has the finite 'can' and the subject (you). It gives the semantic meaning intended by the teacher as he addresses a specific student to write the lecture contents on the whiteboard, while in the second case he is offering all the students to read the question silently.

To sum up, in the declaratives, the information is provided from the speaker (teacher) to the listener (student). The former functions as a provider of information and the latter is a recipient of information. This mood structure is used mostly by the male teacher. But in the interrogatives, it can be seen that the opposite transfer of information is found; the initiator speaker (teacher) expects to receive an answer (information) from a listener (student), and this mood structure appears mostly in the female teacher talk. This shows that the male is a provider of information while the female is a recipient of information. In the imperatives, the female interlocutor demands the goods & services more than the male by the application of direct language (commands) through the lecture. All the offering statements are expressed by modulated interrogative which are used by the male teacher only whilst she prefers using a lot of commands with direct language.

4.1 Realization of Interpersonal Meaning in the Talk

The male teacher has used more declaratives in comparison with interrogatives. In the interaction between the male teacher and students in this research, the process of exchange is mostly one side which is performed by the male teacher through declaratives, by which speaker intends to express information to the addressee. According to the questionnaire, the focus on using more declaratives in the talk by the teacher reflects the teachers' intention to provide his students the concepts of the lecture and improve their knowledge of language, with ignorance of investigating what is going on in their minds. The teacher prefers keeping distance between his students and himself rather than building a close relationship which requires exchanging speech. This is in line with Goffman (2004), who states that using declaratives in high frequency will cause language learners' proficiency to be much more.

On the other hand, the intensive use of questions by the female teacher aims to guide the students to the topic they are going to learn easily. Using a lot of interrogative clauses in her talk more than other types of mood structure means that the lecture is explained in the form of demanding. She tends to make the role of information provider to be played by the students and she takes the role of information seeker and receiver. This means that the female teacher is more serious and guider in the interaction than the male teacher. This is in coordination with Fishman (1978) who explains that "there is an overwhelming difference between male and female use of questions as a resource in interaction. At times I felt that all women did was ask questions. In seven hours of

tapes the three men asked fifty -nine questions, the women one hundred and fifty, nearly three times as many" (p. 400).

According to Alaei (2010: 211-228), "In interrogatives, the route of interaction is two-sided and the addressee can refer to his mind, providing an answer to the question or express his unawareness on it". Some of the questionnaire answers show that the teachers may like asking their students about the lecture topics as a teaching strategy for the purpose of preparing them to the lesson and recognizing their background and thoughts regarding the topic. Furthermore, this strategy helps in making the students' comprehension progressing well. Others state that they like asking questions for seeking information more than giving; because this will make the process of explaining the lesson easier as the effort is given by the students. This strategy may lead to build spontaneous relationship with the students, and make the teacher close to her students' thoughts. This is in line with Goffman (2004:45) who argues that Interrogatives are structures by which the speaker directs the route of transferring information from listener to himself in which the speaker tries to create motivation in listener in the related discourse topic to receive specific information, and this increases two-sided relation between speakers in class.

The application of command clauses with a lack of the offers in the female talk gives a reflection of being direct in her speech. She prefers using commands to express her demanding of goods and services with her students rather than offers; unlike the man who prefers using offers more than commands. Moreover; he uses formal language for asking services with modality expressions and adjuncts

frequently in both offers and commands. This tells how that the male teacher is more polite in classroom interaction

Through the direct language the female teacher wants to create a close relationship with the students. This is in contradiction with Mulac (1999).

4.2 Realization of Teachers' Roles Based on the Analysis of Mood Structure in the Teachers Talk

According to the observations, there are five types of roles have been employed by the male and female teachers in their classroom interaction. Both teachers play the role of controller. While the female teacher functions as prompter and organizer, the male teacher acts as participant and assessor.

As a controller, the teacher takes the lead of all activities like giving instruction, reading aloud and doing explanation asked or required by the course, controls the students and monitors them. These are the common role that is seen in situation when the teacher is in control (Harmer, 2001).

From the findings that the male teacher tends to give more explanation through the declarative clauses while the female teacher tends to extract the explanation from the students through the interrogative clauses, and the female teachers' commodity of exchanging goods and services expressed mostly in commands (direct language) such as: open your books, listen carefully please, you will listen once, go to page (11); moreover, she does not give the students enough chances to ask her questions in comparison with the male teacher, at the last five minutes she answers only 3 questions of the students through 17 clauses as mentioned in

table 3; it can be stated that the speech function of question and command as demanding speech roles (Eggins, 1994: 193), which are mostly used by the female, gives her the role of dominant controller of the group rather than other roles. The teacher can be a controller of: - what is said and done when students speak; and the language students use etc. (Harmer, 2007). From the argument of Harmer (2001) that the teachers who believe in transferring information or knowledge feel at ease participating in the image of a controller as the controller also means the source of knowledge in the classroom, it can be stated that the male teacher as information provider is a controller also; since he is a source of knowledge and information.

Through the role the male teacher plays as an initiator giver of the information, he doesn't focus on the questions as a way of teaching. He just asks some questions at the end of the lecture for the purpose of evaluation and examining students' concentration. Thus; he functions as an assessor, unlike the female teacher who asks the questions for letting her students explain the lecture. The Assessor task is checking students' performance and progress (Harmer, 2001). According to the questionnaire answers, the questions asked at the end of the lecture are usually to correct mistakes, giving feedback after the explanation of the lecture and evaluating the learner; whereas the purpose behind the application of the questions during the lecture is mostly to make the students express their knowledge background, so there is no evaluation, correctness or assessment.

The male teacher prefers group work when he corrects the wrong answers of his students and when he answers his students' enquiries at the end of the lecture. He takes the role

of speech exchanger and respondent that makes him more cooperative than the female teacher. Female teacher is a leader through the heavy use of commands and directing questions, she decides what topics to focus on and never gives the students chances to express their enquires. She is a dominant in the classroom group and not a cooperative or a part of the group. Thus, the male teacher is a participant based on (Harmer, 2001) teacher works as participant if he gets pupils to talk and listen to each other, rather than directing all their talk.

She plays the role of prompter or motivator since she encourages her students to function as lecturers when they answer her questions for the purpose of explanations. When encouragement is needed for the students, it is the teacher's responsibility to provide it (Harmer, 2001). Without motivation, effective teaching or effective learning cannot take place. A motivated teacher can teach better and motivate the learners as well.

She is an organizer since she used a lot of commands and made her students as lecture presenters. Examples of organizational aspects of a teacher's role: (1) giving clear instructions; (2) organizing and setting up activities, (3) managing seating etc. (Harmer 2001).

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, some differences of male and female application of Mood system for the purpose of establishing interpersonal metafunction inside the classroom have been found. The female is less polite than the male teacher, she tries to create a spontaneous relationship with her students through the use of direct language, commands, and asking questions as a strategy of teaching while the male teacher

uses a lot of formal modulated language, offers and compliances. Both of them work as controller of the class. The female teacher takes the roles of prompter and organizer, and the male teacher plays the roles of participant and assessor.

6. Recommendations for Further Studies

Based on this study, it will be better if an analysis is applied on more participants to have various results and to explore if it gives similar or different results from the current study. An investigation of the experiential meaning and the textual meaning as meaning values of systemic functional grammar, in the current data will benefit in the field of speech function studies. Besides, utilizing another research instruments of data collection such as interview may provide more data.

References

Alaei, H. (2010). *Comparative study of the importance of managerial and leadership behaviors from the perspective of teachers and principals (*Unpublished master's thesis). Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Psychology, University of Sistan and Baluchestan, Iran.

Alwasilah, C. A. 2002. *The basics of designing and conducting qualitative research.* Bandung: Pustaka Jaya.

Bloor, T., & Bloor, M. (2013). *The Functional Analysis of English: A Hallidyan Approach.* (Third Edition). New York: Routledge. Cazden, C. (1988). *Classroom Discourse. The Language of Teaching and Learning.* Porthmouth, NH Heinemann.

Christie, F. (2005). Language Education in the Primary years.* Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Eggins, S. (1994). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics.* London/New, York: Pinter Publishers.

Eggins, S. (2000). *Researching Everyday Talk in Research Language in Schools and Communities:* Functional Linguistic Perspectives.

Eggins, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics* (Second Edition.).London/ New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Eggins, S. and Slade. D. (2005). *Analysing Casual Conversation.* Equinox Publishing Ltd.

Fikri, Z., Dewi, Ni., & 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, 2.

Fishman, P. M. (1978a). *Interaction: The work women* do. *Social Problems, 25*, 397–406.

Fontain, L. (2013) Analyzing English Grammar: *A systemic- Functional Introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gee. J. P. (1999). *An introduction to Discourse Analysis Theory and Method.* (1st Edition). Routledge. New York.

Goffman. L. (2004). *Kinematic Differentiation of Prosodic Categories in Normal and Disordered Language Developmet.* Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research 47(5):1088-102. University of Texas.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar.* London: Edward. Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (1994*). An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (Second Edition). London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar.* (Third Edition*).* London: Hodder Arnold.

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

Harmer, J. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching.* 3rd Edition. Longman. Conversation. London: Casell.

Harmer, J. 2007. *The Practice of English Language Teaching:* Fourth Edition". China: Pearson Education Limited. Hayes, R. L., & Lin, H. (1994). Coming to America: Developing social upport systems for international students. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 22, 7–16.

Henry, F. and Tator, C. (2002). *Discourses of Domination: Racial Bias in the Canadian English-Language Press.* University of Toronto, 2002.

Holmes, Janet, 2001. *Learning about language. An Introduction to Sociolinguistics.* London: Pearson Education Limited. 2nd Edition.

Martin, J. R. (1992). English Text: *System and Structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

MacMillan, J.H. and Schumacher, S. (2001) *Research in Education*. A Conceptual Introduction. 5th Edition, Longman, Boston

Merriam, B. S. 1998. *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications*

in Educations: Revised and Expanded from Case Study Research in Education. San Fransisco: Jossey Bass Publisher.

Mulac, A. (1999). *Perceptions of Women and Men Based on Their Linguistic Behavior:* The Gender Linked Effect. In Pasero, Ursula, Braun, Friederike (ed), *Percieving and Performing Gender.* Opladen/ Wiesbaden: Westdeuscher Velag. 88-104.

Nunan, D. (1993). *Introducing Discourse Analysis*. London: Penguin., p.2.

Otten, S. (2010). *Discourse Analysis and Functional Grammar in the Classroom:* The summary of a mini-reading course. Research Paper, Michigan State University.

Paltridge. B. (2012) *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction* (Second Edition). London: Bloomsbury Academic. 2012. Pp. VI, 282.

Silverman, D. 2005. *Doing Qualitative Research*, a Practical Handbook. New Delhi: Sage Publication.

Shitemi, N. L. 2009. *Language and Gender. A Lecture to be given to IUPUI Fulbright-hays group projects abroad program,* July 5th - August 6th 2009 At Moi University Campuses.

Suherdi, D. (2010). *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Systemiotic Approach.* (3rd Ed). Bandung: CELTICS Press.

Van Dijk, T. (1998). *Critical Discourse analysis*. In D. Tannen, D. Schifrin & H. Hamilton (eds.). Handbook of Discourse Analysis.

Xiao-yan. (2006). *Teacher Talk and EFL in University Classroom*. China, 2006. Print

تحليل وظيفي للغة المعلم في فصول اللغة الانجليزية كلغة أجنبية في الجامعة الأسمرية

دراسة مختصرة عن محادثتين أنجزت بواسطة أستاذ وأستاذة لغة إنجليزية من ضمن أعضاء هيئة التدريس في الجامعة ضمن نظرية SFG حول استخدام اللغة ووظائفها

فاطمة محمد محمد فرحات

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية الآداب، الجامعة الأسمرية الإسلامية، زليتن، ليبيا

E-mail: mrsfarhat2009@yahoo.com

الملخص:

هدف البحث إلى تحليل لغة الحديث الانجليزية التي يستعملها الأستاذ الجامعي داخل الفصول للتواصل مع الطلبة أثناء محاضرات اللغة الإنجليزية في الجامعة الأسمرية بزليتن. من خلال هذا البحث ,تمت دراسة التركيبة الوظيفية الشخصية المتواجدة في لغة حوار الأساتذة والأستاذات في القاعات الدراسية مع طلابهم ,و مقارنة الأدوار التي يأخذها كلا من المعلم والمعلمة في عملية شرح المحاضرات والتواصل مع الطلبة اعتمادا على تحليل الصيغ التفاعلية في نظرية النموذج النحوي الوظيفي النظامي التي قدمها (Halliday (1985, 1994, 2004, 2014 تم تطبيق تحليل الخطاب والتحليل الوصفي النوعي كمنهج بحث . وتم جمع البيانات من خلال طريقة الملاحظات بتسجيل المحادثة بين المعلمين والطلاب خلال المحاضرات .واستخدم الاستبيان في البحث أيضا لجمع المزيد من البيانات ودعم التحليل.حيث تم توزيع استبيان علي عدد من المعلمين لأخذ آرائهم فيما يتعلق بعملية تبادل الحديث مع الطلبة داخل الفصل .وتم تحليل الجمل المستعملة في اللغة المنطوقة التي تم جمعها ضمن مفهوم Bloor and Bloor (2013). SFG يوضح أن القواعد الوظيفية هي دراسة كيفية بناء Interpersonal Meaning من خلال اختيارات الكلمات والتراكيب النحوية . وأسفرت النتائج عن أن وظائف النطق قد تم استخدامها بشكل مختلف من قبل المعلمين والمعلمات لإنشاء علاقات شخصية مختلفة في تفاعلهم مع الطالب .وأن المعلمة تميل إلى تطبيق الجمل الاستفهامية كوسيلة لشرح المحاضرات بينما يستخدم المعلم الجمل التوضيحية في الغالب .بالإضافة إلي ذلك يفضل المعلم استخدام أسلوب المدح واللغة الرسمية أثناء تواصله مع الطلبة عكس المعلمة التي تستعمل لغة مباشرة وغير رسمية في تواصلها كتعبيرات

الطلب والأمر . وأن الأدوار التي يؤديها المعلم من خلال لغته استنادا إلي نظرية (Harmer(2001 هي: دور المشارك participant في الفصل من خلال شرحه المتوسع والمكثف باستخدامه للجمل الفرضية declaratives بشكل كبير وعدم اعتماده علي الجمل الاستفهامية . أيضا يأخذ دور المقيم للمستوي الدراسي لطلابه asseser. بينما دور المعلمة يختصر علي كونها الشخصية المشجعة من خلال إعطاء طلابها فرص شرح المحاضرة بأنفسهم باستخدامها المتكرر للجمل الاستفهامية Interrogativesوبالتالي يقع العبء علي الطالب؛ وأيضا تأخذ دور الشخصية القيادية المنظمة للأمور التي تحدد ما هو مهم فيما يتعلق بمواضيع ومحتويات المحاضرة من خلال طريقتها المتبعة في التدريس والتي تعتمد علي الأسئلة وسحب الاجابة من الطلبة أكثر من إعطاء المعلومات لهم . فإذا الأدوار التي يأخذها معلم ومعلمة اللغة الإنجليزية مختلفة في عملية تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية في الجامعة.

الكلمات الرئيسية: لغة المعلمين, لغة الفصل, Interpersonal Meaning