MOOD STRUCTURE ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH LECTURER AND HEALTH INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (HIM) STUDENTS' TALK IN ONLINE AND FACE-TO-FACE LEARNING: SYSTEMATIC FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTIC (SFL) THEORY-BASED STUDY

Herawati Br Bukit[1], Berliana R Br Naipospos[2]

Institut Kesehatan Deli Husada Deli Tua-Indonesia

Abstract-Nowadays learning is requiring lecturers and students to conduct online class in order to cut the spread of the corona virus disease. Based on initial survey, there are frequent misunderstandings when English learning in face-to-face and even more so in online learning for health students. The study reasons concerned with classroom interaction analysis focusing on spoken language utilizing Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) about mood type analysis. It was descriptive qualitative design by observing and recording conversations during face-to-face and online learning process. The realizations of Mood in English lecturer and HIM students' talk in online and face to face learning were divided into initiating and responding. The mood structures in initiating that occurred in online learning were declarative, interrogative, minor/greeting, imperative and minor/call. The mood structures in responding that occurred in online learning were elliptical declarative, minor, elliptical declarative and minor. While the mood structures in initiating that occurred in face-to-face learning were declarative, interrogative, polar interrogative + bothers, minor/greeting and imperative. The mood structures in responding that occurred in face-to-face learning were elliptical declarative, minor, elliptical declarative and minor. There were 7 minor clauses in mood realizations in online learning and 1 minor clause in face to face learning.

Keywords: Mood, face-to-face learning, online learning.

INTRODUCTION

Considering the language importance as a means of interaction, the language choice used by the lecturer greatly determines the success or failure of learning process. English lecturers often encounter problems in delivering material in face-to-face class if they communicate in full English so that they often switch by using Bahasa to help students understand the material. In fact, they often interpret their speech messages by looking at facial expressions and body language. Meanwhile, the current learning conditions are in accordance to Circular from Education and Culture Ministry which states that all learning activities use online methods as an effort to prevent the development and spread of Corona virus disease (Covid-19). The implementation of online learning is carried out through various available social media to anticipate that lecturers cannot meet face-to-face with students and it has resulted in English lecturers being increasingly difficult to ensure whether students understand about topic.

Online learning communication is very different from face-to-face communicating. It is necessary to note because the interaction between students with lecturers produce meaning construct and learning objectives achievement4, and it is lacking in online class. Students also face challenges toward communication and socialization due to face-to-face learning and they do not feel completely connected to lecturers5. Therefore, it will be worth conducting this research which focuses on

grammatical features of lecturer and Health Information Management (HIM) students' talk, particularly in online and face-to-face learning whereas based on hypothesis obtained, there are frequent misunderstandings when English learning in face-to-face and even more so in online learning. The study reasons are, firstly, it is concerned with classroom interaction analysis focusing on spoken language utilizing by Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) about mood structure analysis of interpersonal metafunction whereas it is concerned with communicative function what Halliday refers to as speech functions. Secondly, their speech functions are usually realized in interaction although they use body language, so it will find the differences realization of speech function in mood between online with face-to-face learning. Thirdly, this study is the first research grant development produced by the researchers.

Based on the background above the study problems as following: what are the realizations of Mood in English lecturer and HIM students' talk in online and face to face learning, how are the differences of mood structures realization by SFL as the framework analysis, and why the mood realization are structured in the way they are.

LITERATURE REVIEW

SFL (Systemic Functional Linguistics) is a linguistic theory with an analysis approach of the text, i.e. language that functions in context. This theory considers function and meaning as the basis of human language for communication. This study is based on two basic concepts of SFL, i.e. (a) language is a social phenomenon that forms as semiotic social and (b) language is a text that is in conjunction with (the mutual determine and refer) with the social context.

Mood structure is a clause structure which realizes an interpersonal meaning. The interpersonal meaning concerns the relationship or interaction among participants, which can be classified into two giving and demanding. These interactions related to the nature of commodity being exchanged: good and services or information. The mood structure, then, is used to see the semantic meaning of a clause whether it is proposition (giving or demanding information) and proposal (giving and demanding goods and services). The mood has often been distinguishes as indicative mood, declarative mood, interrogative mood, and imperative mood.

Table 1. Mood Types

Communicative Act	Mood	Example
Making a statement	Declarative	We had a good time.
Asking a question	Interrogative	Did you have a good time?
Giving a directive	Imperative	Have a good time!

The following table is semantic interpretation of central mood system as described in Table 2. Offer and command are grouped together by Halliday as proposal. Statement and question classified as preposition.

Table 2. Semantic Interpretation of Central Mood System

	GIVING	DEMANDING
GOODS & SERVICE	OFFER	STATEMENT
	Various	Declarative
INFORMATION	STATEMENT	QUESTION
	Imperative	Interrogative

The key system of mood and speech function can elaborate and give rise to the seven adjacency pairs as described in Table 3

Table 3. The Basic Speech Function and their Congruent Mood Realization Rising to the Seven Adjacency Pairs

INITIATING	RESPONDING
Statement (s)	Acknowledgement statement (as)
(Declarative)	(Elliptical declarative, minor)
Question (Q)	Response statement to question (rsq)
(Interrogative)	(Elliptical declarative)
Offer (o)	Acknowledgement to offer (ao)
(Polar interrogative + bothers)	(Elliptical imperative + others)
Greeting (gr)	Response to greeting (rgr)
(Minor)	(Minor)
Command (c)	Response offer to command (roc)
(Imperative)	(Elliptical declarative)
Call (cl)	Response to call (rcl)
(Minor)	(Minor)
Exclamation (ex)	-
(Minor)	

Face-to-face and Online Learning

Face-to-face learning is the occurrence of learning interactions carried out by educators and students at the same time and place. Teaching and learning process takes place face-to-face because initially there was no supporting administration to conduct distance teaching. Therefore face-to-face learning is also called traditional learning. Face-to-face learning strategies are teacher-centered strategies and student-centered strategies. A teacher-centered learning approach uses an expository strategy, while a student-centered learning approach uses a discovery inquiry strategy.

Along with the development of information technology, the learning process also changes. The learning process, which was initially only face-to-face, developed with online or e-learning. Currently, it is an effort to prevent the development and spread of Corona virus disease (Covid-19). The implementation of online learning is carried out through various available social media such as whatsapp groups, schoology, google classroom and others to anticipate lecturers not being able to meet face to face with students.

Table 4. Comparison of Face-to-Face and Online Learning

Face-to-Face Learning	Online Learning
Learning is done by face to face	Using a distance learning system
Interaction is done by face to face	Interaction is carried out separately in the concept of a virtual world (online)
The lecturer role is very dominant	Focused on students
Learning progress depends on the lecturer	Students have a big role in the progress and success of their studies
Lecturers and students must meet at the same time	Lecturers and students do not have to meet at the same time
Lecturers play a very important role in the student learning process	Apply the concept of independent learning
Both parties must have the ability to communicate in face-to-face context	It takes the ability to communicate in written language
For lecturers, in particular, they must have the ability to speak in front of the class	Both parties are required to have the ability to use media or computers and internet networks

RESEARCH METHOD

This research was descriptive qualitative design by observing and recording conversations between English lecturers and Health Information Management (HIM) students. This study used discourse analysis of students' talk in order to describe Mood structure realization in face-to-face and online learning at Deli Husada Deli Tua Health Institute. The data were the clauses of spoken and written language transcript from 93 respondents. The data sources are English lecturer and 92 HIM students who are active in academic year of 2020/2021. HIM students divided into 4 groups namely group 1 (14 students), group 2 (31 students), group 3 (30 students) and group 4 (17 students). They have different intelligence, talents, interests, and economic levels.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

After research is done, the realizations of Mood in English lecturer and HIM students' talk in online and face to face learning were divided into 2 namely initiating and responding. The mood structures in initiating that occurred in online learning were declarative, interrogative, minor/greeting, imperative and minor/call. The mood structures in responding that occurred in online learning were elliptical declarative, minor, elliptical declarative and minor. While the mood structures in initiating that occurred in face-to-face learning were declarative, interrogative, polar interrogative + bothers, minor/greeting and imperative. The mood structures in responding that occurred in face-to-face learning were elliptical declarative, minor, elliptical declarative and minor. There were 7 minor clauses in mood realizations in online learning and there was only 1 minor clause in face to face learning.

Table 5. The congruent Mood realization of Initiating Rising to Seven Adjacency Pairs in English Lecturer and HIM Students' Talk In Online Learning

No	Initiating	Number
1.	Declarative	8
2.	Interrogative	12
3.	Polar Interrogative + bothers	-
4.	Minor / greeting	1
5.	Imperative	12
6.	Minor / call	1
7.	Minor / Excl	-
	Total	34

Table 6. The Congruent Mood Realization of Responding Rising to Seven Adjacency Pairs in English Lecturer and HIM Students' Talk in Online Learning

No	Responding	Number
1.	Elliptical Declarative, minor	6
2.	Elliptical Declarative	7
3.	Elliptical Imperative + others	-
4.	Minor	-
5.	Elliptical declarative	9
6.	Minor	1
7.	Minor	-
	Total	23

Table 7. The Congruent Mood Realization of Initiating Rising to Seven Adjacency Pairs in English Lecturer And HIM Students' Talk In Face-To-Face Learning

No	Initiating	Number
1.	Declarative	15
2.	Interrogative	16
3.	Polar Interrogative + bothers	1
4.	Minor / greeting	2
5.	Imperative	6
6.	Minor / call	-
7.	Minor / Excl	-
	Total	40

Table 8. The Congruent Mood Realization of Responding Rising to Seven Adjacency Pairs in English Lecturer And HIM Students' Talk In Face-To-Face Learning

No	Responding	Number
1.	Elliptical Declarative, minor	8
2.	Elliptical Declarative	11
3.	Elliptical Imperative + others	1
4.	Minor	2
5.	Elliptical declarative	4
6.	Minor	-
7.	Minor	-
	Total	22

The differences of mood structures realization by SFL as the framework analysis were found in the clauses total. There were more number of clauses in face-to-face than online learning. This is due to there were more dialogues or utterances that occurred in face-to-face learning. While in online learning, lecturer and HIM students more focused on writing skill, especially in google classroom application. There were new findings outside the formula of Mood structures analysis, namely the existence of minor clauses during online and face-to-face learning, but it was more number of minor clauses in online learning.

The research findings that there were more minor clauses during online learning which is due to more silence when learning occurs. It occurs during online classes where problems occurred such as disconnected of learning environments, especially virtual discussion boards; it can serve as connection points for students located in areas where internet connection is difficult. Plus the invisibility of facial expressions and body language makes it difficult for the recipient to interpret the message accurately, especially if a student is involved in a discussion or team work situation. A breakdown in trust can also occur when students placed in passive teams fail to communicate regularly. And a unique problem that occurred during online learning was when the lecturer asked a question to the student, the student immediately seems to have not heard the instructions from the lecturer and when the lecturer asked, the students said that there was a slow internet connection and eventually exits from the online learning application. It can be conclude that the realization of mood structure analysis was more unique during online than face to face because there were 7 minor clauses while in face-to-face learning was only 1 minor clause. The realization of mood analysis to seven adjacency pairs is more commonly found in face-to-face learning because there are more dialogues that occurred and there were body gestures that can be understood when face to face learning.

CONCLUSION

In designing online classes, teachers need to understand how online students deal with online classroom situations. The available literature shows that online lecturers find it increasingly difficult to maintain a cohesive learning environment in online classes compared to face-to-face classes. The success of distance learning depends on who the teacher is and how students can adapt to this online environment. From the findings and description above, several conclusions can be drawn as follows: The realizations of Mood in English lecturer and HIM students' talk in online and face to face learning were divided into 2 namely initiating and responding. The mood structures in initiating that occurred in online learning were declarative, interrogative, minor/greeting, imperative and minor/call. The mood structures in responding that occurred in online learning were elliptical declarative, minor, elliptical declarative and minor. While the mood structures in initiating that occurred in face-to-face

learning were declarative, interrogative, polar interrogative + bothers, minor/greeting and imperative. The mood structures in responding that occurred in face-to-face learning were elliptical declarative, minor, elliptical declarative and minor. There were 7 minor clauses in mood realizations in online learning and there was only 1 minor clause in face to face learning.

In relation to the conclusion, suggestions are staged as the following:
1. It is suggested that the English lecturer obtain development of online and face to face learning strategies for health students.
2. It is suggested that the Health Information Management (HIM) students increase their ability to speak up English well.
3. It is recommended for lecturers and students to be able to adapt to all learning aspects, both in online and face to face learning environments.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Ahamer, G.. (2010). *A short history of web based learning including GIS. International Journal of Computer Science & Emerging Technologies* (EISSN: 2044-6004) 101-111,Volume 1, Issue 4, December 2010.Diambil pada tanggal 7 Mei 2014, dari http://ijcset.excelingtech.co.uk/vol1issue4/17-vol1issue4.pdf.

Gerot, L. and P. Wignel, 2015. *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Sydney : Tanya Stabler.

Halliday, M., Matthiessen, C., & Matthiesen, C. 2014. *An introduction to functional grammar*. Routledge.

Haradasht, M.A., dan Aidinlou, N.A. 2016. *A Case Study on EFL Classroom Discourse*. International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies. 2 (Special Issue):1762-1770

Hartanto, W. 2016. *Penggunaan E-Learning sebagai Media Pembelajaran*. Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi, Vol. 10 (1), 1-18.

Husamah. (2014). PEMBELAJARAN BAURAN (BLENDED LEARNING) Terampil Memadukan Keunggulan Pembelajaran Face-To-Face, E-learning Offline-Online, dan Mobile Learning. Jakarta: Prestasi Pustaka.

Mahnun N, 2018. *Implementasi Pembelajaran Online dan Optimalisasi Pengelolaan Pembelajaran Berbasis Online di Perguruan Tinggi Islam dalam Mewujudkan World Class University*. Kajian Teori dan Hasil Penelitian Pendidikan, Vol. 1, No. 1, April 2018. Riau.

Martin, J. R. 2012. *English Text: System and Structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Santosa, R. 2012. *Forms and meaning of conjunctive relation in Indonesian magazines*. A Ph.D. thesis draft, Universiti Utara Malaysia.

Saragih, A. 2013. *Discourse Analysis: A Study on Discourse Based on Systematic Functional Linguistic Theory*. Medan : UNIMED

Slagter van Tryon, P. J., & Bishop, M. J. 2012. *Evaluating social connectedness online: The design and development of the Social Perceptions in Learning Contexts Instrument*. Distance Education, 33(3), 347-364.

Swanson, A., Hutkin, R., Babb, D., & Howell, S. 2010, Sep. *Establishing the best practices for social interaction and e-connectivity in online higher education classes*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Phoenix, Arizona. Publication Number: 3525517. Retrieved from http://gradworks.umi.com/3525517.pdf

Yanfen, Liu & Yuqin, Zao. 2011. "*A Study of Teacher Talk in Interactions in English Classes*." Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics no. 3, vol. 2, 76 – 87.