AN ANALYSIS OF MOOD SELECTION IN STUDENTS' EXPOSITION

First Author [1]Gurendi Wiwoho
e-mail: [1]gurendi-wiwoho@untagsmg.ac.id
*Affiliation [1]**Faculty of Languages and Culture University of 17 Agustus 1945 Semarang.***

ABSTRACT

This study purposes to analyze student expository writing. The focus of the analysis is on the realization of interpersonal meanings in their texts. The data collected were five student expository texts that they composed based on classroom assignment. By applying functional approach, the data analysis used tabkes and lexico-grammar to describe elements of Mood selections within the clauses in the texts. The results show that all mood elements such as MOOD TYPE, MOOD PERSON, DEICTICITY, POLARITY and MODALITY altogether indicates how the students realize interpersonal meanings in their texts with various degrees of finiteness and problems in each element. The results also indicate that at least 41.44 per cent of the cases identified are concerned with the finiteness of the propositions. It means they still made mistakes in the mood structure, such as missing finite, missing or unclear subject, and mis-ordering of subject and finite There are actually other problems with the texts, such as punctuation, capitalization and spelling but not discussed in this study.

Keywords: Mood selection, functional, expository text,.

INTRODUCTION

A foundational part of what teachers of English as a foreign language do involves handling students' texts. When we examine students' expository texts we certainly expect that they are well organized, the focus of the analisis is on and expressive enough to be read by others. Unfortunately, this does not always happen. One of the possible reasons is that they still lack the grammatical knowledge of English. The other reason is that they lack experience of producing expository text in English,. Writing is an extremely complex cognitive activity in which the writer is required to demonstrate control of a number of variables simultaneously, both at the sentence level, and beyond the sentence It means that to write effectively the writer should consider not only the

appropriateness of vocabulary, sentence structure and mechanics but also the integration of information into coherent and cohesive text. Therefore, we language teachers face challenging tasks. Not only should we ourselves learn the system, pattern and understanding in the new language but also help learners to get that knowledge and use it effectively.

When examining students' texts, however, we may react differently depending on our own viewpoints. Do we actually realize what tradition we tend to follow when we teach our students and from what point of view do we actually evaluate our students' writing.? To answer this question we need to know about grammar and in what perspective we see language. Grammar is a theory of language, of how language is put together and how it works (Gerot and Wignell, 1994). In general, grammar as a theory of language can help learners learn to understand and produce texts. However, which theory of grammar do we think can sufficiently do this job if there are actually more than one theories of grammar? e hand, is the type of grammar which puts high emphasis on how sentences are constructed and, therefore, view language as a set of rules for sentence construction (Gerot & Wignell, 1994). A follower of this tradition. Hedge (1988:89), for instance, sees text as developing ideas through sentences and paragraphs within an overall structure, whereas Raimes (1983:11) calls for techniques that teach a connected text and not just single sentences and identifies nine areas of relevance, the first three of which are sentence structure, grammar and mechanics. In other words, teachers who subscribe to this tradition will be concerned to see that sentences produced by their students strictly follow the rules inhibited to them.

Functional grammar, which was founded by Halliday (1985,1994)), on the other hand, concerns mainly with how meanings of a text realized and therefore views language as a resource for meaning making. This grammar attempts to describe language in actual use and so focus on texts and their contexts. It concerns not only with the structures but also with how those structures construct meaning or the meanings of a text are realized. So, language teachers who advocate this tradition will be concerned to see how meanings are realized through the texts produced by their students..

Given these two perspectives, I hope we now realize what really is our main concern and how we actually view language in our teaching. Although we are unaware of it, some of us might tend to follow either the traditional or the functional

approach and some others might tend to follow one while incorporating the other. If, for example, a teacher is busy explaining and assigning the students to label elements of a clause in terms of word class such as noun, verb, prepositional phrase, and so on, then we can characterize the teacher, at least in this case, as a follower of traditional grammar. A teacher who follows functional grammar, on the other hand, would be concerned with labeling those elements in terms of the function each is playing in that clause, such as Actor, Material, Manner, and so on.

I use this approach because teaching writing in a foreign language is not merely teaching the rules of how sentences should be structured. When we teach writing to our students we should also teach them how meanings are realized through those structures and therefore should view text in its actual use according to its context. This is the main concern of functional theory. In addition, my concern for expository text is based on my consideration that students seem to face more difficulties in writing expository text than narratives, and that the ability in composing expository texts is important not only for the success in the writing subject alone but also for their smoothness in writing.

My study is mostly inspired by my experience as an English teacher at Fakultas Bahasa dan Budaya Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Semarang (FBB UNTAG Semarang). where I have often found students' writing badly organized, still with a lot of grammatical errors. Inckuding lacks uf finiteness in theit ptopositions. Within micro perspective, each clause in a text is considered containing interpersonal resources, which function to enact social roles and relations. These resources allow the speaker (writer) to interact with the listener (reader), such as by giving or requesting attitudes, comments, and evaluations (Matthiessen, 1995:381, Halliday,1994;). If these resources are not well established in a clause, it will be difficult for the reader to capture one's meaning.. If we examine the extract above, it seems that at least in some part of the text the student fails to create an appropriate modal structure to assign a certain speech role or purpose in the clause.. For example, the "final paragraph" is realized as a single clause combined with an embedded one, but it doesn't show clear predicator (verb) attributed to the predicted subject "This analysis". As a result, it is difficult for the reader to capture what modal assessment is being presented, and it is also difficult to grasp whether she is giving or demanding.

Based on this assumption, I feel motivated to examine further students' texts in terms of mood selection tuay apply in organizing expository text, in the hope that I can identify further some problems that may arise in their texts. By adopting systemic functional approach in this study I hope to find the answer more adequately. Therefore, the research questons are formulated as follows:

1   How do the students realise interpersonal meanings in their texts?

2   What problems do they have in proposing their arguments in their texts**?**

METHODOLOGY

Theoretical Background

1. **Expository Genre**

To begin with I would say that genre is a socio-cultural phenomenon. A certain genre is realized conventionally by particular text structure In this respect, Martin suggests that understanding a certain type of text involves sociocultural learning of how the text is structured. So learning the structure of a text means understanding the sociocultural basis of how the text is organized (Martin ,1985:72)

When we realize that text structure is sociocultural phenomenon then we might also learn that there are systems, networks, and patterns which underlies a text and therefore provide a skeletal framework and structure for the text. This enables us to navigate it, for example by indicating what we can expect next, where we can find a particular piece of information, and how we should interpret a particular reference. The more clearly structured a text is, the easier it is to follow. As with other areas, some kinds of structure are specific to certain kinds of text and genre. So examining a text can be done by looking at some of the structures by means of which texts are organized.

To illustrate the socio-cultural phenomenon of genre I would take for an example the social reality in the process of argumentation based on Maccoun's research summarized by Hatch (1992) It is said that argumentation has often been defined as the process of supporting or weakening another statement whose validity is questionable or contentious. In the social practices, the structure of argumentative is

even more flexible than the other rhetorical mode. However, there is a classical description of the structure of this genre which include introduction, explanation of the case under consideration, outline of the argument, proof, refutation and conclusion. Another type of genre may include problems to be solved, effects, causes, possible solution, assessment of solution, predicted side effects, and selection of one of some combinations of solutions as the best solution.

Exposition or argumentation is a social reality. It emerges in our community as a form of action or reaction to the world. It means that expository patterns are open to change, creation and development with the growth of the human culture. So, to be able to understand and organize exposition, either spoken or written, one needs socio-cultural learning of how the language should be used in the community.

However, it is important to note that despite the differences as described above, we all appreciate the fact that expository genre is different from the narrative, simply because they have different purposes. The narrative tells sequences of events in the past in order to entertain, while the expository has the function to explain something in order to persuade the reader to agree to the judgment(s) that he/she makes. In this case, I would take Gerot and Wignell's (1994) classification as the main reference to identify expository genre, that is by looking at the social functions, generic structure and linguistic features.. They divide exposition into two categories: *analytical* and *hortatory* exposition. *Analytical* exposition functions to persuade the reader or listener that something is the case. Its structure tends to follows [thesis^argument^reiteration]. It is potentially featured by focus on generic human and non-human participants, use of simple present tense, relational processes and internal conjunction to stage argument, reasoning through causal conjunction or nominalization. *Hortatory* exposition socially functions to persuade the reader that something should or should not be the case. Its steps tends to follow [thesis^argument^ recommendation]. Lexicogrammatical, it is usually characterized by use of material relational and mental processes, temporal conjunctions, and use of past tense (see also Martin, 1985: 11-13 and Holland & Lewis 2000: 79-80).

2. Genre and Learning

Expository genre is a valuable genre especially in schools and therefore should be taught effectively. In human development, perhaps, a child is firstly exposed to

narrative, i.e. a kindergarten student telling experience or telling what he/she does beginning from getting up from bed in the morning until going to sleep in the night. But, when he grows up he is gradually exposed to expository genre, like telling why he/she believes or disbelieves in ghost. University students are certainly a model of grown-up students, who are supposed to have the capability of creating expository texts since schools normally require them to do so. However, to create such a condition is not always easy, as Christie put it, 'the early stages of essay writing are probably quite as problematic—and for exactly the sane reason—for youngsters' (Christie::1983:Martin & Rothery 1980). If one student composes an essay writing better than the others it does not imply one piece of writing is more difficult or demanding than the other, hut because one may be more experienced in that particular genre.

One learns to make texts by making texts, in much the same way as one learns to speak a language by speaking that language (Halliday and Hasan,1985). Familiarity with different genres does not grow automatically with growing age, just as language does not simply happen because we are two or three or five years old. For both we need social experience. A child may not experience at home the genres that the system of education particularly requires. In this respect, hone environments might differ significantly. The home where a child naturally encounters different kinds of written communication creates an awareness of language that is not the same as that created in the home where written communication is scarcely encountered.

However, the school requires the same types of tasks to be performed by all its pupils. A teacher's understanding of generic structures will be an active ingredient in his or her success as a teacher. Children need to be exposed to a wide range of genres—particularly those that are actively required in the educational process — for example. résumé, report, expository essay, and so en. It is a mistaken view of both text and learning to imagine that one can get children to write an essay on the relationship between language and culture by simply talking about it; and it is even worse to imagine that one can do this without talking about it at all.

Many of our activities are conducted through speaking (Goffman. 1981). Talk prepares the way into the written mode. But it would be a mistake to think that writing something down is simply a matter of putting down graphically what we could have said phonically. The structures of written and spoken genres vary a great deal even if they might: range around the same, or a similar fled. One thing which can be done is to

assign a group of students to talk about a certain text structure and another group to write about it for the same kind of audience. So, the students need to be given experience of both talking and writing over a large range of genres.

Finally it should be noted that teaching to write a certain genre does not mean that it is something rigid, because they may vary and develop with human civilization. Genres are things already out there in use in the community to accomplish human purposes (Gerot and Wignell, 1994:190). It is possible that a new genre will be created as far as they can achieve communicative goals. So, besides exposing students to different genres and conventions governing them they should be encouraged to apply the genres with their creativity and enhancement as far as they do not destroy the conventions which may lead to misunderstanding of the readers pertaining to the structure that they might expect.

3. The Interpersonal Resources

At the clause level, the important part of the grammar is concerned with the resources of the speaker or the writer for interacting with the listener or the reader—such as by maintaining and establishing an exchange, or by giving or requesting attitudes, comments and evaluations (Matthiessen, 1995:381), This part is called the interpersonal metafunction—the modes of meaning construed by the grammar for assigning interaction between the speaker and the listener. This is the part which enables us to state an argument. So, if one lacks these resources, interaction might not be well established.

Martin et al. (1997) further indicates that the interpersonal metafunction is concerned with the MOOD system, which is the grammatical resource for realizing an interactive move in dialogue. A dialogue comprises moves and each of which takes up role as a speech function—whether the speaker giving something to the addressee or demanding something of him/her. The table below shows speech function selections and how they are realized in the MOOD system. From the table it ca be seen that the key to semantic understanding of dialogue is exchange among the persons taking part , which gives us the notion of (i) the role taken on by an interaction in the exchange and (ii) the nature of the commodity being exchanged—goods and services versus information. As we can see (i) and (ii) combine into the functional categories of

statement, question, offer and demand. Statement and question involve exchange of information and they are called proposition, whereas offer and command are exchange of goods and services and are called proposal. These semantic categories are realized by grammatical MOOD options.

The arrow in the table below represents the realizational move from semantic categories (offer, statement, command, demand) to the grammatical ones (declarative, interrogative, imperative). In the above table the semantic categories are realized congruently, i.e. statement is realized in declarative and question realized in interrogative. However, the speech functional categories may be realized by means of interpersonal metaphor (to use Halliday's term metaphor) as when a command "*Pass me the salt!*" is realized metaphorically by an interrogative clause "*Would you pass me the salt*?" instead of congruently by imperative clause "*Pass me the salt!*".

		goods and services	information
↘	Giving	OFFER (Various)	STATEMENT declarative *He will help me*
↘	demanding	COMMAND imperative *Help me*!	QUESTION interrogative Wh- *Who will help me?* Yes-no *Will he help me*?
		Proposal	proposition

Table 1 Speech function selections and MOOD realization

Based on Martin et al (1997:58)

The underlined words in the table above represent the mood elements in the clause which make the clause "negotiable". This element determines the arguability status of the clause. It shows the mood selection by its presence or absence and, if present, by its internal organization, It consists of Finite, Subject and (sometimes) mood Adjunct(s),. Finite is indicated by finite verb, such as *has*, *is, are*; whereas Subject is typically indicated by nominal groups, such as *John, you, she, the girl*, Mood adjuncts is indicated by adverbial group, such as *perhaps, probably* as can be seen in the table below.

As indicated in the table, MOOD is the central interpersonal clause system but there are other related systems that contribute to enacting the clause as a move in a

dialogue. The interpersonal regions of the clause are MOOD and the closely associated systems such as POLARITY and MODALITY, which will be discussed below.

Function	Class of unit	Example
Finite	verbal group	She *has* left They *won't* come
Subject	(typically) nominal group	*The girl* has left *My father* is a lawyer
mood Adjunct	adverbial group	*Perhaps*, she has left You will *certainly* win the game

Table 2   The MOOD elements (based on Martin et al,1997:58)

Polarity is the resource for assessing, the arguability of a clause.: Yes or No— the validity of proposition ('it is/it isn't') or the actualization of a proposal ('do/don't!'). The basic system of polarity is POSITIVE/NEGATIVE. The choice between positive and negative is clearly interpersonal in character; it is concerned with what the speaker judges the addressee is likely to believe or do. Positive is the unmarked option; the speaker in principal chooses negative if s/he has to cancel what the addressee believes or will do. So the choice of polarity depends on the speaker maintaining and revising a model of relationship between him/herself and the addressee (see Mattiessen, 1995:476).

As discussed above, the interpersonal metafunction gives the value to the clause as a proposition or proposal. There is a recourse specifically concerned with the domain of negotiation of the proposition or proposal. This is the scale of Modality, a scale concerned with probability. For example: "John *must* be at home now" and "John *may* be at home now" are different in the realization of modality. In the first utterance the speaker feels certain that at the time of speaking John is at home. The second utterance indicates that the speaker is not certain if John is at home at the time of speaking.. So, the realization of *must* and *may* in the grammar here indicates modality.

There are several kinds of modality. Martin et al (1997) categorize them into *probability*, *usuality*, *obligation* and *readiness*. Halliday refers to probability and usuality together as *modalization*, which he associates with propositions (statements and questions). He refers to obligation and readiness as *modulation*, which is associated with proposals (offer and command).

As far as probability is concerned, metaphorical and congruent realization may emerge in the grammar. One kind of metaphorical realization involves 'first person', "present tense ', 'mental' processes of cognition (e.g. I think, I reckon, I suspect) or 'relational' processes of cognitive state (e.g. I'm sure, I'm convinced, I'm uncertain). Here, the modal assessment of probability is construed as a clause — a proposition in its own right. This form of realization, known as explicitly subjective makes the speaker. explicitly responsible for the assessment. So if one says: "The governor must be corrup*t*", the certainty of the speaker that the government is corrupt is realized congruently by using modal assessment of probability *must,* but when one says: "I'm sure the governor is corrupt", it is metaphoric because the certainty here is realized by mental process of cognition *I'm sure.*

There is also the possibility of making modalization explicitly objective through nominalizations of probability and usuality, construing them either as a quality (adjective) or a thing (noun), as in *it is likely*, *there is no possibility*. Here, ideational resources for constructing participants are deployed to distance the assessment from the speaker and thus from negotiation. Adjectives such as possible, probable, certain, usual, typical, common are commonly used to construe modalizations objectively as qualities;. nouns such as possibility, probability, certainty, unusualness, regularity, typicality, and so on are commonly used to construe modalizations objectively as things.

As far as inclination and obligation are concerned, the subjectivity of a speaker's assessment can be made explicit through first-person, present-tense mental processes of affection (e.g. *I want, I need, I'd like, I'd hate*). Again, a separate proposition is set up to symbolize assessments of proposals.

Modulation is also regularly made explicitly objective through nominalizations of inclination and obligation, construing these either as a quality or a thing. Adjectives such as *willing, permissible, compulsory,* are commonly used to construe modulations objectively as things.

Method of the Study

1. Research Design

This study is a qualitative study since the data collected are not great in number and therefore, the analysis does not require any delicate statistical account. The data collected are expository texts composed on a given task by the selected subjects and they were analyzed on the basis of descriptive and narrative method.. The purpose of the analysis is to unfold the texts in terms of their mood selection. In the unfolding of the text I adopted the systemic-functional model offered by Mattiessen (1995) which I modified according to the quality of the data collected. This model basically suggests that a text can be analyzed in lexico-grammar by choosing the grammatical systems under which the text will be uncovered.

In addition to data analysis I used simple quantification to reveal the general profiles of both the Mood selections and the expansion choices to represent the tendencies of lexicogrammar choices realized in the texts under study.

2. Unit of Analysis

Lexico-grammar was an integral part I focused on to analyze in this study; therefore, the unit of analysis was the clause.. This coincides with what Eggins (1994) suggests, when the stratum of language to analyze is lexico-grammar, the unit of analysis or description is the clause

To clarify the grammatical systems related to Mood selection in my study, the rank of clause is further differentiated by metafunctions: interpersonal, ideational and textual, In the interpersonal dimension, a clause is interpreted as bearing interpersonal resources to indicate interaction between the writer and the reader. Such resources as Mood, Deicticity, Polarity Mood Person, and Modality, therefore, will be of important consideration in this study..

3. Data Collection

The subjects of this study were the fourth semester English Department students of Fakultas Bahasa dan Budaya Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Semarang with the assumption that they had taken Academic Writing. This selection was also based on the assumption that by this semester, they had, at least to some degree, been

exposed to a variety of genres, such as narrative and exposition. There were six students and all of them were taken to provide data,

> *To collect the data the subjects, who were the participants of Writing III, were assigned in the classroom to compose an argumentative essay based on TOEFL (Lin Lougheed, 1986:245). In the task they were given a case : "The local government has planned to build a new, bigger airport which is supposed create new jobs and allow more planes to land but far way from the city center and will be built in the middle of traditional farming community". Based on the case, the student were asked to give their arguments whether they agreed or disagreed with the plan. They were given 60 minutes to complete the task, and allowed to use dictionaries but should work on their own. However, they would be asked to proof-read their texts before submitting them and also keep within the limits provided.*

> *After around 45 minutes I made them sure that they could use the remaining 15 minutes time to complete the task. And when the given 60 minutes was up I collected all the works, examined them at a glance and then brought them home. Finally I decided that five of the six students' written works would be taken for the analysis.*

4. Data Analysis

In general, the purpose of the analysis is to unfold the students' expository texts through use of lexicogrammar in order to reveal their Mood selection. The main tool for the analysis is lexicogrammar. In this case, I adopted the model of analysis offered by Mattiessen (1995) with slight modification based on the data quality, i.e. by analyzing the selected elements of the grammatical systems under study and draw the structures of Mood selection found in the text. For further clarification of how I analyzed the data, I formulate the procedure as follows:

Identifying Mood selection is the main purpose of segmenting the text into individual clauses because Mood selection is realized in the clause. As noted earlier, Mood selection is concerned with the enactment of a clause as an interaction. So, the purpose of identifying Mood selection is to unfold the texts in terms of realizations connected with the use of the interpersonal resources for meaning negotiation.—for giving or demanding . This is the part from which a clause is regarded arguable, and, to a greater extent, as an aid in reasoning in an argument. Based on this consideration, I was determined that Mood selection is important to be analyzed in connection with

rhetorical development of a text And the systems that I assume are most relevant for this analysis are MOOD TYPES, whether a clause is indicative or imperative, POLARITY selections—whether positive or negative, and MODALITY selections. However, such related systems as DEICTICITY, MOOD PERSON, congruent and metaphorical realizations would also be considered.

Included in the analysis is interpretation. This step is to provide explanation based on the realizations in the texts related to each of those systems Take for example the text composed by the same student as exemplified above. In terms of mood type, for instance, the student chooses alternation between propositions and proposal, which characterizes steps in his argument. In terms of polarity, he mostly use positive polarity except for the opening statement in which he uses the negative feature of polarity embodied in the verb "disagree", regarded as an assessment or the validity of his proposition that he does not agree to something. As far as modality is concerned, he uses the same modal "can" to indicate both obligation ("can use surround area in ahmad yani airport") and probability ("can a farmer lost the job"). Further explanation related to these and the other related systems will be given in the next section.

In the interpretation I include the analysis of the problems that the students might face in relation to mood selection realized in their texts. Within semantic consideration, clause (d), for instance, can be identified as a problem. It is regarded not arguable because of the missing predicator who is supposed to be responsible for the argument, in that it is not clear who "can use surround area in ahmad yani airport", although it may be interpretable. However, the clause is not acceptable in English.

Finally, from simple quantification in the mood selection analysis conducted to clause by clause and text by text I hoped I could draw the profile of mood selection in the students' texts. Besides, general problems could be identified in relation to the use of interpersonal resources organizing expository texts..

DISCUSSION

In presenting the findings of the profile of Mood selection I use tables by onsidering such elements as MOOD TYPE, DEICTICITY, POLARITY, MOOD PERSON, and MODALITY. The interpretations include identification of the problems related to these element. Note that grammatical problems such as misspelling,

incorrect nominal group constructions, including use of articles which I assume often happen in the texts also occur in this text will not be discussed in details, that is only those related to Mood structure will be looked at. Besides, recall that the students' texts are presented as original as they are without any addition or deletion.

As already explained, one aspect of rhetorical development is concerned with the way of realizing the interpersonal meanings, which in lexicogrammar can be seen from the Mood selections. Mattiessen (1995) suggests that there are some systems related to Mood selections, such as MOOD TYPE, DEICTICITY, POLARITY, MOOD PERSON, and MODALITY. Accordingly, in this sub-section I present the findings of Mood selection by considering those systems as unfolded in the students' text. In this case, I present the findings in sequence, first presenting the MOOD TYPES selection by also considering the probability of congruent and metaphorical realization followed by consideration of DEICTICITY, POLARITY and Subject selection (MOOD PERSON) which embody the Mood selection and finally by consideration of MODALITY possibly deployed in the texts.. It should be noted, however, that in my analysis, the projection in the clause complexes are not treated as separate units but as single units with the assumption that they bring single messages.

The table below provides the general profile of Mood selection by looking at Mood types, Polarity, Deicticity, Mood Person as well as Modality. It should be noted again, however, that the Mood selections described in this study are based on interpretation since messages are sometimes difficult to interpret because of the students' language problems.

TOTAL FINITE CLAUSES 80			**N**	%
MOOD TYPE	Indicative	declarative	78	97.50
		interrogative yes/no-	1	1.25
		wh-	1	1.25
	imperative		0	0.00
MOOD PERSON	interactant	Speaker	11	13.75
		Speaker Plus	15	18.75
		Addressee	2	2.50
	Non-interctant		52	65.00
DEICTICITY	Modal	Modalization	30	37.50
		Modulation	15	18.75

TOTAL FINITE CLAUSES 80			N	%
	Temporal	Present	34	42.50
		Past	1	1.25
		Future	0	0.00
POLARITY	Positive		72	90.00
	Negative		8	10.00

.

Table 3   General Profile of Mood Selection

Based on the table above, the students' texts generally pick up declarative option (97.50%) and they are construed as propositions with similar proportions between the choice of modal and temporal in referring to the here and now of the speech event. In terms of the speech function, the chosen mood types generally enact the role of giving rather than demanding information and they are generally realized congruently as statements except for the two clauses in Text II in which the statements are realized metaphorically as wh-interrogative and yes-no interrogative. Perhaps, the most crucial part of the text is not whether they choose declarative or interrogative nor what speech function roles do they enact through the declarative options but **how** they are realized as propositions. I consider it central because in realization as I found in the texts, the proposition is sometimes inappropriate in the sense that it is sometimes realized as if it were a proposal rather than proposition or at least ambiguous between proposition and proposal. To clarify this point, let us take a look back at the discussion of Text IV and V related to their realization of macro-proposition, in which they are both ambiguous or could be interpreted as proposals of inclination or readiness (*I agree to build*) rather than propositions (*I agree with the government*). I assume this becomes serious if the students are not aware of it and I suppose this usually occurs when the students want to develop the text by projection which I will discuss later.

Although difficulties were found in my interpretation of some parts of the texts, the Mood types together with the selections of Deicticity, Polarity, Mood Person and Modality embody to some extent the Mood Selections and at the same time could indicate the degree to which the texts were developed interpersonally. As the texts generally unfold, attempts have been made by the students. to develop argument through certain choices in terms of Deicticity, Polarity, Mood Person and Modality although, of course, still problematic in their realization. One of the then is the

attempted deployment of modalized (37.50%) and modulated (18.75%) propositions to characterize them as argumentative texts rather than texts which merely document information.

The embodying primary tense chosen in the whole text is present tense which indicates that the students are quite aware with reference to time and place of the situation although a past form of a verb was found in one of the texts such as in *This plan brought two effects* in Clause B.6 which is possibly the student's mistake in analogizing *brought* with *would* or *could* as if it could be used to refer to present tense. Despite the awareness of the here and now, however, I found that the realization in the choices of modal and temporal constituted one problematic part of the text and it occurs quite frequently in the texts. Among the 42 cases I found under at least 11 types of problems, some 26 percent falls under the problem of Deicticity—realization of modal and temporal, including deixis, i.e. inconsistency between participants and processes. The following examples could illustrate this point:

> *We **will to***
> *The farmers **used to with***
> *If the government **want***
> *I disagree with that **plans***
> *We will **built***
> *It **have** to get*
> ***This plans** brought*

In terms of MOOD PERSON, I found that among the total of 80 clauses (not to include the non-finite and embedded or rank-shifted clauses), at least 65 percent picked up non-interactant types in selecting Subjects, which means that they tended to refer to nominal Things such as *the plan, the government, the airport,* to be held responsible for the propositions since they become the topics of the propositions to be negotiated. The options of speaker (13.75%). speaker plus (18.75%) and addressee (2.50%) as Subjects are also deployed to indicate that the writers themselves, the readers, or both the writers and the readers are held responsible in the propositions. If we examine further, however, there are still problems in the realization of this part. I found at least four similar cases (9.50%) one is related to the strategy of splitting the subject with confusion between proposition and to-infinitive such as in

> [I.A1]   *It is a good idea **for** built a new the bigger airport.*

compared to the appropriate one:

> [III.A1]   *That is a good idea to build a new airport*

and the three others related to the strategy of nominalizing to serve as subject:

> [I.B3]   *That it creates a new job for unemployment it is good idea for unemployment who looking for a job*
>
> [I.C4]   *We will built in the middle of traditional farming community it is a good idea too*

and complement:

> [IVG6]   *Increasing the quality of the airport is cheaper than to build a new airport*

The polarity option is principally positive (90 percent) which indicates they are basically in agreement with their own position. This negative choice is picked up whenever the writer intents to cancel what s/he believes the government would do, i.e. such as by wording "I disagree", whereas some others are related to things which they believes would not happen when they are expected to happen. However, there is a case when polarity is realized metaphorically—that is in Clause II.J.19 which construes negative declarative through positive yes-no interrogative. Although in general there is no problem of polarity in proposition, it seems still troublesome for the student to realize negative when developing a text through non-finite. At least one case (2.38%) shows this problem,

> [III.D10]   *in order to not be happen a misunderstanding or quarrel between them*

The deployment of modality could also be identified to some extent in the students' texts.—such as probability, usuality and obligation—but with greater tendency to deploy probabilities. This resource is seemingly the least developed in the students' texts in the sense that they are still limited to the use of such familiar finite modal choices (*can, will*) with or without their awareness if they are modals and subjectively oriented. An objective choice such *it is possible/probable* seems unfamiliar to the students in construing modality. So, perhaps, there are only two options available to them, using finite modals *will* or *can* or use of the modality metaphor *I think* to realize it explicitly. However, one text, that is Text II, could show relatively greater degree in construing modality if compared to the other texts. It deploys modality in several ways, i.e. through use of finite modals, mood Adjuncts, as well as metaphorical realization in the form of a clause (see Clause II.B3). In one respect, the limitation of

modality, say for instance the use of *will,* might create difficulty in the interpretation since it can be a modal indicating probability or merely an auxiliary verb to indicate future tense. Another difficulty in interpretation may also arise when, say, the finite modal *can* is involved in a declarative, since it can be a realization of probability, ability as well as obligation. If the writer is not aware of this, then the reader might be confused as to what assessment the writer really wants to give in using such an operator. So, I consider modality fundamental in developing argument since it is from this respect that we can see to what degree one gives assessment to something. But, this kind of resource is, I suppose, the least developed in the students' texts.

The table below shows a little bit more delicately the problems and their distributions within the texts.

TOTAL CASES 42	frequencies of occurrences	Percentage (%)	(%)
Missing Finite	4	9.52	50.00
Missing / unclear Subject	3	7.15	
Mis-ordering of Su/Fi	2	4.76	
Deicticity	11	26.19	
Polarity	1	2.38	
splitting Subject	1	2.38	14.29
Agnate Subject through nominalization	2	4.76	
Nominalization in relational processes	3	7.15	
Deixis	7	16.67	35.71
Agnate relational process	4	9.52	
Fused Finite and Predicator	4	9.52	
	42	100.00	

Table 4. The Percentage of Problems related to Mood Selection

As we can see in the table above there are various indicators which together influence the validity of the propositions. Among the related problems, some 64.29 per cent

represent failures related directly to mood selection, predominated by the problem of deicticity (26.19%), which indicates that many clauses are still problematic in their construal as declarative due to the inappropriateness in referring to the here and now of the speech situation, either in terms of modal (modalization or modulation) or temporal (the primary tense). The finiteness of the propositions are also hindered by the incompleteness of the major Mood elements, such as in the case of missing finite (9.52%) (*the Ahmad Yani airport big enough*); missing/unclear subject (7.15%), and the reverse ordering of Subject and Finite (4.76%) such as in *How far it can be useful* where the mis-ordered *it can* (Subject^Finite) should be ordered *can it* (Finite^Subject) to realize it as an interrogative. One case of polarity problem (2.38) was found, however, although principally it is not serious in this part. As the text unfolded that problem of polarity emerged in locating the negative adjunct in a non-finite clause. Besides, as we also see in the table, 14.29 per cent of the problems represents the failures in the realization of subject by way of agnation and nominalization interpreted as one the strategies in subject selection. The resting percentage (35.71%) represents the problems at the intersection with the ideational, the wordings to construe the world. As can be seen in the table, the texts are still problematic in terms of deixis. At least 16.67 per cent of the problem or around 8.95 per cent of the total finite clauses shows inconsistency between participants and process in the propositions (*if government want*, *if our government build*), whereas the rest is concerned with the same occurrences between the case of inappropriate realization of 'agnate relational process' in projecting the verb *feel* such as in *If we feel so far, they will feel noisy* and the case of 'fused finite and predicator', i.e. unawareness of the difference in function between finite and predicator such as in (*it is need, I'm disagree*). From this simple quantification at least we can see that the problems faced by the students in developing argument is not merely **interpersonal** but also **ideational**; the interpersonal represents the problems in realizing the clause as interchange with readers. whereas the ideational in wordings to realize the clause for construing the world.

This concludes my discussion in unfolding the texts by investigating the interpersonal regions as one important aspect in realizing text as interchange and with the result of conflation with the ideational region. In addition, it is important to note that the table above is not the only way of viewing the texts in terms of its rhetorical development. There is another aspect which is also important to consider and it is still closely related

to the rhetorical development of a text, that is the way of organizing the text by means of elaboration, extension and enhancement as realized in the clause complexes, which will be discussed below.

CONCLUSION

The Mood selection through such elements as MOOD TYPE, MOOD PERSON, DEICTICITY, POLARITY and MODALITY altogether indicates how the students realize interpersonal meanings in their texts

In terms of MOOD TYPE, the texts generally picked up declarative mood type serving to give information to readers, and they were further embodied by the modalization and to certain degree modulation which characterized them as negotiation of information rather than documentation of information. As he texts unfolded, those declarative clauses tended to be realized congruently as statements; however, two clauses in Text II were found to realize the statements metaphorically by using yes-no interrogative and wh-interrogative, However, they were still problematic since the result showed that the problems in deicticity predominated in the realization of the proposition, which implies that in developing argument it is not merely a matter of choosing declarative but how the aspect of modality is deployed since sometimes a proposition is inappropriate by being realized in the grammar as a proposal rather than a proposition as it should be or by being confused whether it is modalized, modulated or merely temporal. This is also connected with the choice of primary tense which is principally present tense

In terms of MOOD PERSON, among the total of 80 clauses (excluding the non-finite, embedded and rank-shifted clauses), 65 percent picked up non-interactant types in selecting Subjects, meaning that they tended to refer to nominal Things to be held responsible for the propositions. The options of speaker (13.75%). speaker plus (18.75%) and addressee (2.50%) as Subjects were also employed to indicate that the writers themselves, the readers, or both the writers and the readers were held responsible in the propositions. However, a

failure (2.38%) was made by a student in an attempt to split subject with confusion between proposition and to-infinitive; and the other failure (4.76%) was related to the choice of subject through nominalizing or down-ranking as well as nominalization in relational processes (7.15%).

The POLARITY option was principally positive (90 percent) which indicates that they were basically in agreement with their own positions. This negative choice was picked up whenever the writer intended to cancel what s/he believed the government would do, i.e. such as by wording "I disagree", whereas some others are related to things which they believes would not happen when they are expected to happen. However, there is a case when polarity is realized metaphorically—that is in Clause II.J.19 which construes negative declarative through positive yes-no interrogative. Although generalyl there is no problem in polarity, one case (2.38%) showed that a student has failed to realize negative polarity as Adjunct in a non-finite clause.

The deployment of modality could also be identified in the students' texts. such as probability, usuality and obligation, but with relative greater tendency to realize it as probability. Unfortunately, this resource seems the least developed in the students' texts since they were still limited to the use of finite modal such as can and will with or without their awareness and tend to be subjectively oriented as realized in the grammar. Although interpersonal metaphor I think, was used quite often, these projecting clause did not always reflect modality as a whole. This limited resource often creates difficulty in the interpretation since it can be a modal indicating probability or merely an auxiliary verb to indicate future tense. Another difficulty in interpretation might also arise when a certain finite modal such as can is involved in a declarative, since it can be a realization of probability, ability as well as obligation.

There are various indicators which together influence the validity of the propositions. Some 64.29 per cent was representation of failure related to mood selection, with greater tendency of the problems in deicticity (26.19%),. The

finiteness of the propositions were further determined by the degree of completeness of the major Mood elements. At least cases were found related to the inappropriateness in realizing the mood structure, such as in the case of missing finite (9.52%), missing/unclear subject (7.15%), and the misordering of Subject and Finite (4.76%) to realize a certain Mood type. All these indicate that realization of clause as interchange to some degree is still problematic.

Based on a simple quantification, the problems faced by students is not merely interpersonal but also ideational, At least 16.67 per cent of the problem or around 8.95 per cent of the total finite clauses showed problems of Deixis, inconsistency between participants and process in the propositions (if government want, if our government build), whereas the rest is concerned with the same occurrences of 'agnate relational process' in projecting the verb feel such as in If we feel so far, they will feel noisy and the case of 'fused finite and predicator', i.e. unawareness of the difference in function between finite and predicator such as in (it is need, I'm disagree). From this simple quantification at least we can see that the problems faced by the students in developing argument is not merely interpersonal but also ideational; the interpersonal represents the problems in realizing the clause as interchange with readers. whereas the ideational in wordings to realize the clause for construing the world.

The result also indicated that 41.44 per cent of the cases identified were concerned with the finiteness of the propositions. At least the analysis showed that they still made mistakes in the mood structure.. They were identified among others as missing finite, missing or unclear subject, and mis-ordering of subject and finite There are other problems with the texts, such as punctuation, capitalization, agreement and spelling but not discussed in this study.

REFERENCES

Agustien, H.I.R. (2000). "*Kinerja Komunikatif Bahasa Inggris Kelompok Intelektual Muda*". dalam Purwo (ed) (2000) Kajian Serba Linguistik untuk Anton Moeliono. Pereksa Bahasa

Arnold. Eggins, S. (1994). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. New York: Pinter.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dornyei, Z., Thrurrell, S. (1995). "*Communicative Competence: A Pedagogically Motivated Model with Content Spe-cifications*", Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6/2, 5-35

Christie, Franchis (1985), *Language Education*. Australia: Deakin University Press

Christie, F. (1989). *Language education* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Christie, F., & Martin, J. R. (eds.). (1997). *Genre and institutions: Social processes in the workplace and school*. London: Cassell.

Cook, G. (1989) *Discourse* Chapters 6 and 9

David Nunan, et al, ed. (1994), *Language Awareness in Language Education: Proceedings of the International language in Education Conference*: Department of Curriculum Studies; University of Hongkong.

Foley, Joseph. (1990). *Genre: Verbal tailoring from readymade cloth?*' Language Sciences, vol 12, no 2/3. Pp 221-242

Fries, P. H. (1983). *On the status of theme in English: Arguments from discourse*. In J. S. Petöfi & E. Sözer (Eds.), *Micro and macro connexity of texts* (pp. 116-152). Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Martin, J. R. (Eds.). (1993). *Writing science: Literacy and discursive power*.Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). London:

Hasan. 1985. "*The Texture of a Text*". Halliday & Hasan, 1980/1985 : 70-96

Hoey, M. (1994) '*Signalling in Discourse: a functional analysis of a common discourse pattern in written and spoken English' being* Chapter 3 of Coulthard (1994)

Lemke, J. L. (1990). *Talking science: Language, learning, and values*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Lougheed. (1986) *Prentice-Hall Prep Book, Instructional Design International, Inc,* McCarthy, M. (1991) Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers CUP Chapters 3 and 6

Mann, Matthiessen, and Thompson's (1992), *The Structure of Discourse and "Subordination"*. In J.Hainan & SA. Thompson (Eds): Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse. Amsterdam, Benjamin. 275-330

Martin, J. R. (1985). *Factual writing: Exploring and challenging social reality*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J. R. (1992). *English text: System and structure*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mattiessen, 1995. *Lexicogrammatical Cartography : English System*. International Language Science, Toko.

Thompson, G. (1996). *Introducing functional grammar*. New York: Arnold.

Winterowd, W.R. 1968. *Rhetoric: A Synthesis*, New York: Holt, Rine-hart and Winston, Inc.