

Unlocking the Potential of Systemic Functional Linguistics for Corrective Feedback in EFL Classroom Interactions

Hieronimus Canggung Darong
hieronimusdarong@gmail.com

Universitas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus Ruteng, Indonesia

Abstract. With an emphasis on corrective feedback, this article review investigates the pedagogical implications of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) in the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom interactions. It discusses how SFL concepts, when incorporated into EFL classrooms, improve teaching techniques, adapt instructional design, reach learning goals and the provision of corrective feedback. Peer-reviewed research articles, books, conference proceedings, and instructional reports published in the fifteen years were accessed using a thorough search approach. This methodological approach is of benefit to comprehend how SFL helps to provide accurate and encouraging corrective feedback in addition to supporting successful language learning. This review provides insightful information about the potential of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) to influence and improve the field of EFL learning, particularly with regard to feedback strategy and its effects on language acquisition, through the synthesis of findings and themes.

Keywords: classroom interaction; feedback; Systemic Functional Linguistics

1 Introduction

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), which is concerned with their organizations and structures, is potentially employed in classroom interactions. Specifically, it helps teachers to assist their students' language productions and lead themselves to inform the way they provide corrective feedback [1]. As such, teachers can make sure that the students can access and understand their feedback in addition to it being informative. As a result of this, students are more likely to understand the corrections and incorporate them into their language repertoire.

Apart from concentrating on linguistic functions, Systemic Functional Linguistics' (SFL's) examination of the situational context [2], [3], which includes field, tenor, and mode, is crucial in deciding when and how to provide feedback. When giving feedback, context is important [4], and Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) enables teachers to customize their feedback strategy for the particular classroom setting. For example, teachers may choose to provide written corrective feedback in the context of a formal written assessment, like grading essays, in order to conform to the written communication style. Giving prompt oral comments during a discussion may be more appropriate in a more participatory classroom environment, as

it respects the oral communication style. Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) gives teachers the ability to provide feedback in a way that is appropriate for the context.

Beyond just how feedback works in an EFL classroom, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) has a significant impact on teacher- student interactions. It advances knowledge of the relationship between classroom interaction and language learning. With the help of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), teachers can better understand how language functions in different contexts and modify their language and feedback techniques to better suit the requirements of their students. Regardless of the setting—formal academic or informal conversational— Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) equips teachers to maximize language learning [5].

In addition, the importance of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) in delivering feedback is crucial in the EFL classroom, when a convergence of varied learning styles and backgrounds occurs. It gives teachers the resources they need to deal with grammatical errors and inconsistencies in a clear, encouraging, and context-sensitive manner [6], [7]. Feedback that is both accessible and focused helps students internalize corrections and advance their language proficiency. Understanding and implementing Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) concepts in EFL classroom interactions is a potent way to prepare students for linguistic success in a time when effective language proficiency is a crucial asset.

To date, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is beneficial for teachers when it comes to giving feedback in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom interactions. Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) gives teachers an advanced tool for identifying linguistic errors and helping students become proficient in the language. Through an exploration of language's metafunctions, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) equips teachers to pinpoint and rectify particular language functions that need improvement. For teachers attempting to customize their feedback to each student's unique needs, this accuracy is priceless because it guarantees that grammatical problems are not only found but also thoroughly comprehended and fixed.

Furthermore, in an EFL classroom, the teacher-student interaction is significantly impacted by Systemic Functional Linguistics' (SFL's) interpersonal metafunction [8]–[10]. Since corrective feedback entails pointing out errors, it can be a touchy subject. Fortunately, the interpersonal component of SFL enables teachers to carefully negotiate this terrain. Teachers can use their knowledge of the tenor element to provide feedback in a way that upholds students' self-esteem, respects one another, and creates a welcoming environment in the classroom. Teachers should encourage students to accept language progress as an integral part of their language learning journey by providing constructive feedback and fostering a supportive learning environment. Thus, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) in EFL classroom feedback is therefore improves teachers' capacity to provide accurate and encouraging feedback while fostering an environment that is favorable to successful language learning.

The relationship between Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and feedback in EFL classroom interaction is further explored in this article. It discusses how the understanding of ideational, interpersonal, and textual metafunctions provided by Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) improves the efficiency of feedback techniques. It also highlights the contextual analysis of field, tenor, and mode, demonstrating how context-driven feedback can be helpful in assisting students in understanding the learned- language. Thus, the article demonstrates the significant influence of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) in fostering efficient language learning and improving the skill of interactions in EFL classrooms through this review.

2 Method

In order to locate, pick, and evaluate pertinent research on the educational applications of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) in classroom interactions, this review paper takes a methodical approach. Peer-reviewed research articles, books, conference proceedings, and instructional reports published in the last fifteen years were accessed using a thorough search approach. A systematic search was conducted utilizing terms and phrases such as Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) in education, pedagogical applications of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) in classroom interactions, feedback and related topics, to access databases and pertinent linguistic publications. The objective was to compile a varied and representative body of literature that discusses the influence of SFL on classroom interactions and pedagogy. In addition, because of the review's focus, only English-language publications were taken into account. Excluded from consideration were any sources that did not specifically discuss the educational uses of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) or that lacked theoretical or empirical support.

The chosen literature underwent a thorough process of data extraction. Important details were methodically documented, such as the authors, year of publication, research emphasis, techniques, and significant discoveries. The evaluation procedure encompassed both thematic and narrative integration. A descriptive synopsis of the most important conclusions and revelations from the chosen literature was produced using narrative synthesis. To find reoccurring themes, difficulties, and advantages related to the educational usage of SFL in classroom interactions, thematic synthesis was utilized. The primary patterns and themes that emerged from the literature were to be captured via thematic analysis.

3 Discussion

3.1 Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)

A comprehensive linguistic framework called Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) aims to comprehend language's structure and function in a methodical and logical way. SFL, which was coined by Michael Halliday in the middle of the 20th century, has become well-known as a useful method for examining how language works in different contexts. (Andersen, Emilie, & Holsting, 2018; Darong, 2022a; Montes, Barboza, & Olascoaga, 2014) According to this linguistic theory, language is a dynamic system that facilitates successful communication and meaning expression rather than just a collection of discrete words and grammatical rules [14]. Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) explores how language choices reflect social, cultural, and communicative dimensions of human interaction by going deeply into the layers of language (Darong, 2022b; Eggins, 1994; Halliday, 1985; Hasan, 2014). Fundamentally, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) highlights the notion that language functions as a semiotic system [17], [18]. Our ability to communicate meaning is based on a system of signs and symbols that are intrinsically linked to the social and cultural settings in which they are employed. Language is seen in SFL as a tool for social interaction, and social norms, positions, and relations have an impact on language usage and structure. From this point, linguists can investigate the ways in which language is used to create and communicate social identities and relations.

The ideational, interpersonal, and textual strata are the three interconnected strata identified by Systemic Functional Linguistics' (SFL's) stratified model of language, which is one of its primary contributions [1], [7], [19]–[21]. The ideational stratum is concerned with how experiences are represented, particularly the ways in which linguistic structures are employed

to transmit meaning and depict reality. The interpersonal stratum examines how language is used to represent attitudes, feelings, and interpersonal dynamics, and it deals with the negotiation of social roles and relationships. The textual stratum studies the structure of language used to produce texts that are cohesive and logical.

The idea of metafunctions, which divides language's purposes into three primary categories—ideational, interpersonal, and textual—is also introduced in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). The ideational metafunction is involved in the processes of naming, describing, and classifying in order to describe the world and construct meaning (Alwasilah & Gunawan, 2023; Darong, 2022c; Hanifa & Ardy, 2023; Malkawi & Fareh, 2023). It is "language about something" since it deals with the expression of both internal and exterior reality. When talking about the outside world or one's interior thoughts, this representation takes the form of "content," also known as experiential meaning, [2]. Furthermore, when language is examined at the clause level, where a clause is a representation of an experience, the language's transitivity system realizes the experiential or representational function. It classifies "what-is-going-on" processes pertaining to actions, events, states, and relations by encoding both the external and internal realities that exist within a person's consciousness. According to Eggins (1994) these processes can also be divided into secondary categories such as behavioral, verbal, existential, and mental in addition to material, mental, and relational.

The interpersonal metafunction is concerned with the ways in which language is employed to navigate social roles and relationships, including the display of solidarity, authority, modality, and civility [24]. The interpersonal function views language as a medium of communication, emphasizing the participatory aspect of exchanges between the writer/speaker and the reader/listener. Clauses are viewed as interactive events involving the speaker, writer, and audience at the grammatical level [7].

Giving and demanding are the two basic speech roles that make up the mood system of language, which realizes interpersonal function. When two individuals interact, they build a relationship by exchanging something requested or offered. Four main speech functions are produced by this interaction, which usually involves commodities and services or information: offering, commanding, asserting, and inquiring. In this respect, there are two ways to look at a clause's interpersonal function. According to power dynamics, the speaker or writer has the ability to project authority from a discipline or organization, which can affect how interpersonal function is communicated [18], [25]. As an alternative, the writer or speaker might convey from a personal perspective free from the influence of authority figures or institutions.

Text structure and organization, including coherence and cohesiveness, are examined by the textual metafunction. The focus of language's textual function is on how language organizes and forms messages, ideas and arguments [6], [20], [26]. This purpose is inherent in language and is related to the situational environment in which it is employed. The arrangement of inter clausal elements to produce cohesive and comprehensible entire texts is the textual function at the sentence level [3]. Furthermore, the thematic structure of the clause, which consists of the two main components Theme and Rheme, represents the textual function, which is achieved through the linguistic theme (clause).

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) also emphasizes how important context is to comprehending language. It acknowledges that language is dynamic rather than static and that an expression's meaning changes depending on the context in which it is used (Kaneyasu). To uncover the complex relations between language, society, and culture, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) promotes context-based language analysis.

To sum up, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) offers a comprehensive method for comprehending the composition and operation of language. SFL allows linguists and

researchers to explore language's nuances and discover how language influences communication and reflects our common experiences. This is achieved by highlighting the relationship between social, cultural, and communicative components of language [27]. Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) provides a strong framework for understanding the complex ways that language acts as a medium for meaning, identity, and communication in our diverse and complex world through its stratified model, metafunctions, and context-based analysis.

3.2 Context of Situation (Register) and the Context of Culture (Genre)

Following the framework of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), language is an actualized system of meaning potential in human interaction that takes on several forms. They place more concern on the idea of a "system" than on strict structural guidelines [9], [19]. In this context, language can be seen as a resource containing choices, their relationships, and the requirements to access those choices when it is understood as a system.

Systemic linguists, in essence, investigate texts as communicative acts that generate meaning in a cultural context—the foundation of all social interactions. The decision to participate in social processes that are acknowledged by culture is taken at the genre level, which establishes this framework [6], [28], [29]. In addition, aside from examining its grammar, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) analysis should also lead to further conclusions concerning the situational and cultural contexts (genre and register) [30]. As a result, functional linguistics includes both a theory of language and a description of the situations in which language is important. This dual viewpoint aids in the comprehension and interpretation of the larger sociocultural framework within which texts are situated.

Context is a linguistic level that addresses the connection between the extratextual elements of the circumstance and the linguistic form. Two different meanings flow from this perspective. Contextual meaning is explained at the semantic level by the idea of "register." Register as the realization of semantic resources connected to a specific setting type inside a culture. It is arranged into three categories: field, tenor, and mode, and it pertains to the meaning potential that is available in a particular social situation (Halliday, 1978). Furthermore, one way to think of context is as the language's metafunctional diversity reflected in it. This indicates that experience, interpersonal, and textual functions are connected to field, tenor, and mode in question. Together, these three contextual factors offer a comprehensive understanding of the semiotic structure of the scenario.

In Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), the term field refers to the entire subject matter or topic of a conversation, including what is being discussed. It symbolizes the idea or subject matter of a writing, discussion, or exchange of ideas and is vital in determining the meaning and information that can be expressed through language. Conversely, tenor is concerned with the people involved in a communication exchange. It focuses on the individuals engaged in the conversation, their social roles, and the connections between them on an interpersonal level (mood structure) (Darong, 2022d; Siregar et al., 2021). Tenor influences the choice of language and expression by illuminating the power relationships, social status, and roles of speakers and listeners in a particular situation. Meanwhile, systemic functional linguistics' concept of mode addresses the channel and how language is employed to structure and communicate messages. It includes the decisions made regarding spoken or written language, in addition to different genres and registers that affect the organization and delivery of the message [25]. Understanding mode is essential to understanding how the overall style and purpose of a text is influenced by the mode of communication, which might be speech, writing, visual features, or a combination of these.

The situational context (register) and the cultural context (genre) are connected. Both of them rely on language to be realized, and register acts as a link between genre and language through words and structures. Register is a more constrained, situational expression of a given genre, whereas genre is the larger framework giving a specific sort of interaction its purpose [3].

It is necessary to understand both the cultural (genre) and situational (register) contexts in which a piece is generated in order to fully appreciate it. Register acts as a link between genre and register, which are two dimensions of context that are manifested through language. The more general background is known as the context of culture (genre), and the specific reality of that context is known as the context of situation (register) [21]. Both are essential to comprehending the role language plays in certain speech such as in EFL classroom interactions.

3.3 Classroom Interaction

In educational contexts, classroom interactions are essential to the learning process. Within the framework of language classrooms, they serve as both a vehicle for learning and a topic of pedagogical study. The participants along with their interactions are useful instruments for achieving learning goals [32]–[34]. Likely, Hu and Duan (2018) have confirmed that classroom interaction is an essential component of teaching and learning that extends beyond the actual physical setting. It is regarded as a vital and active medium for accomplishing learning goals.

In the classroom, teachers and students collaborate to increase knowledge and broaden their thinking, necessitating the application of pedagogical tactics and the skillful use of a variety of methodologies [36]. These methods include taking into account the opportunities for learning, making use of interactional features, using language that is appropriate for teacher-student interactions, and getting feedback from the students [37]–[41].

Additionally, it has been observed that teachers employ particular interactional strategies to support meaning negotiation and learning engagement [42]–[45]. Meanwhile, turn-taking and sequence organization are ways to foster learning [46]–[48]. As such, a key component of the ways in question is teachers' capacity to use strategy to control the classroom, which goes beyond their use of language.

Differently, teachers' language choices in the classroom have a big impact on how well students and teachers interact [40], [49]–[51]. Optimal learning outcomes and learning engagement can be achieved by the effective use of language [52]–[55]. To date, students should be conscious of the characteristics of their own successful discussions and their contributions to the dialogue in order to optimize the advantages and promote language production in the classroom [56]. This demonstrates how meaningful interactions are collaborative in nature, with teachers and students both contributing significantly. In this context, student contributions are essential in classroom interactions, especially when it comes to students' attentiveness and their capacity to relate their ideas to earlier contributions. These receptive exchanges can foster a variety of interaction patterns and aid in learning; it's not only about the roles of the students; it's also about how their shifting positions affect the discourse structure and communication patterns. In this regard, [57] have confirmed that contingent responses—in which the present speaker highlights specifics from the preceding speaker's response—maintain interactional qualities and can influence meaning negotiation as well as interaction pattern.

In conclusion, studies have demonstrated that how teachers speak and encourage students' engagement and reach learning goals in the process of classroom interactions. However, the concern is not only on the types of interactions but also on its functional part, which could be problematic. Therefore, it's critical to look at the purposes of teachers' classroom

interactions in addition to the types of talks they have. Moreover, successful learning outcomes can be achieved by encouraging student participation and engagement through the use of effective teaching language. In this situation, language essentially serves as functions for transferring information and guiding the instructional process. The function in question may include ideational, interpersonal and textual functions which are respectively realized by register category of field, tenor, and mode. This emphasizes the idea that language is an active tool for influencing the dynamics and objectives of classroom interactions rather than merely a passive means of information transmission. As such, language has a purpose that goes beyond communication; it helps accomplish educational goals, establish a supportive atmosphere for learning, and manage the flow of classroom discourse.

3.4 Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and Classroom Interaction

A comprehensive linguistic framework called Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is essential for improving effective classroom interactions. SFL offers teachers important insights into the dynamic character of classroom discourse because of its emphasis on the ideational, interpersonal, and textual metafunctions of language as well as its consideration of the situational context, including field, tenor, and mode. (Linares & Xin, 2020; Montes, Barboza, & Olascoaga, 2014)

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) gives us the opportunity to explore the ideational metafunction, which is concerned with the meaning and expression of experiences in language (Martin & Zappavigna, 2019; Martin, 2020). This entails examining how language creates and transmits knowledge in the classroom. Teachers can identify the different processes students are doing—such as describing, explaining, or analyzing—by knowing the ideational function. Teachers can effectively assist students in creating and sharing information during classroom interactions when they are aware of these things.

The social features of language, such as participant roles, power relations, and attitude and manner are the focus of the interpersonal metafunction. Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) assists teachers in taking into account the identities and interactions that language creates in the classroom. Teachers can adapt their language to accommodate the unique needs and identities of students by, for instance, assessing the tone, which encompasses roles, relationships, and social positioning. This promotes a supportive and inclusive learning environment [8].

Language structure and organization fall under the area of the textual metafunction. This SFL feature can be used by teachers to improve classroom interactions and make sure that communications are coherent and well-structured [28], [59]. As such, teachers can adjust language choices to the situation and make sure that interaction is in line with the desired educational goals by looking at the mode, which includes the channel of communication, the media employed, and the degree of formality.

To date, classroom interactions are enhanced even further by SFL's examination of the situational context; field, tenor and mode. The field component entails taking the topic and the goings-on into account. Teachers can ensure that the language in their interactions with students is understandable and relevant for students by using this analysis to match language to the subject matter, be it science, literature, history and so forth. Teachers can modify language complexity to match students' comprehension levels by having a thorough understanding of the field.

Another important aspect of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) in the classroom is tenor, which has to do with the relations and social roles of the participants[27], [60], [61]. This register can be used by teachers to modify their language to fit the unique dynamics

interactions that exist between them and their students. Teachers can establish a learning atmosphere that is more inclusive and respectful by acknowledging the roles and identities of participants.

Last but not least, the mode analysis—which takes into account the communication medium and formality—helps with language adaptation for various classroom contexts. This Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) feature can be used by teachers to determine whether spoken or written language is better suited for a given speech event. Knowing mode enables teachers to make well-informed choices regarding language structure and delivery in classroom interactions Rima Jamil (Kusuma, Dewi, & Kurniawan, 2018; Malkawi & Fareh, 2023).

Taken together, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), which emphasizes context analysis and language metafunctions, is an effective tool for teachers who want to improve classroom interactions. Teachers can facilitate pleasant social relationships, assure effective communication, and direct the formation of knowledge by employing the ideational, interpersonal, and textual metafunctions. Additionally, teachers can tailor language to the unique classroom setting by examining the scenario through the lenses of field, tenor, and mode. This ensures that language choices are inclusive, relevant, and appropriate for both teaching and learning. Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) gives teachers the tools they need to use language as an active, meaningful tool for instruction and interaction in the classroom.

The crucial question is how Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) benefits teachers in feedback process? The teacher's response to a student's grammatical errors or inaccuracies with the goal of assisting them in strengthening their language skills is known as corrective feedback [63]–[66]. In the development and application of corrective feedback strategies in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom interactions, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is a key component. The emphasis that SFL places on discourse structure, language functions, and context analysis can improve the efficacy of corrective feedback in a number of ways.

First and foremost, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) enables teachers to examine the ideational metafunction, which is focused on the meaning and expression of experiences in language. Teachers can gain an understanding of the type of grammatical faults or inaccuracies in students' writing or speech by using this framework. Through the identification of particular ideational functions that have been misapplied or misinterpreted, teachers are able to offer focused coaching input. When a student misuses the passive voice in a phrase, for instance, a teacher using Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) may recognize this as a misconception about the ideational purpose of the passive and adjust the feedback accordingly.

Second, Systemic Functional Linguistics' (SFL's) interpersonal metafunction aids teachers in taking into account how language functions socially and how pupils could be affected by corrective feedback [67]–[69]. Given that it includes calling attention to mistakes, corrective feedback in language learning can be a touchy subject. Teachers are able to pay attention to the tenor portion of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), which includes the social roles and connections of students in the classroom. Instructors may create a welcoming and inclusive learning atmosphere in the classroom by using their knowledge of tone to give constructive criticism in a courteous and supportive way.

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) also helps teachers analyze the textual metafunction by emphasizing language structure and arrangement. This aids teachers in providing students with corrected feedback in a comprehensible and unambiguous manner, ensuring that they grasp the changes. Teachers help students understand the modifications by offering feedback that is consistent with the discourse structure and textual coherence.

Ultimately, the study of the situational context by Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)—which includes the field, tenor, and mode—is essential to figuring out when and how to provide corrective feedback as assessment activities [19], [70]. Teachers can modify the feedback process and timing according to the unique circumstances in the classroom. For example, in a formal written assessment, a teacher may align with the method of written communication by offering written corrective feedback in the form of essay comments. Immediate oral feedback during a conversation may be more appropriate in a more engaged classroom.

Along with the above argument, the design and employment of corrective feedback strategies in EFL classroom interactions can be improved by applying the concepts of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). Teachers can support effective language learning and a healthy classroom environment by providing targeted, courteous, and well-structured feedback that makes use of SFL's insights into language functions, discourse structure, and the social and contextual dimensions of language. In an EFL classroom, Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) assists teachers and students in navigating the challenges of language learning by supplementing the use of corrective feedback.

By and large, a large corpus of previous research studies on the pedagogical implications of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom interactions has greatly influenced the body of knowledge. The examined research studies indisputably highlight the transformational power of English as a foreign language learning (EFL) in altering language instruction and fostering meaningful and dynamic discourse moves and commodity exchanges in the classroom. In this respect, such power, which emphasizes the ongoing relevance and significance of SFL in the field of language teaching.

Furthermore, previous studies have consistently demonstrated the significant impact that Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) has on EFL language teaching. In addition, the body of research confirms that Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) has a significant impact on classroom interactions in addition to improving our understanding of language pedagogical functions and structures (Morton, 2020). In this case, there should be an agreement toward the consensus saying that Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) has the potential to manage discourse moves and commodity exchanges in EFL classrooms. These results provide convincing evidence that the incorporation of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) concepts into EFL instruction allows teachers to encourage more effective discourse strategies, learning resources, social proposals enabling richer and more involved interactions between teacher and students and among students themselves [71]. In order to help teachers and students achieve stronger communication and language proficiency, the significance of incorporating Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) into language teaching is essential.

Building on these results, I propose that Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) principles be deliberately included into classroom interactions to facilitate more accurate, helpful, and context-sensitive discourse moves and commodity exchanges. As such, SFL has the potential to transform language teaching and the vital role it plays in promoting more lively, interesting, and fruitful interactions between EFL students. Incorporating Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) principles definitely improves classroom discourse and makes it easier for students to engage in deeper, more nuanced language exchanges. This, in turn, improves students' language learning experiences and improves teachers' pedagogical methods.

4 Conclusion

This review has highlighted the significant influence of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) in EFL classrooms interactions. Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) encourages lively conversation movements that improve classroom interactions and provides insightful understanding of language structures and functions that improves the delivery of feedback. Interactions in EFL classrooms can become more dynamic, productive, and interesting by adopting Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) framework. The findings of previous research studies also emphasized how Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) has a significant impact on curriculum design, language instruction, and student learning outcome

A more thorough investigation of Systemic Functional Linguistics' (SFL's) practical application in various EFL contexts is expected for next research. It would be beneficial to look into its adaptability, difficulties, visibility, and eligibility in a particular context. Furthermore, studies on teaching materials may help Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) become more widely used. It is also crucial to conduct longitudinal research on the long-term effects of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) on language competency and acquisition. Analyses that compare Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) to other educational approaches may shed light on the special benefits of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) for creating dynamic learning environments and accurate remedial feedback in EFL contexts.

References

- [1] H. C. Darong, "Register Categories (Field, Tenor, Mode) of the Text," *LLT J. A J. Lang. Lang. Teach.*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 572–581, 2022, doi: 10.24071/llt.v25i2.4724.
- [2] M. A. K. Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Edward Arnold., 1985.
- [3] S. Eggins, *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Pinter. Fernández-agüero, 1994.
- [4] R. Hasan, "Towards a Paradigmatic Description of Context: Systems, Metafunctions, and Semantics," *Funct. Linguistics*, vol. 1, no. 9, pp. 1–54, 2014, doi: <https://doi.org/http://www.functionallinguistics.com/content/>.
- [5] S. Moncada Linares and Z.-Y. Xin, "Language Education and Systemic Functional Linguistics," *NOBEL J. Lit. Lang. Teach.*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 234–249, 2020, doi: 10.15642/nobel.2020.11.2.234-249.
- [6] M. Mustafa and I. Syahriani, "Genre-Based SFL Analysis of Academic Writing English: Investigating Linguistic Features and Genre Convention in Students Essays," *Elit. English Lit. J.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 2023, doi: 10.24252/elite.v10i1.36563.
- [7] X. Zhang, "EFL Writers' Reconstruction of Writing Beliefs in a Functional Linguistics-Based Curriculum: What Does the Trajectory Look Like?," *SAGE Open*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2019, doi: 10.1177/2158244019853915.
- [8] E. T. S. Sujatna and H. Kuswoyo, "An appraisal perspective on students' use of attitudinal resources in university EFL academic oral presentations," *Cogent Arts Humanit.*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2023, doi: 10.1080/23311983.2023.2195728.
- [9] F. Adenan, "Systemic Functional Linguistics: Meaning Carriers In Functional Grammar," *Humaniora*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 221–232, 2012, [Online]. Available: <https://jurnal.ugm.ac.id/jurnal-humaniora/article/view/728>
- [10] E. Emilia and F. A. Hamied, "Systemic Functional Linguistic Genre Pedagogy (Sfl Gp) in a Tertiary Efl Writing Context in Indonesia," *TEFLIN J. - A Publ. Teach. Learn. English*, vol. 26, no. 2, p. 155, 2015, doi: 10.15639/teflinjournal.v26i2/155-

182.

- [11] A. I. Montes, P. A., Barboza, A. M., & Olascoaga, “Systemic functional linguistics and discourse analysis as alternatives when dealing with texts,” *Profile*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 101–116, 2014, doi: <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.15446/profile.v16n2.38113>.
- [12] M. Andersen, T. H., Emilie, A., & Holsting, “Clause Complexing in Systemic Functional Linguistics – towards an Alternative Description,” *Funct. Linguistics*, vol. 5, no. 10, pp. 1–25, 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1186/s40554-018-0059-7>.
- [13] H. C. Darong, “What does Systemic Functional Linguistics say about speech? A discourse-semantic analysis,” *World Media. J. Russ. Media Journal. Stud.*, vol. 4, no. December, pp. 46–67, 2022, doi: 10.47855/jal9020-2022-4.
- [14] Y. Wang and Y. Zhou, “Systemic-functional linguistics in China (2010–2016),” *Word*, vol. 64, no. 1, pp. 9–37, 2018, doi: 10.1080/00437956.2018.1427085.
- [15] H. C. Darong, “It is all about clauses: Speech analysis using systemic functional linguistics theory,” *Englisia J. Lang. Educ. Humanit.*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 54, 2022, doi: 10.22373/ej.v10i1.13029.
- [16] H. C. Darong, “Interpersonal Function of American Political Speech (Systemic Functional Linguistics Approach),” *Ijotl-Tl*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 58–71, 2022, doi: 10.30957/ijotl.v7i1.626.such.
- [17] E. R. Miller, “Advanced language learning: the contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky,” *Int. J. Biling. Educ. Biling.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 348–353, 2009, doi: 10.1080/13670050802149408.
- [18] S. Cheng, “A review of interpersonal metafunction studies in systemic functional linguistics (2012-2022),” *J. World Lang.*, pp. 1–45, 2023, doi: 10.1515/jwl-2023-0026.
- [19] A. Llinares and A. McCabe, “Systemic functional linguistics: the perfect match for content and language integrated learning,” *Int. J. Biling. Educ. Biling.*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 245–250, 2023, doi: 10.1080/13670050.2019.1635985.
- [20] Y. A. Alwasilah and W. Gunawan, “A Systemic Functional Linguistic Study on Language Use of Indonesian Students in Writing,” *Jomantara Indones. J. Art Cult.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 110–124, 2023, doi: 10.23969/jijac.v3i2.3.
- [21] C. M. Cordeiro, “Using systemic functional linguistics as method in identifying semogenic strategies in intercultural communication. study of the collocation of ‘time’ and ‘different’ by Swedish managers with international management experiences,” *J. Intercult. Commun. Res.*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 207–225, 2018, doi: 10.1080/17475759.2018.1455601.
- [22] O. Henry, “TRANSITIVITY ANALYSIS IN SHORT STORY THE LAST LEAF BY,” vol. 12, no. 3, 2023.
- [23] R. J. Malkawi and S. Fareh, “The role of language in advocacy: An SFL analysis of Hanan Ashrawi’s speech on Palestinian rights,” *Cogent Arts Humanit.*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2023, doi: 10.1080/23311983.2023.2276554.
- [24] S. Yang, “A Systemic Functional Study of the System of Modality in Chinese,” *SAGE Open*, vol. 11, no. 3, 2021, doi: 10.1177/21582440211040075.
- [25] A. Nagao, “The SFL genre-based approach to writing in EFL contexts,” *Asian-Pacific J. Second Foreign Lang. Educ.*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2019, doi: 10.1186/s40862-019-0069-3.
- [26] V. To, “Linguistic Complexity Analysis: A Case Study of Commonly-Used Textbooks in Vietnam,” *SAGE Open*, vol. 8, no. 3, 2018, doi: 10.1177/2158244018787586.

- [27] D. Farsani, T. Lange, and T. Meaney, "Gestures, systemic functional linguistics and mathematics education," *Mind, Cult. Act.*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 75–95, 2022, doi: 10.1080/10749039.2022.2060260.
- [28] A. Yu, "Analysis of the problems of the chinese college students' EFL classroom writings," *Int. Educ. Stud.*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 199–203, 2012, doi: 10.5539/ies.v5n5p199.
- [29] J. R. Martin, "Genre and activity: a potential site for dialogue between Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and Cultural Historical Activity Theory (CHAT)," *Mind, Cult. Act.*, vol. 00, no. 00, pp. 216–232, 2020, doi: 10.1080/10749039.2020.1781898.
- [30] H. C. Darong, Y. H. Jem, and S. Guna, "Lexical Cohesion Devices in Students' Narrative Text and Its Pedagogical Implication in Language Teaching (A Discourse-Semantics Point of View)," *J. Pendidik. Progresif*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 362–374, 2022, doi: 10.23960/jpp.v12.i1.202228.
- [31] Y. Siregar, A. N. Pasaribu, and E. Sinambela, "An Analysis of Mood and Modality," *PIONEER J. Lang. Lit.*, vol. 13, no. 2, p. 302, 2021, doi: 10.36841/pioneer.v13i2.1299.
- [32] F. Barbieri, "Involvement in University Classroom Discourse : Register Variation and Interactivity," *Appl. Linguist.*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 151–173, 2015, doi: 10.1093/applin/amt030.
- [33] A. M. Barraja-Rohan, "Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence," *Lang. Teach. Res.*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 479–507, 2011, doi: 10.1177/1362168811412878.
- [34] C. Chadia, "Interaction in Teachers / Learners and Learners / learners ' Discourse : The Case of Third Year Oral Expression Students / Teachers at Mohamed Saddik Ben Yahia University-Jijel .," pp. 1–281, 2011.
- [35] G. Hu and Y. Duan, "Questioning and responding in the classroom : a cross-disciplinary study of the effects of instructional mediums in academic subjects at a Chinese university," *Int. J. Biling. Educ. Biling.*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 1–20, 2018.
- [36] S. Atwood, W. Turnbull, and I. M. Jeremy, "Journal of the Learning The Construction of Knowledge in Classroom Talk," *J. Learn. Sci.*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 358–402, 2010, doi: 10.1080/10508406.2010.481013.
- [37] J. Berger, C. Girardet, C. Vaudroz, and M. Crahay, "Teaching Experience , Teachers ' Beliefs , and Self-Reported Classroom Management Practices : A Coherent Network," *SAGE Open*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 2018, doi: 10.1177/2158244017754119.
- [38] K. Brown and H. Kennedy, "Learning through conversation : Exploring and extending teacher and children ' s involvement in classroom talk," *Sch. Psychol. Int.*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 377–396, 2011, doi: 10.1177/0143034311406813.
- [39] H. R. M. Iv and F. B. Tenore, "Classroom Management in Diverse Classrooms," *Urban Educ.*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 560–603, 2010, doi: 10.1177/0042085910377290.
- [40] G. Palma, "A Classroom View of Negotiation of Meaning With EFL Adult Mexican Pupils," 2014, doi: 10.1177/2158244014535941.
- [41] R. C. Pianta, "Teacher – Student Interactions : Measurement , Impacts , Improvement , and Policy," *Policy Insights from Behav. Brain Sci.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 98–105, 2016, doi: 10.1177/2372732215622457.
- [42] M. Cancino, "Assessing Learning Opportunities in EFL Classroom Interaction : What Can Conversation Analysis Tell Us ?," 2015, doi: 10.1177/0033688214568109.
- [43] C. Griffiths, "What have we learnt from ' good language learners '?" vol. 69, no. 4, pp. 425–433, 2015, doi: 10.1093/elt/ccv040.

- [44] D. O. Jackson and M. Cho, "Language teacher noticing : A socio-cognitive window on classroom realities," *Lang. Teach. Res.*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 29–46, 2018, doi: 10.1177/1362168816663754.
- [45] M. S. Solem, "Negotiating knowledge claims : Students ' assertions in classroom interactions," *Discourse Stud.*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 737–757, 2016, doi: 10.1177/1461445616668072.
- [46] J. C. Rolin-ianziti and C. Ord, "Variations on the IRE pattern in a French beginner task-based classroom," *Lang. Learn. J. ISSN*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 343–356, 2016, doi: 10.1080/09571736.2015.1124445.
- [47] C. Kapellidi, "The organization of talk in school interaction," *Discourse Stud.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 185–204, 2013, doi: 10.1177/1461445612471466.
- [48] B. Maroni and A. Gnisci, "Turn-taking in classroom interactions : Overlapping , interruptions and pauses in primary school," vol. XXIII, pp. 59–76, 2008.
- [49] L. Van Canh and W. A. Renandya, "Teachers ' English Proficiency and Classroom Language Use : A Conversation Analysis Study," *RELC J.*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 67–81, 2017, doi: 10.1177/0033688217690935.
- [50] E. E. Ekembe, "Interaction and Uptake in Large Foreign Language Classrooms," *RELC J.*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 237 –251, 2014, doi: 10.1177/0033688214547036.
- [51] P. N. Shresta, "English Language Classroom Practices: Bangladeshi Primary School Children's Perceptions," *RELC J.*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 147–162, 2013, doi: 10.1177/0033688213488466.
- [52] C. Hsieh and Y. Wang, "Speaking proficiency of young language students : A discourse-analytic study," pp. 1–24, 2017, doi: 10.1177/0265532217734240.
- [53] J. Rothman and P. Guijarro-fuentes, "Input Quality Matters : Some Comments on Input Type and Age-Effects in Adult SLA," *Appl. Linguist.*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 301–306, 2010, doi: 10.1093/applin/amq004.
- [54] K. Saito and K. Hanzawa, "The role of input in second language oral ability development in foreign language classrooms : A longitudinal study," *Lang. Teach. Res.*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 398–417, 2016, doi: 10.1177/1362168816679030.
- [55] H. C. Darong, "Contingency, Convergence, and Divergence of Teachers' Questions In Classroom Interactions," *Indones. J. EFL Linguist.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 265–278, 2022, doi: 10.21462/ijefl.v7i2.508.
- [56] G. T. Jr and M. Stout, "Getting EFL students to speak : an action research approach," *ELT J.*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 11–25, 2014, doi: 10.1093/elt/ccu037.
- [57] D. M. K. Lam, "What counts as ' responding ' ? Contingency on previous speaker contribution as a feature of interactional competence," *Lang. Test.*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 377–401, 2018, doi: 10.1177/0265532218758126.
- [58] M. Martin, J. R., & Zappavigna, "Embodied meaning: A systemic functional perspective on paralinguage," *Funct. Linguist.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–33, 2019, doi: <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1186/s40554-018-0065-9>.
- [59] R. Bouwer, A. Béguin, T. Sanders, and H. van den Bergh, "Effect of genre on the generalizability of writing scores," *Lang. Test.*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 83–100, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0265532214542994.
- [60] L. C. A. Claessens *et al.*, "Positive teacher – student relationships go beyond the classroom , problematic ones stay inside," *J. Educ. Res.*, vol. 110, no. 5, pp. 478–493, 2016, doi: 10.1080/00220671.2015.1129595.
- [61] F. A. Fan, "Teacher : students ' interpersonal relationships and students ' academic achievements in social studies," *Teach. Teach. theory Pract.*, vol. 18, no. 483–490, pp.

- 37–41, 2012, doi: 10.1080/13540602.2012.696048.
- [62] E. Kusuma, R., Dewi, S., & Kurniawan, “Seeing Recount from Systemic Functional Linguistic Perspective: Sine Qua Non Attributes,” *RETORIKA J. Ilmu Bhs.*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 43–52, 2018, doi: <https://doi.org/10.22225/jr.4.1.464.43-52>.
- [63] K. Lindahl and L. Baecher, “Teacher language awareness in supervisory feedback cycles,” *ELT J.*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 28–38, 2016, doi: 10.1093/elt/ccv047.
- [64] S. Li, “The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in SLA: A Meta-Analysis,” *Lang. Learn.*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 309–365, 2010, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x.
- [65] H. Sarandi, “Oral Corrective Feedback : A Question of Classification and Application,” *Tesol Q.*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 235–246, 2016, doi: 10.1002/tesq.285.
- [66] H. C. Darong and S. Guna, “Corrective feedback : Pragmatic exposures in EFL classroom interactions,” *Int. J. Educ. Learn.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 14–22, 2023.
- [67] E. Babaii, A. Parsazadeh, and H. Moradi, “The question of power in language classes from a critical discourse analysis perspective Once a student , always a student ?,” *Pragmat. Soc.*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 542–570, 2018, doi: 10.1075/ps.8.4.04bab.
- [68] L. Mcfarland, E. Murray, and S. Phillipson, “Student – teacher relationships and student self-concept : Relations with teacher and student gender,” *Aust. J. Educ.*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 5–25, 2016, doi: 10.1177/0004944115626426.
- [69] J. Kormos and A. M. Smith, “Teaching languages to students with specific learning differences,” *Teach. Lang. to Students with Specif. Learn. Differ.*, pp. 1–236, 2023, doi: 10.21832/KORMOS8615.
- [70] T. Morton, “Afterword: SFL, theoretical pluralism and content and language integration at the levels of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment,” *Int. J. Biling. Educ. Biling.*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 363–368, 2023, doi: 10.1080/13670050.2020.1806781.
- [71] F. J. Troyan, R. Harman, and X. Zhang, “Critical SFL praxis in teacher education: Looking backward and looking forward (Introduction to special issue on Systemic Functional Linguistics as Critical Praxis in Teacher Education: Looking Backward and Looking Forward),” *Lang. Educ.*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 294–296, 2022, doi: 10.1080/09500782.2021.1960559.