CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1.1.   BACKGROUND OF RESEARCH

Communication is crucial in human interaction, serving as a bridge for sharing thoughts, emotions, and intentions (Kimmig : 2020). In films, dialogue plays a vital role not only in advancing the storyline but also in revealing the intricate dynamics of interpersonal relationships between characters. The way characters interact and convey their thoughts through language provides rich material for analysis, especially from a linguistic viewpoint.

A key framework for examining language in social interactions is Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), developed by Michael Halliday. Halliday (2014:23) asserts, "Language is a resource for making meaning, and meaning resides in systemic patterns of choice." SFL outlines three main metafunctions of language: ideational, interpersonal, and textual. Although all three metafunctions are integral to communication, this study will focus on the interpersonal metafunction. The objective is to explore how dialogue in The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring helps build and reflect character relationships, shaping both the narrative and emotional depth of the film.

The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring is a particularly interesting subject for such analysis. Based on J.R.R. Tolkien's celebrated novel, the film features complex characters and rich dialogue that significantly contribute to the development of its story and character relationships. By analyzing the interpersonal metafunction in the film's dialogue, we can uncover how language shapes interactions and portrays the evolving connections between characters.

Despite the extensive research on The Lord of the Rings and linguistic analysis in films, there is still a lack of studies specifically focusing on the interpersonal metafunction within this iconic movie. This research aims to fill that gap by examining the dialogue in The Fellowship of the Ring through the lens of interpersonal metafunction, offering fresh insights into how language facilitates character development and narrative progression.

This study seeks to deepen the understanding of how language and film interact, emphasizing the importance of interpersonal communication in shaping viewers' perceptions of character relationships and narrative structure. By doing so, it aims to contribute valuable perspectives to the fields of linguistic studies and film analysis, particularly in understanding the role of language in cinematic storytelling.

...TION OF PROBLEMS

...blems identified after analyzing the dialogue in The Lord of the ...o of the Ring, which are:

...nstances of linguistic choices that reflect power dynamics and ...mong characters.

1

1.2.2 The utilization of interpersonal metafunction in characters' dialogue throughout the film.

1.2.3 The influence of dialogue on the audience's perception of character relationships and the narrative's emotional depth.

1.3. SCOPE OF THE PROBLEMS

For the purpose of time efficiency, the researcher has put scopes to the problem by focusing on the role of interpersonal metafunction in understanding characters' dialogue. Moreover, this research will cover the entire movie. This comprehensive approach allows for an in-depth exploration of character development throughout the film.

1.4. RESEARCH QUESTION

1.4.1 What are the types of modality performed by the characters as part of interpersonal metafunction?

1.4.2 What are the meanings of modality, as a part of interpesonal metafunction, performed by characters in the film?

1.5. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Having narrowed down the issue identified in the problem identification section to a more specific scope, the researcher aims to address the following research questions:

1.5.1 To find out the types of modality used by the characters.

1.5.2 To reveal the meanings of modality performed by the characters.

1.6. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study seeks to provide both practical and theoretical contributions to the understanding of interpersonal metafunctions in film dialogue, particularly in The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring.

1.6.1 Theoritical Benefit

This study contributes to the theoretical understanding of how modality operates within the framework of interpersonal metafunction. By exploring the use of modality in character dialogues, it offers deeper insights into how interpersonal meanings shape character interactions and drive narrative progression in films. These findings enhance the body of knowledge in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), particularly in relation to modalization, modulation, and the interpersonal aspect of language in discourse.

y, this study provides a foundation for further linguistic research rpersonal meaning and functional grammar.

efit

learners and educators, this study offers practical insights into n of modality in real-life communication. The findings can be rning tool to improve the comprehension of modality in everyday s, while also serving as a valuable reference for teaching the

pragmatic aspects of language in classroom settings. Additionally, students and researchers can use this study as an accessible resource for understanding interpersonal metafunction, discourse analysis, and applied linguistics, thereby making language learning and research more engaging and relevant.

1.7.   PREVIOUS STUDIES

Previous related studies refer to past research that is similar to the current study. They highlight both the similarities and differences between previous findings and the present research. The first related study was written by Ruijuan Ye (2010), the second study was written by Houfei Yang (2017), the third study was written by Shi Cheng (2023), and the fourth study was written by Muazzma Batool et al (2023).

The first study, *"The Interpersonal Metafunction Analysis Of Barack Obama's Victory Speech"* was conducted by Ruijuan Ye in 2010 employs a qualitative research method, specifically utilizing Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) as its theoretical framework. The research focuses on the interpersonal metafunction to analyze Barack Obama's victory speech. The study is qualitative in nature, aiming to uncover how interpersonal elements like mood, modality, and pronouns contribute to the effectiveness of Obama's speech in building a connection with his audience. The findings reveal that Obama skillfully uses these linguistic tools to establish solidarity, convey his messages clearly, and engage his audience, ultimately contributing to the overall persuasive power of his speech.

The second study, *"The Interpersonal Metafunction Analysis Of Barack Obama's Inaugural Address"* by Houfei Yang (2017) employs both qualitative and quantitative methods to analyze Barack Obama's Inaugural Speech through the lens of Interpersonal Metafunction based on Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG). The research uses a descriptive and analytical approach to explore discourse features such as Mood, Modality, and pronoun usage, focusing on how interpersonal relationships and meanings are constructed in the speech. This discourse analysis reveals that declarative clauses dominate the speech (97%), with imperative clauses accounting for 3% and no interrogative clauses present. Modal verbs like "will," "can," and "must" are frequently used, with "will" indicating a high level of commitment, reflecting Obama's strong determination. The use of personal pronouns, particularly "we" and its variants (our, ourselves, us), underscores an inclusive and dialogic approach, fostering a sense of unity and shared purpose. The pronoun "you" is employed to establish a dialogic relationship with the audience, while third-person pronouns are used sparingly. The findings suggest that the speech effectively ssages, builds interpersonal relationships, and motivates the h the speaker's vision, demonstrating how strategic language effectiveness of political discourse.

dy is from the Journal of World Languages, "*A Review Of nction Studies In Systemic Functional Linguistics (2012–2022)*") employs a systematic methodology, analyzing 160 studies 012 and 2022, to explore the interpersonal metafunction within

3

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). Using an inductive coding method, the research categorizes these studies into four themes: theoretical explorations, multilingual studies, discourse analysis, and language education. The approach combines theoretical frameworks and practical applications of SFL, examining its use across various linguistic contexts and genres while integrating interdisciplinary perspectives. As a review study, it synthesizes existing literature rather than conducting original empirical research. Key findings highlight advancements in theoretical models, methodological developments, and practical applications, emphasizing the adaptability of SFL in different languages and discourses. The study underscores the need for refining theoretical models, developing new research directions, and enhancing methodologies, particularly in typological descriptions and language education, contributing significantly to understanding interpersonal meanings in language.

The fourth study is from Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, *"Tenor Analysis Of Selected Short Stories By Tariq Rahman Applying Halliday's Interpersonal Metafunction"* conducted by Muazzma Batool et al (2023) used Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) method that focuses in interpersonal metafunction, a theory by Michael Halliday. This research used descriptive quantitative approach by interpreting data withing the mood table within social and cultural context. This type of research in discourse analysis which exmine the dimention of tenor such as status, contact, and affect in Tariq Rahman short stories. The result of the research indicates that declarative mood is the dominant mood types; furthermore, the analysis also reveals the social status imbalance amongst the powerful character over the weak, and affect showing a positive influence from the powerful character over the weak. The theme highlighted is the oppression of the weak by the powerfull in Pakistan's patriarchal society.

The main distinction between the previous studies and the present research lies in the subject of analysis. While the previous studies applied Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) to analyze speeches, which are essentially one-way forms of communication delivered by a single speaker to an audience, this study focuses on film dialogues, which involve two-way interactions between characters. By examining dialogic exchanges, this research aims to provide a deeper understanding of how interpersonal meanings, particularly modality, are dynamically negotiated between speakers within a conversational context, offering a perspective that has not been fully explored in the previous studies.

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK
Funtional Grammar

Inctional grammar, metafuntion is one of the core concepts that xplain utilization of languange in communication. The term in Halliday's theory is used because the functions described by are not only related to the direct functions of language itself but er or meta functions in the sense that they govern and shape

how we use language in various communicative contexts. Thus, "metafunction" refers to the more abstract and comprehensive language functions that go beyond the basic functions of language, such as conveying information (ideational), building social relations (interpersonal), and organizing texts (textual). Hallidays famously stating that 'language is as it is because of the functions it has evolved to serve in people's lives (Halliday, 1978).

Ideational metafunction represents what we experience as humans through language. The central idea of the transitivity system is that our life experiences are made up of various processes such as actions, events, perceptions, communications, states, and transformations (Eggins, 1994). Transitivity consist of participant, process, and circumstances. In Halliday's view (1973), Transitivity encompasses the choices available to a speaker for expressing their perception of both the actions occurring in the external world and the thoughts and feelings within their own mind, including the individuals involved in these actions and the surrounding circumstances. What Halliday meant by external experience is what we can persieve and observe through our sense in our life; whereas, internal experience is the emotional process happening in our mind.

The interpersonal metafunction in Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics focuses on the role of language in enacting social relationships and expressing the speaker's attitude. According to Halliday (2004:29), "language is always also enacting: enacting our personal and social relationships with the other people around us". This metafunction allows speakers to interact, make statements, ask questions, give commands, or express feelings. Halliday further explains that the clause functions not only as a representation of processes but also as a proposition or proposal is a way in which we convey information or ask questions, issue commands or make offers, and communicate our evaluation and attitude toward the person we are addressing and the subject being discussed (Halliday, 2004: 30). The interpersonal metafunction plays a crucial role in understanding how language is used as a tool for interaction and how it helps shape social realities.

The textual metafunction in Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics focuses on how language is organized to create coherent and cohesive discourse. This metafunction ensures that language can form structured sequences, enabling the communication of complex ideas effectively. 4))states, "Both the others, construing experience and enacting relations, depend on being able to build up sequences of rganizing the discursive flow and creating cohesion and t moves along". The textual metafunction is essential for linking sentences into a unified text, ensuring that the message is clear t provides the framework that allows the speaker or writer to

create a text that is meaningful and easy to follow, supporting the delivery of ideational and interpersonal meanings within a coherent structure.

The three metafunctions in systemic functional theory, ideational, interpersonal, and textual, work together to create meaning in communication. The ideational metafunction focuses on describing experiences and the world, the interpersonal metafunction shows the relationship between the speaker and listener, and the textual metafunction helps organize the message for clear communication. These metafunctions support each other to make communication more effective and meaningful, whether in everyday conversation or in media like movies and books.

1.8.2. Interpersonal Metafunction

The interpersonal metafunction within SFL focuses specifically on the social aspect of language use. It examines how language is employed to enact social relationships, establish interpersonal meanings, and negotiate social roles and identities. Central to this metafunction are linguistic features such as mood and modality. Mood refers to the grammatical resources used to indicate the speaker's attitude towards the message (declarative, interrogative, imperative), while modality involves expressing the speaker's degree of certainty, obligation, or inclination. These linguistic features play a crucial role in conveying interpersonal meanings and negotiating social interactions. This framework offers a valuable tool for analyzing language use in context and understanding the intricate interplay between language, society, and culture.

This emphasis on how language negotiates our roles and relationships naturally leads us to a closer look at the building blocks of those interactions at the clause level. Once we understand that every utterance does more than simply name or describe, we can see why it is essential to know exactly how a clause is put together. In the next section, we move from the broad aims of the interpersonal metafunction to the detailed study of clause structure, focusing on how the Mood and Residue components work together to create each statement as an arguable unit of meaning.

Every clause in English can be split into two major parts: Mood (the "arguable" core) and Residue (everything else). Mood itself has three obligatory elements: (1) A marker of affirmation (YES) or negation (NO), Polarity; (2) The person or thing "held responsible" for the proposition, Subject; and (3) The element that anchors the clause in time and modality, making it something we can argue about Finite. Each of these Mood

s necessary to form a complete, arguable clause. Anything that those three slots is part of the Residue, which houses the omplements, and any number of Adjuncts.

ts in the Residue add extra information about how, when, where, r what circumstances the action of the Predicator takes place. es them into three broad classes: (1) Circumstantial Adjuncts, experiential context such as time (for example "yesterday"),

place ("in the garden"), cause ("because of rain"), matter ("about nothing"), accompaniment ("with friends"), beneficiary ("for you"), or agent ("by hand"); (2) Modal Adjuncts, which layer on interpersonal coloring, including Mood Adjuncts (probability such as "perhaps," usuality such as "usually," intensification such as "really," presumption such as "evidently," inclination such as "willingly"), Polarity Adjuncts (YES or NO standing in for an ellipsed clause), Comment Adjuncts (speaker's attitude such as "honestly," "frankly," "fortunately"), and Vocative Adjuncts (direct address such as "John," "ladies and gentlemen"); and (3) Textual Adjuncts, which connect clauses in discourse through Conjunctive items like "however" or "therefore" and Continuative items like "well" or "anyway" that guide the flow from one clause or idea to the next.

1. Modality

Modality is all about how speakers show their attitude toward a statement—whether they think something is likely, usual, necessary, or possible. In Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), modality is not just about modal verbs like *can, must,* or *may*. It can also appear in adjectives (*possible, certain*), adverbs (*probably, necessarily*), or even in full sentence structures like *It is possible that....*

Halliday explains that modality is construed by clauses such as *I suppose* and *it is possible*, by verbal groups with finite modal operators such as *may*, and by adverbial groups with modal adverbs such as *perhaps.* This means that modality is spread across different parts of grammar, and each way of expressing it has a slightly different meaning.

Modality, as outlined in Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics, reflects the speaker's judgment or attitude regarding the likelihood, necessity, or desirability of a proposition or action. It is a core component of the interpersonal metafunction and operates between the poles of affirmation ("yes") and negation ("no"). Halliday divides modality into two primary types: modalization and modulation, each of which is influenced by orientation (subjective or objective) and value (high, medium, or low).

Modalization pertains to propositions and deals with degrees of probability or usuality. It answers questions like, "How likely is this?" or "How often does it occur?" Modalization is realized through modal verbs such as might, could, and will or adverbs like probably and usually. For example, the statement "It might rain tomorrow" reflects uncertainty about the likelihood of rain, while "She often visits her grandmother" expresses ____ equency. Halliday (2014) describes modalization as expressing ____ ker's assessment of the probability or usuality of something ____."

____ itionally, modalization is shaped by orientation and value. ____ orientation reflects personal judgment, as in "I think it might ____ reas objective orientation provides an unbiased or impersonal ____ such as "It is likely to rain." The value of modalization ranges

7

from low probability ("It might rain") to high certainty ("It will rain") or from infrequent ("rarely") to frequent ("usually"). These distinctions enable speakers to communicate their confidence or hesitation in nuanced ways, contributing to interpersonal dynamics in discourse.

Modulation, in contrast, applies to proposals and focuses on the degree of obligation or inclination. It addresses questions like, "How necessary is this action?" or "How willing is the participant to act?" For instance, "You must finish your assignment" conveys high obligation, whereas "You may leave early today" reflects permission, a lower level of necessity. Inclination, another dimension of modulation, appears in statements like "He is willing to help," indicating readiness or desire. Halliday explains, "Modulation refers to the degree of necessity or desirability that is attributed to the action or event, reflecting the speaker's judgment" (An Introduction to Functional Grammar, p. 149).

Similar to modalization, modulation varies in orientation and value. Subjective modulation involves personal judgment, such as "I want you to go," while objective modulation appears more detached, as in "You are required to go." The value of modulation ranges from high necessity ("You must go") to low inclination ("You can go if you want"). This flexibility allows speakers to effectively manage interpersonal relationships by negotiating authority, permission, or willingness.

2. Orientation in Modality

Orientation is about whether the modality comes from the speaker's personal opinion or if it's presented as a general fact. There are four types:

1. Subjective-implicit – Modality is inside the sentence without an explicit speaker (*He may come*).
2. Subjective-explicit – The speaker directly shows their opinion (*I think he will come*).
3. Objective-implicit – The modality is presented as fact, not opinion (*He is probably coming*).
4. Objective-explicit – The statement is framed impersonally (*It is certain that he will come*).

It is also noted that modality can be realized in different grammatical forms, with subjective or objective orientation, and either explicitly or implicitly. Basically, subjective modality shows personal judgment, while objective modality makes it seem like an external truth.

In discussing modality and its orientation, it is important to also consider of projecting and projected clauses. According to Halliday & en (2014), a projecting clause is one that introduces an idea, speech, while a projected clause represents the content of that ght, or speech. In other words, the projecting clause functions proposition or proposal, while the projected clause delivers the n or belief itself.

8

The presence of a projecting clause can significantly influence the orientation of modality. If the projecting clause explicitly marks the speaker's stance—such as "I think," "I believe," or "He says"—the modality is typically categorized as subjective-explicit, because the speaker's judgment is overtly attached to the proposition. Geoff Thompson (2014) explains that subjective modality is made explicit when the speaker overtly signals their judgment. In contrast, if the projecting clause presents the information impersonally—such as "It seems" or "It is said"—the orientation leans toward objective-explicit, where the judgment appears to come from an external source rather than from the speaker directly.

Moreover, in cases where the projected clause stands alone without an accompanying projecting clause, the interpretation of orientation depends on contextual clues. If the modality feels personally evaluated, it is treated as subjective-implicit. If it appears more factual or detached, it is considered objective-implicit. Thus, the relationship between projecting and projected clauses provides critical cues in assessing how modality is oriented—whether grounded in personal opinion or framed as general truth. This mechanism plays a vital role in how interpersonal meaning is negotiated within discourse, especially in film dialogues where characters often shift between personal feelings and seemingly universal judgments.

3. Degrees of Modality (Value)

Not all modality expresses the same level of certainty, obligation, or usuality. Halliday (2014) categorizes modality into three levels: high, median, and low, which indicate the strength of commitment expressed by the speaker.

1. High Modality. This level expresses strong certainty, necessity, or obligation. Words like must, always, and certainly indicate a high degree of probability or obligation. For example, You must finish your work today expresses a strong obligation, while He is definitely coming shows strong certainty.

2. Median Modality – This level conveys moderate certainty or obligation. Words like should, probably, and usually fall within this category. For instance, He should be there by now suggests a recommendation rather than a command, while It probably will rain indicates uncertainty but with a reasonable expectation.

3. Low Modality – This level reflects weak probability, obligation, or ⁄. Words like may, possibly, and sometimes suggest a lower certainty. For example, You may leave early today allows for ssibility without enforcing it, while It might rain later expresses robability.

2014) explains that modal expressions range from high (must, median (should, probable) to low (may, possible) values, ating the different degrees of confidence or necessity expressed

in discourse. The degree of modality plays a crucial role in shaping the interpersonal meaning of a statement, as it influences how forcefully an idea or expectation is conveyed.

4. Polarity in Modality

Polarity in modality refers to whether a modal expression affirms or negates a statement. A positive polarity indicates that a statement expresses possibility, certainty, or obligation, while a negative polarity denies or restricts these aspects. For example, He must go (positive polarity) expresses obligation, whereas He must not go (negative polarity) prohibits an action. The presence of polarity affects the interpretation of the speaker's stance and the degree of authority or uncertainty conveyed in discourse.

Negative polarity in modality often implies restriction or prohibition, either subtly or explicitly. Explicit negative polarity appears in sentences such as It is not possible that he will come, where the negation is clearly stated. Implicit negative polarity, on the other hand, may appear in words like unlikely or doubtful, which suggest negation without using direct negative markers. Halliday (2014) notes that while expressions such as I think (explicitly subjective) and It is possible (explicitly objective) indicate low probability, modal verbs like may (implicitly subjective) and adverbs such as perhaps (implicitly objective) also contribute to the overall polarity of a statement.

Additionally, polarity interacts with the degree of modality to influence meaning. A high-modality expression with negative polarity (He must not go) has a stronger prohibitive force than a low-modality negative statement (He may not go), which suggests only a weak restriction. The choice of polarity in discourse affects not only grammatical structure but also pragmatic meaning, shaping how statements are perceived in interaction. Understanding polarity in modality is crucial in discourse analysis, as it reveals subtle distinctions in meaning, speaker intention, and power dynamics within communication.

CHAPTER II
METHODOLOGY

2.1. RESEARCH DESIGN

This study adopted a qualitative descriptive method, chosen for its ability to deeply explore and analyze the interpersonal metafunctions of the main characters in Peter Jackson's film The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring (2001). This research design allowed for a rich, detailed examination of linguistic phenomena as they occurred in the natural context of the film. The method was particularly suited for uncovering the nuances of characters' beliefs, values, and interpersonal dynamics as portrayed through dialogue. By focusing on the interpersonal metafunction framework within Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), this research examined modality, which was instrumental in expressing relationships, attitudes, and intentions.

Additionally, the qualitative descriptive design was instrumental in analyzing narrative contexts. It enabled the researcher to interpret the subtle interplay between dialogue, character relationships, and plot development. This design was particularly relevant to the film medium, where visual and verbal elements were intertwined. Through careful textual analysis, the research captured the intricate ways in which language constructed power dynamics, social roles, and emotional connections between characters, adding depth to the understanding of the story and its ideological underpinnings.

2.2. SOURCE OF DATA

The primary data source for this study was the film The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring (2001), directed by Peter Jackson. The film, which served as the first installment in the iconic trilogy based on J.R.R. Tolkien's novel, provided a rich and diverse array of character interactions and dialogues. These dialogues were crucial for analyzing interpersonal metafunctions, as they revealed the social relationships and ideological perspectives of the characters.

2.3. DATA COLLECTION

The data collection for this study was conducted through the following steps:

1. Watching "The Lord of The Rings: Fellowship of The Ring" movie. The researcher watched The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring multiple times to familiarize themselves with the dialogue, context, and character interactions.
2. Transcribing the movie. Key conversations from the film were transcribed, ...ctions that contain modality.
   ...ta. The transcribed dialogues were cross-checked with official ...es to ensure accuracy.
   ...ity by selected characters. Modal verbs, adverbs, adjectives, ...rs of modality were highlighted to ensure precise analysis.

5. Catagorizing the sentences uttered by the characters. The collected utterances were classified based on modality type (modalization or modulation), orientation, and modality category, and degree (high, median, low).

2.4. DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis for this study was conducted through the following steps:

1. Creating tables for each dialogue that contained modality. A table was created to organize dialogues containing modality. Each entry included details such as type of modality, orientation, modality category, and degree of modality.
2. Analyzing the types of modality performed by characters. The researcher analyzed the modality types performed by the characters to understand how they expressed attitudes and judgments.
3. Comparing the use of modality from each selected character. Modality use was compared across characters to observe differences in speech styles, authority, and communication patterns. the use of modality from each selected characters.
4. Interpreting the meaning of each modality based on the context where it was used. The researcher explained how modality functioned within the film's context, such as expressing uncertainty, commands, or emotional expressions in conversations.
5. Drawing conclusions on the modality used by selected characters. The researcher summarized how modality contributed to character interactions and how it shaped interpersonal meaning in the film.