An Analysis of Mood and Modality in Workplace Discourse and the Impact of Power Differentials: *Ramsay's Kitchen Nightmares*

Zenah Aydh Saeed Dajem[1], Hesham Suleiman Alyousef[2]*

[1]*Department of Applied Linguistics, College of Languages, King Khalid University, Abha, Saudi Arabia*

[2]*Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts, King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia*

Corresponding Author: Hesham Suleiman Alyousef, E-mail: hesham@ksu.edu.sa

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This qualitative study examines the interpersonal meaning of Mood and modality, specifically within the context of workplace discourse, and the influence of power on communication strategies. Its focus is to investigate the Mood structures used by interlocuters and to understand how a speaker's choice of Mood demonstrates various interpersonal meanings. In addition, the paper explores the concept of modality, assessing the different ways in which speakers communicate to express their attitudes and judgments by employing the grammatical resources of modalization (probability) and modulation (inclination and obligation). Data were collected from an episode of *Ramsay's Kitchen Nightmares*, a popular television series filmed in the U.S., in which Gordon Ramsay, a well-known professional chef, visits failing restaurant establishments. The data were transcribed verbatim before being analyzed to identify the use of Mood structures and modality, as well as whether the speakers' power levels and social roles influenced their use of language. The results showed that interlocutors with a higher level of power, i.e., superiors in the work setting, typically used different Mood structures of the clause and different types of modality compared to those with less power, i.e., subordinates. These findings indicate that those in power play the role of instruction-givers, while those with less power are instruction-receivers. Interlocutors who are in power appear to have more opportunities to express their attitudes and judgments than their subordinates. As a result, they can influence workplace and business communication by making it more or less formal.

INTRODUCTION

Interpersonal language is an important part of the workplace since it expresses subjective views and opinions. Workplace discourse is often called "institutional talk" in the literature, and the two terms have been used interchangeably to refer to all kinds of workplace settings (Koester, 2006). The interactions and communication that take place among workers and other interlocutors during workplace discourse include components such as hedges, idioms, and modal verbs (Koester, 2010). Therefore, there are certain discernible linguistic features and characteristics of workplace interactions.

Studies of workplace discourse have been carried out across a variety of disciplines, including sociology, anthropology, psychology, and linguistics, using different research methods and approaches, such as ethnography, conversation analysis, genre analysis, interactional sociolinguistics, and critical discourse analysis (Koester, 2010). These approaches vary in terms of how they define and deal with context because they analyze workplace discourse for differing purposes and with different aims, considerations, and methodologies (Sarangi and Roberts, 1999).

Within linguistics, workplace discourse has been analyzed from different perspectives, including applied linguistics, conversation analysis, genre analysis, pragmatics, discourse analysis, and organizational communication (Mizusawa, 2017). A detailed review of these approaches is outside the scope of the present study, which applies a systemic functional linguistics (SFL) approach to examine with the practical functions of language.

In SFL, the concept of interpersonal meaning helps researchers identify the structure of a clause and understand the meanings required for interactions to occur between interlocutors (Halliday, 2014). In other words, investigating the system of Mood and modality is useful to answer the question of how language is structured to enable interactions. Speakers' choices regarding the Mood system are determined by the social roles the speakers play in different situations (or contexts). For example, in the classroom, teachers are often more demanding about exchanging information in comparison to students, who are typically the givers. Understanding how people interact within these pre-defined social bounds is an important aspect of analyzing Mood in discourse.

An analysis of Mood and modality in workplace discourse and the impact of power differentials: Ramsay's Kitchen Nightmares

49

The system of modality has an important role in analyzing discourse as well. According to Halliday (2014), modality, as an aspect of Mood choice, can help to distinguish between modalization (probability) and modulation (inclination and obligation) in utterances. Analyzing Mood choice can also shed light on the relationship between power and affective involvement. For instance, modalization, which initiates a proposition to exchange information, can help the listener assess various degrees of probability and usuality, such as whether the speaker or writer lacks conviction, or is applying a degree of certainty to his or her position. Moreover, different degrees of modalization can indicate that the speaker is tempering or softening the message. Modulation has a similar level of importance, demonstrating where the speaker or writer is increasing or decreasing the degrees of obligation and inclination in the message.

To the best of our knowledge, no previous studies have investigated the use of Mood and modality in the workplace interactions shown in *Ramsay's Kitchen Nightmares* series. Therefore, this study investigates interpersonal meaning in this context, with the aim of examining whether the use of certain Mood structures of clauses or types of modality has any relationship with power, from the perspective of interactions between superiors and subordinates, in workplace discourse. The purpose is to uncover how interpersonal meanings are realized in interactive discourse in a work setting.

REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES

Workplace discourse may be classified into different genres based on the specific work context, including the business activities, organization, and professional field. Koester (2006, 2010) argues that there are three main types of genres in workplace discourse, each with its own sub-genres. The first, called the unidirectional genre, is where a dominant speaker gives instructions or directives to others, in the form of procedural and directive discourse, briefing discourse, service encounters discourse, reporting discourse, or requesting discourse. The second type, the collaborative genre, is where interlocutors participate equally, such as in decision-making discourse, arrangements discourse, and discussing and evaluating discourse. Then, the third genre, which is called non-transactional, includes workers' discussion of topics that are not directly related to work, such as small talk and office gossip. This non-transactional genre contrasts with the unidirectional and collaborative genres, which are transactional because they are work-oriented and involve performing workplace tasks.

Workplace talk differs from ordinary conversation in a number of ways. According to Drew and Heritage (1992), workplace interactions have two distinct characteristics or features. The first is that the communication is goal- or task-oriented, where at least one of the participants has a main goal or task to be achieved. Task-oriented workplace conversations are often highly structured as the participants tend to use some types of discursive activities, such as instruction giving and decision making.

The second characteristic is that the communication has some constraints on what participants can do and say, since turn-taking systems and the reduction of interactional practice among participants are in operation. The interactions in such discourse are asymmetrical. For instance, people who are in charge or have a professional role, such as employers, doctors, and teachers, tend to ask more questions, control interactions, and participate in turn taking, more than those who are not in charge or are in a less professional role, such as employees, patients, and students. The constraints in this discourse can also be extended to lexical choice, as often people who are in charge use, for example, *we* instead of *I* when speaking as a member of an organization or institution.

Actions that are performed by the participants in workplace discourse through talk could carry different identities. Greatbatch and Dingwall (1998) distinguish between one's social identity such as being an employer, teacher, or a doctor, and discourse identity such as being a speaker-addressee, questioner-answerer, and so on. Speakers' identities and roles in the same discourse with the same people are usually not fixed, since they perform different identities and roles, which make them symmetrical and asymmetrical at the same time. As their interactions involve different roles, they usually carry different social and discourse roles to get things done, to exchange information, or to give or offer goods and services. Additionally, the relationship among interlocutors can influence workplace and business interactions. For example, the length of the pre-existing relationship between participants may make the interactions more or less formal (Koester, 2010), i.e., if the speaker and addressee have known each other for a long time, they are more likely to use informal language, as they may have had frequent contact, which could lead to higher affective involvement than found in a newer professional relationship.

A plethora of studies (e.g., Bargiela-Chiappini, 2009; Handford, 2007; Harris, 2007; Koester, 2006, 2010; Thornborrow, 2014) investigated workplace communication. For example, Handford's (2007) corpus study investigated the frequency of interpersonal clusters or chunks that had interpersonal functions in workplace interactions and proposed four broad areas of categorization. First is "expressing stance," which is used to make judgments and give opinions through the use of modal verbs (e.g., *would*, *could*). Second, "hedging and politeness" is used to protect the solidarity of the addressee, as a politeness strategy, by using modal verbs, adverbs, or vague language. Third, "referring to shared knowledge" is used to reveal familiarity and informality among the interlocutors by showing that they have a relationship with one another. This is done by using interactive expressions (e.g., *of course, you know*). Fourth, "showing solidarity and empathy" is used to provide positive evaluations and express agreement by using positive feedback signals (e.g., *great*, *good*).

Nevertheless, it is occasionally difficult for people who are outside of the workplace, or who are acting as external onlookers to a business discourse, to fully understand what the interlocutors are talking about or to make a judgment about whether some interlocutors have more power than others (Koester, 2006). Therefore, context plays a vital role in understanding such discourse. Harris (2007) argues that

investigations should take place within professional and institutional contexts, so that the researcher can utilize and analyze the inherent unequal degrees of power and levels of status to properly explore the strategies that interlocutors employ in these environments. For instance, when considering doctor-patient interactions, their talk is asymmetrical although it does not necessarily indicate a dominant or subordinate social relationship among the interlocutors (Thornborrow, 2014). This is might be due to the fact that doctors need to control the interaction by asking questions (i.e., using interrogative Mood) and looking for answers (i.e., using declarative Mood) to facilitate effective and efficient consultations with their patients.

Koester (2006) investigated the use of modality in spoken interactions across a wide variety of workplace contexts in a corpus called ABOT. The corpus consists of approximately 34,000 words. It was transcribed from audio-recorded data of very formal and less formal workplace situations, including small talk among workers. Koester found that modulation, or deontic modals, were more frequent in such discourse. Such findings are to be expected due to the nature of workplace discourse having greater degrees of obligation, necessity, and inclination as part of the working environment, as well as to the methods used to conduct work to complete business-related tasks.

Other studies (Bilbow, 1997; Vine 2004) conducted in institutional situations and face-to-face workplace meetings investigated the common Mood structures of clauses for commands or directives used to complete business-related tasks. When the interaction involves a dominant speaker telling an addressee how to do something, or what to do, it is called "directive discourse," which is a sub-discourse category of workplace interactions (Koester, 2010). Hence, to determine the type of discourse occurring in a workplace setting, we need to understand the nature of the utterances, the audience, the relationship between the speaker and the addressee, the contextual situation, the natural of the work, and the task at hand. The studies found that commands by managers in workplace interactions were realized through different configurations such as imperative Mood and obligations in modulation (e.g., *have to*, *need to*), as well as through the use of modalization, or epistemic modals such as *would* and *could*.

However, another study by Holmes and Stubbe (2003) emphasized the importance of considering power as the main variable when analyzing commands and imperatives issued by managers in workplace discourse. Their results showed that direct form and making commands, such as the use of imperative Mood structures, were more frequently used by superiors or those in power, such as when a manager addressed a subordinate.

In this regard, Poynton (1985) investigated the correlation of vocatives with three dimensions (power, contact, and affect) in Australian English. He found that if power was equal, contact was frequent. Moreover, when affective involvement was high, there was likely to be a greater use of vocatives and their use was reciprocal by the interlocutors in the conversation. However, if the power was unequal, vocatives were non-reciprocal, contact was infrequent, and affective involvement was low.

The review of interpersonal interactions in workplace contexts reveals that investigations of Mood and modality have yet to explore the work environment depicted in *Ramsay's Kitchen Nightmares*.

METHODOLOGY

Theoretical Framework

SFL is the social semiotic approach in genre analysis proposed by Halliday (1975) that emphasizes the schematic structure of language and its relation to context. In SFL, language is a form of social behavior that enables people to interact and cooperate in social situations (Thomson, Joyce, and Sano, 2017). This approach explores how interlocutors use language to produce clauses that may carry more than one meaning or functional role at a time. Halliday (1978) proposes three language metafunctions that occur simultaneously and correlate, respectively, with the three register variables of field (What is being talked about?), mode (What is the nature of the communication?), and tenor (What type of social roles do the interlocutors perform?): ideational, textual, and interpersonal meanings. The first refers to the text's real-world knowledge and ideology, while the second refers to how the text is organized into a piece of writing or speech.

The third function, which is the focus of the present study, refers to the lexico-grammar of interpersonal meaning, which represents the way language is used to convey and communicate information between people (Halliday 1975). The term "interpersonal" expresses relations among participants in the situation, detailing the writer's or speaker's relationship with the reader or listener and his/her attitude toward the subject matter (Halliday 1978).

As this study investigates the lexico-grammatical resources of mode (i.e., interpersonal meaning) in *Ramsay's Kitchen Nightmares*, Halliday's (2014) system of Mood and modality and Poynton's (1985) three dimensions of "tenor" are presented next.

Mood

The Mood structure can be represented through the clause types, such as declarative Mood, interrogative Mood, imperative Mood, modulated interrogative Mood, and elliptical declarative Mood. These clause types help to describe and distinguish how language is used to express various interpersonal meanings (Eggins, 2004). The main principle of the lexico-grammatical functional analysis of Mood is not only to label the different functional constituents of Mood and residue (as subject, finite, predicator, complement, and adjunct), but also to look at their possible configuration and whether each constituent occurs before or after the others. In other words, it helps us to describe how language is structured for people to talk to one another.

When people use language to interact with each other through dialogue, they establish a relationship between the speaker and the listener by taking turns at speaking; these are called speech roles (Halliday, 1984, 2014). There are eight

An analysis of Mood and modality in workplace discourse and the impact of power differentials: Ramsay's Kitchen Nightmares

51

speech functions that categorize every move in a dialogue (Table 1). The speech functions of "statement," "question," "command," and "offer" work as initiating moves and tend to be longer, whereas "answer," "acknowledgement," "acceptance," and "compliance" are responding moves that tend to be shorter, as they have abbreviations and ellipsis, called minor clauses. Each speech function involves both a speech role (i.e., "giving" or "demanding") and a commodity choice to exchange either information or goods and service by using speech functions.

When speakers give or demand something, they exchange either information or goods and services, which is known as a "commodity exchange." Giving information is usually expressed in the form of a statement, while giving goods and services is expressed in the form of an offer. On the other hand, demanding information is expressed in the form of a question, while demanding goods and services is typically expressed in the form of a command.

As a response to these speech roles (giving or demanding) that initiate an interaction, the responder usually reacts in one of two ways: with a supporting response, which supports the move in the conversation by showing acceptance, compliance, acknowledgement, or a positive answer (without negation), or with a confronting response, which confronts the move of the interaction by rejection, refusal, contradiction, or disclaimer (Halliday, 2014).

To describe the Mood structure of a clause, it is important to know the functional constituents that are involved. These enable speakers to exchange information and carry an argument forward. According to Halliday (1984, 2014), there are two functional constituents: Mood and Residue. Mood carries the argument or proposition of the clause, and it contains three elements: Subject (a nominal-type element), Finite (a verbal-type element), and Polarity, which is optional and is either positive (Yes) or negative (No). The Finite element occurs in three major forms, carrying tense (e.g., *learns*, *learnt*, *will learn*) to determine time limitations, modality (e.g., *could*, *must*) to express the speaker's judgment of the likelihood something might happen, and polarity (e.g., *was*, *was not*) to make the proposition arguable.

The Reside constituent also has three elements: Predicator (a verb that carries lexical meaning, which is different from the helping verb in Finite, under Mood), Complement (which is the object of the sentence, realized by a nominal group, and can be a subject), and Adjunct (which is real-

ized by an adverbial or prepositional group and cannot be a subject as it is not a nominal element).

Modality

In addition to the structure elements used to describe the grammar of propositions and the organization of clauses in Mood, modality is the other constituent that helps in the analysis of interpersonal meaning within discourse. It covers a range of semantic notions, such as ability, possibility, probability, usuality, obligation, and inclination. When a speaker/writer exchanges information with a listener/reader, the propositions are not necessarily polarized, since a message could carry different levels/degrees of probability, certainty, obligation, or inclination (Eggins, 2004). Understanding modality is useful for analyzing interpersonal meaning because it helps to demonstrate the different ways in which language users communicate when they want to express their messages, attitudes, and judgments.

Modalization (Initiating proposition to exchange information)

According to Halliday (2014), interpersonal meaning can be analyzed in discourse via modality, which is divided into two grammatical areas: modalization and modulation, or epistemic modality and deontic modality, respectively (Lyons, 1977). Modalization is the expression of the speaker's attitude toward what s/he is saying, which is concerned with the degrees of commitment to the truth of the proposition (Halliday, 1994). Modalization analysis is used to investigate two kinds of meaning: the probability and usuality of propositions. Probability is when the speaker expresses judgments about the likelihood, including certainty, of something happening or being brought to fruition. Usuality is when the speaker expresses judgments about the frequency of propositions. Hence, the analytical rationale behind using modalization with propositions is not only to determine what "is" or "is not," but to understand the frequency and degree of probability in between.

The indicators of modalization usually occur in three different positions internally within a clause: as a Finite modal operator (e.g., *might*), as a Mood Adjunct of probability or certainty (e.g., *probably*, *possibly*, *certainly*, *perhaps*, *maybe*), and as both together in the same clause as a Finite modal operator and a Mood Adjunct. Both the Finite modal operator and the Mood Adjunct can be classified in the analysis into three degrees of certainty or usuality: high (e.g., *must*, *certainly*, *always*, *could not possibly*, *never*), median (e.g., *may*, *probably*, *usually*, *perhaps*, *not usually*), and low (e.g., *might*, *possibly*, *sometimes*, *not always*, *possibly might not*).

Additionally, Halliday states that modalization can be expressed as a Mood Adjunct explicitly, or "externally," when the speaker adds a pseudo-clause with different degrees, such as low (e.g., *I reckon, I guess*), median (e.g. I think, I suppose), or high (e.g., *I am sure*). These are called "grammatical metaphors" as they function metaphorically and are not recognized as either Finite modal operators or Mood Adjuncts because they are technically complete

Table 1. Speech functions and typical Mood of a clause (adapted from Eggins, 2004, p. 147)

Speech function (move type) statement	Typical Mood in clause
Statement	Declarative Mood
Question	Interrogative Mood
Command	Imperative Mood
Offer	Modulated interrogative Mood
Answer	Elliptical declarative Mood
Acknowledgement	Elliptical declarative Mood
Compliance	Minor clause
Accept	Minor clause

clauses that have their own Mood or Residue structure (Halliday, 2014).

Modulation (Initiating proposals to exchange goods and services)

Modulation is the second grammatical area of modality according to Halliday, also known as deontic modality (Lyons, 1977). This element looks at whether an argument not just in terms of "do" or "do not," but in terms of whether there is a scale in between of obligation (including permission), necessity, or inclination. Modulation enables speakers to convey their judgment or attitude toward a given situation and demonstrate their degree of obligation or necessity to perform acts. Hence, when a clause is structured to exchange goods and services, it refers to the grammar of proposals (Halliday, 1994). As with modalization, there are different degrees of modulation: high (e.g., *must*, *required to*), median (e.g., *should*, *supposed to*), and low (e.g., *may*, *allowed to*).

Additionally, Halliday claims that the meanings of modulation usually occur in different positions in a clause "internally": as a Finite modal operator (e.g., *should not*, *must*, *have to*) that belongs to the Mood constituent in this case (e.g., *You should not/must/have to take my copy of the Bostonians*). Modulation can also occur outside the MOOD block, i.e., external to the main clause, either to subjectively express the meaning of inclination (e.g., *I am **willing to** make the coffee*) or to objectively express the meaning of obligation and necessity (e.g., *You are **required** to read Henry James*), (Eggins, 2004, p. 181). Interestingly, both modalization and modulation can occur within the same clause (e.g., *You should probably read the Bostonians*) although this is sometimes difficult to identify.

Dimensions of "tenor"

Poynton (1985) proposes three simultaneous dimensions to analyze "tenor" in interpersonal meanings, which enable the exploration of the concept of "role relationships" among interlocutors. The first dimension, power (equal vs. unequal), considers whether the roles that the interlocutors play are of equal or unequal/non-reciprocal power, such as the balance of power between a manager and an employee. Second, contact (frequent vs. occasional) considers the frequency of contact/interactions between the interlocutors, such as the frequent contact between spouses as opposed to the occasional contact between distant relatives. Third, affective involvement (high vs. low) considers the extent to which the interlocutors are emotionally involved or committed to one another or to the contextual circumstances, and whether the affective involvement between them is high or low. For example, interactions in formal situations typically have an unequal power balance among interlocutors, with infrequent contact and a low affective involvement (e.g., employees with the manager). Conversely, interactions in informal situations typically have a more equal power balance, greater frequency of contact, and higher affective involvement.

Setting

This study analyzes data from a popular television series called *Ramsay's Kitchen Nightmares*. The data source was chosen because it helps to unfold the characteristics of workplace interactions where superiors and subordinates interact to complete business-related tasks. In Episode 7, Season 4, Gordon Ramsay visits a restaurant in the U.S. called Down City. He meets the owner, Abby, and the staff members, who are referred to as servers: Josh, Will, Mini, Nick, and Mark. He also meets Jimmy, the recently appointed head chef, who has been struggling to do his job successfully, due to being unable to implement what he believes are the necessary changes required for the restaurant. It appears that this has been because of the excessively controlling behavior of Abby, who appears convinced that everything in her restaurant is going well.

This episode provides us a clear difference in power balances, as Ramsay and Abby are in charge and unquestionably have power over the staff members. In addition, due to the nature and setup of the television series, Ramsay has power over Abby and all other staff members in the restaurant, while Abby, as the business owner and employer, only has power over her employees. The type of interactions that take place during the episode appear to be primarily casual and formal conversations between the visiting chef, Ramsay, and the restaurant staff and owner.

Although the interlocutors have unequal power and the context is formal, Ramsay swears frequently and uses lexis and slang (e.g., he says directly to Abby, "You STUCK-UP, PRECIOUS LITTLE BZ"). Furthermore, speakers refer to each other on a first name basis (i.e., vocative adjuncts), illustrating many of the characteristics of an informal tenor among interlocutors. The television program also tends to focus on the periods in which Ramsay and Abby are not just talking but arguing with one another about the issues that Ramsay discovers at the restaurant.

Finally, the general context of this study can be classified as workplace discourse, as the data are interactions that occur among a manager, employer, and employees in a commercial setting (i.e., a restaurant), and thus it could belong partially to business discourse, too. With regards to the sub-genres of workplace discourse that were discussed previously, this study can be classified as a procedural or requesting genre, which is action-based, because the data are of dialogues where clearly dominant speakers, i.e., those with more power, address and instruct others with less power (Koester, 2006). Therefore, there is a higher frequency of directives and requests for work-related tasks than might otherwise be expected in a normal or more natural setting, i.e. outside of a high intensity working restaurant kitchen that is being filmed and edited to increase viewings by displaying the more intense dialogues between participants.

Additionally, it should be mentioned that there are instruction-givers and instruction-receivers in such types of discourse (Koester, 2010). This emphasizes that the analysis of interpersonal meanings in a procedural or requesting genre in workplace discourse should not only take into account interpersonal markers, but also consider roles such

An analysis of Mood and modality in workplace discourse and the impact of power differentials: Ramsay's Kitchen Nightmares

53

as instruction-giver and receiver, which is similar to the Hallidayan concept of giving or demanding information, goods, and services.

Data Collection

The data were collected from the television series *Ramsay's Kitchen Nightmares* (USA, Series 4, Episode 7, "Down City," Rhode Island, March 2011), in which Ramsay, a well-known professional chef, visits failing restaurant establishments in the U.S. with the intention of turning the businesses around to make them successful ventures. The corpus data comprised 11,380 words. The specific data were chosen for the analysis of the interpersonal meaning of interlocutors in workplace or professional interactions.

Data and Methods of Analysis

As stated in Section 3.1, Halliday's (1975, 1978, 1984 and 2014) system of Mood and modality and Poynton's (1985) three dimensions of tenor were employed to investigate interpersonal meanings in the data and examine the discourse in terms of how language was structured to make meaning, by looking at the lexico-grammatical choices speakers made and the functions they served within the discourse. The concept of role relationships among interlocutors was explored through Halliday's system of Mood and Poynton's (1985) three aspects of power, contact, and affective involvement. With regards to the Mood system, the use of different Mood structures of clauses helps to determine who demands or gives information or goods and services. In addition, it can help to establish whether the social roles that interlocutors play have an impact on the use of specific Mood choice. This is part of the tenor, which considers the degree of politeness, formality, and reciprocity among interlocutors, that would, can control the use of language in different contexts. As far as modality is concerned, this system helps us understand the relationships of power and affective involvement among interlocutors, through the exploration of different degrees of modalization and modulation.

Multiple steps were taken in the data analysis. First, the episode was transcribed verbatim in its entirety, using Stockwell's (2002) transcription conventions (e.g., high pitch, low pitch, shouting, pauses). Including these conventions supports the identification specifically of non-typical Mood structures, where assessing the intonation of a clause can help to determine if the clause is meant to be a question rather than a declarative sentence. It should be noted that non-verbal communication such as gestures and facial expressions were not included in the analysis. These are considered beyond the scope of the study, which is concerned with spoken discourse, namely, the use of Mood and modality. Then, all speech was analyzed manually at the clause level. Although this study is primarily qualitative, we employed basic descriptive statistical information (frequencies and percentages) to validate our claims when comparing the speakers' use of Mood and modality.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-cultural Context

Following the Hallidayan (2014) approach of investigating interpersonal meaning, it is important to analyze the FIELD, TENOR, and MODE of this particular context. Therefore, the socio-cultural context of the workplace interaction in *Ramsay's Kitchen Nightmares*, Series 4, Episode 7 is represented in terms of the three register variables of FIELD, TENOR and MODE, explained as follows:

- FIELD: The interactions take place between a well-known professional chef, a restaurant owner, and the restaurant employees, in a workplace context (or business-related tasks), i.e., the restaurant. The aim is to help the failing restaurant turn around and become a successful venture.
- MODE: The data are all speech by the interlocutors. Conversations were transcribed from an episode of the television series *Ramsay's 'Kitchen Nightmares'* (USA, Series 4, Episode 7, "Down City," Rhode Island).
- TENOR: Poynton's (1985) three simultaneous dimensions of tenor of interpersonal meaning were applied:

Power: According to the speakers' roles within the context, Ramsay, Abby and the restaurant staff have unequal power, i.e., non-reciprocal, as Ramsay is superior to Abby and Abby is superior to the staff. However, Abby frequently misinterprets or tries to elevate her power and attempts to display power equal to or above that of Ramsay, which may be explicable due to her original social role as the restaurant manager and business owner, where she was accustomed to having the most power.

Contact: The contact continuum is discussed in terms of Ramsay's contact with the restaurant staff, and between the restaurant staff themselves. With regards to Ramsay, his contact with the staff can be regarded as infrequent, as he visited them on a daily basis for about a week to help them with the failing restaurant. However, for the restaurant staff, it can be said that they had frequent contact with each other, since they worked together on a daily basis and their relations may have extended even to non-work-related social activities.

Affective Involvement: From what can be determined with the current data, all the participants had low-effective involvement, based on their emotional involvement or commitment in this particular situation.

Due to space constraints, this investigates the interpersonal meanings in workplace interactions in *Ramsay's Kitchen Nightmares* to discover to what extent superiors and subordinates used different types of Mood structures of clauses, and different degrees of modality. The results are presented as an assessment of the degrees of power and social roles of the interlocutors.

Three power levels can be identified. First, Ramsay, as the interlocutor who carries the most power, can be regarded as having a superior role over all the restaurant staff. Second, Abby, is technically a subordinate to Ramsay but is superior to her employees in the restaurant. Third, the other staff members in the restaurant, i.e., the servers, who can be considered as one group, are subordinates to both Ramsay and

Abby. Therefore, analysis examines whether there are any variations between superiors and subordinates in terms of their use of Mood and modality.

Mood Analysis

Overall, the findings of the Mood analysis (Table 2) indicate that Ramsay displayed the highest number of clauses initiating speech functions, followed by Abby, and finally the restaurant staff; 338, 235, and 77, respectively. This indicates that Ramsay was the one who initiated most exchanges.

Accordingly, in terms of the speech roles of giving and demanding, Ramsay gave significantly more information, whether to Abby or the staff, using declarative clauses (181) compared to when he used imperative clauses to demand information, goods, or services from them (76). This was followed closely by his use of the interrogative (75) and the modulated interrogative structure (6).

The types of Mood structure of Abby's clauses were similar to those of Ramsay. That is, Abby mostly used declarative clauses to give information (121), followed by interrogative structures to ask questions and demand information (63) and then the imperative Mood as a command, to demand goods or services (47). Finally, like Ramsay, she used a far smaller proportion of modulated interrogative clauses to offer goods and services (4). As expected, the restaurant staff had less opportunity to initiate exchanges, whether to give or demand, compared to their superiors. They gave information using the declarative Mood just 65 times in total.

Generally, these findings indicate the situation between superiors and subordinates. Namely, superiors have more freedom to choose different Mood structures, either to give or ask for information or to give or ask for goods or services. The data highlight two important issues concerning the dominance of superiors, in this case, Ramsay. First, there appears to be a lack of reciprocity among interlocutors, since the more powerful speaker is often demanding and frequently holds the role of speaker for a greater proportion of the overall interaction when compared to other interlocutors, who have less time talking and often only give information.

Second, it appears that Ramsay's influence and presence, or simply his greater power role, produced some form of special and particular constraints on what participants could do and say, since turn-taking systems and the reduction of interactional practice among participants was in operation. Following Koester's (2010) notion of instruction-givers and instruction-receivers, this appears to support his assumption of workplace genres. That is, it matches the unidirectional

genre, in which a dominant speaker gives instructions or directives to others. In this case, Ramsay was the most likely person in the interactions to give commands that demand goods and services, and he asked more questions to demand information in comparison to the other interlocutors. Thus, we can label him as an instruction-giver, while the restaurant staff members were instruction-receivers.

Ramsay vs. Abby

This section separately analyzes Ramsay's and Abby's interactions to investigate the impact of their social roles and degrees of power on their choice of Mood. Although Ramsay had more power and control in the situation, the existing social role that Abby had might have given her equal power in terms of using the same type of Mood structures of clauses, since she still acted as an employer, a manager, and a business owner.

Table 3 shows only the interactions that occurred between Ramsay and Abby. It reveals that Ramsay was consistently the dominant character, as he used more types of Mood structures of clauses and initiated more exchanges than Abby, producing 201 clauses compared to Abby's 122 clauses. The responding speech function is realized using the elliptical declarative Mood, and both Ramsay and Abby produced a similar number of responding speech functions to each other, 14 and 11, respectively.

With regards to the type of Mood structures that represent Ramsay's speech role of giving and demanding when interacting with Abby, the datashow that he used the declarative, interrogative, and imperative Mood structures far more often than he used the modulated interrogative. He tended to give Abby more information (50.74%), ask her more questions to demand information (24.37%) and give her commands to demand goods or services (22.88%). Such results were to be expected, as Ramsay's contextual social role was to help Abby with her failing restaurant, and it was assumed that he would use such types of Mood structures in the situation.

Additionally, both Ramsay and Abby used elliptical declaratives (e.g., "appreciate it" for "I appreciate it") and interrogatives (e.g., "Disgusting?" for "Is it disgusting?") Mood structures as well as non-typical Mood structures (e.g., "Abby, you've got to understand how frustrating this is": using a declarative structure to express imperative Mood) are expected in spoken language. According to McCarthy (1998), spoken language has some characteristic features such as incomplete clauses, false starts, interruptions, grammatical complexity, and non-standard grammar.

Table 2. Overall frequency of Mood structure of the clauses of all interlocutors

No.	Mood Structure	Ramsay		Abby		Staff	
		Freq.	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**
1.	Declarative (Statement)	181	53.55	121	51.49	65	84.42
2.	Interrogative (Question)	75	22.19	63	26.81	6	7.79
3.	Imperative (Command)	76	22.49	47	20	4	5.19
4.	Modulated Interrogative (Offer)	6	1.77	4	1.70	2	2.60
	Total	338	100	235	100	77	100

An analysis of Mood and modality in workplace discourse and the impact of power differentials: Ramsay's Kitchen Nightmares

55

Furthermore, there was a correlation between most Mood structures and the speech functions. In other words, there was a match between the semantic choice of speech function and the grammatical structure typically chosen to encode it. For example, typically, statements were expressed using declarative Mood, questions are expressed using interrogative Mood, commands are expressed using imperative Mood, and offers are expressed using modulated interrogative Mood.

Nevertheless, there were some cases with interrogatives (questions), imperatives (commands) and modulated interrogatives (offers) that were non-typical. Both Ramsay and Abby occasionally expressed interrogative Mood, imperative Mood, and the modulated interrogative using the declarative Mood structure. These cases were found to have been communicated in a non-typical declarative structure but can be classified as another feature of spoken language (McCarthy, 1998). This emphasizes the importance of considering context in analyzing workplace interactions (Koester, 2006;

Harris, 2007) since it plays a vital role in understanding such discourse and in helping us examine such cases.

Ramsay and Abby vs. Restaurant Staff

As shown in Table 4, in Ramsay's and Abby's interactions with the servers, they used more types of Mood structures of clauses than the servers did (137 and 113, respectively). The staff addressed Ramsay a total of 52 times but spoke to Abby just 25 times. Interestingly, but as expected, Ramsay and Abby used the interrogative Mood to ask questions (75 times) far more than the servers, who only asked their superiors questions 6 times. This is expected because in this type of workplace discourse, superiors often need to ask their subordinates questions to get work done.

With regards to the imperative Mood, Ramsay (e.g., "Bring it to the table") and Abby ("Can I have another calamari") commanded the restaurant staff 30 and 32 times, respectively, while the staff only used this function once

Table 3. Frequency and percentage of Mood structures used by Ramsay vs. Abby

Mood structure		Ramsay to Abby		Abby to Ramsay	
		Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Declarative	Full	88	43.78	79	64.75
	Typical	88	43.78	79	64.75
	Non-typical	0	0	0	0
	Elliptical	14	6.96	11	9.01
	Typical	14	6.96	11	9.01
	Non-typical	0	0	0	0
	Total	102	50.74	90	73.77
Interrogative	Full	38	18.90	12	9.84
	Typical	30	14.92	9	7.38
	Non-typical	8	3.98	3	2.46
	Elliptical	11	5.47	2	1.64
	Typical	7	3.48	1	.82
	Non-typical	4	1.99	1	.82
	Total	49	24.37	14	11.48
Imperative	Full	46	22.88	15	12.29
	Typical	39	19.40	10	8.20
	Non-typical	7	3.48	5	4.09
	Elliptical	0	0	0	0
	Typical	0	0	0	0
	Non-typical	0	0	0	0
	Total	46	22.88	15	12.29
Modulated interrogative	Full	3	1.43	3	2.46
	Typical	0	0	2	1.64
	Non-typical	3	1.43	1	.82
	Elliptical	1	.49	0	0
	Typical	0	0	0	0
	Non-typical	1	.49	0	0
	Total	4	1.92	3	2.46
Sub-total		201	100	122	100

Table 4. Frequency of mood structures used by Ramsay and Abby vs. The staff

Mood Structure		Ramsay to Staff		Staff to Ramsay		Abby to Staff		Staff to Abby	
		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Declarative	Full	65	43.78	31	59.62	31	27.43	19	76
	Typical	65	43.78	31	59.62	31	27.43	19	76
	Non-typical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Elliptical	14	6.96	14	26.93	0	0	1	4
	Typical	14	6.96	14	26.93	0	0	1	4
	Non-typical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	79	57.66	45	86.55	31	27.44	20	80
Interrogative	Full	22	16.06	3	5.77	48	42.48	2	8
	Typical	16	11.68	3	5.77	4	3.54	2	8
	Non-typical	6	4.37	0	0	44	38.94	0	0
	Elliptical	4	2.92	1	1.92	1	.88	0	0
	Typical	4	2.92	1	1.92	0	0	0	0
	Non-typical	0	0	0	0	1	.88	0	0
	Total	26	18.98	4	7.69	49	43.36	2	8
Imperative	Full	29	21.17	0	0	32	28.32	3	12
	Typical	23	16.79	0	0	13	11.50	2	8
	Non-typical	6	4.38	0	0	19	16.82	1	4
	Elliptical	1	.73	1	1.92	0	0	0	0
	Typical	1	.73	1	1.92	0	0	0	0
	Non-typical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	30	21.90	1	1.92	32	28.32	3	12
Modulated Interrogative	Full	2	1.46	1	1.92	1	.88	0	0
	Typical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Non-typical	2	1.46	1	1.92	1	.88	0	0
	Elliptical	0	0	1	1.92	0	0	0	0
	Typical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Non-typical	0	0	1	1.92	0	0	0	0
	Total	2	1.46	2	3.84	1	.88	0	0
Sub-total		137	100	52	100	113	100	25	100

with Ramsay, in the elliptical imperative, and 3 times with Abby, in the typical structure.

Again, Ramsay and Abby also use non-typical commands (imperative Mood) and non-typical questions (interrogative Mood) in the form of the declarative Mood, which could be a feature of spoken language, as indicated in the previous section. This is when they gave semantical commands or ask questions but were in fact using the declarative structure of a statement. In addition, the data reveal that Abby used a far higher frequency of non-typical Mood structures with her employees (64 times, 56.64%), compared to Ramsay (14 times, 10.22%), specifically when asking them questions and giving them commands. This could be explained by the frequent contact between Abby and the staff, as they worked together on a daily basis, which would be expected to make their use of language more informal.

Therefore, it can be said that superiors initiated a far larger number of speech functions. Additionally, their choice of Mood structure of clauses (Table 2) followed a similar

proportional constitution, with Ramsay and Abby using the declarative in approximately half of their clauses (Ramsay: 53.55%; Abby: 51.49%), followed by the interrogative (Ramsay: 22.19%; Abby: 26.81%) and the imperative (Ramsay: 22.49%; Abby: 20.0%), with the modulated interrogative making up less than 2% for both (Table 2). In comparison, the restaurant staff used considerably fewer choices of Mood structure of clauses, with the declarative making up 84.42% of their speech functions.

Regarding the interactions between those in power, i.e., Ramsay vs. Abby, context played an important role in their exchanges. Aside from the previously referred to influence of being part of a television program that was filmed and edited to increase views (thereby focusing on the more dramatic dialogues), Ramsay's general contextual social role was to help Abby with her failing restaurant. Thus, his power should have been higher than hers, and this was reflected in his greater proportion of imperative use (22.88%) and interrogative use (24.37%) in his speech to Abby, com-

An analysis of Mood and modality in workplace discourse and the impact of power differentials: Ramsay's Kitchen Nightmares

57

pared to Abby's significantly higher use of the declarative to Ramsay (73.77%) (Table 3). Hence, again, we see the role of the instruction-giver vs. the instruction-receiver, or superior vs. subordinate.

Mood Adjuncts: Ramsay vs. Abby

Table 5 indicates the types of adjuncts used by the interlocutors. Regarding vocative adjuncts, Halliday (2014) claim that they were used more often with interrogative and imperative clauses than with declarative clauses. In this study, Ramsay used vocative adjuncts more frequently than Abby and the staff combined, perhaps demonstrating that he was really the superior since he asked more questions and gave more commands: e.g., "Have a look *in there* [Adjunct: circumstantial]. Look at the state *of what they're cooking out of* [Adjunct: circumstantial]. Have you any idea *what's in what box*? [Adjunct: circumstantial]."

However, referring to Poynton's (1985) study on the use of vocatives and their correlation with the three dimensions of power, contact, and affect involvement, it appears that Ramsay and Abby had equal power because their use of vocatives was reciprocal (23 and 10, respectively). This was not the case with the restaurant staff who, based on this approach, had considerably less power than Ramsay and Abby, as they

used vocatives only once. The reciprocal use of vocatives might have been due to the frequent contact between Ramsay and Abby during the week that the television episode was filmed. However, it seems that power still played an important role between superiors and subordinates, since even the frequent contact over one week between Ramsay and the restaurant staff did not increase the subordinates' use of vocatives.

Ramsay and Abby used Mood Adjuncts equally, revealing that they expressed their personal opinions but did not necessarily attempt to give more commands or ask more questions, as the Mood analysis in the previous section indicated, and Ramsay was both dominant and superior.

Modality Analysis

As mentioned previously, modality can help in analyzing interpersonal meaning in discourse, as it demonstrates the different ways in which language users use express their messages, attitudes, and judgments. The grammars of a proposition (i.e., modalization) and proposal (i.e. modulation) carry different levels/degrees of probability, certainty, obligation, and inclination (Halliday, 2014), and this enables us to understand and analyze the meaning behind a speaker's choice of words.

The findings showed that Ramsay and Abby used a similar number of modalizations and modulations (Table 6), far greater than that of the staff, who exhibited little change, whether to modalize or modulate, during their interactions. Ramsay and Abby expressed their attitudes toward what they were saying by using different types of modalization (39 and 40 times, respectively). They also displayed a similar frequency of expressing their judgments or attitudes about actions and events by using modulation (30 and 29 times, respectively). From this perspective, the data appear to suggest that Ramsay and Abby had equal levels of power and/ or similar social roles, which justified their use of a similar frequency of modalizations and modulations. This finding contrasts with Koester's (2006) study, which found that

Table 5. Types of Adjuncts used by the interlocutors

No	Type of adjunct	Ramsay (N = 225)	Abby (N = 129)	Restaurant Staff (N = 52)
1	Circumstantial	100	75	23
2	Mood	22	23	10
3	Comment	6	16	3
4	Polarity	12	6	1
5	Conjunctive	34	5	7
6	Continuity	34	10	10
7	Vocative	23	10	1

Table 6. Types and frequency of modality among interlocutors

Modality Type	Ramsay		Abby		Staff	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Modalization (N = 95)						
Probability	16	23.19	19	27.54	9	47.36
Certainty	18	26.08	12	17.39	3	15.79
Usuality/Frequency	1	1.45	1	1.45	2	10.53
Intensification	4	5.80	8	11.59	2	10.53
	39	56.52	40	57.97	16	84.21
Modulation (N = 62)						
Obligation/Necessity	15	21.74	21	30.43	2	10.53
Permission	3	4.35	1	1.45	0	0
Inclination/Willingness	12	17.39	7	10.15	1	5.26
	30	43.48	29	42.03	3	15.79
Sub-total	69	100	69	100	19	100

modulation was more frequent among interlocutors across a wide variety of workplace contexts.

To support this claim, the data reveal that the staff members, as subordinates, expressed their attitudes toward what they were saying, (i.e., modalization) and expressed judgments about actions or events (i.e., modulation) less frequently than their superiors did (16 and 3 times, respectively). This might indicate that the level of power they had compared to Ramsay and Abby was lower.

The data also show that modalization, or epistemic modals, were more frequently used in the workplace discourse than modulation or deontic modals (95 and 62, respectively). This contradicts Koester's (2006) investigation, which found that modulation or deontic modals were more frequently used by interlocutors in workplace interactions. However, it should be noted that Koester used a larger amount of data, consisting of approximately 34,000 words, gathered from different formal and informal conversations across multiple workplace contexts. This was not the case with the current corpus, as it consisted of just 11,000 words collected from the same workplace.

Ramsay vs. Abby

The degrees of modalization and modulation (low, median, or high) used by both Ramsay and Abby are detailed in Table 7. Ramsay and Abby are again considered separately in this section, as they both are superiors to the servers, and it is an area of interest to investigate whether Abby displays an equal level of power to that of Ramsay in terms of her use of modality, including modalization and modulation, when addressing Ramsay.

The analysis shows that both Ramsay and Abby used different degrees of modalization, which help them to express their attitudes toward what they are saying, but with quite similar frequencies, 23 and 28 times, respectively. The data reveals that both used high and median degrees of modalization, specifically when they need to express probability and certainty. for example, Abby uses the high modality verb *going to* to express her certainty that she will not listen to Ramsay: "↑I'm not gonna listen to you=."As far as modulation is concerned, the results suggest that Ramsay was still superior to Abby in the situation, as he expressed his judgments and attitudes toward actions and events over twice the number of times than Abby did (17 and 8 times, respectively). For instance, in the excerpt below, Ramsay employed the verb *need to* to express obligation.

This is somewhat expected, as it can be considered that his use of modulation was directly related to the purpose of his visit to the restaurant. He tended to express his attitudes and willingness with a high degree in both commands and offers, which could indicate not just his greater power over Abby, but also his attitude toward getting work done properly and his strong desire in completing his objective within the context of their encounters, i.e., to help her failing restaurant.

The results reveal that the two superiors (i.e., Ramsay and Abby) employed relatively equal high and median degrees

So	*tomorrow*	*we*	*need to*	*start*	*being honest and open*
Adjunct: Conjunctive	Adjunct: Circ.	Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement
		Mood			Residue

So		*I*	*can*	*start*	*rebuilding*
Adjunct: Conjunctive		Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement
		Mood			Residue

Table 7. Types and frequency of modality of Ramsay vs. Abby

Modality type	Ramsay to abby				Abby to ramsay			
	H.	M.	L.	Total	H	M.	L.	Total
Modalization								
Probability	5	4	2	11	3	8	2	13
Certainty	3	5	1	9	8	0	1	9
Usuality/Frequency	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Intensification	1	0	2	3	4	0	1	5
Total Frequency	9	9	5	23	16	8	4	28
%	40.9	90	62.5	57.5	84.21	88.89	50	77.78
Modulation								
Obligation/Necessity	4	1	0	5	2	0	1	3
Permission	0	0	3	3	0	1	0	1
Inclination/Willingness	9	0	0	9	1	0	3	4
Total Frequency	13	1	3	17	3	1	4	8
%	59.1	10	37.5	42.5	15.79	11.11	50	22.22

An analysis of Mood and modality in workplace discourse and the impact of power differentials: Ramsay's Kitchen Nightmares

59

of modalization toward each other, specifically when they needed to express probability and certainty. However, interesting results are demonstrated within the analysis of modulation, reinforcing the idea that Ramsay was superior to Abby. He expressed his judgments and attitudes toward actions and events in his dialogue with her over twice the number of times than she did with him. The important point here is the degree to which he did so, as there was a high degree in 59.1% of his modulations to Abby (compared to Abby's 15.79% of high degree modulations to Ramsay). This finding is ascribed to the contextual situation of Ramsay's visit to the restaurant, which provided him with power presumably to use modulation.

restaurant staff. Regarding modalization, Ramsay expressed his attitudes toward what was he saying when interacting with the servers, typically using a high degree (e.g., "It must be freaking embarrassing for you to serve this"), far more frequently than the other way around (16 times compared to just 9 times for the staff).

Regarding modulation, Ramsay expressed judgments 13 times, with high and median degrees, compared to the staff, who expressed judgment only one time with a median degree. Ramsay consistently expressed his obligation of commands and inclination of offers with high degree, more so than the restaurant staff. This, again, was expected due to the differing levels of power between them.

Ramsay vs. Restaurant Staff

The findings in Table 8 show a significant difference in the expression of attitudes or judgments between Ramsay and the

Abby vs. Restaurant Staff

Table 9 shows the use of modality between Abby and her employees. As in the case of Ramsay vs. the restaurant staff

Table 8. Types and frequency of modality of Ramsay vs. Staff

Modality type	Ramsay to Staff				Staff to Ramsay			
	H.	**M.**	**L.**	**Total**	**H.**	**M**	**L.**	**Total**
Modalization								
Probability	2	0	0	5	1	3	2	6
Certainty	4	0	2	9	0	0	1	1
Usuality/Frequency	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Intensification	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2
Total Frequency	8	0	2	16	3	3	3	9
%	53.33	0	40	55.17	100	75	100	90
Modulation								
Obligation/Necessity	4	3	3	10	0	0	0	0
Permission	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Inclination/Willingness	3	0	0	3	0	1	0	1
Total Frequency	7	3	3	13	0	1	0	1
%	46.67	100	60	44.83	0	25	0	10

Table 9. Types and frequency of modality of Abby vs. staff

Modality Type	Abby to Staff				Staff to Abby			
	H.	**M.**	**L.**	**Total**	**H.**	**M.**	**L.**	**Total**
Modalization								
Probability	2	3	1	6	0	1	2	3
Certainty	2	0	1	3	1	0	1	2
Usuality/Frequency	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Intensification	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0
Total Frequency	6	3	3	12	2	1	4	**7**
%	66.67	27.27	23.08	36.36	100	50	80	77.78
Modulation								
Obligation/Necessity	3	8	7	18	0	1	1	2
Permission	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Inclination/Willingness	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0
Total Frequency	3	8	10	21	0	1	1	2
%	33.33	72.73	76.92	63.64	0	50	20	22.22

discussed in Section 4.3.2, the data show a significant difference between the groups, revealing that Abby had more power than her staff, shown by the use of both modalization and modulation. In terms of modalization, Abby expressed her attitude toward what she was saying when interacting with her employees using high to median degrees, which, again, was not the case for the staff (12 and 7 times, respectively). This is illustrated in the excerpt below, Abby she employs the verb *going to* to express probability.

With regard to modulation, like Ramsay, Abby expressed judgment far more often than the staff (21 times compared to just 2 times), with various degrees of obligation and inclination.

We	*are*	*going to rock*	*this town*	*tonight*
Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement	Adjunct: circ
	Mood		Residue	

Abby's use of lower degree modulation may be explained by her pre-existing social role with the staff, and therefore, she may not have needed to express obligation and inclination to the same extent as Ramsay, since her relationship with the staff was already clearly established as one of a superior and subordinates.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper was to explore the realization of the interpersonal meanings in the interactions seen in an episode of *Ramsay's Kitchen Nightmares* to gain insights into the influence of power on the communication strategies used between superiors and subordinates. The results demonstrated that individuals with power, i.e., the superiors in the work setting, clearly displayed a greater level of freedom in their choice of Mood structures than those with less power, i.e., their subordinates. Additionally, their choice of Mood structure of clauses followed a similar proportional constitution, with superiors using the declarative in approximately half of their clauses, followed by the interrogative and the imperative, and finally, the modulated interrogative. In comparison, the restaurant staff, their subordinates, appeared to have a considerably lower choice of Mood structure of clauses, with the declarative making up most of their speech functions.

In summary, the main conclusion that can be drawn from these findings is that there is a lack of reciprocity between superiors and subordinates. The study results reveal that interlocutors with a higher level of power within a workplace setting use different Mood structures of the clause and modalities compared to those with less power, during the workplace discourse. In other words, the Mood structures and modality implemented by superiors are clearly distinguishable from those of subordinates, who appear to have reduced opportunity to initiate speech functions and express their attitudes and judgments. The more powerful speakers use a greater ratio of demanding speech functions and hold the role of speaker for a disproportionate amount of time. This indicates that those in power play the role of instruction-givers, while those with less power are instruction-receivers. Furthermore, superiors use an almost identical number of modalizations and modulations, notably more than the number used by their subordinates. This suggests that those in power have more opportunities to express their attitudes and judgments than their subordinates.

REFERENCES

Bilbow, G. T. (1997), Spoken discourse in the multi-cultural workplace in Hong Kong: Applying a model of discourse as "impression management." In F. Bargiela-Chiappini, & S. Harris (Eds.), *The languages of business: An international perspective* (pp. 21-48). U.K: Edinburgh University Press.

Bargiela-Chiappini, F. (2009). *The handbook of business discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (Eds.) (1992). *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eggins, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics* (2nd. ed.). London and New York: Continuum.

Greatbatch, D., & Dingwall, R. (1998). Talk and identity in divorce mediation. In C. Antaki, & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in Talk* (pp. 121-132). London: Sage.

Handford, M. (2007), *The Genre of the business meeting: A Corpus-based study*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Nottingham, School of English Studies.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1975). *Learning how to mean: Explorations in the development of language*. London, U.K.: Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1984). Language as code and language as behavior: A systemic-functional interpretation of the nature and ontogenesis of dialogue. In R. Fawcett, M. A. K. Halliday, S. M. Lamhand, & A. Makkai (Eds.), *Semiotics of Language and Culture* (Vol. 1, pp. 3-35). London, U.K.: Pinter.

Halliday, M. A. K. (2014). *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Revised by Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen (4th ed.). London/New York: Taylor & Francis.

Harris, S. (2007). Politeness and power: Making and responding to requests in institutional settings. *Text & Talk, 23*(1), 27-52. doi:10.1515/text.2003.003

Holmes, J., & Stubbe, M. (2003). *Power and politeness in the workplace*. London, U.K.: Pearson Education.

Koester, A. (2006). *Investigating workplace discourse*. London & New York: Routledge.

Koester, A. (2010). *Workplace discourse*. London & New York: Continuum Int. Group Publishing.

Lyons, J. (1977) *Semantics, vol. II*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, M. (1998). *Spoken language and applied linguistics*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Mizusawa, Y. (2017). The directive genre in the Japanese workplace. In E. Thomson, M. Sano, & H. de Silva Joyce (Eds.), *Mapping Genres, Mapping Culture: Japanese texts in context* (Vol. 281, pp. 57-91). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Poynton, C. (1985). *Language and gender: Making the difference*. Geelong, Vic.: Deakin University Press.

Sarangi, S., & Roberts, C. (Eds.) (1999). *Talk Work and Institutional Order: Discourse in Medical, Mediation and Management Settings*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Thomson, E., Joyce, H, & Sano, M. (2017). Mapping genres using systemic functional linguistics. In *Mapping genres, mapping culture: Japanese texts in context* (pp. 1-28). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Thornborrow, J. (2014). *Power talk: Language and interaction in institutional discourse*. London & New York: Routledge.

Vine, B. (2004). *Getting Things Done at Work*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.