

The Power of Pedagogy: Teacher Language Authority in EFL

Yulia Indah Sari Nasution¹, Margana²

^{1,2}Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia

¹yuliaindah.2020@student.uny.ac.id

Abstract

Although power teacher has been widely studied, many investigations lack linguistic depth, leaving the nuanced meanings of classroom discourse underexplored. This study critically examines how teacher power is linguistically enacted and perceived in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom interactions and how it shapes student learning. The research aims to (1) identify the types of power enacted by teachers, (2) explore students' perceptions of these power dynamics, and (3) assess their impact on EFL learning. A qualitative case study design was employed, drawing on Fairclough's (1989) Critical Discourse Analysis and Raven's (2008) typology of social power. Data were gathered through classroom observations, interviews, and document analysis and analyzed using Fairclough's three-dimensional framework: description, interpretation, and explanation. The findings reveal five types of teacher power: legitimate (institutional authority), expert (subject knowledge), referent (student admiration), reward (praise/incentives), and coercive (disciplinary control). Information power was absent, as it is typically exercised in administrative settings. Students largely accepted teacher authority, shaped by early-established classroom norms. These power enactments positively influenced student motivation, engagement, critical thinking, confidence, and behavior. This study highlights how ethically exercised teacher power contributes to respectful and effective EFL teaching. The findings illuminate the role of discourse in constructing authority and offer implications for teacher education aimed at fostering inclusive, empowering pedagogies. Although context-specific, the study encourages further exploration of power relations across diverse educational settings to advance EFL pedagogy.

Keywords: *SFL, Critical Discourse Analysis, Teacher Power, EFL Classroom Interaction*

Introduction

Language is a powerful tool in shaping interpersonal communication and institutional structures such as education. In the classroom, teachers use language to deliver subject matter and organize interactions, manage student behavior, and assert authority (Harahap & Fithriani, 2023; Khusna et al., 2022). In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, where language is both the medium and object of learning, teacher talk holds a crucial role (Ismar & Rahmatillah, 2024; Zou et al., 2024). In Indonesia, however, EFL teachers face unique challenges due to varied student proficiency levels, limited exposure to English outside the classroom, and diverse socio-cultural dynamics (Sebayang et al., 2025; Eddraoui et al., 2023; Wulyani et al., 2019). Within this context, teacher talk often serves not only as instructional input but also as a means of exercising power. However, suppose teachers rely on language that emphasizes their authority and limits student autonomy. In that case, they risk creating a passive learning environment where students become reluctant to share ideas or challenge existing knowledge, potentially hindering their academic and personal growth.

Numerous studies have examined teacher discourse in Indonesian English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, primarily focusing on teacher-student interactions, questioning techniques, and feedback provision (Agustina & Cahyono, 2016; Rachmawati, 2022a). While

these studies are informative, they often neglect how language reflects power dynamics and ideological constructs. Research on power dynamics frequently provides rudimentary descriptions without in-depth analysis (Bahar et al., 2022; Dianithi et al., 2020). This study addresses this gap by exploring students' perceptions of teacher authority in classroom discourse, thereby shifting the focus from solely teacher perspectives to include student insights. This approach facilitates understanding potential discrepancies between teacher intentions and student interpretations. The objective is to enhance pedagogical strategies that balance authority with student autonomy.

Despite the contributions of earlier studies, two significant gaps remain. First, there is limited research that integrates linguistic analysis with theories of power to examine teacher discourse comprehensively. Second, most studies prioritize teacher perspectives, while student perceptions an essential dimension for understanding classroom power relations are rarely explored. To adress these gaps, this research integrates CDA, SFL, and Raven's theory to analyze teacher power comprehensively. It also incorporates student perspectives to illustrate how teacher discourse influences student learning and engagement. This comprehensive analysis contributes to the discourse on classroom power dynamics and offers insights into teacher training and classroom management. The recent study is distinctive in its application of CDA to examine discourse, SFL to analyze linguistic choices, and Raven's power typologies, all within the context of Indonesian EFL classrooms. Incorporating student perspectives offers a holistic view of how teacher language impacts learning.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) represents an interdisciplinary methodology that conceptualizes discourse as a form of social practice, highlighting the role of language in power dynamics, ideologies, and social inequalities (Durmaz & Yoğun, 2022; Farrelly, 2020). Distinct from other forms of discourse analysis, CDA is characterized by its dedication to social critique and transformation. The approach gained prominence in the late 1980s and early 1990s, with seminal contributions from scholars such as Norman Fairclough, Teun A. van Dijk, and Ruth Wodak, who developed foundational frameworks (Mughal et al., 2024). These frameworks offer analytical tools to reveal how language reflects and sustains institutional authority and social hierarchies. In educational contexts, CDA has been employed to examine the influence of institutional discourse on teaching methodologies, curriculum development, and classroom interactions (Suyitno et al., 2024). It investigates how educators' linguistic choices position students, construct identities and allocate power. CDA is particularly pertinent in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings, where English serves as both a medium of instruction and a determinant of social mobility. The analysis demonstrates that classroom discourse is not neutral but is imbued with ideologies concerning knowledge, authority, and learning.

Language power refers to the capacity to influence others through speech, predominantly wielded by educators in classroom settings. Teachers control discourse, curriculum, and student assessment (Ng & Deng, 2022). This power manifests overtly through directives or reprimands and covertly via questioning techniques or topic shifts. For instance, legitimate power is evident in role-based directives, while expert power is demonstrated through knowledge dissemination. These power dynamics significantly influence classroom management and student experiences. Empirical studies have examined power in educational contexts: Eriyanti (2018) investigated Indonesian teachers' use of imperatives for classroom control, while Rouf & Mohamed (2022) explored power dynamics in bilingual settings. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has been employed in the UK and South Africa to examine how discourse shapes student identities and participation (Janks, 2009; Mulderrig, 2011). However, there is a paucity of research integrating CDA with Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and

Raven's power theory, particularly in Southeast Asian English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, and limited exploration of student perspectives on these power dynamics.

EFL classrooms differ significantly from first-language or immersion contexts. In countries like Indonesia, English is typically taught in formal settings, with little real-life exposure outside the classroom. Students often learn English as a subject rather than a medium of communication, which influences teaching methods and classroom discourse patterns. Teachers in EFL contexts often dominate classroom talk, partly due to students' limited proficiency and partly due to cultural norms that emphasize teacher authority (Agustina & Cahyono, 2016).

Teacher talk in EFL classrooms serves multiple functions: delivering content, modeling language use, managing classroom behavior, and scaffolding learner comprehension. However, it also plays a key role in shaping classroom power relations. Studies have shown that teacher questioning patterns, feedback styles, and turn-taking control can empower or marginalize students (Sundari, 2018; Walsh, 2006). In many EFL contexts, teacher talk tends to be monologic, limiting student opportunities for interaction and critical thinking. One of the significant challenges in EFL discourse is balancing teacher authority with student-centered learning. Excessive teacher control can lead to passive learning, while a lack of structure may confuse, especially for learners with low proficiency. However, teacher talk also presents opportunities for strategic use of power, such as referent or informational power, to build rapport or foster learner autonomy. Recognizing these dynamics can help educators make conscious linguistic choices supporting classroom management and language development.

Several studies have investigated teacher power in classroom interactions, providing important insights into how power is exercised and negotiated in educational settings. However, most of these studies differ from the present research's objectives, focus, and analytical approaches. While prior research has extensively examined the types of teacher power and the utterances teachers use, there remains a need for a more in-depth analysis that reveals the often subtle power imbalances embedded in classroom language. Previous researchers have primarily focused on categorizing teacher power and describing its manifestations (Agustina & Cahyono, 2016; Allo & Baa, 2020; Anagaw & Mousu, 1959; Asrianti, 2019; Assadi Aidinlou & Jafari Amineh, 2016; Bahar et al., 2022; Dianithi et al., 2020; Rachmawati, 2022b; Xueqing & Sandaran, 2023). These studies typically draw upon the foundational theories of power by French and Raven (1959) and the expanded framework by Raven (2008). For discourse analysis, Fairclough's (2013, 1989, 1995) Critical Discourse Analysis model is commonly employed to uncover power relations within language use.

For instance, Dianithi et al. (2020) analyzed teacher language power in EFL classrooms, focusing on the linguistic expressions of power bases identified by French and Raven (1959). Their findings highlighted expert power as the dominant type, contributing to students' dependency on teachers. Legitimate and informational power, although less frequent, were noted as potentially important for fostering student autonomy. In a related study, Allo and Baa (2020) applied Speech Act Theory (Searle, 1969) to investigate lecturers' language power in EFL instruction, emphasizing how power is enacted through speech acts.

Bahar et al. (2022) examined teachers' use of power foundations to reduce student silence in Indonesian EFL classrooms. Using Raven's (2008) power framework, they found that reward power was the most frequently employed strategy to engage students, with coercive power used under specific conditions.

Despite these valuable contributions, this study differs by focusing on the full range of six power types conceptualized by Raven (2008): informational, reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, and expert power. Recognizing the intrinsic connection between language and power,

the study applies Fairclough's (1989) three-dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis framework—text analysis, discourse practice, and sociocultural practice—to reveal how power relations are constructed and contested in classroom interactions.

Furthermore, to uncover the implicit meanings in teacher utterances, this research integrates Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), specifically the ideational metafunction's transitivity system. This linguistic tool categorizes processes into material, mental, relational, behavioral, verbal, and existential types, providing a nuanced understanding of how power is linguistically enacted and maintained in classroom discourse.

The current research is focused on filling these gaps by providing an integrated discourse analysis that is:

1. How is teacher power represented in EFL classroom interactions at SMPN 4 Pakem?
2. How do students perceive the teacher power in EFL classroom interactions at SMPN 4 Pakem?
3. To what extent does the teacher's power impact students' English learning?

Method

This study adopted a qualitative descriptive case study design to explore teacher power in EFL classroom interaction. The single case focused on classroom discourse at SMPN 4 Pakem, with embedded subunits: teacher power as the central unit and students' perceptions as the supporting unit. A case study is suitable for examining phenomena within real-life contexts where boundaries are unclear (Yin, 2018). This study used Fairclough's (1989) Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to analyze discourse. CDA comprises three dimensions: text, discourse practice, and sociocultural practice. It was supported by Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), particularly the transitivity system, to identify ideational meanings in teacher talk. Additionally, qualitative content analysis (Roller, 2019) was employed to interpret language use and reveal patterns of power—this combination of approaches gave a comprehensive understanding of how power operates in classroom communication.

The research was conducted at SMPN 4 Pakem, a nationally accredited institution in Yogyakarta noted for its teacher-centered instructional approach. Two female English teachers, aged 24 and 27, with teaching experience ranging from two to four years, were purposively selected to provide an in-depth analysis of teacher power in classroom interactions within grades VII and VIII. The third English teacher, responsible for grade IX, was excluded due to students' focused preparation for national examinations. Additionally, four students, two males and two females from classes VIIE and VIID, were selected based on their active participation in EFL classroom activities, offering varied perspectives on power relations. The selection of these grade levels reflects their distinct interactional dynamics and the prominent role of teacher authority, which are pivotal for examining power relations in EFL educational settings. Data collection involved classroom observations, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis to ensure triangulation and depth of understanding.

Data were collected through direct classroom observations, semi-structured interviews, and document analysis. Classroom observations were conducted once per week for each class, focusing on teacher-student interactions to identify manifestations of power in verbal and non-verbal communication. Observation protocols included detailed note-taking and audio recordings to capture contextual nuances and ensure accuracy. Semi-structured interviews with selected teachers and students utilized open-ended questions to explore perceptions of power relations and interactional dynamics in the EFL classroom. Additionally, relevant documents such

as lesson plans and teaching materials were collected to supplement and contextualize the observational and interview data.

The data analysis was performed using a methodical methodology to guarantee Audio recordings from classroom interactions and interviews were transcribed verbatim. Coding was conducted using qualitative data analysis methods, focusing on linguistic features indicative of power relations. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), based on Fairclough's (1989) three-dimensional model—text, discourse practice, and sociocultural practice—was applied to interpret how power is constructed and maintained through language in classroom discourse. Triangulation of data sources was employed to enhance the trustworthiness and credibility of the findings, alongside peer debriefing and member checking procedures.

Results

Representation of Teacher Power in EFL Classroom Interactions

Teacher power at SMPN 4 Pakem was evident through five types identified in classroom discourse: legitimate, reward, coercive, referent, and expert power. These types were distributed across different linguistic processes (material, mental, behavioral, verbal), as detailed in Table 1.

Type of Power	Occurance based on Transitivity Process				Total Instances
	Material	Mental	Behavioural	Verbal	
Legitimate	9	7	5	3	24
Reward	3	0	0	0	3
Coercive	2	1	0	1	4
Referent	1	2	0	1	4
Expert	0	0	1	2	3

Legitimate power is dominated, marked by commands and directives such as “Everybody, look at this” and “Listen up,” which regulate student behavior and classroom order. Reward power appeared primarily as verbal praise, e.g., “I do really appreciate it,” encouraging positive student behavior. Coercive power was conveyed through firm but polite requests like “I want you to go to our school library,” encouraging compliance without harsh penalties. Referent power emerged through the teacher's positive modeling and relationship-building statements, such as delegating tasks: “Fatih will read this scene.” Expert power was exercised via questioning and scaffolding strategies, including utterances like “Must not? Is must not obligation?” to stimulate student reflection. These results prove that competent teachers utilize an appropriate combination of power types, adjusting their methods to accommodate various classroom contexts and student requirements, thus supporting an effective classroom.

Student's Perception towards Teacher's Power

From the observations and interviews with students regarding teacher's powers, there are several points regarding students' perceptions of various typologies of power, especially in the learning process.

Table 2. Teacher's Power Represented during Interaction

No	Types of Teacher's Power	Student's Perception
1	Reward	Verbal praise motivates and builds confidence.

2	Coercive	Non-punitive accountability (deadlines, grade adjustments) is seen as fair.
3	Legitimate	Authority based on respect and fairness encourages compliance
4	Referent	Teacher enthusiasm and fairness increase engagement and willingness to participate.
5	Expert	On average, students thought that teachers delivered the material in a language that was easy to understand, and the methods used by teachers were always varied so that students did not get bored easily. Apart from that, according to them, teachers are very responsive in helping students to understand material that they find difficult.

Table 2 shows that reward power was most strongly associated with motivation and encouragement. Students appreciated utterances like “I really appreciate it” and “Good job, that’s a nice answer,” which were seen as supportive and confidence-boosting. One student stated, “When the teacher compliments me, I feel proud and want to try harder.”

Although minimal, students understood coercive power as a tool to foster responsibility. Rather than punishment, teachers used redirection through utterances like “I want you to go to our school library,” which students interpreted as a chance to complete their work and improve. A student noted, “The teacher gives chances instead of punishing, so we learn to be responsible.”

Students respected legitimate power when it was exercised through fairness and consistency. Commands such as “Everybody, look at this” or “Listen up” were considered part of structured learning rather than authoritarian control. Students also appreciated being invited into class decisions, reflecting shared classroom authority.

Referent power was seen in actions that built emotional connections. When the teacher said, “Fatih will read this scene,” it was interpreted as an expression of trust and student involvement. Students admired teachers who demonstrated enthusiasm and modeled fairness.

Finally, expert power was highly regarded due to its influence on comprehension. Students cited moments where teachers used probing questions like “Must not? Is must not obligation?” to guide their thinking. This style of questioning deepened understanding and encouraged autonomy in learning.

In light of these findings, students perceived teacher power as constructive and relational, supporting their academic growth and emotional well-being in the EFL classroom.

Impacts of Teacher’s Power towards In-class Learning

The use of power in the learning process certainly impacts effectiveness in the classroom. After analyzing the independent teacher’s powers and students’ perceptions of them, the impact of each teacher’s power on the learning process can be seen in Table 3.

Table 2. Teacher’s Power Represented during Interaction

No	Types of Teacher’s Power	Impacts In-class Learning
1	Reward	Students became more motivated by being actively involved, had courage and self-confidence (when answering the teacher’s

		questions), and forming good relationships between teachers and students
2	Coercive	Students can be responsible for what they do, creating a conducive learning environment and reducing distractions in class.
3	Legitimate	Encouraging students to think critically, establishing order and discipline in the classroom and supporting effective learning.
4	Referent	Students respected the teacher by paying full attention during the teacher's teaching, such as focusing on explanations and listening carefully. Students were also actively involved in learning by answering the teacher's questions.
5	Expert	Students gaining a deep understanding of the subject matter, growing students' motivation to dig deeper into the material being studied, and receiving quality feedback that helps students understand concepts, improve skills, and increase academic achievement.

The results clearly demonstrate that each type of teacher power positively influences in-class learning. Reward power boosts students' motivation, confidence, and teacher-student relationships. When applied constructively, coercive power fosters responsibility and creates a focused learning environment. Legitimate power encourages critical thinking and discipline and supports effective classroom management. Referent power promotes student respect and attention, leading to active participation and engagement in learning. Teacher power helps students develop a deeper understanding of the material, enhances motivation to explore content further, and ensures valuable feedback for academic growth. To conclude, the ethical use of teacher power contributes to a more effective and supportive EFL classroom, where students feel motivated, respected, and guided toward better academic performance.

Discussion

Teacher Power Represented in EFL Classroom Interactions at SMPN 4 Pakem

Teacher power in EFL classrooms at SMPN 4 Pakem manifests through various linguistic strategies that reflect different types of power, as theorized by French and Raven (1959) and applied through Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). This study identified five primary types of teacher power: reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, and expert power, which operate across multiple transitivity processes, including material, mental, behavioral, and verbal (Table 1).

Legitimate power predominates, represented by teachers' use of commands, instructions, and rule enforcement expressed through the material and mental processes (Halliday, & Matthiessen, 2014). This power type includes utterances such as "Everybody, look at this" or "Listen up," functioning to direct student attention and maintain classroom order (Raven, 2008). These findings align with Agustina & Cahyono (2016), Anagaw & Mousu (1959) and Dianithi et al. (2020), who argue that legitimate power supports classroom discipline without demanding blind obedience. (Burns, 2023) notes that affirmative commands facilitate immediate student action by focusing attention rather than imposing harsh control.

Reward power is displayed through verbal praise and positive feedback, such as "I do really appreciate it," highlighting teachers' favorable judgments and emotional engagement (Raven, 2008; Zhang et al., 2021). This verbal appreciation reinforces desired student behavior, motivating learners without relying on material rewards due to the Merdeka Curriculum's policies

(Brown, 2001; Xueqing & Sandaran, 2023). The frequent use of reward power contrasts with Purwanto's concerns (Faidy & Arsana, 2014) about fostering unhealthy competition; instead, the verbal praise observed encourages equity and learner confidence.

Coercive power is exercised subtly in classroom interactions, where teachers use polite yet firm requests, such as asking students to complete unfinished work during library time ("I want you to go to our school library"), avoiding physical or harsh punishments in compliance with Indonesian child protection laws (Peraturan Pemerintah RI, 2014). The coercion functions more as educational sanctioning than punishment, fostering student responsibility and classroom discipline (McDaniel, 2020; Rachmawati, 2022). These results support findings by Kusumawati et al. (2023) and contrast with Aidinlou & Jafari Amineh's (2016) context, where coercion is more frequent.

Referent power emerges from positive teacher-student relationships built on respect, fairness, and admiration (French & Raven, 1959). Teachers employ this power by modeling good moral values, enthusiasm, and fairness, encouraging students to participate actively and respect the teacher's authority (Rachmawati, 2022). The teacher's balanced use of referent power, such as delegating responsibility ("Fatih will read this scene"), enhances students' willingness to engage without coercion, consistent with Qamaria's (2023) caution on ethical application.

Finally, teacher power is articulated through knowledgeable scaffolding and questioning techniques that invite students to critical thinking. For example, the teacher's utterances like "Must not? Is must not obligation?" prompt student reflection and engagement (Raven, 2008). Expert power supports deeper understanding and student autonomy by allowing learners to respond and self-correct, thus fostering a constructivist learning environment (Agustina & Cahyono, 2016; Allo & Baa, 2020).

To conclude this section, these findings demonstrate that teacher power in EFL classroom interactions at SMPN 4 Pakem is complex and multifaceted. Teachers employ a mix of direct commands, encouragement, sanctions, role modeling, and expert guidance to control and shape classroom discourse and learning processes.

Students Perceive Teacher Power in EFL Classroom Interactions at SMPN 4 Pakem

Students generally perceive teacher power positively and recognize the legitimacy and benefits of different types of power employed by teachers in their EFL classrooms. Their perceptions are influenced by cultural background, language proficiency, and classroom climate (Rachmawati, 2022). Regarding reward power, students appreciate verbal praise and acknowledgment, which they report as motivating and confidence-building. They associate verbal rewards with increased courage to participate and improved performance (Kusumawati et al., 2023; Xueqing & Sandaran, 2023). This aligns with Brown (2001) emphasis on praise linking student behavior to learning goals. For coercive power, students report that while punishment is not physical or severe, they experience accountability measures such as assignment deadlines or grade reductions. They accept these as fair disciplinary practices that maintain order without undermining their self-esteem (Kusumawati et al., 2023; Rachmawati, 2022). This perception supports the notion that coercive power, when applied ethically and constructively, supports responsibility and reduces classroom distractions.

Students regard legitimate power highly, perceiving it as a rightful authority based on respect and fairness. Teachers who model good behavior and provide opportunities for dialogue are respected, reinforcing students' willingness to comply (Dianithi et al., 2020; Nasmilah, 2023). This perception fosters a cooperative learning environment where students feel valued and heard (Azennoud et al., 2025). Referent power is linked to teachers' personal qualities such as enthusiasm, fairness, and moral integrity, which students admire. Such qualities encourage

engagement and active participation, reflecting the importance of teacher-student rapport and positive identification (French & Raven, 1959; Rachmawati, 2022). Students appreciate being treated fairly and allowed to ask questions, which enhances their interest in English learning. Lastly, expert power is perceived as essential for effective teaching. Students value clear explanations, varied instructional methods, and teacher responsiveness, which help them grasp difficult concepts and stay motivated (Allo & Baa, 2020; Rachmawati, 2022). Expert power builds student trust in teacher competence and encourages deeper exploration of content.

Overall, student perceptions reveal that when teacher power is exercised with fairness, respect, and care, it positively influences their attitudes towards learning and their motivation to engage in EFL activities (Syahriani et al., 2024; Tupalessy et al., 2024).

Teacher Power Impact Students' English Learning

The impact of teacher power on students' English learning at SMPN 4 Pakem is substantial and multifaceted, contributing to motivation, classroom discipline, critical thinking, and academic achievement. Reward power significantly boosts student motivation, self-confidence, and participation, enhancing active involvement in learning activities (Brown, 2001; Kusumawati et al., 2023). Verbal praise creates a positive emotional climate conducive to learning (Xueqing & Sandaran, 2023). When applied constructively through non-punitive sanctions, coercive power cultivates student responsibility and contributes to a focused and orderly learning environment. This fosters accountability and minimizes disruptions, enabling more effective teaching and learning (Kusumawati et al., 2023). Legitimate power supports classroom order and discipline, prerequisites for effective learning. It also encourages students to think critically by establishing clear behavioral and academic expectations (Dianithi et al., 2020). Referent power enhances students' respect for teachers, leading to attentive listening and active participation during lessons. The positive rapport built through referent power increases student engagement and facilitates deeper learning (Sandjaja, 2025). Finally, expert power contributes to students' more profound understanding of the subject matter and motivates them to explore content more thoroughly. Teacher feedback helps students clarify concepts, improve skills, and achieve better academic outcomes (Agustina & Cahyono, 2016; Allo & Baa, 2020).

To synthesize the key points discussed, these types of teacher power create a learning environment where students feel motivated, respected, and guided, which enhances their English learning outcomes and overall academic achievement. The ethical and balanced use of teacher power is crucial in fostering student autonomy and classroom discipline, thus promoting effective EFL education at SMPN 4 Pakem.

The findings of this study have several important implications for EFL teaching practices and classroom management. The balanced use of different types of teacher power appears to create a positive learning environment that supports student motivation, engagement, and academic achievement. This suggests that EFL teachers should be mindful of how they exercise power in the classroom and strive for an approach that combines clear expectations, positive reinforcement, fair discipline, and expert guidance. Some limitations of this study should be acknowledged. The research was conducted at a single school in Indonesia, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other educational contexts or cultures. Additionally, the study relied primarily on observational and self-reported data, which could be subject to bias or misinterpretation. Future research could explore how teacher power dynamics vary across different cultural contexts or educational levels. Longitudinal studies examining the long-term effects of teacher power on student learning outcomes would also be valuable. Additionally, investigating how teacher training programs can effectively prepare educators to use power constructively in the classroom could yield important insights for improving EFL instruction.

Conclusion

The current research investigated the representation of teacher power in EFL classroom interactions at SMPN 4 Pakem, student perceptions of this authority, and its effects on English learning. The research demonstrated that teacher power is exercised through diverse linguistic strategies and transitivity processes, employing French and Raven's power theory, Critical Discourse Analysis, and Systemic Functional Linguistics. Legitimate power was predominantly evident in teachers' employment of directives and evaluative language. Students perceived teacher authority favorably when exercised ethically and respectfully, particularly valuing reward and expert power. The research discovered that teacher power significantly affected student motivation, participation, discipline, and academic achievement when engaged appropriately. The results enhance comprehension of the roles of power in language education and provide practical implications for improving EFL teaching methodologies through respectful discourse and student-centered approaches.

References

- Agustina, S., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2016). Politeness and power relation in EFL classroom interactions: A study on Indonesian learners and lecturers. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(2), 92–100. <https://doi.org/10.30845/ijll>
- Aidinlou, N. A., & Amineh, R. J. (2016). Students' perceptions of teachers' power in high school, university, and English language institute. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 6(6), 76–83. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v6n6p76>
- Allo, M. D. G., Rahman, A., & Sultan. (2020). A critical discourse analysis on lecturers' language power in EFL teaching (An ethnography study at a higher education). *Vision*, 27(3), 142–154.
- Anagaw, M., & Mossu, Y. (2019). Teacher power in EFL classroom: Associations with classroom interaction. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 59, 6–17. <https://doi.org/10.7176/jlll/59-02>
- Asrianti. (2019). Representasi kekuasaan dalam wacana kelas di sekolah menengah pertama. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 12(1), 14–25. <https://doi.org/10.26858/retorika.v12i1.7384>
- Azennoud, A., Guaad, N. A., & Lamghari, N. K. (2025). Interactional practices and normative expectations in EFL classrooms: A conversation analysis approach to turn-taking. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Studies*, 7(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jhsss.2025.7.2.1>
- Bahar, Purwati, O., & Setiawan, S. (2022). Exploring teacher power use and student silence in an EFL classroom: Evidence from Indonesia. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi*, 12(2), 157–165. <https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.12.02.16>
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Longman.
- Burns, A. (2023). Action research and language teaching. In *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 1–7). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal20446>
- Dianithi, N. W. A. S., Nititiasih, P. K., & Putra, I. N. A. J. (2020). The power of language in EFL classroom of a senior high school. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Indonesia*, 8(2), 41–58. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbi.v8i2.3452>
- Durmaz, Z., & Yoğun, M. S. (2022). A critical discourse analysis of a visual image in Norman Fairclough's CDA model. *Uluslararası Eğitim Araştırmacıları Dergisi*, 5(1), 25–33. <https://doi.org/10.52134/ueader.1101763>

- Eddraoui, B., Sukyadi, D., Musthafa, B., & Bukhori Muslim, A. (2023). Revisiting pre-service education for secondary EFL teachers in Indonesia. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 17(2), 276–286. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v17i2.41629>
- Eriyanti, R. W. (2018). Power gap as one of the triggers of verbal abuses committed by teachers in schools. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(1), 363–378. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11125a>
- Faidy, A. B., & Arsana, I. M. (2014). Hubungan pemberian reward dan punishment dengan motivasi belajar pendidikan kewarganegaraan siswa kelas XI SMA Negeri 1 Ambuten Kabupaten Sumenep. *Kajian Moral dan Kewarganegaraan*, 2(2), 454–468. <https://doi.org/10.26740/kmkn.v2n2>
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Farrelly, M. (2020). Critical discourse analysis. In *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526421036815631>
- French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150–167). Institute for Social Research.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203431269>
- Harahap, N., & Fithriani, R. (2023). Indonesian pre-service EFL teachers' attitudes and motivation toward English language learning. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra*, 9(1), 674–689. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v9i1.2572>
- Ismar, R. T., & Rahmatillah, R. (2023). The effect of native-English-speaking teachers on EFL learners' attitudes and motivation in learning English as an international language. *Indonesian Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education*, 4(2), 84–91. <https://doi.org/10.58835/ijtte.v4i2.399>
- Janks, H. (2009). *Literacy and power*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203869956>
- Khusna, K. A., Ubaidillah, M. F., Mustofa, M., Lee, H. Y., Alka, W., & Putra, S. P. (2022). Portrait of teacher talk and language choices in EFL classroom: Insights for children's language learning. *Child Education Journal*, 4(2), 139–174. <https://doi.org/10.33086/cej.v4i2.3501>
- Kusumawati, M., Fauziddin, M., & Ananda, R. (2023). The impact of reward and punishment on the extrinsic motivation of elementary school students. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 15(1), 183–192. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v15i1.2856>
- McDaniel, T. R. (2020). School law and classroom discipline: New questions about corporal punishment. *The Clearing House*, 93(2), 58–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2020.1713615>
- Mughal, M., Fizza, F., Abro, S., & Javed, F. (2024). Political critiques and power dynamics within Pakistani society: A critical discourse analysis of Pakistani drama “Ishq Murshid.” *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, 13(3), 1101–1118. <https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2024.13.3.90>
- Mulderrig, J. (2011). The grammar of governance. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 8(1), 45–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2011.511832>
- Nasmilah, N. (2023). Teachers' talk and students' attitude in learning English at secondary schools in Indonesia: A correlational analysis. *Education Research International*, 2023, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/8959615>
- Ng, S. H., & Deng, F. (2017). Language and power. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of communication*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.436>

- Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia. (2014). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 35 Tahun 2014 tentang Perlindungan Anak*. <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Home/Details/38723/uu-no-35-tahun-2014>
- Qamaria, N. A. (2024). Situational factors influencing students' willingness to communicate. *Al Lughawiyyat*, 4(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.31332/alg.v4i1.4079>
- Rachmawati, S. A. (2022). Critical discourse analysis of language and power in EFL classroom interaction. *JET (Journal of English Teaching)*, 8(2), 224–232. <https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v8i2.3633>
- Raven, B. H. (2008). The bases of power and the power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 8(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-2415.2008.00159.x>
- Roller, M. R. (2019). A quality approach to qualitative content analysis: Similarities and differences compared to other qualitative methods. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung*, 20(3). <https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-20.3.3385>
- Rouf, M. A., & Mohamed, A. R. (2022). Secondary school EL teachers' classroom language proficiency: A case study in Bangladesh. *The Qualitative Report*, 27(6), 1601–1618. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5293>
- Sandjaja, M. (2025). Blended learning: Innovation in college classrooms for deeper student engagement. *Psikoborneo: Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 13(2), 182–192. <https://doi.org/10.30872/psikoborneo.v13i2.19644>
- Sebayang, F. A. A., Rambing, R. R., & Basri, M. H. (2025). Exploring challenges faced by English language teachers: Voices from EFL teachers in Indonesia. *ETERNAL (English Teaching Journal)*, 16(1), 93–102. <https://doi.org/10.26877/eternal.v16i1.1104>
- Sundari, H. (2017). Classroom interaction in teaching English as a foreign language at lower secondary schools in Indonesia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(6), 147–154. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.8n.6p.147>
- Suyitno, M., Rampeng, R., Rahim, I., Surwuy, G. S., & Poncowati, S. D. (2024). The influence of teacher training, curriculum development, and technological integration on student academic achievement. *Global International Journal of Innovative Research*, 2(6), 1397–1406. <https://doi.org/10.59613/global.v2i6.207>
- Syahrani, I., Supriadi, S., Mustafa, M., Saifullah, A. R., Riski, H., & Mubarak, Y. (2024). Power dynamics in a classroom interactions context: Critical discourse analysis. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 12(3), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijsci.2024.2037993.3632>
- Trubina, Z. I. (2025). Foreign language teachers' ideas about the educational autonomy of schoolchildren. *Moscow Pedagogical Journal*, 1, 121–130. <https://doi.org/10.18384/2949-4974-2025-1-121-130>
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203015711>
- Wulyani, A. N., Elgort, I., & Coxhead, A. (2019). Exploring EFL teachers' English language proficiency: Lessons from Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 389–402. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i2.20217>
- Xueqing, W., & Sandaran, S. C. (2023). A critical discourse analysis on power relationships in the classroom: The case of *The school that turned Chinese*. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(1), 467–478. <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v13-i1/16204>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.

- Zhang, S., Deng, J., & Du, X. (2021). A mixed study on the effectiveness of verbal praise in primary school class. *Science Insights Education Frontiers*, 10(1), 1353–1363. <https://doi.org/10.15354/sief.21.or060>
- Zou, L., Ismail, L., & Jeyaraj, J. J. (2024). A systematic review of teacher talk and its effects on English language learning outcomes. *World Journal of English Language*, 14(5), 454–468. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n5p454>

--- This page is intentionally left blank---