

## **Major Problems in Analyzing Transitivity: A Case from Indonesia**

**Sri Harto**

Department of English Education  
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

**Sri Handayani**

English Literature Department  
Universitas Kebangsaan

### **CORRESPONDING AUTHOR**

<sup>1</sup> **SRI HARTO**, harto@upi.edu

### **ABSTRACT**

This research applied a descriptive qualitative method to identify the major problems encountered by students in analyzing transitivity. It also aims to find out some of the alternative solutions to the students' problems proposed by the lecturers. The data were collected through three group assignments made by the students sitting in the sixth semester taking a Functional Grammar course. Among the three group assignments, i.e. transitivity, mood, and theme and rheme, transitivity was chosen as the sample of this research involving five group papers analyzed based on some relevant theories of transitivity. The analysis was focused on the major problems encountered by the students in three semantic categories: participants, processes, and circumstances. The data were classified into some categories, presented in percentages, and analyzed to see the more dominant types of the semantic categories. Then, some of the answers to the students' major problems were presented to provide the students with some solutions on their problems offered by the lecturers. Based on the data findings and analysis, it is concluded that the major problems encountered by the students in analyzing transitivity, from the most to the least dominant types of semantic categories are participants (46.9%), processes (33.3%), and circumstances (19.8%). Finally, the ways out to solve the students' problems were done through explaining differences of the conceptual framework of the functions of words and providing them with some relevant and contextual examples.

**Keywords:** *major problems, transitivity, functional grammar*

### **INTRODUCTION**

The curriculum of an English Language Education Department in one prominent public university in Bandung, Indonesia has mandated that during their study at the department, the students are supposed to complete four courses in grammar, i.e. grammar 1, grammar 2, grammar 3, and functional grammar. Grammar 1 is offered in the first semester focusing its course on classes and patterns. Grammar 2 is studied in

the second semester highlighting the sentence structures. Grammar 3 (advanced grammar) is taken in the third semester exploring more conceptual framework of an English grammar, and finally, functional grammar is set up in the sixth semester trying to analyze grammar based on its functions. Grammar is a theory of a language describing how the language is put together and how it works (Gerot & Wignell, 1995, p.2). The grammar of the language is then

classified into three types, i.e. traditional grammar, formal grammar, and functional grammar. Traditional grammar identifies the grammar of a standard English through the

description of parts of speech showing a prescription of a language and the correction of a 'bad' grammar. Formal grammar tries to analyze a structure of individual sentences and views the language as a set of rules allowing or disallowing certain sentence structures. Finally, functional grammar focuses its analysis on the actual use of a language and on its texts and contexts (Gerot & Wignell, 1995, pp.5-6). In addition, in compliance with its function, the language is to make meanings and these meanings are influenced by the social and cultural contexts (Kondowe, 2014, p.175).

With regard to the grammar courses and the descriptions of competencies required by the curriculum, functional grammar as the last grammar course recommended by the curriculum was found to be the most difficult course for the students to study. The high difficulty level of the course has given some consequences to the students in which one of them is that they encountered some fundamental problems in understanding the functional grammar course. This has encouraged and triggered the lecturers of the course to do a research on this topic in order to get some ideas and frameworks to find adequate solutions to the students' problems, particularly the one related to transitivity.

The research in Functional Grammar organized by the lecturers tried to examine the major problems encountered by sixth semester students in analyzing the transitivity. It was implemented by the lecturers in the Functional Grammar (IG510) course which worth two credit hours at the English Education Department, Faculty of Language and Literature Education of one prominent state university in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia. The syllabus of the IG510 (Lukmana and Harto, 2010) mandated that

the students should be introduced with a meaning-based theory of grammar, i.e. functional grammar. It also provides a step-by-step account of functional grammar and then relates it to a language pedagogy and critical analysis of language use, an increasingly popular account of discourse that concerns language practices.

In accordance with the objectives of the course, the syllabus requires that upon the completion of the course, the students are expected to (1) have a solid understanding of the key topics in functional grammar; (2) be able to analyze texts by means of functional grammar theory; and (3) be able to relate the analysis to the concerns of language pedagogy and critical analysis of language use. Then, it is also explicitly written in the syllabus that the students are then assessed by the lecturers through three aspects with their percentages in the running semester, i.e. chapter report (15%), three group assignments (45%), and one test (40%) (Lukmana and Harto, 2010). Considering the three aspects of course assessment, the group assignments are considered to be the highest percentage (45%) in the course assessment process. It means that the group assignments play an important role in determining the final score of the students at the end of the semester.

In relation to the assignments given by the lecturers to the students during the semester, there were three different texts assigned to the students with three different topics to analyze, i.e. mood, transitivity, and theme and rheme. Among the three topics, transitivity was found to be the most difficult topic for the students to analyze viewed from the problems dominantly found in their analysis. It seems to be quite reasonable since transitivity analysis is so complex involving three main aspects of semantic categories, i.e. participants, processes and circumstances (Halliday, 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; 2014; Gerot & Wignell, 1995; Martin et al., 1997). Then, three aspects of the semantic categories are typically realized by three different groups, i.e. the participant by nominal group, the

process by verbal group, and the circumstance by adverbial group or prepositional phrase (Zhao & Zhang, 2017, p.33; Caili, 2005, p.112).

In addition, transitivity patterns represent the encoding of experiential meanings covering the meanings about the world, about experience, about how we perceive and experience what is going on (Eggins, 2004, p.249). Similarly, the system of transitivity belongs to the experiential meta-function and these are represented as a configuration of a process, participants involved in it, and attendant circumstances (Martin et al., 1997, p.100). Then, transitivity is achieved by mode of reflection which is imposing order on the endless variation and flow of events (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, p.170). The endless variation and flow of events in the grammatical system are construed into world of experience which is known as process types. The types of processes in transitivity are then identified as material, mental, relational, behavioral, verbal, existential processes (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, pp.170-171; Gerot & Wignell, 1995, p.54; Adjei et al., 2015, p.25) and meteorological processes (Gerot & Wignell, 1995, p.54).

Considering the complexities and a high level of difficulty in the analysis of transitivity, therefore, it is interesting to find out the major problems encountered by the students, classify the dominant problems encountered by them, and provide the students with some descriptive solutions proposed the lecturers. For these reasons, this topic is worth investigating.

## **METHOD**

This study applied a descriptive qualitative method to identify the types of major problems encountered by the students in analyzing transitivity, including three semantic categories, i.e. participants, processes, and circumstances. In addition, this study also aims to present the answers to the students' major problems in analyzing the transitivity. The data were collected from three group assignments of the students

sitting in the sixth semester at the English Education Department of a public university in Bandung, West-Java, Indonesia taking a Functional Grammar (IG510) course. From the three group assignments, transitivity was chosen as the sample of this research, instead of mood and theme and rheme, since there were some major problems found in the students' work in analyzing the transitivity compared to those of the other two, i.e. mood and theme and rheme. There were five group papers written by the students on transitivity analyzed based on some theories of transitivity by Halliday (1994), Halliday & Matthiessen (2004, 2014), Gerot & Wignell (1995), and Martin et al. (1997). The analysis was focused on the major problems encountered by the students in analyzing the transitivity in the three semantic categories. The data were then classified, presented in percentages, and analyzed to see the more dominant types of the semantic categories. Then, some of the answers to the students' major problems were presented to provide the students with some solutions on their major problems. Some conclusions are then drawn from the data findings and analysis on the students' major problems particularly in analyzing the transitivity.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The analysis on the students' major problems in transitivity in the Functional Grammar class is classified into three semantic categories as proposed by Halliday (1994), Halliday & Matthiessen (2004; 2014), Gerot & Wignell (1995), and Martin et al. (1997), i.e. participants, processes, and circumstances. The details of the major problems encountered by the students in the analysis of transitivity are presented in Table 1 below. Each category is preceded by a table representing the findings of the research and followed by a discussion of the results on the relevant issues.

No	Types of Semantic Categories	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
1	Participants	38	46.9
2	Processes	27	33.3
3	Circumstances	16	19.8
<b>Total</b>		<b>81</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 1 above clearly indicates that the highest percentage of the problems encountered by students in analyzing transitivity in the Functional Grammar class is the participants (46.9%), then followed by processes (33.3%) and circumstances (19.8%). These percentages show that the terms such as Actor, Goal, Behavior, Range, Sayer, Phenomenon, Sayer, Target, and Receiver have not been appropriately understood by the students. The discussion

on each type of the semantic categories is presented below.

### Participants

The major problems encountered by the students in the analysis of participants as one of the semantic categories can be seen in the Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Percentage of Participants**

No	Types of Participants	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
<b>Non-relational participants</b>			
1	Actor	6	15.7
2	Goal	5	13.2
3	Senser	5	13.2
4	Phenomenon	5	13.2
5	Range	3	7.9
6	Sayer	2	5.3
7	Behavior	1	2.6
8	Target	0	0
9	Receiver	0	0
<b>Relational participants</b>			
1	Carrier	4	10.5
2	Attribute	4	10.5
3	Token	2	5.3
4	Value	1	2.6
<b>Total</b>		<b>38</b>	<b>100</b>

The results of the data analysis on the problems of participants encountered by students in the transitivity analysis show that there are eleven types of problems of participants: Actor, Goal, Senser, Phenomenon, Range, Sayer, and Behavior for the non-relational participants; and Carrier, Attribute, Token and Value for the relational participants. Meanwhile, Target and

Receiver of the non-relational participants did not occur.

In accordance with the Table 2 above, the Actor (15.7%) is the most dominant type of problem made by the students and the least dominant types (2.6%) are Behavior (non-relational participant) and Value (relational participant) successively. The example of problems with participants can be seen in the Case 1 in the Excerpt 1 below.

**Excerpt 1: Problems with Participants**

Text	Words to analyze	Identified mistake	Intended type	Type of mistake
Case 1: Most people in Padang cannot watch the news	The news	Phenomenon	Range	Participant

The word ‘watch’ in the Case 1 above belongs to the behavioural process as described in the discussion section. It means that the obligatory participant in this clause should be Behaver for most people and should not be a Phenomenon. So, the participant for the news is Range.

**Non-Relational Participants**

**Actor and Behaver**

The term “Actor” is used to mark the participant in the material process. The Actor shows ‘an entity who or which does something (Gerot & Wignell, 1995, p.55; Adjei et al., 2015, p.26). Data found in the students’ assignments showed that there were many problems encountered by the students in analyzing participant which was classified as an Actor. This kind of problem happened in the participant where it supposed to be an Actor, but the students analyzed it as a Behaver. See the following example ([1]).

[1] I took the TEFL course.

The students analyzed the word “I” as an Actor where it supposed to be a Behaver since the word “took” in the sentence [1] is not included in a material process, but it supposed to be a behavioural process. It is a behavioural process since “took” is not a physical action like taking something that can be seen as a physical movement. The word “took” in this sentence is more likely as the students’ activity to attend a lecture in a Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) course. Therefore, the word “took” is not included in a material process. The students’ problem in analyzing the participant was caused by the students’ confusion in understanding the word “took”

in the sentence. Another students’ problem can be viewed in the following sentence.

[2] ... others outside the city can see and need to know the extent of the damage...

The word “others” in [2] is classified by the students as an Actor where it supposed to be a Behaver. The words “see and need to” are verbs showing physiological and psychological behaviour (Gerot & Wignell, 1995, p.60). So, “others” is not included in a material process, but in a behavioural process.

[3] The driver thought he was in a Formula One Race.

In this case, the students made a mistake in analyzing a participant “he” in the sentence [3]. The students analyzed “he” as a participant Actor where it supposed to be a participant Carrier since “he” is followed by “was” and is followed by circumstance in a Formula One Race. It means that “was” is an auxiliary in the sentence [3]. Therefore, “he” is a Carrier.

From the above problems, it can be concluded that the students still showed a confusion to analyze transitivity due to their problems in understanding the appropriate meaning of the verbs in the above sentences, i.e. in the sentences [1], [2], and [3].

**Goal and Range**

The term “Goal” is placed in the second position in the table of students’ problems in analyzing participants. Goal is categorized as a participant where it can be classified as an “entity to which the process is extended or directed” (Gerot & Wignell, 1995; Adjei et al., 2015). The term “Goal” is present both in a negative sentence and in a positive one. The

examples of the students' problems are indicated in the following examples.

[4] My friend ran out of patience.

The word "patience" in the sentence [4] is included in a Range as it is seen in the following formula.

<u>My friend</u>	<u>ran out of</u>	<u>patience.</u>
Actor	Material	Range

This is the case since "ran out of" is classified as a material process in which the phrase "ran out of" actually means "*habis*" in Indonesian language.

In this case, the students analyzed the word "patience" as a "Goal" considering that the verb in that sentence was a material process. Therefore, the word "patience" was viewed by the students as a Goal. However, in this case, the word "patience" is not a Goal, but a Range considering that the word "patience" provides a specific coverage to the process that occurred, i.e. "ran out of patience".

Another case of Goal is also identified in the students' analysis on a phrase "an assistant of English teaching position" which was analyzed as a Range by the students where it supposed to be a Goal.

[5] I had already applied to an assistant of English teaching position.

Students' problems in analyzing the sentences in the first case [4] and in the second case [5] were found to show that the students did not have any sensitivity to differentiate the verbs indicating "the notion that some entity physically does something" (Gerot & Wignell, 1995, p.55) when it is followed by a participant, the students' analysis was supposed to classify it as "participant as a Goal" but they classified it as "participant as a Range". These conceptual frameworks of verbs have to be continuously trained to students to understand various differences of verbs used in different texts and contexts.

### ***Senser and Phenomenon***

Senser and Phenomenon are participant's roles that are available in the mental processes. A Senser is viewed to have a conscious being who has a sensitivity to feel, think, or see. Meanwhile, a Phenomenon is something that is felt, thought, or seen. There are several problems encountered by the students in the analysis of mental processes.

[6] They found only one body alive.

The word "they" in the sentence [6] was analyzed as a Senser by students. It supposed to be an Actor since the verb "found" is included in a material verb meaning "doing something physically". This verb is, therefore, not included in a mental process. It is different from the following case which is indicated in the sentence [7]. The students found problems with a phrase "a live rabbit" in the following sentence.

[7] One man finds a live rabbit.

"A live rabbit" in the sentence [7] was analyzed by the students as a Phenomenon. The right analysis is that it is a Goal since the verb in the sentence is a material process.

### ***Sayer***

A sample of students' problems in the analysis of a Sayer can be seen in the following case [8].

[8] None of the passenger complained...

The word "complained" was analyzed by the students as a participant Sayer where it supposed to be an Actor. The word "complained" in the sentence [8] does not mean to directly talk to a person, however, it means to say that "the activity which is done to express an unexpected event". Therefore, an Actor is more appropriate to analyze the sentence [8]. Another student's problem to analyze the Sayer is also seen in the sentence [9] in the following.

[9] A report on the costs of climate change said...

From the overall problems encountered by the students above, they can be analyzed and identified that the types of problems encountered by the students show some patterns which are indicated in the following table (Table 3).

**Table 3: Patterns of Students' Mistakes in Analyzing Participants**

No	Mistakes	Intended correction
1	Actor	Behaver
2	Actor	Carrier
3	Goal	Range
4	Range	Goal
5	Senser	Actor
6	Phenomenon	Goal
7	Sayer	Actor

### *Relational Participants*

The Table 2 above mentions that there are some problems found by the students in the analysis of participants and processes in the relational processes. The most dominant problems found by the students were in the analysis of participants. The other problems were also found by the students in the analysis of processes, i.e. Identifying process and Attributive process.

### *Participants*

In the relational processes, participants were classified into two main categories, i.e. Attributive processes covering Carrier and Attribute; and Identifying processes consisting of Token and Value. Samples of these problems can be seen and identified in the following cases.

### *Carrier*

Carrier is a participant functioning as a subject in a sentence. Carrier is considered to have an important role in a sentence since it is to construct parts of the sentence. The students' problems were also found in the participant particularly in the category of Carrier. Carrier is then contrasted with Goal,

Actor, and Behaver as indicated in the following descriptions.

### *Carrier vs Goal*

The students made a mistake in analyzing a participant Carrier where it supposed to be a participant Goal. This mistake can be seen in the following case [10].

[10] They found 16 bodies all dead.

The words "16 bodies" in the sentence [10] was analyzed by students as a Carrier. When the result of the students' analysis is carefully analyzed, it is wrong since the word "found" in the sentence is a material process. Therefore, the right analysis of the participant is a Goal. It means that the students still showed their confusion in determining the process in the sentence [10].

### *Carrier vs Actor*

The sample of the students' problem in the analysis of a Carrier also happened in the analysis of a participant Actor which was analyzed by the students as a Carrier. See the sentence [11] below.

[11] Our actions over the coming few decades could create risk of major disruption to economic and social activity, ... on the scale similar to those associated with the great wars and economic depression ...

The noun phrase in the sentence [11] was analyzed by the students as a participant Carrier. They thought that the verb phrase "could create" was classified as a material process since "could" is followed by a verb "create". Hence, "could" is present not to identify something, but it functions as a modal in the sentence. Therefore, "our action over the coming few decades" is an Actor. In this particular case, the students made a mistake in understanding the function of a word "could" as an identification of a noun, not as a modal in the sentence.

### *Carrier vs Behaver*

An example of a wrong analysis done by the students is in the analysis of a Carrier. It supposed to be a participant Behavior, but it was mistaken analyzed by the students as a participant Carrier. See the sample of the case in the sentence [12] below.

- [12] The benefits of determined worldwide steps to tackle climate change would greatly outweigh the cost.

The noun phrase “The benefits of determined worldwide steps to tackle climate change” was analyzed by students as a participant Carrier where it supposed to be a participant Behavior. Therefore, the phrase “would greatly outweigh the cost” is included into a behavioural process, not an identifying process. This problem was caused by the students’ misconception in understanding the phrase where it supposed to be a process involving physiological and psychological behaviour.

### *Attributive*

#### *Attribute vs Value*

The students’ problem to differentiate participant Attribute from participant Value is explored in the following case [13].

- [13] Budi Syahril is the news presenter.

The noun phrase “the news presenter” in the sentence [13] was analyzed by students as a participant Attribute where it supposed to be a participant Value. It is considered so since “is” in the sentence is functioning as a “attributive” in the sentence. It means that “is” to attribute the phrase “the news presenter”, not to identify “the news presenter”.

Based on the above cases, there are at least two conclusions that can be drawn from the students’ problems. First, the students showed their confusion in identifying a process when the word “being” or “having” appeared in the sentence. Second, students showed their misconception in understanding the word “being” or “having” which appeared in the sentence. As the consequence, they made a mistake in identifying the category of the participant.

### **Processes**

Process can be considered a central to transitivity. It is realized by verbs. The verbs indicated in this process tend to express states of being or having (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004, 2014). The problems of processes encountered by the students in the analysis of the transitivity are indicated in Table 4 below.

**Table 4: Percentage of Processes**

No	Types of Processes	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
<b>Non-relational processes</b>			
1	Mental	10	37.04
2	Material	9	33.34
3	Behavioural	1	3.70
4	Verbal	1	3.70
5	Existential	1	3.70
6	Relational	0	0
7	Meteorological	0	0
<b>Relational processes</b>			
1	Attributive	4	14.82
2	Identifying	1	3.70
<b>Total</b>		<b>27</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 4 above shows that the students made some mistakes in term of processes in analyzing transitivity. Seen from the highest to the lowest, Mental process (37.04%) that belongs to non-relational process poses the highest percentage, followed by Material process (33.34%), then Attributive (14.82%) in relational process, and Behavioural, Verbal, Existential, and Identifying in the

same percentage (3.70%) while relational and meteorological processes did not occur. The example of problems with processes encountered by the students in analyzing transitivity is described below.

**Excerpt 2: Problems with Processes**

Text	Words to analyze	Identified mistake	Intended type	Type of mistake
Case 1: One man finds a live rabbits	finds	Mental: perception	Pro: material	Pro: material
Case2: Most people in Padang cannot watch the news	watch	Mental: perception	behavioural	Pro: behavioral
Case 3: The benefits of determined worldwide steps to tackle climate change would greatly outweigh the cost	would outweigh	Attributive: intensive	bahavioural	Relational Processes: attributive

From the example of Case 1, in Excerpt 2, the students classified the word “finds” as a mental process. The analysis can be considered incorrect since the word “finds” in the clause of the Case 1 is unconscious being. The Actor cannot be in purpose to find the rabbit. The Actor does a process of material doing physically without including emotional, intellectual, and sensory processes like in the following clauses. *One man finds a new formula.* The word “finds” in this clause can be categorized as a mental process since the activity of finding includes emotional, intellectual, and sensory activities such as searching, experiencing, and formulating. Hence, the word “finds” in the Case 1 should be a material process. Then, in the Case 2, students categorized the word “watch” as a mental process. As mentioned earlier that a mental process should include

emotional, intellectual, and sensory activities, then, the word “watch” in the Case 2 cannot be classified as a mental process. Watching is one of Behavioural processes which is consciously done by the Behaver physiologically and psychologically. Therefore, the appropriate analysis is that the word “watch” should be a Behavioural process. Finally, in the Case 3 is an example of inappropriate analysis on relational process. Here, the phrase “would outweigh” was categorized as an Attributive process. The students spited the words “would out” so that they recognized it as “would outweigh” which belongs to an Attribute process. It supposed to be a Behavioural process.

Based on the cases of the students’ problems found in the analysis of processes, it can be drawn some conclusions that the underlining factors causing the problems,

among others, are: (1) the students misinterpreted the meaning of verbs in the sentences; (2) the students misunderstood the contexts of the sentences; and (3) the students did not comprehensively understand the significant differences in each of the processes. These problems have caused some confusion on the students in determining the appropriate processes, identifying the right participants, and choosing the most adequate circumstances in each of the sentences.

### Circumstances

As it is earlier mentioned in the literature review, the circumstance is divided into seven main types which will answer questions such as when, where, why, how, and what. Meanwhile, the findings are then elaborated in seven types: Time, Place, Manner, Cause, Accompaniment, Matter, and Role. Each type of the circumstances is preceded by a table which represents the findings derived from the data collection of the problems encountered by students in the analysis of transitivity in a Functional Grammar class. The details of the problems of the circumstances are presented in Table 5 below.

**Table 5: Percentage of Circumstances**

No	Types of Circumstances	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
1	Cause	6	37.50
2	Manner	4	25.00
3	Matter	3	18.75
4	Place	2	12.50
5	Time	1	6.25
6	Accompaniment	0	0
7	Role	0	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>16</b>	<b>100</b>

Based on the Table 5 above, Cause (37.50%) is the most dominant problem faced by the students in analyzing the circumstances. It is then followed by, from the highest to the lowest, Manner (25.00%), Matter (18.75%),

Place (12.50%), Time (6.25%), while Accompaniment and Role did not occur. The problems with Cause are indicated in the examples below.

### Excerpt 3: Problems with Cause

Text	Words to analyze	Identified mistake	Intended type	Type of mistake
<b>Case 1:</b> A friend of mine shares <u>her story of riding</u> in a public minivan	her story of reading	Cir: Matter	Goal	circumstance
<b>Case 2:</b> The whole experiences was really enjoyable <u>for me</u>	<u>for me</u>	Cir: Cause	Cir: Behalf	circumstance

The sentence in the Case 1, Excerpt 3, is “A friend of mine shares her story of riding in a

*public minivan*”. The students analyzed *her story of riding* as a circumstance of Matter.

This analysis is incorrect since in the Case 1, the Actor physically acts something that is to share the story. Hence, the word “shares” belongs to a Material process then her story of riding comes to a Goal. Meanwhile, in the Case 2, the students analyzed the words “for me” as a Cause. They did not mention the description in details that “for me” is included in a Behalf. It can be categorized as an incorrect answer since there are three types of Cause: Reason, Purpose, and Behalf. The words “for me” belongs to Behalf since it tells for whose sake and is probed by for whom.

### CONCLUSION

Based on the data findings and discussion above, some conclusions are drawn in the followings. The major problems encountered by the students in analyzing transitivity, from the most to the least dominant types of semantic categories are participants (46.9%), processes (33.3%), and circumstances (19.8%). The first semantic category, participants, indicates that the Actor shows the highest percentage (15.7%) and then followed by Goal, Sensor, and Phenomenon (each reaches 13.2%) successively, then Carrier and Attribute (10.5%), and the rest (Range, Sayer, Behavior, Token, Value) successively achieves less than 10%. The second semantic category, processes, indicates that the mental process shows the highest percentage (37.04%) of the non-relational processes and then followed by material process (33.34%), and behavioural, verbal, and existential (each reaches 3.70%) successively. Meanwhile, in the relational processes, attributive reaches 14.82% and followed by identifying (3.70%). In terms of circumstances, Cause is the most dominant problem encountered by the students (37.50%), then followed by Manner (25.00%), Matter (18.75%), Place (12.50%), and Time (6.25%). The ways out to solve the students' confusion on the major problems in analyzing transitivity were done through explaining differences of the conceptual framework of the functions of words and

providing the students with some relevant and contextual examples.

### REFERENCES

- Adjei, A.A., Ewusi-Mensah, L., and Okoh, H. (2015). Transitivity in political discourse: A study of the major process types in the 2009 state-of-the-nation address in Ghana. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 16, 32-23.
- Caili, W. (2005). The process of transitivity in ‘Weeping for my smoking daughter’. *CELEA Journal*, 28(1), 111-115.
- Eggins, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). New York: Continuum.
- Gerot, L, and Wignell, P. (1995). *Making sense of functional grammar: An introductory workbook*. Reprinted with amendments. Cammeray, NSW: Gerd Stabler.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A. K., and Matthiessen, C. M.I.M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). London: Arnold, a member of the Hodder Headline Group.
- Halliday, M.A. K., and Matthiessen, C. M.I.M. (2014). *An introduction to functional grammar* (4<sup>th</sup> ed). London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Kondowe, W. (2014). Presidents and ideologies: A transitivity analysis of Bingu wa Mutharika's inaugural address. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 2(3), 174-180.
- Lukmana, I., and Harto, S. (2010). *Syllabus of functional grammar (IG510)*. English Education Department, Faculty of Language and Literature Education, Indonesia University of Education. Bandung: Unpublished Course Syllabus.

Martin, J.R., Matthiessen, C. M.I.M. and Painter, C. (1997). *Working with functional grammar*. London: Arnold.  
Zhao, M., and Zhang, Y. (2017). A transitivity analysis of American

President Donald J. Trump's inaugural address. *International Journal of Liberal Arts and Social Science*. 5(5), 31-43.