

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides the background of the study, research problem, limitation of the study, purpose of the study, and significance of the study. This study will focus on analyzing the transitivity system of English and Indonesian written jokes which are published on www.rd.com and www.Readersdigest.co.id through the model of transitivity system proposed by M. A. K. Halliday.

1.1 Background of the Study

Everybody needs to refresh their mind. It is usually done whenever they got tired after having done their work or in spare times in their daily routines. There are lot of ways can be done to fulfil that need. One of them is by getting some jokes.

People can get jokes in any forms. An easy way to get jokes is by reading in written form. Jokes can be found written in newspapers, magazines, or even websites. The contents of jokes are varied. They can be about political matters, technology, daily life situations, etc. And of course, it is very not wise to take such religion or race matters to be joked.

Jokes can be written, spoken, or done. A well known phrase from Halliday states that “when people speak or write, they produce text”. The term ‘text’ refers to any instance of language expressed in any medium, which makes sense to someone who knows language (Halliday and Hasan (1976) in Halliday and

Matthiessen (2004)). From this statement, we can include jokes to be a form of language. There are many jokes written in different languages in different countries. There is no exception that jokes can also be written in English and Indonesian. In Indonesia case, most of the people tend not to laugh when they read English jokes. This may because of the lack of English vocabulary they have and it seems that they are less likely to understand the meaning.

One thing that should be noticed in discussing meaning is transitivity system. "Transitivity is a system that focuses on building our experience around inside us. The transitivity system construes the world of experience into a manageable set of process types." (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004: 170). There are six types of the processes as follow, (1) the material process (realize referential concepts of doing and happening), (2) the verbal process (express referential concepts of saying), (3) the mental process (represent referential concepts of sensing), (4) the relational process (signal referential concepts of being and having), (5) the behavioral process (process of behaving), and (6) the existential process (process of existing).

In this study, the data sources are taken from 15 titles of English jokes from <http://www.rd.com/jokes> and 15 titles of Indonesian ones from <http://www.readersdigest.co.id/Humor> to be analysed and compared in terms of the transitivity system. By analyzing through the model of transitivity system proposed by M. A. K. Halliday, the researcher is interested to investigate the similarities and differences of the transitivity system of English and Indonesian jokes.

1.2 Research Problem

Concerning the focus of the study, the research is focused on answering the question: “what are the similarities and differences of the transitivity system of English and Indonesian written jokes in websites?”

Based on the research problem, there are sub-questions emerge as follow:

- 1.2.1 What are the similarities and differences between Indonesian and English process distribution?
- 1.2.2 What the similarities and differences between Indonesian and English verbal group in representing the process of meaning?
- 1.2.3 What are the similarities and differences between Indonesian and English nominal group in representing the participants?
- 1.2.4 What are the similarities and differences between Indonesian and English adverbial group and prepositional phrase in representing the circumstance?

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to investigate the transitivity of English and Indonesian written jokes in websites; kinds of process, participants and circumstances in order to investigate the similarity and difference in constructing meaning of clause structure in English and Indonesian written jokes.

1.4 Limitation of the Study

The study focuses on analyzing the similarities and the differences of transitivity system in representing the process, participants, and circumstance

between English and Indonesian written jokes. The result of this study cannot be generalized to other similar researches since the focus is limited to the 15 titles of English and Indonesian written jokes in each.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The results of the study are to enrich the knowledge and understanding about the transitivity system which is represented in written jokes. The similarities and the differences of English and Indonesian written jokes will reflect how Indonesian and English native speaker represent the world experiences through the clause modified by the verbal, nominal, and prepositional group into the written language. The results also lead the English teachers of Indonesia to be aware of the language structure and the use of expressions in writing English and Indonesian text. Thus, the teachers may teach the students to write the appropriate structure and expression, whether it is English or Indonesian 'style', so the reader may correctly get the message or everything the writer tries to deliver. Moreover, this study is worthy, inspiring and useful for readers, especially for researchers interested in conducting further study in the related issue.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides some theories related to the study. First, it deals with the theory of the transitivity system of M.A.K Halliday, particularly on the processes, the participants, and the circumstances. The second is about the study of contrastive analysis. The last is concerned with a little description of written jokes as the corpus of this study.

2.1 Transitivity System

Transitivity, originally proposed by MAK Halliday in 1967, is “the system which represents the world of experience into a manageable set of process types” (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004: 170). The process types express inner and outer experience. The outer experience is what we experience as going on around us. The typical of the outer experience is that of action and events: people or other actors do things and make them happen. While inner experience represents what we experience as going on inside ourselves in the world of consciousness (including perception, emotion, and imagination). English grammar distinguishes clearly between the outer experience, what we experience as going on around us, and the inner experience which deals with the consciousness.

Clause as representation is the way of a clause in representing an experiential meaning. Halliday and Mathiessen (2003: 169) pointed out that”... the clause construes a quantum of change as a figure, or configuration of a process,

participants involved in it and any attendant circumstances”. In the same way, Eggines (2004: 206) defined that “experiential meaning is expressed through the system of transitivity or process type, with the choice of process implicating associated participant roles and configuration”. Thus, it can be obtained that the clause as representation is realized in the term of the verbal group representing the process, the nominal group representing the participants, and the prepositional phrase representing the circumstance to represent the experiential meaning.

In representing the experiential meaning, there are six types of process proposed; they are material, mental, relational, behavioural, verbal, and existential processes. The processes are organized logically in a systemic ways. The material process exists to represent the action of doing and happening process, while the mental action is represented through mental process. There is a process lying between the first two processes, it is called behavioural process where it expresses the blend of the physical and psychological experiences. There is also the verbal process which expresses the verbal action. Then there are the relational process which exists to express the process of being and relating and the existential process which represents the process of existing.

Material processes ‘model outer experience’ An Laffut (2006: 157) are the processes of doing and happening. The participants involved are known as Actor and Goal. In material clause, it may involve one only participant, the Actor, for example *the lion (Actor) sprang*. This clause usually represents a ‘happening’ and is called intransitive. And there is a form representing a ‘doing’ named transitive. In this case, the process may need another participant, the goal, to be involved; for

example, *the lion* (Actor) *caught* (process) *the tourist* (Goal) (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 180).

Material processes represent not only the concrete or physical event but also the abstract processes of doing or happening. With a concrete process, which role a given participant is playing is usually clearly identified. A sharp distinction is seen as in *the boy kicked* (*operative/ active form*), *the boy* plays as Actor while in *the boy was kicked* (*receptive/ passive form*), where *the boy* is Goal. Besides, with a concrete process, an Actor may be involuntary and in some case like a Goal; for example, *the tourist collapsed*. This is considered as a happening rather than a doing because the probe is not *what did the tourist do?* but *what happened to the tourist?* (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 196). The material process may be transitive and intransitive. The intransitive one underlies the idea “What did x do?” therefore it needs only one participant (standing as the actor of a process) whereas the transitive one covers the idea “What did x do to y?” and it takes two participant to be associated with— x as the actor and y as the goal or range—.

Sometimes it is difficult to differentiate between a goal and a range. A goal is the direct participant to which the action is addressed to whereas a range is the ‘extension, restatement, or the continuation’ of a process. Hence, between range and a process, there is a logical relationship.

While with an abstract process, the difference between the ‘operative’ and ‘receptive’ forms are little. There is still some difference as seen in (*operative/ active form*) *the two schools combined* and (*receptive/ passive form*) *the two schools were combined*. If with the ‘receptive’ form we can ask for an explicit

Actor (who by?) but with the ‘operative’ form we cannot do so (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 196).

The summary of the “type of doing” and additional participants are shown in the table below:

Table 2.1 “Type of Doing” And Additional Participants in Material Process
(adapted from (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004)).

		intransitive	transitive
creative		Actor + happen	Actor + do
		<i>Icicles formed.</i>	<i>They built a house.</i>
			+Client: <i>They built me a house.</i>
transformative		happen to + Actor; Actor + do	happen to + Goal; Actor + do to + Goal
		<i>They melted.</i>	<i>The sun melted them.</i>
		<i>He ran away.</i>	<i>They chased him away.</i>
	elaboration	<i>They washed.</i> +Scope (process): <i>They played a game of tennis.</i> +Scope (entity):	<i>They washed the plates.</i> <i>They played.</i> +Attribute (resultative):

		<i>They played the piano.</i>	<i>They washed the plates clean. +Role (product): They cut it into cubes.</i>
	extension		<i>They donated a house. +Recipient: They gave him a house. +Accompaniment: provide sb with something</i>
	enhancement	<i>She crossed. +Scope (entity): She crossed the room. +Place: She crossed (the room) into the opposite corner.</i>	<i>She threw it. +Place: She threw it across the room.</i>

In our life, we talk not only about what we are doing but also what we think or feel about something. And the processes which ‘encode meanings of thinking or feeling’ (Halliday in Eggins (2004)) are known as mental processes. Mental processes are the process of sensing and concerned with the ‘inner experience’ (Halliday 1994). They deal with mental phenomena such as thoughts, feelings, emotion, perception, etc. These processes involve two participants:

Senser and Phenomenon. For example, *I* (Senser) *love* (mental process) *you* (Phenomenon). In written jokes, this process has a function as one of the ways of the writers of jokes represents someone experiences which are realized emotionally, intellectually and sensory in the real world into a language.

The summary of verbs in mental process and ‘type of sensing’ are shown in tables as follow:

Table 2.2 The Summary of Verbs Representing the Mental Process
(adapted from Halliday and Matthiessen (2004)).

Category of Mental Process	‘Like’ Type	‘Please’ Type
perceptive	perceive, sense, see, notice, hear, smell, taste, etc.	(assail)
cognitive	think, believe, expect, dream, imagine, remember, recall, etc	remind, escape, convince, surprise, etc
desiderative	want, wish, desire, like, hope (for), intend, etc	(tempt)
emotive	hate, abhor, loathe, enjoy,	attract, please,

	love, adore, etc	displease, sadden, horrify, entertain, etc
--	---------------------	--

Table 2.3 Type of Sensing
(adapted from Halliday and Matthiessen (2004)).

perceptive	cognitive	desiderative	emotive
<i>He saw the car</i>	<i>He knows the car</i>	<i>He wants the car</i>	<i>He likes the car</i>
<i>He saw the car speeding</i>	-	-	<i>He likes the car speeding</i>
<i>He saw that they had left</i>	<i>He thought that they had left</i>	<i>He wanted them to leave</i>	<i>He regretted that they had left</i>

Behavioural processes are located between material and mental processes. These processes express physiological and psychological behaviour, like breathing, coughing, smiling, dreaming, and staring (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 248). Behavioural clauses usually have only one participant involved called the Behaver. They can also contain a second participant which is a restatement of the process; it is called the Behaviour. If the participant is not a restatement of the process, then it is called a Phenomenon (Eggins 2004: 234). . In written jokes, this process represents an event happen and or an activity done by the actor toward the

goal. Besides, it is used to represent someone's relatively funny experience of physical activity that happen to them or their environment.

Table 2.4 Examples of the Verbs in the Behavioural Process
(adapted from Halliday and Matthiessen (2004)).

near mental	processes of consciousness represented as forms of behaviour	look, watch, stare, listen, think, worry, dream
near verbal	verbal processes as forms of behaviour	chatter, grumble, talk, gossip, argue, murmur, mouth
-	physiological processes manifesting states of consciousness	cry, laugh, smile, frown, sigh, sob, snarl, hiss, whine, nod
-	other physiological processes	breathe, sneeze, cough, hiccup, burp, faint, shit, yawn, sleep
near material	bodily postures and pastimes	sing, dance, lie (down), sit (up, down)

Verbal processes are the processes of saying. These typically involve three participants: Sayer, Receiver, and Verbiage. Sayer refers to the first participant that expresses the activity of saying or the verbal process. Receiver is the participant to whom the verbal process is directed. Verbiage refers to the content what is said. erbal process may project a second clause by either quoting or

reporting. For example, *Andi* (Sayer) *told* (verbal process) *her* (Receiver) *a lot of rubbish* (Verbiage). Verbals may project a second clause by either quoting or reporting. Example of quoted speech: *She* (Sayer) *said* (Verbal process) *'I love you'* (Quoted). While in reported speech: *I* (Sayer) *asked* (Verbal process) *them* (Receiver) *to tell the truth* (Reported). In written jokes, this process is to represent activities of quoting or reporting someone's relatively funny experiences or thoughts to the reader.

Table 2.5 Verbal Process Expressing Quotes and Reports
(adapted from Halliday and Matthiessen (2004)).

Quotes	John	said	'I'm hungry'
	Quoting		Quoted
Reports	John	said	he was hungry.
	Reporting		Reported

As mentioned above that relational processes are one of the three major types of process proposed by Halliday, have important services to characterize and to identify (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 210). These are the processes of being and having. These processes are classified into two types: attributive and identifying. In the 'attributive' form, the participants are Attribute and Carrier. The Attribute belongs to or is attributed to the Carrier e.g. *mice* (Carrier) *are* (intensive process) *timid creatures* (Attribute). In the 'identifying' form, the participants are Identified and Identifier. The Identified is an element which is identified by the Identifier which functions as identity e.g. *Alice* (Identified) *is* (process) *the clever one* (Identifier) (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004). In written

jokes, the daily life experiences relating to ascribing a characteristic of something are represented by this process named Relational Attributive process while the relational identifying has a function as showing or giving identity to something.

Table 2.6 Relational Process (adapted from Suzanne Eggins (2004))

relational	Attributive	intensive	Di is a blood donor.	
		circumstantial	as attributive	<i>The operation was in Geneva.</i>
			as process	<i>The operation lasted one hour.</i>
			as participant	<i>The story was Diana's.</i>
			as process	<i>Diana has a daughter.</i>
	Identifying	intensive	<i>Women are the brave ones.</i>	
		circumstantial	as participants	<i>The best place to give blood is in Geneva</i>
			as process	<i>The operation took one hour.</i>
		possessive	as participant	<i>The bomb was her boyfriend's.</i>
			as process	<i>The bomb belonged to the boyfriend's.</i>

The last type of process is Existential processes. The processes represent that there was/ is something or something exists or happens e.g. *there was snow on the ground* (Eggins 2004: 238). The participant involved in these processes is the Existent, which can be represented by a 'thing' such person, object, etc. or by any action or event, as in *there was another robbery in the street* (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 258).

2.1.1 Process, Participant, and Circumstance

As Halliday (1994 p. 107) states that the ‘process’, in principle, consists of (1) the process itself, (2) participants involved in the process, and (3) circumstances associated with the process.

2.1.1.1 Process

A process in a clause plays the most important role since it construes experiential meaning and is realized by the form of verbal groups. Concerning the verbal group, Halliday and Matthiessen (2004:335) define the verbal group “the verbal group is the constituent that functions as finite plus predicator (or as predicator alone if there is no finite element) in the mood structure (clause as exchange) and as process in the transitivity structure (clause as representation).”

In English clause, a verbal group consists of finite plus predicator or predicator alone, while in Indonesian, verb only consists of predicator, without any finites. This occurs because there is no tense (time or event assigner) in Indonesian clause. The form of Indonesian predicator doesn’t change even though the time of the event is changing.

The predicators of Indonesian clause may be attached with prefix only, suffix only, or both of them. Alwi et. al. (109-117) classified Indonesian verbal prefix into *meng-*, *per-*, *ber-*, *ter-* and *-di* and Indonesian verbal suffix into *-kan*, *-I*, and *-an*.

2.1.1.2 Participant

In a clause, a participant plays the second role in representing meaning. It represents the thing that experiences the process and the thing to which the process is addressed to. A participant is realized by the form of nominal group. A nominal group may contain a head (thing) only or a head with pre-modifier and post-modifier. Pre-modifier consists of Deictic, Numerative, Epithet, and Classifier, while the Post Modifier consists of a Qualifier.

Both English and Indonesian nominal group have similar elements but different in the structure. In English, the pattern is fixed where the Pre-modifier (deictic, numerative, epithet and classifier) comes before the Thing and the Post-modifier (qualifier) comes after the Thing. In Indonesian, the deictic and the numerative may come before and after the thing while the epithet, classifier, and qualifier are placed after the Thing.

2.1.1.3 Circumstances

In a clause, a circumstance plays the third role in expressing the experiential meaning. It provides additional meaning of situation. A circumstance may be realized in the form of prepositional phrase or adverbial group. Halliday and Matthiesen (2004:360) pointed out that “a prepositional phrase consists of a preposition plus a nominal group...”. The head of the prepositional phrase is a preposition.

Halliday and Matthiessen (2004) divide the circumstances into 9 types as follows:

Table 2.7 Types of the Circumstances By Halliday And Matthiessen

No.	Types	Specific, categories (subtypes)
1.	Extent	Distance, Duration
2.	Location	Place, Time
3.	Manner	Means, Quality, Comparison
4.	Cause	Reason, Purpose, Behalf
5.	Contingency	Condition, Concession, Default
6.	Accompaniment	Comitation, Addition
7.	Role	Guise, Product
8.	Matter	
9.	Angle	

2.2 The Study of Contrastive Analysis

Contrastive analysis is “an approach which is represented from perceived similarities of meaning across two or more languages, and determines the ways those similarities or shared meanings are expressed in different languages”

(Andrew Chesterman (1998)). This is used to compare phonological systems, morphological systems, syntax and the lexicon of two or more languages in order to know its relatedness to one another and its typology of similarities and differences. Moreover, this can exploit the analysis of language function, the notion of language as meaning potential, textual phenomena above the sentence (64-65). In CA, there is a well-known terminology called *tertium comparationis* (TC). As James (1980) mentioned that the TC can serve as “a basis for interlingual comparison”. Based on that, it is considered that the transitivity system of English as the basis for comparison and of Indonesian as the target.

The similarity is a state when people or things look or are the same (Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary – 3rd Edition). The difference is a state when two or more things which are compared are not the same (Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary – 3rd Edition). Different with the difference in which the concept is relatively clear, the similarity is not that simple and considered as a problematic concept actually. It is related to perception and cognition. It doesn’t only deal with entities “being similar”, but also of them “being thought of as similar”. As what can be inferred from Andrew’s is that this enables to identify entities, name, refer, “deictically” locate, and classify them, in terms of perceived similarities with other entities. What is meant by to perceive a similarity is to “see something as something else and to imagine it in a particular way” (Andrew Chesterman (1998)).

2.3 The Study of Jokes

According to Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary- 3rd Edition, joke means 'something, such as a funny story or trick, which is said or done in order to make people laugh'. The word 'joke' was firstly said to have been originated in ancient Greece in 1200 BC (retrieved from <http://www.funny-jokes.arollo.com/origin.html>).

Jokes can be spoken, written or done. The purpose is to entertain. What makes jokes different with the other texts is the presence of the "punchline" in jokes. As CJ Alexander states in his article that a joke consists of three elements: the "set-up", the "punchline", and an optional element that is the "tag" (CJ Alexander. (2008) *Joke Structure: Setup, Punchline, Tag*. Retrieved July 29 2012 from <http://www.creatingacomic.com/2009/how-to-write-a-joke-joke-structure/>). The "set-up" is the "premise" of a joke that provides any background information for the "punchline". The "punchline" itself is a "twist" on the information provided in the "set-up" which typically abuses the premise. The "tag" is additional information that comes directly after the "punchline" (Miller Barry. 2010. *The Art of Stand-Up: Basic joke structure*. Retrieved July 29 2012 from <http://www.examiner.com/article/the-art-of-stand-up-basic-joke-structure>).

2.4 Theoretical Framework

In order to investigate the realization of structure of meaning in English and Indonesian written jokes in websites, this study used the theory of Transitivity System which was proposed by M.A.K. Halliday. Transitivity system allows an

analysis of the meaning of clauses through ‘choice of process types and participants roles seen as realizing interactants’ encoding of their experimental reality: the world of action, relation, participants and circumstances that give context to their talk’ (Eggins, 1994:220).

Transitivity system reveals the representation meaning (what the clause is about, it reflects in language of processes, the participant therein, and the circumstantial features associated with them. The transitivity system is the language system which represents the experience into a convenient set of process types. The experience consists of ‘going on’ (happening, doing, sensing, meaning, being, and also becoming. In this study, the type of process would be material, mental, relational, verbal, behavioural, and existential process. The writer would explore the distribution of processes and its function in written jokes in general way.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides the theoretical framework and research methodology used in this study. The methodologies are about Research Methodology, Data and Data Source, Data Collection Procedure, and Data Analysis Procedure.

3.1 Research Method

This method used in this study was the content analysis approach. The data here is viewed as ‘representations of texts, images, and expressions that are created to be seen, read, interpret, and act on for their meaning and then must be analyzed with such uses in mind’ (Krippendorff, 2004: xiii). The purposes of content analysis which proposed by Berelson (1952) in Neuendorf (2002) are: (a) to describe substance characteristics of message content, (b) to describe form characteristics of message content, (c) to make inferences to producers of content, (d) to make inferences to audiences of content, and (e) to determine the effects of the content to the audience. By using the content analysis, this would help the writer in analyzing the realization of structure of meaning in English and Indonesian written jokes.

In conducting the content analysis study, Wilkinson (2000) proposed five steps. First, ‘conducting the problem in the study for questions emerging’, this step was already done by the writer in Chapter 1. Second, deciding the data which will be analyzed, this was also done and would be described further in the following subchapter. Third is, constructing the categories of coding procedure.

Fourth, conducting the content analysis, this means that a specific measurement has to be selected in analyzing the data. Fifth, interpreting the findings, this would be presented in chapter 4.

3.2 Data and Data Sources

The data which were analyzed are clauses of the chosen titles of jokes written in both websites. The English jokes were retrieved from <http://www.rd.com/jokes> and for Indonesian ones were retrieved from <http://www.readersdigest.co.id/humor>. For English jokes, 15 titles of jokes which belong to ‘Daily Life Jokes’ category are: (1) *Judging the Restaurant by its Name*, (2) *Organization*, (3) *The Difference between an Optimist and a Pessimist*, (4) *Lawnmower Upgrade*, (5) *Gassing Up*, (6) *Life or Something Like It*, (7) *Moving Time*, (8) *Airplane Talk*, (9) *Cooking Tip*, (10) *Long Day*, (11) *Overhead at the Salon*, (12) *Everyday Occurrence*, (13) *Good Eulogy*, (14) *Location*, and (15) *Hi-Def*. For Indonesian jokes, the 15 titles which belong to ‘Humoria’ category are: (1) *Psst..jangan kasih tahu yang lain ya*, (2) *Budiman bukannya nama bis, ya?*, (3) *Merdeka!!*, (4) *Korek Api untuk Komputer*, (5) *Aturan Ibu*, (6) *Situs Main Tennis*, (7) *Apa Rencana Anda?*, (8) *Ikan Kejang*, (9) *Undangan Pesta Ulang Tahun*, (10) *Aku Cinta Kamu*, (11) *Ikut Clubbing*, (12) *Serangga Centil*, (13) *Cita-Cita*, (14) *Judul Berita*, and (15) *Keramas*.

The following table describes the source of the data:

Table 3.1 Data of Study

No	Sources	Numbers of clauses	Identities of clauses
1.	English written jokes	122	1 En – 122 En
2	Indonesian written jokes	116	1 I – 116 I

Notes: En (English), I (Indonesian)

3.3 Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected through following steps, they are:

- 1) collecting and choosing jokes written in <http://www.rd.com> and in <http://www.readersdigest.co.id>,
- 2) reading the chosen jokes carefully,
- 3) breaking down each jokes into clauses,
- 4) identifying the clauses and putting them into analysis table.

3.4 Data Analysis Procedure

The data would be analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. These include several steps:

- 1) breaking all the clauses into the division of clauses of transitivity system and identifying the types of process of English and Indonesian written jokes,
- 2) categorizing each clause in terms of the types of process, the participant(s), and the circumstance(s) based on the Transitivity System and in the term of the verbal group, the nominal group, and the prepositional group and then presenting them into the analysis table. The following tables are used to analyze the data:

Table 3.2 Process Distribution Analysis

[illegible]

Table 3.3 Transitivity System Analysis

[illegible]

Table 3.4 English Verbal Group Analysis

No.	Finite		Non-finite			Predicator	Tense
	Finite	Modal	To-infinitive	Present Participle	Past Participle		

Table 3.5 Indonesian Verb Analysis

No.	Prefix	Root	Suffix

Table 3.6 English Nominal Group Analysis

No.	Participant	Deictic	Numerative	Epithet	Classifier	Thing	Qualifier

Table 3.7 Indonesian Nominal Group Analysis

[illegible]

Table 3.8 English Prepositional Phrase Analysis

[illegible]

Table 3.9 Indonesian Prepositional Phrase Analysis

Prepositional Phrase									Clause	Circ Type
No	Preposition	Deictic	Numerative	Thing	Deictic2	Epithet	Classifier	Qualifier		Circ Type

- 3) counting the percentage of the occurrence of the process types,
- 4) discussing the findings and comparing them in order to investigate the similarities and difference between English and Indonesian written jokes in terms of the transitivity,
- 5) and finally, drawing a conclusion in the end of chapter 5.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter provides the findings and discussion of the transitivity system of English and Indonesian written jokes. It deals with the analysis of the processes distribution, the verbal group, the nominal group, and the adverbial group and the prepositional phrase. The discussion was conducted by face-to-face contrasting those elements in both languages to figure out the similarities and the differences of each element.

4.1 Data Description

The data in this study are described in groups as follow: (1) the processes distribution in English and Indonesian written jokes, (2) the analysis table of the transitivity system of English and Indonesian, (3) the analysis table of the verb and verbal group representing the process, (4) the analysis table of nominal group, representing the participant and (5) the analysis table of the adverbial group and prepositional phrase representing the circumstance.

4.2 Processes Distribution

In expressing experiences, there are some questions arise: what was done, who did it, and (optionally) where, when, why, or how the experiences was done. Those questions are answered by the term of process, participants, and circumstance in a clause. In transitivity system, the heart of experiences refers to processes. The process determines a unit of experiences and relates to the

activities which are going on in the clause. The processes in which the experience is determined are many and varied.

4.2.1 Comparison of English and Indonesian Processes Distribution

Table 4.1 Comparison of Process Distribution

Type of Process	English Percentage	Indonesian Percentage
Material	40.2%	43.1%
Mental	11.5%	15.5%
Verbal	25.4%	23.3%
Relational		
• Attributive	17.2%	12.1%
• Identifying	4.1%	4.3%
• Possessive	0.8%	0.0%
Behavioral	0.0%	1.7%
Existential	0.8%	0.0%
Total	100%	100%

Based on the comparative table of process distribution above, it can be concluded that the similarities and the differences of the transitivity system of English and Indonesian written jokes in websites are:

4.2.1.1 the similarities:

Both languages distribute five types of the processes: the material, the mental, the verbal, the relational attributive and the relational identifying process.

Material process is a process of doing and happening. In written jokes, this process represents an event happen and or an activity done by the actor toward the goal. Besides, it is used to represent someone's experience of physical activity that happen to them or their environment, for example:

I dusted the screen. [122 En]

Aku memberhentikan sebuah taksi. [15 I]

The two clauses involve the actor, *I* and *Aku*, as the doer of the process, **dusted** and **memberhentikan**, and the goal as the element which is affected by the process, *the screen* and *sebuah taksi*. Besides, there is another participant involved in material process named Range, as in *We* (actor) **do** (process) *it* (range) *all the time* (circ. frequency) [86 En] and in *anak saya, Fauzan (4,5)* (actor) **bermain** (process) *game di komputer* (range) [25 I]. Material process in written jokes also shares an extra element called the circumstance, which gives additional information of when, where, how, and why to the process. In this case, both languages have the same dominant circumstance which is realized in the place type. It is considered that the writers of the jokes emphasize where the processes occur or are done.

Mental process is the process of sensing, feeling, thinking, wanting, and perceiving. This can be realized emotionally, intellectually and sensory. In written jokes, this process has a function as one of the ways of the writers of jokes represents someone experiences which are realized emotionally, intellectually and sensory in the real world into a language, for example:

A fellow shopper commiserated with her [117 En]

Aku cinta kepadamu. [84 I]

The two clauses involve the Sensor, *A fellow shopper* and *Aku*, who ‘senses’ the Phenomenon, *her* and *-mu (kamu)*.

Verbal process is the process of saying. In the term of the function in written jokes, verbal process relates to the activities of quoting or reporting someone's experience or thoughts to the reader. In this case, the writer of jokes places him/her self as a facilitator to the reader. For example:

*"Have you changed clothes?" she **asked**.* [63 En]

*"Buat apa?" saya **bertanya**.* [45 I]

Both clauses involve the sayer, *she* and *saya*, who is speaking. Here, what is said by the sayer is directly quoted. While in *(dia) **memberitahu** bahwa undangan itu hanya berlaku untuk teman-teman dekatnya* [77 I], what the sayer said is indirectly reported. The content of what is said is called verbiage.

Relational processes involve state of being, having, relating, and identifying. In written jokes, the daily life experiences relating to ascribing a funny characteristic of something are represented by this process named relational attributive process, *i.e. this thing **is** great* [17 En] and *ketika ruangan **menjadi** cukup terang* [43 I]. The two clauses include the carrier, *this thing* and *ruangan*, which carry the attribute, *great* and *cukup terang*, where the quality or the adjective (attribute) is assigned to the participant (carrier).

Besides, there is a relational process that has a function as showing or giving identity to something. This is called relational identifying process. The distribution of this process can be seen as in *An optimist **is** the guy who created the airplane* [12 En] and in *cita-cita saya **adalah** menjadi petugas pemadam kebakaran* [102 I]. From the example, it is seen that there are two

participants involved; the identified, *An optimist* and *cita-cita saya*, which is given identification by the identifier, *the guy who created the airplane* and *menjadi petugas pemadam kebakaran*. Thus, the relational identifying can be said as the process of the Identifier serving to define the identity of the identified.

English and Indonesian jokes have the material process as the dominant process in its distribution. It indicates that both languages mostly involve activities of representing a funny event happen and or a funny activity done by the actor towards the goal.

Another similarity is that the verbal process takes the second place as the dominant process in both English and Indonesian written jokes. This indicates that both of languages in their written jokes mostly include activities of quoting or reporting someone's funny experience or thought to the reader.

The other is that the relational processes come as the third dominant process followed by the mental process. This is considered that written jokes tend to share the daily life experiences relating to ascribing a characteristic of something and showing or giving identity to something more compare to the mental process which represents human experiences which are realized emotionally, intellectually and sensory in the real world into a language.

4.2.1.2 the differences:

The relational possessive attributive process is found in English written jokes even though it is distributed only 0.8% of the whole clauses broken down, *i.e.* *I*(possessor) *just got*(process) *a GPS*(possessed) *for my car* [105 En]. But the process is not found in Indonesian. This is considered that in Indonesian, an expression of possessing or having is not commonly used.

The behavioral process includes human physiological and psychological behavior like smiling, staring, coughing, etc. This process is found in Indonesian while not in English. For example, *anggota keluargaku yang lain* (behave) *hanya senyum-senyum saja* (process), *sebelum akhirnya kujelaskan maksudku* [22 I]. It indicates that in Indonesian written jokes, there is still a tendency to express the physiological and psychological behavior.

The other difference is that it is found the Existential process in English but not in Indonesian, as in *There was no sign of smoke* [77 En]. This shows that in Indonesian written jokes, it is not inclined to express process of existing or happening.

The English verbal groups can be composed of two main elements (finite and predicator), a finite, or a non-finite element. The finite do occurs to represent simple tenses. The finite 'be' is to indicate continuous tenses and simple tenses (relational process). The finite 'have' is used to indicate 'perfect' tenses. Different with it, Indonesian verbs are comprised of predicator only or predicator with a modal i.e. *harus* (modal) *lihat* (predicator). This occurs since Indonesian process doesn't have tenses modification. The time when the process occurs will not affect the predicator. Moreover, Indonesian verbs may be modified with a prefix, a suffix, or prefix + suffix. While in English, predicator consists of a verbal head modified with grammatical inflection of the tense changes.

4.4 Nominal Group

The participants have an essential role in a clause. The role is that the participants act as the doer of the process or as the one who is treated by the process. Participants are usually realized by nominal group consisting of the thing as its head and some nominal modification's elements.

Essentially, nominal group consists of pre modifier and post modifier. Those parts are functioning to give the modification to the thing. The pre modifier comes before the thing and consists of information of deictic, numerative, epithet, and classifier of the thing, while the post modifier is the additional information which comes after the thing. This is called qualifier. A qualifier can be a word, phrase, or clause. If the nominal group serves those elements well, it can be said that the author strongly recommends the thing.

Table 4.4 Comparison of English and Indonesian
Percentage of Nominal Group

Pattern of Nominal Group	English Percentage	Indonesian Percentage
D+T	20.8%	3%
D+T(T+C)+C(T+E)	-	0.6%
D+T+C	-	1.8%
D+T+Q	5.2%	0.6%
D+N+T	1.2%	-
D+N+T(N+T)	-	0.6%
D+N+T+Q	1.7%	-
D+N+E+C+T	0.6%	-
D+C+T	4.6%	-
D+E+T	0.6%	-
D+E+C+T	1.3%	-
D+E+T+Q	0.6%	-
N+T	1.7%	0.6%
N+E+T	0.6%	-
N+T+E	-	1.2%
N+T+Q	-	0.6%
T	57.8%	55.6%
T (T+C) + D	-	1.2%
T (T+C) + D+Q		0.6%
T (T+E) + D	-	0.6%
T+C	-	4.1%
T+C+Q	-	1.2%
T+D	-	13.0%
T+D(D+T+C+Q)	-	0.6%
T+D+E	-	0.6%
T+D+Q	-	4.1%
T+E	-	1.8%
T+E+Q	-	0.6%
T+Q	3.5%	7.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Based on the comparative table above, it is obtained the similarities and the differences of English and Indonesian participants as follow:

4.4.1.1 the similarities:

Both languages have all the similar elements of the nominal group, they are: deictic (d), numerative (n), epithet (e), classifier (c), thing (t), and

qualifier (q). The patterns which occur in both languages are deictic + thing (d+t), deictic + thing + qualifier (d+t+q), thing (t), and thing + qualifier (t+q).

The pattern that dominantly occurs in both languages is the ‘thing’ (T). Thing is used to represent a participant consisting of only a head. After the thing, the pattern which consists of element deictic and thing comes as the second dominant pattern. The pattern represents a participant who is accompanied with a demonstrative. It is considered that English and Indonesian tend to use simple pattern of nominal group to represent the participants.

4.4.1.2 the differences:

In English, the deictic must precede the thing while in Indonesian, it may come before the Thing i.e. *sebuah* (d) *taksi* (t) or even after the thing as in *anak* (t) *saya* (d). Second, if the Epithet of English nominal group must come before the Thing as in *a* (d) *huge* (e) *semi* (t), it doesn’t occur in Indonesian where epithet comes after the thing as in *pekerjaan* (t) *baru* (e). Another element that must come before the thing is classifier i.e. *the* (d) *human* (c) *race* (t). This is different with Indonesian where the classifier comes after the thing as in *seorang* (d) *gadis* (t) *Jerman* (c).

The other difference lies in the variation of the patterns which occur. In English written jokes, there are 13 different patterns; they are D+T, D+N+T, D+N+T+Q, D+N+E+C+T, D+C+T, D+E+T, D+E+C+T, D+E+T+Q, D+T+Q, N+T, N+E+T, T, T+Q. whereas in Indonesian, it occurs 20 patterns as follow: D+N+T(N+T), D+T, D+T(T+C)+C(T+E), D+T+C,

D+T+Q, N+T, N+T+E, N+T+Q, T, T (T+C) + D, T (T+E) + D, T+C, T+C+Q, T+D, T+D(D+T+C+Q), T+D+E, T+D+Q, T+E, T+E+Q, and T+Q.

This is considered that the structure of elements in Indonesian Nominal Group of written jokes is more variable than in English one.

4.5 Adverbial Group and Prepositional Phrase

4.5.1 Comparison of Adverbial Group in English and Indonesian Written Jokes

Table 4.5 Comparison of English and Indonesian Adverbial Group

English		Indonesian	
Adverb	Example	Adverb	Example
just	I'm just calling... (no. 53)	dengan santai	Saya menjawab dengan santai ... (no. 94)
unprotected	I'm walking around unprotected ... (no. 71)	tiba-tiba	tiba-tiba lampu padam. (no. 26)

The similarity of English and Indonesian adverbial group lies in their function as the modifier of the participant and the process. For example, *I'm walking around **unprotected*** and *saya menjawab **dengan santai***, both of them put the additional information of how the participants do the process.

Table 4.7 Comparison of English and Indonesian
Percentage of Prepositional Phrase

Pattern of Prepositional Group	English Percentage	Indonesian Percentage
P+E+T+Q	5.0%	-
P+D+T	45.0%	-
P+T	-	17.1%
P+N+T+Clause	2.5%	-
P+D+T+Clause	2.5%	-
P+N+T	7.5%	-
P+D+C+T	7.5%	-
P+D+E+T	2.5%	-
P+D+E+T+Q	2.5%	-
P+D+T+Q	2.5%	-
P+T+Q	-	4.9%
P+E+(T)	2.5%	-
P+CLAUSE	-	48.8%
P+T+E+C+Q	-	2.4%
P+T+C+Q	-	2.4%
P+T+D	-	9.8%
P+T+C	-	4.9%
P+T(T+C)+D	-	4.9%
P+T+E	-	4.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

4.5.2.1 the similarities

The first similarity is that both of languages have Prepositional phrase which is used to represent circumstances and consists of a preposition as a head plus a nominal group. The second, both of languages consist of six similar elements of prepositional phrase; they are preposition (p), deictic (d), thing (t), epithet (e), classifier (c) and qualifier (q). Second, there are two same patterns which occur; they are p+t i.e. *of* (p) *us* (t) and *di* (p) *kantor* (t) and p+t+q i.e. *in* (p) *outfit* (t) *number two* (q) and *ke* (p) *Museum Gajah* (t) *di jalan merdeka barat* (q). Further, a clause may function to represent

circumstance and consist a predicator as the head as in *(for) two days (pp) to do it all* (clause) and in *untuk (pp) mengambil uang* (clause).

The Prepositional Phrase of both languages share circumstance of place at the most. It indicates that the location where the process is done or happens is emphasized here.

4.5.2.2 the differences

It has been explained that there are some differences in the location where each elements of Nominal Group are located between English and Indonesian. So are in Indonesian prepositional phrase, where the pattern of the nominal group that follows the preposition is deictic, numerative, thing, epithet, classifier, and qualifier. The second difference is that element of numerative doesn't occur in Indonesian written jokes. It indicates that Indonesian tend not to express the quantity of the Thing.

In English written jokes, the most dominant pattern occurs is P+D+T i.e. *in the car*. It indicates that English jokes tend to express the location where the process is done or happens directly to the thing. In Indonesian, the pattern which dominantly occurs is 'P+Clause' i.e. *untuk menyalakan lilin*. This indicates that Indonesian written jokes tend to express the circumstance of the process by telling another process. There are 12 patterns occur in English as follow: P+E+T+Q, P+D+T, P+T, P+N+T+CLAUSE, P+D+T+CLAUSE, P+N+T, P+D+C+T, P+D+E+T, P+D+E+T+Q, P+D+T+Q, P+T+Q, AND P+E+(T). While in Indonesian, P+CLAUSE, P+T+E+C+Q, P+T+Q, P+T, P+T+C+Q, P+T+D, P+T+C, P+T(T+C)+D, and P+T+E.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 Conclusion

Based on the analysis, both English and Indonesian written jokes have some similarities and differences in realizing their transitivity system. The similarities and differences of those written jokes realize in the three elements of transitivity system: the verbal group representing the process, the nominal group representing the participants, and the prepositional group representing the circumstances.

Both English and Indonesian written jokes have material and verbal process as the two dominant processes in their distribution. This can be concluded that both languages mostly tell about events happen and or an activity done by the actor towards the goal and also share about activities of quoting or reporting someone's experiences or thoughts to the readers in constructing meaning in written jokes.

In the term of verbal group representing the process, the result shows that the English verbal group can be composed of two main elements (finite and predicator), a finite, or a non-finite element. The finite do occurs to represent simple tenses. The finite 'be' is to indicate continuous tenses and simple tenses (relational process). The finite 'have' is used to indicate 'perfect' tenses. Different with it, Indonesian verbs are comprised of predicator only or predicator with a modal i.e. *harus* (modal) *lihat* (predicator). This occurs since Indonesian process

doesn't have tenses modification. The time when the process occurs will not affect the predicator. Moreover, Indonesian verbs may be modified with a prefix, a suffix, or prefix + suffix. While in English, predicator consists of a verbal head modified with grammatical inflection of the tense changes.

The first difference lies in the distribution of mental and relational process. As well as material and verbal process, mental and relational processes have also a slightly different number of percentages, but in this case, English written jokes distribute relational processes more than Indonesian do. In Indonesian jokes, mental process is distributed more dominant than in English ones. This indicates that Indonesian shares human experiences which are realized emotionally, intellectually and sensory in the real world into a language more. The relational possessive attributive process is found in English written jokes, but not in Indonesian. This is considered that in Indonesian, an activity of possessing or having is not commonly used. Besides, the way of expressing the process can be replaced by providing the information of possessing the thing directly after the thing.

The behavioral process includes human physiological and psychological behavior like smiling, staring, coughing, etc. This process is found in Indonesian while not in English. It indicates that in Indonesian written jokes, there is still a tendency to express the physiological and psychological behavior. The other difference is that it is found the existential process in English but not in Indonesian. This shows that in Indonesian written jokes, it is not inclined to express the process of existing or happening.

The second element of the transitivity is the nominal group representing the participants. Both languages have all the similar elements of nominal group, they are: deictic (d), numerative (n), epithet (e), classifier (c), thing (t), and qualifier (q). the patterns which occur in both languages are deictic + thing (d+t), deictic + thing + qualifier (d+t+q), thing (t), and thing + qualifier (t+q).

The pattern that dominantly occurs in both languages is the 'Thing' (T). Thing is used to represent a participant consisting of only a head. After the Thing, the pattern which consists of element deictic and thing comes as the second dominant pattern. The pattern represents a participant who is accompanied with a demonstrative. It is considered that English and Indonesian tend to use simple pattern of nominal group to represent the participants.

In English, the deictic must precede the thing while in Indonesian; it may come before the thing or even after the thing. Second, if the epithet of English nominal group must come before the, it doesn't occur in Indonesian where epithet comes after the thing. Another element that must come before the thing is classifier. This is different with Indonesian where the classifier comes after the Thing.

The other difference lies in the variation of the patterns which occur. In English written jokes, there are 13 different patterns, while in Indonesian, it occurs 20 patterns. This is considered that the structure of elements in Indonesian Nominal Group of written jokes is more variable than in English one.

The third element of the transitivity is the prepositional phrase representing the circumstance. The result shows that both of languages have

Prepositional phrase which is used to represent circumstances and consists of a preposition as a head plus a nominal group. The second, both of languages consist of six similar elements of prepositional phrase; they are preposition (p), deictic (d), thing (t), epithet (e), classifier (c) and qualifier (q). second, there are two same patterns which occur; they are p+t and p+t+q. Further, a clause may function to represent circumstance and it consists of a predicator.

The prepositional phrase of both languages share circumstance of place at the most. It indicates that the location where the process is done or happens is emphasized here.

There are some differences in the location where each elements of nominal group are located between English and Indonesian. So are in Indonesian prepositional phrase, where the pattern of the nominal group that follows the preposition is deictic, numerative, thing, epithet, classifier, and qualifier. The second difference is that element of numerative doesn't occur in Indonesian written jokes. It indicates that Indonesian tend not to express the quantity of the thing.

In English written jokes, the most dominant pattern occurs is p+d+t. It indicates that English jokes tend to express the location where the process is done or happens directly to the thing. In Indonesian, the pattern which dominantly occurs is 'P+Clause'. This indicates that Indonesian written jokes tend to express the circumstance of the process by telling another process.

There are 12 patterns occur in English as follow: P+E+T+Q, P+D+T, P+T, P+N+T+CLAUSE, P+D+T+CLAUSE, P+N+T, P+D+C+T, P+D+E+T,

P+D+E+T+Q, P+D+T+Q, P+T+Q, and P+E+(T) while in Indonesian, it occurs 9 patterns as follow: P+CLAUSE, P+T+E+C+Q, P+T+Q, P+T, P+T+C+Q, P+T+D, P+T+C, P+T(T+C)+D, and P+T+E.

5.2 Recommendation

Based on the findings and discussion of the transitivity system between English and Indonesian written jokes, it is recommended that by learning the transitivity system, it can give new insight and broader views in comparing the English and Indonesian text. Each language has its own structure and function, by learning it, people can understand what others mean especially about concepts and thoughts. Thus it can be implied in the real life and it is hoped that there is no more misunderstanding and misinterpret the text. The transitivity system is an important element in language. When people write a text, s/he should write the correct and clear structure of meaning so the reader may correctly get the message or everything the writer tries to deliver.

The study has revealed a small number of English and Indonesian written jokes in websites. Due to the limitation of the study, the results are not able to generalize all types of jokes. In addition, to improve this study, it is also suggested to conduct further research in the same field in different types of jokes.

REFERENCES

- Alwi, et. Al. *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia*. Edisi Ketiga. Jakarta:
Balai Pustaka. 1988/2000
- Chesterman, Andrew. *Contrastive Functional Analysis*. Philadelphia: John
Benjamins Publishing Co., 1998.
- Eggins, Suzanne. *An Introduction to a Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London:
Continuum International Publishing Group, 2004.
- Eggins, Suzanne. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London:
Pinter, 1994.
- Ferraresi, Gisella, and Maria Goldbach. *Principles of Syntactic Reconstruction*.
Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 2008.
- Halliday, M.A.K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar (2nd ed.)*. London:
Arnold, 1994.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Matthiessen. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*
(3rd ed.). London: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- James, Carl. *Contrastive Analysis*. Harlow, Essex: Longman Group Ltd.
1980/1990.
- Krippendorff, Klaus. *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*
(second edition). California: Sage Publication, Inc., 2004.

Laffut, An. *Three-Participants Constructions in English: A functional-cognitive approach to caused relations*. John Benjamins Publishing Co: Amsterdam, 2006.

Neuendorf, K.A. *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. California: Sage Publication, Inc., 2002.

Wilkinson, David. *The Researcher's Toolkit: The Complete Guide to Practitioner Research*. London: RoutledgeFalmer, 2000.

Difference. (2008). In Elizabeth Walter (Ed.). *Cambridge Advance Learner's Dictionary*. 3rd Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Joke. (2008). In Elizabeth Walter (Ed.). *Cambridge Advance Learner's Dictionary*. 3rd Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Similarity. (2008). In Elizabeth Walter (Ed.). *Cambridge Advance Learner's Dictionary*. 3rd Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CJ Alexander. (2008). Citing Websites. *Joke Structure: Setup, Punchline, Tag*. Retrieved July 29 2012 from <http://www.creatingacomic.com/2009/how-to-write-a-joke-joke-structure/>

Miller, Barry. (2010). Citing Websites. *The Art of Stand-Up: Basic joke structure*. Retrieved July 29 2012 from <http://www.examiner.com/article/the-art-of-stand-up-basic-joke-structure>

The Origin of Jokes. About Jokes. (n. d.). Retrieved April 10 2012 from <http://www.funny-jokes.arollo.com/origin.html>