A TRANSITIVITY ANALYSIS OF IDEATIONAL MEANING IN TWO TEXTS

Dela Elysabet Sihite[1], Syeila Nurifki[2], Nia Putri Rahmadina[3], Selfi Anjany[4], Afiyah Syafina[5], Rahel Salsabila[6], Shaquille Adam Rafa Dhero[7], Johannes Jefria Gultom[8] , M.Eko Isdianto[9]

English Education Departement.
Faculty of Languages and Arts,
Medan State University, Medan 20221, Indonesia,
delasihite.2253121052@mhs.unimed.ac.id[1] ,
Ellapopop.2251121008@mhs.unimed.ac.id[2],
niaw.2253121040@mhs.unimed.ac.id[3],
selfi.2251121046@mhs.unimed.ac.id[4],
afiyahsy.2253121099@mhs.unimed.ac.id[5],
rahel.2253121067@mhs.unimed.ac.id[6],
adamdhero.2253121049@mhs.unimed.ac.id[7],
johannes@unimed.id[8]
ekoisdianto13@gmail.com[9]

ABSTRACT

This study examines how ideational meaning is represented through the transitivity system in two texts, "The Importance of Clean Water" and "My First Day as a Volunteer." It employs a descriptive qualitative approach based on Halliday and Matthiessen's (2014) transitivity framework, focusing on processes, participants, and circumstances. The findings reveal that material, mental, relational, and behavioral processes occur in both texts, while verbal processes appear only in Text 2, and no existential processes are identified. Text 1 contains 28 processes, including 19 material, 6 relational, 2 mental, and 1 behavioral process. These processes describe water use, pollution, its effects, and environmental protection. Meanwhile, Text 2 contains 40 processes, consisting of 15 material, 9 verbal, 8 relational, 7 mental, and 1 behavioral process. These processes represent personal activities, communication, feelings, thoughts, and reflections during volunteering. Furthermore, the participants and circumstances reveal different experiential orientations. Text 1 mainly involves general groups and non-human entities, emphasizing environmental conditions and collective responsibilities. In contrast, Text 2 focuses on the writer, teacher, and children, highlighting personal interactions and experiences. These differences demonstrate how transitivity patterns shape the representation of experience in written texts. Overall, the study shows that transitivity is an effective framework for analyzing ideational meaning and understanding how language represents environmental issues and personal activities. The findings may also support English language learning and further research in functional grammar and textual analysis. This comparison offers a practical example for students learning to identify process patterns in academic written discourse.

Keywords: Ideational Metafunction[1], Systemic Functional Linguistics[2], Transitivity[3], Process[4], Participant[5], Circumstance[6]

A. INTRODUCTION

Language does more than convey information; it also represents people's experiences of the world. In Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), language is treated as a resource for making meaning in social contexts (Eggins, 2004). Within this framework, the ideational metafunction concerns how language construes human experience and consists of two parts: experiential meaning and logical meaning (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). This study focuses on the experiential component—how clauses represent events, actions, people, and situations (Thompson, 2014). Experiential meaning is realized through the transitivity system, which construes experience by classifying processes, participants, and circumstances (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014).

The transitivity system includes six main process types: material, mental, relational, verbal, behavioral, and existential. Material processes represent actions and events; mental processes represent sensing and thinking; relational processes represent being and having; verbal processes represent saying and communicating; behavioral processes represent physiological or psychological behaviors; and existential processes represent existence. Analyzing these process types, along with associated participants and circumstances, reveals how experiential meaning is constructed in a text (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014; Thompson, 2014).

Previous research has applied transitivity analysis across many text types, with student-written narratives receiving considerable attention. For example, Agustina and Suarnajaya (2021) found material processes dominant in EFL students' narratives. Budi et al. (2025) reported the same dominance among Grade 9 writers, and Zein et al. (2019) observed this pattern in English department students' narratives. These studies show that material processes are central to representing actions and events in narrative writing. However, because they focus on a single text type and writer group, they reveal typical patterns within that genre but not how experiential meaning varies across texts that represent different kinds of experience.

Other studies applied transitivity analysis to different genres. Sianipar et al. (2021) found all six process types in students' recounts. Yolanda and Zaim (2021) reported material process dominance in students' hortatory expositions, while Anggun (2016) examined descriptive texts in an English textbook. Wahyuni et al. (2019) analyzed processes, participants, and circumstantial elements in EFL students' memoirs, demonstrating the value of examining participants and circumstances alongside processes. Still, these studies typically address a single genre, so their findings are not contrasted with texts that construe different kinds of experience.

Comparative studies begin to address that gap. Wibowo et al. (2024) compared model and student descriptive texts and found differences in process types, though material processes and location circumstances were prominent in both. Septiana et al. (2023) analyzed English for Logistics texts and reported material, mental, relational, and verbal processes, with mental processes most frequent. These results suggest that process distributions vary by genre, purpose, and the type of experience represented. Yet, Wibowo et al. (2024) compare texts within the same genre, and Septiana et al. (2023) focus on a single specialized field. None of the studies reviewed directly contrast an impersonal informative text about an environmental issue with a personal lived-experience account two text types that would likely differ in who is represented, what is done, and under what circumstances.

Overall, most transitivity research examines a single genre or writer group, documenting dominant process types within that type. Some studies include participants and circumstances, but few compare how experiential meaning is built across texts representing different experiences. For instance, Wahyuni et al. (2019) focused on memoirs, and comparative work often remains within one genre or field.

Therefore, there is limited research comparing the distribution of transitivity processes and the construction of experiential meaning through processes, participants, and circumstances between an impersonal

informative environmental text and a personal account of lived experience. “The Importance of Clean Water” presents environmental conditions, collective human actions, and responsibilities toward water resources. “My First Day as a Volunteer” presents an individual's actions, feelings, communication, and learning. Comparing these two texts will show how different experiences are construed through distinct choices of process types, participants, and circumstances. Accordingly, this study analyzes the transitivity system in both texts to identify the process types used and to explain how experiential meaning is constructed in each.

Research questions:

1. What types of transitivity processes are used in “The Importance of Clean Water” and “My First Day as a Volunteer”?

2. How are experiential meanings construed through transitivity processes, participants, and circumstances in “The Importance of Clean Water” and “My First Day as a Volunteer”?

B. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employs a descriptive qualitative research design to analyze ideational meaning through the transitivity system in two texts, “The Importance of Clean Water” (Text 1) and “My First Day as a Volunteer” (Text 2). The two texts were selected because they represent different types of experience and therefore provide suitable data for a comparative analysis. The data were collected through documentation.

Data Source and Characteristics of the Texts

The data consist of two English texts. Text 1, “The Importance of Clean Water,” is an informative text about the importance of clean water, environmental pollution, and the roles of individuals, communities, and governments in protecting water resources. Text 2, “My First Day as a Volunteer,” is a first-person personal narrative in which the writer describes joining a volunteer program at a small village near the writer’s university and teaching English to children, together with communication with the teacher and the children and the writer’s

feelings and reflections. After the texts were divided into clauses, Text 1 consisted of 25 clauses and Text 2 consisted of 40 clauses.

The original sources of the two texts, including their authors, publishers, and years of publication, could not be verified from the materials and publicly accessible sources checked for this study. For this reason, no source is attributed to either text in this article. Both texts were used as research data based on the information available, and the analysis describes the transitivity patterns of these two texts only. Because the origin of the texts is unknown, the findings should not be generalized to other informative texts or personal narratives.

Unit of Analysis and Analytical Procedure

The unit of analysis is the transitivity process identified in each clause, not the clause itself. A clause normally realizes one process, but some clauses contain more than one process. In such cases, each process was identified, classified, and counted separately, so the number of processes in a text can be higher than the number of clauses. In Text 1, the 25 clauses contain 28 processes, while in Text 2, the 40 clauses contain 40 processes.

The same procedure was applied to both texts. First, the text was read carefully to understand its content and context. Second, the text was divided into numbered clauses and recorded in a data table containing processes, participants, and circumstances. Third, the process or processes in each clause were identified based on Halliday and Matthiessen's (2014) transitivity framework and Thompson's (2014) experiential meaning framework, and each process was classified into one of six types: material, mental, relational, verbal, behavioral, and existential. Fourth, the number of processes of each type was counted, and the percentage was calculated with the following formula to answer the first research question:

Percentage = (number of processes of a given type / total number of processes in the text) × 100%

The denominator is the total number of processes in the text, not the number of clauses. For example, Text 1 has 19

material processes out of 28 processes, so the percentage of material processes is (19 / 28) × 100% = 67.86%. Percentages were rounded to two decimal places, and the rounded percentages for each text add up to 100%.

Fifth, the participants associated with each process were identified according to their roles, such as Actor and Goal in material processes, Senser and Phenomenon in mental processes, and Sayer, Receiver, and Verbiage in verbal processes. Sixth, the circumstances accompanying the processes were identified and classified according to their functions, such as time, place, manner, cause, and purpose. Finally, the findings from the two texts were compared and interpreted by examining how processes, participants, and circumstances work together to represent experience. This analysis was conducted to answer the second research question.

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULTS

Types of Transitivity Processes

According to Halliday and Matthiessen (2014), transitivity represents experience through six types of processes: material, mental, relational, verbal, behavioral, and existential processes. These processes are realized together with participants and circumstances. In this study, the two texts were analyzed to identify the types and frequency of transitivity processes used in each text.

The first text, “The Importance of Clean Water,” contains 28 processes. Material process is the most dominant process with 19 occurrences, followed by relational process with 6 occurrences, mental process with 2 occurrences, and behavioral process with 1 occurrence. Verbal and existential processes were not found in the text.

For example:

"People need water for drinking, cooking, washing, and agriculture."

People	**need**	**water**	**for drinking, cooking, washing, and agriculture**
Participant: Senser	Process: Mental	Participant: Phenomenon	Circumstance: Purpose

The word **"need"** is categorized as a mental process because it expresses a state of feeling or cognition. **"People"** functions as the Senser, while **"water"** functions as the Phenomenon. The phrase **"for drinking, cooking, washing, and agriculture"** functions as a circumstance of purpose.

The second text, "My First Day as a Volunteer," contains 40 processes. Material process is also the most dominant process with 15 occurrences. It is followed by verbal process with 9 occurrences, relational process with 8 occurrences, mental process with 7 occurrences, and behavioral process with 1 occurrence. Existential process was not found.

For example:

"I joined a volunteer program at a small village near my university."

I	**joined**	**a volunteer program**	**at a small village near my university**
Participant: Actor	Process: Material	Participant: Goal	Circumstance: Place

The word **"joined"** is a material process because it represents an action performed by the participant. **"I"** functions as the Actor and **"a volunteer program"** as the Goal. The phrase **"at a small village near my university"** functions as a circumstance of place.

The frequency of transitivity processes in both texts is presented below.

No	**Types of Process**	**The Importance of Clean Water**	**Percentage**	**My First Day as a Volunteer**	**Percentage**

1	Material	19	67.86 %	15	37.50 %
2	Mental	2	7.14 %	7	17.50 %
3	Relational	6	21.43 %	8	20.00 %
4	Verbal	0	0%	9	22.50 %
5	Behavioral	1	3.57 %	1	2.50 %
6	Existential	0	0%	0	0%
Total		**28**	**100%**	**40**	**100%**

The table shows that material process is the dominant process in both texts. However, the distribution of the other processes is different. "The Importance of Clean Water" contains a higher proportion of material processes, while "My First Day as a Volunteer" contains more mental and verbal processes. This difference reflects the different experiences represented in the two texts.

Representation of Experience

Thompson (2014) explains that experiential meaning is represented through processes, participants, and circumstances. These elements work together to show what is happening, who is involved, and under what conditions an experience takes place.

In "The Importance of Clean Water," the clause **"Governments can reduce water pollution by creating environmental regulations and controlling industrial waste"** represents an action taken to solve an environmental problem.

Governments	**can reduce**	**water pollution**	**by creating environmental regulations and controlling industrial waste**
Participant: Actor	Process: Material	Participant: Goal	Circumstance: Means

The participant **"Governments"** functions as the Actor because it performs the action. **"Can reduce"** is a material process because it represents an action, while **"water pollution"** functions as the Goal. The phrase **"by creating environmental**

regulations and controlling industrial waste" shows the means through which the action is carried out. The clause therefore represents environmental experience as an action that can be managed through human intervention.

In "My First Day as a Volunteer," the clause **"Last Saturday, I joined a volunteer program at a small village near my university"** represents the writer's personal experience of participating in a volunteer activity.

Last Saturday	**I**	**joined**	**a volunteer program**	**at a small village near my university**
Circumstance: Time	Participant: Actor	Process: Material	Participant: Goal	Circumstance: Place

The word **"joined"** is a material process because it represents an action performed by the writer. **"I"** functions as the Actor, while **"a volunteer program"** functions as the Goal. The circumstances **"Last Saturday"** and **"at a small village near my university"** provide information about the time and place of the experience.

These examples show that the two texts represent experience through similar grammatical resources but in different contexts. The first text mainly represents environmental issues through actions involving governments, communities, individuals, and water resources. In contrast, the second text represents a personal experience through actions, feelings, and communication between the writer, teachers, friends, and students.

A closer look at the figures in the table shows that the two texts differ not only in the dominant process type but also in how the remaining processes are spread. In "The Importance of Clean Water," material processes (19 of 28, 67.86%) account for more than two thirds of all processes, and the remaining processes are limited to relational (6, 21.43%), mental (2, 7.14%), and behavioral (1, 3.57%) processes. In "My First Day as a Volunteer," material processes (15 of 40, 37.50%) are still the largest group, but the other types are distributed more evenly: verbal (9, 22.50%),

relational (8, 20.00%), mental (7, 17.50%), and behavioral (1, 2.50%). The gap between the largest and the second largest process type is therefore 46.43 percentage points in the first text and only 15.00 percentage points in the second text.

The most visible contrast concerns verbal and mental processes. Verbal processes occur nine times in the second text, which is 22.50% of its processes, but they do not occur at all in the first text. Mental processes occur seven times (17.50%) in the second text and twice (7.14%) in the first text. Taken together, mental and verbal processes make up 16 of 40 processes (40.00%) in the second text, compared with only 2 of 28 processes (7.14%) in the first text. Because these are the process types through which thinking, feeling, and speaking are represented, the difference suggests that the first text mainly describes the world, while the second text also presents how people sense and talk about the world.

Relational processes are the most similar between the two texts in terms of proportion, with 21.43% in the first text and 20.00% in the second text. Behavioral processes occur only once in each text (3.57% and 2.50%), so they contribute very little to the contrast between the texts. Existential processes are absent from both texts, which means that neither text introduces entities mainly through clauses whose function is to state that something exists. These results show that the main differences between the two texts lie in the material, mental, and verbal processes rather than in the relational, behavioral, and existential processes.

The examples analyzed above also show differences in participants and circumstances. In the clauses used as examples from the first text, the participants are people in general, governments, and non-human entities such as water and water pollution, and they function as Senser, Actor, Phenomenon, and Goal. The circumstances accompanying them express purpose and means, such as “for drinking, cooking, washing, and agriculture” and “by creating environmental regulations and controlling industrial waste.” In the clauses used as examples from the second text, the central participant is

the writer, who appears as “I” and functions as the Actor, and the circumstances express time and place, such as “Last Saturday” and “at a small village near my university.” These examples indicate that the first text answers the questions of what is needed and how a problem can be handled, whereas the second text answers the questions of who did something, when, and where.

DISCUSSION

The distribution of process types shows that the two texts are similar in using material processes, but they differ in the other process types that accompany them. In “The Importance of Clean Water,” material and relational processes together make up 25 of 28 processes (89.29%), while mental and verbal processes make up only 2 (7.14%). In “My First Day as a Volunteer,” the same two inner-experience and communication categories account for 16 of 40 processes (40.00%). In other words, the first text mainly presents actions and states, while the second also presents the writer’s thoughts, feelings, and interactions with other people. This shows that the two texts have different experiential orientations.

The dominance of material processes in both texts is consistent with several earlier studies, but it needs to be interpreted with the genre in mind. Agustina and Suarnajaya (2021), Budi et al. (2025), and Zein et al. (2019) found material processes dominant in narrative texts, and Yolanda and Zaim (2021) and Kencana et al. (2022) found the same in hortatory exposition and explanation texts, respectively. The pattern in the first text therefore resembles the findings for explanation texts (Kencana et al., 2022), in which actions and activities carry the content of the text. However, not every study reports this pattern. Sianipar et al. (2021) identified all six process types in recount texts, and Septiana et al. (2023) found mental processes to be the most frequent in English for Logistics texts. Together with the lower proportion of material processes in the second text (37.50%), these findings suggest that material dominance is common but not universal, and that it weakens when a text gives space to feelings, thoughts, and talk.

In “The Importance of Clean Water,” the material processes (e.g., release, throw, create, use, reduce, and protect) present water-related actions as human activities that affect the environment, covering both causes of pollution and actions to prevent it. The relational processes add the descriptive and explanatory side, defining the importance and condition of water. With only two mental processes and no verbal ones, the text contains almost no individual perspective or dialogue. Experience is presented as general and impersonal, and the responsibility it conveys belongs to categories of actors rather than to a particular person.

In “My First Day as a Volunteer,” The verbal and mental processes add information about the writer’s thoughts, feelings, and interactions, which the material processes alone do not show. Mental processes such as “wanted,” “felt,” “realized,” and “thought” present the volunteer as someone who senses and reflects, and verbal processes such as “asked,” “told,” “said,” and “thanked” present the volunteer, teacher, and students as people who interact. Material processes still describe what happened, but the personal meaning of the experience comes from the writer’s thoughts, feelings, and communication with others. This is consistent with Wahyuni et al. (2019), who examined processes, participants, and circumstances in students’ memoirs, although their findings cannot be taken to show the same distribution here.

The analysis of participants and circumstances addresses the second research question by showing who the experience belongs to and how it is framed. In “The Importance of Clean Water,” the clause “Governments can reduce water pollution by creating environmental regulations and controlling industrial waste” presents “Governments” as the Actor and “water pollution” as the Goal. The Circumstance of Manner (Means) specifies how the action is achieved, so the clause presents pollution control as something that depends on concrete, collective measures rather than on personal choice. This agrees with the overall participant pattern of the text, in which general groups and non-human entities predominate. In “My First Day as a Volunteer,” the clause “Last Saturday, I joined a

volunteer program at a small village near my university" casts the writer ("I") as Actor and the program as Goal. Here, the Circumstances of Time and show when and where the event happened, making the experience more personal and specific. The prominence of location circumstances reported by Wibowo et al. (2024) in descriptive texts shows that circumstances are a productive feature to compare across texts, but the function they serve differs here: in the first text they specify how actions are done, while in the second they locate an individual's experience.

Overall, the differences between the texts are not only in the number of process types. They also appear in the participants involved and the circumstances surrounding the actions. The first text uses material and relational processes, general participants, and circumstances of manner to present environmental responsibility as a collective issue. The second text uses material, mental, and verbal processes, an individual participant, and circumstances of time and place to present a personal experience. These findings support Halliday and Matthiessen's (2014) and Thompson's (2014) idea that experiential meaning is created through the combination of processes, participants, and circumstances in clauses. Because the study compares only two texts, the differences should be read as a description of these texts and not as a general rule about environmental or personal texts.

The differences found in this study can also be related to the context in which each text is produced. In Systemic Functional Linguistics, ideational meaning is closely connected to the field of a text, that is, what is happening and what is being talked about, while interpersonal and textual meanings are related to tenor and mode (Eggins, 2004; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). The field of "The Importance of Clean Water" is an environmental issue, so the language mostly names things, actions, and conditions in the world, such as water, pollution, regulations, and waste. The field of "My First Day as a Volunteer" is a personal volunteering experience, so the language must also deal with people, what they say, and how they react. The transitivity patterns found in the two texts are therefore consistent

with their different fields, and they show how a choice of process type is connected to the kind of experience that a text represents.

The contrast between impersonal and personal experience is also visible in the way responsibility and agency are distributed. In the first text, the Actors are general groups such as governments, communities, and individuals, so the text points to what these groups do, or can do, to cause or reduce pollution. No particular person is identified as responsible for an action, and the reader is positioned as an observer of general facts and recommendations. In the second text, the Actor, Senser, and Sayer roles are mostly taken by specific people, namely the writer, the teacher, and the children, so the reader follows one person's experience from the inside. This difference in participants explains why the first text feels general and informative, while the second text feels specific and personal, even though both texts rely heavily on material processes.

From the reader's point of view, the different patterns also affect how each text is understood. A text with a high proportion of material processes and general participants, such as the first text, encourages the reader to see the topic as a set of actions and consequences that concern society as a whole. A text with a more varied distribution of processes and a specific participant, such as the second text, invites the reader to share the writer's perspective and to understand the experience through the writer's feelings and conversations. These effects are interpretations of the patterns found in the analysis and were not tested with readers.

The second text also shows how a personal narrative combines action and reflection. Material processes such as "joined" establish what the writer did and in what sequence, but the mental and verbal processes show how the writer evaluated the experience and communicated with others. Mental processes such as "wanted," "felt," "realized," and "thought" show the writer as someone who senses and reflects, and verbal processes such as "asked," "told," "said," and "thanked" show the volunteer, the teacher, and the children as people who interact. In this

way, the experience is not presented only as a list of events but as a learning process in which actions, feelings, and conversations are connected. This is a pattern that is hardly present in the first text, where the few mental processes and the absence of verbal processes leave little space for individual feelings or dialogue.

The findings extend the earlier studies discussed in the introduction. Most previous studies describe the dominant process types within one genre or one group of writers (Agustina & Suarnajaya, 2021; Budi et al., 2025; Zein et al., 2019; Yolanda & Zaim, 2021). Because the present study compares two texts that represent different kinds of experience, it shows that the same dominant process type can be accompanied by very different supporting patterns. If only the dominance of material processes were considered, the two texts would appear similar. When the whole distribution of processes is examined together with participants and circumstances, the difference between an impersonal informative text and a personal account of lived experience becomes clear. This supports the suggestion of Wibowo et al. (2024) and Septiana et al. (2023) that process distributions vary according to genre, purpose, and the type of experience represented, and it adds a contrast between an environmental informative text and a personal narrative, which had not been directly compared in the studies reviewed.

Using percentages calculated from the total number of processes also makes the comparison fairer. The two texts differ in length: the first text has 28 processes in 25 clauses, while the second text has 40 processes in 40 clauses. Comparing only the raw number of processes would suggest that the second text simply has more of everything, whereas the percentages show how each text divides its resources among process types. For example, the 19 material processes in the first text and the 15 material processes in the second text look similar in number, but they represent 67.86% and 37.50% of the processes in their texts, which are very different proportions. The decision to count processes rather than clauses is also important

because some clauses in the first text contain more than one process, and counting clauses alone would have hidden part of the experience that those clauses represent.

The findings also have implications for the teaching of English as a foreign language, especially in an English education department. Transitivity analysis can help students see that the choice of a verb is not neutral, because each verb construes a particular type of experience. A student who writes an informative text about an environmental issue may need to rely on material and relational processes with general participants, while a student who writes a personal narrative can use mental and verbal processes to present thoughts, feelings, and conversations. Lecturers could use short texts such as the two analyzed here to show how the same grammatical system produces different representations of experience, and students could practice identifying processes, participants, and circumstances in their own writing (Thompson, 2014). This is a suggestion drawn from the findings of this study and has not been tested in a classroom.

Several limitations should be considered when reading these findings. First, only two texts were analyzed, and, as explained in the methodology, their original sources could not be verified, so the patterns described here belong to these texts and cannot be taken as general characteristics of informative or narrative texts. Second, the study focuses on ideational meaning and does not examine interpersonal or textual meaning, which would also contribute to the differences between the texts. Third, the classification of processes depends partly on the analyst's interpretation of each clause in its context, so other analysts might classify a small number of clauses differently. These limitations do not remove the value of the comparison, but they show that the results should be treated as a descriptive account of two contrasting texts.

D. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussion, this study concludes that both "The Importance of Clean Water" and "My First Day as a Volunteer" use different

types of transitivity processes to represent experience. Six types of processes were considered in the analysis: material, mental, relational, verbal, behavioral, and existential. The material process was the most dominant in both texts, with 19 occurrences (67.86%) in "The Importance of Clean Water" and 15 occurrences (37.50%) in "My First Day as a Volunteer." However, the second text contained more mental and verbal processes, reflecting its focus on personal feelings, thoughts, and communication.

The analysis also shows that processes, participants, and circumstances work together to represent experience. "The Importance of Clean Water" mainly represents environmental experience through actions related to water pollution, protection, and responsibility. Meanwhile, "My First Day as a Volunteer" represents a personal volunteering experience through actions, communication, feelings, and learning experiences. Therefore, the transitivity system helps reveal how different types of texts construct and represent human experience through language.

The study also has implications for the use of transitivity analysis in language education. The comparison shows that a close reading of processes, participants, and circumstances can explain why two texts that look similar in one respect, such as the dominance of material processes, still represent experience in very different ways. For students and lecturers in an English education department, this means that transitivity can be used not only to label clauses but also to discuss how writers choose language to fit the kind of experience they want to represent.

Based on the limitations of this study, several suggestions can be made for future research. Future studies could analyze a larger number of informative environmental texts and personal narratives with verified sources so that the results can be generalized more carefully. They could also compare other pairs of text types, such as procedural, argumentative, or descriptive texts, or analyze texts written by students to see how learners construct different kinds of experience. In addition, combining the

analysis of ideational meaning with interpersonal and textual meaning would give a fuller picture of how the same texts construct meaning as a whole.

REFERENCES

Agustina, M., & Suarnajaya, W. (2021). Transitivity analysis of EFL students' narrative text in vocational high school. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Undiksha, 9*(3), 298–307. https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbi.v9i3.38314

Anggun, S. K. (2016). An analysis of descriptive text in English textbook using transitivity system: A case study of reading passages. *Journal of English and Education, 4*(1), 147–158. https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/191886-EN-an-analysis-of-descriptive-text-in-engli.pdf?exp=1791446044&kid=1&sig=_s-NiQAFsXFvXf34yJGz6FTL0jPVj5qKap-xM7J38OY

Budi, F. S., Rahmawati, I. N., & Rini, Y. P. (2025). Transitivity analysis in narrative writing of Grade 9 students of junior high school. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature, 12*(2). https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v12i2.5889

Eggins, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nd ed.). Continuum.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Septiana, P. M., Yuliyanti, A. Y., & Sari, T. (2023). Transitivity analysis in English for Logistics: A systemic functional linguistic study. *Humanis, 27*(3), 276–284. https://doi.org/10.24843/JH.2023.v27.i03.p04

Sianipar, S. D., Ginting, S. A., & Siregar, T. M. S. (2021). A transitivity analysis on students' writing recount text.

REGISTER: Journal of English Language Teaching of FBS-Unimed, *9*(2). https://doi.org/10.24114/reg.v9i2.24657

Yolanda, F., & Zaim, M. (2021). "Transitivity Analysis of Hortatory Exposition Written by Third Years Student of English Education Program at Universitas Negeri Padang." *Journal of English Language Teaching,* *10*(1), 160–169. https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v10i1.111518

Thompson, G. (2014). *Introducing functional grammar* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Wahyuni, R., Hamzah, H., & Wahyuni, D. (2019). An analysis of transitivity system in memoirs written by EFL students. *English Language and Literature,* *8*(1), 150–157. https://doi.org/10.24036/ell.v8i1.103060

Wibowo, E. P., Lestari, A., & Adrian, M. (2024). A comparative analysis of transitivity system in model and student descriptive texts. *Jurnal Al-Azhar Indonesia Seri Humaniora,* *9*(2), 104–115. https://doi.org/10.36722/sh.v9i2.2831

Kencana, D. M. N. I., Hikmah, I., & Gemilang, A. V. (2022). Transitivity analysis of eleventh-grade students' explanation texts at one of vocational high schools in Klaten. *English Education Journal,* *10*(3). https://jurnal.uns.ac.id/englishedu/article/view/59643/35722

Zein, T. T., Sinar, T. S., Nurlela, N., & Yusuf, M. (2019). Process types of transitivity system in English department students' narrative texts. In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on English Language and Teaching (ICOELT 2018)* (pp. 149–155). Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/icoelt-18.2019.21