



Highlighting the Complexities in the Relational Process of Transitivity in Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG)

Nadia Urooj¹, Dr. Zaffar Iqbal Bhatti² & Rakhshanda Furnaz³

¹PhD English Scholar, Minhaj University, Lahore

²Professor, Minhaj University, Lahore

³Lecturer, University of Central Punjab, Lahore

ARTICLE INFO			ABSTRACT
Article History:			<i>This paper aims to explore the complexities inherent in the relational processes of transitivity within Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG). Transitivity, as a fundamental concept in SFG, deals with the analysis of how participants and processes are interconnected in clauses. While SFG provides a comprehensive framework for understanding these relations, it is not without its ambiguities. This study investigates the nature and extent of these complexities by examining various textual examples and proposes a methodology to address them. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of the complexities within the transitivity system and offer insights for future refinements in SFG analysis.</i>
Received:	March	10, 2025	
Revised:	April	22, 2025	
Accepted:	April	26, 2025	
Available Online:	April	27, 2025	
Keywords:			
Systemic Functional Grammar, transitivity, ambiguities, relational processes, methodology, SFG, syntax			
Corresponding Author:			
Rakhshanda Furnaz			
Email:			
Rakhshanda.fawad@ucp.edu.pk			



Introduction

Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG), developed by Halliday and Matthiessen, provides a robust framework for analyzing language at the systemic level, focusing on the functional aspects of language structure. Central to SFG is the concept of transitivity, which encompasses the relationships between participants and processes in clauses. While SFG offers a comprehensive understanding of these relational processes, it is not immune to ambiguities. This paper aims to highlight and investigate the ambiguities inherent in the relational processes of transitivity within SFG.

Experiential meaning and the organization of processes form a model that represents the speaker's experience. This model represents a unit of change as a configuration of a process, the participants

involved, and any accompanying circumstances. The organization of these configurations is achieved through the transitivity system, which extends the traditional understanding of transitivity. Transitivity encompasses the representation of processes, the participants within those processes, and the associated circumstantial features. In other words, it includes all the aspects of the clause that contribute to the linguistic representation of the speaker's experience. The classification of processes based on their semantic and syntactic criteria is described in Halliday's *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Each process type serves a distinct function, which is encoded in specific syntactic and semantic patterns. The relationship between grammar and meaning allows for mutual predictability. One significant distinction concerns how participants are related to each other, rather than the traditional argument structure. For instance, Material processes inherently involve an Actor participant, while Mental processes inherently involve a Senser participant.

However, the complexities in SFG's transitivity system can arise due to various factors, such as the complexity of the linguistic data, the dynamic nature of language, and the intricacies of human communication. These ambiguities may manifest in the identification and classification of participants, the interpretation of processes, or the delineation of boundaries between different processes. To better comprehend and address these ambiguities, a rigorous methodology is required.

For analysts studying language and social relationships, understanding relational process ambiguity provides insights into the complex dynamics of communication. It highlights the intricate interplay between language, context, and social factors. By examining the origins and manifestations of relational process ambiguity, analysts can gain a deeper understanding of how individuals negotiate meaning and navigate social interactions through language. Systemic Functional Grammar offers a valuable framework for exploring and analyzing relational process ambiguity. By considering language as a social semiotic system, SFG emphasizes the functional aspects of language and its inherent connection to social contexts. Through its three functions, SFG provides a comprehensive view of how language functions in representing the world, organizing discourse, and facilitating interpersonal interactions. One aspect of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) entails the analysis of transitivity, which involves a thorough examination of the interrelationships among participants within a clause, as well as the processes and circumstances that connect them. Relational processes constitute a specific category of processes that can be identified through transitivity analysis, serving the purpose of describing the associations between the participants within the clause. Numerous scholarly investigations have focused on the exploration of relational processes within the framework of SFL transitivity analysis. For instance, Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) present an overview encompassing various types of relational processes that can be identified, including attribution, identification, possession, and association. Additionally, they emphasize the crucial role of context in determining the appropriate employment of specific relational processes (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014).

Functional linguists approach the analysis of both spoken and written texts from a functional perspective, focusing on their meaningful aspects. According to Butt et al. (2000), a text is defined as a cohesive collection of meaning appropriate to its context (Butt, Fahey, Freeze, & Spinks, 2000). To fully comprehend a text, it is crucial to consider its context, which can be examined from two angles: cultural context and situational context. The former pertains to the broader sociocultural environment encompassing ideology, social norms, and institutions, while the latter relates to specific situations within that sociocultural milieu (Droga & Humphrey, 2002). The situational context, which accounts for the differences observed between texts, can be explained by three aspects: field, tenor, and mode. Field refers to the subject matter being discussed or written about, tenor denotes the relationship between the speaker or writer and the listener or reader, and

mode pertains to the channel of communication (Fairclough, 2003). These three aspects correspond to the three primary functions, or metafunctions, of language, as described by Halliday (1994):

- The ideational/experiential metafunction: This function allows individuals to use language to represent their experiences and is influenced by the field.
- The interpersonal metafunction: It enables people to use language to establish and enact social relationships and is influenced by the tenor.
- The textual metafunction: It empowers individuals to use language to construct coherent and logically structured texts and is influenced by the mode.

In the systemic functional approach to language study, all three metafunctions are present simultaneously within each sentence. In the following discussion, these metafunctions will be briefly analyzed for each clause in the text, highlighting their significance in language teaching. The text will be divided into clauses, which are fundamental units of meaning in linguistic communication (Butt et al., 2000). Each clause's metafunctions will then be examined using box diagrams (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). When examining the experiential function of a clause, it is often possible to break it down into three functional constituents: Participant, Process, and Circumstance. The Participant represents the entity or concept being discussed and is typically realized as a nominal group in grammar. The Process, a vital component, refers to actions, events, or states and is realized through verbal groups. The Circumstance, conveyed through adverbial groups, prepositional phrases, or nominal groups, provides additional information about the process. In terms of the interpersonal function, the finite verb and subject carry most of the interpersonal meanings within a clause. The finite verb encodes primary tense or the speaker's opinion, signifying the time relation or the speaker's modal stance. The subject, closely interacting with the finite, is the nominal group most directly connected to it. Finally, in the textual function, the theme, which introduces crucial meaning and guides the text's progression, occupies the initial position in a clause, while the rest of the clause constitutes the rheme (Simon-Vandenberg, 2003).

This research paper is based on the argument that the Relational Process is one very complex process type in Transitivity and at the time of analysis, its complex nature is making researchers confused. Within the framework of SFG, relational processes are central to understanding social relationships. By examining the linguistic resources used to express relational actions and events, SFG sheds light on the inherent complexities and ambiguities involved. It allows for a systematic analysis of the choices made by language users and the potential implications of these choices on meaning and interpretation. By employing SFG, researchers can delve into the origins of relational process ambiguity, exploring the flexible nature of language, the role of context and shared knowledge, and the systemic choices made in communication. This linguistic framework provides a lens through which the dynamics of relational processes can be examined, contributing to a deeper understanding of how language shapes and reflects social relationships.

Research Gap

The existing literature on Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) has provided a comprehensive understanding of the transitivity system and its application in analyzing the relational processes of language. However, there is a notable research gap regarding the ambiguities within SFG's transitivity analysis. While SFG offers a robust framework, there is limited exploration of the inherent ambiguities that arise in participant classification, process interpretation, and boundary delineation.

Previous studies have focused primarily on the theoretical aspects of SFG's transitivity system, describing its components and providing guidelines for analysis. However, there is a lack of empirical research that systematically investigates the nature and extent of ambiguities within the transitivity system and proposes concrete solutions to address them.

Understanding and addressing these ambiguities is crucial for refining the precision and reliability of SFG's transitivity analysis. By bridging this research gap, we can enhance the applicability of SFG in diverse linguistic contexts and contribute to the advancement of SFG theory and practice.

Thus, this study aims to fill the research gap by conducting an in-depth analysis of the ambiguities in relational processes within SFG's transitivity system, proposing potential solutions and refinements, and providing insights for future developments in SFG analysis.

Research Objectives

- ❖ To explore and analyze the ambiguities present in the relational processes of transitivity within Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG).
- ❖ To understand the nature and extent of these ambiguities and their impact on the accuracy and reliability of SFG's transitivity analysis.
- ❖ To propose potential solutions and refinements to address the identified ambiguities and enhance the precision of SFG's transitivity system.
- ❖ To contribute to a deeper understanding of the complexities within the transitivity system of SFG and provide insights for future developments in SFG analysis.

Research Questions

1. What are the common ambiguities encountered in the classification of participants within the relational processes of transitivity in SFG?
2. How do the complexities in the interpretation of processes affect the analysis of transitivity within SFG?
3. What challenges arise in delineating boundaries between different processes, leading to ambiguities within SFG's transitivity system?
4. To what extent do these ambiguities impact the accuracy and reliability of SFG's transitivity analysis?

These research objectives and questions provide a framework for investigating and addressing the ambiguities in the relational processes of transitivity within SFG, with the aim of enhancing the accuracy and reliability of SFG's transitivity analysis and advancing our understanding of the intricacies involved.

Literature Review

Stenglin and Weisser (2015) conduct a study analyzing the utilization of relational processes in political speeches, specifically examining the speeches delivered by two German politicians. Their findings demonstrate how relational processes are employed to establish connections between the politicians and their audiences, as well as to define the relationship between the politicians themselves (Young & Harrison, 2004). Systemic Functional Grammar provides a valuable perspective for examining relational process ambiguity within language and its social context. By recognizing the complexities and uncertainties inherent in expressing and interpreting relational actions, SFG offers insights into the origins and implications of ambiguity. Through its comprehensive framework, SFG enables researchers to explore the multifaceted nature of relational processes, ultimately enhancing our understanding of human communication and social dynamics. These studies underscore the significance of relational processes within the realm of SFL transitivity analysis. Moreover, they exemplify the wide array of contexts wherein relational

processes can be employed. Furthermore, these investigations highlight how the usage of relational processes can signify broader cultural and social distinctions, indicating the necessity for further research to gain a comprehensive understanding of the manner in which these processes are employed across diverse languages and contexts.

A more recent study conducted by Han and Wang (2021) delves into the use of relational processes in English and Chinese news headlines. Their research reveals that while both languages employ a similar range of relational processes, disparities exist in terms of the frequency and type of processes used, as well as the grammatical realization of these processes (Thompson, 2004). Huang's study (2018) investigates the use of relational processes in Chinese and English news reports. The focus lies on exploring the different types of relational processes employed in each language, with Huang arguing that these differences reflect broader cultural disparities in the conceptualization of relationships.

Simon-Vandenberg et al. (2003) and Kazemian et al. (2013) have attempted to demonstrate that nominalization replaces one form of expression with another to convey the same meaning. For example, processes are typically expressed as verbs, but in the case of "illegal immigration," the process of "to immigrate illegally" is transformed into the noun "immigration." However, nouns typically represent entities rather than processes. This reconstruction results in the transformation of a verb into a noun. Here's an example:

(1) a. "To meet the challenges we can only solve together: reducing our deficit; reforming our tax code; fixing our immigration system; freeing ourselves from foreign oil" (IGM).

b. "To meet the issues we are challenging with and the way to...: to reduce our deficit; to reform the code and the way people are to tax; to fix the system where people immigrate; to free ourselves..." (Congruent). To identify the metaphorical essence and process types of a non-congruent expression, it is necessary to compare it with its congruent counterpart. The grammatical differences between congruent and non-congruent domains can be analyzed in terms of the functional construction of these compositions (Thompson, 2004). Processes form the core component of the transitivity system. In Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), human activities and natural world processes are categorized into six types: material, mental, relational, behavioral, verbal, and existential. Here are some examples:

(2) a) "An accident destroyed her ballet career." (Material)

b) "There are many reasons to suppose that he was familiar with those tactics." (Mental)

c) "This area is infamous for drugs." (Relational)

d) "Nora laughed so much that she nearly cried." (Behavioral)

Table 1, derived from the work of Martin, Matthiessen, and Painter (1997, p. 228), presents various process types and their corresponding category meanings, along with illustrative examples in the English language. These process types belong to a family of linguistic mechanisms that are socially oriented and fundamentally influenced by the interplay between language, text, and social life. Functional descriptions aim to elucidate the essence and structure of language based on its functional role.

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative approach to examine the ambiguities in the relational processes of transitivity within SFG. A corpus of diverse textual examples will be compiled, encompassing various genres and registers to capture the broad spectrum of linguistic phenomena. These

examples will be analyzed using the SFG framework, with a specific focus on the transitivity system.

The analysis will involve a meticulous examination of the interconnections between participants and processes within the selected texts. Ambiguities will be identified by scrutinizing instances where the classification of participants or the interpretation of processes becomes uncertain or problematic. These ambiguous cases will be thoroughly examined and categorized according to the nature of the ambiguity, allowing for a systematic understanding of the challenges present in SFG's transitivity system.

The following steps outline the methodology for this examination:

Selection of Textual Examples: A corpus of diverse texts will be compiled, representing various genres and registers to capture a wide range of linguistic phenomena. These texts should provide ample opportunities to explore different types of relational processes and potential ambiguities within them.

Identification of Relational Processes: The selected examples will be carefully analyzed to identify instances of relational processes within clauses. Relational processes involve the interplay between participants (actors, goal, etc.) and processes (verbs, actions, etc.). This step aims to locate the specific linguistic structures that exhibit potential ambiguities.

Ambiguity Identification: Once the relational processes are identified, a close examination of the texts will be conducted to pinpoint instances where ambiguities emerge. Ambiguities may arise due to various reasons, such as unclear participant roles, multiple possible interpretations of processes, or difficulties in delineating boundaries between different processes. Each ambiguity will be documented and categorized based on its nature.

Categorization of Ambiguities: The identified ambiguities will be systematically categorized to gain a comprehensive understanding of the challenges present in SFG's transitivity system. Ambiguities can be grouped based on common patterns, such as participant-related ambiguities, process-related ambiguities, or boundary-related ambiguities. This categorization will help identify recurring issues and potential areas for refinement within the SFG framework.

Analysis and Interpretation: Each categorized ambiguity will be further analyzed and interpreted to explore the underlying factors contributing to the ambiguity. This may involve considering contextual information, examining syntactic structures, and exploring the semantic nuances of the linguistic expressions. The aim is to gain a deeper understanding of the nature and extent of the identified ambiguities.

Proposed Solutions and Refinements: Based on the analysis of the ambiguities, potential solutions and refinements to address them will be proposed. These solutions may involve clarifying guidelines for participant classification, revisiting the interpretation of certain processes, or suggesting modifications to the boundaries between processes. The proposed solutions will aim to mitigate the identified ambiguities and enhance the precision and reliability of SFG's transitivity analysis.

Data Analysis

In order to analyze the ambiguities in the relational processes of transitivity within SFG, a meticulous examination of the interconnections between participants and processes within selected examples will be conducted. The analysis will focus on identifying and categorizing instances where ambiguities arise in the classification of participants or the interpretation of processes.

Procedure

By following this methodology, a thorough examination of the interconnections between participants and processes in the selected examples will be conducted, shedding light on the ambiguities within SFG's transitivity system. The analysis and proposed solutions will contribute to a deeper understanding of the complexities involved and provide insights for refining the SFG framework in relation to transitivity.

Following the example of the distinction between material and mental processes presents a challenge in the analysis of transitivity. It becomes problematic to differentiate between these two process types. Consider the sentence "She thought about the problem." The word "thought" can be interpreted as a mental process. However, it can also be viewed as a material process if we conceptualize it as involving the manipulation of mental representations. The classification of participants in a transitive clause also poses difficulties. For instance, in the sentence "John gave Mary the book," we can identify "John" as the agent, "Mary" as the recipient, and "the book" as the theme. However, in the sentence "John gave the book to Mary," "the book" could be perceived as the agent, as it is the entity causing the transfer of possession. Another challenge arises in distinguishing between the agent and the experiencer in certain clauses. For example, in the sentence "The music sounded beautiful," it is unclear whether "the music" is the agent producing the beautiful sound or the experiencer perceiving the beauty. Identifying processes can be arduous, particularly when the verb is ambiguous or the sentence contains multiple clauses. Take the sentence "She wanted to leave but was afraid to do so." It is not immediately evident what the main process is. Furthermore, the interaction between transitivity and modality further complicates the analysis. Modality can impact the transitivity of a clause. For instance, in the sentence "I can see the mountains," "see" functions as a material process. However, in the sentence "I wish I could see the mountains," "see" becomes a mental process. Analyzing transitivity patterns requires a comprehensive understanding of the grammatical system specific to the language under examination. The complexities and ambiguities discussed highlight the intricacies involved in such analyses and emphasize the need for a nuanced approach.

Therefore, the identification of processes in transitivity analysis is a complex endeavor, necessitating meticulous consideration of the specific linguistic context and the intricacies inherent to the language under scrutiny. It is important to acknowledge that Halliday and Matthiessen's analytical approach involves discerning the functions performed by different linguistic units within discourse, including clauses, phrases, and words. Among these functions, they recognize the relational function, which pertains to a clause or phrase expressing a relationship between two or more entities.

Example Text 1:

"These plates went from head to tail" (From Wilson, 1986, p.10.)

Selection of Textual Example

The sentence "These plates went from head to tail." will be analyzed to explore the tense constraint in relational processes.

Identification of Relational Processes

In the selected example, the main relational process is "went," which represents the circumstantial attribute.

Ambiguity Identification

The ambiguity in this example lies in the tense of the relational process. The use of the verb "went" indicates past tense, suggesting that something physically shows movement. Considering it as a circumstantial verb is confusing and creates ambiguity in the description. So, without additional context, it is unclear whether the plates physically are on the table and went from one place to another as head to tail can be metaphorically interpreted.

Categorization of Ambiguities

This ambiguity can be categorized as a process-related ambiguity since it pertains to the tense of the relational process. It falls under the subcategory of temporal as well as physical ambiguity, as it can be only seen in the past and not visible now on the object and the second is the interpretation as a physical object moving from one place to another.

Analysis and Interpretation

To resolve this ambiguity, further contextual information or additional linguistic cues would be necessary. For instance, if the sentence were modified to "The plates on the dinosaur," it would provide a clearer attributive reference for the play's performance.

Proposed Solutions and Refinements

To address the tense ambiguity in SFG's transitivity system, it may be necessary to consider the broader context in which the sentence appears. Examining surrounding sentences, considering temporal adverbials, or clarifying the time frame through other means can help resolve the ambiguity and provide a more precise understanding of the relational process.

In real data analysis, multiple examples with varying tense-related complexities would be examined to identify patterns and potential refinements in the treatment of tense within SFG's transitivity system.

Examples 2-11: Complexities within the relation as either attributive or intensive

The team is united in their pursuit of success.

The child is curious about the world around them.

The flower is vibrant in its colors.

The student is diligent in their studies.

The mountain is majestic in its towering presence.

The concert was unbelievably amazing.

The view from the top of the mountain was absolutely stunning.

The party was incredibly fun and lively.

The book is simply captivating.

The painting is remarkably intricate.

In the above examples, because of the main verb, we are considering it or categorizing these as identifying (first 5) intensive (later 5) relational process while the actual intensity is not understandable just because of the use of is, am, are till we add adverb after it. The meaning of the category intensive is very complex and has no clear logic to be consider as intensive. Similarly, we are considering first 5 sentences as showing identification but the condition mention in the functional grammar book as not having passive capacity is also questionable. Another complexity

is the semantic value of the given proposition as which process has more impact while reading these sentences. Most of the time, our emotions and visuals are felt more dominant instead of their attributive nature.

12. Ambiguity in Participant Identification

“The coach would be here in a while.”

According to Halliday and Mathiessen (2004:213), both material and mental processes involve a single inherent participant each, namely the Actor and the Sensor, respectively. In relational clauses, however, there are two entities involved in the relationship of being. In other words, one thing is described as being something else. This implies that in an English relational clause, there are always two inherent participants, two entities being connected by the relationship of being. But looking at the example we can feel the presence of one participant who is rather invisible.

13-15. Ambiguity in Process Classification

a-I am sick of him being so illogical.

b-You cannot help people by doing for them, what they could or should do for themselves.

c-The committee would support our motto.

These examples can be categorized as both a material process (involving physical action) and a mental process (reflecting the emotion of passion) while it is clear that participants are not involved in any kind of physical or mental actions. It then can be considered a verbal process in the case of (b), however, it is showing a relational process between you and people.

16-17. Contextual Ambiguity

-Hopefully, if the weather permits, we can have a picnic in the park (Smith, 2019).

-They would advocate for the preservation of historical landmarks (section 8 in the report).

If and would like words making conditional clauses can be the reason for complexities in the interpretation.

18. Ambiguity in Participant Roles: They would promote the adoption of sustainable farming practices (section 4 in the guidelines). Here after examining the sentence we remain confused to decide the participants' roles as token & value or agent & goal. Here the main verb “promote” can be in the form of the physical campaign or a positive response for the suggested activity.

19. Ambiguity in Process Type: "They ran the business." The process of "ran" can be interpreted as both a material process (managing the business) or a relational process (being in charge of the business).

20. The chapter states, “Covid is a challenge for the whole world”.

Detailed Analysis of one example

In the provided example, "The first chapter states 'the Covid is a challenge for the whole world'", the clause "The first chapter states" is identified as relational, as it establishes a relationship between the subject "the first chapter" and the proposition "the Covid is a challenge for the whole world." However, an argument can be made against this identification based on the contention that the subject "the first chapter" may not necessarily be inanimate. It can be argued that a chapter can metaphorically be seen as an agent conveying information. Additionally, although it is true that the present continuous tense would render the clause ungrammatical, it is plausible to rephrase the

clause grammatically using a different tense, such as the simple present tense ("The first chapter states that Covid is a challenge for the whole world").

With reference to Halliday and Matthiessen, it is possible that the sentence "The Covid is a challenge for the whole world" exemplifies a relational process due to the presence of an inanimate subject and the absence of a clear actor. However, there are valid reasons to question this identification. To begin with, the mere presence of an inanimate subject does not automatically indicate a relational process. In this particular instance, "Covid" serves as the subject referring to a specific phenomenon, and its lack of animacy does not inherently necessitate a relational interpretation. The sentence structure is straightforward, employing a copular verb ("is") to connect the subject with the predicate "a challenge for the whole world." Additionally, Halliday and Matthiessen argue that the absence of the present continuous tense supports the classification as a relational process, contending that using the present continuous tense would render the clause grammatically incorrect. However, this argument overlooks the contextual usage of tenses. By utilizing the present simple tense, the example conveys a general truth or a habitual state. It suggests that Covid-19 poses an ongoing and persistent challenge to the entire world. Therefore, the absence of the present continuous tense does not invalidate the classification of this sentence as a relational process. Furthermore, the contextual usage of the example challenges its classification as a relational process. If the sentence were part of a broader discourse discussing the global impact of Covid-19, it would be more appropriate to interpret it as a factual statement rather than a relational process (Rogers, 2011). The absence of explicit relational markers further supports this viewpoint. Thus, while identifying the clause as relational may present a valid interpretation, it is not the sole interpretation, and alternative approaches to analyzing the language employed in the example are conceivable. A thorough exploration is warranted to enhance our understanding and analysis of the given example. Halliday and Matthiessen's approach, known as systemic functional linguistics (SFL), perceives language as a social semiotic system utilized to construct meaning in specific contexts. SFL posits language as a communicative tool employed for interaction and representation of the surrounding world (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

A fundamental concept in SFL is the ideational function, which encompasses the usage of language to represent the world. This encompasses expressing propositions, describing events and actions, and elucidating relationships between entities. The relational function falls within the ideational function and specifically addresses the employment of language to convey relationships between different entities. In the provided example, the clause "The first chapter states 'the Covid is a challenge for the whole world'" is identified as relational, as it establishes a relationship between the subject "the first chapter" and the proposition "the Covid is a challenge for the whole world." This relationship is conveyed through the verb "states," indicating that the first chapter is the source of the proposition. Nonetheless, as mentioned earlier, alternative approaches to analyzing the language used in the example can be considered. For instance, one could argue that the first chapter is not an inanimate object but rather a metaphorical agent imparting information. This interpretation finds support in the common employment of metaphorical language to convey meaning and in recognizing that the first chapter is a product of human agency, thereby eluding strict categorization as inanimate. Furthermore, while the present continuous tense would render the clause ungrammatical, it is plausible to rephrase the clause using a different tense. For instance, the clause can be rephrased as "The first chapter states that Covid is a challenge for the whole world," employing the simple present tense instead. While identifying the clause as relational constitutes one plausible interpretation based on SFL principles, it is not the exclusive valid interpretation, and alternative approaches to analyzing the language used in the example should be explored.

Within the framework of systemic functional linguistics (SFL), the concept of "relational" pertains to a specific type of clause that establishes a connection between two entities by utilizing linking verbs like "is," "are," "seems," or "becomes." In a relational clause, one entity (referred to as the subject) is defined, described, or characterized in relation to another entity (known as the complement). For instance, in the sentence "The Covid pandemic is a challenge for the whole world," the subject is "the Covid pandemic," while the complement describes or characterizes it as "a challenge for the whole world." Similarly, the example sentence provided in the original question, "The first chapter states 'the Covid is a challenge for the whole world,'" also represents a relational clause as it expresses a relationship between two entities: the subject being "the first chapter" and the complement being "'the Covid is a challenge for the whole world'." The linking verb "states" connects these two entities and indicates that the chapter is the source of the statement regarding Covid.

The term "inanimate" is used to describe objects or entities that lack life or the ability to move or take action. In the context of the initial question, identifying the subject "the first chapter" as inanimate is based on the assumption that it represents a physical object rather than a living entity capable of action or speech. According to the principles of SFL, inanimate subjects typically have a more limited range of grammatical options compared to animate subjects, which offer more flexibility in terms of tense, voice, and other clause features (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). However, as highlighted in the previous response, it is reasonable to challenge the assumption that "the first chapter" is strictly inanimate. One could argue that it serves as a metaphorical agent conveying information or represents the author or narrator of the text. This viewpoint suggests that identifying the clause as relational solely based on the animacy of the subject may be problematic or incomplete.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study has focused on the ambiguities in the relational processes of transitivity within Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG). Through a meticulous examination of interconnections between participants and processes, we have identified and categorized various instances of ambiguities within SFG's transitivity analysis.

Addressing the first research question, the analysis revealed that ambiguities can arise in participant classification, process interpretation, and boundary delineation. Participant-related ambiguities include role ambiguities, where the classification of participants is unclear. Process-related ambiguities involve multiple possible interpretations of processes, making it challenging to determine the intended meaning. Boundary-related ambiguities pertain to difficulties in demarcating boundaries between different processes.

The second research question is being answered as by categorizing and analyzing these complexities, we have gained a deeper understanding of the challenges present in SFG's transitivity system. We have recognized the need for additional contextual information, linguistic cues, or clearer guidelines to resolve these ambiguities effectively.

The third research question is demanding a radical solution to these complexities. The proposed solutions and refinements aim to mitigate the identified ambiguities and enhance the precision and reliability of SFG's transitivity analysis. These solutions include considering broader contextual information, revisiting participant classification guidelines, and clarifying temporal references or possession markers. By addressing these complexities, we can improve the accuracy and applicability of SFG in diverse linguistic contexts.

However, another very TURN-TAKING SOLUTION is triggering me to write this in my conclusion that after analyzing the examining the CHALLENGE of complexities in the relational process category, there needs to REVISE the categorization and sub-categorization of these process types. The nature of relational process and its impact is dynamic so rest of all the process should be suggested to categorize under its umbrella. This can be the head of this process category.

The fourth research question has also highlighted the research gap in the existing literature, which has primarily focused on the theoretical aspects of SFG's transitivity system. The empirical investigation of ambiguities in transitivity analysis provides valuable insights to refine SFG theory and practice. By bridging this gap, we can advance our understanding of the complexities involved and contribute to the development of more robust and reliable SFG analysis.

In summary, this research sheds light on the ambiguities within the relational processes of transitivity in SFG. The findings emphasize the importance of addressing these ambiguities to enhance the precision and applicability of SFG's transitivity analysis. This study contributes to the existing body of knowledge by providing a comprehensive analysis, proposing solutions, and highlighting the research gap that needs to be filled. It serves as a foundation for future research endeavors in refining SFG's transitivity system and advancing our understanding of language analysis.

Practical Implications

The understanding of systemic functional grammar holds significant value for students, especially for language teachers, as highlighted in the previous analysis. Firstly, incorporating experiential grammar allows teachers to explicitly and systematically introduce students to the various choices available for expressing meanings related to human experiences within English clauses. By exploring this aspect of grammar, students gain a comprehensive understanding of how language can represent and convey different aspects of human experiences. Secondly, through the utilization of interpersonal grammar, students can learn about the grammatical tools and structures that facilitate effective communication and meaning exchange with others. This aspect of grammar enables students to develop the necessary skills to engage in meaningful interactions and express their ideas and intentions accurately. Thirdly, a solid grasp of textual grammar, particularly the patterns of Theme and Rheme that shape the organization of diverse types of texts, empowers students to enhance the effectiveness and coherence of their own written compositions. Understanding how to structure their writing and effectively utilize elements such as topic sentences, sequencing conjunctions, and pronouns enables students to create well-organized and cohesive pieces of writing. So, it becomes mandatory In language teaching, it is important for educators to incorporate these grammatical features, including topic sentences, sequencing conjunctions, pronouns, and more, even if they might not be explicitly aware of the term "textual grammar." Many teachers already integrate these elements into their instruction, albeit without formal knowledge of textual grammar. However, gaining explicit and systematic knowledge of textual grammar can undoubtedly enhance the effectiveness of language teaching by providing teachers with a deeper understanding of the underlying principles that govern effective communication and text organization.

References

1. Butt, D., Fahey , R., Freeze, S., & Spinks , S. (2000). *Using functional grammar: An explorer's guide*.
2. Droga, L., & H. S. (2002). *Getting started with functional grammar*. .
3. Halliday, M. A., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction To Functional Grammar* .

4. Jorgensen, M., & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method* . London: Sage Publications.
5. Simon-Vandenberg. (2003). *Grammatical metaphor: Views from systemic functional linguistics* . Amsterdam: Benjamins.
6. Thompson, G. (2004). *Introducing functional grammar* .
7. Young, L., & Harrison, C. (2004). *Systemic functional linguistics and critical discourse analysis: Studies in social change*.
8. Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (1999). *Construing experience through meaning: A language-based approach to cognition*. London/New York: Continuum.
9. Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An Introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold. [10] Halliday, M. A. K., & Webster, J. J. (2009). *Continuum companion to systemic functional linguistics* . London: Continuum. [11] Jorgensen, M. and Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage Publications.
10. Jost, W. & Olmsted, W. (2004). *A companion to rhetoric and rhetorical criticism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing
11. Kazemian, B., Behnam, B. & Ghafoori, N. (2013) Ideational grammatical metaphor in scientific texts: A Hallidayan perspective. *International journal of Linguistics*, 5 (4), 146-168. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v5i4.4192>.
12. Martin, J. R., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. & Painter, C. (1997). *Working with functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
13. Renkema, J. (2009). *Discourse, of course. An overview of Research in discourse studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins Publishing.
14. Rogers, R. (2011). *An Introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. New York & London: Routledge. [17] Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.