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ABSTRACT

Introduction: This paper aimed to analyze FCE and Summit Books which are among popular English language teaching textbooks. In particular, this study was an attempt toward the objective analysis of reading passages by finding the differences and similarities of the books in terms of their processes.

Methodology: To conduct the study, a corpus of 1964 clauses from reading passages of the two books named Ready for First Certificate of English FCE and Summit was formed, classified, and coded. The corpus was then analyzed based on Halliday and Matthiesen (2004) transitivity system.

Results: The findings of the study revealed that there were significant differences between Summit and FCE books in terms of relational, existential, and verbal processes.

Conclusion: The findings of this study suggest that analyzing the schemas of the texts not only reveals the mindsets of their authors, but also can be an objective method for better understanding of a text. The results were also discussed from an educational perspective, and suggestions were made for future research.

1. Introduction

The saliency of textbooks in English language teaching (ELT henceforth) classes cannot be ignored due to their importance in providing language input and practices for language learners (Richards, 2001). Textbooks are, in fact, the means of consistency in the language learning process which can give learners a sense of cohesion and belonging to a system (Toms, 2004) by guiding them and balancing the contents to be learned. The content of a textbook not only does transfer knowledge and information, but also develop certain attitudes in the mind of the learners. Coursebooks will directly or indirectly communicate sets of cultural values (McLean, 2011). This is called a ‘hidden curriculum’ (Cunningworth, 1995; Holly, 1990). Many educationalists claim that the hidden curriculum is more effective than the official curriculum. As mentioned, foreign language teaching textbooks are implicit means through which no cultural transmission occurs and it is not sheer development of foreign language pedagogy (Li, 2016). Since the underlying system is not explicitly stated, it requires us to look at course books in detail to understand the unstated values. Consequently, evaluating English as a Foreign Language (EFL) or English as a Second Language (ESL) textbooks in any educational program can be of utmost importance.

Texts and reading passages are the integral components of textbooks which mirror how a writer comprehends and sees the world. In fact, authors of texts make a special choice of grammar and vocabulary with regard to those who are supposed to read their texts. Therefore, these are the writer’s choices which create the meaning of the text (Teo, 2000). In this regard, systemic functional linguistics is a theory of linguistics that claims language, or any other semiotic system, can be seen as a system of choices. This theory focuses mainly on the principle that “…behaviors, beliefs and values within a particular cultural and social environment influence and shape both the overall language system...and language “instances,” the way people use language in everyday interaction (Coffin, 2001, p. 95).

Functionalist movements began in Europe and flourished in the work of Halliday (1985) when he introduced systemic functional grammar (SFG). Systemic in this sense, considers language as “a network of systems, or interrelated sets of options for making meaning” (Halliday, 1985); functional refers to Halliday’s view that language is as it is because of what it has evolved to do. Functionalists hold to the belief that the very first role of language is to transfer meaning, and the speakers of a language produce spoken/written texts as an instrument. Halliday (1971) asserted that SFG could be really beneficial in text analysis.
since it is meaning-based. In fact, SFG deals with language as a system of meaning which focuses mainly on the system rather than structure.

The system of a language is represented in the form of text (2004). Since texts are instances of the systemic choices being made, we can work backward from the text to discover the meaning, choices which have been made by writers, and what function they might serve. In addition, we can discover here what meaning choices have been made over other possible choices (Iddings & Oliveria, 2011). Halliday takes a very strong stand on functional theory in claiming that everything in the grammar can be explained in terms of use/function and supports the claim that a functional grammar is essentially a natural grammar in the sense that everything in it can be explained, ultimately, by reference to how language is used (Halliday, 1985).

According to this theory not only the emergence of grammar, but also the specific forms that grammars are closely related to the functions that language aims at serving (Halliday, 1985).

Figure 1.
Halliday's Metafunctions

In systemic functional grammar, clause as an initial unit of analysis carries three different meanings which are interrelated. In other words, these meanings provide a "theory of human experience, and certain of the resources of the lexicogrammar of every language" which are manifested in a specific function (p. 29). Many discourse analysts have used the functional theory by looking at these three different levels of meaning called metafunctions. Metafunctions are further divided into three major categories, including ideational, interpersonal, and textual.

Ideational metafunction embraces the meaning that "language is used to organize, understand and express our perceptions of the world and of our own consciousness" (Bloor & Bloor, 2004, p. 11). It determines the ways in which the clause represents the experiences an author/speaker expresses. Lexico-grammatically speaking, "we are concerned here with the participants, typically expressed in nouns and nominal groups, who do some kinds of processes, typically expressed in verbs and verbal groups, under certain circumstances, typically expressed in prepositional and adverbial phrases" (Iddings & Oliveria, 2011, p. 27). Interpersonal metafunction considers interactive and personal aspects of language; in fact, it determines how a clause is represented as an exchange between speakers/writers and listeners/readers; it also maintains relations with them, to affect their behavior, to express their viewpoint on things in the world, and to provoke or make change others (Thompson, 2004). Finally, the bridge between these two metafunctions is called textual metafunction, which is the main concern of this study. In using language, individuals organize their messages in ways that show how suitable they are in accordance with other messages around them and with the wider context in which we are talking or writing. This metafunction plays the role of sequencing discourse, organizing the discursive flow, and creating cohesion and continuity in the text. It is, in fact, the manifestation of the world within discourse.

The researchers' focus is on transitivity when analyzing what the speaker/writer wants to say. The term transitivity would probably be familiar as a way of distinguishing between verbs according to whether they have an object or not; however, in SFG it is used in a broader sense. The grammatical system through which experiences are explained is called transitivity (Halliday, 1967). The transitivity system is composed of a manageable set of process types which form experience (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). Each process type provides its own model or schema for construing a particular domain of experience. It should not be ignored that processes are one of the major components of transitivity systems. The other two components in this semantic system are participants and circumstances associated with the process. Processes, as the main concern of this study, are classified into two axes of major and minor processes in which minor processes are the link between major processes. The processes in the transitivity system are:

1. Material: the process of doing and happening, which involves physical actions; some verbs in this category include go, catch, occur, burn, paint, melt, unfold, and extend. “The doer of this type of action is called the Actor: any material process has an Actor; even though the Actor may not be mentioned in the clause. Material devices can be divided into those which represent the action as involving only the Actor and those which also affect or are ‘being done to’ another participant. This second participant is called the Goal, since the action is, in a sense directed at this participant” (Thompson, 2004, p.90).

2. Mental: the process of thinking which involves perception, reaction, and cognition. There are clear differences between something that goes on in the external world and something that goes on in the internal world of the mind (p. 92); some verbs refer to these mental processes including think, know, feel, smell, hear, see, want, like, hate, please, disgust, admire, enjoy, fear, and frightened.

3. Relational: the process of being, and having; identifying and characterizing; verbs in this category include seem, become, appear, have, own, possess, and so on. Two different types of relational process has been indicated: the first type is called an attributive relational process; and the two participants are the Carrier and the Attribute. The second type is called an identifying relational process. “The function of this process is to identify one entity in terms of another” (p. 96).

4. Behavioral: the process of behaving; it is the link
between material and mental. “One of the main reasons for setting up this category is that they allow us to distinguish between purely mental processes and the outward physical signs of those processes” (p.103); some verbs in this category include breath, dream, smile, laugh, cry, and cough.

5. Verbal: the process of saying; as saying something is a physical action that reflects mental operations, it is the link between relational and mental; some verbs in this category include say, quote, urge, report, and explain.

6. Existential: the process of existing; there is only one participant in such clauses: the Existent, but it has no experiential meaning its function is to avoid the need for, or the possibility of, a second participant in the clause and normally the subject is ‘there’. It is the link between material and relational; verbs in this category include to be, exist.

Not only linguistic choices, but also comprehension of texts involves rapid integration of various types of semantic and syntactic knowledge (Altmann et al., 1992; Blom & Baayen, 2013; Ferretti et al., 2001; Tanenhaus et al., 1995). Among various syntactic entities, verbs are considered the most important ones, and their absence can lead to grammatical disorders (Druks, 2002). It is the semantic aspect of the verb which provides prompt access to the generalized situation structure (which could be called a schema) that relates to the situations/events to which it alludes (Ferretti et al., 2001). Fadanelli (2022) investigates the SFG manifestation in receipt genres and its effect on TEFL teaching. Xiang (2022) seek the representation of SFG version 22) in order to see if there are significant differences between FEC and Summit reading passages with regard to transitivity system processes.

2. Results and discussion

This study deals with the possibility of any significant difference between the Summit and FEC books with respect to their transitivity system processes. The statistical chi-square test was used to investigate the aim of the research.

As is seen in Table 1, there is a significant difference among the transitivity processes used in the FEC book ($\chi^2 = 9.747, p < .05$). As can be seen, material and relational processes ($N= 516$ and 236) were employed more than expected ($N= 176.3$) in this book. Moreover, the findings revealed that while FEC book concentrates significantly on material and relational; other processes like mental, existential, verbal, and behavioral processes are utilized less ($N= 150$, 71, 58, 27). Behavioral was the least used process in this book.

The results of Table 2 reveal that there is a significant difference among the processes applied in the Summit book ($\chi^2 = 9.967, p < .05$). In this book, the writer benefits significantly from the presence of material (observed $N= 451$) and relational (observed $N=208$) processes more than expected ($N=122.0$). The notable point is that the least frequent transitivity process in Summit book is related to the existential process. Comparing these two groups suggests that the writers of both FEC and Summit books rely heavily on material and relational processes, which are among those major processes. On the other hand, minor processes, including behavioral, existential, and verbal, are those which receive less attention.

2. Methodology

2.1. Material

This study entails the reading passages of the two books named Ready for First Certificate of English FCE and Summit. The first criterion in selecting these two books to be compared was their similar level of difficulty, asserted by their writers to be high-intermediate to advance for adults. Secondly, these books are being published internationally by leading publishers, including Pearson Longman and Macmillan. The final criterion was that the passages were longer than books in the lower levels and thus provided a better chance for the word choice of the writers. In fact, the total number of 30 reading passages (from the FCE book and from the Summit book) formed our corpus.

2.2. Procedure

The reading passages were broken into clauses, later, each clause was classified based on Hallidays and Matthiessen’ (2004) transitivity system, and they were again coded. What challenged the researchers was the fact that some verbs, including to be belong to both relational and existential processes. Therefore, after codifying and classifying the clauses, two specialists were used to attest the soundness of model application. Moreover, to increase the reliability of the results, clauses were double-checked after passing about one month from the first analysis.

2.3. Data analysis

After the classification, the frequency of each category was calculated based on the number of words. The results were analyzed by running the Chi-square test (SPSS version 22) in order to see if there are significant differences between FEC and Summit reading passages with regard to transitivity system processes.
Table 1.
Chi-square Test for FCE Book

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Observed N</th>
<th>Expected N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>176.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.747</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>176.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>176.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>176.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>176.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>176.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df: Degree of freedom

Table 2.
Chi-square Test for Summit Book

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Observed N</th>
<th>Expected N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>134.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.967</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>134.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>134.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>134.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>134.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>134.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df: Degree of freedom

Table 3.
Distribution of Chi-square Test of Transitivity Processes in FCE and Summit Books

| Transitivity processes | FCE | Summit | | |
|------------------------|-----|--------|-----|
|                        | Observed N | Expected N | Observed N | Expected N | Sig. | $\chi^2$ |
| Material               | 516 | 483.5  | 451 | 483.5      | 0.187 | 1.738 |
| Mental                 | 150 | 140    | 130 | 140        | 0.232 | 1.429 |
| Relational             | 236 | 186.5  | 138 | 186.5      | 0.000 | 26.276 |
| Behavioral             | 27  | 27.5   | 28  | 27.5       | 0.893 | 0.018 |
| Verbal                 | 58  | 56.5   | 42  | 56.5       | 0.006 | 7.442 |
| Existential            | 71  | 38     | 18  | 38         | 0.000 | 21.053 |
| Total                  | 1058|        | 807 |            |       |       |

df: Degree of freedom

Table 3 summarizes the distribution of transitivity processes chi-square test in both FCE and Summit books.

As it is shown in Table 3, there are non-significant differences among the three processes of material, mental and behavioral (p > .05). However, the utilization of relational ($\chi^2 = 26.276, p < .05$), verbal ($\chi^2 = 7.442, p < .05$) and existential ($\chi^2 = 21.023, p < .05$) processes were significantly different as the table illustrates, not only does the relational process occur more in the FCE book (observed N=236) than expected (expected N=186.5), but also this is the similar situation for verbal and existential processes, as well. This means that the verbal process (observed N=58) and existential process (observed N=71) are employed more in the FCE book than expected.

Overall, Figure 2 shows the differences regarding transitivity processes in FCE and Summit books.

4. Conclusion

This study investigated the differences between FCE and Summit books with respect to Halliday and Matthiessen’s (2004) transitivity system. Considering this, it cannot be ignored that language is a manifestation of its speakers’ thought patterns, and in Austin’s (1976) words, language encompasses all acts and functions its speakers do. Therefore, delving into the language people use can pave the way for a better understanding of their thought patterns and mindset. What counts in this regard is the process of word choice, and the meaning words carry. Accordingly, it can be seen both FCE and Summit books weigh down with material verbs, which signals the fact that the writers of these two books followed a realistic approach and tried to present the English language as tangible as possible for their readers, as Bloor and Bloor (2004) mentioned material processes are action-oriented. Regarding the major processes, there is a significant difference between the two books in utilizing the relational process. Bloor and Bloor (2004, p. 120) claimed that “The semantics of relational processes is very complicated, and different sets of participant functions can be associated with different, more delicate categories of relational process.” It can be thus concluded that Morris, the writer of the FCE book, involves her readers in a more complicated process of understanding which is quite acceptable at advanced level.
Taking minor processes into account, significant differences can be seen in the utilization of verbal and existential processes which has traces of relational processes in themselves. Verbal processes are on the borderline of mental and relational processes and existential processes, on the other hand, are on the borderline of relational and material processes. In this situation, it is not surprising that the FCE book differs significantly from a Summit book in terms of its relational processes; this book also favors the utilization of verbal processes and existential processes more than Summit books. In other words, the FCE book learners are involved in a more complex and abstract mental aspect of language learning in comparison with Summit book.

The findings of this study suggest that analyzing the schemas of the texts not only reveals the mindsets of their authors, but also can be an objective method for better understanding of a text, as it was suggested in the previous studies of Khodadady and Khosravani (2014) and Khodadady and Lagzian (2013). According to Khodadady (2017), the elements of texts are best captured by the words whose employment in isolation and in combination with each other creates the texts. It can also be witnessed that looking at a text or more specifically, a language book through the lens of transitivity processes can reveal the flow of events learners are supposed to follow and decode in that language. In addition, such analysis can provide a deeper insight not only for material development, but also for those teachers and instructors who are teaching the books to language learners. Teachers should be aware of the underlying meaning they are transferring to the learners when they are teaching such textbooks.
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