

TRANSITIVITY ANALYSIS OF SENATOR HAWLEY AND PROFESSOR BRIDGE'S GENDER IDENTITY DEBATE

Erica Christiana¹, Lucia Lusi Ani Handayani²

^{1,2}Universitas Indonesia

ericachristiana27@gmail.com¹, Lusidua@gmail.com²

ABSTRACT

Using Halliday's transitivity concept, this paper analyzes the debate between Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges conducted on July 12, 2022. The debate focuses on the topic of people with a capacity for pregnancy, which led to views of gender identity. The way individuals identify their gender has become a social phenomenon, as the idea of gender has broadened to the point that it is seen as a spectrum. The creation of new words outside the two polarizations (i.e., man and woman) could create acknowledgment for the minority group of people with lesser-known gender identities. Using Halliday's (1994) Transitivity Concept in Systemic Functional Linguistics, this study analyzes the clause structures of both Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges to examine the distribution of the six transitivity processes and their relation to the clauses chosen to represent each participant's ideology regarding their views on gender. The different approaches in their arguments regarding gender identity also show the different ideological beliefs of their parties, which are the Republicans and the Democrats. Senator Hawley dominantly uses mental processes consisting of the desideration process, cognition process, and emotion process. In comparison, Professor Bridges shows a high use of relational processes consisting of the attribution process and identification process. Professor Bridges' relational processes point out Senator Hawley's rigid idea of gender by identifying and valuing the variety of genders. The many clauses stated by Professor Bridges also affirm her liberal belief that views gender as more than just two polarizations while also supporting equality in the idea of abortion rights as something that is needed for women and other groups of genders. Senator Hawley counters Professor Bridges' allegations using mental processes by seeking clarification to align their awareness of gender, which reveals his gender polarization. The use of clauses mentioned by Senator Hawley is done to showcase his implied Republican ideology, which does not find significance in the topic of people with the capacity for pregnancy leading to transphobia.

Keywords: gender identity, ideology, political debate, transitivity analysis, transphobia

INTRODUCTION

Gender identity is the trait that an individual believes best describes themselves (Mousavi et al., 2018). The way individuals identify their gender has become a social phenomenon, as the idea of gender has become broader to the point that it is seen as a spectrum. The traditional understanding of gender is divided only into two opposite polarizations: man and woman. However, the changes of time broaden the idea of gender, as it holds more identity within it, i.e. cis-man, cis-woman, non-binary, transgender man, or transgender woman (Joel et al., 2013). Changes in language use may occur because language is dynamic and fluid, which will develop according to its time. Therefore, the topic of gender identity is an enticing study that showcases a shift in words that could represent a larger community. The creation of new words that are outside of the two polarizations could create acknowledgment for the minority group of people in the lesser-known gender identity.

One cultural issue that portrays the degree of changes in language use over gender identity is the overturn of *Roe v. Wade*. Although the focus of *Roe v. Wade* is in regard to abortion rights, the problem that could be further discussed is regarding the recipient who is seen as qualified to receive abortion rights. Some fail to realize that the overturn of *Roe v. Wade* on the idea of abortion rights affects cis-women, and other genders within the spectrum. Many believe that the overturn of *Roe v. Wade* leads to a modern step back, as it strips the right of freedom in choosing. The law within *Roe v. Wade* itself states that an individual is allowed the right to choose abortion when their pregnancy is between 21 to 24 weeks (Johnson, 2022). However, ultimately under the case of *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, No. 19-1392, 597 U.S., The U.S. Supreme Court issued a landmark decision in which the Constitution of the United States does not grant the right to abortion. This led to the downfall of *Roe v. Wade*, resulting in restrictions on abortions for pregnancies over 15 weeks.

The new regulations on abortion rights impact many communities of different race, culture, and religion within the gender spectrum. During a senate hearing over abortion rights after the overturn of *Roe v. Wade* on July 12, 2022, a dispute happened between Republican Senator Hawley and Berkeley Law Professor, Professor Bridges, as their view regarding the term people with the capacity for pregnancy did not align with one another. Senator Hawley as a prominent figure of the Republican often voiced out his opinion on gender. In an interview with *Axios* on November 7, 2021, Senator Hawley specified that the idea of masculinity nowadays effected men to perform less. Through the discussion, Senator Hawley spoke

about his idea of men which assigned role was based on them being a father, a husband, and somebody who takes responsibility (Plank, 2021). Another article on Senator Hawley's views of gender discussed a campaign email sent out by Senator Hawley on January 6, 2021 to his supporter. The email consisted of a survey on transgender propaganda, which was being taught to children as young as first grade. The survey provided two answers, where one sparked a conversation on Twitter, as the answer stated "No – Teach young children there was more than one gender". The puzzling answer appeared to relate Senator Hawley to being gender-confused, as it conveyed that there was only one gender (Wiggins, 2022). With many news outlets covering Senator Hawley's views of gender, his opinion regarding gender was not unknown to the world. Therefore, on the senate hearing on July 12, 2022 regarding abortion right, Professor Bridges immediately pointed out Senator Hawley's well-known view of gender. Professor Bridges called out Senator Hawley as being potentially transphobic. She pointed out that gender identity was broader than the compartmentalized idea of male and female which led to her sarcastic comments on Senator Hawley's rigid idea of gender. The heated exchange also highlighted the larger debate on the inclusive term, people with the capacity for pregnancy. Senator Hawley argued that such phrase excludes cisgender women who needed abortion the most, while, Professor Bridges affirmed that including the variety of gender into the idea of abortion rights doesn't erase or exclude women.

This shows that in terms of the idea of gender identity the respective individual holds different beliefs. The different approach in their argument regarding gender identity also shows the different ideological belief of their parties, which are the Republicans and the Democrats. According to Brown (2017), eight-in-ten Republicans and Republican-leaning independents believe that a person's sex at birth determines whether they are a man or a woman. This means that the topic of people with a capacity for pregnancy is irrelevant to the Republicans, as gender is only seen from the sex assigned at birth which are men and women. In contrast to that, 64% of Democrats and Democratic leaners believe that a person's gender can differ from the sex assigned to them at birth, implying that gender is a fluid concept.

Several studies have analyzed the intention of individuals in their debate through the use of Halliday's transitivity concept in Systemic Functional Grammar. A study by Peñuelas (2015) has demonstrated the use of transitivity as an ideological instrument for persuasion and legitimization of economic policies. Obama has employed mental desiderative processes to convey desires, as well as put forward the active role of 'us' in effecting positive change. In contrast, Rajoy prefers relational, verbal, and existential processes to contribute to his view of ideology. Another study by Zhao & Zhang (2017), through the use of transitivity concept, finds that the material process is regularly utilized by President Trump to present a negative picture of America and to characterize new government efforts. He also employs relational process to sketch out a new vision for America. In addition, a study by Setiawan (2018) describes the linguistic experiences of the two presidential candidates of Indonesia in their debate to the various aspects of the exposure system. Liani et al. (2021) and Fadilah & Kuswoyo (2021) possess similar studies where they have analyzed the most frequently used processes in their corpus. Liani et al. (2021) have analyzed the presidential victory speech of Kamala Harris through the use of transitivity analysis. The debate invites the people of America to focus on others to implicitly demonstrate her liberalism ideology through the utilization of Material (60%), Relational (19%), Mental (11%) and Behavioral (3%) processes in her speech, whereas, Fadilah & Kuswoyo (2021) has discussed the debate between Trump and Biden, whose study has shown that there is a dominant use of material process by both Trump and Biden to focus on their subjective.

The five previous studies have used Halliday's theory as their methodology and apply it to their analysis of political debate. The studies have shown the effect of different individuals with different backgrounds in regards to their choice of words to convey their personal ideology. Although the studies have analyzed political discourse in different topics, few have analyzed political discourse regarding gender identity. Therefore, this study aims to give a comprehensive knowledge regarding gender identity, as seen from political discourse of different parties, the Republicans and the Democrats.

Using Halliday's (1994) Transitivity Concept in Systemic Functional Grammar, this study analyzes the clause structures of both Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges by looking at six transitivity concept processes: Material Process, Mental Process, Relational Process, Behavioral Process, Verbal Process and Existential Process. From there, this study examines how the transitivity theory elaborates on how the debate between Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges covers the idea of gender identity according to their political belief system, which is the Republican and the Democrat. In examining this debate, this study asks two questions:

1. What are the distributions of six processes in transitivity used by the two participants on the debate of gender identity?

2. How do the transitivity processes in the debate explained the portrayal of gender identity according to the ideologies of Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges?

METHODOLOGY

Data Collection

The corpus being analyzed was transcribed utterances of the debate between Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges during a U.S. senate hearing on July 12, 2022. The U.S. senate hearing lasted more than two hours but the debate between Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges started at the latter half of the hearing from minute 2:08:24 to 2:10:03 I focused the corpus on this 2:19 minute. The utterances of the hearing were obtained from CNBC Television YouTube channel with the title *Congress Holds Hearing on the Consequences of Supreme Court's Abortion Decision*. <https://youtu.be/veDrsG8qesM> (July, 2022)

Analytical Procedure

Several steps were taken within this study. The first step was listening to the Congress Holds Hearing. Second, the debate between Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges was transcribed. Third, the study dissected the clauses by assigning each clause with a code, i.e. SH for Senator Hawley and PB for Professor Bridges. Then the analysis proceeded with counting the different variety of processes into Halliday's transitivity concept (i.e. Material Process, Mental Process, Relational Process, Behavioral Process, Verbal Process, and Existential Process). The analysis aimed at determining which process was most frequent and which process was least frequent used by Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges. Lastly, the analysis elaborated on how the process within the clause could impact the implied ideology regarding gender identity according to Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges.

Theoretical Framework

The study discusses the debate between Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges using Halliday's transitivity concept. According to Halliday (1994) as cited in Zhao & Zhang (2017), systemic functional grammar consists of three meta-functions which are ideational, interpersonal, and textual. The ideational meta-function interprets our external and internal experience of the world, and ideational system at clause rank is called transitivity. Transitivity is a semantic concept that is used to describe the whole clause. The use of transitivity analysis can showcase the represented bias, manipulation and ideology within a discourse (Matu, 2008). The three main components within transitivity concepts are process, participants, and circumstantial. Within the six processes, i.e. material process, mental process, relational process, behavioral process, verbal process, existential process, of Halliday's transitivity process, each clause element is described differently from one another.

One notable similarity between the six processes is the presence of a "process".

Table 1. *Process and Participants*

Processes	Participants
Material Process	Actor, Goal
Mental Process	Senser, Phenomenon
Relational Process	Carrier, Attribute, Identified, Identifier
Behavioral Process	Behaver, behavior
Verbal Process	Sayer, Receiver, Verbiage
Existential Process	Existent

Source: (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004)

1) *Material Process*

Material process is a clause that is doing or happening. The material process expresses the concept that one entity commits an action to another entity (Halliday, 1994). The clause element within material process is differentiated into actor, process, and goal. The Actor is an entity that causes the process, which leads to the goal within the clause. The material clause can be transitive or intransitive according to the present or absence of the goal in the clause. When deciding on a clause as a part of the material processes, the following questions can be a helpful guide (Zhao & Zhang, 2017):

- (i) What did X do?
- (ii) What happened to Y?
- (iii) Who by?

2) *Mental Process*

The mental process is the process of sensing, which refers to the reflection of people’s awareness. Mental process deals with perception, cognition, desideration, and emotion. The four sub-types differ according to the process within the clause. The perception type deals with the matter of “seeing”, the cognition process deals with the matter of “thinking”, the desideration process deals with the matter of “wanting”, and lastly, the emotion process deals with the matter of “feeling”. In the case of Mental Processes, the clause element within the mental process is divided into the senser, process, and phenomenon. The senser is the participant within the clause, and the process is the action which leads to the phenomenon. The senser is not limited to human beings, as it can also be defined as an object that can be treated as conscious.

3) *Relational Process*

Relational process is a state of “being” that is done to identify or give quality to something. The clause that is classified as relational process can be divided into two types: attribution and identification. The attribution process deals with “attributing” or giving quality to a particular person or thing. On the other hand, the identification process deals with matters concerning identifying. The clause element within relation process is divided according to their process sub-type. The attribution clause element consists of carrier, process, attribute, while the identification process sub type consists of clause element, which consists of identified, process, identifier.

4) *Behavioral Process*

Behavioral process is an outer reflection of our inward thought. Breathing, dreaming, coughing, and smiling, are examples of physiological and psychological activities associated with the behavioral process. (Haratyan, 20). The clause element within behavioral process is classified into behavior, process, behavior. The behavior within behavioral process is a conscious being as to show certain behavior, the behavior needs to understand their surroundings.

5) *Verbal Process*

The process of saying is identified as verbal process. The use of verbal process is done to reflect an individual’s consciousness through the use of language. The clause element of verbal process is divided into sayer, process, target.

6) *Existential Process*

Existential process is done to express an existence. The use of “there is” is mainly present in the clause of existential process (Opara, 2012). This process depicts the concept of something existing or happening. The clause element within the process is classified into existent and process.

Through the use of specific clauses, the transcribed utterances showcase the different perspective about the topic of people with a capacity of pregnancy according to different ideologies.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Distribution of Process

The table below exhibits the distribution of the six-process type that is present in the debate between Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges. The results can be seen in the following table.

Table 2. *Transitivity processes distribution found in the debate between Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges*

Transitivity Process	Senator Hawley		Professor Bridges	
	Frequencies	Percentage	Frequencies	Percentage
Material Process	2	16.67%	5	33.33%
Mental Process	4	33.33%	4	26.67%
Relational Process	3	25%	6	40%
Behavioral Process	2	16.67%	0	0%
Verbal Process	1	8.33%	0	0%
Existential Process	0	0%	0	0%
Total	12	100%	15	100%

The results show that Senator Hawley possesses five out of the six processes, which are material process, mental process, relational process, behavioral process, and verbal process. However, in Professor Bridges' case, only three out of the six processes are present. They include material process, mental process, and relational process. Further, the data reveals that the most dominant process used by Senator Hawley is the mental process, whereas Professor Bridges mostly uses relational process.

Table 2 shows that there are 12 clauses found in Senator Hawley's utterances, and 15 clauses found in Professor Bridge's utterances. The finding has found that Senator Hawley frequently uses mental process with a percentage of 33.33%, which is 4 occurrences. The second highest frequency is relational process, with a percentage of 25%, which occurs 3 times. It is followed by behavioral process and material process, 16.67%, with 2 occurrences for both of them. Lastly, the least likely to show up within the clauses of Senator Hawley is the verbal process, with a percentage of 8.33%, which occurs once. Within Senator Hawley's utterances, there are no occurrences of the existential process, making the percentage of 0% with an occurrence of 0. As for Professor Bridges, her most frequent use of process is relational process, with a percentage of 40%, which occurs 6 times. The next frequent use of process is material process, which occurs 5 times with a percentage of 33.33%. Lastly the less frequent use process is the mental process, with a percentage of 26.67% with 4 occurrences. Within Professor Bridge's utterances, there is an absence of the three-other processes, namely: behavioral process, verbal process, and existential process.

Transitivity Analysis on the Debate of Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges

Table 3. *Process Analysis on the Debate of Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges*

Debate Text	Process
Senator Hawley	
(SH1) Professor Bridges (SH1.1.1) you said <u>several times</u> , (SH1.1.2) you've used a phrase, (SH1.1.3) I want to make sure I understand (SH1.1.4) what you mean by it.	SH1.1.1 Behavioral Process SH1.1.2 Material Process SH1.1.3 Mental Process SH1.1.4 Mental Process
Senator Hawley	
(SH2) (SH2.1.1) you've referred to people with a <u>capacity</u> for pregnancy, (SH2.1.2) would that be women?	SH2.1.1 Mental Process SH2.1.2 Relational Process
Professor Bridges	
(PB1) (PB1.1.1) Many women cis women <u>have</u> the capacity for pregnancy, (PB1.1.2) many cis women <u>do not</u> have the capacity for pregnancy, (PB1.1.3) ... there are also trans men who are capable of pregnancy as well as (PB1.1.4) non-binary people who are capable of pregnancy.	PB1.1.1, PB1.1.2, PB1.1.3, PB1.1.4 Relational Process
Senator Hawley	
(SH3) So, (SH3.1.1) this isn't really a women's <u>rights</u> issue? it's uh	SH3.1.1 Relational Process
Professor Bridges	
(PB2) we can recognize that (PB2.1.1) this impacts women, while also recognizing that (PB2.1.2) it impacts other groups.	PB2.1.1 Material Process PB2.1.2 Material Process
Professor Bridges	
(PB3) (PB3.1.1) Those things are not mutually exclusive Senator Hawley.	PB3.1.1 Relational Process
Senator Hawley	
alright so your view is? is that the core of this, this right then, is about what?	No Process
Professor Bridges	
(PB4) So, I want to recognize that (PB4.1.1) your <u>line of questioning</u> ... is <u>transphobic</u> , ... and (PB4.1.2) it opens up trans people to violence by not recognizing that	PB4.1.1 Relational Process PB4.1.2 Material Process
Senator Hawley	
(SH4) Wow you're saying that (SH4.1.1) I'm opening up people to violence by asking whether or not (SH4.1.2) <u>women</u> are the folks who can have <u>pregnancies</u> ?	SH4.1.1 Material Process SH4.1.2 Relational Process

Professor Bridges	
(PB5) so, one, (PB5.1.1) I want to <u>note</u> that (PB5.1.2) <u>one out of five</u> transgender persons have attempted suicide, so I think it's important	PB5.1.1 Material Process PB5.1.2 Material Process
Senator Hawley	
because of my line of questioning? so we can't talk about it?	No Process
Professor Bridges	
(PB6) because (PB6.1.1) <u>denying</u> that trans people exist, and (PB6.1.2) <u>pretending</u> not to know that they exist	PB6.1.1 Mental Process PB6.1.2 Mental Process
Senator Hawley	
(SH5) (SH5.1.1) I'm <u>denying</u> that trans people exist by asking you, if (SH5.1.2) you're talking about <u>women</u> having pregnancies?	SH5.1.1 Mental Process SH5.1.2 Verbal Process
Professor Bridges	
Are you?	No Process
Professor Bridges	
(PB7) Do (PB7.1.1) <u>you</u> believe that the <u>men</u> can get pregnant?	PB7.1.1 Mental Process
Senator Hawley	
No, I don't think	No Process
Professor Bridges	
(PB8) So, (PB8.1.1) you're <u>denying</u> that trans people exist, thank you.	PB8.1.1 Mental Process
Senator Hawley	
(SH6) And that leads to violence? is this how (SH6.1.1) you run your classroom? are students allowed to question you? or are they also treated like this opening up <u>people</u> to <u>violence</u> .	SH6.1.1 Behavioral Process

Table 4. Clause Element Analysis on the Debate of Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges

Code	Debate Text	Clause Element
Senator Hawley:		
SH1.1.1	Professor Bridges, <u>you said several times</u> .	Behavior-Process-Behavior
SH1.1.2	<u>you've used a phrase</u> .	Actor-Process-Goal
SH1.1.3	<u>I want to make sure</u> I understand	Senser-Process-Phenomenon (Desideration Process)
SH1.1.4	<u>what you mean by it</u> .	Senser-Process-Phenomenon (Cognition Process)
SH.2.1.1	<u>you've referred to people with a capacity for pregnancy</u> ,	Senser-Process-Phenomenon (Cognition Process)
SH2.1.2	<u>would that be women?</u>	Identified-Process-Identifier (Identification Process)
Professor Bridges:		
PB1.1.1	<u>Many women cis women have the capacity for pregnancy</u>	Carrier-Process-Attribute (Attribution Process)
PB1.1.2	<u>many cis women do not have the capacity for pregnancy</u>	Carrier-Process-Attribute (Attribution Process)
PB1.1.3	... <u>there are also trans men who are capable of pregnancy</u>	Carrier-Process-Attribute (Attribution Process)
PB1.1.4	as well as <u>non-binary people who are capable of pregnancy</u>	Carrier-Process-Attribute (Attribution Process)
Senator Hawley:		
SH3.1.1	So <u>this isn't really a women's rights issue?</u> it's uh	Carrier-Process-Attribute (Attribution Process)

Professor Bridges:		
PB2.1.1	we can recognize that <u>this impacts women</u>	Actor-Process-Goal
PB2.1.2	while also recognizing that <u>it impacts other groups</u>	Actor-Process-Goal
PB3.1.1	<u>those things are not mutually exclusive</u> senator Hawley	Carrier-Process-Attribute (Attribution Process)
Professor bridges:		
PB4.1.1	So ... I want to recognize that <u>your line of questioning ... is transphobic</u>	Identified-Process-Identifier (Identification Process)
PB4.1.2	um and <u>it opens up trans people to violence</u> by not recognizing that	Actor-Process-Goal
Senator Hawley		
SH4.1.1	Wow you're saying that <u>I'm opening up people to violence</u> by asking whether or not	Actor-Process-Goal
SH4.1.2	<u>women are the folks who can have pregnancies</u>	Identified-Process-Identifier (Identification Process)
Professor Bridges:		
PB5.1.1	so one, <u>I want to note</u> that	Actor-Process-Goal
PB5.1.2	<u>one out of five transgender persons have attempted suicide</u> so I think it's important	Actor-Process-Goal
Professor Bridges:		
PB6.1.1	because <u>denying that trans people exist</u>	Process-Sensor-Phenomenon (Emotion Process)
PB6.1.2	and <u>pretending not to know that they exist</u>	Process-Sensor-Phenomenon (Emotion Process)
Senator Hawley:		
SH5.1.1	<u>I'm denying that trans people exist</u> by asking you	Senser-Process-Phenomenon (Emotion Process)
SH5.1.2	if <u>you're talking about women having pregnancies</u>	Sayer-Process-Receiver
Professor Bridges:		
PB7.1.1	Do <u>you believe that the men can get pregnant?</u>	Senser-Process-Phenomenon (Cognition Process)
Professor Bridges:		
PB8.1.1	So <u>you're denying that trans people exist</u> , thank you	Senser-Process-Phenomenon (Emotion Process)
Senator Hawley:		
SH6.1.1	And that leads to violence? <u>is this how you run your classroom are students allowed to question you</u> or are they also treated like this opening up people to violence	Behavior-Process-Behavior

Senator Hawley:

(SH1) Professor Bridges (SH1.1.1) you said several times, (SH1.1.2) you've used a phrase, (SH1.1.3) I want to make sure I understand (SH1.1.4) what you mean by it.

Behavioral Process

In SH1.1.1, Senator Hawley uses the behavior “you” to refer to Professor Bridges, and the clause shows the outward reflection of the inward thought that Professor Bridges has. The process in this clause is “said” and the circumstantial is “several times”. In this clause, Senator Hawley states that Professor Bridges has mentioned several times a phrase, i.e. *people with the capacity for pregnancy* which is elaborated after this clause. This clause shows that Professor Bridges stands on her idea of the phrase as she has continuously used the term several times.

Material Process

The statement mentioned by Senator Hawley in SH1.1.2 shows the actor “you” which refers to Professor Bridges, and the “ve used” is the process. The clause here is used to affirm the statement mentioned earlier. The goal of “a phrase” here has been mentioned several times by Professor Bridges. “A phrase” here contextually means people with the capacity for pregnancy. The clause shows that Professor

Bridges stands on her idea of the phrase as she has continuously used the term several times. This idea supports her belief on the broad term of people that are capable of pregnancy.

Mental Process

In *SH.1.1.3*, the senser “I” refers to Senator Hawley. The clause use here shows the state of being where it focuses on the thought awareness of Senator Hawley. The process “want to” can be determine as a desiderative or a process of wanting something. In this clause, Senator Hawley wants to affirm the awareness of both himself and Professor Bridges. The use of phenomenon “make sure” shows that Senator Hawley wants to clarify whether or not their thought process in their debate regarding people with the capacity for pregnancy is the same. However, we can implicitly conclude that Senator Hawley already knows the answer to his statement, as both he and Professor Bridges hold different beliefs.

The *SH1.1.4* shows that the senser is “you” which refers to Professor Bridges, and the process “mean” can be recognize as cognition process, where “mean” can be explain as the way in how someone perceives something. The phenomenon “it” refers to the phrase people with the capacity for pregnancy. Therefore, the *SH1.1.4* is done by Senator Hawley to clarify the cognitive thinking of Professor Bridges in regard to the idea of people with the capacity for pregnancy.

Senator Hawley

(SH2) (SH2.1.1) you've referred to people with a capacity for pregnancy, (SH2.1.2) would that be women?

Mental Process

The *SH2.1.1* shows that the senser “you” is referring to Professor Bridges and the process of “have referred” is a part of the cognitive thinking process, which shows the phenomenon of people with a capacity for pregnancy as the state of being in Professor Bridge’s belief. The introduced phrase of *people with a capacity for pregnancy* by Professor Bridges shows the idea of gender that is seen as fluid where the two polarizations of gender, i.e. women and men, is not something that is adapted cognitively by Professor Bridges.

Relational Process

In *SH2.1.2*, “that” as the identified, refers to people with a capacity for pregnancy. The process “be” and identifier “women” is done to identify the belief of Senator Hawley. The relation between that question and women here shows that in regards to pregnancy, Senator Hawley believes that the individual who can get pregnant is women. This idea shows that Senator Hawley holds the belief that gender identity is only seen as two polarizations.

Professor Bridges

(PB1) (PB1.1.1) Many women cis women have the capacity for pregnancy, (PB1.1.2) many cis women do not have the capacity for pregnancy, (PB.1.1.3) ... there are also trans men who are capable of pregnancy as well as (PB1.1.4) non-binary people who are capable of pregnancy.

Relational Process

The sequence of clauses *PB1.1.1*, *PB1.1.2*, *PB.1.1.3*, *PB1.1.4* are stated by Professor Bridges to show her belief of gender fluidity in regards to people with the capacity for pregnancy. The use of carrier in her clauses shows the different variety of gender identities, such as cis women, trans men, and non-binary people. Through the use of relational process, Professor Bridges expresses that the relation of pregnancy capabilities can be achieved by several gender identities in the gender spectrum.

Senator Hawley

(SH3) So, (SH3.1.1) this isn't really a women's rights issue? it's uh

Relational Process

In *SH3.1.1* mentioned by Senator Hawley, the carrier is “this” while the process is “isn’t really” and the attribute is “a women’s right issue.” Senator Hawley shows that according to his beliefs “this” referring to abortion rights is not identified as a women’s right issue because the statement mentioned before by Professor Bridges, i.e. the variety of gender identity in the gender spectrum, expresses the idea of people with the capacity of pregnancy. Therefore, this shows that Senator Hawley believes that if there is other

gender identity which the law of abortions applies to than it should not be classified as a women's right issue.

Professor Bridges

(PB2) we can recognize that (PB2.1.1) this impacts women, while also recognizing that (PB2.1.2) it impacts other groups.

Material Process

PB2.1.1 and *PB2.1.2* show a process of an entity doing something to another entity. The actor "this" and "it" refer to abortion rights, which through the process of "impacts" affect the goal which is "women" and "other groups". This clause shows that Professor Bridges believes abortion rights should be applied not only to the rigid idea of gender which is women. Rather, it should also apply for gender in a larger spectrum. The statement done by Professor Bridges accuses and corners Senator Hawley's view regarding gender who are able to obtain pregnancies.

Professor Bridges

(PB3) (PB3.1.1) Those things are not mutually exclusive senator Hawley

Relational Process

The *PB3.1.1* mentioned by Professor Bridges portrays her view about abortion rights, and its relation to the idea of women and gender identity as not mutually exclusive. The clause shows that the carrier "those things" which is abortion rights "are not mutually exclusive" or in other words are able to create outcomes that can occur simultaneously for women and other groups of gender. The use of this clause affirms that Professor Bridges believes that abortion rights does apply to women, while also acknowledging that it also applies to a broader idea of gender identity. This supports her idea of gender being fluid and not limited to the traditional two polarizations.

Professor Bridges

(PB4) So, I want to recognize that (PB4.1.1) your line of questioning ... is transphobic, ... and (PB4.1.2) it opens up trans people to violence by not recognizing that

Relational Process

In *PB4.1.1*, the identified is "your line of questioning" and the process is "is" and "transphobic" is the identifier of the clause. The *PB4.1.1* uses the relational process to give identification and link the line of questioning by Senator Hawley to the idea of transphobic. The line of questioning can be identified as transphobic, as it holds meaning where Senator Hawley believes that gender is not fluid and only consists of two polarizations. According to Serano (2007) as cited in Rogers (2017), the roots of transphobia stems from the rigid understanding of gender with mutually exclusive categories.

Material Process

The *PB4.1.2*, which Professor Bridges says, uses "It" as its actor to refer to the line of questioning by Senator Hawley, i.e. *people with a capacity for pregnancy, would that be women?* It is mentioned before the clause, "Opens up trans people to". "Opens up trans people to" is the process, and "violence" is the goal. Therefore, from the clause, Professor Bridges wants to convey that the line of questioning by Senator Hawley showcases a notion where some entity does something which may be done to some other entity. The entity here, which is the line of questioning by Senator Hawley, impacts another entity, which is trans people that leads them to the goal of violence. This affirms the idea of Professor Bridges' belief that acknowledges gender outside the two polarizations, i.e. man and women.

Senator Hawley

SH4) Wow you're saying that (SH4.1.1) I'm opening up people to violence by asking whether or not (SH4.1.2) women are the folks who can have pregnancies?

Material Process

The *SH4.1.1* showcases Senator Hawley's counterargument, which situates the actor "I'm" as himself and the process of "opening up people" to the goal of "violence". In *SH4.1.1*, Senator Hawley wants to question the material process of opening up people to violence and its link to his line of questioning as he believes that he is only stating the factual belief that he has upon women as the one who can carry pregnancy.

Relational Process

The *SH4.1.2* thrown by Senator Hawley shows the identified “women” and the process “are” and identifier “the folks who can have pregnancies”. The *SH4.1.2* is done to affirm his belief on the identity of individuals that are capable of pregnancies which is women. Through the use of the clause, Senator Hawley shows his state of being in regard to the identification of gender that is capable of pregnancy, i.e. women.

Professor Bridges

(*PB5*) *so, one, (PB5.1.1) I want to note that (PB5.1.2) one out of five transgender persons have attempted suicide, so I think it's important*

Material Process

The *PB5.1.1* shows that the “I” represents Professor Bridges, and the process of her clause is to achieve the goal of “note,” which according to (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.), it can represent “an emotion or a way of expressing something”. This idea of expressing is later supported by *PB5.1.2* where the actor of the clause is “one out of five transgender persons” and the process and goal emphasize the factual “happening” or “doing” that has happened to transgender people. *PB5.1.1* and *PB5.1.2* show that the reality of transgender person is bleak and some may even drive themselves to suicide. Therefore, in this statement two clauses work together to further support the link of Senator Hawley’s line of questioning to violence.

Professor Bridges

(*PB6*) *because (PB6.1.1) denying that trans people exist, and (PB6.1.2) pretending not to know that they exist*

Mental Process

PB6.1.1 as mentioned by Professor Bridges classifies “trans people” as the senser of the clause, and “denying” represents the process that specifically deals with the emotion process. According to Cambridge Dictionary, the word “denying” can mean to not admit that you have knowledge, responsibility, or feelings. Therefore, this clause is used by Professor Bridges to show her belief that by not acknowledging and not admitting the other possibilities of gender which may be able to carry pregnancies, it does lead to denying trans people existence.

In addition, the *PB6.1.2* mentioned by Professor Bridges also further mentions the idea of not acknowledging trans people. In *PB6.1.2*, the senser is “they” which refers to trans people, and the process of “pretending not to know” has the same implication of emotion process to the previous clause. *PB6.1.2* is used to support the argument of denying trans people existence.

Senator Hawley

(*SH5*) (*SH5.1.1*) *I'm denying that trans people exist by asking you, if (SH5.1.2) you're talking about women having pregnancies?*

Mental Process

The *SH5.1.1*, which Senator Hawley expresses is an immediate response to cut off the argument which Professor Bridges makes regarding denying trans people existence. In *SH5.1.1*, the senser is “I’m” which refers to Senator Hawley and the process “denying that trans people exist” is classified as an emotion process. The use of the clause *SH5.1.1* in Senator Hawley’s response is stated to show his awareness, in which he does not support the believe that by asking the line “if you’re talking about women” relates him to denying or not acknowledging trans people phenomenon of existence.

Verbal Process

In *SH5.1.2*, the sayer “you” in this clause refers to Professor Bridges, which shows the process of talking that can manifest the consciousness of a human in the form of language. The process is “re talking” and the verbiage is “about women having pregnancies”. The use of verbal process shows that Senator Hawley is referring to the consciousness of Professor Bridges in obtaining clarification regarding the link of talking about women having pregnancies with its link to the idea of denying that trans people exist.

Professor Bridges

(*PB7*) *Do (PB7.1.1) you believe that the men can get pregnant?*

Mental Process

In *PB7.1.1*, Professor Bridges uses the senser “you” which refers to Senator Hawley, and the cognition process “believe that”, that talks about the thought process of the individual. The phenomenon within the clause is “the men can get pregnant”. Although the clause is meant to clarify the thought process of Senator Hawley regarding male pregnancy, the clause can also affirm the thought process of Professor Bridges which she believes that men can get pregnant. Therefore, this affirm the different view of gender identity between Professor Bridges and Senator Hawley, in which the question of men getting pregnant will result in different answer for the both of them.

Professor Bridges:

(PB8) So, (PB8.1.1) you're denying that trans people exist, thank you.

Mental Process

In *PB8.1.1*, Professor Bridges affirms again the emotive process of “denying” the phenomenon “exist” regarding the existence of trans people. This clause also uses the senser “you” which refers to Senator Hawley. This clause shows the awareness of Professor Bridges, which she believes that the answer of NO by Senator Hawley regarding men’s abilities to carry pregnancy does equal to him denying trans people existence.

Senator Hawley

(SH6) And that leads to violence? is this how (SH6.1.1) you run your classroom? are students allowed to question you? or are they also treated like this opening up people to violence.

Behavioral Process

In *SH6.1.1*, Senator Hawley uses the behavior “you” to refer to Professor Bridges, and the clause shows the outward reflection of the inward thought that Senator Hawley has. The process in this clause is “run” and the behavior is “your classroom”. In this clause, Senator Hawley tries to show his inward thought regarding the classroom situation of Professor Bridges. The inward thought reflects the classroom situation of Professor Bridges to the debate that is going on, in which Senator Hawley tries to belittle the argument by assuming that the students in Professor Bridges’ class are also treated to opening up people to violence.

All in all, from the clause analysis, Senator Hawley shows a dominant use of mental process. The apparent use of mental process portrays three types of process which are the desideration process, cognition process, and emotion process. Desideration process shows that the senser of Senator Hawley demonstrates a process of wanting and desiring toward a phenomenon (Afrianto et al., 2021). Senator Hawley shows his desire by making sure that the belief of people with the capacity of pregnancy between himself and Professor Bridges aligns with one another. Next, the cognition process for mental clause refers to the way of thinking, which Senator Hawley refers back to Professor Bridges to get further clarification of Professor Bridges’ awareness. Lastly, the emotion process deals with feeling and emotion, which the clause emphasizes on the awareness of Senator Hawley’s emotion towards trans people. Within the different process types, the senser shows the use of personal pronoun, such as I and you. This is done to refer to the individual awareness of Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges on the topic of gender. The clauses use by Senator Hawley also show an active voice, as they tell about what a person does. The action of a person refers to the action of gaining clarification on the mental awareness regarding the topic of people with a capacity for pregnancy. The phenomenon in the clauses also differs in terms of their process types. In desideration process, the phenomenon shows the use of adverb to modify the verb of the clause, while the cognition process uses personal pronoun and noun as its phenomenon and the emotion process uses the object complement. As such, the different use of phenomenon all links back to acquiring the awareness of Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges by getting more clarification through the use of desideration process, cognition process, and emotion process.

Meanwhile, Professor Bridges’ dominant use of relational process relates a participant to its identity and description. There are two types of process found in the relational process of Professor Bridges, which are attribution process and identification process. In attribution process, the attribute is being described to some entity (Wanodyatama, 2015). The attribution process is used by Professor Bridges to link the groups of people which are capable of pregnancy. In contrast, the identification process portrays the relationship between the two terms which one entity possesses another. Professor Bridges utilizes the use of identification process to link Senator Hawley’s question to the idea of transphobic. The subject within the

relational clauses is classified into carrier and identified. The carrier of attribution process uses noun to describe the belief of Professor Bridges in regards to her idea of gender as a spectrum, while personal noun in the identified of identification process is utilized to link her opponent, Senator Hawley, to the idea of transphobic. As such, the use of noun and personal pronoun in the relational process describes the entity which is related to another entity. The relational process also shows the use of verb, such as *is*, *are*, and *have* in its process, to show ownership or possession towards the entity that is describe. The attribute and identifier of the clauses use adjective to modify the noun that is stated on the subject of the clause. Further explanation of the noun gives relation between the entity and its attribute and identity. Therefore, we can conclude that the attribution process describes and gives quality to an entity, while the identification process identifies the relation of the entity.

Portrayal of gender identity according to the ideologies of Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges

Senator Hawley

From the transitivity analysis above, we can conclude that the most used process by Senator Hawley is the Mental process. Senator Hawley dominant use of mental process shows his sense of thought, observations, and sentiments regarding the topic of people with the capacity for pregnancy. Mental process is a reflection of people's awareness in their state of being. The mental process used by Senator Hawley in his clauses often refers to showcase the thought process of both of them. Through the portrayal of their thought, the mental process shows the different view of gender between Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges, which many of the clauses that Senator Hawley uses is done to clarify the difference understanding of people with the capacity for pregnancy. Through the use of mental process, Senator Hawley often asks for clarification and elaboration on the topic of people with the capacity for pregnancy. As he does not grasp the idea of gender identity as something other than men and women.

Therefore, the use of clauses mentioned by Senator Hawley is done to showcase his implied Republican ideology, which he does not find significance in the topic people with the capacity for pregnancy. This is because as a part of the conservative Republican, Senator Hawley only sees gender identity as the two-fix assign gender at birth, i.e. male and female.

Professor Bridges

From the transitivity analysis above, we can conclude that the most used process by Professor Bridges is relational process. Professor Bridges identify the term which she introduces, i.e. *people with the capacity for pregnancy*, to the variety of genders which she mentions in her clauses. She also uses the identifier in relational process to link Senator Hawley's question to transphobic ideologies, as Senator Hawley only believes that gender is of two polarizations which is men and women. Professor Bridges also affirms her argument regarding abortion rights and women rights. She believes acknowledging the variety of genders in the gender spectrum does not stray abortion rights from the idea of women rights issue, as abortion rights are not mutually exclusive to only women. All in all, Professor Bridges dominantly use relational process, to identify and acknowledge the variety of gender which should be included in the idea of people with a capacity for pregnancy.

The many clauses stated by Professor Bridges also affirm her liberal belief that view gender as more than just two polarizations while also supporting the equality on the idea of abortion rights as something that is needed for women and other groups of gender.

CONCLUSION

The study has found that there is different presence of the six processes in the debate. The use of transitivity concept highlights the clause process which uncovers the different approach on how an individual choose their phrase structures to fit their intended goal. The dominant process used within Senator Hawley's clauses is the mental process. There are three process types present which are desideration process, cognition process, and emotion process. The mental process possesses qualities of senser that uses personal pronouns such as, *I* and *You*, while also utilizing the use of active voice to signal a process of action. The phenomenon in the clause is also divided into *adverb*, *noun*, and *object complement*. Senator Hawley uses the mental process to clarify the different understanding of people with the capacity for pregnancy between himself and Professor Bridges. The analysis shows that Senator Hawley, as a part of the conservative, only sees gender identity as the two-fix assign gender at birth, i.e. male and female.

While, Professor Bridges holds liberal belief that sees gender as a spectrum. For Professor Bridges, the dominant process used within her clauses is the relational process. There are two types of processes

present which are attribution process and identification process. The relational process uses noun for its attribution process and personal pronoun for its identification process. The process within relational process is described with verbs of ownership and possession. In addition, *the attribute* and *the identified* of relational process utilize the use of adjective to modify the noun and personal noun. Professor Bridges uses the relational process to identify the term which she introduces, i.e. *people with the capacity for pregnancy*, to the variety of genders which she believes could carry pregnancy. This shows the ideology of Professor Bridges where she believes that gender is fluid.

This research dives deeper into the phrase structures of the clause processes to highlight the importance of employing the transitivity concept when examining multiple interpretations of gender identity. Professor Bridges' relational processes identify and give value to the variety of genders to point out Senator Hawley's rigid perspective on gender identification. Through the use of mental process, Senator Hawley counters Professor Bridges' claims by asking clarification to align both of their gender awareness. The use of clarification reveals Senator Hawley's awareness on gender as two polarizations leads to the idea of transphobia. The study has its limitations, which could have been more comprehensive if more debates that showcase the ideology of Senator Hawley and Professor Bridges over the topic of gender are researched. Due to the limited scope of this research, further research can be conducted to show how clauses are used to support the ideology of individuals in pointing across their beliefs.

REFERENCES

- Afrianto, Sujatna, E. T. S., Darmayanti, N., & Ariyani, F. (2021). Configuration Of Lampung Mental Clause: A Functional Grammar Investigation. *Advances In Social Science, Education And Humanities Research*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210325.039>
- Brown, A. (2017). Republicans, Democrats Have Starkly Different Views On Transgender Issues. *Pew Research Center*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/11/08/transgender-issues-divide-republicans-and-democrats/>
- Fadilah, R & Kuswoyo, H. (2020). Transitivity Analysis Of Presidential Debate Between Trump And Biden In 2020. *Linguistics And Literature Journal*, 2(2), 98–107. http://jim.teknokrat.ac.id/index.php/linguistics_and_literature/article/view/1374/438
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction To Functional Grammar (2nd Ed.)*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An Introduction To Functional Grammar*. Routledge.
- Haratyan, F. (2011). Halliday's SFL And Social Meaning. *Semantic Scholar*. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Halliday-%E2%80%99-S-SFL-And-Social-Meaning-Haratyan/834fa499be33fd49e93192f1f4bb845c6becdf9c>
- Joel, D., Tarrasch, R., Berman, Z., Mukamel, M., & Ziv, E. (2014). Queering Gender: Studying Gender Identity In "Normative" Individuals. *Psychology & Sexuality*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19419899.2013.830640>
- Johnson, C. (2022). Drafting Injustice: Overturning Roe V. Wade, Spillover Effects And Reproductive Rights In Context. *Feminist Theory*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14647001221114611>
- Liani, A. E., Annidi, A., & Wirza, Y. (2021). Transitivity Analysis Of Kamala Harris' 2020 Presidential Victory Speech Concerning COVID-19. *Proceedings Of The Thirteenth Conference On Applied Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210427.002>
- Matu, P. M. (2008). Transitivity As A Tool For Ideological Analysis. *Journal Of Third World Studies*, 25(1), 199-211. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/45194444>
- Mousavi, M. S., Shahriari, M., Salehi, M., & Kohan, S. (2018). Gender Identity Development In The Shadow Of Socialization: A Grounded Theory Approach. *Archives Of Women's Mental Health*, 22(2), 245–251. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00737-018-0888-0>
- Opara, S. (2012). Transitivity Systems In Selected Narrative Discourse. *International Journal Of Arts And Commerce*, 1(7), 109-121. <https://ijac.org.uk/images/frontimages/gallery/vol1no7december2012/10.pdf>
- Peñuelas, A. B. C. (2015) Transitivity And Evaluation In American And Spanish Parliamentary Discourse: The 2015 State Of The Union Address In The US Vs. The 2015 State Of The Nation Address In Spain. *Critical Discourse Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2022.2041450>
- Plank, L. (2021, November 10). Josh Hawley Wants To Fix America's Men. Good Luck To Him. *MSNBC*. <https://www.msnbc.com/msnbc/amp/ncna1283604>
- Rogers, M. M. (2017) The Intersection Of Cisgenderism And Hate Crime: Learning From Trans People's Narratives. *Journal Of Family Strengths*, 17 (2). 5. <https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/178945/>

- Serano, J. (2007) *Whipping Girl: A Transsexual Woman On Sexism And The Scapegoating Of Femininity*. Berkeley, CA: Seal Press.
- Setiawan, I. (2018). Transitivity In The Text Of Indonesian Presidential Candidates' Debate. *International Research Journal Of Management, IT And Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.21744/irjmis.v5n6.428>
- Supreme Court Of The United States. (2021). *Dobbs V. Jackson Women's Health Organization*. https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/21pdf/19-1392_6j37.pdf
- Wanodyatama, N, P. (2015). Relational Process In The Newspaper Of The Jakarta Post Edition Of February 2015 - June 2015: A Functional Grammar Approach. *Lingua Didaktika: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Pembelajaran Bahasa*, 13(1), 1–10. <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/linguadidaktika/article/view/104313/pdf>
- Wiggins, C. (2022, September 22). Republican Sen. Josh Hawley Seems To Think There's Only One Gender. *Advocate.Com* <https://www.advocate.com/politics/2022/9/22/republican-sen-josh-hawley-seems-think-theres-only-one-gender?amp>
- Zhao, M., & Zhang, Y. (2017). A Transitivity Analysis Of American President Donald J. Trump's Inaugural Address. *International Journal Of Liberal Arts And Social Science*, 5(5), 31-43. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/5b07/fcac9501efe0c11a8d72d60a22df43e541a3.pdf>