



VERBAL REPRESENTATION ANALYSIS OF MEANING IN GOJEK AND GRAB TV COMMERCIALS

Mutia Resha Gucen¹ & Hamzah²

English Department

Faculty of Languages and Arts

Universitas Negeri Padang

email: mutiareshagucen99@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to examine the difference in meaning in verbal analysis in Gojek and Grab advertisements. The purpose of this research is to find the difference in meaning in verbal analysis at the level of Systemic Functional Linguistics, namely ideational, interpersonal, and textual metafunction. The data were analysed using the theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics Halliday (2006). The data is the utterances contained in the Gojek and Grab advertising videos. The method of this research uses descriptive qualitative research. The results showed that there were some differences in the two advertisements in using Systemic Functional Linguistics, namely mood analysis, attitude, modality, graduation, and theme. The five differences are dominated by Gojek advertisements.

Key words: systemic functional linguistics, semiotics, advertisement

A. INTRODUCTION

Multimodal analysis in an advertisement in print or mass media has been carried out by many language researchers recently. Multimodality is an approach related to meaning by using several modes of communication other than language, and also in expressing this meaning using a semiotic approach. For instance, in a face-to-face conversation people do not just communicate with spoken language. They also communicate through their gestures, gaze, facial expressions, posture, dress, how close or far away they stand or sit from each other, and many other things. Multimodal discourse analysis is how text is combined with text to express meaning by combining communication modes such as pictures, movies, videos, images and sounds with words. Many of the work in multimodal discourse comes from Halliday's socio-semiotic approach to language.

Multimodal text is a text that consists of two or more semiotic systems. There are five kinds of semiotic system: linguistics aspect, visual, audio, gesture, and location. Linguistics aspect, which consists of aspects such as vocabularies, generic structure, and grammatical of written and spoken language. Visual, which consists of aspects such as colours, vector. Audio, which consists of aspects such as

1 English ELLSP of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang graduated on September 2021

2 Lecturer of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang



volume and sound effect. Gesture, which consist of aspects such as movement, speed, and clarity in face expression and body language. Location, which consist of aspects such as near or far of place of the object, direction, layout position.

The semiotic approach aims to determine the meaning contained in the verbal and visual of an advertisement. Semiotics is the field of research related to signs and/or meaning (the process of creating meaning). According to Gerald R McMenamin (2002), semiotics is the study of communication and language as a system of signs. Such systems are called codes and languages, that are examples of codes with verbal and non-verbal symbols. The symbols in the code have normal meanings. The speaker and writer encode; and the audience and reader decode system. It means that listener and readers have to understand the verbal and non-verbal signs to know the whole meaning. Advertisement is information that is made as attractive as possible to make people who see it or consumers want to buy or use the services listed.

In this study, the author explores systemic functional linguistics in the metafunction field used in the Gojek and Grab advertising videos. Searchers are interested in these two advertising videos because no one has discussed multimodal in online transportation advertising videos. This study tries to explore the metafunction levels used in making the ad video. This study analyzes the types of systemic functional linguistics by looking at the similarities and differences that appear in these two transportation advertisements.

In this study, the authors followed the research steps proposed by Sudaryanto (1993:57). Namely: collecting data, analyzing data, and presenting the results of the analysis. The data is taken from spoken and written language in Gojek and Grab advertising videos. The searcher watched the two advertisement videos, listened and paid serious attention to all the words of the two advertisements. This method is applied using a note-taking technique in which the author records all spoken and written language which shows the use of systemic functional linguistics

B. RESEARCH METHOD

This research was conducted using descriptive-qualitative method. The researcher collects the data, organizes it, classifies it, then makes an interpretation of the data, and finally, the researcher draws conclusions based on the analyzed data. The data in this Gojek and Grab ad video is in the form of utterances. Furthermore, the speech was analyzed descriptively to describe and explain in detail the speech phenomenon based on semiotic theory and systemic functional linguistics theory.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The data of this research is a collection of clauses derived from speech and images in two online transportation advertisement videos; Grab and Gojek. The duration of this Gojek advert is 78 seconds and Grab's duration is 62 seconds. The verbal element in this online transportation advertisement video includes all spoken

and written language. While the visual elements in this advertisement include the images contained in the online transportation advertisement video.

This research is analyzed based on Halliday's (2004) Systemic Functional Linguistics in analyzing the verbal text. Specifically, the researcher focuses on the ideational which is classified on the transitivity system in analyzing participant, process, and circumstances. The interpersonal classified in the mood analysis in analyzing declarative, imperative, interrogative, and exclamative sentences; appraisal in analyzing attitude, graduation, and engagement; modalization to analyze probability and usuality; and modulation analyze obligation and inclination. The textual clarified on theme and rheme.

Data from Grab's online transportation advertisement video consists of 26 clauses and 29 images, while Gojek's consists of 45 clauses and 24 images. These three types of analysis will answer the four research questions. The question is in the form of differences in visual and verbal meaning in the processes that occur at the metafunction level of Halliday's theory; and Kress and Van Leeuwen. Generic structure that composes the two transportation advertisement videos. Finally, look at the congruence between visual and verbal in the two online transportation advertisement videos.

To answering the question, the researcher found several differences in Gojek and Grab advertising videos based on Halliday's theory. Table 1 shows the comparisons spoken language of ideational occurrences found in both video transportation online advertisement.

Indicators	Gojek		Grab	
	F	%	F	%
Ideational: Transitivity				
Material	14	83	8	80
Relational	2	17	2	20
Σ	16	100	10	100

Based on table 1 above, the systemic functional linguistic video advertisement Gojek and Grab has similarities in conveying information about health protocols during the Covid-19 pandemic. Gojek and Grab have similarities in using material and relational processes. Gojek has a frequency of using material processes 83% and relational 17%. And the frequency at Grab in using material processes is 80% and relational 20%. These two advertisements also do not use mental, verbal, behavioral, and existential processes. Apart from the ideational level, we can see similarities and differences from the interpersonal metafunction

level. Table 2 shows the comparisons spoken language of interpersonal occurrences found in both video transportation online advertisement.

Indicators	Gojek		Grab	
	F	%	F	%
Declarative	16	95	8	73
Interrogative	1	5		
Imperative			3	27
Affect Security	1	6	3	27
Judgement Social Esteem Positive			2	9
Judgement Social Esteem Negative	2	11		
Appreciation Positive	2	11	6	54
Graduation Up			4	36
Graduation Down	1	6		
Probability	3	17		
Usuality	2	11		
Obligation			4	36
Naming	5	28	2	18
Swearing			2	18

The first difference is in the form of negotiation. Negotiation is divided into declarative, interrogative, imperative, and exclamative. And in the table 2, it can be seen that Gojek tends to use declarative and interrogative types, while Grab uses declarative and imperative types in its advertising videos. The frequency of interrogative is 5% and imperative in Grab is 27%. Because Gojek tends to use declaratives that can be seen with a frequency of 95% and Grab 73%.

The second is on the various attitudes of affect, judgment, and appreciation. Of these three have a division as well as shown in the table. In the table, Gojek prefers to use negative social esteem judgments and Grab uses positive social esteem judgments. The frequency that Gojek has for negative social esteem judgments is 11% and Grab uses positive social esteem judgments with a frequency of 9%. In addition to using the attitude above, these two ad videos also use affect security, each ad with a frequency of 6% for Gojek and 27% for Grab.

The third difference is found in graduation. Graduation is divided into graduation up and graduation down. In the table above, Gojek uses graduation down more, while Grab uses graduation up. Where the frequency on Gojek is 6% and Grab 36%. The fourth difference is that there is a modality which is divided into probability, usuality, obligation, and inclination. In the table above, Gojek is more dominant in modality than Grab. It can be seen that Gojek has capitality probability and usuality, while Grab only uses obligation. The frequency of each modality is 17% probability, 11% usuality, and 36% obligation on Grab.

The fifth difference between these two advertisements is involvement. Involvement is divided into naming and swearing. According to the table above, the Gojek advertisement only uses one indicator, namely naming. But Grab uses naming and swearing in its ads. The naming frequency on Gojek is 28%, and the frequency on Grab is 18% both in naming and swearing. Beside from the interpersonal level, we can see similarities and differences from the textual metafunction level. Table 3 shows the comparisons spoken language of textual occurrences found in both video transportation online advertisement.

indicators	Gojek		Grab	
	F	%	F	%
Marked	1	7	1	9
Unmarked	13	93	10	91
Topical	6	27	8	68
Vocative	9	41	1	8
Modal	1	4		
WH- Question	1	4	1	8
Continuative	2	10	1	8
Conjunctive	3	14	1	8
Rheme	19	100	11	100

Based on table 3, it can be seen differences and similarities at the textual level in the theme-rheme. Theme is divided into three, namely experiential, interpersonal and textual. In experiential divided into topical; interpersonal is divided into vocative, modal, finite, and Wh-question; and textual themes are divided into continuative, structural, and conjunctive. In the table above, it can be seen that Gojek uses the modality theme and Grab does not use that type of theme. These two advertisements have similarities in using topical, vocative, Wh-question, continuative, and conjunctive themes. The frequency with which Gojek uses the theme is topical 27%, vocative 41%, modal 4%, Wh-question 4%, continuative

10%, and conjunctive 14%. And the frequency in Grab is 68% topical, 8% vocative, 8% Wh-question, 8% continuative, and 8% conjunctive.

So spoken language has differences in systemic functional linguistics, namely in mood analysis, attitude, graduation, involvement, modality, and theme. The most dominant in using this system is the video advertisement on Gojek. Verbal in the online transportation advertisement video is also supported by written language.

Discussion

In the ideational there is transitivity which is the process of speech in both spoken and written advertisements. At this level, there are only similarities between the two advertisements in spoken and written. These two advertisements dominate the material process that is commonly found in notifying the health protocols carried out by the two online transportation companies during this pandemic. This is supported by the statement of Thomas and Meriel Bloor (2004) that material processes dominate in speaking because the material world acts as a fundamental basis for referring to human and natural activities. This existence also emphasizes the relational process that comes after the material process which is the highest of these two advertisements. Because this advertisement refers to all people so that they are protected from the virus and also shows that this transportation has carried out health protocols correctly.

The second is in the interpersonal field which is divided into negotiation, appraisal, and involvement. In this field, these two advertising videos have similarities and differences, both spoken and written. The equation at the level of negotiation spoken and written is to use a declarative sentence that dominates these two online transportation advertising videos. Based on Thompson (p.38) that declarative is to tell something to the listener. The declaratives in both spoken and written advertisements show in informing everyone about the health protocol process they are going through before operating.

The difference in negotiation in these two ad videos is that Gojek uses interrogatives, while Grab uses imperatives. Gojek uses interrogatives to ask passengers for things like jokes or name puns. Unlike Grab, they use imperatives in their advertisements which aim to provide instructions on how to follow health protocols. From this, it can be seen from different cultures that Indonesian culture uses more playful words and Singapore uses good and correct words. Even so, the two advertisements are very interesting, because Gojek matches the Indonesian people who like jokes and new words.

The difference in the appraisal level is attitude. In this level there are similarities and differences in spoken only because in written it does not use attitude in this advertising video. The similarity of these two advertisements is to use affect security and positive appreciation. Based on Halliday (2006) affect is to build empathy and suspension. Function of affect to involve readers and listeners. Appreciation is a judgment of object, texts, appearance, and phenomena. Function

of appreciation to focus on emotional response of writer/speaker, to see the scene, and to evaluation of books, artworks, films as constructed texts. The attitude in these two ads builds empathy and judgment in viewing or using health protocols so that we avoid the virus.

The difference in these two advertisements is in the level of attitude, namely the use of judgments that exist in Grab using negative social esteem judgments and Grab using positive ones. Based on Halliday (2006) Judgment is judge what people do. Function of judgment to influence readers opinion, to build characters so reader builds strong relationship, and to make evaluation of characters attitude and behavior. So it can be seen that Gojek emphasizes that bad things will happen if they don't comply with health protocols. At Grab, it is built in a good direction if we comply with our health protocols we will be safe from all viruses.

In the appraisal in the field of engagement which is divided into modalization and modulation. In this field, the two video advertisements differ in spoken and written language. This difference is found in Gojek using engagement modalization probability and usuality, while Grab uses engagement modulation obligation in its advertisements. Based on Halliday (2006) modalization is giving information to listeners, modulation is giving goods and services to listeners or readers. Based on this, Gojek in its advertisement does not place too much emphasis on implementing health protocols, while Grab places great emphasis on implementing health protocols.

In graduation, these two advertisements only have differences in spoken and written language. The difference is that Gojek only uses graduation down and Grab uses graduation up. Based on Halliday (2006) graduation is involves force and focus, and it may be helpful to think of it terms of a slider where the force / focus of a word is scaled up or down to create a certain effect. This shows that Gojek is more dominant in using scale down than up. On the other hand, Grab uses scale up rather than down.

Next is involvement which consists of naming and swearing. Both of these ad videos have similarities and differences. Based on Halliday (2006) involvement is the fact or condition of being involved with or participating in something. Involvement divided into naming and swearing. Naming is assigning a name to something. Wearing is considered similar to the use of obscene words. The similarity in these two advertising videos is the use of naming in spoken and written language. Naming in the second is about naming related to health protocols. And the difference is that Grab also uses swearing in its advertising video which is in spoken language. The wearing he uses refers to germs and viruses that disrupt health.

The third is the level of textual metafunction, namely in the theme-rheme field. In the field of theme, these two ads have similarities and differences. The similarity in these two advertisements is to use topical, vocative, WH-question, continuative, and conjunctive. The difference is that Gojek uses capital and Grab uses finite. And in rheme they have a rheme for every spoken and written.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the findings of the analysis of two online transportation advertisement videos, it can be concluded that these two videos provide differences in verbal. In the verbal element, namely from systemic functional linguistics, the difference in mood analysis is Gojek using an interrogative sentence and Grab using an imperative sentence. In the attitude of these two videos, Gojek uses negative social esteem judgments, while Grab uses more positive social esteem judgments. The graduations for the two videos are very different because Gojek uses graduation down, while Grab uses graduation up. And in modality, there is also a difference in this video, where Gojek uses probability and usuality, while Grab only uses obligation. The involvement video is also different, because Gojek uses naming more, while Grab uses naming and swearing. In textual metafunction these two ad videos have differences in the type of theme used. Gojek uses the modal type, while Grab uses the finite type.

This research, which mainly studies the differences in meaning in online transportation advertising videos, still has a number of limitations or limitations. This study only compares the differences between two video ads. Therefore, to obtain more comprehensive study results, more in-depth research is needed on various other advertisements. Further research, it is suggested to study the same area of semiotic analysis or multimodal analysis to fill the gap by using more recent data. Thus, future research can conduct new analyzes in semiotics or multimodal that are relevant to this research and gain a better understanding in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amatullah, F., Rosa, R. N., & Fitrawati, F. (2019). An analysis of multimodal in beauty product advertisements. *E-Journal English Language and Literature*, 8(1).
- Ananda, R., Fitriani, S. S., Samad, I. A., & Patak, A. A. (2019). Cigarette advertisements: A systemic functional grammar and multimodal analysis. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(3), 616-626.
- Bloor, T., & Bloor, M. (2004). *The Functional Analysis of English*. London: Arnold.
- Chandler, D. (2007). *Semiotics: the basics*. Routledge.
- Cheong, Y. Y. (2004). Open linguistics series: The construal of ideational meaning in print advertisements (Edited by Kal L. O'Halloran). *Continuum, London and New York*, 165-174.
- Cobley, P. (2001). Analysing narrative genres. *Σημειωτική-Sign Systems Studies*, 29(2), 479-502.
- Cruse, A. (2006). *Glossary of semantics and pragmatics*. Edinburgh University Press.

- Dewi, U. (2017). Multimodal Analysis on Advertisement of Bodrex Extra in Electronic Media. *Vision*, 11(11).
- Du, N. T., Yen, D. H., & Phuong, N. T. A Multimodal Discourse Analysis of Fast Food Advertisement in English.
- Fernando, S. (2019). Insecurity and Self-Acceptance Portrayed in Samsung Galaxy A8 Advertisement “Lets You Be You”: A Multimodal Analysis. *Kata Kita*, 7(2), 260-268.
- Gbadegehin, V., & Onanuga, P. (2018). A multimodal interaction analysis of selected 2015 Nigerian election campaign adverts. *Communication*, 44(2), 41-66.
- Gee, J. P., & Hayes, E. R. (2011). *Language and learning in the digital age*. Routledge.
- Goldman, R. (2005). *Reading ads socially*. Routledge.
- Guo, F., & Feng, X. (2017). A multimodal discourse analysis of advertisements-based on visual grammar. *Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 6(3), 59-69.
- Halliday, M.A.K (2004). *An Introduction Functional Grammar*. Mathiesen, C (ed). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2006). *Linguistic studies of text and discourse* (Vol. 2). A&C Black.
- Halliday, M. A. K., Matthiessen, C. M., Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Routledge.
- Halliday, M. A. (1995). Language and the theory of codes. *Knowledge and pedagogy: The sociology of Basil Bernstein*, 127-144.
- Hu, C., & Luo, M. (2016). A Multimodal Discourse Analysis of Tmall's Double Eleven Advertisement. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 156-169.
- Höllerer, M. A., van Leeuwen, T., Jancsary, D., Meyer, R. E., Andersen, T. H., & Vaara, E. (2019). *Visual and multimodal research in organization and management studies*. Routledge.
- Jewitt, C. (2013). Multimodal methods for researching digital technologies. *The SAGE handbook of digital technology research*, 250, 265.
- Joshi, P., Satija, L., George, R. A., Chatterjee, S., D'Souza, J., & Raheem, A. (2012). Congenital high airway obstruction syndrome—antenatal diagnosis of a rare case of airway obstruction using multimodality imaging. *Medical Journal, Armed Forces India*, 68(1), 78.

- Kress, G. Van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse: The Modes and Media Contemporary Communication*. London: Arnold.
- Kress, G., & Van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. Routledge.
- Kuswandini, E. (2018, July). Multimodal analysis of car advertisements. *In International Conference on Language Phenomena in Multimodal Communication (KLUA 2018)* (pp. 348-352). Atlantis Press.
- Li, D. (2016). Multimodal discourse analysis of the interpersonal meaning of TV advertisements. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 6(12), 934.
- Liu, S. (2019). A multimodal discourse analysis of the interactive meaning in public service advertisement. *Journal of Advances in Linguistics*, 10, 1523-1534.
- Ly, T. H., & Jung, C. K. (2015). Multimodal discourse: a visual design analysis of two advertising images. *International Journal of Contents*, 11(2), 50-56.
- Martinez, A. (2002). *An introduction to semiclassical and microlocal analysis* (Vol. 994, p. 1872698). New York: Springer.
- Matthiessen, C., Teruya, K., & Lam, M. (2010). *Key terms in systemic functional linguistics*. A&C Black.
- Napitupulu, L. H., Bako, E. N., Ars, N. R., & Zein, T. (2018). A Multimodal Analysis of Advertisement of Online Marketplace Shopee. *KnE Social Sciences*, 452-460.
- Norris, S. (2019). *Systematically working with multimodal data: Research methods in multimodal discourse analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.
- O'Halloran, K. L. (2011). Multimodal discourse analysis. *Continuum companion to discourse analysis*, 120-137.
- Olowu, A., & Akinkurolere, S. O. (2015). A multimodal discourse analysis of selected advertisement of malaria drugs. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 3(2), 166-173.
- Pratiwy, D., & Wulan, S. (2018). Multimodal discourse analysis in Dettol Tv advertisement. *KnE Social Sciences*, 207-217.
- Purba, R. (2020). MULTIMODAL ANALYSIS ON ERTIGA CAR ADVERTISEMENT. *Wiralodra English Journal*, 4(1), 21-32.
- Raharjo, A. R., Hidayat, D. N., Alek, A., & Jalil, N. (2020). MULTIMODAL ANALYSIS OF WARDAH LIPSTICK ADVERTISEMENT. *English and Literature Journal*, 7(2), 149-159.

- Rambe, R. P. (2019). A Multimodal Analysis of English Courses' Brochures Advertisement in Medan.
- Rosa, R. N. (2014). Analisis Multimodal Pada Iklan Sunsilk Nutrien Shampo Ginseng. *Kajian Linguistik*, 12(2), 136-148.
- Rubio, M. D. S. (2018). A multimodal approach to the analysis of gender stereotypes in contemporary British TV commercials: "women and men at work". *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, 54(2), 185-221.
- Umiker-Sebeok, J. (1994). Behavior in a museum: A semio-cognitive approach to museum consumption experiences. *Signifying Behavior*, 1(1), 52-100.
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2011). Multimodality. In *The Routledge handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 688-702). Routledge.
- Wang, J. (2016). Multimodal narratives in SIA's "Singapore Girl" TV advertisements—from branding with femininity to branding with provenance and authenticity?. *Social Semiotics*, 26(2), 208-225.
- Wells, L. G., & Auken, S. V. (2006). A comparison of associational and claimless-informational advertising in Russia. *Journal of East-West Business*, 12(1), 29-48.
- Wildfeuer, J. (2014). *Film discourse interpretation: Towards a new paradigm for multimodal film analysis*. Routledge.
- Zulita, Y., & Muthalib, K. A. (2020). MULTIMODAL ANALYSIS ON SHOP SIGNS IN BANDA ACEH. *English Education Journal*, 11(2), 180-198.