



Language Style in Horror Movies

Yulia Silpitri¹, Hamzah²

English Department

Faculty of Languages and Arts

Universitas Negeri Padang

email: yuliasilfitri1299@gmail.com

Abstract

The aim of this research is to compare the differences and similarities between *The Conjuring 1* and *The Conjuring 3* in the level of Field. This study was analyzed using Halliday's systemic functional linguistics theory. This study is a descriptive research. According to the study findings, both of *Conjuring 1* and *Conjuring 3* have four similarities and four differences in the level of Field. The findings lead to the conclusion that both of *Conjuring 1* and *Conjuring 3* are more similar than different and affects in how they produce utterances are influenced by word selection at the Field level, in context of situation.

Key words: Language style, horror movies, context of situation level of Field, *The Conjuring 1*, *The Conjuring 3*

A. INTRODUCTION

Stylistics, often known as style and linguistics, is a subfield of general linguistics. According to Simpson (2004), stylistics is a method of textual interpretation in which language is given primacy of position. The primary goal of stylistics is to investigate and explain the distinctions in language style that are employed in written or spoken scientifically by the linguistics profession.

Ducrot and Todorov (in Sapriyani: 58) define language style as an alternative way to use language. It is evident in the manner in which the same information is expressed using various expressions under various circumstances and conditions. When speaking about language variations, however, Akamajian et al. (2001) assert that there is a connection between language styles and language variations because they are essentially the same language variety.

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) is a language approach that investigates how language is used in context and how it is structured for use as a semiotic system (Eggins, 1994). It considers language to be a system of choice (Halliday, 1994). SFL, rather than simply representing grammatical

¹ English ELLSP of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang graduated on December 2022

² Lecturer of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang



form, documents its appropriateness for a specific context and as a function of meaning (Lock, 1996). Furthermore, language is viewed as the realization of cultural context (genre) and situational context (register) (Eggins, 1994; Halliday, 1994; Hasan 1985).

Language choice in SFL is influenced by the situation or time and place where the language is produced, as well as the cultural context. As previously stated, the context of the situation has three variables: Field, Tenor, and Mode (Hassan, 1985). Field is associated with actual experience. Tenor is related to interaction attitudes. Textual mode is related to logical structure (Butt, Fahey, Spinks & Yallop, 1995; Eggins, 1994). As a result Field, Tenor, and Mode work together to realize the situation's context.

Register theory in systemic functional linguistics indicated the socio-semiotic relationships between context and language. A text is created in a specific situational context. According to Halliday, "context of situation is the contextual variables of Field, Tenor, and Mode" (1985, p.12). The concept "context of situation" refers to what is going on in the world outside the text that makes the text meaningful as what the speakers and writers mean. The relationship between language and context is very important to functional linguists. The main point here is that understanding the meaning of what someone has said or written requires knowledge of the context surrounding the text. And the converse is also true: if we can understand what our interlocutor writes or says, we can draw conclusions about the situation's context (Martin, 2001).

Field is concerned with what is happening, who is doing what, and how, why, when and where they are doing it, in addition to defining the basic nature of the subject matter or topic area. Butt et al., go on to say that the subject matter or Field not only offers the goal for making a text, but also determines the grammar used in that text, whether written or spoken. The concept of Field is amorphous. Field must be realized in linguistics forms in a text in order for it to be quantified using the transitivity systems (Halliday, 1994).

Several studies on language style have been conducted. Saputri (2021), Shofihara (2019), Syafri, Hamzah and Rosa (2018). The first researcher looked into the main character's language style in Scott Derrickson's film "The Exorcism of Emily Rose." She employs Martin Joos' (1976) theory to analyze the data. Second, the researcher examined interpersonal meaning in the film script "Smurfs: The Lost Village." The mood analysis of the various clauses identified was part of the research. The third researcher used three levels of metafunction to analyze the language style of a stand-up comedian. The researcher examines the language styles of Daiso Chaponda and Elon Gold in stand-up comedy. According to the study's findings, there are more similarities than differences in three level metafunction.

This study, which will be conducted, is similar to the three previous studies mentioned above. Most research on language style, however, is conducted using a sociolinguistics approach, and a lot of theory from Martin Joos (1967) was used, whereas the researcher in this study uses a functional grammar approach and the Halliday systemic functional linguistic theory to conduct this research. In both *Conjuring 1* and *3*, the context of the situation will be examined using lexicogrammatical terms such as transitivity process.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

The descriptive research method was used in this study because the researcher analyzed the data descriptively and the result was in the form of an explanation. The researcher watches the film in order to better comprehend the plot. The researcher ensures that the utterances in the film correspond to the script. The data was analyzed to determine the differences and similarities between *The Conjuring 1* and *The Conjuring 3* films on the levels of Field. The data sources were scriptslug.com and scrapsfromtheloft.com, which obtained the collection of clauses from the movie script.

In order to collect data, four steps require. To begin, the researcher watched the films *The Conjuring 1* and *The Conjuring 3* to better understand the plot. Second, the researcher looked through the scripts of *The Conjuring 1* and *The Conjuring 3* films to find the textual form of the dialogue. Third, once the transcript is obtained, the researcher ensures that the text in the script corresponds to the utterance in the film and focuses on the constraints between clauses. Finally, the researcher transcribed the data into clause-to-clause sequences that will be investigated based on their functional structures; Field.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Research Finding

A. Comparing the use of Processes between *The Conjuring 1* and *The Conjuring 3*

After analyzing the data, the findings in the level of Field were obtained by comparing the use of processes between *The Conjuring 1* and *The Conjuring 3* movie.

Table 1. Comparing the use of processes between *The Conjuring 1* and *The Conjuring 3*

Process	The Conjuring 1		The Conjuring 3	
	F	%	F	%
Material	466	48,64%	430	52.89%
Behavioural	5	0,52%	6	0,74%
Mental				
Affection	29	3,03%	15	1.85%
Cognition	97	10,13%	82	10.08%
Perception	43	4,49%	14	1.72%

Verbal	27	2.82%	15	1,85%
Relational				
Attributive	212	22,13%	177	21,77%
Identifying	53	5,53%	51	6,27%
Existential	26	2,71%	23	2,83%
Meteorological	0	0%	0	0%
Σ	958	100%	813	100%

The similarity of the two horror film styles in conveying information through dialogue is shown in Table 1 above. Both horror films use material and attributive processes in conveying dialogue that dominate other data collection processes, with Material about 48.64% in *Conjuring 1* and 52.89% in *Conjuring 3*. In relation to the emergence of processes that are rarely used in horror films, they are similar in that they use behavioral and meteorological in the lack of a process to be used in the films. The two horror films also share similarities in cognition identification, indicating that this process makes extensive use of the sense of thinking, as evidenced by the percentages of 10,13% in *Conjuring 1* and 10,08% in *Conjuring 3*. As a result, they share similarities in information conveying through the dominance of material, attributive, cognition, identifying, perception, affection, verbal, existential, and lack of use of behavioral and meteorological.

In addition to these similarities, the two films have differences. *Conjuring 1* employs 4,49% mental perception, while *Conjuring 3* employs 1,72% mental perception. *Conjuring 1* enriched 3,03% by producing words denoting mental affection, but *Conjuring 3* only 1.85%, similar to the verbal process, which enriched *Conjuring 1* with 2,82% but *Conjuring 3* only 1.85%. As a result, they differ in how they present information through verbal and mental processes.

B. Comparing the use of Participants between The Conjuring 1 and The Conjuring 3

After analyzing the data, the findings in the level of Field were obtained by comparing the use of participants between *The Conjuring 1* and *The Conjuring 3* movie.

Table 2. Comparing the use of participants between The Conjuring 1 and The Conjuring 3

participant	Comparison participants			
	The Conjuring 1 (762 clauses)		The Conjuring 3 (710 clauses)	
	F	%	F	%
Participant 1				
Actor	351	47,05%	368	53,10%
Behavior	5	0,67%	8	1,15%
Senser	160	21,45%	108	15,58%
Carrier	205	27,48%	188	27,13%

Existent	25	3,35%	21	3,04%
Σ	746	100%	693	100%
Other participant				
Goal	310	41,00%	308	42,42%
Phenomenon	92	12,17%	70	9,64%
Attribute	205	27,12%	188	25,90%
Target	0	0%	2	0,28%
Receiver	8	1,06%	13	1,80%
Range	1	0,13%	0	0%
Token	53	7,01%	51	7,02%
Value	53	7,01%	51	7,02%
Beneficiary	34	4,50%	43	5,92%
Σ	756	100%	726	100%

Participant 1 covered a wide range of differences between participants, but the most prominent appeared to be actor and carrier as the higher number than other participants. Following the actor and carrier participants, there are Senser and Existent in participant 1. Conjuring 1 covered more ground for Senser and Existent than Conjuring 3. Furthermore, the results for existent participants differ slightly, with a percentage of 3,35% for Conjuring 1 and a percentage of 3,04% for Conjuring 3. The behavior participant had the fewest number of participants 1 (0,67%) for Conjuring 1 and 1,15% for Conjuring 3.

Goal and Attribute were found to be the most dominant participants in Other Participant, with a percentage of 41,00% for Conjuring 1 and 42,42% for Conjuring 3 for Goal participant. Meanwhile, for Attribute participants, Conjuring 1 obtained 27,12% and Conjuring 3 received 25,90%. Following the occurrences of Goal and Attribute, there are Phenomenon, Token, Value, and Beneficiary, each with a slightly different percentage. Furthermore, as shown in the table above, Receiver, Target, and Range have the fewest occurrences in both movies.

C. Comparing the use of Circumstances between The Conjuring 1 and The Conjuring 3

The findings in the level of Field were obtained after analyzing the data by comparing the use of circumstances between The Conjuring 1 and The Conjuring 3 movie.

Table 3. Comparing the use of Circumstances between The Conjuring 1 and The Conjuring 3

Circumstances	The Conjuring 1		The Conjuring 3	
	F	%	F	%
Place	135	43,55%	99	39,6%
Manner	42	13,55%	28	11,2%
Cause	3	0,97%	0	0%
Accompaniment	34	10,97%	25	10%
Extent	26	8,39%	24	9,6%
Reason	10	3,23%	6	2,4%

Time	57	18,39%	61	24,4%
Role	2	0,65%	4	1,6%
Contingency	0	0%	0	0%
Purpose	1	0,32	3	1,2%
Σ	310	100%	250	100%

According to table 3, there are similarities and differences between the two horror films. The similarities between them are contingency circumstances, which are not found in either horror film. Furthermore, both horror films are devoid of a role, a purpose, and cause circumstances.

There are also differences between the two horror films. With 0.97 percent, the first conjuring was discovered to use cause as circumstance. The difference is also noticeable in terms of place; The Conjuring 1 is 43,55%, but The Conjuring 3 is only 39,6%. The Conjuring 1 then used time circumstance 18,39%, whereas The Conjuring 3 used it 24,4%, which is higher than The Conjuring 1. The percentage difference is 6.01%. Conjuring 1 had 13,55% circumstance of manner, while Conjuring 3 had only 11,2%. The following circumstance is accompaniment; 10,97% in Conjuring 1 and 10% in Conjuring 3, implying a slightly different percentage of circumstance.

2. Discussion

The language styles analysis results for Conjuring 1 and Conjuring 3 reveal similarities and differences in the level of Field. This section discusses each process one by one in order to compare one film with another film at Field level in contexts of situation as a result of differences in both horror films in language style because Conjuring 1 was released in 2013 and Conjuring 3 is the most recent version, which was released in 2021. This distinction undoubtedly influences the manner in which a movie script is conveyed. These discoveries are linked to the literature, allowing these assumptions to be formed objectively. As a result, the differences and similarities discovered by the findings are discussed in the following paragraph.

The appearance of Conjuring 1 and 3 at the level of Field is dominated by the emergence of material processes commonly found in the dialogue because both horror films generally convey films about the phenomena happened on horror movie. Hu's statement in Zheng (2014: 17) confirms this, explaining that the material process is the dominant process in speaking. The term material serves as a fundamental foundation for discussing human activities and existence in nature. This statement also emphasizes the high frequency of occurrence in data of attributive processes that arise after material processing.

The similarity also exists in the mental process of cognition. This is understandable because the dialogue in two horror films must be conveyed with the intention of connecting with their audience. As a result, mental processes can draw the audience's mental reactions to the thoughts that will occur, as confirmed by Alani & Ahanga (2016: 206). He claims that mental processes necessitate affective, cognitive, and perceptual reactions, as well as less common meteorological events, identification processes, behavioural and existential

concerns. This is due to the genre's purpose, which is to explain the problems that they face, particularly supernatural problems.

There are also similarities in the participant types, which are participant 1 and other participant. First, the similarities in participant 1 reveal that Actor, Carrier, and Senser are the most dominant appear in the process for both films, while Behavior is the fewest appear in both films. Second, the similarities found in Goal and Attributive as the most dominant participant types appears in both films. Other participants with the fewest appearances are Receiver and Target. Following participant types, the similarities are also found in Circumstances as a process element. The similarities include the lack of contingency in both films, which is none of them found in both horror films, and the lack of role, purpose, and cause circumstances in both horror films.

Among the similarities mentioned above, there are also differences in the level of Field. Conjuring 1, on the other hand, relies heavily on mental perception. Meanwhile, Conjuring 3 differs significantly from Conjuring 1 in the verbal process. Clauses like I saw her, she said, as in data analysis, occur frequently, indicating the use of verbal process as the style in delivering an utterance. Conjuring 1 is more dominant in terms of mental process affection, rather than Conjuring 3. This study also discovered differences in Participant 1. Conjuring 3 received a higher score than Place Circumstances. While the time constraints are higher in Conjuring 3 than in Conjuring 1, Conjuring 1 has a higher circumstance manner than Conjuring 3.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

1. Conclusion

The researcher can conclude this research as follows in order to answer the research question. The researcher discovered four similarities in both Conjuring 1 and Conjuring 3 movies at the level of Field. First, it is dominated by material and attributive process in process type. Second, In addition, both horror films show infrequent meteorological events, identification processes, behavioral and existential concerns in the process type. Third, In the case of participants, participant 1 and the other participant are dominant. Fourth, in both horror films, circumstances play an important role as a process element. The researcher discovered differences in the level of Field as well, there are four differences. Both horror films are distinct in terms of mental perception, verbal process, and mental affection. In the case of Circumstance, it differs in terms of place, time, and manner.

So, by examining both horror films Conjuring 1 and Conjuring 3 through the levels of situational context; Field, it is possible to conclude that the two horror films share more similarities than differences. This is possible because the word choice and clause structure are nearly identical. As a result, stylistic differences are influenced by script writer preferences, which lead to different ways of producing processes at the Field level.

2. Suggestion

This study, which focuses on the similarities and differences in language styles in horror films, has a few limitations. To determine language style, this study only compares the similarities and differences between the two horror films. As a result, more in-depth research on various films and other genres is required to obtain a more comprehensive study. Furthermore, it is suggested that future researchers study language styles in this genre from a different perspective or compare this research to other genres in order to gain a better understanding of language styles.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akmajian, A., Demers, R. A., Farmer, A. K., & Harnish, R. M. (2001). An introduction to language and communication. In *Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*.
- Bordwell, D. (2006). *The way Hollywood tells it*. University of California Press.
- Butt, D., Fahey, R., Feez, S., & Spinks, S. (2012). Using functional grammar: An explorer's guide. South Yarra. *Victoria palgrave Macmillan*.
- Crystal, D. (1970). New perspectives for language study. 1: Stylistics. *English Language Teaching*, 24(2), 99-106.
- Eggins, S. (2004). Introduction to systemic functional linguistics. A&c Black.
- Eggins, S., & Martin, J. R. (1997). Genres and registers of discourse. *Discourse as structure and process*, 1, 230-256.
- Emilia, E., & Hamied, F. A. (2015). Systemic functional linguistic genre pedagogy (SFL GP) in a tertiary EFL writing context in Indonesia. *TEFLIN journal*, 26(2), 155-182.
- Gerot, L., & Wignell, P. (1994). *Making sense of functional grammar: An introductory workbook*. Queensland: Antipodean Educational Enterprises.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). Spoken and written modes of meaning. *Media texts: Authors and readers*, 7, 51-73.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1989). Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective.
- Halliday, M. A. K., Matthiessen, C. M., Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Routledge.
- Leech, G. (2007). Style in fiction revisited: the beginning of Great Expectations. *Style*, 41(2), 117-132.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. (2003). *The language of evaluation* (Vol. 2). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Zheng, S., Yang, A., & Ge, G. (2014). Functional stylistic analysis: Transitivity in English-medium medical research articles. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 4(2), 12.