

تمثيل الايديولوجيات الاجتماعية والسياسية في المسلسل الكارتوني ساوث بارك: تحليل اسلوبي نقدي

The Presentation of Socio-Political Ideologies in *South Park*: Critical Stylistic Analysis

الاستاذ الدكتور سراب خليل حميد العزاوي

المدرس غسان جبار كاظم

Prof. Dr. Sarab Khalil Hameed Al-Azzawi

Inst. Ghasan Jabbar Kadhim

Sarabkhalil@coart.uobaghdad.edu.iq

josephkazim81@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq

قسم اللغة الانكليزية - كلية الآداب - الجامعة المستنصرية / قسم اللغة الانكليزية - كلية الآداب - الجامعة بغداد

المخلص

إن خطاب المسلسلات الكوميدية المتحركة مليء بالايديولوجيات الاجتماعية والسياسية التي تعكس الأفكار والمواقف المشتركة للمجتمع الأمريكي. تركز معظم الدراسات الأسلوبية النقدية على تحليل الأعمال الأدبية (مثل القصائد والروايات) والخطب السياسية لشخصيات بارزة. بينما تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحديد الوظائف النصية المفاهيمية المستخدمة في خطاب المسلسلات الكوميدية المتحركة لإظهار الدلالات الأسلوبية والايديولوجية و تقتصر البيانات التي يتم التركيز عليها على المسلسل الكوميدي الأمريكي المتحرك "ساوث بارك". تم اختيار الحلقة الثامنة من الموسم الثامن. تم أخذ المشهدين ٢ و ٣ من الحلقة، والتي تحمل عنوان *"Douche and Turd"*، لتمثيل البيانات. وخلصت الدراسة إلى أن وظيفتي (التسمية والوصف) و (التلميح والافتراض) سجلت أعلى معدل تكرار مقارنة بالوظائف الأخرى، مما يشير إلى أن المسلسلات الكوميدية تعتمد على مراجع وأحداث ثقافية

محددة، وأن السخرية أكثر مباشرة وصراحة، وأن هناك إشارات محددة إلى الحزبين السياسيين (أي الحزب الجمهوري والحزب الديمقراطي)، وأن الموضوع ساخر ويهاجم السلطة السياسية و أفرادها. وأخيرًا، يتم استخدام اختيار الأسماء بشكل متكرر للإشارة إلى الدلالات المهينة وكذلك الإشارات المجازية مثل (*Turd Sandwich*) و (*Giant Douche*).

Abstract

The discourse of animated sitcoms is full of socio-political ideologies that reflect shared thoughts and attitudes of Americans. Most of critical stylistic studies focus on analyzing literary works (e.g. novels) and political speeches. This study aims to identify the textual-conceptual functions used in the discourse of animated sitcoms to show the stylistic and ideological implications. The data under the focus is limited to American animation "*South Park*", which is written by Trey Parker. Scene 2 and 3 are taken from the episode 8 of season 8, entitled "*Douche and Turd*", to represent the data. The study has arrived at several conclusions, the most important of which are: Naming & Describing and Implying & Assuming scores the higher frequencies than the other functions, indicating that sitcoms rely on culture specific references and events. Satire is much more direct and explicit. Specific references are made to the two political parties (i.e. The Republican and Democratic parties), and the theme is satirical, confronting the political authority.

1. Introduction: Animated Sitcoms

Animated Sitcom is one type of situation comedies that primarily employ animation. According to Stabile & Harrison (2003), prime time animated sitcoms have become more popular among American television audiences since "*The Flintstones*" became a huge hit in the early 1960s. It was the first animated series that was not exclusively aimed at children. A number of animated sitcoms have been made since

the late 1980s as a result of the genre's surprising popularity, including "*The Simpsons*", "*South Park*", and "*Family Guy*". However, one prominent type of animated sitcoms is American family sitcom or "domesticom", as Marc (1989) refers to it. "*Family Guy*" and "*The Simpsons*" represent this subtype, centering on recurrent characters in amusing everyday scenarios to have a framework akin to live-action comedies. But more exaggeration, absurdity, and visual license are permitted in the animation medium, which frequently broadens the narrative possibilities beyond what is possible in live-action (Turner, 2010).

Modern American animated sitcoms represents a fascinating area of study for researchers in many academic fields because they are full with humorous satirical texts that address current social and political, philosophical, and psychological themes. Their main purpose is to communicate particular information about current topics. Moreover, animated sitcoms frequently tackle taboo or contentious social and political subjects, use creative comedy, social critique, exaggeration techniques, and hyper-stereotyping in an amusing manner (Demina, 2021, p. 1126) .

The cinema industry has evolved into an effective means of expression that attracts public attention by employing creative linguistic devices to convey ideas from a certain angle. The unique linguistic characteristics of this language have made creative movie discourse a fruitful area of study. Over the years, linguists have been researching the precise ways that language is employed in different genres to facilitate communication (ibid, p. 1127) .

The popularity of the animated sitcoms quickly spread around the world, and as a result, "the genre has achieved a prominent spot in contemporary Western popular culture" as noted by Dhaenens & Van Bauwel (2012). In 1999, just after "*South Park*" and "*Family Guy*" were originally released in the United States, 75% of animated

comedy sales were recorded from non-US regions (Stabile & Harrison, 2003, Raymond, 2013, Gray, 2012 and Dhaenens, 2012).

However, the key components frequently seen in animated sitcoms as follows. First, similar to conventional sitcoms, animated ones emphasize humor that comes from character interactions and commonplace situations, including coming-of-age themes (*Bob's Burgers*), workplace interactions (*Futurama*), or family dynamics (*The Simpsons*). Second, characters and scenarios that defy common sense are made possible by animation, which permits imaginative or exaggerated features that would be impossible to create in live action (*Rick and Morty*). Third, through satire, several animated comedies use their genre to delve deeper into societal themes. For example, "*The Simpsons*" often parodies American society, while "*South Park*" is renowned for its critical social and political satire. Lastly, animated sitcoms, like their live-action counterparts, include a recurring cast of characters and frequently conclude with an established structure that permits each episode to have its own stand-alone plot (Gray, 2006, Mittell, 2004 and Booker, 2006).

2. Critical Stylistics

Critical Stylistics (henceforth CS) is developed as a useful method for addressing ideology in language and to serve as a connection between stylistics and critical studies. Leslie Jeffries (2007) initially used the term "Critical Stylistics" to investigate the dominant power in hegemonic discourses about the female body in society and determine whether or not these discourses successfully integrate feminist beliefs. Jeffries (2010) adopts a "language-oriented" stance grounded on the firm belief in some characteristic "form-function relations of language" and is engaged in the first two stages (description and interpretation). However, stylistics aims to analyze literary and nonliterary texts by applying linguistic methods and analytical strategies to make style easier to examine. As a study approach, stylistics might be likened to critical

linguistics rather than CDA since, unlike CDA, stylistics provides a set of instruments to address problems regarding the meaning of texts and how they mean what they signify (Tabbert, 2013, p. 76).

Both stylistic and critical stylistic studies have used the problem of form and function coupling in human language. The key idea is that "Textual-Conceptual Functions" try to understand how the text conceptually reflects the world in a particular manner. In this approach, they demonstrate how verbal resources are used to generate conceptual meaning. This textual aspect of the process is what basically characterizes the stylistics approach (Jeffries, 2014, p. 409) .

3. Methodology

According to Jeffries (2015, p. 387), Textual-Conceptual Functions work as "the different aspects of the text world which the text produces". The following are the five functions used in this study.

3.1 Naming and Describing

According to Jeffries (2014, p. 413) , the primary function of texts is to identify and characterize objects in the world, whether they are living, inanimate, or abstract. Text producers may use this feature to defend their decision to label a "politically-motivated producer of violence" as a terrorist or a freedom warrior. One of the most significant decisions authors make when incorporating ideas is the names they use for reference. However, three linguistic processes can be given ideological meaning by naming, i.e. The Choice of Nouns to denote a referent, The Noun Modification for identifying the referent's nature, and Nominalization to employ a name instead of a procedure (Jeffries, 2007, p. 63)

3.2 Representing Actions/Events/States

The idea of transitivity, which was introduced by Halliday (1985) and expanded upon by Simpson (1993), centers on classifying lexical verbs into distinct groups based on the type of state or process they represent (Jeffries, 2010: 40). Halliday's transitivity has the ability to link specific actors to actions, events, and states. The primary verb used in a phrase by the speaker/writer may alter how the hearer/reader perceives the process. For instance, the same incident (someone calling the police) might highlight multiple facets of the process when explained in many ways without altering the essential details:

- *John spoke to the police.* (Verbalization)
- *John informed the police.* (Material Action Intentional)
- *John was a police informer.* (Relational Intensive)
- *John let the cat out of the bag to the police.* (Supervention)

This indicates that text creators have the freedom to choose how they want to communicate their story, which might have ideological implications (Jeffries, 2014, p.413). Transitivity was established by Simpson (1993), who claimed that it demonstrates how speakers use language to encode their mental images of the outside world in order to account for their perceptions of it. He organizes processes into categories to symbolize speech, actions, states of being, and mental states.

3.3 Equating and Contrasting

Despite the fact that English has more synonyms than other languages due to its lengthy history, lexical semanticists continue to hold that no two words are exactly the same. Similar circumstances arise with antonyms, when language experts presume a distinct semantic connection between certain lexical item pairings (Jeffries, 2010, p. 51).

Texts can provide new synonyms and antonyms (equivalence and opposition) between words (phrases, sentences, or even paragraphs) that are never connected outside of the text's context. Certain syntactic frames can be used to place words and sentences as oppositional and comparable:

1. It was X, Y. (to set up equivalence) : e.g. *It was fury, incompetence.*
2. It was X not Y. (to set up opposition) : e.g. *It was car-maintenance, not cake-decorating.*

The first example uses apposition to refer to the same referent, which suggests that the two terms are somewhat equivalent. Since "*incompetence*" is a synonym for "*inadequacy*" and "*fury*" is a synonym for "*rage*", the reader must create a scenario in which both terms relate to the same thing, such as when someone is so furious that he is unable to work normally. The second example requires the speaker to provide a setting in which these actions might be viewed as opposites in order to expose certain ideas. For instance, comparing two activities to gender ideologies, with one being more feminine or insignificant (*cake-decorating*) and the other more masculine or important (*car-maintenance*). Table (3:1) shows the typical forms for constructing equivalence (Jeffries, 2010).

Table (3:1) Equivalence Types with Syntactic Triggers and Realizations

Equivalence Type	Syntactic Trigger	Example
Intensive Relational Equivalence	X is Y; X seems (become, appear) Y; Z make X Y; Z cause X to be Y; Z think X Y	<i>The worst danger to the whole world is terrorism.</i>
Parallel Structure	X is Y. X is Z	<i>Corruption is the disease that needs immediate</i>

		<i>cure. Corruption is fatal.</i>
Appositional Equivalence	X, Y, (Z) etc.)	<i>Clinton, the US President</i>
Metaphorical Equivalence	X is like Y, Z is Y	<i>The government is like a poodle</i>

Jeffries (2007, p. 114) states that "opposition is one of the ways in which cultural and socio-political norms created as over-simplistic binaries in texts, with the potential influence on readers being to embed such oppositions in their reflex/default perception". Table (3:2) shows some of the most prominent syntactic triggers that have been covered by Jones (2002), Davies (2008), and Jeffries (2007, 2009):

Table (3:2) Opposition Types with Syntactic Triggers and Realizations

Opposition Type	Syntactic Trigger	Example
Negated Opposition	X not Y; some X, not Y; plenty of X, a lack of Y; X, but not Y; not X, just Y etc.	<i>Home not dry</i>
Transitional Opposition	Turn X into Y; X becomes Y; from X to Y etc.	<i>Turn water into wine</i>
Comparative Opposition	More X than Y; less X than Y	<i>More stupid than evil</i>
Replacive	X instead of Y; X rather than Y; X in	<i>Gold instead of</i>

Opposition	preference to Y; X over Y etc.	<i>yellow</i>
Concessive Opposition	Despite X, Y; X, yet Y; X still, Y etc.	<i>Despite her anger, she danced</i>
Explicit opposition	X by contrast with (contrasted with) Y; X as opposed to Y; difference between X and Y etc.	<i>Steel by contrast with water</i>
Parallelism	He liked X. She liked Y; your house is X, mine is Y etc.	<i>He liked coffee. She liked tea.</i>
Contrastive	X, but Y	<i>She was young, but ugly.</i>

3.4 Implying and Assuming

In the fields of pragmatics and semantics, this textual-conceptual function is associated with implicature (Grice, 1975) and presupposition (Levinson, 1983), respectively. Since these ideologies are not expressly constructed into the propositional content of the sentence, one of the primary capacities of language is to generate them through assumption and inference (Jeffries, 2010, p. 93)

Presupposition makes the assumption that something exists, that an event occurs, or that an action takes place. Although they are difficult to recognize because they are assumed to be made up in the text world, presuppositions do not constitute

the sentence's proposition. According to Jeffries (2010, p. 94) authors attempt to convey their beliefs to readers/hearers who can recognize and respond to them through inference and assumption.

Naming has the potential to generate presupposition. Consequently, it overlaps with the textual function of naming since the noun phrase assumes the existence of the referent. However, Existential and logical presuppositions are the two main categories. The existential presumptions, frequently referred to as the "shared knowledge" among speakers of a particular language, is fundamental to language and how it functions. Further, Logical presupposition is difficult to recognize due to its open-ended triggers, which are categorized into the following: (1) **Change of State verbs**, such as "*stop, resign, etc.*", (2) **Factive verbs**, such as "*realize, discover, etc.*", and some senses of "*know*", (3) **Cleft sentences**, (4) **Iterative words**, such as "*again, another, further, revisit*", and (5) **Comparative structures** (Levinson, 1983, pp. 181-185)

According to Jeffries (2010, p. 99), implicature is the area of pragmatics that occurs when texts deviate from or disregard the Gricean maxims that Grice (1975, p. 47) proposed for effective language usage. Due to its textual character, implicature can be considered a part of the ideational function. Implication is categorized into conventional implicature or conversational implicature. Conventional implicature is used to describe the implicit meaning that is affixed to specific lexical elements (Levinson, 1983, p. 127) Conventional implicature can be "intuitively grasped" without being connected to pragmatic principles such as the maxims whereas Conversational Implicature occurs when a speaker violates one or more Gricean Cooperative Principle maxims during a conversation, and it is the hearer's responsibility to "read between the lines" to deduce the implicit meaning (Jeffries, 2010, pp. 99,105)

3.5 Negating

People spend a lot of time communicating by attempting to create and understand "non-existent versions of the world" for a variety of reasons because, as the speaker or writer assumes, texts create a sort of image of the world. Therefore, individuals may construct a universe by connecting the missing elements to it either critically, as in "*The world's resources are not finite*" or narratively, as in "*He didn't reach the bridge in time*". This function is not only about negating the verb; it is about a more comprehensive mental process (Jeffries, 2010, pp. 106–107).

Negating might have a core syntactic realization or an open-ended variety of options that reflects English form–function flexibility, such as adding a "negative particle" to the first item in the verb phrase, pronouns like "*none, nobody*", adjectival form of "*no*", as in "*There is no consensus in this meeting*", lexical elements that convey the absence or lack of action, such as "*fail, absent, lack*", or morphological, such as "*incomplete, dislike*". However, the three kinds can be used to illustrate the negating function: syntactic, lexical and morphological (Jeffries, 2010, p. 108)

The impact of negating on ideology is that pragmatic force plays a role in creating "hypothetical situations" in the mind of the reader/hearer that are not real. For instance, in an interview with a newspaper, Ken Livingstone, who ran for mayor of London in 2008, said, "*This election is not a joke*." Livingstone claims ideological motive in his denying statement, suggesting that there is someone who believes the election is a nonsense (Jeffries, 2015, p. 394)

4. The Analysis of The Data

This section will base on the above model of Jefferies (2010) of selected tools to deduct the ideological consequences of socio–political issues in "*South Park*". The author sheds light on the election campaigns and voting process in democratic

country, i.e. United States of America. The following analysis of the selected scenes explains the different types of socio-political attitudes and actions politicians and peoples do to invest them for their profit.

4.1 Scene Two (*Mr. Garrison's class. The class is seated*)

Garrison: All right, children, I have just been informed that since our school has been attacked by eco-terrorists for the 47th time, we *are* going to change our school mascot.

Class: Awwwwwwww!

Stan: But, Mr. Garrison, if we change our mascot, that means the eco-terrorists win!

Garrison: That's right, Stanley, the eco-terrorists win. [*approaches the students with a stack of papers and begins distributing it*] Now, I have here a mascot selection sheet. Every student is supposed to check the box next to the mascot they like the most. And the most popular selection will be the school's new mascot.

Clyde: But we like being the Cows! [*a bucket of real blood is doused on him and the rest of the class gasps.*]

Dreadlocked PETA man: You're responsible for the enslavement and genocide of millions!

Garrison: [*taking action*] Ge-get outta here, PETA! We're changin' the mascot already!

Dreadlocked PETA man: Who'll speak for those who cannot speak for themselves?!

Garrison: *[throws some papers at the PETA member]* Oh, ge-get outta here! *[breaks out a can of mace and sprays it on him]* Ge-get out! *[the man leaves]* Jesus, where do they keep coming from?! *[sprays some more for effect]* Go on, get outta here.

Stan: This is bullcrap, dude!

Garrison: Now children, it's not that bad. There's plenty of great new mascots on the sheet to choose from. The Hurricanes, the Blizzards, the Redskins, the Indians...

Wendy: But aren't Indians and Redskins just as offensive?

Garrison: No, those are fine. PETA doesn't care about people."

4.1.1 Critical Stylistic Realizations of Scene 2

As table (4:1) indicates and the numbers show in this scene, the author well satirizes the PETA as being eco-terrorists who overact as animal defendants but in fact the people targeted are eco-friendly kids and not animal enemies.

4.1.1.1 Naming and Describing

This function (31.1%) has the highest frequency, indicating that the scene relies heavily on detailed descriptions to build the narrative and create vivid imagery. The Choice of Nouns (22.9%) shows that the high number of specific nouns helps establish clear and distinct elements within the scene, making it easy for the audience to visualize the setting and characters, which is essential for creating a humor and satire. For instance, the *nouns "the Redskins, the Indians"* reveals the attitude of PETA's that although they do care about animals, they do not actually care about humans. Also, there is an interesting ideology in *"eco-terrorists"* which is compared to

terrorists, indicating the excessive extremism of those activists (PETA). Noun Modification (4.9%) enhances the specificity and descriptiveness of nouns, adding layers to the characters and actions. The absence of Nominalization suggests that the scene focuses on concrete actions and descriptions rather than abstract concepts.

4.1.1.2 Representing Actions/Events/States

In this scene, this function (18%) highlights how actions and states are portrayed, adding dynamism to the scene. Material processes (3.2%) describe physical actions which is essential for the chaotic intrusion of PETA. Furthermore, Verbalization processes (1.6%) indicate that direct speech acts are less emphasized, possibly to focus more on visual and physical humor. The high frequency of Relational processes (8.1%) suggests that the scene places significant emphasis on describing relationships and states of being, such as the responsibility of people toward enslaving and killing cows. For instance, *"You're responsible for the enslavement and genocide of millions!"* represents the state of thinking of PETA who believes that the majority mistreat and kill cows. Mental processes (4.9%) highlight individual emotional responses, adding depth to characters like Garrison who believes that such activists do not care about people. To exemplify, the sentence *"PETA doesn't care about people"* shows the mentality of those activists.

4.1.1.3 Equating and Contrasting

This function (13.1%) shows how the scene draws parallels to enhance socio-political ideologies. Frequent Equating (11.4%) underscores the direct connections made between the symbolic and real life, intensifying the satirical impact. The author uses mostly metaphorical techniques for ridiculing the serious events and situations.

For instance, *"we like being the Cows!"* is stated to satirize the state of common people being similar to cows. This indicates that either people are coward, they do not care about election, or they are not interested in who will lead or represent them in the government. The single instance of Contrasting (1.6%) designates that the scene touches more on drawing parallels rather than highlighting differences.

4.1.1.4 Implying and Assuming

This function (31.1%) specifies how assumptions and implications are operated to add layers of meaning. Frequent presuppositions (22.9%) suggest that the scene relies on shared knowledge about PETA and school mascots, making the satire more accessible to the audience. For instance, *"the Hurricanes, the Blizzards, the Redskins, the Indians, PETA"* are noun phrases mentioned to ridicule such actual names found in American culture. However, the terms such as *"eco-terrorists, genocide, PETA, mascot, the Hurricanes, the Blizzards, the Redskins, the Indians"* involve ideological representations. Implicature frequency (8.1%) means much of the satire is conveyed indirectly, through implications, enhancing satire and humor toward socio-political stances. Each noun is loaded with social, political, and cultural implications that contribute to create a satirical discourse. To illustrates, *"since our school has been attacked by eco-terrorists for the 47th time, we are going to change our school mascot"* frames an implication by using the term *"eco-terrorists"* to describe the group responsible for attacking the school. Such noun is highly loaded, suggesting extreme and violent behavior from people interested in environmental issues. The members of PETA are perceived in a negative picture and there is always a picture of a danger and threat linked with them.

4.1.1.5 Negating

Although Negating (4.9%) is less prominent, it still contributes to the overall tone. This category is not employed frequently as the others. However, the satirical target can be assumed by negating certain structures or lexical item. Syntactic Negating (4.9%) indicates that negation is used sparingly, perhaps to maintain a more positive narrative. For example, *"Who'll speak for those who cannot speak for themselves?"* is loaded with ideological implications. It conveys that there is a resemblance between people and animals concerning the disability of speaking. This provoking satirical element leads the audience to perceive clearly the ideologies hidden in this discourse. Moreover, there is also syntactic negating. Although *"No, those are fine"* is used to dismiss the offensiveness of the Redskins and the Indians, assuming that such concerns are invalid in this context, there is a powerful humorous satire used by the addresser in which PATA do not have any concern to humans. The absence of Lexical Negating and Morphological Negating (0.00%) advocate that the language stays straightforward without relying on inherently negative terms.

Table (4:1) Distribution of Textual Conceptual Functions of Scene 2

Textual Conceptual Functions		Overall
Naming and Describing		19 (31.1%)
Choice of Nouns	14 (22.9%)	
Noun Modification	3 (4.9%)	
Nominalization	2 (3.2%)	
Representing Actions/ Events/ States		11 (18%)
Material Processes	2 (3.2%)	
Verbalization Processes	1 (1.6%)	
Relational Processes	5 (8.1%)	

Mental Processes	3 (4.9%)	
Equating and Contrasting		8 (13.1%)
Equating	7 (11.4%)	
Contrasting	1 (1.6%)	
Implying and Assuming		19 (31.1%)
Presupposition	14 (22.9%)	
Implicature	5 (8.1%)	
Negating		3 (4.9%)
Syntactic negating	3 (4.9%)	
Lexical negating	0 (0.00%)	
Morphological negating	0 (0.00%)	
		60

4.2 Scene Three *(the school hallway)*

Cartman: Goddammit, vegans piss me off! Now we're gonna end up with a stupid eagle or a faggy (gay) bobcat as a mascot.

Kyle: Wait. You guys, I have an awesome idea! We should secretly go around and tell all the students we can, to not check any of the mascots on this election sheet, and instead write in "Giant Douche."

Cartman: Ye-heah!

Kenny: (Yeah, totally awesome!)

Cartman: Yeh– no, no, wait, wait. I got a better idea you guys. What we should do is we should secretly go around and tell all the students we can to not check any of the mascots on this election sheet, and instead write in "Turd Sandwich."

Kyle: Turd Sandwich isn't better than Giant Douche.

Cartman: Heh, it's only about a thousand times better, am I right guys? Come on! We have to tell everybody fast! This is gonna be *so* funny!

Kyle: It was *my* idea and we're gonna tell everyone to write in "Giant Douche!" It's way funnier!

Cartman: It is not!

Kyle: Kenny, what's funnier? A giant douche or a turd sandwich?

Kenny: (Giant douche.)

Cartman: Aw, you're just saying that because I broke your cat's leg last week.

Kyle: Stan, do you pick giant douche or turd sandwich?

Stan: Dude, I really don't care. *[walks away]*

Kyle: *[tallies the votes. Behind him, Butters approaches his locker and prepares to open it]* That's two against one, 'cause Stan doesn't care. So it's giant douche.

Cartman: *[notices, then runs to Butters and pulls him towards the other boys]* ...Wait, wait, what about Butters?

Butters: Huh?

Kyle: You *hate* Butters.

Cartman: Goddammit, you guys, Butters is our friend! And he's allowed to have his opinion! Butters, which is funnier? A stupid not-funny giant douche or a *super funny* turd sandwich?

Butters: Hahaha, a turd sandwich!

Kyle: You misled him, fatass!

Cartman: It's the best choice, and me and Butters are sticking with it.

Butters: [*crosses his arms*] Yeah! ...What's this for? [*the boys approach Jimmy*]

Kyle: Jimmy, we're gonna have everyone write in a mascot that's really funny, and you have to tell us which one would be funnier.

Jimmy: That's a... fantastic idea fellas. Uh, the key to successful humor is s-staying power. Uh, tell me the first mascot idea.

Kyle: A giant douche.

Jimmy: Heh, huh okay, that's pretty funny. Now, what's the second?

Cartman: A turd sandwich.

Jimmy: Turhr... Ohokahay. Okay, now let's wait ten seconds. [*ten seconds pass*] Okay now, t-tell me the first one again?

Kyle: Giant douche.

Jimmy: [*snickers*] And the second?

Cartman: Turd sandwich.

Jimmy: *[snickers]* Gee, th–they're both screamingly funny, fellas. Better give it another ten seconds.*[ten seconds pass]* All right, now we'll see which one *really* has staying power. Number one?

Kyle: A giant douche.

Jimmy: *[snickers]* Okay, I think, that's it. Number 2?

Cartman: Turd sandwich.

Jimmy: *[snickers]* Gee, I don't know what to say, fellas. They're both instant classics. But I guess I'll have to go with giant douche, simply because the fact that it's a giant renders it useless, adding a parody slant to the satire.

Cartman: Awwwww!

Butters: Ohhh, we lost?

Kyle: All right, it's decided. Let's all write in "Giant Douche."

Cartman: Okay. You win, Kyle."

4.2.1 Critical Stylistic Realizations of Scene 3

As table (4:2) indicates, the author criticizes the insignificance with which democratic procedures are occasionally handled. The text draws attention to the ridiculousness of the scenario by exaggerating the characters' arguments and actions, which invites hearers/readers to consider the more complex issues of society that are being made fun of.

4.2.1.1 Naming and Describing

This function (32.4%) has the highest frequency. This suggests that the scene primarily depends on descriptions to develop the story and produce vivid visuals. It appears from the Choice of Nouns (5.2%) that the specific nouns aids in establishing distinct and clear features in scene 3, which facilitates the audience's ability to imagine the characters and setting. For example, there is a negative attitude towards PETA when Cartman uses "*vegans*" in a derogatory way, creating an ideological satire. However, Noun Modification (27.1%) simultaneously adds layers to the characters and actions by improving the descriptiveness of nouns. By highlighting particular characteristics or behaviors, this adds to the power of ideology. To exemplify, "*a super funny turd sandwich*" is employed to enhance the nature of satire meant and gives a powerful picture to the humour. Furthermore, "*Stupid eagle and faggy bobcat*" are highly pejorative attributives used underlying a socially unacceptable traditions. However, the idea of irreverence toward politicians is also used in "*Giant Douche*" and "*Turd Sandwich*" in which vulgar and absurd names are employed humorously to reflect the characters' lack of respect. On the other hand, the lack of Nominalization implies that the scene is more concerned with specific events and descriptions than with abstract ideas.

4.2.1.2 Representing Actions/Events/States

This function (21%) draws attention to the ways in which states and actions are depicted, bringing life to the picture. Material processes (5.2%) define physical acts, which are reflected by Kyle's plan in influencing the election results, representing the secret collective action which covertly manipulates the election. "*We should secretly go around and tell all the students we can*" represents the secret collective action which covertly manipulates the election. However, Mental processes (6.1%) highlight individual emotional responses, reflecting the characters' emotional reaction against

PETA, such as the following instance, *"Goddammit, vegans piss me off"*. This aggressive mental reaction suggests that vegans being as a source of irritation. Relational processes (9.6%) appear to focus on depicting relationships and states of being, such as satirizing the state of thinking of most Americans who mostly believe that the election candidates are the same, such as in *"th-they're both screamingly funny, fellas"*. The absence of Verbalization processes (0.00%) suggests that direct spoken acts are not as important, maybe in order to stress physical and visual satire more.

4.2.1.3 Equating and Contrasting

This function (19.2%) demonstrates how the scene uses comparisons to suggest certain ideologies that are enhanced by frequent Equating (12.2%), which highlights the clear linkages between the mascot election and evaluating election candidates. As an example, *"the fact that it's a giant renders it useless, adding a parody slant to the satire"* is stated to indirectly ridicule both names (Giant Douche and Turd Sandwich) which are treated as equally ridiculous options. This equating shows how insignificant the characters think the mascot election is. However, this scene has greater satirical effect because the focus is on giant douche. Contrasting (7%) indicates that the scenario focuses more on making comparisons than on emphasizing differences. *"Turd Sandwich isn't better than Giant Douche"* serves as an example of how most voters evaluate election candidates with common sense.

4.2.1.4 Implying and Assuming

This function (23.6%) identifies how assumptions and implications are used to create implied ideologies. Socio-political ideologies are more approachable to the readers/hearers because many presuppositions (18.4%) imply that the situation is predicted on common information regarding election candidates and campaigns. *"the*

students, the mascots, this election sheet, Turd Sandwich" are employed, for example, to emphasize a humorous scenario intended. However, the frequency of implicature (5.2%) indicates that a significant ideologies are expressed implicitly through humour. This scene contains a lot of assumptions in terms of implicature. The first is Cartman's assumption of influence, when he believes he can influence the group's decision by persuading Butters and Jimmy together. In addition, Kyle implies that he believes originality is essential as he maintains that his concept—Giant Douche—is unique and so superior. Furthermore, humor can be utilized as a social tool. The entire conversation concentrates around what is considered funnier, suggesting that humor plays a major role in their interpersonal relationships.

4.2.1.5 Negating

Despite being less noticeable, Negating (3.5%) nevertheless adds to the overall tone. Syntactic Negating (3.5%) is employed infrequently to keep the story more action-oriented. For instance, there is provocative satire of the usage of the negated statement *"Turd Sandwich isn't better than Giant Douche"* which shows the common sense of some voters who believes that the candidates are the same. Another example is *"Stan: Dude, I really don't care. Kyle: That's two against one, 'cause Stan doesn't care. So it's giant douche"* which has an implicit, provocative meaning. This discourse contains an inferred meaning that refers to votes that have been stolen from people who typically do not desire to vote in US elections.

Table (4:2) Distribution of Textual–Conceptual Functions of Scene 3

Textual Conceptual Functions		Overall
Naming and Describing		37 (32.4 %)
Choice of Nouns	6 (5.2%)	
Noun Modification	31(27.1%)	

Nominalization	0 (0.00%)	
Representing Actions/ Events/ States		24 (21 %)
Material Processes	6 (5.2%)	
Verbalization Processes	0 (0.00%)	
Relational Processes	11(9.6%)	
Mental Processes	7 (6.1)	
Equating and Contrasting		22 (19.2 %)
Equating	14 (12.2%)	
Contrasting	8 (7%)	
Implying and Assuming		27 (23.6 %)
Presupposition	21 (18.4%)	
Implicature	6 (5.2%)	
Negating		4 (3.5 %)
Syntactic negating	4 (3.5 %)	
Lexical negating	0 (0.00%)	
Morphological negating	0 (0.00%)	
		114

5.1 Results and Discussions


The high frequency of **Naming & Describing** (32.1%), as illustrated in figure (5:1), suggests that the data rely on tangible representations to define the targets. The discourse gives the audience distinct and striking targets to criticize by

concentrating on the person or event being portrayed. Having involved the high frequency of this function, Western societies used to media criticism of public people may recognize political personalities, celebrities, or societal phenomena instantly. For example, Names play a central role in framing the debate around school mascots, such as "**the Hurricanes, the Blizzards, the Redskins, the Indians**", which serve as symbols of identity and critique social dynamics, especially in the context of cultural and political sensitivities. Furthermore, the absurdity of "**Giant Douche and Turd Sandwich**" as write-in mascots reflects the show's satire on democracy and trivializing important decisions.

Implying & Assuming has a very high frequency (26.4%) in the data under focus, indicating a satirical inclination to depend less on overt statements of meaning and more on the audience's capacity for inference. The author establishes an ideological agreement with his audience by supposing that they have common knowledge, so he does not have to explicitly state that some actions or viewpoints are absurd or inappropriate.

To sum up, with an emphasis on the function of **Naming & Describing**, Scene 2 explores the social dynamics of protest and political correctness. However, the focus of Scene 3 is on interpersonal disputes and ridiculous decision-making, with a greater emphasis on **Implying & Assuming** to create mockery. **Representing Actions/Events/States** (20.1%) demonstrates that social and political ideologies are more overt, using absurd or ethically suspicious actions from characters to highlight inequalities in society and reveal injustice or corruption. However, the low frequency of **Equating & Contrasting** (17.2%) as well as **Negating** (4%) is a reflection of the humorous tendency for direct comedy and exaggeration over delicate reasoning.

Figure (5:1) Frequencies and Percentages



Conclusions

The study comes to the following conclusions:

1. The animated sitcoms employed creative collocations, such as *giant douche*, *turd sandwich*, *eco-terrorists*.
2. The animated sitcoms rely on culture specific references and events, they are much more familiar to the non-American audience due to the effect of globalization.
3. Satire is much more direct and explicit. This was reflected in the frequent use of explicit naming of political figures and racial groups, with the use of real names in the sitcoms.
4. Specific references are made to the two political parties (i.e. The Republican and Democratic parties) targeted by satire in the animated sitcoms. Thus, the main theme is satirical, intimidating to political authority and people.
5. The author tends to satirize real figures and events by employing the technique of Absurdity in selecting names and combining unrelated events to achieve powerful satirical messages.

6. The choice of nouns within Naming & Describing is used frequently to indicate pejorative connotations as well as metaphorical references such as *Turd Sandwich* and *Giant Douche*.
7. The data mirror the corrupted democratic process, which is ridiculed in the election campaigns and voting.

References

- (Demina, O. V. (2021). Linguistic and Stylistic Means of Satire Construction in the Animated Series. RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics, 12(4), 1124–1146)
- (Dhaenens, F., & Van Bauwel, S. (2012). Queer resistances in the adult animated sitcom. Television & New Media, 13(2), 124–138.)
- (Gray, J. (2012). Watching with The Simpsons: Television, parody, and intertextuality. Routledge.)
- (Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Arnold.)
- (Jeffries, L., (2007). Textual Construction of the Female Body: a Critical Discourse Approach. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.)
- (-----, (2010). Critical Stylistics. The Power of English. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.)
- (-----, (2014). Critical Stylistics. In The Routledge Handbook of Stylistics. M. Burke, ed. London: Routledge. pp. 408 – 420.)

(-----, (2015). Language and Ideology. In *Introducing Language and Linguistics*. N. Braber, L. Cummings and Morrish, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.)

(Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge UP.)

(Mittell, J. (2004). *Genre and Television: From Cop Shows to Cartoons in American Culture*. Routledge.)

(Sayfo, O. A. (2015). Arab sitcom animations as platforms for satire. The power of satire, 81–91.)

(Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London: Routledge.)

(Stabile, C., & Harrison, M. (Eds.). (2003). *Prime-time Animation*. London: Routledge.)

(Tabbert, U. (2013). *Crime Through a Corpus: The linguistic Construction of Offenders, Victims and Crimes in the German and UK Press*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Huddersfield). available at <http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/18078>)

(Turner, C. (2010). *Planet Simpson: how a cartoon masterpiece documented an era and defined a generation*. Vintage Canada.)

(1. South Park: [site]. URL: <https://www.southparkstudios.com>)