

2.2 Relevant Theory

2.2.1 Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) theory is introduced by M.A.K Halliday. SFL is a theory to analyze text and their context of use. In another way, SFL aims to explain how people use language and how language is structured differently for its usage. The word systemic refers to language as a set of choice systems which provides how the speakers/writers express their intended meaning in the varied ways. The functional aspect serves language as functional purposes (Halliday, 1979: 57).

This study presents that language is a resource for making meaning and text is a process of making meaning in context (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014: 3). Text cannot stand by itself, it always occurs in two contexts, context of culture and context of situation. Context of culture describes how a text relates to the particular culture. Whereas, context of situation describes how a text relates to the social process. They combine and make differences and similarities between one piece of language and another. According to Systemic Functional Linguistics, there are three aspects of context of situation as field, tenor and mode of discourse. Generally, we can define these three terms as follows: *Field*, what is to be talked or written about or the long and short term goals of the text; *Tenor* is the relationship between the speaker and hearer or writer and reader; *Mode* is the kind of text that is being made (Butt, 2003: 4-5).

language (clause) is realized by the *theme* system of language (clause). This system is represented by the thematic structure of the clause which comprises two major elements: theme and rheme (Wang, 2010: 256).

The interpersonal meaning describes language usage to express social and personal relations (Hu Zhuanglin, 1988: 313 in Wang, 2010: 255). As Halliday (1997: 333 in Wang, 2010: 255) said that the speaker uses language to express the speech event as the relation of the social and himself. The speech event can be the expression of his comments, attitudes and evaluations, and it also can be the relationship that he sets up between himself and the listener in particular, and the communication role that are informing, questioning, greeting, persuading, and the like. The interpersonal meaning can be analyzed using two element: mood and modality. Mood expresses what role the speaker selects in the speech situation and what role he give to the addressee and modality refers to the intermediate ranges between the extremely positive and the extremely negative (Wang, 2010: 256). The concepts of mood and modality construct the appraisal theory by Martin.

2.2.2 Appraisal Theory

Appraisal theory is based on tenor in context situation and interpersonal meaning in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). This theory is taken from M.A.K Halliday's interpersonal meaning in language at the level of discourse semantics (Martin & White, 2005: xi) for expressing the speaker writer opinion in particular context and expressing linguistic meaning with whom they communicate (Martin, 2000: 142). Appraisal theory concerns into three point (1) the way speakers/writers approve and disapprove (2) the way text can produce feeling,

1. dis/inclination deals with the way the speakers/writers inclined or disinclined to something. The typical words classified in this region are *miss, long for, etc.*
2. un/happiness deals with emotional feeling of the speakers/writers whether they are happy or sad. The typical words classified in this region are *cheerful, gloomy, buoyant, etc.*
3. in/security deals with how the speakers/writers share their peace, anxiety, fear, confident and trust emotion in relation to our environs. The typical words are: *confident, comfortable, trusting, etc.*
4. dis/satisfaction deals with feelings of the speakers/writers about achievement and frustration that can be displeasure, curiosity, respect. The typical words are: *engrossed, satisfied, pleased, etc.*

Table 2.1 Affect types

Affect	Positive	Negative
dis/inclination	miss, long for, yearn for	wary, fearful, terrorized
un/happiness	cheerful buoyant, jubilant; like, love, adore	sad, melancholy, despondent; cut-up, heart-broken ... broken-hearted, heavyhearted, sick at heart; sorrowful ... grief-stricken, woebegone dejected, joyless, dreary, cheerless, unhappy, sad; gloomy, despondent, ... downcast, low, down, down in the mouth, depressed ...; weepy, wet-eyed, tearful, in tears ...
in/security	together, confident, assured; comfortable, confident, trusting	uneasy, anxious, freaked out; startled, surprised, astonished

Table 2.2 Judgement- Social Esteem

Social Esteem	Possitive (admire)	Negative (critise)
normality lucky, 'how special?'	fortunate, charmed ...; normal, natural, familiar ...; cool, stable, predictable ...; in, fashionable, avant garde ...; celebrated, unsung ...	unlucky, hapless, star-crossed ...; odd, peculiar, eccentric ...; erratic, unpredictable ...; dated, daggy, retrograde ...; obscure, also-ran ...
capacity 'how capable?'	powerful, vigorous, robust ...; sound, healthy, fit ...; adult, mature, experienced ...; witty, humorous, droll ...; insightful, clever, gifted ...; balanced, together, sane ...; sensible, expert, shrewd ...; literate, educated, learned ...; competent, accomplished ...; successful, productive ...	mild, weak, whimpy ...; unsound, sick, crippled ...; immature, childish, helpless ...; dull, dreary, grave ...; slow, stupid, thick ...; flaky, neurotic, insane ...; naive, inexpert, foolish ...; illiterate, uneducated, ignorant ...; incompetent; unaccomplished ...; unsuccessful, unproductive ...
tenacity 'how dependable?'	plucky, brave, heroic ...; cautious, wary, patient ...; careful, thorough, meticulous tireless, persevering, resolute ...; reliable, dependable ...; faithful, loyal, constant ...; flexible, adaptable, accommodating ...	timid, cowardly, gutless ...; rash, impatient, impetuous ...; hasty, capricious, reckless ...; weak, distracted, despondent ...; unreliable, undependable ...; unfaithful, disloyal, inconstant ...; stubborn, obstinate, wilful ...

Besides social esteem, the next types of judgement is social sanction. Social sanction is different from social esteem. Social sanction is more often known in writing, as rules, regulations and laws (Martin, 2015). Judgements of social sanction concerns with legal and religious rule. From the religious perspective, breaking of social sanction will be seen as sins, from the legal perspective they will be seen as crimes. Those who break the social sanction can get risk legal or religious

1. Reaction describe the emotional impact of the work on the reader/listener. The product/process is evaluated into impact (whether the phenomena grabs our attention) that use words such as *arresting, captivating, engaging* and quality (whether the phenomena is liked by the speaker) that use words *okay, fine, good*.
2. Composition describes our view texturally. The product/process is evaluated into balance (whether the phenomena is orderly, has a sense of balance and connectedness in it) that use words such as *balanced, harmonious, unified..* and complexity (whether the phenomena is easy or difficult to comprehend) that use words such as *simple, pure, elegant*.
3. Value deals with cognition or our considered opinion using wrpds such as *penetrating, profound, deep*.

Table 2.4 Appreciation types

Appreciation	Possitive	Negative
<u>Reaction:</u> impact 'did it grab me?'	arresting, captivating, engaging...; fascinating, exciting, moving ...; lively, dramatic, intense ...; remarkable, notable, sensational ...	dull, boring, tedious ...; dry, ascetic, uninviting ...; flat, predictable, monotonou unremarkable, pedestrian ...
<u>Reaction:</u> quality 'did I like it?'	okay, fine, good ... lovely, beautiful, splendid ...; appealing, enchanting, welcome ...	bad, yuk, nasty ...; plain, ugly, grotesque ...; repulsive, revolting, off-putting ...
<u>Composition:</u> balance 'did it hang together?'	balanced, harmonious, unified, symmetrical, proportioned ...; consistent, considered, logical ...; shapely, curvaceous, willowy...	unbalanced, discordant, irregular, uneven, flawed ...; contradictory, disorganised ...; shapeless, amorphous, distorted ...
<u>Composition:</u>	simple, pure, elegant ...;	ornate, extravagant, byzantine ...;

