CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The chapter is divided into two theoretical framework and relevant theory. The theoretical framework describes the structure of the theory used and the phenomenon. The relevant theory describes the theory that we uses to analyze the phenomenon.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

This study is based on the phenomena of our social life. The use of assumptions or perceptions that are made by people in social interaction to share their assessment about women in managerial jobs. It creates gender stereotype in managerial jobs field. It also exists in the opinion of the responders towards a topic discussion about *do women make good manager*? in indiabix.com. In their opinion, they also share their positive or negative feeling toward women in managerial job and their positive or negative normative assessment.

This study uses developed systemic functional linguistic (sfl). SFL has three function of linguistics namely ideational, interpersonal, and textual. Interpersonal function is divided into three mood, modality, and appraisal. Attitude is one of type of appraisal. Attitude type of appraisal theory is used to describe the stereotyped value of the assumptions or perceptions in their opinion. The study investigates attitude types to describe the way speakers or writers express their attitudes, sharing feelings or normative assessments and evaluating the worth of thing and the way it is portrayed by positive or negative (Martin, 2015). This study presents the theoretical framework as diagram below:





of Appraisal (Martin & White, 2005)

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).

The three parameters of context of situation affect our language choices precisely because they reflect the three main functions of language (Butt, 2003: 5). They are ideational meaning, interpersonal meaning, and textual meaning.

As ideational meaning, the speaker or writer express in language his experience of the phenomena of the social world. The experiences include his reactions, cognitions, and perceptions, and also his linguistic acts of speaking and understanding (Halliday, 1971: 332 in Wang, 2010: 255). The ideational function is represented by the transitivity system in grammar. There are six processes of transitivity system namely material process, mental process, relational process, behavioral process, verbal process, and existential process.

Material process shows action verb such as *eat, go, give.* Mental process expresses mental phenomena namely perception, reaction and cognition, as perception using the verbs such as *see, look*, reaction using the verbs such as *like, please* and cognition using the verbs such as *know, believe, convince*, relational process shows the process of being using the verbs such as *is, become, stand for*. Behavioral process refers to physiological and psychological behavior using the verbs such as *breathing, coughing, smiling, laughing, crying, staring, and dreaming.* Verbal process shows the exchanging information using the verbs are *say, tell, talk, praise, boast, describe,* etc. Existential process refers to something exists or happens using the verbs such as *is, am, go by* (Wang, 2010: 255).

Textual meaning deals with the way text is organized in relation to its context and its message. The relationship between language and context make a different living passage from the random list of sentences. The textual meaning of 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,

values and the linguistic mechanisms share emotion, taste and normative (3) the way speaker/writers construe their particular authorial identities or personae (Martin & White, 2005: 1). In addition, Martin said (2015), appraisal is a theory to describe and explain how the speaker/the writer uses language to show their feeling, and their relationship to the listener/the reader.

Appraisal has three types namely attitude, engagement, and graduation as the interacting domains (Martin & White, 2005: 35). Below is the example of realization appraisal in ABC Radio Interview taken from www.grammatics.com:

Well, there's <u>a lot of [graduation: force] anger</u> [attitude: affect] about <u>many</u> [graduation: force] of the fees and this is <u>really why</u>, I say again, [engagement: proclamation] the more competition we can have <u>the better</u> [attitude]. <u>And there's no doubt that [engagement: probability] home loan</u> interest rates, in particular, are lower now because of competition.

From the example above, engagement is realized in the clause, *I say again, there's no doubt, that*. Engagement itself deals with how speakers/writers deliver their meanings, the way they or disagree the diversity of view-points as risk and negotiation by their utterances (Martin, 2015). Graduation attends to grading feeling are amplified into two (1) speakers graduate (raise or lower) the interpersonal impact, force or volume of their utterances, and (2) by which they graduate (blur or sharpen) the focus of their semantic categorizations (Martin, 2015). Graduation is found in a clause *a lot of,* and a word *many*.

Attitude is found in the words *anger, the better* Attitude is divided into three regions of feeling affect namely affect, judgement, and appreciation. Affect deals with resources for construing emotional reactions, judgement is concerned with resources for assessing behavior according to various normative principles, appreciation as the resources for construing the value of things resources (Martin & White, 2005: 38).



Figure 2.2 An overview of Appraisal resources (Martin & White, 2005:

38)

This study only focuses on one appraisal subtypes, attitude. It will be explained more in the below.

2.2.3 Attitude

Attitude will discuss about the way people use their feeling more or less instance and amplified. It explores feeling into two realization namely the positive (or, the likable) attitude and the negative (or, the unlikable attitude). The negative feeling is differentiated from the negation of positive feeling and vice versa. This is because the two are different, although on certain contexts they may look similar. For example *sad* (which is a negative attitude) is differentiated from *not happy* (which is a negated positive attitude) because in the fact, a person can be not happy without being sad (Martin & White, 2005: 73)

As simply, attitude refers to the three semantic regions covering emotion, ethics and aesthetics. Attitude itself is divided into three types:

> <u>AFFECT</u>: the characterisation of phenomena by reference to emotion. <u>JUDGEMENT</u>: the evaluation of human behaviour with respect to social norms. <u>APPRECIATION</u>: the evaluation of objects and products (rather than human behaviour) by reference to aesthetic principles and other systems of social value (Martin, 2015).

Affect take role as the basic of systems or the heart of organized feelings. As Judgement, Affect takes part as an evaluation framework for behavior, with a view to controlling what people do, how we should behave or not; some of these proposals get formalized as rules and regulations administered by church and state. As Appreciation, affect take part as an evaluation framework for products of behavior that evaluate what people achieve, what they are worth or not; some of these valuations get formalized in systems of awards (prices, grades, grants, prizes, etc.). To make it summarize, we can conclude that judgement institutionalized feeling as proposals (about behavior), whereas appreciation institutionalizes feeling as propositions (about things). (Martin & White, 2005: 45, Martin, 2000: 147)



Figure 2.3 Judgement and appreciation as institutionalized affect (Martin &

White, 2005: 45)

Three types of attitude, affect, judgement, and appreciation commonly realizes in the adjective form. Martin and White (2005: 58-59) make different each type from grammatical frames. For affect and judgement is relational clause and mental clause for appreciation. In affect, person feels affect about something and it makes person feel affect, for example:

- I feel happy (about that/that they've come).
- It makes me feel happy that they've come.

For judgement, it was judgement for person/of person to do that and for person to do that was judgement, for example:

- It was silly of/for them to do that
- (For them) to do that was silly.

For appreciation, people consider something appreciation and people see something as appreciation, for examples:

- I consider it beautiful
- They see it as beautiful.

Besides the grammatical frame, we can distinguish three regions attitude from target evaluation and points of evaluations. For affect, the targets are human and conscious being, the point of evaluations are emotion, feelings, things that happen in the heart. For judgement, the targets are human and conscious being, the point of evaluations are behavior, conduct, characters. For appreciation, the targets are things/phenomena, the point of evaluations are value, composition, and the things impact on speakers.

2.2.3.1 Affect

Affect is the evaluation of people's feeling or emotion. We can have good or bad feeling, so affect can be positive or negative. There are six factors that construct the types of affect: (1) Are the feeling positive or negative? (2) Are the feeling a surge of emotion or an ongoing mental state? (3) Are the feeling reacting to some specific external agency or an ongoing mood? (4) Are the feeling as more or less intense? (5) Do the feeling involve intention rather than reaction? (6) Are the feeling to do with un/happiness, in security or dis/satisfaction?

From the six factors above, it can be clearly divided affect into four types (Martin & White, 2005: 51):

- 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.
- 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.

Affect	Positive	Negative
dis/inclination	miss, long fo yearn for	or, wary, fearful, terrorized
un/happiness	cheerful buo jubilant; like love, adore	
in/security	together, cor assured; con confident, tr	fortable, freaked out; startled,

Table 2.1 Affect types

2.2.3.2 Judgement

Judgement is the evaluation of human behavior towards how they behave and how they measure their characters up. Judgement deals with attitude towards behavior, which we admire or criticize and praise or condemn. Generally, judgement can be divided into two. They are social esteem and social sanction (Martin & White, 52: 2005).

Social esteem usually occurs in the oral culture, through chat, gossip, jokes and stories of various kinds (Martin & White, 52: 2005). The negative values of social esteem will not be estimated as sins or crimes but they will be seen as something inappropriate or to be discouraged (Martin, 2015).

Judgement of esteem divided into three subtypes namely normality, capacity and tenacity. Normality focus on how special someone is using verb such as *normal, natural, familiar, cool,* etc, capacity focus on how capable they are using verb such as *clever, gifted, fit, experienced*, etc and tenacity focus on how dependable they are using verb such as *tireless, persevering, resolute* (Martin & White, 53: 2005).

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

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 punishment, hence the term "sanction". Clearly, we can conclude that if you breach social sanction you may well need a lawyer or a confessor but if you breach social esteem you may just need to try harder or to practice more or to consult a therapist or possibly a self-help book. (Martin & White, 2005: 52, Martin, 2015).

Judgement of sanction deals with veracity and propriety. Veracity focus on how truthful someone is and propriety focus on how ethical someone is.

Social Sanction	Possitive (praise)	Negative (condemn)
veracity [truth]	truthful, honest, credible;	dishonest, deceitful, lying;
'how honest?'	frank, candid, direct;	deceptive, manipulative, devious;
	discrete, tactful	blunt, blabbermouth
propriety [ethics]	good, moral <mark>, e</mark> thical;	bad, immoral, evil
'how far beyond	law abiding <mark>, f</mark> air, just;	corrupt, unfair, unjust;
reproach?'	sensitive, kind, caring;	insensitive, mean, cruel;
	unassuming, modest, humble;	vain, snobby, arrogant;
	polite, respectful, reverent;	rude, discourteous, irreverent;
	altruistic, generous, charitable	selfish, greedy, avaricious

 Table 2.3 Judgement- Social Sanction

As interpersonal meaning, modal also works on attitude. Below explanation how modal can realize in judgement subtypes (Martin & White, 54-55; 2005).

1. As Judgements of veracity, modalities of probability using modal such as *surely, maybe, probably, certainly*. For example:

He's certainly naughty.

It's true he's naughty. [Judgement: veracity]

2. As Judgements of normality, modalities of usuality using modal such as *often, usual, normal, average*. For example:

He's often naughty.

It's usual for him to be naughty. [Judgement: normality]

3. As Judgements of capacity, modalities of ability using modal such as *can*,

able, strong enough, capable of.... For example:

He can go.

He's able to go. [Judgement: capacity]

4. As Judgements of tenacity, modalities of inclination using modal such as *will, intend to, resolved.* For example:

He will go

He intend to go. [Judgement: tenacity]

5. As Judgements of propriety, modalities of obligation using modal such as *should, supposed, expected*. For example:

You **should** go.

You're supposed to go. [Judgement: propriety]

2.2.3.3 Appreciation

Appreciation deals with how people appreciate something. It is closely related to Martin & White (2005: 43) statement that appreciation is the evaluation of object and products that relate to aesthetic principle and other systems of social value.

There are three types of appreciation namely reaction, composition, and valuation. There three types will be discussed below (Martin & white, 2005: 56):

- 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 wprds such as *penetrating*, *profound*, *deep*.

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	<pre>bad, yuk, nasty; plain, ugly, grotesque; repulsive, revolting, off-putting</pre>
<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
Composition:	simple, pure, elegant;	ornate, extravagant, byzantine;

Table 2.4 Appreciation types

Complexity	lucid, clear, precise;	arcane, unclear, woolly;
'was it hard to follow?	' intricate, rich, detailed, precise	plain, monolithic, simplistic
	_	
Valuation	penetrating, profound, deep;	shallow, reductive, insignificant
'was it worthwhile?'	innovative, original, creative;	derivative, conventional, prosaic
	timely, long awaited, landmark;	dated, overdue, untimely;
	inimitable, exceptional, unique;	dime-a-dozen, everyday, common;
	authentic, real, genuine;	fake, bogus, glitzy;
	valuable, priceless, worthwhile;	worthless, shoddy, pricey;
	appropriate, helpful, effective	ineffective, useless, write-off

Three of the types are realized in mental process, so Suzanne Eggins (as cited in Martin & White, 2005: 57) describes how to identify three types of attitude with metafunction. Reaction is related to affection and related to interpersonal, composition is related to perception and related to textual, and valuation is related to cognition and related to ideational.

Table 2.5 Sub-types of appreciation

Appreciation	Mental process type	metafunction
reaction	affection	interpersonal
composition	perception	textual
valuation	cognition	ideational