

APPRAISAL – AN APPROACH TO DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Vo Duy Duc*

Quy Nhon University

Ngày nhận bài: 10/12/2016; ngày hoàn thiện: 9/1/2017; ngày duyệt đăng: 15/3/2017

Abstract

Appraisal has emerged for over two decades as a framework for investigating how language is used to evaluate, to adopt stances, to construct textual personas and to manage interpersonal positioning and relationships. It is an extension of the linguistic theories of M.A.K. Halliday, and is developed by a group of linguists in Australia. The research aims at providing an overview of Appraisal framework and examining how it is used in discourse analysis, especially in multimodal discourse analysis, both domestically and internationally. It was found that Appraisal has been widely deployed as framework for investigation into interpersonal meaning conveyed in a range of genres; however, this framework is still quite new in Vietnam. The findings can be seen as a useful reference to those who are interested in doing discourse analysis in the light of Appraisal.

Key words: appraisal, discourse analysis, interpersonal meaning, multimodal

1. Introduction

Nowadays, it seems to be common knowledge that discourse analysis is the study of language in use. By looking at the way in which language is used, it is possible to understand what is meant by such a linguistic use. Traditionally, linguistic features of a text are the focus of the analysis, but now, linguists have found that it is not sufficient to consider just textual features and that in order to obtain a complete picture of language use, the combination of semantics of wording and images in making meaning should be taken into consideration. This paper discusses Appraisal - a framework for investigation into interpersonal meaning in texts - and the extent to which this framework has been used in discourse analysis. New trends in discourse analysis, especially in multimodal discourse analysis, are presented at the end of the paper as a suggestion to those who seek frameworks for their language study.

2. Appraisal – The language of evaluation

Appraisal is understood as ‘an approach to exploring, describing and explaining the way language is used to evaluate, to adopt stances, to construct textual personas and to manage interpersonal positionings and relationships’ (White, 2001, p. 1). It is an extension of the linguistic theories of M.A.K. Halliday and his colleagues, and it is the result of an attempt to develop a comprehensive framework for analyzing evaluation in discourse by a

* Email: ducquynu@yahoo.com

group of functional linguists in Sydney in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Martin, 2003). Since then, Appraisal has been used as a framework for several studies over a range of genres (see Section 3 for the discussion of Appraisal studies). Arguably, one of the reasons why Appraisal theory has been so widely adopted is that it offers a framework for the study of interpersonal meaning at the level of discourse, rather than at lexico-grammatical level, where choices in the system of mood and modality are the focus of the analysis (see, for example, Halliday, 1985, 1994). As Martin (2000, p. 144) argues, the earlier systemic-functional linguistic (SFL) work on interpersonal meaning is not sufficiently descriptive for ‘the semantics of evaluation – how the interlocutors are feeling, the judgments they make, and the value they place in the various phenomena of their experience’.

Appraisal is an umbrella term which covers all language resources by which speakers/writers can offer a positive or negative assessment of people, things, places, happenings, and states of affairs, by which they can engage interpersonally with listeners/readers either actually or potentially, and by which degrees of intensity and preciseness of an utterance can be achieved. These three semantic areas of Appraisal are termed Attitude, Engagement, and Graduation, all of which are, in turn, discussed below.

2.1. Attitude

Attitude is concerned with feelings, judgments of human behavior and appreciation of things. The attitudinal assessments are grouped under three headings: Affect, Judgment, and Appreciation.

Affect is concerned with positive or negative feelings about people, things, places, happenings, or states of affairs. It is a resource by which writers/speakers indicate emotion. For example,

I know how disappointed you feel because I feel it too, and so do tens of millions of Americans who invested their hopes and dreams in this effort.

[Hillary Clinton’s concession speech, November, 9th, 2016]

In the extract above, the emotional response of Hillary Clinton’s supporters to the outcome of the presidential election is observed by her as “disappointed”. There are two types of Affect: observed Affect (as in the case of this example) and authorial Affect. Authorial Affect is concerned with the author’s own emotion as in the following statement made by Donald Trump in his reaction to the sexual assault accusation.

And when I read the story, I was sort of surprised — how could she say that? And she didn’t say it.

[Time.com, 13/10/2016]

While Affect is concerned with the affectual values of feelings and emotions, Judgment deals with people’s behavior and actions. The behavior and actions performed by

people are positively and negatively judged by reference to social norms. Judgment values are divided into two categories – Social Esteem and Social Sanction. Social Esteem deals with what Martin and White (2005) term “normality” (how special someone is), “capacity” (how capable they are), “tenacity” (how resolute they are). With regard to Social Sanction, Martin and White divide it into two sub-categories: “veracity” (how honest someone is) and “propriety” (how good they are). The following excerpts are provided below by way of illustration.

1. I've just received a call from Secretary Clinton. She congratulated us. It's about us. On our victory, and I congratulated her and her family on a very, very hard-fought campaign {+Social Esteem/Tenacity}. I mean, she fought very hard. Hillary has worked very long and very hard over a long period of time {+Social Esteem/Tenacity}, and we owe her a major debt of gratitude for her service to our country.

[Donald Trump's victory speech, November 9th 2016]

2. Let me state this as clearly as I can, these attacks are orchestrated by the Clintons and their media allies {- Social Sanction/Veracity}. The only thing Hillary Clinton has going for herself is the press, without the press, she is absolutely zero {- Social Esteem/Capacity}.

[Donald Trump's speech in West Palm Beach, Florida, October 13th 2016]

In the first excerpt, Mrs. Clinton is positively judged by Mr. Trump and the judgment is concerned with Social Esteem/Tenacity because it describes how resolute she is in her effort to be the owner of the White House. By contrast, Mrs. Clinton and her allies in the second excerpt are negatively judged by Mr. Trump and the judgment is concerned with Social Sanction/Veracity because it indicates how dishonest they are in their election campaign. By the other judgment in the second excerpt – ‘without the press, she is absolutely zero’, Mrs. Clinton is seen as a presidential candidate with no real capability to lead the nation. These judgments are explicitly passed by means of the semantics of phrases and clauses underlined. However, judgmental values are not always inscribed (explicit) via words or wording. As White indicates, they can be implicit and implicit judgments are termed “tokens” or “invocations” of judgment. He states:

Under these tokens, JUDGMENT values are triggered by what can be viewed as simply 'facts', apparently unevaluated descriptions of some event or state of affairs. The point is that these apparently 'factual' or informational meanings nevertheless have the capacity in the culture to evoke JUDGMENTAL responses (depending upon the reader's social/cultural/ideological reading position). (White, 2001, p. 3) [emphasis original]

In the light of his statement, the judgment conveyed in the following extract can be seen as implicit.

I believe that success isn't measured by how much the wealthiest Americans have, but by how many children climb out of poverty; how many start-ups and small businesses open and thrive; how many young people go to college without drowning in debt; how many people find a good job; how many families get ahead and stay ahead.

[Hillary Clinton's official campaign launch speech, January 31st 2016]

A glance at the extract shows that it contains no explicit value of judgment passed on the Republicans. A closer analysis of the whole passage, however, reveals points of interest as to how values of judgment can be “triggered” via the wording. The passage as a whole refers to how the government's success in leading the nation should be measured in Mrs. Clinton's point of view; it is, however, evaluative. The hidden meaning of her argument is that Mr. Trump is judged a leader favoring the upper class, leaving the working class behind, which is morally wrong. Additionally, her use of intensification via repetition of the question words ‘how much’ and ‘how many’ adds more weight to the evaluation.

The third attitudinal type is Appreciation. It is concerned with ‘evaluations of semiotic and natural phenomena, according to the ways in which they are valued or not in a given field’ (Martin & White, 2005, p. 43). In the following example, where the values of Appreciation are presented in bold, America on the day before the attack was depicted as peaceful through the evaluation of that fateful morning and the sky.

It was nearly 10 years ago that a bright September day was darkened by the worst attack on the American people in our history. The images of 9/11 are seared into our national memory – hijacked planes cutting through a cloudless September sky; the Twin Towers collapsing to the ground; black smoke billowing up from the Pentagon; the wreckage of Flight 93 in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, where the actions of heroic citizens saved even more heartbreak and destruction.

[Barack Obama's speech on Bin Laden's death, May 2nd 2011]

Interestingly, ‘bright’ and ‘cloudless’ are the two values of positive Appreciation, but they are implicitly used with ‘the worst’ – the evaluation of the attack, to pass negative judgment on the immoral acts of the terrorists. This is a case of implicit judgment discussed above.

It is also worth noting that Appreciation is not always concerned with the evaluation of things, but in many instances, it deals with the aesthetic evaluation of humans. For example,

*Tốt gỗ hơn tốt nước sơn
Xấu người đẹp nét còn hơn đẹp người.*

[Vietnamese folk poems]

‘Tốt gỗ’ and ‘tốt nước sơn’ in the first verse are both evaluative resources, but they function differently. ‘Tốt gỗ’ is a value of Judgment as it metaphorically refers to good nature of a person. By contrast, ‘tốt nước sơn’ is merely an aesthetic evaluation of a person and hence it is a value of Appreciation. Similarly, ‘xấu người’ and ‘đẹp người’ in the second verse are the appreciation of human appearance while ‘đẹp nét’ means a good behavior and hence it is a judgment.

The discussion above has indicated that Appreciation is concerned with the evaluation of things while Judgment deals with the evaluation of human behavior according to the social norms. However, White (1998) points out that Appreciation and Judgment, in some instances, are semantically related and that due to this semantic relation, there is some difficulty in distinguishing them. He states, “Since judgment is concerned with evaluation behavior, and appreciation with, in some instances, evaluating the products of behavior, the boundary between judgment and appreciation may be a fuzzy one. This is particularly the case when the wording at issue involves nominalisation – that is to say, a process realised as an entity.” (White, 1998, p. 107)

White’s statement can be exemplified by the extract presented below.

Over the last 10 years, thanks to the tireless and heroic work of our military and our counterterrorism professionals, we've made great strides in that effort.

[Barack Obama’s speech on Bin Laden’s death, May 2nd 2011]

Therefore, the nominal group “the tireless and heroic work” can be rewritten in the two sentences below.

1. Our military and our counterterrorism professionals work tirelessly and heroically.
2. The work of our military and our counterterrorism professionals is tireless and heroic.

In the first sentence, the US military and counterterrorism professionals are presented as working ‘tirelessly and heroically’; therefore, ‘tirelessly and heroically’ is a value of Judgment. In other words, it is a positive Judgment concerning their tenacity to fight against terrorism. By contrast, the attitudinal value ‘tireless and heroic’ in the second sentence is the one of Appreciation evaluating the work carried out by the US military and counterterrorism.

In summary, the language of evaluation attitudinally comes from the three language resources – Affect, Judgment, and Appreciation. Affect is a resource for indicating emotional feelings, Judgment for evaluating human behavior, and Appreciation for assessing things. The section that follows will shift the focus from Attitude into the second sub-category of Appraisal – Engagement, a linguistic resource for the writer/speaker’s interpersonal positioning.

2.2. Engagement

As Martin and White (2005, p. 92) state, Engagement is concerned with ‘the linguistic resources by which speakers/writers adopt a stance towards the value positions being referenced by the text and with respect to those they address’. By the use of the resources, they can adjust and negotiate what White (2001) terms the “arguability” or “dialogic terms” of their utterance.

By the use of Engagement resources, the speakers/writers can be presented as being dialogistically engaged with their real or potential audience. The degrees of “dialogism” vary according to the Engagement resources employed. These resources are divided into two groups under the headings of dialogic contraction and dialogic expansion. The division of the resources is based on their inter-subjective functionality, that is, whether they present the speakers/writers as contracting the dialogic space or expanding it.

The speakers/writers are presented as opening up dialogic space for alternative positions via the use of the resources put together under the two dialogically-expansive headings of Entertain and Attribute. Under Entertain, the speakers/writers indicate that the value position being referenced is just one of several possible positions. In other words, by the use of this resource, they entertain those dialogic alternatives. The locutions employed for dialogic expansiveness are often referred to in the literature as instances of Modality (e.g. may, must, perhaps, it is possible that...) and those of Evidentiality (e.g. it seems, it appears, apparently). Additionally, dialogic expansiveness under Entertain can be achieved via the use of such formulations with mental processes as *I think, I believe, I am convinced that, I doubt that*.

With regard to the second sub-category of dialogic expansion – Attribute, the alternative positions concerning the issue under discussion are not invoked by entertaining values, but rather by those attributed to external sources such as authorities or experts in a given field. These resources involve the use of reporting verbs like *say, report, believe, think, argue, and claim*.

The speakers/writers are presented as closing down dialogic space for alternative positions rather than opening them up via the use of the resources put together under the two dialogically-contractive headings of Disclaim and Proclaim. Under Disclaim, ‘some prior utterance or some alternative position is invoked so as to be indirectly rejected, replaced or held to be unsustainable’ (Martin and White 2005, p. 118). The following example is provided below by way of illustration.

And when I read the story, I was sort of surprised — how could she say that? And she didn't say it.

[Time.com, 13/10/2016]

As can be seen in the example above, Mr. Trump rejected the sexual assault accusation by the use of what Martin and White term ‘Deny’ – ‘didn’t’. By this, he could contract the space in the dialogue between him and his audience. Apart from Deny, Disclaim can be realized via conjunctions such as *yet, although, but*.

Under Proclaim, dialogic contraction can be placed under the headings of Concur (e.g. of course, obviously), Pronounce (e.g. I content..., the facts of the matter are ...), and Endorse (e.g. the report demonstrates/ shows/ proves that...). The following section is devoted to the discussion of the last dimension of the Appraisal Theory – Graduation.

2.3. Graduation

Graduation is concerned with resources for up-scaling and down-scaling. Via the resources, language users can scale up as well as scale down the degree of their investment in the value position being advanced in the story. The degrees of their investment can be located on a scale either from low to high intensity/ amount or from marginal to core membership of a category (White, 2001). These two parameters of scaling are termed Force and Focus in the Appraisal Theory.

Force is concerned with the assessment of the degree of intensity as well as the amount of the values realized via the two sub-categories of Force – Intensification and Quantification. With respect to Intensification, the assessments can operate over qualities (e.g. a bit high, slightly high, extremely high; slight recovery, amazing recovery; the crisis spread quite fast, the crisis spread very fast) and over processes (e.g. the crisis slightly struck Australia, the crisis greatly struck Australia). Especially, Intensification can be especially realized via a repetition. This kind of intensification is commonly found in a politician’s speech. For example,

They will attack you; they will slander you; they will seek to destroy your career and your family. They will seek to destroy everything about you, including your reputation. They will lie, lie, lie, and then again they will do worse than that, they will do whatever is necessary. The Clintons are criminals. Remember that they’re criminals.

[Time.com, 13/10/2016]

In the example above, Donald Trump attacked his political opponent – Hillary Clinton via a message to his supporters in which he deployed intensification mode - Repetition (‘they will’, ‘lie’, and ‘criminal’). By the use of the intensification resources, Mr. Donald arguably wanted to degrade his opponent to attract more people supporting him in his run for president of the United States.

In the case of quantification, the assessment is on numbers (e.g. a few customers, many customers), mass/presence (e.g. a small amount of money, a huge amount of money), and extent which is concerned with the proximity of time and space (e.g. near future, distant

future; nearby village, distant village) and with distribution of time and space (e.g. short-termed deposit, long-termed deposit; local news, global news).

The values of Force can be sub-divided into Infusing and Isolating according to the lexico-grammatical status of the values. As the names suggest, Isolating is concerned with the semantics of intensification which are realized by an isolated lexical item (e.g. a bit, somewhat, slightly, very), while Infusing deals with those which are achieved by infusing the sense of intensification with a meaning which performs other semantic functions (e.g. the dollar plunged = the dollar fell suddenly, the crisis is escalating = the crisis is getting worse and worse in a large scale). As White (2001) observes, infusing intensification has been widely used in English-language hard news reporting.

Unlike Force, Focus is concerned with values which are not gradable in terms of intensity or volume from low to high. They are, however, similar to force values in that they are scalable. The scaling system applied to focus values is concerned with prototypicality and marginality of the category. As far as prototypicality is concerned, an entity can be presented as prototypical via such locutions as real in a real father and true in a true friend. In other words, such values sharpen semantic focus (up-scaling). By contrast, such locutions as sort'v and kind'v operate to shift the focus from the core to margin of the category, hence softening the semantic focus of the material being referenced (down-scaling).

In summary, Appraisal is concerned with linguistic resources by which speakers / writers can offer their positive and negative assessment of people, their emotional response, things, and states of affairs. The resources for the expression of these meanings are grouped together under the heading of Attitude. Another significant dimension of Appraisal is ENGAGEMENT, resources by which the language users can adjust the arguability of their utterances, hence dialogically engage with the actual or potential audience. The last sub-category of Appraisal system is Graduation, the scaling system of intensity of values at issue. The combination of these three dimensions has made Appraisal a practical and useful framework for language analysis, especially media discourse analysis. The section that follows will discuss the previous Appraisal studies, both domestically and internationally.

3. Appraisal studies

As mentioned earlier, Appraisal theory has been the framework for many studies over a range of areas, such as writing in secondary school history (Coffin, 1997), narrative in secondary school (Rothery & Stenglin, 2000), popular science (Fuller, 1998), casual conversation (Eggins & Slade, 1997), media discourse (White, 1997, 1998, 2000, 2002b, 2004a; Thomson & White, 2008) and teaching reading at tertiary level (Liu, 2010). Appraisal has also been employed for the evaluation of language used by other researchers. For instance, Swales' writing has been analyzed by Hyland (2008) to identify how he positions himself, presents his ideas and interacts with his readers, or Pascual and Unger (2010) use Appraisal to evaluate Argentinean researchers' writing for grant proposals.

In Vietnam, there are a growing number of Appraisal studies also over a range of genres such as love letters (Le, 2014), football commentaries (Nguyen, 2014), IELTS essays (Truong, 2015). Recently, Appraisal has been widely used in media textual analysis from different perspectives. For example, Vo (2012) studied journalistic voices operating in English Vietnamese hard news reports in the light of Appraisal and the system of voices suggested by White (1997, 1998) and Martin and White (2005). Van (2014) also used Appraisal resources and journalistic voices to examine how the East Sea tensions were depicted on Chinese and Vietnamese online newspapers. There are several other studies conducted in the light of Appraisal such as expansion resources in English and Vietnamese political editorials (Nguyen, 2014), modes of expression of attitude in commentaries about Panama profiles, social attitude in news reports towards president Obama's visit to Vietnam (Nguyen, in press).

4. New trends in discourse analysis

As discussed above, Appraisal analysis is mainly based on the semantics of wording. However, not every meaning can be fully expressed in words. Rather, meanings can be better conveyed via both words and images. Actually, they work together and support each other in making meanings as images can clarify the meaning constructed by language (Unsworth, 2014). Investigating how words work with images in the creation of meanings is currently one of the new trends in doing discourse analysis.

To shed light on meanings conveyed in images, Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) formulated a framework named 'the Visual Grammar' based on the three modes of meanings in Systemic Functional Grammar – Experiential, Interpersonal, and Textual meaning. The framework is used to analyze meaning making resources entailed in images. In their observation, every image carries three different kinds of meanings: Representational meanings, Interpersonal meanings, and Compositional meanings. With regard to representational meanings, images construct the representation of reality through participants which can be human or non-human. Interpersonally, as Unsworth and Ngo (2015) point out, meanings mainly indicate (1) the contact between the viewer and the represented participant through the gaze of the participant, (2) the social distance between the viewer and the participant indicated via how the image is taken (i.e. a close-up, medium or long shot), and (3) the interpersonal attitude constructed by vertical and horizontal angles of the image. The last kind of meaning – compositional meaning, deals with the way the layout of the image works as an organizer to put the representational and interpersonal meanings into a meaningful composition. This framework has been widely applied in multimodal discourse analysis (Russell, 2000; Luke, 2003; Petrie, 2003; Unsworth, 2006; Unsworth & Chan, 2008). In Vietnam, Unsworth and Ngo (2015) used Visual Grammar as a framework to conduct an investigation into the roles of the images in secondary school textbooks for teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL). The work can be seen as a good reference for English language teachers and textbook writers.

The combination of Visual Grammar and Appraisal for the examination of meaning making resources is another new trend in discourse analysis. Economou (2009) studied visual meanings of photos in print news discourse through appraisal analysis. Likewise, visual appraisal serves as a framework in Pounds (2012)'s study of authorial affect in a British television programme. The leading scholar in the field of multimodal and appraisal analysis is arguably Len Unsworth, who has extensively carried out research on media and educational semiotics. He suggested an Attitude network based on Appraisal and Visual Grammar. In this adapted attitude network, Affect can be realized by a smile, a frown, crying or laughing; Judgment can be conveyed by clapping, carrying on shoulders or by iconic gestures. However, he points out that it is impossible to explicitly depict Appreciation meaning through images; hence this mode of meaning is just evoked in viewers. The analysis of visual meaning based on Appraisal theory is still in its infancy. Accordingly, more research should be done to make Appraisal a perfect framework for multimodal textual studies.

References

- Coffin, C. (1997). Constructing and giving value to the past: an investigation into secondary school history. In F. Christie & J. R. Martin (Eds.), *Genre and institutions - social processes in the workplace and school* (pp. 196-230). London: Cassell.
- Economou, D. (2009). *Photos in the news: appraisal analysis of visual semiosis and verbal-visual intersemiosis*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Sydney.
- Eggins, S., & Slade, D. (1997). *Analysing casual conversation*. London: Cassell.
- Fuller, G. (1998). Cultivating science: negotiating discourse in popular texts of Stephen Jay Gould. In J. R. Martin & R. Veel (Eds.), *Reading science: critical and functional perspectives on discourse of science* (pp. 35-62). London: Routledge.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hyland, K. (2008). 'Small bits of textual material': a discourse analysis of Swales' writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27(2), 143-160.
- Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading images – the grammar of visual design*. London: Routledge.
- Le, T. H. (2015). *An investigation into 'attitude' – a sub-system of appraisal in English and Vietnamese love letters*. Unpublished master thesis, Quy Nhon University.
- Liu, X. (2010). An application of appraisal theory to teaching college English reading in China. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(2), 133-135.
- Luke, C. (2003). Pedagogy, connectivity, multimodality and interdisciplinarity. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 38(10), 356-385.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Martin, J. R. (2000). Close reading: functional linguistics as a tool for critical discourse analysis. In L. Unsworth (Ed.), *Research language in schools and communities: functional linguistic perspectives* (pp. 275-302). London: Cassell.

- Martin, J. R. (2003). Introduction. *Text*, 23(2), 171-181.
- Nguyen, T. T. D. (2014). *An investigation into evaluative language used in football commentaries in English and Vietnamese online newspapers – A comparative study*. Unpublished master thesis, Quy Nhon University.
- Nguyen, T. T. H. (2016). Nghĩa liên nhân của ngôn ngữ trong thể loại bình luận báo chí tiếng Anh - nhìn từ Ngữ pháp Chức năng và Thuyết Đánh giá. *Tạp Chí Từ Điển Học và Bách Khoa Thu*.
- Nguyen, T. T. H. (2014). An expansion resources analysis of English and Vietnamese political editorials in the light of Appraisal Theory. *Journal of Science of HCM University of Education*, 60, 54-62.
- Nguyen, T. T. H. (in press). An appraisal study of social attitude in news reports towards president Obama's visit to Vietnam. *Journal of Science*, Hanoi National University.
- Nguyen, T. T. H. (in press). Các phương thức thể hiện thái độ trong diễn ngôn bình luận về “Hò sơ Panama” từ góc nhìn của Thuyết Đánh giá. *Tạp Chí Từ Điển Học và Bách Khoa Thu*.
- Pascual, M., & Unger, L. (2010). Appraisal in the research genres: an analysis of grant proposals by Argentinean researchers. *Revista Signos*, 43, 261-280.
- Petrie, G. (2003). ESL Teachers' views on visual language: A grounded theory. *The Reading Matrix*, 3(3), 137-168.
- Pound, G. (2012). Multimodal expression of authorial affect in a British television news program. *Discourse, Contexts, and Media*, 1, 68-81.
- Rothery, J., & Stenglin, M. (2000). Interpreting literature: the role of appraisal. In L. Unsworth (Ed.), *Researching language in schools and functional linguistic perspectives* (pp. 222-244). London: Cassell.
- Russell, G. (2000). Print-based and visual discourses in schools: implications for pedagogy. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education*, 21(2), 205-217.
- Thomson, E. A., White, P. R. R., & Kitly, P. (2008). "Objectivity" and "hard news" reporting across cultures. *Journalism Studies*, 9(2), 212-228.
- Truong, T. T. L. (2015). *An investigation into IELTS essays bands 6-7 – an engagement study*. Unpublished master thesis, Quy Nhon University.
- Unsworth, L., & Chan, E. (2008). Assessing integrative reading of images and text in group reading comprehension tests. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 28(3), 71-76.
- Unsworth, L., & Ngo, T. (2015). The role of images in Vietnamese textbooks for the teaching of English as a Foreign Language. *An International Journal*, 12, 31-42.
- Unsworth, L. (2006). Multiliteracies and a metalanguage of image/text relations: Implications for teaching English as a first or additional language in the 21st century. *Tales out of school: Identity and English language teaching. Special edition of TESOL in Context Series*, 1, 147-162.
- Unsworth, L. (2014). Analyzing images and image-language interaction in multimodal discourse analysis and educational semiotics, presented at *Multimodality Symposium*, Quy Nhon University.
- Unsworth, L. (2014). Multimodal reading comprehension: Curriculum expectations and large-scale literacy testing practices *Pedagogies. An International Journal*, 9, 26-44.
- Van, T. T. N. (2015). *Two stories for the same happenings? A journalistic voice study of English written news reports on Chinese and Vietnamese online newspapers*. Unpublished master thesis,

Quy Nhon University.

Vo, D. D. (2012). *Style, structure, and ideology in English and Vietnamese business hard news reporting – a comparative study*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, the University of Adelaide.

White, P. R. R. (1997). Death, disruption and the moral order: the narrative impulse in mass "hard news" reporting. In F. Christie & J. R. Martin (Eds.), *Genres and institutions: social processes in the workplace and school* (pp. 101-133). London: Cassell.

White, P. R. R. (1998). *Telling media tales: the news story as rhetoric*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Sydney: University of Sydney.

White, P. R. R. (2000). Dialogue and inter-subjectivity: reinterpreting the semantics of modality and hedging. In M. Coulthard, J. Cotterill & F. Rock (Eds.), *Working with dialogue* (pp. 67-80). Tubingen: Neimeyer.

White, P. R. R. (2001). Appraisal website: www.grammatics.com/appraisal.

White, P. R. R. (2002b). News as history – your daily gossip. In J. R. Martin & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Rereading the past: critical and functional perspectives on time and values* (pp. 61-89). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

White, P. R. R. (2004a). Subjectivity, evaluation and point of view in media discourse. In C. Coffin, A. Hewings & K. O'Halloran (Eds.), *Applying English grammar*. London: Hodder Arnold.

THUYẾT ĐÁNH GIÁ – PHƯƠNG PHÁP PHÂN TÍCH DIỄN NGÔN

Tóm tắt. Thuyết đánh giá ra đời cách đây hơn hai thập kỷ, được xem là khung lý thuyết dùng để tìm hiểu cách sử dụng ngôn ngữ khi tác giả đưa ra đánh giá, quan điểm, hay duy trì quan hệ liên nhân. Thuyết đánh giá được phát triển từ thuyết ngôn ngữ của nhà ngôn ngữ học Halliday bởi một nhóm các nhà ngôn ngữ học tại Úc. Bài báo này trình bày tổng quan về Thuyết đánh giá và tìm hiểu việc vận dụng lý thuyết này trong phân tích diễn ngôn, đặc biệt phân tích diễn ngôn đa phương thức, trong nước cũng như quốc tế. Kết quả nghiên cứu cho thấy Thuyết đánh giá được dùng phổ biến trên thế giới trong nghiên cứu nghĩa liên nhân trên nhiều thể loại văn bản khác nhau; tuy nhiên ở Việt Nam việc sử dụng cơ sở lý thuyết này trong phân tích diễn ngôn còn khá mới mẻ. Bài báo này có thể được xem là nguồn tham khảo hữu ích cho các nhà nghiên cứu quan tâm tới lĩnh vực phân tích diễn ngôn dưới ánh sáng của Thuyết đánh giá.

Từ khóa: thuyết đánh giá, phân tích diễn ngôn, nghĩa liên nhân, đa phương thức