

Systemic Functional Linguistics as Interpersonal Semantics: Appraisal and Attitude in the Stylistic Analysis of an English Novel

Yaser Hadidi (Corresponding Author)

Department of English Language and Literature, The University of Tabriz, Iran

Tel: 98-914-315-6780 E-mail: hadidiy@yahoo.com

Leila Mohammadbagheri-Parvin

Department of English Language and Literature, The University of Tabriz, Iran

E-mail: Leila_mohammadbagheri@hotmail.com

Received: Nov. 7, 2014 Accepted: December 20, 2014 Published: March 7, 2015

doi:10.5296/ijl.v7i1.7199 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v7i1.7199>

Abstract

Subsumed under Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) that emphasizes functionality of language in social contexts, Appraisal is a recent theoretical framework that extends the interpersonal dialogistic semantics dimension of SFL into interesting elaboration. This system, in turn, has three subsystems, one of which is Attitude which is geared to justifying and explaining the processes through which writers and speakers communicate their evaluations towards individuals, material objects and phenomena, or even their own emotions. Since Appraisal has evolved in recent years, studies have often been concerned with introducing the framework, and extensive attention could obviously not have been paid to tapping into the practical, and equally, enormous use of this system in illuminating and insightful discourse analysis. This study is a small step in such a direction. The selected corpus for this research was “The Great Gatsby” by F. Scott Fitzgerald, and the whole novel was analyzed discursively, linguistically, and stylistically through one of the subsystems of Appraisal, namely Attitude. Two research questions at the macro level were concerned with the analysis of the whole text (the whole novel) employing Attitude. Two other research questions at the micro level were concerned with the analysis of the discourse of each of the main discourse producers (main characters of the novel) when employing Attitude. The data

that included frequencies and percentages of each of the Attitudinal modes were used to answer and discuss the four research questions. It was found that Attitude was deployed in the expected order of Appreciation, Judgment, Affect, and also that Attitude was stylistically indicative of and worked in line with character and context within the novel in question. Finally, the role of this research in paving the way for prospective further studies was presented concisely.

Keywords: Systemic Functional Linguistics, Appraisal, Attitude, Appreciation, Judgment, Affect

1. Introduction and the Framework

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), the substantive father discipline to which the Appraisal framework belongs and out of which it has evolved, favors the possibility of a more profound exposition of linguistic phenomena in the light of references to the functional demands put upon language by its users plus social functions performed by language in social contexts. The social metafunctions according to Systemic Functional Linguistics are attributable to three broad categories. Through the “ideational” metafunction, language reflects totality of experiences. The “interpersonal” metafunction fashions social roles and relationships, and the “textual” metafunction molds both internal and contextual coherence of texts.

Emerging within the zone of the “interpersonal” social metafunction of language in Systemic Functional Linguistics, Appraisal is a framework for investigating the mechanisms language employs in the evaluation and adaptation of stances adopted by discourse producers. It was driven in its early days by work in the field of educational linguistics and the development of Australia’s genre-based literacy programs. It is important to know that the medium for the realization of Appraisal is mainly lexical rather than grammatical, although the significant role grammatical structures play in such realization is unchallengeable. Appraisal enquires into how discursive productions of writers and speakers are a reflection of the way they pass judgment on other people, events, material objects, and in general, the way they see the world. Appraisal is the language of evaluation composed of three focal simultaneous subsystems each of which consists of subcategories of their own: Attitude, Engagement and Graduation.

Attitude negotiates the manner in which attitudes are explicated and demonstrated in English texts. Attitude in turn, is the crux of three semantic regions traditionally pointed out as emotion, ethics and aesthetics, also respectively known as Affect, Judgment and Appreciation (Martin & White, 2005; White, 2011):

- Affect is concerned with the manifestation of the emotions brought alive to the speaker or the writer mainly by an external agent other than the speaker or writer himself/herself. It displays positive and negative feelings engendered in discourse producers.
- Judgment deals with registration of evaluation and assessment towards behaviors of other individuals by the speaker or the writer with an eye on the social norms and morality; i.e. passing judgment on individuals’ behaviors through checking them against current social norms as the optimal patterns for behaving in a particular context.
- Appreciation is concerned with disclosure of evaluation of natural and semiotic phenomena by the speaker or the writer, i.e. passing judgment, but on such natural/semiotic phenomena.

Appraisal/Evaluation is a framework for analyzing evaluation in language. It has emerged from within Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday 1994; Martin 1992; Matthiessen 1995). Appraisal takes its roots and existence from a work on narrative genres carried out in the late 1980s, and the framework was developed as the fruit of the efforts of a group of functional linguistics researchers led by Professor James Martin of the University of Sydney. The

framework is concerned with the interpersonal metafunction of language in Systemic Functional Linguistics, and endeavors to explore the ways in which language is used for evaluation and adaptation of stances by discourse producers. It provides techniques for the systematic analysis of evaluation and stance as they operate in whole texts and in groupings of texts. It deals with the social function of these resources, not simply as the means by which individual discourse producers express their feelings and assume stands, but as the means by which they engage with socially-determined value positions and thereby align and dis-align themselves with the social subjects who hold to these positions.

Coming onto the scene rather recently, and being of avowedly extensive potential for discourse and stylistic analysis, the Appraisal/Evaluation framework is yet to find its real potential tapped into. But some of the previous work using the paradigm of research has centered around different strands including, among many others: covert evaluation (Coffin & O'Halloran, 2006), sentiment evaluation using appraisal hierarchies (Fletcher & Patrick, 2006), the ontogenesis of Appraisal in human language as children acquire it (Painter, 2003), an impressive work by Read & Carroll (2012) annotating expressions of Appraisal in English, focus on interpersonal meanings within Evaluation and the Engagement subsystem of it in works like Souza (2006), Taboada & Carretero (2012), White (2003), White (2009), and so on.

2. Objective of the Study

This qualitative exploratory discourse analytic study seeks for the interplay between Attitude, a major subsystem of the Appraisal framework, and a sample of prose fiction in English, i.e. the novel. Put in other terms, this study is an attempt to set out a manner in which a piece of text, particularly an extended one, e.g. a novel, could be analyzed and evaluated discursively, linguistically, and stylistically employing the metalanguage afforded by the theory behind Appraisal/Evaluation, or Attitude in this particular case. The study is a qualitative, stylistic, critical and discourse analytic one and employs quantification only very marginally.

In this spirit, the current work aims at taking a few first steps in this direction, drawing upon the system of Attitude and its subsystems of Affect, Judgment, and Appreciation, along with two of its components, i.e. **polarity** (which refers to whether the attitudinal choice carries a negative load, or a positive one) and **strategy** (which refers to whether the attitudinal choice is **inscribed**, i.e. explicitly and conspicuously marked in text and discoverable, or **invoked**, implicitly and indirectly marked and needs inference from the text and context) (Matthiessen et al, 2010).

3. Significance

As pointed out above, the theoretical area used here is a relatively recent line of Systemic Functional Linguistics thinking. It is, therefore, yet to prove capable of shedding light on many relevant areas in discourse and text as yet unexplored. Most of the literature concerning Appraisal has its focal attention fixed on the introduction of the subsystems and their components, while little has been stated about how Appraisal and especially each of its subsystems and their delicacy could be employed practically for analysis and critical

evaluation of an extended piece of text, especially the literary one.

With respect to its general objectives, the genre and the corpus, and the issues the research questions deal with, this study could be considered a step in a rather new direction and an attempt at exploring what is, in essence, uncharted territory; that is, using the extended tools of interpersonal semantics and the theoretical batch proposed in Appraisal/Evaluation, geared to the stylistic and critical analysis of literature-text in its different manifestations and sub-genres, i.e. poetry, prose and drama; although here, the focus is clearly on applying the framework to the text of the English novel, or, in other words, prose fiction text, and seeing how the analytic tools within the system of Attitude can fall in line with the literary purport of the novel in question and how characterization can be elucidated and expounded more helpfully in terms of the subsystems of Affect, Appreciation, and Judgment. In this abovementioned sense, this study could pave the way for prospective similar studies, some suggestions for which will be provided at the end.

4. Research Questions

This study pursues four research questions at two levels: macro and micro. Research questions 1 and 2 investigate macro level issues, while research questions 3 and 4 concern micro level ones:

1. What are the frequencies of each Attitudinal mode in the whole corpus regarding Type (Affect, Judgment or Appreciation), possible Polarity (Positive or Negative) and Strategy (Inscribed or Invoked)?
2. How do these Attitudinal choices in the corpus (with regard to their frequencies) contribute to discursive, linguistic, and stylistic aspects of the corpus of analysis?
3. What are the frequencies of each Attitudinal mode in the discourse of each of the main discourse producers regarding Type (Affect, Judgment or Appreciation), possible Polarity (Positive or Negative) and Strategy (Inscribed or Invoked)?
4. How do these Attitudinal choices of the main discourse producers (with regard to their frequencies) contribute to above-the-text parameters of discourse like semantic organization and semiosis (meaning-making) of the corpus text?

5. Corpus and Procedure

The corpus picked out for this study is a work by an American author, the masterpiece by F. Scott Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby*, a well-known novel first published in 1925, from which lots of adaptations have been made in various areas and artistic expressions. The plot of the novel revolves around a young mysterious millionaire called Jay Gatsby and the imprudent extravagant engrossment of this character with Daisy, his long-loved dame, lost to him through his poverty and inability to marry her once. The setting of the novel is Long Island in the summer of 1922. The novel is one of the most celebrated novels in the world of English literature.

The reasons behind the selection of this novel as the corpus for this study included, among

others, the researchers' personal interest in the novel, academic affiliations with linguistic stylistics and literary linguistics and, therefore, with working on literary text material, and the novel's reflective literary language and discourse, including appropriate use of metaphors and literary expressions, which lend themselves suitably to an involved and rigorous discursive and linguistic analysis.

The corpus is subjected to complete analysis, that is, the whole novel is scrutinized manually by the researchers to extract and lay bare Attitudinal patterns of the whole selected text in a sentence-by-sentence fashion. The analysis carried out falls on the meticulous end of the scale, although subjectivity, which is inevitable in most Discourse Analysis studies, played a partial role here as well. The analysis is also carried out in a context-dependent fashion; i.e. the contexts in which the attitudinal incidents occur are brought into play for the sake of more accurate discernment of the Attitudinal incidents, Type, Strategy and possible Polarity of them. The Attitudinal choices within the whole corpus, their Type (Affect, Judgment or Appreciation), the Strategy in their realization (Inscribed or Invoked), and their possible Polarity (Positive or Negative), are identified by the researchers.

Having carried out discursive and linguistic analysis of the corpus, the numerical analysis of the data is conducted. The total number of Attitudinal choices and also the number of occurrences for each mode are counted using Microsoft Word software. Since the "total" numbers of the evaluative expressions for each mode were not equal, for a more tangible view of the results and finer interpretations and comparisons, the simple percentages of the total numbers and occurrences for each mode are also calculated manually so as to equalize the total numbers; therefore, the comparisons of Type, Polarity, and Strategy between the categories would be much easier; i.e. both occurrences and percentages of the frequencies are identified. For example, it would be said that there are 16 Affectual instances in Gatsby's discourse; i.e. 4.87 % of his evaluative expressions are Affect. Also, it would be described that 94.04% of Nick's evaluative expressions are realized in an Inscribed fashion; i.e. there are 4308 instances of Inscribed evaluation in his discourse.

These two paths of calculation and analysis are considered to be sufficient for this research for the purposes of data analysis and following discussions on the answers of the research questions and the issues engaged with.

6. Data Analysis and Discussion

The results of data analysis followed by pertinent discussions will be presented in this section. Each of the four research questions will be answered in a separate section. When answering research questions 1 and 3, the results of the analysis will appear in tables containing (a picture of) the frequencies of the Attitudinal modes in question plus the percentages of each for a more tangible view of the results and easier comparison of them. Some related examples from the corpus of analysis and interpretations of the tables, i.e. the numeric data, will follow the tables. Research questions 2 and 4 will be discussed with reference to and insight from a general look at some literary criticism on the corpus of analysis, i.e. the novel 'The Great Gatsby'.

6.1 Attitude in the Whole Corpus: Answer to Research Question 1

The distribution of Attitudinal resources in the whole corpus, regarding their Type, is set out in the table below:

Table 4.1. Distribution of type of Attitudinal choices in the whole corpus

Type	Affect	Judgment	Appreciation
Instances	243	1057	4534
Percentages	4.16 %	18.11 %	77.71 %

As table 4.1 maps out, Appreciation exceeds other Attitudinal modes by a fair margin in the whole corpus. Almost 80 % of Attitudinal resources in the corpus of analysis constitutes Appreciation. The second place belongs to Judgment with almost 20 % of Attitudinal resources, and Affect takes up only around 5 % of Attitudinal choices in the corpus of analysis for this study. Numeric data on Polarity of Attitudinal resources in the whole corpus are represented in the following table. To be less subjective, the analysis brought out 28 % of what context definitely designated as being either positive or negative Attitude. The rest, for the sake of optimal objectivity, was consigned to the realm of the neutral. Although, being involved in the novel, we could bring our more cases of polar Attitude, this was done less regulated by the researchers' analysis and analytic judgment (that could have proved to be subjective) and more through exercising theoretical dedication to the model at hand. We believe more research could deal with procedures and hypothesizing on how to be more objective and confident with the analysis of attitude, either in polarity or its other aspects. Examples for each category mentioned above are as follows:

- ... *nice restaurant*... => Appreciation (Inscribed, Positive)
- ... *fine fellow* ... => Judgment (Inscribed, Positive)
- ... *I'm scared of him* ... => Affect (Inscribed, Negative)

Distribution of Attitudinal resources in the whole corpus, regarding their Polarity, is shown in the following table:

Table 4.2. Distribution of polarity of Attitudinal choices in the whole corpus

Polarity	Positive	Negative
Instances	846	756
Percentages	14.50 %	12.95 %

According to table 4.2, almost 13 % of Attitudinal resources hold negative connotations regarding their literal meanings and context of use, while 14.5 % deploy positive values. With a difference of only about 1.5 % setting them apart, it would be justifiable to conclude that Positive and Negative realizations of Attitudinal choices in the whole corpus of analysis are almost equal. Examples for each category are:

- ... *gloomiest event* ... => Negative (Appreciation, Inscribed)
- ... I began to like ... => Positive (Affect, Inscribed)

Distribution of Attitudinal resources in the whole corpus, regarding their Strategy of realization, is shown in the next table:

Table 4.3. Distribution of strategy of Attitudinal choices in the whole corpus

Strategy	Inscribed	Invoked
Instances	5451	344
Percentages	93.43 %	5.89 %

Table 4.3 shows the stark difference in the frequencies of realization strategies of Attitudinal resources in the whole corpus. Almost 94 % of Attitudinal incidents have been realized overtly and explicitly (Inscribed evaluation), and the remaining (almost 6 %) have been realized covertly and implicitly (Invoked evaluation). Examples of Attitudinal resources for each of the main discourse producers (major characters including the narrator himself) will be provided in section 4.4 of this chapter when answering research question 3. Examples for each category are as follows:

- ... *You remind me of a rose...* => Invoked (Judgment, Positive)
- ... *nice restaurant...* => Inscribed (Appreciation, Positive)

6.2 Contribution of Attitudinal Choices of the Whole Corpus to Discursive, Linguistic, and Stylistic Aspects of the Corpus: Answer to Research Question 2

According to general but well-established literary expositions of *The Great Gatsby* (e.g. Wikipedia, SparkNotes, enotes), Fitzgerald's masterpiece, was published in 1925, his own life providing him with tremendous inspiration in creating this work by way of its setting, characterization and the plot of the novel. Fitzgerald tries to communicate these similarities between the novel and his own life to the addressees. He endeavors to get across the similarities between his own personal characteristics and Nick's and (especially) Gatsby's; and in turn, he has actually created the work to divulge his more hidden and locked-away thoughts and emotions to the addressees. A strong assumption of this research holds that, looking more closely into the deep layers of the work yields the discernable outlook that the whole novel (characters, setting, and events taking place) is a reflection of Fitzgerald's views and appraisals towards issues that have turned into mental obsessions for him.

Given the stylistic assumption that authors of literature-text create literary works to express – by indirect means – their own evaluations towards concepts, people, and their emotions, one could point to the related stylistic feature of fiction in general, i.e. that their works abound with textual devices realizing the interpersonal semantic system of Appraisal/Evaluation. However, in line with the current status quo in modern stylistics thinking, it would also be safe to argue (following the above) that the frequencies of evaluative modes would differ according to the type and purpose of the work of fiction in question.

It is obvious that instances of Appreciation are expected to be more frequent than Judgment and Affect; and, in turn, instances of Judgment are expected to exceed those of Affect. The results of analysis confirm that these expectations have been met in *The Great Gatsby*, since almost 80 % of Attitudinal resources in this novel are Appreciation, around 20 % Judgment,

and only about 5 % are comprised by Affect. Speaking about the present study and its target corpus of analysis, it should be emphasized, in the first place, that the medium through which the literary author has chosen to communicate his evaluations to others is the text of the novel. Naturally, this novel, as is the case with the genre of the “novel”, demands a great deal of descriptions; i.e. descriptions of scenes, actions, and phenomena (employing adjectives), descriptions of how actions take place, or in what time or place (employing adverbs). It also contains descriptions of people by one of the characters who is the narrator as well.

The comparative back-grounding of Affect is justifiable by arguing that in the novel, the author is not supposed to talk directly about his affections and make them directly known. All the incidents of Affect appear couched in discourses of characters; and characters in turn do not usually talk about their emotions frequently. The novel is supposed to strike some resemblance to the real world, and people in the real world do not usually talk in extended ways about their emotions in casual conversations. The general conclusion would be that because *The Great Gatsby* is a work of fiction, Attitudinal choices are expected to be realized in a descending frequency order of Appreciation, then Judgment, and finally Affect. This arguably could be considered a requirement for all instances of the novel in English prose fiction, and this expected order has been accomplished in *The Great Gatsby*.

It is relevant to note that the above is a claim this study is making, and a hypothesis put forward here, that we think would serve as fertile and thought-provoking grounds for further research for interested researchers. It comes in the form of a hypothesized tendency postulated for all prose fiction that we think could be explored by further research. This general and expected Attitudinal tendency claimed for all prose fiction comes in the light of the results of analysis of this novel, the fact that there is a descending order in which Appreciation is deployed as the most frequent Attitudinal choice in fictional prose, Affect as the least frequent Attitudinal choice, with Judgment standing somewhere in the middle. We think that generally the order holds (we think it is supposed to hold) consistent in all novels; however, there will be stylistic variation in the frequencies of Attitudinal resources due to some other factors such as the themes, symbols and setting of a novel.

Coming back to our own corpus of analysis, *The Great Gatsby*, two major themes have been suggested for *The Great Gatsby*. The first is “the decline of the American dream in the 1920s”, and to insert this theme into the novel, Fitzgerald had no choice but to employ Appreciative resources, since this theme deals with description and moulding of a specific situation. The second theme of this work is “the hollowness of the upper class”. Fitzgerald has employed Judgmental resources for the insertion of this theme into the novel since this theme deals with description and evaluation of people. The conclusion is that Attitudinal choices of themes (Appreciation and Judgment) have contributed equally to Attitudinal choices of the whole novel. Three symbols have been picked out by Fitzgerald in *The Great Gatsby*: the green light standing for Gatsby’s hope, the valley of ashes standing for moral and social decadence perpetrated by the rich, and the eyes of Doctor T. J. Eckleburg (an advertisement on a billboard) standing for the eyes of God staring down upon and judging American society as a moral wasteland. All three symbols are material objects; therefore, in the description of them throughout the novel, Fitzgerald has used (and has had to use)

Appreciative resources. The conclusion is that Judgmental choices of the symbols have not been much of a contributing factor to Attitudinal resources of the whole novel, with the chief Attitudinal contribution constituted by Appreciative choices of the symbols.

As to Polarity and realization Strategy of Attitudinal resources, and with regard to the related numeric data on Polarities and Strategies of *The Great Gatsby*, this study postulates two further claims and hypotheses that are NOT part of this research but that are our own lines of hypothetical surmise and could be said to hold true in most English fiction, although there remains room for further investigation by interested researchers to commit this claim to the realm of confident analysis. The first, according to analysis results, is that novels should hold an Attitudinally unbiased tone as a default condition. As a provisional comparison, the novel does not operate after the fashion of political texts, supposed to adopt a particular stance. Novels are supposed to narrate plots neutrally, and therefore, they are expected to hold similar or very close frequencies of Positive and Negative evaluations, with the general tone of the novels expected to remain neutral. This is at least the default assumption for the reader prior to mental decoding and comprehension of the work.

The Great Gatsby falls in line with this pattern regarding polarities of Attitudinal choices in novels. According to table 4.2, almost 13 % of Attitudinal resources carry negative connotations regarding literal meanings and context of use, and 14.5 % convey positive connotations. The Attitudinal resources for which Polarities have not been specified are of course neutral. And this is where ‘polarity’ within the system of Mood in the interpersonal layer of systemic functional linguistics is different from the Polarity intended in Appraisal/Evaluation. Here Polarity has a more semantic undercurrent, operating in all subsystems of the Appraisal/Evaluation framework, with each choice falling on the positive or negative side, although we find a considerable number of cases with neutral polarity. On the other hand, the data holds up the closeness of the frequency of Positive and Negative Polarities in *The Great Gatsby*, which leads to an unbiased tone, and therefore, the general tone of the novel remains neutral as it is expected to be.

When it comes to the realization Strategy of Attitudinal choices in prose fiction, and as regards the numeric data collected out of this analysis, there is a second claim/hypothesis with respect to Attitudinal resources available to the novel in English literature that we would like to make. Novels require a clear semantic choice, a clear semantic organization, and a clear expression of events and people; i.e. a clear expression of evaluations in general. This is the case for casual everyday conversations of real life as well, and since novels are deemed to hold some resemblance to the real world, we think that another default Appraisal assumption would involve a smaller number of Attitudinal choices allocated to Invoked expressions of evaluation, with the bigger number going to Inscribed choices. *The Great Gatsby* meets this assumption, since as table 4.3 confirms, only around 5 % of Attitudinal choices are realized by Invoked elements (covertly and implicitly); these appear sporadically in metaphoric or sarcastic expressions, for example, and the rest are realized by Inscribed means.

To recapitulate, what was provided here was a general account of the corpus of analysis for this study, along with a brief picture of the author’s biography and background. In the

meantime, the similarities between his own life and the forces governing it and the elements he uses in the novel were quickly discussed as means of diminishing his distance from the addressees for a stronger self-expression. It was pointed out that not only Fitzgerald, but also all literary authors in all genres, create their works to convey and express their thoughts, feelings, life, experiences and ideas to the addresses; and the researchers claimed that a careful in-depth look at such expressions reveals that these authors actually express their evaluations of the world around them through their works. Also, the data from the analysis of the corpus and subsequent discussions were presented regarding Attitudinal choices of *The Great Gatsby*. Finally, this study makes three claims on the sidelines that we think serve as hypotheses in need of further research, not to say that they are interesting grounds for it:

1. Considering “type” of Attitudinal choices, Appreciation should exceed Affect and Judgment by far; the default assumption is that Attitudinal choices in the English novel are deployed with Appreciation occupying most prominent position, Judgment second, and Affect third in descending order of frequency.
2. Considering “polarity” of Attitudinal choices, Positive and Negative evaluations should relatively remain equal so as to keep the general tone of the novel neutral. A discussion of why this should hold true was provided above.
3. Considering realization “strategy” of Attitudinal choices, Inscribed evaluations should far exceed Invoked evaluations in the novel. Again, a line of argument was offered above to explain this trend.

The Great Gatsby met these three assumptions, while we reiterate that these are only suggested hypotheses that could benefit greatly from further research into other works of prose fiction which might be found to depart from these three statements to lesser or greater degree. All the same, we think part of the greatness of this particular work can be stylistically explained by recourse to Appraisal and what we find to be true with regard to the system of Attitude and these three patterns. Although unconscious of Appraisal and its system at work, Fitzgerald must have known how to work its systemic resources to his advantage sentence by sentence.

6.3 Attitude in the Discourse of each of the Main Discourse Producers: Answer to Research Question 3

6.3.1. Nick Carraway

Distribution of Attitudinal resources in the discourse produced by Nick regarding Type, Polarity and Strategy of realization is mapped out in the following tables.

Table 4.4. Distribution of type of Attitudinal choices in Nick’s discourse

Type	Affect	Judgment	Appreciation
Instances	142	626	3813
Percentages	3.09 %	13.66 %	83.23 %

Table 4.5. Distribution of polarity of Attitudinal choices in Nick's discourse

Polarity	Positive	Negative
Instances	515	561
Percentages	11.24 %	12.24 %

Table 4.6. Distribution of strategy of Attitudinal choices in Nick's discourse

Strategy	Inscribed	Invoked
Instances	4308	234
Percentages	94.04 %	5.10 %

According to the tables and as to the type of Attitudinal resources in Nick's discourse, Appreciation exceeds other modes by far, taking up almost 85 % of Attitudinal choices. Judgment takes up around 14 % and Affect forms a very partial amount of his Attitudinal choices with almost 3 %. Nick has had almost equal Positive and Negative evaluations, both around 12 %; however, the realization of almost all of his evaluations has been Inscribed, with only around 5 % of evaluations being Invoked. Here are some examples of Attitudinal analysis from Nick's discourse:

1. ... *an absurd resemblance* ...
(Appreciation, Inscribed, Negative)
2. *I wouldn't have been surprised* ...
(Affect, Inscribed)
3. ... *warm human magic* ...
(Appreciation, Invoked, Positive & Appreciation, Inscribed)
4. ... *careless people* ...
(Judgment, Inscribed, Negative)
5. ... *orgastic future* ...
(Appreciation, Invoked, Negative)

6.3.2 Jay Gatsby

Distribution of Attitudinal resources in the discourse produced by Gatsby regarding Type, Polarity and Strategy of realization is demonstrated in the following tables.

Table 4.7. Distribution of type of Attitudinal choices in Gatsby's discourse

Type	Affect	Judgment	Appreciation
Instances	16	161	151
Percentages	4.87 %	49.08 %	46.03 %

Table 4.8. Distribution of polarity of Attitudinal choices in Gatsby's discourse

Polarity	Positive	Negative
Instances	141	28
Percentages	42.98 %	8.53 %

Table 4.9. Distribution of strategy of Attitudinal choices in Gatsby's discourse

Strategy	Inscribed	Invoked
Instances	273	55
Percentages	83.23 %	16.76 %

The tables show almost equal frequencies of Appreciation and Judgment in Gatsby's discourse; however, Judgment partially exceeds Appreciation taking the role of the most dominant Attitudinal mode of Type in his discourse. Affect plays a very little role, at almost 5 % of his Attitudinal choices. Gatsby's evaluations mirror the most frequent usage of Positive evaluations among all other characters with almost 43 % and only around 8 % of Negative evaluations. Also, he has often appraised overtly and explicitly (about 83 % of Inscribed evaluation), and covert/implicit evaluation assumes a very smaller part in his evaluations (around 17 % of Invoked evaluations). Here are some examples of Attitudinal analysis from Gatsby's discourse:

1. ... *old sport* ...
(Judgment, Invoked, Positive & Judgment, Inscribed, Positive)
2. ... *wrong idea* ...
(Appreciation, Inscribed, Negative)
3. ... *Oxford days* ...
(Appreciation, Inscribed)
4. ... *he's no use to us* ...
(Judgment, Inscribed, Negative)
5. *She never loved you* ...
(Judgment, Invoked, Positive & Appreciation, Inscribed)

6.3.3 Daisy Buchanan

The following table shows the distribution of Attitudinal resources in the discourse produced by Daisy in terms of Type, Polarity and Strategy of realization.

Table 4.10. Distribution of type of Attitudinal choices in Daisy's discourse

Type	Affect	Judgment	Appreciation
Instances	27	40	80
Percentages	18.36 %	27.21 %	54.42 %

Table 4.11. Distribution of polarity of Attitudinal choices in Daisy's discourse

Polarity	Positive	Negative
Instances	51	18
Percentages	34.69 %	12.24 %

Table 4.12. Distribution of strategy of Attitudinal choices in Daisy's discourse

Strategy	Inscribed	Invoked
Instances	137	10
Percentages	93.19 %	6.80 %

Appreciation is the most frequent type of Attitudinal resources in Daisy's discourse as the tables represent. Also, in comparison with other characters, she is the one who has had the most frequent usage of Affect with around 18 % of Affectual expressions in her evaluations. Her Appraisal devices have mostly been Positive, at about 35 %, with almost 12 % of Negative evaluations. Also, she has used a great deal of Inscribed evaluations, with only about 7 % of Invoked evaluations. Here are some examples of Attitudinal resources extracted

from Daisy's discourse:

1. ... *a beautiful little fool* ...
(Judgment, Inscribed, Positive & Judgment, Inscribed & Judgment, Inscribed, Negative)
2. ... *white girlhood* ...
(Appreciation, Invoked, Positive)
3. *I adore it* ...
(Appreciation, Inscribed, Positive)
4. *You always look so cool* ...
(Judgment, Inscribed, Positive & Appreciation, Inscribed)
5. *You know I love you* ...
(Judgment, Inscribed & Affect, Inscribed, Positive)

6.3.4 Jordan Baker

Distribution of Attitudinal resources in the discourse produced by Jordan in terms of type, polarity and strategy of realization is presented in the following tables.

Table 4.13. Distribution of type of Attitudinal choices in Jordan's discourse

Type	Affect	Judgment	Appreciation
Instances	13	69	118
Percentages	6.50 %	34.50 %	59 %

Table 4.14. Distribution of polarity of Attitudinal choices in Jordan's discourse

Polarity	Positive	Negative
Instances	36	32
Percentages	18 %	16 %

Table 4.15. Distribution of strategy of Attitudinal choices in Jordan's discourse

Strategy	Inscribed	Invoked
Instances	191	9
Percentages	95.50 %	4.50 %

As the tables indicate, the order of Attitudinal choices in Jordan's discourse is Appreciation, then Judgment, and finally Affect with relative percentages of 60 %, 34 %, and 6 % respectively. The polarities of her Attitudinal resources are again almost equal with 18 % of Positive evaluations and 16 % of Negative evaluations. The frequent strategy she has used in her appraising incidents is Inscribed evaluation at about 95 %. Here are some examples of Jordan's discourse analyzed in terms of Attitude:

1. *I like large parties* ...
(Affect, Inscribed, Positive & Appreciation, Invoked, Positive)
2. ... *simply amazing* ...
(Appreciation, Inscribed & Appreciation, Inscribed, Positive)
3. *I was scared* ...
(Affect, Inscribed, Negative)
4. ... *immediately* ...

(Appreciation, Inscribed)

5. ... *secret pride* ...

(Appreciation, Inscribed)

6.3.5 Tom Buchanan

Distribution of Attitudinal resources in the discourse produced by Tom with respect to Type, Polarity and Strategy of realization is the content of the following tables.

Table 4.16. Distribution of type of Attitudinal choices in Tom's discourse

Type	Affect	Judgment	Appreciation
Instances	13	57	128
Percentages	6.56 %	28.78 %	64.64 %

Table 4.17. Distribution of polarity of Attitudinal choices in Tom's discourse

Polarity	Positive	Negative
Instances	23	48
Percentages	11.61 %	24.24 %

Table 4.18. Distribution of strategy of Attitudinal choices in Tom's discourse

Strategy	Inscribed	Invoked
Instances	185	13
Percentages	93.43 %	6.56 %

The tables demonstrate that, similar to other characters (except Gatsby), Tom's evaluations have been mostly Appreciation, then Judgment, and then Affect. However, among all characters, he has had the most frequent usage of Negative evaluation with about 24 % of Negative Attitudinal choices. Again, similar to other characters, his evaluations have been frequently Inscribed at around 93 %. Here are some examples of the discourse produced by Tom analyzed in terms of Attitude:

1. *I hate* ...

(Affect, Inscribed, Negative)

2. *He's so dumb* ...

(Judgment, Inscribed, Negative)

3. ... *in oblivion* ...

(Appreciation, Inscribed)

4. ... *big bootleggers* ...

(Judgment, Invoked, Negative & Judgment, Inscribed, Negative)

5. *Daisy loved me* ...

(Judgment, Inscribed, Positive)

This section demonstrated how each character (discourse producer) in the novel deploys discourse and language in such a way as to fall in line with attitudinal choices and modes which happen to be in keeping with each respective characters' mental states, emotions, decisions, roles they play throughout the plot, and their overall personality. We showed that, in part at least, the theoretical framework manages to possess explanatory and stylistic power and validity in linking linguistic patterns of the characters' language with their roles in the

natural flow of the literary piece of fiction and the kinds of human being they are or that the novel seeks to portray them as. Research question 4, in fact, expands below upon this linguistic stylistic pursuit of the third research question, taking it one level upwards into discourse.

6.4 Contribution of Attitudinal Choices of each of the Main Discourse Producers to Above-the-Text Parameters of Discourse: Answer to Research Question 4

In this section, the Attitudinal choices relating to each of the characters which were mapped out in the previous section are analyzed in terms of the intended overarching meanings, themes and symbolism of the novel in question and the organization of ideas and characters in the text.

6.4.1 Nick Carraway

Nick is the narrator of the novel who is depicted as an honest and tolerant young man often serving as a confidant for troubling secrets of other characters. Interestingly, his discourse is totally similar to what was discussed above regarding Attitudinal frequencies expected for novels as dictated by their authors. No prominent pattern highlights itself in his discourse regarding Attitudinal choices. This is justifiable seeing as Nick is the narrator, and his discourse is actually Fitzgerald's dominant discourse when he is indulging in the creation of the novel while sticking unconsciously to the Attitudinal rules hypothesized above. Nick is the narrator and, therefore, the novel is totally colored by his viewpoints which are actually Fitzgerald's. Consequently, he is supposed to hold his generally neutral tone while giving an account on the events of the novel, i.e. while expressing his evaluations. He is supposed to evaluate overtly, and stick to the frequent use of Appreciation and minimum use of Affect as was mentioned above.

6.4.2 Jay Gatsby

Gatsby represents hope, love and loyalty in the novel. There are two outstanding points regarding his Attitudinal resources. The first point is that he deploys the most positive evaluation among all other characters, and there is a huge gap between frequencies of his Positive and Negative evaluations. This reflects his extraordinary hope and optimism. The second point concerns frequencies of his Attitudinal choices considering their "type". Unlike all other characters and discourses in the novel and what is expected to occur, where Appreciation exceeds Judgment by a fair margin, Gatsby's Judgmental resources are more than his Appreciative resources. This reflects Gatsby's attention to people, and by extension, his judgment of them. Bringing these two points together, i.e. his mostly Positive evaluative attitude plus his dominantly Judgmental tone, a humanistic and sentimental picture of Gatsby emerges. The Attitudinal choices appearing in his discourse are tellingly in line with the analysis of his character presented in general literary references on this novel.

6.4.3 Daisy Buchanan

Daisy is Gatsby's beautiful beloved. Her discourse evidences no significant Attitudinal pattern as to Type and Polarity; however, the outstanding part of her discourse is her more

frequent employment of Affectual resources compared to all other characters. The results of the analysis support that not only is Daisy an emotional character, but she also expresses her emotions more than others in general principle. However, according to other characters' judgments about her and what happens in the novel, it is discernable that her emotions are immature, ruled as she is by these swings of immature emotions rather than by her wisdom. She is an emotional sensitive woman who feels a deep need to be loved, and, as analyses of the work in some online general literary resources (e.g. SparkNotes.com) put it, she behaves superficially to mask her pain at her husband's constant infidelity.

6.4.4 Jordan Baker

Jordan represents one of the "new women" of the 1920s. She is described to be cynical, egotistical and boyish. However, the role she plays in lieu of her discourse throughout the novel is an unbiased reporter of the events as the analysis of her Attitudinal choices confirm. During the course of the novel, Jordan quotes characters' requests to each other, passes unbiased information about some characters to some others, and retells events of the past in decidedly unbiased ways. Although incidents of Attitudinal choices in her discourse regarding their Type and Strategy do not reveal any prominent feature, the evenly matched number of Positive and Negative Attitudinal choices in her discourse confirms her generally neutral and unbiased viewpoints towards other characters and what happens within the course of the novel.

6.4.5 Tom Buchanan

Tom is described to be Daisy's arrogant, hypocritical and pessimistic husband, with his social attitudes mirroring racism and sexism to some extent. Generally speaking, Tom is the exact opposite character to the optimist, sentimental and hopeful Gatsby, and by the end, it is also Tom who plays every instrumental role in Gatsby's assassination, virtually occasioning it, in fact. All these traits of his are stylistically and linguistically aligned with the discourse the author has Tom produce throughout the novel, with the most frequent use of Negative evaluations compared to all other characters. These Negative Attitudinal choices are carried forward in his contemptuous tone and sarcastic expressions, especially and most of all, directed as they are at Gatsby. Type and Strategy of his Attitudinal choices do not represent any significance since they are similar to other characters (except Gatsby), and they are in line with the three default patterns of Attitude discussed above as being expected to occur in the novel.

In this section, discourses of the major characters (main discourse producers) and the patterns of Attitude analyzed in them were placed alongside their literary standing and the literary elements comprising them, and they were found to be largely aligned with the characterization, symbolism and themes in the novel. The Attitudinal analysis both supported and threw light on some key angles of their discourses. The simple articulation of this argument would hold that individuals' discursive productions, regardless of the context being fictional or non-fictional, are relative reflections of their personality traits and the roles they

play in various contexts and situations. This was demonstrated concisely above through the Attitudinal analysis of discursive productions of each of the major characters of this novel, in an attempt to bring out the potentials of Appraisal/Evaluation and the strengths of the theoretical paradigm to conduct rigorous stylistics and discourse analysis with strong and reliable patterns found therein. In this particular case, this was deemed to be conducted in two variant ways, i.e. moving from the discourse producers to the framework, or moving from their discursive productions to the Appraisal framework to grasp a more tangible picture of what personality traits they are reflecting, what roles they are playing, and what their actual intentions are. The resulting picture will be further honed and refined if other influential elements such as context of language use and genre are brought into play as well.

7. Conclusions and Suggestions for Further Research

The area of Appraisal is a relatively recent mode of Systemic Functional Linguistics thinking, its complete articulation developed in the late 90s at the very best. In that spirit, it could have contributions to many untapped and unexplored fields of discourse, text and stylistic analysis. Other areas that could be on the receiving end of Appraisal insights include English Literature, English Language Teaching, and Syllabus Design, among many others.

Below we touch upon a number of speculative areas of suggested research that we think the area can claim to contribute to in terms of providing rich tools of analysis and a theoretical framework amenable to operationalization.

The purpose of this study was to point to a small set of practical uses to which the Appraisal framework can be put and various types of analysis feasible through its subsystems, namely Attitude, Engagement and Graduation. This study focused on a literary corpus, and a stylistic/linguistic analysis as a result; however, similar types of analysis could very well be conducted on other genres and in other contexts, and it is safe to say that rich and promising outcomes will appear out of such studies. Some relevant general implications of this study and what it demonstrated about the practical utility of Appraisal are as follows.

To start with, it is worth mentioning that a profound appreciation of the Appraisal framework could lead to a deeper general understanding of the English language, the mechanisms of its operations, and various types of discourses. Apart from the EFL classroom, this may carry significant implications for linguists, especially those dedicated to Systemic Functional Linguistics, particularly when such a practical use of Appraisal for various types of analysis is brought into play.

English Literature (literary discourse) and Literary Criticism could benefit from the contributions of the Appraisal framework. This pursuit receives more importance when one takes note of the fact that Appraisal in literary genres remains particularly under-researched. Undertaking analyses using the Appraisal framework, a much better grasp of literary genre in general will result, not to say of characterization in prose fiction, and of the application of literary theories to works of literature, and stylistic analysis of literary works. These are merely some examples of how working with Appraisal/Evaluation and utilizing it will have clear significance for those engaged with the field of English Literature, and

discourse/stylistic analysis of literary text.

As for other types of Discourse and Genre Analysis, Appraisal has advantages to offer as well, especially where a tinge of “critical” analysis is present, e.g. Critical Discourse Analysis. Appraisal deals with evaluation and adaptation of stances. In that vein, there exists a possibility of linking its analytical findings to power relations in various discourses too.

Appraisal has not been researched very well in English Language Teaching yet, and little work has been cited applying the Appraisal framework to different contexts in TEFL and the issues therein; in doing so lies huge room for interesting and beneficial findings and new perspectives. A possible perspective is using the Appraisal theory in Classroom Discourse Analysis, especially Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis. Appraisal could paint promising horizons from which to contribute to the field through the practical utilization of its analytical aspects, concerning the advent of the newly-introduced “Critical Pedagogy/Education”, and its call for empowering students and establishing social justice and social changes and development of critical thinking abilities in learners plus its claim that these changes should be triggered in classrooms. Using and building upon the Appraisal framework in producing curriculum materials for such courses, or familiarizing learners with the Appraisal framework and its applications in going beyond the texts to disclose hidden ideologies will pave the way for the goals of “Critical Pedagogy”, will develop their critical thinking abilities, and will give them better understandings of the language. Reading comprehension in upwards of intermediate levels stands to particularly benefit from these kinds of research. The Appraisal theory will speak to the heart of advanced reading pedagogy and designing English Language Teaching syllabi within which the teacher of upper-intermediate and advanced reading will be equipped with rudimentary awareness of the semantic and systemic forces in texts.

Generally speaking, the area is quite open to applying its subsystems and tools of analysis to different genres and contexts for various purposes. What should be noted is the important fact that the framework lends itself to various types of ‘interdisciplinary’ studies as well, and leads to promising, innovative, and beneficial findings applicable to various aspects of the subjects under scrutiny. Interested researchers would find it well-advised to continue research in this paradigm, helped and boosted along by the assurance that their research will most probably be articulating fresh insights and valuable findings.

References

Coffin, C., & O’Halloran, K. (2006). The role of appraisal and corpora in detecting covert evaluation. *Functions of Language*, 13, 77-110. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/foL.13.1.04cof>

Fletcher, J., & Patrick, J. (2006). Evaluating the utility of appraisal hierarchies as a method for sentiment classification. *Proceedings of the Australasian Language Technology Workshop, 2005*, 134-142.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, Ch. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Hodder Arnold.

Jones, R. (2012). *Discourse analysis (a resource book for students)*. London: Routledge.

Jorgensen, M., & Philips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London:

SAGE Publications.

Kreidler, C. W. (1998). *Introducing English semantics*. London: Routledge.

Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., Teruya, K., & Lam, M. (2010). *Key terms in systemic functional linguistics*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Mey, J. L. (Ed.). (2009). *Concise encyclopedia of pragmatics* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Elsevier.

Painter, C. (2003). Developing attitude: An ontogenetic perspective on APPRAISAL. *Walter de Gruyter*, 23, 183-209.

Read, J., & Carroll, J. (2012). Annotating expressions of Appraisal in English. *Language Resources & Evaluation*, 46, 421-447. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10579-010-9135-7>

Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics (a resource book for students)*. London: Routledge.

Souza, A. A. (2006). The construal of interpersonal meanings in the discourse of national anthems: An appraisal analysis. *33rd International Systemic Functional Congress, 2006*, 531-550.

Taboada, M., & Carretero, M. (2012). Contrastive analyses of evaluation in text: Key issues in the design of an annotation system for attitude applicable to consumer reviews in English and Spanish. *Linguistics and the Human Sciences*, 6, 275-295. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1558/lhs.v6i1-3.275>

Thompson, G. (2004). *Introducing Functional Grammar*. London: Hodder Arnold.

White, P. R. R. (2003). Beyond modality and hedging: A dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance. *Walter de Gruyter*, 23, 259-284.

White, P. R. R. (2009). Media power and the rhetorical potential of the “hard news” report – attitudinal mechanisms in journalistic. *VAKKI Symposium XXIX*, 36, 30-49.

White, P. R. R. (2011). Appraisal. In J. Zienkowski, J. O. Ostman, & J. Verschueren, (Eds.), *Discursive pragmatics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/hoph.8.02whi>

Zienkowski, J., Ostman, J. O., & Verschueren, J. (Eds.). (2011). *Discursive pragmatics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/hoph.8>

Copyright Disclaimer

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).