

## **CHAPTER II**

### **THEORY AND METHOD**

#### **2.1 Theoretical Frameworks**

##### **2.1.1 Appraisal Theory**

According to Halliday and Matthiessen (1999), language has three main functions, namely ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings. The ideational function is related to expressing experiences and ideas, the interpersonal function is related to expressing attitudes and building social relationships, while the textual function is related to organizing language into a coherent text. Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), views language as a tool for making meaning in social life, not only as a set of grammatical rules, since people use language to communicate meanings, express opinions, and interact with others. In this study, the interpersonal function is the most relevant because the study focuses on evaluative language and the representation of social class. Through interpersonal meaning, speakers can express feelings, attitudes, opinions, and evaluations toward other people or events.

Interpersonal meaning refers to how language is used to build and maintain social relationships between speakers and listeners or writers and readers. It is related to how people express attitudes, opinions, emotions, and evaluations in communication. Martin and White explain that interpersonal meaning shows the presence of speakers or writers in a text through expressions of approval, disapproval, praise, criticism, and other evaluations (2005). In addition, interpersonal meaning also helps writers or speakers position readers to agree with

certain values or perspectives. This means that language does not only deliver information, but also reflects social values and viewpoints in society.

To analyze interpersonal meaning more specifically, this study uses Appraisal Theory developed by Martin and White (2005), especially the Attitude system. One part of Attitude is Judgement, which is used to evaluate people's behaviour and character based on social norms and values.

Appraisal Theory is a framework within Systemic Functional Linguistics that examines how language is utilized to express evaluation, attitude, and interpersonal stance in discourse. Appraisal is concerned with the ways speakers or writers adopt positions, negotiate feelings, and align or misalign themselves with others through language (Martin & White, 2005). Operating at the level of discourse semantics, appraisal focuses on how evaluative meaning is organized across clauses and texts rather than within isolated grammatical units.

Appraisal is positioned as part of the interpersonal metafunction in Systemic Functional Linguistics, which deals with the implementation of social relations and attitudes through language (Halliday, 1994 as cited in Martin & White, 2005). Appraisal enhances these frameworks by specifically analyzing how our evaluations and stances shape social relationships, particularly regarding power and solidarity. This framework includes attitude for feelings, including emotional reactions, judgements of behavior, and evaluations of things, engagement for managing viewpoints, and graduation for scaling intensity. Attitude is the most central part because it shows how we express social meaning.

### **2.1.1.1 Judgement**

According to Martin and Rose (2007), judgement refers to the evaluation of people's character, behavior, and actions based on socially shared values and expectations. Through judgement, speakers or writers assess whether a person is considered admirable or admirable, praiseworthy or blameworthy within a particular social context. Unlike affect, which focuses on emotions and feelings, judgement is concerned with evaluating human behavior and personal qualities. Judgement can be expressed positively or negatively, depending on whether the evaluation approves or disapproves of the person being judged.

Martin and Rose (2007) also explain that judgement may be realized explicitly through direct evaluative expressions or implicitly through descriptions of actions, events, and behaviors that invite readers to make their own evaluations. In addition, judgement can be conveyed metaphorically, where figurative language is used to imply particular evaluations of a person's character. Therefore, judgement involves both polarity (positive and negative) and different modes of realization (explicit, implicit, and metaphorical) in the evaluation of people.

The author has decided to only use Judgement subsystem of attitudes within Appraisal Theory, given that Judgement is directly related to the evaluation of human behaviour in relation to social norms and moral values, which form the core of the analysis of social class representation in the character of Vivian Ward. Furthermore, Martin and White (2005) divide judgement into two major categories, namely social esteem and social sanction.

Table 1. The System of Judgement Social Esteem (Martin & White, 2005)

| Type of Judgements | Judgements Sub-type                             | Admiration Characters                                                                                                                     | Criticism Characters                                                                                                                                        |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Social Esteem      | Normality<br>( <i>how special/unusual?</i> )    | lucky, fortunate, normal, natural, cool, stable, fashionable, avant garde, celebrated, predictable.                                       | unlucky, helpless, odd, peculiar, eccentric, erratic, unpredictable, dated, daggy, obscure.                                                                 |
|                    | Capacity<br>( <i>how capable?</i> )             | powerful, vigorous, sound, robust, sound, healthy, adult, mature, witty, clever, gifted, sane, expert, learned, accomplished, successful. | weak, wimpy, sick, crippled, immature, childish, helpless, dull, dreary, slow, stupid, thick, flaky, neurotic, naive, illiterate, incompetent, unproductive |
|                    | Tenacity<br>( <i>how dependable/resolute?</i> ) | plucky, brave, heroic, cautious, wary, patient, thorough, meticulous, tireless, resolute, reliable, faithful, loyal, flexible.            | timid, cowardly, gutless, rash, impatient, reckless, capricious, weak, distracted, despondent, unreliable, disloyal, stubborn, obstinate.                   |

Table 2. The System of Judgement Social Sanction (Martin & White, 2005)

| Type of Judgement | Judgement Sub-type                          | Praise Characters                                                                                                                             | Condemnation Characters                                                                                                                                     |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Social Sanction.  | Veracity<br>( <i>how honest/truthful?</i> ) | truthful, honest, credible, authentic, frank, candid, direct, discrete, tactful.                                                              | dishonest, deceitful, lying, deceptive, manipulative, devious, bogus, blunt, blabbermouth.                                                                  |
|                   | Propriety<br>( <i>how ethical/proper?</i> ) | good, moral, ethical, law abiding, fair, just, sensitive, kind, caring, unassuming, modest, humble, polite, respectful, altruistic, generous. | bad, immoral, evil, corrupt, unfair, unjust, insensitive, mean, cruel, vain, snobby, arrogant, rude, discourteous, irreverent, selfish, greedy, avaricious. |

Martin and White (2005) explain Judgement as one of attitude that concerns the evaluation of human behavior in relation to social norms, moral values, and expectations of conduct. Judgement evaluates people by assessing their behavior, character, and credibility. Judgement is particularly relevant for this study because it enables the analysis of how Vivian Ward is socially evaluated and positioned through language, especially in relation to her social class background.

#### **2.1.1.2.1 Social Esteem**

Judgements of social esteem involve three subtypes, namely normality, capacity, and tenacity, which respectively refer to how unusual someone is, how capable they are, and how dependable they are (Martin & White, 2005). Social esteem focuses on whether a person is perceived as capable, normal, or dependable in everyday social interaction rather than whether they are morally right or wrong. These evaluations commonly occur in informal social interaction, such as conversation, gossip, or everyday communication, where people express approval or disapproval toward others' behavior. this judgement type functions as a tool to analyze how characters evaluate Vivian's social competence, behavior, and suitability within particular social environments, especially those associated with higher social status.

In terms of polarity, social esteem includes both positive and negative evaluations. Positive evaluations represent qualities that are admired, while negative evaluations represent qualities that are criticized. Therefore, in this study, positive social esteem is interpreted as admiration, and negative social esteem is

interpreted as criticism, depending on how the speaker evaluates the target character.

#### **2.1.1.2.1.1 Normality**

In this study, normality is used to examine how a person is evaluated in terms of being typical, acceptable, or socially appropriate within a particular environment. This subtype focuses on whether an individual is perceived as ordinary and fitting into a social group or, on the contrary, as unusual or out of place. As explained by J.R. Martin and Peter R.R. White, normality concerns “how unusual someone is” (Martin & White, 2005). Table 2.1 shows that normality Judgements can be identified through various personal characteristics that reflect social acceptance or difference. Positive normality is associated with qualities such as normal, stable, or fashionable, which indicate that a person is perceived as fitting into a social environment. In contrast, negative normality is associated with qualities such as odd, peculiar, or unpredictable, which suggest that the individual does not conform to expected social norms. In the analysis of this study, positive normality is interpreted as admiration when Vivian is perceived as fitting into the social environment, while negative normality is interpreted as criticism when she is perceived as different, inappropriate, or out of place. those evaluation characters help explain how social boundaries are constructed through acceptance or exclusion.

#### **2.1.1.2.1.2 Capacity**

Capacity concentrates on whether a person is considered capable of handling certain responsibilities or participating skillfully in social interaction. In

other words\_capacity relates to “how capable they are” (Martin & White, 2005). Capacity judgement can be recognized through characteristics that indicate competence or lack of competence, where admiration concerns characters such as clever, gifted, experienced, or successful, which reflect recognition of skill and ability, and there is criticism includes qualities such as immature, naive, slow, or incompetent, which indicate doubt about a person’s competence. Capacity is identified in utterances that evaluates Vivian’s skills, knowledge, or ability to function within upper-class environments. These evaluations reflect how competence is often associated with perceptions of social status.

#### **2.1.1.2.1.3 Tenacity**

Tenacity subtype presents several characters to evaluated “how resolute they are”, it focuses on whether a person is considered dependable, committed, or emotionally strong in facing challenges. as shown in Table 2.1 are Positive tenacity includes characters such reliable, loyal, patient, or resolute, which indicate persistence and responsibility, while negative tenacity possess such as reckless, impatient, unreliable, or disloyal, which suggest a lack of commitment or responsibility. based on the analysis to be carried out, positive tenacity is interpreted as admiration when Vivian is perceived as strong, persistent, or responsible, while negative tenacity is interpreted as criticism when she is perceived as unreliable or lacking commitment. It remains relevant for understanding how character strength contributes to social evaluation.

#### **2.1.1.2.2 Social Sanction**

Social sanction refers to the evaluation of a person based on moral or ethical standards that are socially recognized within a community. Unlike social esteem, which focuses on personal qualities and abilities, social sanction concerns whether a person's behavior is considered morally right or wrong. According to Martin and White (2005), social sanction involves Judgements related to honesty and ethical conduct. In this study, social sanction is used to analyze how characters are evaluated through utterances that reflect moral approval or disapproval of behavior. These evaluations are categorized into two sub-types: veracity and propriety. Table 2.2 shows the classification of social sanction judgement along with examples of characteristics that indicate positive and negative moral evaluations.

Positive evaluations in social sanction are referred to as praise, while negative evaluations are referred to as condemnation. These terms indicate whether the speaker expresses moral approval or moral disapproval toward another person's behavior.

##### **2.1.1.2.2.1 Veracity**

Veracity is applied in this research to examine how a person is evaluated in terms of honesty and truthfulness. This subtype focuses on whether an individual is perceived as trustworthy or deceptive in communication and interaction. Martin and White (2005) define veracity as relating to how truthful someone is. As shown in Table 2.2, veracity Judgements can be identified through characteristics associated with honesty and trustworthiness. Positive veracity is interpreted as praise includes qualities such as honest, truthful, credible, or sincere, which indicate reliability and

transparency, while negative veracity is interpreted as condemnation includes qualities such as dishonest, deceptive, or manipulative, which suggest a lack of honesty. Veracity is suitable to be applied in situations where Vivian's intentions or motives are questioned by other characters, revealing how trust and suspicion influence social relationships.

#### **2.1.1.2.2.2 Propriety**

The term "propriety" is used in this study to analyze how a person is evaluated in terms of moral and ethical behavior. Propriety emphasizes whether an individual is considered socially appropriate, polite, and morally acceptable. Martin and White (2005) describe "propriety" as relating to how ethical or appropriate a person is. Positive propriety or praise includes traits such as kind, respectful, fair, or generosity, which represent socially valued behavior. On the other side, negative propriety or condemnation includes traits such as rudeness, selfishness, or unfairness, which indicate behavior that violates social norms. In the context of this study, politeness is particularly relevant in scenes where Vivian is evaluated based on her social background or her job. These evaluations demonstrate how moral judgments contribute to the formation of social class identity within the narrative.

Judgement could be articulated as either positive or negative, based on whether the assessment communicates positive or negative of actions. This polarity is demonstrated through an analysis of the meanings of the attitudes expressed by the choice of words and clauses, in accordance with the appraisal framework introduced by (Martin and White 2005). In this analysis, positive Judgement signifies social or moral endorsement, whereas negative Judgement denotes critique

or disapproval. Recognizing judgement polarity enables this research to systematically classify evaluative expressions and to uncover trends in how distinctions of social class are formulated through language.

### **2.1.2 Representation and Stereotyping**

In his book, Hall (1997) states that representation is a process through which meaning is produced and exchanged via language, signs, images and discourse. Representation does not merely reflect reality, but actively constructs meaning and shapes society's perspectives on certain social groups. Stereotypes operate across various dimensions of difference, including race, gender, sexuality and social class (Hall, 1997). In this context of analysis, the focus is specifically on social class stereotypes represented through the character of Vivian Ward as a working-class woman in the film *Pretty Woman*.

Although Hall (1997) does not propose a fixed framework for identifying stereotypes, his discussion in *The Spectacle of the Other* highlights several recurring ways in which stereotyping operates within representation. These recurring mechanisms include the construction of difference and otherness, the reduction of individuals to simplified and fixed characteristics, the symbolic exclusion of groups that are perceived as outside social norms, and the maintenance of unequal power relations between dominant and marginalized groups. Drawing on these discussions, the present study adapts Hall's theoretical insights into four analytical categories: Otherness, Simplification and Fixing Difference, Exclusion, and Power Relations. The purpose of this adaptation is not to modify Hall's theory, but to operationalize his discussion of stereotyping into analytical tools that can be

applied systematically to the data. These categories function as interpretive lenses for examining how Judgement resources identified through Appraisal Theory contribute to the representation of Vivian Ward's lower-class social identity in *Pretty Woman*.

Through representation, lower-class individuals may be associated with certain negative images, behaviours, or moral values that distinguish them from dominant upper-class society. In relation to stereotyping, Hall argues that stereotypes simplify and naturalize differences by reducing people to limited and generalized characteristics. He states that stereotyping "reduces, essentializes, naturalizes and fixes difference." Through this process, stereotypes may reinforce unequal social relations and maintain social hierarchy between dominant and marginalized groups.

*Table 3. Analytical Stereotyping Concepts Derived from Hall's (1997)*

| Analytical Concepts                  | Explanation                                                                                                    |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Otherness                            | Certain groups are represented as different from dominant social norms and values                              |
| Simplification and Fixing Difference | Individuals or group are reduced to limited characteristics that are treated as natural, fixed, and unchanging |
| Exclusion                            | Certain groups are symbolically                                                                                |

|                |                                                                                         |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                | seperated from what is considered socially acceptable or socially belonging             |
| Power Relation | Dominant group control representation and maintain social hierarchy through stereotypes |

#### **2.1.2.1 Otherness**

Hall explains that stereotyping works by constructing certain groups as “the Other,” meaning groups that are viewed as different from dominant social norms and values. Through representation, these groups are often portrayed as socially different in terms of appearance, behaviour, language, or lifestyle. Otherness frequently operates through binary oppositions such as normal/abnormal or respectable/immoral. In this study, the concept of otherness is used to analyze how Vivian Ward is represented as different from dominant upper-class society.

#### **2.1.2.2 Simplification and Fixing Difference**

Stereotype reduce individuals or groups into limited and generalized characteristics that are treated as natural and unchanging. Instead of presenting people as complex individuals, stereotypes simplify them into fixed labels or images. Through repetition, these characteristics become attached to particular social groups. In this study, this concept is used to identify how Vivian’s lower-class identity is associated with simplified and stereotypical characteristics.

#### **2.1.2.3 Exclusion**

Stereotyping creates symbolic boundaries between groups that are considered socially acceptable and those viewed as outsiders. Certain groups may be excluded from dominant social spaces, values, or standards because they are considered not to “belong.” Exclusion is used to examine how Vivian experiences social separation from upper-class environments and social acceptance.

#### **2.1.2.4 Power Relation**

Furthermore, Hall states that stereotypes are closely related to power relations because dominant groups have greater control over representation and meaning. Through representation, dominant groups are able to maintain social hierarchy by defining how other groups should be viewed in society. In this study, power relation is used to analyze how upper-class values and perspectives influence the representation of Vivian as a lower-class woman.

These adopted concepts are used to explain how stereotyping operates in the representation of Vivian’s lower-class identity, particularly through processes of difference, reduction, exclusion, and power relation.

### **2.2 Research Method**

#### **2.2.1 Types of Research**

This investigation utilizes a qualitative research framework. Qualitative research is an approach used to explore and understand the meanings that individuals or groups ascribe to social or human problems, with emphasis on interpretation and the construction of meaning rather than statistical measurement (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Qualitative inquiry is particularly appropriate when

the aim is to comprehend the construction of meaning rather than to quantify variables through statistical means. This research distinctly employs qualitative descriptive analysis, as it centers on the identification and categorization of Judgement polarity within the Appraisal framework in selected dialogues from the film *Pretty Woman*. Given that the data comprises utterances and clauses necessitating interpretative examination, a qualitative methodology is considered appropriate.

#### **2.2.2 Data Source**

The data for this study primarily are taken from Garry Marshall's movie called *Pretty Woman* released in 1990. The data consist of selected utterances that contain judgement, accompanied by their contextual situations, which support the analysis of social class representation.

#### **2.2.3 Population and Sample**

Population in this study consists of whole dialogue spoken by Vivian with other characters that contain judgement expression. Purposive sampling was selected because it focuses on identifying and selecting 'information-rich cases' (Patton, 2015), which in this study refers to, 14 key scenes from 36 data selected as the samples because they were considered the most significant and representative in showing judgement utterances related to Vivian's social class, allowing a deeper understanding of the research phenomenon.

#### **2.2.4 Method of Collecting Data**

The primary data of this study is the film *Pretty Woman* (1990). The method of collecting said data is by watching the film and transcribe the dialogues.

Furthermore, the researcher identify utterances containing judgement expressions based on the research focus. The selected data were classified according to the types of judgement. Finally, the collected data were compiled and prepared for further analysis.

#### **2.2.5 Method of Analyzing Data**

The collected data were analysed by focusing on utterances containing judgement evaluation in the film. Each utterance was examined in relation to its dialogue context to understand how characters evaluate Vivian Ward and how these evaluations are conveyed through language. The classification determined the type of judgement expressed, the character who produces the judgement, the target of the evaluation, its polarity as either positive or negative, and whether it realized implicit or explicit. Hereinafter, it also interprets how these evaluative expressions reflect and reinforce social class representation, stereotyping, and the positioning of Vivian within upper-class social structure.