

# Appraisal Theory in Translation Studies: An Introduction and Review of Studies of Evaluation in Translation<sup>1</sup>

Gholam-Reza Tajvidi<sup>2</sup> & S. Hossein Arjani<sup>3</sup>

Received: 28/01/2017

Accepted: 15/06/2017

## Abstract

Translation studies (TS), as a young (inter)discipline, has partly relied on metadiscussions, critical assessments of its literature, and compilation of bibliographies to deal with certain problems of its youth, such as polarity and fragmentation. While the current status of TS shows general maturity, there are still young areas of inquiry in the discipline that are faced with similar issues. The current study is an attempt to introduce and bring together an area of research in TS that draws on appraisal theory (AT; Martin & White, 2005) to functionally and systematically study the expression of feelings, emotions, viewpoints, and intersubjective positioning in translation. It is argued that this body of research has not received enough attention, partly due to its fragmentation and diversity. Several appraisal theory-informed studies of translations in different languages, genres, and mediums are introduced and reviewed, and certain points of similarity and differences are highlighted. More elaborate methodologies are given a closer look, and a general view of the findings in the literature is also provided. Finally, suggestions are made to address some limitations in the literature.

**Keywords:** Translation Studies (TS); Appraisal Theory (AT); Evaluation; Stance; Attitude; Positioning

---

<sup>1</sup>Please cite this paper as follows:

Tajvidi, G. R., & Arjani, S. H. (2017). Appraisal theory in translation studies: An introduction and review of studies of evaluation in translation. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 3-30.

<sup>2</sup>Corresponding author, Translation Studies Department, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran; tajvidi@atu.ac.ir

<sup>3</sup>Translation Studies Department, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran; s.hossein.arjani@gmail.com

## 1. Introduction

The youth of translation studies (henceforth TS), as an (inter)discipline, has meant striving in the past half a century to mark an academic territory, to bring together approaches to a common phenomenon and object of study, and to consolidate directions and foci. Such scholarly efforts were simultaneous with a rapid growth of the discipline that experienced many turns (cf. Snell-Hornby, 2006), as it was trying to recognize the areas that fell within its widening scope and found new directions. Such turns included a turn away from applied linguistics and literary theory toward pragmatic and functional considerations, for instance, with the rise of German functionalist approaches (e.g., Reiss & Vermeer, 1984) and Descriptive TS (e.g., Hermans, 1985/2014; Toury, 2012), which snowballed toward the “cultural turn” (cf. Bassnett, 1998) and brought considerations of culture, ideology and power to the fore (e.g., Bassnett & Lefevere, 1990), overshadowing linguistic approaches.

The changes and the fact that many scholars were importing theories, toolkits, concepts and terms to study translation, naturally brought about a degree of “plurality and fragmentation” to TS (Delabastita, 2005, p. 38), aspects of which would be among “childhood diseases” of the discipline (Lefevere, 1993, p. 229). However, metadiscussions, critical assessments of the literature, and compilation of bibliographies (e.g., TS Abstracts<sup>i</sup>), among others, have helped address some of those diseases and have pushed TS toward becoming increasingly consolidated through bringing a certain degree of coherence and uniformity to different approaches.

The problems that TS experienced in the previous decades are gradually overshadowed by the relative maturity of the discipline; however, the interdisciplinary nature of many publications in TS has resulted in similar problems in subareas or subbranches of TS, and it is necessary to address the fragmentation and the plurality in (new) areas of inquiry, to show similarities as well as differences in approaches that deal with similar phenomena, and to show how the contributions have shed light on aspects of translation, as a product or a process, as well as of the task of the translators (cf. Chesterman, 2009). Such accounts both serve future empirical studies and help methodological progress by pointing to the gaps and limitations in the body of research. Therefore, the current study is an attempt to introduce and bring together an area of research in TS that focuses on evaluation in discourse as seen through the lens of appraisal theory<sup>ii</sup> (henceforth AT) and aims to provide a coherent picture of the literature on translation drawing on AT. Evaluation here is seen as “the broad cover term for the expression of the speaker or writer’s attitude or stance towards, viewpoints on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about” (Thompson & Hunston, 2000, p. 5). This will be discussed below.

In the following sections, a quick overview of research on TS from the perspective of Halliday's systemic functional linguistics (henceforth SFL), which provides the general theoretical underpinning of AT, is provided, followed by a brief account of some relevant concepts from SFL. Then, evaluation and AT are introduced and the major part of the paper focuses on research on translation informed by AT, highlighting their contributions and various points of similarity and difference among them. A brief discussion of some aspects of the literature follows, and the paper concludes with some suggestions for future research.

### *1.1. Systemic Functional Linguistics and Translation Studies*

The limitations of early linguistic approaches in TS which focused primarily on linguistic correspondence and textual relation (e.g., Catford, 1965) and ignored discursal and social aspects of texts were to be addressed by developments in discourse analysis and text linguistics. Such developments manifested in TS and applications of (critical) discourse analysis, drawing most notably on Halliday's SFL for textual analysis and for discussing relations of text to the sociocultural context became more popular in TS. Among these were publications by Hatim and Mason (1990, 1997), Baker (1992), House (1997), and Steiner (1998).

In SFL, text is seen as “a process of making meaning in context” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p. 3) and an instance of language use, and language is seen as a social semiotic system which provides the text with its meaning-making potential. Therefore, text is seen as a specific configuration, and an instance, of that meaning potential which is conditioned by the social context. In SFL, context is modelled under the notion of register including three dimensions or variables, namely field, tenor, and mode, respectively dealing with the social activity of the interactants in the discourse, the relationship between them, and the role language plays in the interaction (Martin & Rose, 2003, 2008). Register, as the model of context, is realized through three simultaneous semantic domains or metafunctions (i.e., ideational, interpersonal, and textual), describing how language is used to “to represent experience,” “to enact relationships,” and “to organize text,” respectively (p. 7). These metafunctions are, in turn, realized simultaneously through lexicogrammatical choices in different types of (semantic) structures. Therefore, SFL sees all choices in text as significant against the alternative choices that could have been made from the meaning potential the linguistic system provides and offers the discourse analyst proper tools and descriptions to analyze semantic configuration and patterns of choices and to gain insight into the metafunctions and contextual variables of a stretch of discourse.

The tenor, which describes patterning of interpersonal meaning, is the variable most relevant to discussions of evaluation and appraisal which deal with emotions, values, opinions, and intersubjective positioning. However, “[u]p to about

1990, work on interpersonal meaning in SFL was more strongly oriented to interaction than feeling” (Martin & White, 2005, p. 7), which prompted a group of scholars from the Sydney school of SFL “to extend the model of interpersonal meaning” (p. xi) and add more delicacy to description of emotions, attitudes, and interpersonal assessments. This resulted in the birth of AT, which will be introduced below.

## 2. Evaluation and Appraisal Theory

Evaluation refers to those aspects of human behavior usually discussed under various terms such as stance, attitude, affective meaning and appraisal, and generally deals with how writers/speakers express positive or negative opinion toward real world entities or toward propositions, how solidarity relations are constructed and maintained, and how alternative views are recognized (or ignored) and responded to. AT is the most significant development in systematic analyses of evaluation and will be our focus here; a discussion of the literature on evaluation or stance from other perspectives falls out of the scope of the current study.

AT, which has been evolving since the late 1990s and was in a solid form in the early 2000s, is a “model of evaluation [. . .] within the general theoretical framework of SFL” (Martin & White, 2005, p. 7), a description at the level of discourse semantics of how “texts convey positive or negative assessments,” how “the intensity or directness of such attitudinal utterances is strengthened or weakened,” and how “speakers/writers engage dialogistically with prior speakers or with potential respondents to the current proposition” (White, 2015, p. 1). Those three areas are, respectively, accounted for within three simultaneous systems (i.e., Attitude, Graduation, and Engagement) that interact with each other to create a certain evaluative orientation in the text.

The central system among the three is Attitude which has to do with “our feelings, including emotional reactions, judgements of behaviour and evaluation of things” (Martin & White, 2005, p. 35), respectively dealt with under the subsystems of Affect (e.g., *She was very unhappy*), Judgment (e.g., *It was rude of him to say that*), and Appreciation (e.g., *The performance was enchanting*). These are, in turn, categorized into different (fuzzy) types, each with positive and negative instances. Affect includes dis/inclination (e.g., ‘yearn for,’ ‘fearful’), un/happiness (e.g., ‘cheerful,’ ‘sorrowful’), in/security (e.g., ‘confident,’ ‘anxious’), and dis/satisfaction (e.g., ‘absorbed,’ ‘furious’). Judgment is divided into social esteem (normality, capacity, and tenacity; e.g., ‘lucky’/‘eccentric,’ ‘clever’/‘weak,’ ‘brave’/‘unreliable’) and social sanction (veracity and propriety; e.g., ‘honest’/‘manipulative,’ ‘moral’/‘corrupt’). Appreciation subcategories are reaction (e.g., ‘exciting,’ ‘monotonous’), composition (e.g., ‘balanced,’ ‘unclear’), and valuation (e.g.,

‘profound,’ ‘insignificant’). Appreciation and Judgment are seen as “institutionalised affect” (Martin & White, 2005, p. 45). Attitude might be activated explicitly (inscribed), as in the above examples, or implicitly (invoked), as in the sentence *He beats his son* which, in most contexts, would invoke in the reader a negative Judgment of the father. It is acknowledged in AT that certain inscriptions of Attitude might also serve as invocations of another type of Attitude; therefore, double-coding is acceptable. In addition, considering the context is essential in identifying attitudinal items and their value.

Another system of appraisal, Engagement, includes “resources of dialogistic positioning” that “in various ways construe for the text a heteroglossic backdrop of prior utterances, alternative viewpoints and anticipated responses” (Martin & White, 2005, p. 97). Utterances are either monoglossic (bare assertions) with “no reference to other voices and viewpoints” or heteroglossic, that is, they “invoke or allow for dialogistic alternatives” (pp. 99-100). Heteroglossic resources can either *contract* the dialogic space (e.g., *obviously that is the case*) or expand it (e.g., *I believe that is the case*), with the former establishing the point and restricting the alternatives, and the latter recognizing and allowing some space to dialogically alternative viewpoints. Dialogically contractive resources are divided into resources of disclaim (deny and counter) and proclaim (concur, pronounce, endorse), and expansive resources are divided into entertain and attribute (acknowledge and distance). Space constraints do not allow further illustration of Engagement resources, which are essential in writer-reader relationship, establishing solidarity, and aligning the readers into a certain value position (Martin & White, 2005).

The third Appraisal system, Graduation, comprises resources which describe grading (up-scaling or down-scaling) of Attitude and Engagement and show “the degree of the speaker/writer’s personal investment in the propositions being advanced in the text” (White, 2015, p. 4), either through an isolated lexical item (e.g., a *very modest man*) or as infused quality of the item used (e.g., *terrible* vs. *bad* or *I believe* vs. *I suspect*). Graduation resources are divided into force and focus, with the former describing “grading according to intensity or amount” of scalable categories (e.g., *somewhat abruptly*, *greatly hindered*), and the latter “grading according to prototypicality and the preciseness” of typically nonscalable categories (e.g., a *true friend*, *an apology of sorts*; Martin & White, 2005, p. 137). Graduation resources can add personal meaning to otherwise nonevaluative utterances (e.g., *they play jazz, sort of*).

The fine-grained description in AT has brought it recognition as being “the only systematic, detailed and elaborate framework of evaluative language” (Bednarek, 2006, p. 32), and “[t]he most fully developed model of evaluation” (Thompson, 2014, p. 48). Even van Dijk, who adopts a critical attitude toward

aspects of SFL, considers AT among the “very original studies that go beyond the core theory” of SFL (van Dijk, 2008, p. 28). Several monographs and edited volumes have demonstrated applications of AT in different genres and languages (e.g., Bednarek, 2006; Thomson & White, 2008).

As AT was a later extension to Halliday’s interpersonal semantics, the work drawing on SFL in TS (as in the publications introduced above) was not detailed when it came to analyzing attitude and feeling and, at best, included considerations of evaluative adjectives and modality, and commentary on ideational triggers of emotions, and a systematic account of such aspects was lacking. The developments in SFL description of evaluation and negotiation of attitude gradually found its way into TS, and more research utilized AT to inform their discussions of viewpoints and stances in texts and the relations between the writer/speaker and real and putative audience and how these were affected in the course of translation, becoming situated in another sociocultural context. This is the focus of the following section.

### 3. Research on Translation Drawing on Appraisal Theory

While AT-informed research in other fields began appearing in the early 2000s, research on translations from the perspective of AT mostly appeared a decade later, especially from 2012 onward. In 2012, Munday’s book entitled *Evaluation in Translation: Critical Points of Translator Decision Making* was published (Munday, 2012a), in which he applies AT to different genres and focuses on critical points in the translation process. The book became the subject of several reviews in the following years (Greenall, 2013; Schäffner, 2013; Souza, 2015), and several researchers have, thereafter, applied aspects of the theory to the studies of different genres, registers, and text types, providing insights into the working of interpersonal semantics and tenor relations in texts, although not building on each other’s research or linking their findings to the literature.

To provide some statistics<sup>iii</sup>, there are, at least, one book (Munday, 2012a), more than 20 journal articles (see below), four articles in edited volumes (Abbamonte & Cavaliere, 2006; Mouka, Saridakis, & Fotopoulou, 2015; Pan, 2014; Rosa, 2013), three Ph.D. dissertations (Al-Shunnag, 2014; Pan, 2012; Souza, 2010), one M.A. thesis (Arjani, 2011), and several conference presentations drawing on AT to study translation<sup>iv</sup>. A quantitative analysis of citations in this body of research shows that, among the very few cited (cross-referenced), the book by Munday (2012a) is the most cited reference. In fact, except for a few more citations in two Munday publications, two-third of the publications using AT in TS have not cited or recognized any other application of AT in TS, and the number in the third that has cited other AT-informed TS research does not exceed one or two citations. Even the

cited publications are isolated and briefly (and noncritically) reviewed and rarely linked to the findings and results of the research. To make matters worse, the majority of publications, which are authored by TS insiders, are disconnected from TS literature, and in cases where they have recognized the TS literature, it has remained in the Introduction and Review sections with no direct influence on the methodology of the research or interpretation of the results. We suggest that the lack of cross-referencing and critical assessment of the literature as well as not drawing on TS literature is partly responsible for the fragmentation of this body of research and its low prominence among TS researchers (compared to other SFL-oriented studies introduced above) and also outsiders<sup>v</sup>.

It certainly serves the TS research community to stop and look back every so often, to see what has been accomplished, and what areas need further development. The current paper is an attempt to bring together and introduce the body of AT-informed research on translation. It is part of a larger study in which the second author has critically reviewed the majority of publications on translation informed by AT, highlighting their limitations and attempting to propose an explanatory hypothesis for evaluative behavior based on the literature. However, as the literature is varied and we have not narrowed down our focus here, an in-depth discussion and critique of the works falls out of the scope of the current paper and planned for a later publication. Here, the focus is mostly on providing bibliographic information and summary, and a holistic view of the literature to serve as a point of departure for TS researchers interested in systematic studies of evaluation, and appraisers who might be interested in trying their analytical view on a different object of study. We have tried to provide a synoptic account of the findings in the literature, however limited, to suggest ways for explaining and predicting the changes that evaluation undergoes in the course of translation. Due to space constraints, conference presentations have been excluded.

In the following sections, AT literature on translation is introduced based on the different aspects of the research. First, a tabulated overview and summary of the main publications is presented. Next, the literature is overviewed in separate sections according to the languages involved in the analyses, genres, and text types focused on, terminology and descriptive titles used or proposed, analytical models and methodologies proposed, and a general view of the findings. Observations and comments are included in each section, and the last section is an attempt to highlight some gaps in the literature and suggest the way forward. More space is given to those publications that are more methodologically detailed and have the potential to be developed. Due to space constraints, the content of some sections are not exhaustive, and only the more relevant publications are considered.

The majority of publications on AT in translation has been empirical and carried out through comparison of existing texts and their translations. There is one instance of experimentation (Munday, 2012a) and a few primarily conceptual studies (Souza, 2010, 2013; White, 2012, 2016); however, the conceptualizations are mainly related to SFL and AT. Table 1 provides an overview of the empirical part of AT research on translation. A few publications that could not be accessed in their full text (Munday, 2010; Pan, 2012; Zhang, 2002/2011) are not listed.

AT contributed to the research on translations differently. Some studies have adopted AT as their primary conceptual toolkit for their descriptions and/or classifications; some borrowed concepts and general classifications; others have complemented AT with other models and lenses. This has been specified in Table 1. Empirical chapters in Munday's book (Munday, 2012a) are listed separately due to their different focus and methodology. The table also highlights type and number of texts investigated, focus of the research, and its method of analysis, as well as a very brief look at their findings. However, only findings related to translational aspects are included, and other findings such as the evaluative features of STs are omitted.

Table 1. *An Overview of Research on Translation Using Appraisal Theory*

Author(s)	Texts/ Subjects	Focus of the Research	Role of AT— AT Systems Studied	Method of Analysis	Findings on TTs
Abbamonte and Cavaliere (2006)	1 UNICEF report & its TR	Stance-taking (affective and ideological)	Central in the first phase (Affect and Judgment) (+Implicitation)	Qualitative	TT became more distant, less emotional, more informational, and more committed.
Pérez-González (2007)	4 scenes of a movie with their translations (dubbing) <sup>a</sup>	Naturalness and interpersonal shifts	Complement. (Attitude as Appraisal telos)	Mixed	Neutralization of interpersonal dynamics and reduction of Appraisal in TT
Qian (2007) [in Chinese]	4 short perfume ads (case study)	Attitude resources	Central (Attitude)	Mixed	Increase in no. of Attitude markers, also shifting toward TL values
Munday (2009)	1 UN speech and its INTR.; 1 political booklet and its TR; a few text extracts	Interpersonal meaning and translators' decision-making and intervention	Central (Attitude and Graduation)	Qualitative	Distancing in political speech TT to downplay sensitive evaluation; change in power relation and gaps in writer-reader relations in TR of the booklet: TT less involved with its intended audience



Author(s)	Texts/ Subjects	Focus of the Research	Role of AT— AT Systems Studied	Method of Analysis	Findings on TTs
Souza (2010, 2013)	1 political commentary (blog post) and 2 TRs of it <sup>b</sup>	Attitudinal and dialogistic positioning	Central (all three systems)	Mixed	TTs “may elicit from the reader the instantiation of unexpected meanings which may disturb the intended reading” (2010, p. 247)
Arjani (2011, 2012)	100 pairs of dissertation abstracts in social and natural sciences	Explicit Attitude markers	Central (Attitude and Graduation)	Quantitative	Loss of evaluation in TTs; omission of explicit Attitude markers is the most common type of shift
Chen (2011)	26 newspaper commentaries and their TRs	Solidarity and intersubjective positioning	Complement. (Engagement) (+ van Dijk’s CDA)	Mixed	Different context models in TTs; Addition of heteroglossic resources to TTs; headlines and body more dialogically expansive in TTs: more solidarity in TTs
Lu and Chen (2011)	20 soft news items and their TRs	Reader involvement	Central (Engagement) (+ Nord’s text functions)	Mixed	TTs more appellative in function; more heteroglossic resources in TTs; addition of Deny and Counter; Acknowledge replaced with Endorse
Vandepitte, Vandebusschea, and Algoeta (2011)	1 chapter of a scientific book and 2 of its TRs	Certainty and epistemicity	Marginal (Epistemic modality)	Mixed	Shift of value toward more certainty in TTs; older TT has more, and larger, shifts
Munday (2012a, chap. 2)	Obama’s inauguration speech & 1 TR & 3 INTR of it	Appraisal, solidarity, critical points in translator decision-making	Central (all three systems) (+ deictic positioning)	Qualitative	Noncore lexis and invocation difficult for the translator/ interpreters; flattening or loss of intensification of the attitude in TTs; evaluation downscaled; more shift in invocation and less tangible lexis of evaluation; no increase in evaluation in TTs; modals are stable

Author(s)	Texts/ Subjects	Focus of the Research	Role of AT— AT Systems Studied	Method of Analysis	Findings on TTs
Munday (2012a, chap. 3)	Interview with 11 technical translators; samples from online TR query forums	Critical points in translator decision- making	Complement. (Attitude and Engagement)	Qualitative	Tendency of professional translators to explicate and disambiguate attitudinally rich items; more Graduation shift in adjectives; evaluative items critical in cases
Munday (2012a, chap. 4)	1 classic and its revised TR; samples of TR, revision and self-revision	Critical points in translator decision- making	Complement. (Attitude)	Mixed	Evaluation more prominent in revision; evaluative items critical in cases; loss of intensification of evaluation in TTs
Munday (2012a, chap. 5)	1 literary passage; 15 students (experiment)	(In)variability in TR and in Attitude resources	Central (Attitude and Graduation)	Mixed	Abstract evaluative nouns more prone to shift; Attitude adjective vary in TTs; salient words prone to more instability
Munday (2012b)	An EU parliament speech and its INTR and its later TR	Interpretation of evaluation in sensitive discourse	Central (Attitude, Graduation, and counter- expectancy lexis)	Qualitative	Loss (omission) of ideational content, Attitude, Graduation, and counter- expectancy lexis in INTR TTs; not the case in the TR TT
Munday (2012c)	A political speech and its translated subtitles (crowdsourced)	Decision- making and critical points	Central (Attitude, Graduation, and counter- expectancy lexis)	Qualitative	more variation in Graduation than in Attitude in TTs; downscaling of Graduation in TTs
Qian (2012)	Q&A section of a political speech and its TR	Translator's positioning	Central (Engagement)	Mixed	TT less friendly and more dialogically contracted: weakening of solidarity rel.
Rodrigues-Júnior and Barbara (2013)	10 Extracts of a novel and its TR and adaptations	Evaluative representation and construction of characters	Central (Engagement) (+narrative voice and POV)	Qualitative	TTs fail to capture evaluative nuances, partly due to cultural differences
Rosa (2013)	Some 500 sentences from three novels and 14 TRs of them	Shift of power of narrative voice	Complement. (Engagement) (+narrative theory & CDA)	Quantitative	TTs rendered the narrator less visible: less narrative power; more solidarity with readers; these were more intense for adult readership

Author(s)	Texts/ Subjects	Focus of the Research	Role of AT— AT Systems Studied	Method of Analysis	Findings on TTs
Zhang (2013)	4 news headlines on sensitive topics and their several transedited TTs	Stance and mediation	Central (Attitude: Judgment)	Quantitative	Addition and intensification of negative Judgment in TTs; lack of coverage or slow coverage of some events as a marker of stance
Al-Shunnag (2014)	10 newspaper opinion pieces on Arab Spring and their TRs	Stance	Complement. (all three systems) (+Biber's classification, Fairclough's CDA & Baker's socionarrative approach)	Mixed	Stance realized more through value-laden lexis than grammatical forms; frequent shift of stance, mostly weakened in TTs; cases of deliberate omission and intensification of stance
Pan (2014)	2 sensitive news reports and their TRs <sup>c</sup>	Stance and mediation	Complement. (Graduation) (+Baker's socionarrative approach & Fairclough's CDA)	Mixed	A pattern of change of Force and Focus toward being scaled-down and softened; conflict made ambiguous in TTs
Romagnuolo (2014)	4 political memos and their TRs <sup>d</sup>	Manipulation, evaluative language and voice positioning	Central (all three systems)	Qualitative	TTs became more biased, less factual and more dialogically closed and changed rhetorical purpose of ST, rendering it less effective
Mouka et al. (2015)	Samples of a subtitled corpus of 5 (9 hours of) racism-themed movies in two TLs <sup>e</sup>	Register shifts in racist discourse	Central (Attitude [modified] and <i>strength</i> [instead of Graduation]) (+corpus)	Qualitative	Instances of intensification, toning-down, or neutralization of the negative Attitude primarily realized through racial slurs; the general tendency is mitigation of racist Attitude
Munday (2015)	Extracts of different TRs of a UN meeting; INTR of an EP debate	Evaluation and translator/interpreter positioning	Central (Engagement & Graduation) (+ deictic positioning)	Qualitative	Instances of neutralization and standardization of positioning in TR TTs; distancing from deictic center; Downscaling of Graduation and shift in Judgment in INTR TTs;

Author(s)	Texts/ Subjects	Focus of the Research	Role of AT— AT Systems Studied	Method of Analysis	Findings on TTs
Pan (2015)	2 sets of sensitive news reports and their TRs	Ideological positioning	Central (Graduation) (+Fairclough's CDA)	Qualitative	Subjective 'deviation' of Force and Focus of news items toward an ideological agenda; subtle changes to textual positioning to invoke different evaluation
White (2016)	Opening paragraph of a novel and several TRs of it <sup>f</sup>	Variation in Register and Attitude	Complement. (invoked Attitude) (+ Register analysis)	Qualitative	Small variations in translations affects registerial and attitudinal profile of the TT, for instance portraying different degrees of intimacy between characters
Qian (2017)	5 public notices and their TRs	Differences in rendering evaluation	Central (Attitude and Engagement)	Mixed	Significantly different evaluation in TTs, partly due to cultural considerations

*Notes.* Abbreviations in the table—complement: complementary; ST: source text; TL: target language; TT: target text; INTR: (oral) interpretation; TR: translation; TRR: translator; POV: point of view.

<sup>a</sup>Souza's research is primarily conceptual and the detailed empirical part, which is on just one ST and two TTs, is to illustrate her conceptualization of translation as interlingual reinstantiation.

<sup>b</sup>The small size of the analyzed parts is because they serve to illustrate a proposed methodology.

<sup>c</sup>The small case study is used to illustrate a proposed analytical model.

<sup>d</sup>The paper consists of two parts. The first part includes a detailed discussion of many political memos to show manipulation of language toward political agenda. The number here indicates the memos analyzed in the second part focusing on translation of some of the memos.

<sup>e</sup>The paper mainly introduces an annotation scheme and the empirical part is an illustration using some extracts from their corpus.

<sup>f</sup>The small size of ST and TTs is because White aims to simply illustrate a methodology he proposes for investigating attitudinal and registerial variation.

Table 1 shows the variety of foci and approaches in studying evaluation in translation. As the number and volume of analyzed texts show, empirical analyses in several publications are limited in size, and where new methodologies or analytical models have been proposed, these are merely illustrated through a limited case study, and larger scale application of the models has not appeared yet. Therefore, the findings and results have remained limited, and it is difficult to draw generalizations at this stage. In addition, because no researcher has built on other applications of AT to translation and they have all pursued different lines of inquiry, the results and findings are not currently of much significance in comparison.

Early application of AT focused mostly on translation of (explicit) Attitude markers and their Graduation, and more attention was paid to Engagement resources in later research. A few of the publications have also tried to account for different

aspects of evaluation and consider all the three systems of AT. However, application of AT has not always been quite precise and complete. For example, Al-Shunnag (2014) uses AT in his functional analysis phase to look at shift of stance, but misses many instances of Graduation and Engagement, especially Disclaim resources, and uses sweeping categorizations for Attitude markers. Pan (2014, 2015) focuses only on Graduation, but casts its net too wide to discuss changes mostly in experiential content, and Pan (2015) misses instances of Engagement and other AT resources in the examples he provides. Partial marking of Attitude can also be seen in Qian (2007), among others, who misses several instances of Affect that are not realized as adjectives.

Another issue common to the majority of publications is that they are not transparent about aspects of their methods, especially coding criteria and procedures. In particular, in most of the publications, even those with quantification, it is not clear how overlapping categories and double-coding are dealt with. On the other hand, when an aspect of evaluation or a system of AT is focused on, there is usually little mention of how it interacts with other aspects or systems to create an evaluative orientation in the text and how (necessarily) partial the provided picture is. This, for instance, can be observed in Pan (2015) who studies positioning but bases his discussion on Graduation without looking at Engagement resources or acknowledging their role. As a different example, Abbamonte and Cavaliere (2006), who analyze a UNICEF report and its translation, do not point to the fact their source text is loaded with visual features, such as photos that have a significant role in the function of the text and appealing to the readers. Another point worth mentioning is that in cases where several Appraisal systems are investigated separately, an integrated view of the results is lacking.

These points do not serve to attack or discredit the body of research and their findings, but rather highlight the need to address these limitations and move toward more comprehensive and accurate integration of new lenses into the field of TS. Other aspects of the literature are discussed below.

### ***3.1. Languages Involved***

Research on translation from the perspective of AT has focused on different language pairs. Expectedly, English is the most frequent language in the language pairs, but it also exists in all pairs and is the dominant source language, as well. Excluding languages that have been merely used in a few examples, the language pairs involved in research on translation informed by AT are presented below, ordered first by frequency, then alphabetically:

- English > Spanish (Mouka et al., 2015; Munday, 2009, 2010; 2012a, chap. 2; 2012b, 2012c; Pérez-González, 2007)

- English > Chinese (Lu & Chen, 2011; Pan, 2012, 2014, 2015; Qian, 2007 [in Chinese]; Zhang, 2002/2011 [in Chinese], 2013)
- English > Brazilian Portuguese (Rodrigues-Júnior & Barbara, 2013; Souza, 2010, 2013)
- French > English (Munday, 2012a, chap. 4; White, 2012, 2016)
- Chinese > English (Chen, 2011; Qian, 2017)
- English > Italian (Abbamonte & Cavaliere, 2006; Romagnuolo, 2014)
- Spanish > English (Munday, 2010; 2012a, chaps. 4 & 5)
- Persian > English (Arjani, 2011, 2012)
- English > Arabic (Al-Shunnag, 2014)
- English > Dutch (Vandepitte et al., 2011)
- English > Greek (Mouka et al., 2015)
- English > Portuguese (Rosa, 2013)
- Latin > English (Munday, 2012a, chap. 4)

Munday (2015) also studies extracts of translations from English to Arabic, Spanish, French, and German. As the above list shows, English > Spanish and English > Chinese translations were the most frequent pairs in the analyses, followed by English > Brazilian Portuguese. It is worth noting that authors with several publications can be seen in the most frequent pairs.

### **3.2. *Genres and Text Types Investigated***

The research on AT in TS has focused on a variety of genres and text types in translation, including:

- Newspaper reports, stories, and commentaries (hard, soft; Al-Shunnag, 2014; Chen, 2011; Lu & Chen, 2011; Pan, 2012, 2014, 2015; Zhang, 2013)
- Literary texts (fiction; Munday, 2012a, chaps. 4 & 5; Rodrigues-Júnior & Barbara, 2013; Rosa, 2013; White, 2016; Zhang, 2002/2011)
- Official reports and documents (Abbamonte & Cavaliere, 2006; Munday, 2009, 2015; Romagnuolo, 2014)
- Academic, scientific, and technical texts (Arjani, 2011, 2012; Munday, 2012a, chap. 3; Vandepitte et al., 2011)
- Dubbed and subtitled film dialogues (Mouka et al., 2015; Pérez-González, 2007)

- Speeches by political figures (Munday, 2009, 2010, 2012a, chap. 2, 2012c, 2015; Qian, 2012)
- Advertisements and public notices (Munday, 2009; Qian, 2007, 2017)
- Political commentary (blog posts; Souza, 2010, 2013)

As for the mode of the materials analyzed, the majority of studies has focused on translations of written texts; a few publications deal with (oral) interpretations (Munday, 2009, 2010, 2012a, 2012b); and three articles focus on dubbed or subtitled movies and other audiovisual materials (Mouka et al., 2015; Munday, 2012c; Pérez-González, 2007), although the audiovisual features and constraints of the medium are mainly not taken into consideration and the transcriptions/subtitles are investigated textually. White (2012) uses the translation of a small set of words in a panel of a cartoon to advance a theoretical discussion. Except for Munday's research, interpreting and interpretation seem to be still unexplored regarding attitudinal and dialogic positioning<sup>vi</sup>. It has to be noted, however, that the current research focused on publications within the scope of TS and not interpreting studies, although, other than the ones cited, no other applications of AT in the latter were found.

### ***3.3. Terminology Used/Proposed for Evaluation and Shift of Evaluation***

Different descriptive terms or labels were used in the literature to show the focus of the analysis and the treatment of changes of evaluation in the course of translation. Interestingly, the descriptive labels used are so varied that it might hint at distinct approaches. While the approaches have treated different issues, there are certainly overlaps and similarities, but such similarities are hidden behind the variety of terms used to describe semantic aspects investigated in the texts. These labels and descriptive terms are important and serve as frames that reflect the authors' approaches and points of interest. A sample of these is presented in Table 2, ordered chronologically. Obviously, these terms do not reflect the entire focus of the listed research:

Table 2. *Descriptive Terminology in Studies of Evaluation in Translation*

Author(s)	Descriptive Terminology Used/Proposed
Zhang (2002/2011)	Attitudinal positioning
Abbamonte and Cavaliere (2006)	Affective positioning
Pérez-González (2007)	Interpersonal shifts (proposed) (of mood telos and appraisal telos)
Qian (2007)	Deviation of attitude
Munday (2009)	Evaluative rich points (proposed)
Souza (2010)	Attitudinal positioning Dialogic positioning

---

	Coupling and commitment of Appraisal
	Differences in the use of appraisal resources
Arjani (2011)	Changes in Attitude markers
	Changes in Graduation markers
Chen (2011)	Intersubjective positioning shifts
Lu and Chen (2011)	Mediation of reader involvement
	Dissimilar source and target text functions
Vandepitte et al. (2011)	Shift in epistemic stance
Munday (2012a)	Value-rich points (proposed)
	Critical points (proposed)
	“Invoked-associative” Attitude (proposed)
	“Translator voice” (proposed)
Qian (2012)	Translator’s positioning
	Speaker’s changed positioning
Rosa (2013)	Power of voice (in fiction)
	Narrator’s power (in fiction)
Zhang (2013)	Stance and mediation
Al-Shunnag (2014)	Stance patterns (lexicogrammatical)
	Shifts in stance (proposed)
Pan (2014)	Deviation of evaluation
	Deviation patterns
	Mediation (in news translation)
Pan (2015)	Ideological positioning
	Evaluation deviations
Romagnuolo (2014)	Changes in the textual voice positioning (among others)
Mouka et al. (2015)	Translators’ stance-taking tendencies
	Register shifts
Munday (2015)	Translator/interpreter positioning
	Evaluative positioning
White (2016)	Registerial and attitudinal variability (under translation)

---

*Note.* Some of these terms and descriptions are proposed (marked inside the table).

Positioning, used in different phrases, is the most frequent word in the descriptive titles used, as in attitudinal positioning and dialogic positioning. Shift also seems to be favored by several researchers to describe changes of evaluation in the course of translation. Whereas, in most of the publications, the terms are taken to be transparent and obvious, little effort has been made to clearly define and delimit them and to show the areas that fall in or out of their conceptual scope. Even similar methods and foci are represented by different terminology, and while several studies have similar, overlapping foci, there is an abundance of terminology used or even proposed, and this lack of terminological consensus has a role in the fragmentation of the area of study. Terminological variability and inconsistencies coupled with



certain terminological/conceptual issues such as using inaccurate terms and ambiguous concepts and interchangeable use of different terms raise concerns over the epistemological status of this body of research. For instance, a few times, Munday treats semantic prosody and evaluative/interpersonal prosody as the same (e.g., Munday, 2012a), while the focus and scope of the two concepts are different (cf. Hood, 2010)<sup>vii</sup>. A detailed account and critique of such terminological/conceptual issues falls out of the scope of the current study.

### ***3.4. Methodologies and Analytical Models***

Whereas some studies drawing on AT in TS have used the theory to mark evaluative resources in their comparative analyses, focusing on isolated extracts or examples, some others have proposed models or methodologies for studying aspects of evaluation in different genres, using different tools and integrating AT into their analysis, complementing it with additional lenses, theoretical frameworks, and conceptual toolkits. This section briefly reviews the more elaborate methodologies used or models of analysis proposed in the TS literature drawing on AF. The findings, a summary of which was presented in Table 1, are not a focus of this section, as our interest here is methodological. Certain limitations of some approaches are briefly pointed to but not elaborated due to space constraints. The list is chronological.

Chen (2011) uses van Dijk's sociocognitive CDA approach (e.g., van Dijk, 2008) to compare context models of ST and TT, and then carries out a textual analysis of Engagement resources in the ST and the TT in comparison to identify intersubjective positioning shifts. The textual analysis uses quantification to compare such positioning, but illustrative examples and a discussion of shifts are also added.

Munday (2012a) uses AT along with deictic positioning to study evaluation in a political inauguration speech. After providing the context, he first focuses on realizations of Affect, tabulating and discussing them. Then, Judgment is dealt with, followed by Appreciation. Afterward, provoked evaluation and lexical metaphors are discussed. Graduation resources are analyzed next, followed by a discussion of counter-expectancy indicators. Finally, use of Engagement modals is compared. The next section in the chapter takes Chilton's (2004) deictic positioning and applies it to the text, linking the results to the previous section.

As part of a methodology for semiautomatic quantitative analysis of fiction in translation, Rosa (2013) draws insights from literary narrative theory (speech and thought representation; e.g., Leech & Short, 1981), CDA (discourse representation and ideology; Fairclough, 1995), and AT (Engagement system) to develop a classification for tracing power of voice. She sees dialogic contraction in the

representation of characters as more narrative power and visibility and less solidarity with the readers, whereas dialogic expansion means less narrative power and visibility and more solidarity with the readers. She does not provide much information on the actual steps and procedure of her semiautomatic methodology, but basically uses binary distinction, quantifications, and comparison to juxtapose narrative power and solidarity in the ST and TT. She adds the variable of readership type (adult vs. child/teenage) to further distinguish the results. Her analysis, as declared, is textual-linguistic, but independent variables such as contextual factors are considered to interpret the results.

The methodology in Al-Shunnag (2014) who tries to account for shift of stance in a political corpus consists of three stages: In the first stage, lexicogrammatical categorizations of stance markers proposed by Biber and his colleagues (e.g., Biber, 2006; Biber & Finegan, 1988) are used to quantify instances and to provide an account of different realizations of stance in the STs and TTs. Then, in a qualitative analysis, functions of different instances of stance (at the unit of a sentence usually) are discussed using AT resources. Different functions are marked in each chunk and discussed in the ST, then in the TT compared to the ST. The discussions are also informed by some aspects of CDA (e.g., Fairclough, 1992) and the socionarrative theory (e.g., Baker, 2006). A further quantification is used at the end of the discussions to show the frequency of shifts of stance toward being weakened, accentuated, or lost in the course of translation. The quantification is simply based on the number of such shifts and the total number of instances of stance. However, the demarcation of stance is problematic in the work, hence the quantification, and the use of AT is partial and provides a limited and incomplete view of the evaluative function of the texts.

Pan (2014) proposes an analytical framework for studying stance in media discourse, structured based on Fairclough's CDA approach (e.g., Fairclough, 1998). The first stage is the description, which is lexicogrammatical analysis. The analysis is carried out through four procedures: identification, classification, distinction, and quantification. The identification is based on some framing features in Baker's socionarrative approach (e.g., Baker, 2006), although there are problems with the categories. The classification is made according to the deviations of those framing features (labeling deviation, ambiguity deviation, and selective appropriation deviation). Next, deviations are marked based on Graduation resources (Force and Focus). The last procedure is a quantification of such deviations and observing trends. The second stage entails interpretation of such evaluative features and deviations at the discourse production level (stance). The last stage is the explanation that relates the previous stages to the sociocultural practice and ideology. While the three stages are based on Fairclough's approach, the description

stage (text analysis) has several limitations. For instance, using Baker's socionarrative approach to classify instances and find patterns is not compatible with the approach (e.g., see Baker, 2014). A modified and simplified version of the analytical framework is presented in Pan (2015) labeled as "analytical model of evaluation and positioning in news translation" (p. 220). The difference is that the narrative theory and the four procedures are omitted. In the description stage (text analysis), deviation of evaluation is identified through a combination of Graduation and news elements (deviations in identifying news actors, deviations in presenting news events, and deviation in dissimulating representations) and the second and third stages are similar. Still, focusing merely on Graduation, without paying proper attention to other AT systems and the role of Graduation in propagating prosodies, seems to offer a partial view of evaluative positioning.

Mouka et al. (2015) develop a corpus annotation scheme importing from AF. The scheme includes Attitude subsystems (Affect, Judgment, and Appreciation), and features of Attitude such as explicitness, ironical meaning, directness, polarity, and strength are included. Different software programs are used to annotate the corpus of movie dialogue transcriptions and their translations. They use this annotation scheme to analyze translational shifts of register, and use reference corpora to support their marking of Attitude features. While the methodology is detailed and sound, their paper does not demonstrate its application properly and merely provides examples of certain shifts of register (which are not necessarily shifts of register) in their corpus and does not provide the corpus-driven data that the methodology seeks to uncover. This seems to be because of the fact that the publication is part of an ongoing research.

The methodologies and models described above show much potential, especially in having triangulated their analytical lenses and drawn on different conceptual toolkits and explanatory framework. In practice, however, some of them were imprecise in importing from those toolkits and frameworks and some others failed to operationalize their models properly. The next section is an attempt to combine the findings of different publications on AT in TS.

### ***3.5. A General View of the Findings***

A summary of the findings of the research applying AT to translation was presented in Table 1. Here, we aim to put aside the bibliographic details and try to bring together the findings of this body of research. Different studies introduced above have shown that evaluations, more specifically appraisal resources, are subject to shifts in translation and interpretation, especially where there is processing pressure, a greater weight is given to ideational content or ideological differences arise. Attitude was intensified, added, downscaled, or omitted; Graduation instances were omitted, added, intensified, or downscaled; Engagement resource were

omitted, or added, shifting in number and type and rendering the text more dialogistically open or closed. Such findings show an openness of possibilities to what may happen to evaluation in the course of translation.

Different patterns and trends identified in the empirical research were looked at to provide a relatively more general view of what evaluation undergoes in translation and the more probable factors contributing to it. The list provided below omits references to the literature as some items bring together findings of several publications. However, the information in the sections above can be used to get more detailed information on each item:

- Under processing pressure, for instance, in simultaneous interpretation, Attitude and Graduation are scaled-down and reduced. This is due to more weight given to ideational content and a result of explication of complex or abstract evaluative words.
- In translating official or organizational documents into languages with different generic conventions, evaluation, particularly Attitude and Engagement, shifts toward TL conventions. Examples in the literature have shown examples of shifting toward a less emotional, more distant language, and, in one case, a less involved one.
- In translation of appellative texts, evaluative resources shift toward TL readers' values and expectations, not only in their intensity, but also in their type and frequency. Examples in the literature have shown an increase of Attitude markers in advertisement and expansion of dialogic space (Engagement) in soft news translation.
- In translation of sensitive content in an institutional context, such as that of a news corporation, the institutional value orientation and ideology as well as a consideration of target readers' (audience) cultural values dictate what evaluation undergoes in the course of translation. Examples in the literature have shown that in translations of foreign perspectives on local issues, which are not necessarily compatible with the ideological orientation of the institution or TL cultural values, for local readers, evaluation tends to get neutralized or reframed, hiding the incompatible aspects of the event and evaluation of its participants. Intensification of compatible (favorable) evaluation can also be expected in such a context. In extreme cases where the ST topic or content might be insulting or abusive toward TL community, negative evaluation toward the insulter might be added and intensified in government-affiliated institutions, instances of omission (censoring) of certain ideologically conflicting aspects and voices are also expected. On the other hand, in offering translations of local news (local

events) to foreign readers, institutions tend to consider the TL readers and accommodate their viewpoints, offering TTs that are more tolerant and more dialogically open.

- When translating scientific texts, more emphasis is given to ideational content and the TTs tend to become more factual and more certain; therefore, more probable epistemic modals are used and evaluative and interactive nature of the STs is reduced in the TTs.
- In audiovisual translation, for instance, dubbing or subtitling, less weight is given to the spontaneous, interactive, and attitudinal meaning of the text, and other semantic aspects and medium considerations are prioritized.
- In literary translation (fiction), there is a tendency to shift the dialogic space of the narrative toward more solidarity with readers, an influence from the dominant poetics and discursive norms.
- In revising literary texts, ideological stance and subjectivity of the reviser as well as considerations of readability of the text direct the rendering of evaluation in the TTs. These might include explication of invoked Attitude.
- Nonprofessional or amateur translators focus more on information content of the ST, rather than its attitudinal, dialogic nature. This has been observed in crowdsourced subtitles and in academic translations.
- In (political) interpreting, modals tend to be stable.
- In interpreting, insults or verbal attacks are toned down, which seems to be a risk-minimizing strategy.
- In case of translation of insults, attacks, or racial slurs, the tendency is to tone down or omit such instances, although intensification, with a lower frequency, might also be observed.

It must be emphasized that these observations and findings have arisen in studies of different language pairs, contexts, fields, and genres and in research with different scopes, amount of data, and scale. Moreover, patterns are reductionist in most cases and ignore nonsystematic, fragmented instances. Therefore, similar findings cannot be yet generalized or turned into hypotheses because much more varied, large scale empirical research has to be carried out. However, the above descriptions can be used as a point of departure to be tested by researchers interested in gaining better insights into the nature of translation, as a product and a process, and also of appraisal across sociocultural contexts. Then, we might be able to arrive at certain explanatory hypotheses.

#### 4. Concluding Remarks

There is a lot of potential for research on appraisal in TS, especially when AT is used in a triangulation of lenses and complementary frameworks. Such potentials, however, remain mostly untapped at this stage, partly because the area of inquiry is relatively new to TS and most research still moves in different directions. Consideration of the overall effect of changes of evaluation in the course of translation on the target text and its reception by target audience has not been yet focused on. It is also important to see how the translation functions in the target (sociocultural) environment, where a different system of value is at work giving a different significance to evaluative resources. Furthermore, a lot of research has focused mostly on differences between the source and target texts, while the points of similarity are as important when considering an overall picture of the text (cf. Chesterman, 2007). While effort has been made to highlight the role of the translators in the process of translation, many analyses are textually oriented, and sociological and cognitive factors are still underexplored. It is also important to study evaluative behavior in larger sets of text to be able to gain an understanding of the working of evaluation in translation at higher levels in the cline of instantiation (e.g., evaluative key).

We believe that critical reading of, and building on, the literature, testing previous findings, and carrying out larger scale studies to put forward explanatory hypotheses and predictions for evaluative behavior in translation, as well as a more active involvement with the theory will foster progress and grant richer insights into the nature of evaluation and the role of translators as mediators of evaluation in translation; therefore, we look forward to more contributions to this fascinating area of study that deals with emotions, values, and viewpoints across languages and cultures.

#### Notes

<sup>i</sup>St. Jerome Publishing (now defunct) started Translation Studies Abstracts (TSA) in 1988 and it ran in print as well for a few years. TSA was later acquired by Routledge, and in 2015 was acquired and merged with John Benjamin's online Translation Studies Bibliography, now accessible at <https://benjamins.com/online/tsb/>

<sup>ii</sup>There have been inconsistencies in labeling appraisal as both a theory and a framework, partly due the involvement of several scholars who hold different perspectives in this regard. The best-know publication on AT (Martin & White, 2005) uses it without any label in its title (*The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*), which is also the dominant form of reference in the book; however, there are also mentions of "appraisal theory" (e.g., p. xi) and "appraisal framework" (e.g., p. 208), and appraisal is also labeled a "model of evaluation" (p. 7, emphasis added). The encyclopedia entry by White (2015) is entitled "Appraisal Theory," but in a recent publication, Martin (2017) notes:

. . . colleagues working with APPRAISAL, and I include myself among them, have made countless references to 'Appraisal Theory' in presentations and publications, as a short-hand

for a ‘description of APPRAISAL resources in English within the general theoretical framework of SFL’. We need to be more careful. (p. 23)

and keeps with “appraisal” and “appraisal resources” in the paper. Here, we have consistently used the more popular appraisal theory (AT) as the term of reference. Appraisal is also used synonymously with evaluation as seen through the lens of AT.

<sup>iii</sup>Whereas attempts have been made to find and include as many publications on translation drawing on AT as possible, it has to be acknowledged that except for a few publications in Chinese (cited by Munday in his publications), research in languages other than English (as their medium) are not included here. There are, of course, several publications on translations from and into other languages, introduced above. In addition, unlike many outsiders to the discipline of TS who regard translations as (merely) close textual correspondence, we have not narrowed the notion of translation here. Therefore, the cited research include studies of adaptations, transedited pieces, dubbing, and so on; however, comparative research (of original texts of similar genre in different languages) falls out of the scope of the current review and we have excluded conference presentations.

<sup>iv</sup>There are also other TS publications that, while not having used AT, have recommended it to TS researchers, for example, Holland (2013) and Lefer and Grabar (2015).

<sup>v</sup>To support this claim of low prominence, we can provide as an example *The Bibliography of Appraisal, Stance, and Evaluation*, compiled and updated by Professor Monika Bednarek (Bednarek, 2015), one of the prolific authors on AT, who does not include any of the application of AT to TS. However, we see the fragmentation as a consequence and, at the same time, a cause of starting from ground zero and not building on the literature, whereas similarities in foci and directions are many.

<sup>vi</sup>Tebble (2014) also briefly reports on having applied AT in an interpreter training setting.

<sup>vii</sup>Souza (2015) points to some of such issues in Munday’s book (Munday, 2012a), too.

## References

- Abbamonte, L., & Cavaliere, F. (2006). Lost in translation: The Italian rendering of UNICEF “The State of the World’s Children 2004” report. In M. Gotti & S. Šarčević (Eds.), *Insights into specialized translation* (pp. 235-258). Berg: Peter Lang.
- Al-Shunnag, M. (2014). *Stance in political discourse: Arabic translations of American newspaper opinion articles on the ‘Arab Spring.’* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Salford.
- Arjani, S. H. (2011). *Attitudinal markers in translations of M.A. and Ph.D. dissertation abstracts.* Unpublished master’s thesis, Allameh Tabataba’i University, Tehran, Iran.
- Arjani, S. H. (2012). Attitudinal markers in translations of dissertation abstracts in social and natural sciences. *Translation Studies Quarterly*, 36, 9-26.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In other words: A coursebook on translation.* London: Routledge.
- Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and conflict: A narrative account.* London: Routledge.

- Baker, M. (2014). Translation as renarration. In J. House (Ed.), *Translation: A multidisciplinary approach* (pp. 158-177). UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bassnett, S. (1998). The cultural turn in translation studies. In S. Bassnett & A. Lefevere (Eds.), *Constructing cultures: Essays on literary translation* (pp. 123-140). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bassnett, S., & Lefevere, A. (Eds.). (1990). *Translation, history, and culture*. London: Pinter.
- Bednarek, M. (2006). *Evaluation in media discourse: Analysis of a newspaper corpus*. New York: Continuum.
- Bednarek, M. (2015). *Bibliography of appraisal, stance, and evaluation*. Retrieved October 3, 2015, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.monikabednarek.com/downloads>
- Biber, D. (2006). *University language: A corpus-based study of spoken and written registers*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Biber, D., & Finegan, E. (1988). Adverbial stance types in English. *Discourse Processes*, 11(1), 1-34.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation: An essay in applied linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Chen, Y.-M. (2011). The ideological construction of solidarity in translated newspaper commentaries: Context models and intersubjective positioning. *Discourse & Society*, 22(6), 693-722.
- Chesterman, A. (2007). Similarity analysis and the translation profile. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 21, 53-66.
- Chesterman, A. (2009). The name and nature of translator studies. *Hermes—Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, 42, 13-22.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Delabastita, D. (2005). Research in translation between paralysis and pretence. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 51, 33-49.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). Discourse representation in media discourse. In N. Fairclough (Ed.), *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (pp. 54-69). London: Longman.



- Fairclough, N. (1998). Political discourse in the media: An analytical framework. In B. Allan & P. Garrett (Eds.), *Approaches to media discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Greenall, A. K. (2013). Evaluation in translation: critical points of translator decision-making [Review]. *Perspectives*, 21(4), 614-616.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: Routledge.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the translator*. London and New York: Longman.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.
- Hermans, T. (Ed.). (1985/2014). *The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation*. New York: Routledge.
- Holland, R. (2013). News translation. In C. Millán & F. Bartrina (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of translation studies* (pp. 332-346). London: Routledge.
- Hood, S. (2010). *Appraising research: Evaluation in academic writing*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- House, J. (1997). *Translation quality assessment: A model revisited*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Leech, G. N., & Short, M. H. (1981). *Style in fiction. A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose*. London: Longman.
- Lefer, M.-A., & Grabar, N. (2015). *Super-creative and overbureaucratic: A cross-genre corpus-based study on the use and translation of evaluative prefixation in TED talks and EU parliamentary debates*. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 16(2), 187-208.
- Lefevere, A. (1993). Discourses on translation: Recent, less recent, and to come. *Target*, 5(2), 229-241.
- Lu, G.-H., & Chen, Y.-M. (2011). The mediation of reader involvement in soft news transediting. *Translation & Interpreting*, 3(2), 48-66.
- Martin, J. R. (2017). The discourse semantics of attitudinal relations: Continuing the study of lexis. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 21(1), 22-47.
- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2003/2007). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Continuum.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Mouka, E., Saridakis, I. E., & Fotopoulou, A. (2015). Racism goes to the movies: A corpus-driven study of cross-linguistic racist discourse annotation and translation analysis. In C. Fantinuoli & F. Zanettin (Eds.), *New directions in corpus-based translation studies* (pp. 35-70). Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Munday, J. (2009). The concept of the interpersonal in translation. *SYNAPS*, 23, 15-27.
- Munday, J. (2010). Evaluation and intervention in translation. In M. Baker, M. Olohan, & M. Calzada (Eds.), *Text and context: Essays on translation and interpreting in honour of Ian Mason* (pp. 77-94). Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Munday, J. (2012a). *Evaluation in translation: Critical points of translator decision-making*. London: Routledge.
- Munday, J. (2012b). The expression of attitude in translation. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 65, 101-114.
- Munday, J. (2012c). New directions in discourse analysis for translation: A study of decision-making in crowdsourced subtitles of Obama's 2012 State of the Union speech. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 12(4), 321-334.
- Munday, J. (2015). Engagement and graduation resources as markers of translator/interpreter positioning. *Target*, 27(3), 406-421.
- Pan, L. (2012). *Stance mediation in news translation: A case study of sensitive discourse on China 2008*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Macau.
- Pan, L. (2014). Mediation in news translation: A critical analytical framework. In D. Abend-David (Ed.), *Media and translation: An interdisciplinary approach* (pp. 246-265). New York: Continuum.
- Pan, L. (2015). Ideological positioning in news translation: A case study of evaluative resources in reports on China. *Target*, 2(27), 215-237.
- Pérez-González, L. (2007). Appraising dubbed conversation: Systemic functional insights into the construal of naturalness in translated film dialogue. *The Translator*, 13(1), 1-38.
- Qian, H. (2007). Investigating "unfaithful" translations via the appraisal theory: A case study on perfume ads translation. *Journal of Foreign Languages*, 6, 57-63.
- Qian, H. (2012). Investigating translators' positioning via the appraisal theory: A case study of the Q&A part of a speech delivered by the U.S. Vice President Cheney. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 9(12), 1775-1787.

- Qian, H. (2017). Investigating “unfaithful” translations via the appraisal theory: A case study of public notices. *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies*, 1(1), 187-200.
- Reiss, K., & Vermeer, H. J. (1984). *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationslehre*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Rodrigues-Júnior, A. S., & Barbara, L. (2013). Linguistic constructions of appraisal in the novel the picture of Dorian Gray and its Brazilian translation and adaptations: An exploratory analysis. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*, 13(1), 259-285.
- Romagnuolo, A. (2014). (Re)interpreting human rights: The case of the “torture memos” and their translation into Italian. *Humanities*, 3, 313-339.
- Rosa, A. A. (2013). The power of voice in translated fiction: Or, following a linguistic track in translation studies. In C. Way, S. Vandepitte, R. Meylaerts, & M. Bartłomiejczyk (Eds.), *Tracks and treks in translation studies* (pp. 223-245). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Schäffner, C. (2013). Evaluation in translation: Critical points of translator decision-making [Review]. *Translation Studies*, 6(3), 355-357.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *The turns of translation studies: New paradigms or shifting viewpoints?* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Souza, L. M. F. (2010). *Interlingual reinstantiation: A model for a new and more comprehensive systemic functional perspective on translation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.
- Souza, L. M. F. (2013). Interlingual reinstantiation—a new systemic functional perspective on translation. *Text & Talk*, 23(4-5), 575-594.
- Souza, L. M. F. (2015). Evaluation in Translation: Critical points of translator decision-making [Review]. *Cadernos de Tradução*, 35(2), 441-455.
- Steiner, E. (1998). A register-based translation evaluation: An advertisement as a case in point. *Target*, 10(2), 291-318.
- Tebble, H. (2014). A genre-based approach to teaching dialogue interpreting: the medical consultation. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 8(3), 418-436.
- Thompson, G. (2014). Affect and emotion, target-value mismatches, and Russian dolls: Refining the appraisal model. In G. Thompson & L. Alba-Juez (Eds.), *Evaluation in context* (pp. 47-66). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Thompson, G., & Hunston, S. (2000). Evaluation: An introduction. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse* (pp. 1-27). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thomson, E., & White, P. R. R. (Eds.). (2008). *Communicating conflict: Multilingual case studies of the news media*. London: Continuum.
- Toury, G. (2012). *Descriptive translation studies—And beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Vandepitte, S., Vandebussche, L., & Algoeta, B. (2011). Travelling certainties: Darwin's doubts and their Dutch translations. *The Translator*, 17(2), 275-299.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, P. R. R. (2012). Attitudinal meanings, translational commensurability and linguistic relativity. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 65, 147-159.
- White, P. R. R. (2015). Appraisal theory. In K. Tracy (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of language and social interaction* (pp. 1-7). Hoboken, U.S.A: Wiley-Blackwell.
- White, P. R. R. (2016). Constructing the “stranger” in Camus’ L’Etranger: Registerial and attitudinal variability under translation. *The Journal of Translation Studies*, 17(4), 75-106.
- Zhang, M. (2002/2011). The language of appraisal and the translator’s attitudinal positioning. In J. Y. Zhang (Ed.), *Functional linguistics and translation studies* (pp. 180-190). Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Zhang, M. (2013). Stance and mediation in transediting news headlines as paratexts. *Perspectives*, 21(3), 396-411.