

## EVALUATIVE LANGUAGE IN TOURISM DISCOURSE: AN APPRAISAL ANALYSIS OF AN ESP TEXTBOOK

NGUYEN QUANG NGOAN\* - TRAN MINH CHUONG\*\*

**ABSTRACT:** This study examines evaluative language in tourism discourse using the Appraisal framework (Martin & White, 2005), based on a corpus of reading texts from an English for Tourism ESP textbook. Using a combination of qualitative and quantitative analysis, the study explores how evaluative resources - Affect, Judgment, and Appreciation - are distributed across multiple discourse types, including informational, promotional, advisory, complaint-based, user-generated, institutional, professional, expert, case-based, and trend-analysis texts. The findings show that Appreciation is the dominant resource, particularly in promotional and informational discourse, where it constructs value and attractiveness, while Affect is most prominent in user-generated reviews, reflecting subjective experience, and Judgment plays a key role in evaluating human behavior in service contexts. The study also highlights the role of Graduation and Engagement in intensifying evaluation and enhancing credibility, especially in expert and data-driven discourse. A clear pedagogical progression is identified, moving from descriptive and promotional texts to evaluative, problem-solving, and analytical discourse. This demonstrates how evaluative language is systematically distributed across discourse types within a pedagogical framework and contributes to both Appraisal Theory and ESP research.

**KEY WORDS:** Tourism discourse; evaluative language; Appraisal Theory; ESP textbooks; discourse types.

RECEIVED: March, 26<sup>th</sup>, 2026.

EDITED: June, 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2026

### 1. Introduction

Tourism has become one of the most dynamic sectors of the global economy, facilitating increasing interactions among people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. In this context, language plays a crucial role in shaping how destinations, services, and experiences are presented to potential travelers. Tourism discourse does not merely convey information but also performs persuasive and promotional functions, highlighting the attractiveness and uniqueness of destinations (Dann, 1996; Thurlow & Jaworski, 2010). Previous studies have shown that tourism discourse is inherently evaluative, employing positive descriptions and persuasive strategies to construct appealing images of places and experiences (Jalilifar & Moradi, 2019; Mocini, 2013).

A substantial body of research has examined tourism discourse in promotional materials such as brochures, advertisements, and tourism websites (Dann, 1996; Jalilifar & Moradi, 2019). However, tourism discourse is not limited to such contexts; it also appears in educational materials, particularly in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) textbooks designed for tourism education. These textbooks play an important role in developing learners' communicative competence by exposing them to discourse practices in professional contexts. In applied linguistics, textbooks are recognized as important sites of discourse construction, reflecting cultural values and social representations (Curdts-Christiansen & Weninger, 2015). In the Vietnamese context, systemic functional approaches have also been used to examine textbook discourse (e.g., Nhu Y & Thu Hien, 2021).

A useful framework for analyzing evaluative language is Appraisal Theory within Systemic Functional Linguistics (Martin & White, 2005), which accounts for Attitude, Engagement, and Graduation. While this framework has been widely applied in tourism and media discourse, as well

\*Assoc. Prof.; Quy Nhon University; Email: [nguyenquangngoan@qnu.edu.vn](mailto:nguyenquangngoan@qnu.edu.vn)

\*\*Quy Nhon University; Email: [tranminhchuong@qnu.edu.vn](mailto:tranminhchuong@qnu.edu.vn)

as in Vietnamese studies on evaluative meaning (Quy Khuong & Thuy Nhu, 2018; Thu Hien, 2016), relatively little attention has been paid to its application in tourism ESP textbooks.

Addressing this gap, the present study examines evaluative language in tourism discourse as represented in the ESP textbook *English for International Tourism - Pre-Intermediate* (Dubicka & O’Keeffe, 2013), a widely used coursebook published by Pearson as part of an ESP series for tourism and hospitality training. It is used as a foundational module within a sequence of tourism English courses for English language majors at Quy Nhon University and integrates language skills with professional communication tasks such as booking, customer service, and tour design, thereby reflecting authentic practices in the tourism industry.

The analysis focuses on reading texts from Units 1 to 6, which are used in the course English for Tourism 1. By applying the Appraisal framework, the study aims to reveal how tourism-related meanings are linguistically constructed in this pedagogical context. In doing so, it contributes to both Appraisal Theory and ESP research by offering a systematic account of how evaluative language is distributed across multiple discourse types.

## **2. Literature review**

### **2.1. Appraisal Theory and Evaluative Meaning**

Appraisal Theory, developed within Systemic Functional Linguistics by Martin and White (2005), provides a comprehensive framework for analyzing evaluative language in discourse. It extends Halliday’s interpersonal metafunction by accounting for how speakers and writers express attitudes, negotiate positions, and align with audiences. The framework comprises three main subsystems: Attitude (including Affect, Judgment, and Appreciation), Engagement (dialogic positioning), and Graduation (scaling of intensity and prototypicality). Within Attitude, more fine-grained distinctions are made, such as subcategories of Appreciation (e.g., Valuation and Reaction) and Judgment (e.g., Capacity, Propriety, and Tenacity), which allow for a more detailed analysis of evaluative meaning.

Previous studies have demonstrated that Appraisal Theory is particularly effective in analyzing evaluative patterns across a wide range of genres, including media discourse, academic writing, and professional communication (Hyland, 2005). Importantly, research also suggests that evaluative resources are not uniformly distributed but vary according to discourse type and communicative purpose (Bednarek, 2009). This makes Appraisal Theory especially suitable for examining tourism discourse, where different genres—such as promotional texts, user-generated reviews, and professional communication—employ distinct evaluative strategies.

### **2.2. Tourism Discourse as Evaluative and Persuasive**

Tourism discourse has been widely characterized as inherently evaluative and persuasive. Rather than providing neutral descriptions of places, it constructs desirable images of destinations and experiences through selective representation and positive evaluation (Dann, 1996; Thurlow & Jaworski, 2010). Previous studies have shown that such texts rely heavily on evaluative language—particularly adjectives and intensifiers—to highlight attractiveness, uniqueness, and value (Jalilifar & Moradi, 2019; Mocini, 2013). In this sense, evaluation functions as a key mechanism for shaping audience perception and influencing decision-making in tourism contexts. Recent studies on tourism discourse further confirm that evaluative language is predominantly realized through Appreciation, with a strong tendency toward positive representation, while Affect plays a comparatively limited role, reflecting a balance between subjective experience and descriptive evaluation (Kraidi & Younus, 2024).

At the same time, the rise of digital platforms has diversified tourism communication by introducing user-generated content such as online reviews. Unlike traditional promotional texts, these texts often combine positive and negative evaluations and foreground subjective and experiential perspectives (Fürsich & Kavoori, 2001; Hanusch, 2010). Such evaluations are frequently realized through Affect and Judgment resources, reflecting personal attitudes and assessments of service

quality. This shift illustrates how tourism discourse has expanded from predominantly promotional language to a more complex system of evaluative practices, incorporating both institutional and individual voices.

### ***2.3. Appraisal Studies in Tourism and Vietnamese Contexts***

Building on these observations, recent studies have increasingly applied Appraisal Theory to tourism and related discourse to examine how evaluative meaning is constructed across different genres. Research consistently indicates that Appreciation is the dominant resource in promotional discourse, while Affect and Judgment are more prominent in user-generated and service-related contexts (Jalilifar & Moradi, 2019). This variation reflects the context-dependent nature of evaluation, which is shaped by discourse type and communicative purpose (Bednarek & Caple, 2012; Fuoli, 2015). Similar patterns have been observed in academic genres. Pascual and Unger (2010) show that evaluative discourse in grant proposals is predominantly heteroglossic and relies heavily on expansive Engagement resources, particularly those that entertain alternative viewpoints, in order to construct persuasive yet dialogically open communication.

In the Vietnamese context, Appraisal Theory has been used to analyze evaluative meaning in media and tourism-related discourse (e.g., Quy Khuong & Thuy Nhu, 2018; Thu Hien, 2016). In particular, Quy Khuong and Thuy Nhu (2018) demonstrate that Appreciation plays a central role in constructing positive images in tourism advertising. Similarly, research on Vietnamese tourism media discourse indicates that evaluative meanings are predominantly positive but are influenced by readers' social characteristics and interpretive frameworks (Ngô Thị Thu Hương, 2020). This suggests that evaluation is not only shaped by discourse type but also by audience context.

Additionally, research on textbook discourse has shown that teaching materials can encode social meanings and ideological representations through linguistic choices (Curdts-Christiansen & Weninger, 2015; Nhu Y & Thu Hien, 2021). These findings suggest that evaluative language is not only a feature of authentic tourism communication but also a key component of pedagogical discourse. Taken together, these studies suggest that evaluative language is systematically shaped by both discourse type and audience context, reinforcing the view that evaluation is a dynamic and context-dependent resource in tourism and related discourse.

### ***2.4. Research Gap and Analytical Focus***

Despite the growing body of research on tourism discourse, most studies have focused on authentic materials such as brochures, websites, and online reviews, with limited attention to pedagogical texts. Moreover, existing research tends to examine individual genres rather than comparing multiple discourse types within a single framework. This leaves a gap in understanding how evaluative language is systematically distributed across multiple discourse types within ESP textbooks.

Addressing this gap, the present study applies Appraisal Theory to a corpus of reading texts from the English for Tourism textbook (Dubicka & O'Keeffe, 2013). The data are drawn from Units 1 to 6, which form part of the course English for Tourism 1 in the undergraduate English Language curriculum at Quy Nhon University. This pedagogical context ensures the relevance of the selected materials to ESP training in tourism and hospitality. By examining the distribution of evaluative resources across different discourse types, the study aims to provide a systematic and discourse-based account of how evaluative language is constructed in pedagogical contexts.

## **3. Methodology**

### ***3.1. Research Design***

This study adopts a discourse-analytic approach grounded in Appraisal Theory (Martin & White, 2005) to examine how evaluative language is constructed in tourism discourse. The study combines qualitative interpretation with quantitative description by identifying and categorizing evaluative resources, including Affect, Judgment, Appreciation, Engagement, and Graduation. This mixed-

method approach enables a systematic examination of both the distribution and communicative functions of evaluative language across discourse types.

### **3.2. Data Source and Corpus**

The data are drawn from the textbook *English for International Tourism – Pre-Intermediate*, an ESP coursebook widely used in tourism and hospitality education. To ensure pedagogical relevance, the study focuses on Units 1 to 6, which are used in the course English for Tourism 1 within the undergraduate English Language program at Quy Nhon University. The corpus consists of 28 reading texts (R1.1–R6.4) extracted from these units. These texts are expected to represent a sufficient range of discourse types, as they are selected from different sections of the textbook, including reading texts, professional skills sections, and case-based tasks, thereby reflecting both descriptive and task-based communication in tourism contexts.

Taken together, the selected texts cover a wide range of communicative contexts and discourse types commonly used in tourism training. This diversity provides a sufficiently representative basis for identifying recurring evaluative patterns and examining how evaluative language is systematically distributed across pedagogically structured discourse in ESP contexts.

### **3.3. Analytical Framework and Procedure**

The study applies the Appraisal framework (Martin & White, 2005), which comprises three subsystems: Attitude (Affect, Judgment, and Appreciation), Engagement (dialogic positioning), and Graduation (scaling of evaluation). This framework enables the systematic identification and classification of evaluative meanings in the corpus. The analysis combines qualitative interpretation with quantitative description to examine how evaluative resources are distributed and function across discourse types.

The analysis was conducted in four stages. First, the texts were compiled into a digital corpus and labeled systematically (e.g., R1.1, R5.4). Second, evaluative expressions were identified, including adjectives, verbs, adverbs, modal verbs, and numerical expressions. Third, these items were coded according to Appraisal categories. Finally, the coded data were analyzed to identify patterns, compare distributions across discourse types, and interpret their communicative functions. More specifically, each of the 28 reading texts was analyzed individually, with all evaluative expressions identified and coded according to Appraisal categories. The coded data were then aggregated across the corpus to calculate the frequency and distribution of each evaluative resource and its subcategories. These quantitative results were subsequently interpreted qualitatively in relation to discourse types and communicative functions, allowing for an integrated analysis of both distribution and meaning.

To ensure reliability, the coding followed a consistent, theory-driven framework with clearly defined criteria. The combination of qualitative and quantitative analysis enhances the validity of the findings through methodological triangulation.

## **4. Results**

### **4.1. Discourse Types and Pedagogical Organization**

The analysis of the reading corpus (R1–R6) shows that the textbook presents a wide range of tourism-related discourse types. These include informational, promotional, advisory, complaint-based, user-generated, institutional, professional, expert, case-based, and trend-analysis discourse. This diversity reflects the complexity of real-world communication in the tourism and hospitality industry and aligns closely with the communicative demands of ESP contexts, where learners are expected to operate across multiple genres and interactional settings. As shown in Table 1, the corpus includes ten discourse types representing distinct communicative functions. The table illustrates the functional diversity of tourism discourse represented in the textbook.

*Table 1. Distribution of discourse types in the corpus*

| No. | Discourse Type  | Text Examples | Description                                           | Communicative Function    |
|-----|-----------------|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1   | Informational   | R1.1, R4.1    | Factual descriptions of tourism data and services     | Description               |
| 2   | Promotional     | R4.3–R4.5     | Positive descriptions of destinations and attractions | Persuasion                |
| 3   | Advisory        | R5.1          | Travel tips and service recommendations               | Guidance                  |
| 4   | Complaint-based | R5.3          | Expressions of dissatisfaction and service issues     | Criticism                 |
| 5   | User-generated  | R5.4          | Online reviews reflecting personal experiences        | Evaluation                |
| 6   | Institutional   | R5.5          | Internal communication and staff suggestions          | Problem-solving           |
| 7   | Professional    | R6.1          | Workplace routines and service procedures             | Procedural communication  |
| 8   | Expert          | R6.2          | Advice and insights from professionals                | Authority building        |
| 9   | Case-based      | R6.3          | Business scenarios requiring decisions                | Decision-making           |
| 10  | Trend analysis  | R6.4          | Market trends supported by data and research          | Analytical interpretation |

Rather than relying on a single discourse type, the textbook exposes learners to a range of communicative contexts, from objective description (e.g., R4.1, which provides factual information about accommodation) to subjective evaluation (e.g., R5.4, where hotel reviews include expressions such as *fantastic* and *really disappointing*). Similarly, the progression from problem identification (R5.3, e.g., *dirty room, uncomfortable bed*) to solution-oriented institutional discourse (R5.5, e.g., *we should improve service*) illustrates how learners are guided toward more complex communicative tasks. A clear pedagogical progression is evident across units. Unit 4 focuses on descriptive and promotional texts, characterized by positive and selective evaluation (e.g., *beautiful, spectacular, luxury*). Unit 5 introduces evaluative and experiential discourse, including complaints and user-generated reviews, where both positive and negative evaluations are present. Unit 6 extends this progression to professional, expert, and analytical discourse, incorporating procedural language, attribution (e.g., *experts suggest*), and data-driven reasoning (e.g., percentages in R6.4). This pattern suggests that discourse is not only pedagogically sequenced but also functionally differentiated in terms of evaluative language use.

Taken together, these observations confirm that evaluative language is not merely an additional feature of tourism discourse but a central functional component. Across the corpus, evaluation serves multiple communicative purposes, including description, persuasion, experience sharing, and decision-making. The dominance of Appreciation further highlights the object-oriented nature of tourism discourse, where places, services, and experiences are consistently evaluated in terms of quality and attractiveness. This pattern aligns with previous research (Jalilifar & Moradi, 2019; Mocini, 2013), while also extending it by showing that Appreciation operates across both promotional and non-promotional contexts, albeit in more neutral and generalized forms depending on communicative purpose.

#### 4.2. Distribution and Functions of Appraisal Resources

To provide an overview of evaluative distribution, Table 2 summarizes the frequency of Appraisal resources across the corpus, showing that all major subsystems—Affect, Judgment, and Appreciation—are present, though their distribution varies across discourse types.

**Table 2.** *Quantitative distribution of Appraisal resources*

| Category            | Frequency  | Percentage |
|---------------------|------------|------------|
| <b>Appreciation</b> | <b>420</b> | <b>58%</b> |
| Valuation           | 260        |            |
| Reaction            | 160        |            |
| <b>Judgment</b>     | <b>150</b> | <b>21%</b> |
| Capacity            | 90         |            |
| Propriety           | 35         |            |
| Tenacity            | 25         |            |
| <b>Affect</b>       | <b>90</b>  | <b>12%</b> |
| Positive            | 55         |            |
| Negative            | 35         |            |
| <b>Engagement</b>   | <b>40</b>  | <b>6%</b>  |
| Monogloss           | 18         |            |
| Heterogloss         | 22         |            |
| <b>Graduation</b>   | <b>20</b>  | <b>3%</b>  |
| Force               | 15         |            |
| Focus               | 5          |            |

As shown in Table 2, Appreciation is the dominant evaluative resource, accounting for 58% of all instances. This clearly outweighs other categories and confirms that tourism discourse primarily focuses on evaluating objects, services, and experiences rather than expressing personal emotions or interpersonal judgments. Within Appreciation, Valuation (260 instances) is more frequent than Reaction (160), indicating that evaluation is primarily oriented toward assessing the value, quality, and usefulness of tourism products rather than emotional responses to them.

In informational and promotional texts (e.g., R4.1, R4.3–R4.5), Appreciation is used extensively to construct value and attractiveness. For instance, expressions such as *luxury hotels*, *beautiful scenery*, *spectacular views*, and *famous attractions* serve to position destinations as desirable and appealing. These lexical choices are typical of tourism promotion, where evaluation is strategically used to influence perception (Mocini, 2013; Jalilifar & Moradi, 2019). In contrast, in analytical texts (R5.2, R6.4), Appreciation becomes more generalized and abstract, often combined with numerical expressions such as *63 percent* or *one in three customers*. Here, evaluation is less affective and more data-driven, contributing to a more objective and authoritative tone.

Affect, by contrast, is concentrated in user-generated and complaint-based discourse. In R5.4, expressions such as *fantastic*, *disappointed*, *really disappointing*, and *not very comfortable* directly encode emotional responses to tourism experiences. These expressions are often accompanied by first-person pronouns (e.g., *I think*, *we found*), which further reinforce the subjectivity and personal stance of the speaker. For example, a review stating “*I was really disappointed with the service*” not only evaluates the service negatively but also foregrounds the personal experience of the reviewer. This pattern is consistent with research on online tourism discourse, which highlights the role of emotion and subjectivity in constructing authenticity and credibility (Hanusch, 2010). At the subtype level, positive Affect (55 instances) slightly outweighs negative Affect (35), suggesting that even

subjective discourse retains an overall positive orientation, possibly reflecting the generally promotional nature of tourism contexts.

Judgment is closely associated with the evaluation of human behavior, particularly in service-related contexts. In user-generated reviews, it is frequently used to assess staff performance through expressions such as *friendly*, *helpful*, *unattentive*, and *rude*. For example, a statement such as “*the staff were very friendly but sometimes inattentive*” illustrates how Judgment can be used to provide nuanced evaluation. In institutional discourse (R5.5), Judgment takes on a more internal and strategic role, as in expressions such as “*staff should be more attentive*” or “*employees need to improve communication skills*”. This reflects the use of evaluation as a tool for professional development and quality control. Within Judgment, Capacity (90 instances) is the most prominent subtype, indicating that evaluation is primarily concerned with professional competence rather than moral behavior or personal attitude.

More broadly, evaluative resources are systematically aligned with discourse types. Promotional texts rely almost exclusively on positive Appreciation, whereas complaint-based discourse emphasizes negative evaluation (e.g., *dirty room*, *noisy environment*, *uncomfortable bed*). User-generated texts combine both positive and negative elements, resulting in a more balanced and realistic representation of experience. This duality reflects the coexistence of promotional and experiential perspectives in contemporary tourism discourse.

In institutional discourse, evaluation shifts toward problem-solving and future-oriented communication. This is often realized through modal verbs such as *should*, *could*, and *need to*, which indicate recommendations rather than direct judgments. For example, expressions such as “*we should improve customer service*” or “*staff could be more efficient*” illustrate how evaluation is linked to action and improvement.

In expert and analytical discourse, evaluation becomes more implicit and is mediated through attribution and numerical data. Expressions such as “*research shows*”, “*experts suggest*”, and “*data indicates*” introduce external authority, allowing evaluation to be presented as objective rather than subjective. At the same time, Graduation plays an important role in scaling evaluation. It operates through both intensification (e.g., *very*, *extremely*, *really*) and quantification (e.g., percentages, numerical data), reinforcing both emotional impact and evidential strength. Within Graduation, Force (15 instances) is more frequent than Focus, suggesting that evaluation is primarily intensified through degree and quantity rather than categorical sharpening.

Taken together, these findings demonstrate that evaluative language in tourism discourse is not uniformly distributed but functionally differentiated according to communicative purpose. The interaction between Appraisal resources and discourse types highlights the dynamic nature of evaluation, showing how language is adapted to suit different contexts, audiences, and communicative goals.

#### 4.3. Key Patterns and Implications

The analysis reveals a systematic alignment between Appraisal resources and discourse types. Appreciation dominates object-oriented discourse, Affect is closely associated with subjective and experiential communication, and Judgment is central to evaluating human behavior in service contexts. These patterns indicate that evaluative language is not randomly distributed but is functionally aligned with communicative purpose.

From a pedagogical perspective, the integration of multiple discourse types enables learners to develop the ability to interpret and produce a range of communicative forms. For example, descriptive and promotional texts (e.g., R4.1, R4.3–R4.5) expose learners to positive evaluation through expressions such as *beautiful* and *spectacular*, while complaint-based and user-generated texts (e.g., R5.3, R5.4) introduce negative and subjective evaluation through expressions such as *dirty*, *uncomfortable*, and *really disappointing*. This contrast allows learners to engage with both

idealized and realistic representations of tourism experiences. At a more advanced level, institutional and analytical texts (e.g., R5.5, R6.3, R6.4) require learners to interpret evaluation in professional and data-driven contexts. Expressions such as *we should improve service* or *63 percent of customers* demonstrate how evaluation is linked to problem-solving and decision-making. This progression from descriptive to evaluative and analytical discourse reflects real-world professional practice and aligns with ESP objectives.

Another important pattern is the shift from subjective evaluation to more objective, evidence-based discourse across the corpus. While user-generated texts rely heavily on Affect and personal stance (e.g., *I was really disappointed*), analytical and expert texts employ evaluation in a more implicit manner, supported by statistical data and attribution (e.g., *research shows, experts suggest*). This transition reflects a movement from experiential knowledge to institutional and professional knowledge. In this context, Engagement plays a key role in enhancing credibility by introducing external voices, while Graduation operates primarily through quantification (e.g., percentages) rather than emotional intensification. As a result, evaluation becomes less personal and more authoritative, reinforcing the reliability of the discourse.

From a broader perspective, these findings are consistent with previous studies which highlight the context-dependent nature of evaluative language across discourse types (Bednarek & Caple, 2012; Pascual & Unger, 2010). In particular, the dominance of Appreciation and the limited role of Affect align with research in tourism discourse, where evaluation tends to prioritize descriptive and value-oriented meanings over purely emotional expression (Kraidi & Younus, 2024). More importantly, the results support the Appraisal framework's view that evaluation is inherently dialogic and shaped by the interaction between speaker, text, and audience (Martin & White, 2005). The variation observed across discourse types reflects different degrees of dialogic openness, ranging from subjective and experiential discourse to more authoritative and data-driven forms. In this sense, evaluative language functions not only as a descriptive tool but also as a resource for constructing knowledge, negotiating stance, and establishing credibility in professional communication.

Taken together, the findings demonstrate that evaluative language in tourism discourse is both functionally differentiated and pedagogically structured. This reinforces the importance of considering discourse type, communicative purpose, and audience context in Appraisal-based analysis.

### 5. Conclusion and remarks

This study demonstrates that evaluative language plays a significant role in tourism discourse within ESP textbooks. The findings show that Appraisal resources are systematically distributed across discourse types in accordance with their communicative purposes. Appreciation emerges as the dominant resource, particularly in promotional and informational discourse, while Affect is associated with subjective and experiential communication, and Judgment is central to evaluating human behavior in service contexts. Engagement and Graduation further contribute to enhancing credibility and scaling evaluative meaning, especially in expert and analytical discourse. The textbook also exhibits a clear pedagogical progression, moving from descriptive and promotional texts to evaluative, professional, and analytical discourse, thereby reflecting authentic industry practices and supporting the development of learners' communicative competence in tourism and hospitality contexts.

The findings also have practical implications for ESP teaching and material design. They provide a framework for understanding how evaluative language can be systematically introduced across discourse types in tourism education, supporting instructors in selecting and designing materials that reflect authentic communicative practices. In addition, they may help learners develop the ability to interpret and produce evaluative meanings in professional contexts such as customer service, promotion, and problem-solving. From a theoretical perspective, the study highlights the dynamic

and context-dependent nature of evaluative language across discourse types. Pedagogically, it suggests that ESP materials should integrate diverse discourse types to better prepare learners for real-world communication.

Despite these contributions, the study is limited to a single textbook and primarily written texts. Future research may expand the dataset to include multiple materials and spoken interaction, as well as provide more detailed quantitative analysis of Appraisal resources.

## REFERENCES

### English

1. Bednarek, M. (2009), Language patterns and ATTITUDE. *Functions of Language*, 16(2), 165–192. <https://doi.org/10.1075/fol.16.2.01bed>.
2. Bednarek, M., & Caple, H. (2012), ‘Value added’: Language, image and news values. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 1(2–3), 103–113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2012.05.006>
3. Curdt-Christiansen, X. L., & Weninger, C. (2015), *Language, ideology and education: The politics of textbooks*. Routledge.
4. Dann, G. M. S. (1996), *The Language of Tourism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. CAB International. <https://doi.org/10.1079/9780851989990.0000>.
5. Dubicka, I., & O’Keeffe, M. (2013), *English for International Tourism – Pre-Intermediate*. Pearson.
6. Fuoli, M. (2015), Review of Thompson & Alba-Juez (2014): Evaluation in Context. *Functions of Language*, 22(2), 278–287. <https://doi.org/10.1075/fol.22.2.06fu>
7. Fürsich, E., & Kavoori, A. (2001), Mapping a critical framework for the study of travel journalism. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 4(2), 149–172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/136787790100400202>.
8. Hanusch, F. (2010). The dimensions of travel journalism: Exploring new fields for journalism research beyond the news. *Journalism Studies*, 11(1), 68–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700903290569>.
9. Hyland, K. (2005), Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 173–192. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605050365>
10. Jalilifar, A., & Moradi, Y. (2019), Tourism discourse revisited: An analysis of evaluative strategies in tourist brochures from a Systemic Functional Linguistics perspective. *Journal of English Studies*, 17, 211–232. <https://doi.org/10.18172/jes.3595>
11. Kraidi, A. S. S., & Younus, M. R. (2024), An Appraisal Perspective on Attitudinal Analysis of the Language of Tourism in English Travel Blogs about Iraq. *Evolutionary Studies in Imaginative Culture*, 8(2), 1447–1470. <https://doi.org/10.70082/esiculture.vi.1984>.
12. Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005), *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan.
13. Mocini, R. (2013), The promotional functionality of evaluative language in tourism discourse. *Lingue e Linguaggi*, 9, 157–172. <https://doi.org/10.1285/i22390359v9p157>
14. Nhu Y, H. N., & Thu Hien, N. T. (2021), A visual grammar analysis of gender representation in Solutions Elementary textbooks. *Of the International Scientific Conference: Trends of Modern Linguistics: Theoretical and Applied*, 581–592.
15. Pascual, M., & Unger, L. (2010), Appraisal in the research genres: An analysis of grant proposals by Argentinean researchers. *Revista Signos*, 43(73). <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-09342010000200004>.

16. Quy Khuong, L., & Thuy Nhu, P. T. (2018). "Appreciation in online English tourism advertising discourse: An appraisal analysis". *Tạp Chí Khoa Học và Công Nghệ – Đại Học Đà Nẵng*, 16(5), 85–90.
17. Thu Hien, N. T. (2016), An Appraisal Study of Social Attitudes in News Reports towards President Obama's Visit to Vietnam. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies*, 32(4), 21–29.
18. Thurlow, C., & Jaworski, A. (2010), *Tourism Discourse: Language and Global Mobility*. Palgrave Macmillan.

#### Vietnamese

19. Ngô Thị Thu Hương (2020), "Thái độ của độc giả đối với diễn ngôn truyền thông về du lịch Quảng Nam - Đà Nẵng trên các trang điện tử tiếng Việt". *Tạp Chí Khoa học xã hội miền Trung*, 5(67), 62–72.

#### Ngôn ngữ đánh giá trong diễn ngôn du lịch:

##### Phân tích theo Thuyết Đánh giá cho giáo trình tiếng Anh chuyên ngành

**Tóm tắt:** Bài viết này khảo sát ngôn ngữ đánh giá trong diễn ngôn du lịch dựa trên khung Thuyết Đánh giá (Martin & White, 2005), với dữ liệu là tập hợp các văn bản đọc được trích từ giáo trình tiếng Anh chuyên ngành Du lịch. Nghiên cứu kết hợp phương pháp định tính và định lượng nhằm làm rõ cách các ngôn liệu đánh giá-Cảm xúc, Phán xét và Đánh giá cảm quan-được phân bố trong nhiều kiểu diễn ngôn khác nhau, bao gồm văn bản thông tin, quảng bá, tư vấn, phản nàn, nội dung do người dùng tạo, diễn ngôn thể chế, chuyên môn, chuyên gia, tình huống và phân tích xu hướng. Kết quả nghiên cứu cho thấy Đánh giá cảm quan là ngôn liệu chiếm ưu thế, đặc biệt trong diễn ngôn quảng bá và thông tin, nơi nó góp phần kiến tạo giá trị và sức hấp dẫn của điểm đến; trong khi đó, Cảm xúc nổi bật trong các đánh giá do người dùng tạo, phản ánh trải nghiệm mang tính chủ quan; và Phán xét đóng vai trò quan trọng trong việc đánh giá hành vi con người trong các bối cảnh dịch vụ. Nghiên cứu cũng làm nổi bật vai trò của Thang độ và Tham thoại trong việc gia tăng cường độ đánh giá và nâng cao độ tin cậy của diễn ngôn, đặc biệt trong các văn bản chuyên gia và dựa trên dữ liệu. Đồng thời, nghiên cứu cũng đồng thời xác định một tiến trình sơ phạm rõ ràng, thể hiện qua sự chuyển dịch từ các văn bản mô tả và quảng bá sang các dạng diễn ngôn mang tính đánh giá, giải quyết vấn đề và phân tích. Kết quả này cho thấy ngôn ngữ đánh giá được phân bố có hệ thống theo các kiểu diễn ngôn trong một khuôn khổ sơ phạm, qua đó đóng góp cho cả Thuyết Đánh giá và nghiên cứu về tiếng Anh chuyên ngành.

**Từ khóa:** Diễn ngôn du lịch; ngôn ngữ đánh giá; Thuyết Đánh giá; giáo trình tiếng Anh chuyên ngành; kiểu diễn ngôn.