

**A Pragmatic Study of  
Deliberate Evaluation in Military Interviews**  
**军事访谈中刻意评价的语用研究**

龚双萍◎著



中国出版集团



世界图书出版公司



# 军事访谈中刻意评价的语用研究

A Pragmatic Study of Deliberate Evaluation  
in Military Interviews

龚双萍 著



中国出版集团  
世界图书出版公司  
广州·上海·西安·北京



## 图书在版编目 ( CIP ) 数据

军事访谈中刻意评价的语用研究 / 龚双萍著 . — 广州 :  
世界图书出版广东有限公司 , 2012.8

ISBN 978-7-5100-5052-7

I . ①军… II . ①龚… III . ①军事—新闻采访—语用  
学—研究 IV . ① G212.1 ② H1

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2012) 第 189433 号

## 军事访谈中刻意评价的语用研究

---

责任编辑 黄 琼

出版发行 世界图书出版广东有限公司

地 址 广州市新港西路大江冲 25 号

[http:// www.gdst.com.cn](http://www.gdst.com.cn)

印 刷 湖北新新城际数字出版印刷技术有限公司

规 格 880mm×1230mm 1/32

印 张 8.25

字 数 230 千

版 次 2012 年 8 月第 1 版 2012 年 8 月第 1 次印刷

ISBN 978-7-5100-5052-7/E · 0051

定 价 25.00 元

---

版权所有, 翻印必究



## 序

本书是龚双萍在其博士论文的基础上修改完成的,是她三年多的研究成果。

本书是针对军事新闻访谈中刻意评价现象的语用研究,这有别于日常言语交际和日常话题的语言学研究。回顾国内外的相关文献,专门基于军事方面的题材、交际领域、交际模式等的语言学探究却很少见,主要原因之一是这方面的研究往往涉及敏感话题或非公开话题,语料获取有一定难度,因此相关研究具有很大的挑战性。可以说,龚双萍博士知难而上,选择军事访谈中的刻意评价作为研究对象,这样的精神无疑值得称道。

评价是当今语言学研究中的一个热点课题。自系统功能语言学的著名学者马丁(J. R. Martin)提出评价理论(appraisal theory)以来,该理论引起了我国外语界学者及读者的很大兴趣,其运用性研究取得了丰硕成果。除系统功能语言学以外,社会语言学、语料库语言学、心理语言学、语义学、语用学等领域对评价体系、评价言语行为及其影响因素等都有一定研究或涉及评价理论的具体运用,但这些研究多以书面语篇中的评价语言作为探究对象,较少涉及动态会话语境中的评价体系、评价言语行为等现象。仔细观察会话中的各类评价及其语境制约,我们会发现评价现象涉及说话人的立场、观点、态度、情感、价值体系等,并与其自我身份及参与者的他人身份、地位等语境因素密切相关,从语言选择的角度看,它们的使用往往具有策略性,体现出明显的语用特征。这种语言现象在军事访谈的机构性言谈互动(institutional interaction)中亦是如此。

龚双萍博士从语用学的角度将“刻意评价”视为一种交际策略,这是评价研究的一种新视角。她抓住军事访谈所具有的机构性话语



特点,从刻意评价的表现形式到影响其使用的语境因素,再到刻意评价在军事访谈中的语用功能,都做了详细的描写、分析和理论阐释,努力揭示刻意评价这一语用策略使用背后所隐藏的语用机制。本研究在理论上跳出了系统功能语言学中评价理论的限制,在Jef Verschueren提出的语言顺应论基础上形成了自己的分析框架,丰富了有关语言选择的顺应论研究,可以说是评价性语言现象研究的新成果。

当然,这本书只是龚双萍博士的一个阶段性研究成果,还存在一些值得改进的地方,有的问题还可继续深挖拓展。做学问往往就是这样,在点滴积累中发现问题,先期成果可进一步激发自己的研究兴趣,当自己前行到一个更高的地方回望时才能看得更全面,才会有新的体会并发现新的研究思路。作为导师,我很高兴看到龚双萍博士出版自己的第一本学术著作,更高兴看到我国外语界又多了一位有潜质的青年学者,希望她在今后的学术生涯中永葆军人气质,锐意进取,在语用学研究中愈行愈深,愈行愈高,取得有影响力的新成果,与其他学者一起推进中国语用学学科的蓬勃发展。

冉永平

2012年4月于广州



## 摘 要

本文的研究对象是军事访谈中被访者对评价的刻意性使用。这种语言现象我们视之作为一种交际策略,并冠名“刻意评价”。

本研究采取定性研究的方法,试图回答以下四个问题:①军事访谈中的刻意评价有哪些类别?②哪些语境因素影响被访者对刻意评价的选择?③刻意评价如何实现各种交际功能?④被访者为什么要选用刻意评价作为一种交际策略?

本研究的理论框架以 Verschueren 的“语言顺应论”为基础,辅以 Spencer-Oatey 的“和谐管理理论”以及 Bucholtz 和 Hall 的“身份与交际理论”,依此形成一个更全面更具有解释力的框架。

刻意评价是一种违背交际常规的交际策略。从军事访谈这一特定的机构性话语中所获取的语料进行观察,被访者所使用的刻意评价的刻意性体现在两个方面:①刻意背离主持人的提问;②刻意背离军事访谈的话轮分配系统。由此,我们将语料中的刻意评价分为五大类:①追加性刻意评价;②替代性刻意评价;③离题性刻意评价;④打断性刻意评价;⑤竞争性刻意评价。

刻意评价的顺应过程分为三类,即自我顺应、他人顺应和群体顺应。与自我顺应相关的语境因素主要有:被访者的自我面子、身份、权势;与他人顺应相关的语境因素主要有:他人面子、认知需求、情感;与群体顺应相关的语境因素主要有:群体面子、群体利益、国际关系、公众理解。

军事访谈中被访者使用刻意评价可以实现三个方面的交际功能,即人际趋向性功能、自我趋向性功能、群体趋向性功能。人际趋向性功能包括缓和人际关系、利他功能,以及缩短心理距离;自我趋向性功能包括保护自我和加强说服力;群体趋向性功能包括构建正



面群体形象、实施反驳、澄清事实和引导观众行为。

评价与身份有着固有的联系。通过情感表达或价值判断,说话者不可避免地构建了自身的身份。在言语交际中,说话者倾向于构建自身的正面身份而非负面身份。在军事访谈这一特定机构性话语中,构建正面身份这一需要尤为突出。这也就是被访者采用刻意评价的理据。被访者的身份并非预先确定、一成不变,而是具有多个层面。在访谈中,随着会话的进行,会话者根据交际需求,凸显自己不同的身份。在交际进程中,被访者选用不同类型的刻意评价调节各种和谐取向来实现一系列功能,从而满足交际需求,并构建自身在军事访谈这一特定机构中的正面身份。



## ABSTRACT

The present study aims to explore the interviewee's deliberate use of evaluations in military interviews, which is perceived as a communicative strategy and termed as 'deliberate evaluation' (DE).

Based on the data obtained from Chinese military interviews, this study attempts to answer the following questions with a qualitative methodology: ① what are the various types of deliberate evaluation employed by the interviewee in military interviews? ② what are the contextual correlates that influence the interviewee's choice of deliberate evaluation in military interviews? ③ how does deliberate evaluation in military interviews realize diversified communicative functions? ④ why does the interviewee choose deliberate evaluation as a communicative strategy?

The research questions are tackled within the theoretical framework which takes Verschueren's Linguistic Adaptation Theory as the theoretical backbone, supplemented by Spencer-Oatey's Theory of Rapport Management and Bucholtz & Hall's Theory of Identity and Interaction, so as to make the analytical framework more comprehensive.

Deliberate evaluation is a communicative strategy which deviates from the norm of the interaction. In the specific context of military interviews, the deliberateness of deliberate evaluation is manifested in two ways: ① deliberate deviation from the interviewer's question; ② deliberate deviation from the turn-allocation system in military interviews. Based on the various



forms of deviation, five groups of deliberate evaluation are identified, namely additive DE, substitutive DE, digressive DE, interruptive DE and competitive DE.

The adaptation process of deliberate evaluation is divided into self-oriented adaptation, other-oriented adaptation and group-oriented adaptation. The self-oriented adaptation gratifies the language user's communicative needs. The contextual correlates concerned with this process are self-face, identity and power. The other-oriented adaptation satisfies the addressees' communicative needs, and the related contextual factors are other-face, cognitive needs and emotions. Lastly, the group-oriented adaptation meets the communicative needs of the group which the interviewee identifies with. The pertinent contextual correlates are group-face, group interests, international relationship and public understanding. It is these contextual factors that impel the interviewee to opt for DE as a communicative strategy in the ongoing interaction.

The functions of deliberate evaluation in military interviews are three-field, namely interpersonal-oriented functions, self-oriented functions and group-oriented functions. The interpersonal-oriented functions include mitigating interpersonal conflicts, altruistic functions and decreasing psychological distance. The self-oriented functions comprise protecting the self and reinforcing persuasion. The group-oriented functions consist of constructing positive group images, implementing refutation, clarifying the truth and manipulating the audience.

People's evaluation is intrinsically related to their identity. By expressing his feelings and values, one constructs who he is. In human communication, people have a propensity to show their positive attributes establishing positive images to others instead of negative ones. That is to say, people tend to construct positive



identities in public. It is the motivates that the interviewee employs manner of deliberate evaluation in military interviews. In the dynamic process of interaction, the interviewee's identities are open to constant negotiation rather than predefined. Triggered by his communicative needs, the interviewee may deliberately foreground a certain identity, and deliberate evaluation is a linguistic device that can index it. By using different types of deliberate evaluation, the interviewee manipulates various rapport orientations and thereby realizes an array of functions. As a result, the interviewee satisfies his communicative needs and constructs a positive identity.



## CONTENTS

<b>Chapter 1 Introduction</b> .....	001
1.1 The object of the study .....	001
1.2 The rationale of the present research .....	007
1.3 Problems existing in the past studies .....	009
1.4 Objectives of the current research .....	011
1.5 Data of the research .....	013
1.6 Notes on methodology and terminology .....	019
1.7 The outline of the dissertation....	021
<b>Chapter 2 Literature Review</b> .....	022
2.1 Introduction .....	022
2.2 Terminological issues.....	022
2.3 Approaches to evaluation .....	024
2.4 Achievements and limitations in the past researches .....	045
2.5 Summary .....	047
<b>Chapter 3 A Description of the Conceptual Framework</b> ...	048
3.1 Introduction .....	048
3.2 The working definition of DE .....	048
3.3 Delimitation of DE .....	057
3.4 A sketch of the theoretical basis.....	063
3.5 The conceptual framework of the present research.....	075
3.6 Summary .....	083
<b>Chapter 4 A Classification of DEs in Military Interviews</b> ...	085
4.1 Introduction .....	085
4.2 Additive DE .....	086



4.3 Substitutive DE ... 098

4.4 Digressive DE ... 102

4.5 Interruptive DE ... 108

4.6 Competitive DE ... 113

4.7 Summary ... 119

**Chapter 5 Adaptability of Deliberate Evaluation ... 121**

5.1 Introduction ... 121

5.2 Self- oriented adaptation... 122

5.3 Other- oriented adaptation ... 135

5.4 Group- oriented Adaptation ... 146

5.5 Summary ... 158

**Chapter 6 Functions of Deliberate Evaluation ... 160**

6.1 Introduction ... 160

6.2 DE, rapport management and identity construction ... 161

6.3 Communicative functions of DE in military interviews ... 163

6.4 Summary ... 206

**Chapter 7 Conclusion ... 209**

7.1 Introduction ... 209

7.2 Major findings ... 210

7.3 Implications ... 220

7.4 Limitations of the present study ... 222

7.5 Suggestions for future study ... 223

**References ... 226**

**Acknowledgements ... 242**

**Appendix Transcription Conventions ... 244**

后 记... 246



## FIGURES

Figure 2- 1 Key resources of academic interaction (Hyland, 2005)	
.....	032
Figure 3- 1 The stance triangle (Du Bois, 2004) .....	059
Figure 3- 2 The relation between DE and stancetaking .....	060
Figure 3- 3 The relation between DE and overinformativeness .....	063
Figure 3- 4 The structure of a pragmatic theory .....	066
Figure 3- 5 The bases of rapport .....	068
Figure 3- 6 The conceptual framework for the explanation of DE ...	084
Figure 4- 1 Classification of DE in military interviews .....	120
Figure 5- 1 Participation frameworks in military interviews	
involving the interviewee ,where IE represents the	
interviewee, IR represents the interviewer .....	136
Figure 5- 2 Contextual correlates related to DE in military interviews	
.....	159
Figure 6- 1 Functions of DE in military interviews .....	208



# Chapter 1 Introduction

## 1.1 The object of the study

Evaluation is a ubiquitous language phenomenon in human communication, both in written texts and in verbal interactions. Vološinov (1973) pronounces that no utterance can be put together without value judgement, and it is evaluation that determines referential meaning. Richards (1964) conceptualizes two functions of language, one is scientific, the other emotive. Hayakawa (1972) identifies three modes of information exchange—report, inference and judgment. More recently, Hurvitz and Schlesinger (2009) claim that evaluations lie at the heart of every discussion. Thus, it is not surprising that there is a notable upsurge of interest in the study of evaluation in recent years.

Military interviews in Chinese TV programs, an area never touched upon by scholars before, are characterized by the activities of questioning and answering. Questioning in this context primarily aims to elicit an answer and request information and/or opinions from interviewees. It is without doubt that interviewees overwhelmingly give information and express opinions in response to interviewers' questions, and evaluation is thus a frequent speech act. Consider the following example:

### Example (1)

Situation: The interviewee, Luo Yuan is a major general from Chinese Academy of Military Science; Xu Sanduo is the protagonist in the best-selling TV series in China in 2007



entitled 'Soldiers, Charge'. In the story, Xu Sanduo grew out of an ugly stupid clumsy rural boy into a No.1 soldier through his persistence.

主持人 :罗部长觉得许三多是个什么样的兵 ?

嘉 宾 :他的个性 = 很 ^突出啊 , 我可以说他是 <MRC> 比较憨厚 , 比较执著 , 比较善良 </MRC>。可能大家最看重的是他比较憨厚的一面 , 这个给大家印象 ^很深。

《防务新观察 : 未来士兵拿什么突击》<sup>[1]</sup>

In this conversation, when asked to give opinion on Xu Sanduo, the protagonist in the hottest TV series entitled 'Soldiers, Charge' in 2007 in China, the interviewee evaluates Xu Sanduo as simple, honest, and perseverant. By giving the assessment, the interviewee aligns with the interviewer's question and fulfills the institutional task.

However, a close examination of the evaluations given by the interviewee reveals that not all of them are elicited by the interviewer. Let us enumerate the excerpts below:

Example(2)

Situation: On September 3, 2007, the US claims that it is the Chinese People's Liberation Army who hacked into the Pentagon network.

主持人 : 难在哪儿呢 ? ^ 怎么就找不出是谁干的呢 ?

嘉 宾 : 一个是像我们刚才讨论的 , (TSK) 他借助第三方进行攻击 , 偷你的车坐你的车去做案 , 这是一种办法。

---

[1]The symbols in this coversation here represents special functions which are illustrated in the appendix in detail.



(TSK) 还有呢,就是利用网络上的一些后门。现在黑客软件非常的普及,很多小孩在家里没事捉摸摸摸,他下载那个程序以后就能够上去以后搞黑客,然后大家集中向你那扔一炸弹,堵塞你的流量,让你的宽带慢慢变窄,变窄以后让你死掉,但是那个很快就恢复了,造不成很大的影响。现在呢,黑客已经进入了非常专业化的程序了,专门的黑客程序进入你的银行账户,(TSK) 要盗取你的金钱。另外呢,也有一些进入^军队的一些网络系统中窃取一些军事机密。美国还成立了“网络战”这样的专门部队,使用^网络作为一种专门的武器去进攻对方。...(GLOTTAL) 啊,这个呢 <MRC> 美国做得最好 </MRC>。( ( 点头 ) )

《防务新观察 : 谁触动了五角大楼的网络神经》

### Example(3)

Situation: In a press conference, Li Zhaoxin, the ex-foreign minister, released the military budget of China for 2010.

主持人 : 罗将军,从发布会上透露的信息来看,中国的军费预算确实要比去年有所增长,涨幅是7%。但是(TSK)从这几年情况来看,这个涨幅是有所回落的,涨幅正逐渐地往下降。我记得以前有很多国外的媒体采访您,问您(TSK)为什么中国的军费要涨,您的回答是<@ 为什么不?“ @>,您的观点是什么?

嘉 宾 : 我就感到^非常奇怪,每次我们在“两会”的时候一公布我们的国防费,一些国家就开始说三道四。<A> 我就觉得奇怪了</A>,世界上军费^最多的国家你怎么不去问它?卖军火^最多的国家怎么不去问它?在国外军事基地^最多的国家怎么不去问它?介入军事冲突^最多的国家怎么不去问它?中国稍微增加一点军费,有些



国家就对我们说三道四。从这一次我们的军费增长来看,我们这次军费李肇星公布的是5 321.15 亿元人民币,我给它按汇率折算了一下,也就是<MRC>783 亿美元</MRC>。美国是多少?美国2012 年全年的国防预算是<MRC>7 080 亿美元</MRC>。

《今日关注:中国军费增长,合理适度透明》

In example (2), the interviewer asks why it is impossible to find out the specific source of hacking on the global internet, the interviewee first answers the question, but then gradually shifts the topic and intentionally evaluates that America is the country which does best in attacking other countries by using the internet as a weapon. In example (3), the interviewer requests the interviewee to offer his opinion on the military budget of China for 2010. However, the interviewee does not focus his evaluation on the requested topic, but shows his surprise toward both the negative comments on the Chinese military expenditure spread by other countries and the over curiosity held by some foreign media.

Another deliberate evaluative maneuver is deployed in the following case where the interviewee digresses from the ongoing topic to employ evaluation as a means of supporting his viewpoint displayed in the current turn.

#### Example(4)

Situation: The topic under discussion is which party would win the presidential election in Israel.

主持人:那岂不是^正好和我们刚才记者的分析应该是吻合的吗?怎么您不同意?

嘉宾:他说^吻合是对的。他说所谓的^“微弱”优势,我个人