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Information about the conference:

Location: Lehrstuhl für Englische Sprachwissenschaft
Phil-Hist. Fakultät, Gebäude 5E (see map below)
Raum 4056
Universität Augsburg
Universitätsstr. 10
86159 Augsburg
Tram: Universität

Homepage: http://www.philhist.uni-augsburg.de/lehrstuehle/anglistik/sprachwissenschaft/
Conference_on_evaluation_and_text_types/

Fees
25 € for non-students

Addresses of hotels
CITY HOTEL OST AM KÖ
Fuggerstraße 4-6
86150 Augsburg
Phone: +49 (0)821/ 502040
Fax: +49 (0)821/ 5020444
Email: ulrich@ostamkoe.de
Tram: Königsplatz

BERUFSBILDUNGswerk
Förderwerk St. Elisabeth
Fritz-Wendel-Str. 4
86159 Augsburg
Phone: +49 (0)821/ 59790
Fax: +49(0)821/ 5979115
Email: Info@SanktElisabeth.de
Tram: BBW/Institut für Physik

Important phone numbers
Departmental office (Gudrun Nelle)
Phone: +49 (0)821/ 5982747
Fax: +49 (0)821/ 5985638

Conference organisation (Monika Bednarek)
Phone: +49 (0) 821/5985754 (office)
Phone: +40 (0) 173/ 9905532 (mobile)

Taxis
+49 (0)821/ 35025
+49 (0821/ 36333
+49 (0)821/ 7298896

Xerox
available on campus

Conference warming
BRAUEREI „ZUR GOLDENEN GANS“
Weite Gasse 11
86150 Augsburg
Phone + 49 (0) 821/ 35 0 75
TRAM: Theodor-Heuss Platz/IHK or Ulrichsplatz

Conference dinner
FONDACO JACOBO
Damenhof
Maximilianstr. 36
86150 Augsburg
Phone +49 (0)821/ 151444
TRAM: Moritzplatz

Lunch
Friday, 22 July 2005 and Saturday, 23 July 2005, ca. 12.30
IL PÓRÇINO RISTORANTE
Salomon-Idler-Str. 24B
86159 Augsburg
Phone: +49 (0)821/ 576198
How to get there and around:

From Augsburg station (Hauptbahnhof) tram line 3 (Straßenbahnlinie 3) takes you directly to the university (via the city centre, Königsplatz). The conference takes place in building 5E (see map below), 4th floor, No 4056. The departmental office is in No 4036. For arrivals by car there are quite a few parking spaces around the university (see map below).
## Programme:

**Freitag, 22 July 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic (short title only)</th>
<th>Presenting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.00-09.15</td>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.15-09.55</td>
<td>Evidentiality in police interviews</td>
<td>Alison Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.55-10.30</td>
<td>A parameter-based framework of evaluation</td>
<td>Monika Bednarek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td><strong>Coffee Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-11.45</td>
<td>Status in multi-modal discourse</td>
<td>Susan Hunston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45-12.30</td>
<td>Evaluation and context</td>
<td>Siahoui Kok/Wolfram Bublitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30-14.00</td>
<td><strong>Lunch Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00-14.40</td>
<td>Evaluative language in a corpus of book reviews</td>
<td>Ute Römer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.20-16.00</td>
<td>Evaluation in Italian and French research articles</td>
<td>Nadine Rentel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00-16.30</td>
<td><strong>Coffee Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30-17.15</td>
<td>Intercultural aspects of evaluations in letters to the editor</td>
<td>Hannes Kniffka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.15-18.00</td>
<td>Stance taking in political interviews (Germany vs. Britain)</td>
<td>Anita Fetzer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Saturday, 23 July 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic (short title only)</th>
<th>Presenting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.15-10.00</td>
<td>Appraisal in Dutch news bulletins</td>
<td>Gisela Redeker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00-10.45</td>
<td>Appraisal in media interviews</td>
<td>Luisa Granato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45-11.15</td>
<td><strong>Coffee Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15-12.00</td>
<td>Positioning and metaphor in academic book reviews</td>
<td>Graham Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-12.45</td>
<td>Goal markers and their evaluative force</td>
<td>Hanna Pishwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45-14.30</td>
<td><strong>Lunch Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30-15.15</td>
<td>Persuasion in e-mail communication</td>
<td>Tunde Opeibi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-15-16.00</td>
<td>Evaluation in spoken BE and AE</td>
<td>Brigitta Mittmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00-16.30</td>
<td><strong>Coffee Break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30-17.15</td>
<td>Evaluation in problem talk</td>
<td>Elisabeth Reber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.15-18.00</td>
<td>Evaluation in Russian oral communication</td>
<td>Nicole Richter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00-?</td>
<td><strong>Closing session</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abstracts (in alphabetical order):

Monika Bednarek (Augsburg, Germany)

A parameter-based framework of evaluation

Evaluation, the linguistic expression of speaker opinion, has only recently become the focus of linguistic analyses, and this mainly within the context of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) (e.g. Hunston 1994, Bondi & Mauranen 2003) as well as within the systemic-functional theory of appraisal (e.g. Macken-Horarik & Martin 2003, Martin and White 2005). There are also large-scale corpus analyses dealing with the expression of stance in different registers (e.g. Biber & Finegan 1988, 1989, Hyland 1999, Conrad & Biber 2000, Charles 2003, Precht 2003). Whereas studies within EAP often differ in the approaches used for investigating evaluation, and whereas stance analyses offer only a broad system for analysing stance (distinguishing between three types of stance and concentrating on their grammatical realizations), appraisal theory provides a systematic, detailed and elaborate theory of evaluative language. While the contribution of this theory to the study of evaluation can hardly be overestimated, there are some potential drawbacks concerning its application. Furthermore, appraisal is an ongoing research project “with some of its analytical typologies still having the status of proposals or hypotheses requiring further investigation and testing” (White 2002: 3). This suggest that evaluative frameworks outside systemic functional linguistics can and should be developed to provide alternative accounts of evaluation without denying the importance and value of the work that is being done within systemic functional linguistics. One such alternative account is provided by the parameter-based framework of evaluation which is the subject of this paper.

Expressions of non-alignment in British and German political interviews: preferred and dispreferred variants

Political interviews have been defined as question and answer sequences in which interviewers and interviewees negotiate validity claims. Looked upon from an interpersonal angle, the interviewer sets up a position and requests the interviewee to ratify their propositions by expressing alignment or non-alignment. Because of the context of institutional communication, the actions can be conceived of as institutionalized stance taking. This contribution examines institutionalized stance taking with respect to the expression of non-alignment in a corpus of 12 interviews between journalists and the losers of the general elections in Britain (1997) and Germany (1998). The data share identical external parameters, very similar contextual features and the interviewees’ argumentation is based on almost identical premises, namely that they cannot align with the interviewer’s position because their defeat has not yet been assigned an official status. In spite of the contextual similarities, the expression of non-alignment differs significantly. This is primarily due to language-specific preferences for the realization of turn-initial positions and their functions as interpersonal, topical and textual themes. In the British data, multiple themes are preferred:

- [textual theme, interpersonal theme, topical theme] is the preferred variant. It indicates that a negotiation of meaning is possible
- [interpersonal theme, topical theme] is a preferred variant with the same function
- [textual theme, topical theme] is a preferred variant with the same function
- [topical theme] is dispreferred and indicates that no further negotiation of meaning is intended.

In the German data, multiple themes are realized differently and have a different function:

- [textual theme, topical theme] is the preferred variant. It does not indicate that a negotiation of meaning is possible
- [textual theme, interpersonal theme, topical theme] is a dispreferred variant.

To conclude, British institutional stance taking for the expression of non-alignment prefers multiple themes. Its German counterpart tends to avoid interpersonal themes, and textual and topical themes signify propositional meaning only. Regarding possible perlocutionary effects, British stance-taking is dynamic and less abrupt, while German stance-taking is product-oriented and more abrupt.

Affect, judgement and appreciation in media interviews

The aim of this paper is to present the results of a study of the use of evaluative language in the process of negotiating the roles and identities projected by the participants in interactive texts. To fulfil the aims proposed, the analysis was carried out in the light of the principles of the Appraisal Theory (Martin and Rose 2003, Eggins and Slade 1997) which present the ways in which discourse producers make others know about their attitudes towards people and things. The corpus used as a basis for the empirical work carried out consisted of oral interviews made by journalists to scientists and the corresponding publication of a modified version of these interactions in popular science magazines and quality newspapers. The participants are well known media interviewers from Chile and Argentina and public figures at the moment these interviews took place. First expressions of affect, judgement and appreciation were identified in fragments of the two types of texts under analysis. The second step was to look at the consequences these evaluations bore on the speakers’ relationships manifested in the oral interviews and reflected in the written texts. The analysis showed how the interactants handle positive and negative evaluation resources to create association or dissociation effects between them in the spoken versions and how the journalist makes modifications in his writing according to what he considers more convenient from the point of view of the different role he has to play.
The term ‘status’ has been used to refer to the averred or claimed alignment between a text (or part of a text) and the world. Languages are well provided with words that express these alignments, such as (in English) fact, claim, hypothetical, fiction, lie and so on. Language users are adept at managing the complex matches and mismatches between text and world that form part of their routine written and spoken discourse practices. Increasingly, however, written texts occur as web publications rather than or as well as on paper. In addition, texts do not only comprise words; they are also made up of pictures, film, graphics and so on. The status of propositions may be of low salience in a text, or it may be, in effect, the ‘point’ of the text.

This paper will explore the concept of status in two contexts:

i. Websites concerned with giving the public information about two health issues: MMR vaccinations, and cancer;

ii. Television documentaries dealing with historical events or with scientific discoveries.

It will also argue that labels of status occur in typical semantic sequences and that these are revealing of practices of epistemology.
Alison Johnson (Birmingham, UK)

“From where we’re sitting…” Narrative evaluation of evidential value in police interviews with suspects and witnesses.

Labov and Waletzky’s (1997) model of narrative has been applied to both oral and written narratives in a range of contexts. Edwards (1997), though, points out that they overlook the presence of evaluation in the things that “occasion” the narrative, looking only at narrative as monologue rather than as an interaction. In the police interview the narrative is produced in dyadic interaction within an institutional context where the key goal is to occasion a narrative as evidence and this is done through questioning and elicitation sequences. This paper examines police interviews with suspects, looking at evaluative patterns and frameworks that reveal how evaluation is carried out in a range of question and response speech acts (Stenstrom, 1984) and looks at the marking of stance by interviewers in relation to the evidential value of the elicited narrative. The analysis illustrates features of contested and collaborative evaluation, marked in turns that reveal concessive and adversative positions. It shows how discourse rules and roles develop in an evolving and “renewing” context (Heritage, 1984) with interviewers and interviewees changing their stance and altering their footing, moving from interrogator to therapist and from cooperation to non-cooperation and back again. I draw on pragmatic principles from conversational analysis of institutional interaction (Drew & Heritage, 1992) and from appraisal theory, particularly Martin (1993), Hunston and Sinclair and Hunston and Thompson (1993). Conclusions point to the function of evaluative frames as important features of interviewer activity. It is suggested that these function to achieve a change of state in suspect and witness knowledge through the interview. They also have a role in the elicitation of a confession, in the case of suspects. I shed some light on the marking of narrative evaluation in stories that are elicited rather than performed and for legal rather than social purposes.
Hannes Kniffka (Bonn, Germany)

Contrasting letters to the editor in an intercultural perspective

Letters to the editor (LTE) appearing in a daily newspaper are a source and a mirror of culture specific features of prime importance. They are also of interest in that they represent stances, attitudes, and evaluations of people that otherwise cannot, or would not be heard/read in other genres of written texts. LTE reflect, so to speak, the (voice of the) man in the street – and that of the woman? This is the pivotal contrast investigated in this paper.

A selection of LTE from a larger corpus (analyzed for a different purpose and dealt with elsewhere) is employed here to illustrate intercultural contrast, or, rather, to create some awareness of dimensions to be taken into consideration for an adequate description and explanation of “real life”-intercultural contrast. To this end, LTE-pairings designed as “minimal pairs ceteris paribus” for a particular contrastive aspect of evaluations are set up, such as males’ and females’ attitudes and expressions on a particular issue (e.g. the same topic of an LTE), “Western” and “Non-Western” (Islamic) perspective of two LTE written by women, LTE reflecting a special editorial treatment on a special topic, including textual and phenotypic data appearing in the paper’s edition, and others.

The overall hypothesis is that a description of the detail of intercultural contrast would allow (though not guarantee) a more encompassing and deeper understanding of culture specific behavior and the various layers of intercultural contrast, and thus, hopefully, contribute to a reduction of intercultural conflict.
The goal of this paper is to approach evaluation by applying the cognitive model of conceptual blending, i.e. of relating it to cognitive processes that are used to combine conceptual structure in mental spaces (Fauconnier & Turner). Mental spaces are partial and sketchy representations of the entities and relations of a particular scenario as perceived, imagined, remembered, or otherwise understood by participants (Fauconnier). Blending takes place in a conceptual integration network, an array of mental spaces which typically includes (at least) two input spaces, a generic space, and a blended space. Input spaces represent information from discrete cognitive domains, a generic space contains structure common to all spaces, and the blended space contains structure from both inputs, as well as its own emergent structure. New structures in the blended space may be projected back to their input spaces and alter, if only temporarily, the structures therein. Take for example the following political joke: „Yes- terday, Saddam Hussein got 100 percent of the vote. Well, that's according to Saddam's campaign manager, Jeb Hussein. (Jay Leno)”. One way of explaining how this joke works, i.e. of accounting for its evaluative bias is to relate „Jeb Hussein” to a particular blend. One input includes conceptual structure related to the presidential elections in Iraq, and the other input includes conceptual structure related to the presidential elections in the U.S., where the role of Jeb Bush affected the counting procedures in a way that eventually enabled his brother George W. Bush to be installed as President of the United States.

In the blending model the locus of evaluation is not in the language of a text but in thought. Our paper is a proposal to argue for this particular cognitive approach as complementary to other current approaches to the description of evaluation.
Graham Low (York, UK)

*Positioning and metaphor in academic book reviews*

Book reviews in academic journals are a major vehicle for disseminating evaluations, but are themselves rarely described or evaluated (Motta-Roth, 1998). As a result, little is known about how reviewers present themselves and their opinions. Previous studies have shown that journal reviews can employ complex examples of metaphor (Low, 1997) and that metaphor is frequently connected in speech and writing with evaluations and opinions, as well as with attempts to foreground or background them (Cameron & Low 2004).

This paper uses a corpus of 20 reviews from science (SCI) and social science (SSCI) journals and examines how reviewers position the three main ‘actors’ involved - the book’s author, the reader (of the review or the book) and themselves – and how they use metaphor to help them do it.

The interest lies in the way authorial positioning ‘flows’ through the review, building on earlier positionings or changing them. The method adopted is therefore not genre analysis, but rather Positioning Theory (van Langenhove & Harré, 1999), supplemented by alignment, appeals to the reader, and breakdowns/repairs, from Conversation Analysis.

All the reviewers present themselves as more expert in some way than the readers. In many cases, however, they go well beyond this, and expend considerable textual effort to retain face and to claim some sort of superiority: in short, to come out ‘on top’, even where they lack experience, expertise or status, and even where the book is admitted to be extremely good. Examples will be discussed of where reviewers compete directly with the authors for equality and where they attack them (and in the process reposition the reader). In one case, the reader becomes the jury in a simulated court case, and metaphor is used not to mitigate status loss, but to intensify the force of the questions and to support the reviewer at the end.
Brigitta Mittmann (Augsburg, Germany)

A big deal or not so bad? *Evaluation in spoken British and American conversation*

A recently published study of multi-word units in spoken British and American corpora (Mittmann 2004) contains a wealth of linguistic items that can be used to express evaluation. For many of them, evaluation is ‘inscribed’ (cf. Martin 2000), or part of the meaning of the item in question. Amongst these, there are multi-word hedges, swearing expressions, frequent multi-word responses, and many other types of frequent clauses and phrases. In other cases, the relationship between the items and the act of evaluating is less straightforward. This applies, for example, to thanking and apologising expressions or to expressions inviting appraisal from others, such as tag questions.

This collection has hitherto not been studied from the perspective of evaluation. Applying some of the procedures and categories that have evolved within the framework of evaluation theory (such as the parameter approach developed by Bednarek) will help to reconsider the previous classification of the material and to discuss category boundaries.

Another section of the talk will focus on salient differences between the two varieties represented in the corpora and point out potential intercultural differences with respect to evaluation.

Moreover, the material makes it possible to address a question which should be interesting both for the study of evaluation and for lexicologists focusing on pragmatic phenomena, namely in how far evaluation is lexicalised in prefabricated phrases and clauses. Interesting structural properties of the items under discussion can be shown.

Using material that was collected for a different purpose has some drawbacks, such as the fact that many evaluative items had to be ignored. However, there are also advantages. One asset of the study lies in numbers: For most of the items mentioned, there was a variety of contexts to make relevant statements about them. Moreover, the large size of the corpora permits observations about formal phenomena.
Evaluation in academic book reviews: the interplay between the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual planes of language

Evaluation is a recurrent object of study in disciplines such as linguistics and discourse analysis. However, there is not much agreement on how this aspect of the meaning of language should be approached. One basic area of debate in relation to evaluation relates to whether evaluation belongs within the ideational or the interpersonal functions of language (cf. Halliday, 1985b). The present study tries to elucidate this question by narrowing the focus down to the detailed analysis of: a) one particular function of language, an act of evaluation, b) a given phenomenon of the external world, a book, c) in a given text type or genre, the academic book review. In this context, the paper shows the need to distinguish between the three major functions of language: the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual (cf. Halliday, 1985b). It considers the act of evaluation as such as part of the ideational plane of language on the basis that an evaluative act contributes propositional content. However, the expression of this evaluative act may include other textual features not directly involved in evaluating the book but in sharing the evaluation with the other participants in the communicative situation. Thus the paper shows, on the one hand, the interpersonal role of text elements, such as hedges and boosters, in modifying the propositional meaning expressed in an act of evaluation with pragmatic effects such as minimising criticism or emphasising praise. It also considers interpersonal features such as who takes the responsibility for the act of evaluation. Finally, the study pays attention to the textual function of language and examines the role of connectives and equivalent expressions in helping writers to organise their evaluation in sequences of acts for different rhetorical purposes. The analysis is based on a corpus of 20 academic book reviews taken from journals in the field of literature. The study also has important applications in the L2 writing classroom in general and in the teaching of critical writing techniques in particular.
Tunde Opeibi (Lagos, Nigeria)

**Persuading people and information management through the internet: A study of selected e-mails**

Communication experts have consistently argued that a message is deemed successfully transmitted (from an encoder to a decoder through a channel), when it is received and interpreted appropriately and the receiver responds positively/negatively through a feedback. Since the world has become a global village through advancement in information technology, e-mails have become one of the most viable and successful means of conveying information among humans in the modern world. This paper is a study of how people living several kilometers apart have been able to successfully persuade one another; get things done; express opinions; influence attitudes and reactions of others through messages sent via e-mails. The data set for the study are selected e-mails sent to two mail boxes- opeibit@yahoo.com and tundeopeibi@yahoo.com. I adopt both linguistic and discourse analysis approaches in the description and analysis of the texts with the primary aim of identifying and documenting linguistic and discourse features that contribute towards influencing the attitude of the interlocutors.
Hanna Pishwa (Hannover, Germany)

Goal markers and their evaluative force

Goals, which together with their outcomes create the nucleus of each schema, motivate and guide behaviour and are related to our well-being. They are associated with evaluation from two perspectives: They arise through the appraisal of events as probable goals on the one hand; on the other, they serve as source for further evaluations and emotions. Expressions for goals are hence good candidates for evaluative devices and may be conveyed by different linguistic means in dependence on their firmness and the speaker’s knowledge of their achievability. These properties are reflected in the meaning and function of, for instance, verbs which are used to verbalize goals in English, three of which are examined here: intend, plan, and try. These differ concerning the attainability and firmness of the goal as well as their evaluative force. Due to this, the spread and the function of the single verbs and their different forms vary according to the text sort. While plan and intend maintain more stable functions across different contexts, try is of particular interest in that it carries little inherent meaning and is more flexible and could be labelled “multifunctional” with the basic meaning of ‘uncertain goal’. These properties allow its use as an expression for evaluation of all kinds of goal. The paper investigates the behaviour of these verbs as evaluative goal markers from a cognitive and a linguistic point of view. The question is why the verbs differ in their behaviour concerning evaluation despite the shared feature ‘goal’. The answer can only be provided by considering both linguistic and cognitive issues involved with aspects relevant for the differences mentioned above; cognition will not be restricted solely to world knowledge, such as schemas, but will be extended to social and creative facets as well. Particular attention will be devoted to multifunctionality as a potential source for evaluation.
Elisabeth Reber (Potsdam, Germany)

_Evaluating in everyday problem talk_

In conversation analytic (CA) research, the activity “problem talk” - or “troubles talk“ as introduced by Jefferson (1980) - has been investigated from various angles in everyday conversation and in institutionalised talk. Interestingly enough, all of these investigations focus on its interactional establishment and organisation with the evaluative dimension of the activity treated as a side effect. At the same time, the activity / action of evaluating (and specifically of “assessing”; cf. Pomerantz 1984) has attracted considerable attention in CA literature in terms of its prosodic, lexical and syntactic realisation and its sequential organisation in everyday conversation in general. However, no extensive work has been done on the role of evaluations in problem talk.

According to Fiehler (1990), informative and evaluative aspects are insolubly linked in communicative processes; one of these aspects may predominate in talk. It follows that unless we take the evaluative dimension of speech into consideration in the analysis of problem talk, we cannot understand “Why that now?” (Schegloff 1990:55), e.g. how coherence in the ongoing activity is being constructed. Evaluations are regarded as serving as vehicles for specific actions and activities in which participants interactively engage in problem talk. In my paper I set out to show what linguistic and paralinguistic resources participants deploy to display this evaluative dimension and what interactional goals they achieve in doing so.

Fiehler, R., (1990), „Emotionen und Konzeptualisierungen des Kommunikationsprozesses“, _Grazer Linguistische Studien_ 33/34, 63-74.
Evaluation and stance in public and commercial broadcasters’ news bulletins

This paper investigates evaluation and stance in news bulletins of commercial and public broadcast stations in the Netherlands in order to test if and how the differences in the stations’ identities and intended audiences are reflected in the formulation of evaluation (ATTITUDE) and stance (ENGAGEMENT and GRADUATION).

News broadcasts on Dutch public and commercial television stations differ in a variety of ways, including topic selection and number and role of news readers. This is in line with their mission and identity: RTL4 addresses a somewhat broader, less intellectual audience than NOS. Both the public NOS and the commercial station RTL4 provide written news bulletins on their websites. This allows us to investigate how the different identities and intended audiences are reflected in the textual realization of the same news items without interference from different studio settings. We expected the commercial station RTL4 to use more involving elements like AFFECT and FORCE (in Appraisal terminology), while NOS was expected to project an authoritative image with JUDGEMENTS, FOCUS-elements, and HETEROGLOSSIC ENGAGEMENT.

We collected 60 news items (comprising almost 10,000 words) on 30 topics which were covered on both websites. The texts were analyzed with Appraisal-analysis following White (2003), Hood (2004), and Martin and Rose (2003).

Based on about one third of our material which has already been analyzed by both authors and compared, the following pattern emerges: AFFECT occurs very rarely, but slightly more(!) often in NOS than in RTL4 internet news. As expected, NOS news contains substantially more explicit and implicit JUDGEMENTS by the journalistic (authorial) voice; JUDGEMENTS by others are slightly more frequent for the commercial station. RTL4 uses APPRECIATION much more often than NOS. There is no quantitative difference in (overall) use of ENGAGEMENT, FORCE, and FOCUS. We will refine our quantitative results and complement them with qualitative analyses.
Nadine Rentel (Duisburg, Germany)

*Interlingual varieties in written academic discourse: evaluation in Italian and French research articles in linguistics*

In academic discourse, the process of knowledge transfer is highly influenced by culture-specific norms that are, for example, conveyed by the educational system. As a consequence, we have to deal with numerous “intellectual styles” concerning academic discourse in different speech communities. If a researcher wants to participate successfully in the academic discussion in another language, he has to be aware about existing interlingual differences in order to avoid misunderstandings.

In normative guidelines and coursebooks, scientific discourse is often supposed to be objective, impersonal and abstract, with the author remaining behind the facts. However, a researcher has to adopt a certain position towards approaches and results and express his or her attitude in order to contribute to the enhancement of science. We develop a model of analysis concerning central aspects in academic research papers that can be subject to evaluation, e.g. claiming a gap and boosting own results, and compare their linguistic realisation in French and Italian, for the discipline of linguistics.

Taking a cross-cultural view on academic discourse is of growing relevance due to its high degree of the globalisation: students spend a part of their studies in another culture, and researchers attend international conferences or publish and teach in foreign languages. In the last decade, a lot has been published on “academic” or “scientific” texts. However, the largest part of the studies focus on English as the *lingua franca* of academic discourse, and even in contrastive analyses, English appears in many cases as the dominant target language. Romance languages have, also under a contrastive perspective, only been very modestly studied. This can be observed for French, despite the fact that it boasts a considerable scientific production, and particularly for the “smaller” languages like Italian or Spanish. The paper aims at closing this gap by analysing systematically a corpus of 15 French and 15 Italian research papers taken from the field of linguistics, published between 2002 and 2004.
Evaluation in Russian oral communication and its prosodic cues

Utterances may convey a factual and also an emotive meaning. Emotive meanings include e.g. emotional, emphatic, and evaluative-attitudinal meanings. Evaluation phenomena „include all types of speech choices that are suggestive of positive or negative evaluative stances on the part of the speaker with respect to topic, part of a topic, partner, or partners in discourse“ (Janney 1996:12). This evaluative-attitudinal meaning does not necessarily have to be conveyed via lexical items. In oral communication we usually make use of certain prosodic cues (e.g. melodic and temporal) that lead to an evaluative interpretation.

In my talk I will report on evaluative utterances in Russian. These kinds of utterances either contain lexemes with an inherent evaluative meaning or they function via prosody alone without evaluative lexemes. I will mainly concentrate on the latter. Two production experiments on read and spontaneous speech and two perception tests were carried out to investigate the prosodic cues of evaluative utterances in Russian. I recorded Russian dialogues that contained utterances first in a positive and secondly in a negative evaluating context. The differences in the prosodic cues for positively and negatively appreciated utterances will be presented.

Prosodic characteristics under discussion include syllable duration, pitch range and pitch intervals on certain syllables as well as over a whole utterance. I have looked at these features in an acoustic analysis and have found certain characteristics that are relevant for interpreting an utterance as either positive or negative evaluating. The results show major differences between these two categories for tonal and temporal cues.

In a perception test native speakers of Russian were able to judge whether an utterance (without lexical evaluative material) was evaluative only by its prosody. So, prosody seems to play an important role in both production and perception of evaluation.

Evaluation everywhere! An attempt to identify and classify evaluative language in a corpus of book reviews

Evaluation can be described as a pervasive element of language and as a, or maybe the key function of verbal interaction. This is particularly true of a number of text types which belong to the genre of academic discourse, e.g. research articles, academic lectures, review articles or book reviews.

The present paper offers a corpus-driven approach to expressions of evaluation in the language of English linguistic book reviews. Starting from the assumption that the data should ideally precede the system in language analysis and description, I will not impose an existing model of evaluation on the data (such as Martin's APPRAISAL system or Bednarek's parameter-based framework), but put the corpus in pole position and try to work towards a model in the presence of large amounts of linguistic evidence.

I shall report on the process of identifying items with evaluative meaning in BRILC (the Book Reviews In Linguistics Corpus), a monitor corpus of reviews published in Linguist List issues (between 2001 and 2005), currently at a size of about 2.3 million words and covering 1,000 reviews. Different analytic strategies and their results will be presented and a first model of classifying evaluation will be sketched on the basis of the corpus findings.
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