View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by Xiamen University Institutional Repository

学校编码：10384　　分类号_____密级_____

学　　号：B200104010　　UDC _____

厦　门　大　学

博　士　学　位　论　文

会话中问句的批评性分析

A Critical Analysis of Questions in Dialogues

王 晋 军

指导教师姓名：杨信彰　教授

专 业　名 称：英语语言文学

论文提交日期：2004 年 8 月

论文答辩时间：2004 年　　月

学位授予日期：2004 年　　月

答辩委员会主席：_____

评　　阅　　人：_____

2004 年 **8** 月

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库

Abstract

This dissertation argues that questions are an important means to exercise power in all verbal interactions. Through a substantial statistical study, the dissertation expounds that questions are a latent powerful means in casual conversation and a prominent powerful means in institutional dialogue. Furthermore, it is pointed out that the immediate allocation of turn-taking and the temporary topic control result in the latency of questions as a powerful means in casual conversation. Comparatively, the prominence of questions as a powerful means centers on three factors: notably unequal distribution of questions producing the unequal allocation of turn-taking, dominant questions controlling both local and global topics, and Yes/No questions and Wh-questions exercising power in different degrees.

The significance of the dissertation is twofold. On the one hand, the dissertation establishes the theoretical underpinning for questions and power relations. It is argued that not only is there a natural and inherent joint of questions with power, but also questions and power relations can be interpreted from social semiotics, social cognition and psychology and systemic-functional linguistics. On the other hand, the dissertation sets up a four-layered critical framework of questions. In other words, questions and power relations can be revealed at the phonological level, the lexical level, the conversational structure level and the generic structure level. Such a critical framework of questions not only enriches research on questions, but also complements Fairclough's critical tools of spoken texts in CDA.

The critical framework of questions furnishes approaches for people to reveal questions and power relations in dialogues. Moreover, the critical framework of questions has been applied to both casual conversation and institutional dialogue to verify its feasibility and practicability. Besides, questions and power relations in intertextual dialogues are discussed. It is argued that questions as a prominent powerful means are reduced and power relations between participants are weakened in intertextual dialogues. It is also elaborated that two factors lead to the subtle change of questions and power relations, that is, the transformation of social status between participants and a tendency towards informality.

Key words: questions, CDA, power

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库

论 文 摘 要

本论文围绕着问句是会话中实施权势的重要手段而展开。在大量语料统计的基础上本论文论证了在日常会话和机构对话中问句都是实施权势的重要手段，只不过问句作为实施权势的手段在日常会话中较为隐含，而在机构对话中较为突出。本论文进一步指出日常会话中的问句控制了即刻的话轮和临时的话题，从而潜在地实施着权势。相比而言，机构会话中的问句由于三个因素而突出地实施着权势：其一，问句使用的明显不对等导致话轮分配的明显不对等；其二，占主导地位的问句不仅控制着序列话题而且控制着会话话题；其三，是非问句和特殊问句在不同程度上实施着权势。

本论文首先从理论上确立了问句与权势的关系。文中指出问句与权势不仅具有内在的和自然的联系，而且问句和权势关系可从社会符号学、社会认知和社会心理学以及系统功能语言学等三方面得到论证，从而为问句与权势关系确立了理论基础。其次，本论文确立了一个对问句进行批评性分析的四层框架，即从语音层、词汇层、会话结构层和语类结构层来揭示会话中的问句与权势关系。这样不仅拓展了对问句分析的视角，丰富了对问句的研究，而且弥补了批评话语分析对会话语篇分析的不足，并对批评话语分析的方法给予了有力的补充。

所确立的对问句的批评性分析框架向人们提供了用于揭示会话中问句与权势关系的手段。同时，该框架被应用到了日常会话和机构会话中以验证其可行性和可操作性。本论文也探讨了互文性会话中的问句与权势关系。文中指出互文会话中的问句会有所减少，而且问句所体现出的权势关系会有所减弱。同时本论文也阐述了参与者间社会地位的变化和非正式化的趋势是导致互文会话中问句与权势关系变化的两个因素。

关键词：问句；批评话语分析；权势

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库

Table of Contents

Introduction **1**

1. Background **1**

2. Objectives **5**

3. Research methodology **7**

4. Data collection **10**

5. The general outline of the dissertation **14**

Chapter 1 A brief survey of critical discourse analysis **16**

1.1 Introduction **16**

1.2 The development of CDA **16**

1.3 Power as the central concern of CDA **19**

1.4 The analytical tools of CDA **22**

1.4.1 Text and discourse 22

1.4.2 The analytical tools of written texts 25

1.4.3 The analytical tools of spoken texts and their drawbacks 28

1.5 Summary **31**

Chapter 2 The previous studies of questions and the necessity of a critical analysis of questions **33**

2.1 Introduction **33**

2.2 Defining question and interrogative **33**

2.3 The previous studies of questions **34**

2.3.1 The syntactic research on questions 35

2.3.2 The semantic research on questions 38

2.4 The necessity of a critical analysis of questions **47**

2.4.1 The drawbacks of the previous studies of questions 48

2.4.2 The natural joint of questions with power 49

2.5 Summary **51**

Chapter 3 Three theoretical interpretations of questions and

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库

power relations 52

3.1 Introduction 52

3.2 The interpretation of questions and power relations from social semiotics 52

3.2.1 Questions as an ideological act associated with power 52

3.2.2 Context of questioning conveying power and solidarity 54

3.3 The interpretation of questions and power relations from social cognition and psychology 57

3.3.1 The question/answer sequence as the effect of shared knowledge 57

3.3. 2 The question/answer sequence as the orderliness 59

3.4 The interpretation of questions and power relations from systemic-functional linguistics 63

3.4.1 Halliday's functional-systemic model of questions 63

3.4.2 Questions as an initiating speech function realizing unequal status 66

3.5 Summary 77

Chapter 4 Questions and the exercise of power 78

4.1 Introduction 78

4.2 Unattainable power-free 'ideal dialogue' 78

4.3 The classification of dialogues 80

4.4 Questions in casual conversation and the exercise of power 83

4.4.1 Power as covert in casual conversation 83

4.4.2 Questions as a pervasively latent means to exercise power in casual conversation 86

4.4.3 Questions in child/parent (adult) talk—an exceptional case ... 89

4.5 Questions in institutional dialogue and the exercise of power 93

4.5.1 Power as overt in institutional dialogue 93

4.5.2 Questions as a prominent means to exercise power in institutional dialogue 96

4.6 Summary 106

Chapter 5 The critical framework of questions in dialogues .. 108

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库

5.1 Introduction 108
5.2 The setup of the critical framework of questions 108
5.2.1 The phonological level 109
5.2.2 The lexical level 119
5.2.4 The generic structure level 143
5.3 The application of the critical framework of questions 153
5.3.1 A critical analysis of questions in a courtroom cross-examination 154
5.3.2 The critical analysis of questions in a piece of news interview 164
5.3.3 The critical analysis of questions in a medical encounter 175
5.3.4 The critical analysis of questions in casual conversation 186
5.4 Summary 198

Chapter 6 Questions and power relations in intertextual dialogues 202

6.1 Introduction 202
6.2 Defining intertextuality 202
6.3 Questions and power relations in intertextual dialogues 205
6.4 Two factors in the subtle changes of questions and power relations in intertextual dialogues 211
6.4.1 The transformation of social status between participants 211
6.4.2 A tendency towards informality 218
6.5 Summary 222

Conclusion 224

Appendix Data Samples 233

Bibliography 245

Acknowledgements 259

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库

目 录

绪论 ····· **1**
1. 背景介绍 ····· **1**
2. 论文的目标 ····· **5**
3. 研究方法 ····· **7**
4. 语料收集 ····· **10**
5. 论文结构 ····· 14
第一章 批评话语分析概述 ····· **16**
1.1 引言 ····· **16**
1.2 批评话语分析的发展历史 ····· **16**
1.3 权势是批评话语分析研究的中心问题 ····· **19**
1.4 批评话语分析的手段 ····· 22
1.4.1 语篇和话语 ····· 22
1.4.2 书面语篇分析的手段 ····· 25
1.4.3 口语语篇分析的手段及其不足 ····· 28
1.5 小节 ····· **31**
第二章 前人对问句的研究及批评性分析的必要性 ····· **33**
2.1 引言 ····· **33**
2.2 Question 和 interrogative 的定义 ····· **33**
2.3 前人对问句的研究 ····· 34
2.3.1 对问句的句法研究 ····· 35
2.3.2 对问句的语义研究 ····· 38
2.4 对问句进行批评性分析的必要性 ····· **47**
2.4.1 前人对问句研究的不足 ····· 48
2.4.2 问句与权势的自然结合 ····· 49
2.5 小节 ····· **51**

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库

第三章 问句与权势关系的三种理论解释 ……52
3.1 引言 ……52
3.2 社会符号学对问句与权势关系的解释 ……52
3.2.1 问句是与权势相关的意识形态行为 ……52
3.2.2 提问的语境传递着权势和稳定 ……54
3.3 社会认知和社会心理学对问句与权势关系的解释 ……57
3.3.1 问答序列是共有知识的结果 ……57
3.3.2 问答序列是一种秩序 ……59
3.4 系统功能语言学对问句与权势关系的解释 ……63
3.4.1 韩礼德对问句的系统功能模式 ……63
3.4.2 问句作为一种起始言语功能实现不平等地位关系 ……66
3.5 小节 ……77
第四章 会话中的问句与权势的实施 ……78
4.1 引言 ……78
4.2 不含权势的“理想会话” ……78
4.3 会话的分类 ……80
4.4 日常会话中的问句与权势的实施 ……83
4.4.1 日常会话中的权势是隐藏的 ……83
4.4.2 日常会话中的问句是实施权势的潜在手段 ……86
4.4.3 孩子/父母（成人）会话中的问句——日常会话中的例外 ……89
4.5 机构会话中的问句与权势的实施 ……93
4.5.1 机构会话中的权势是公开的 ……93
4.5.2 机构会话中的问句是实施权势的突出手段 ……96
4.6 小节 ……106
第五章 会话中问句的批评性分析框架 ……108
5.1 引言 ……108
5.2 问句批评性分析框架的确立 ……108
5.2.1 语音层 ……109

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库

5.2.2 词汇层 ……119
5.2.3 会话结构层……134
5.2.4 语类结构层……143
5.3 问句批评性分析框架的应用……153
5.3.1 法庭交互讯问中问句的批评性分析……154
5.3.2 新闻采访中问句的批评性分析 ……164
5.3.3 医疗会话中问句的批评性分析 ……175
5.3.4 日常会话中问句的批评性分析 ……186
5.4 小节……198
第六章 互文会话中的问句与权势关系 ……202
6.1 引言……202
6.2 互文性的定义……202
6.3 互文对话中的问句与权势关系……205
6.4 导致互文会话中问句与权势关系变化的两个因素 ……211
6.4.1 参与者间社会地位的变化 ……211
6.4.2 非正式化的趋势……218
6.5 小节……222
结 论……224
附录 语料范例……233
参考文献……245
致谢……259

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库

List of figures and tables

Figure 1.1 Discourse and discourse analysis
Figure 2.1 The previous studies of questions
Figure 2.2 The turn-taking system
Figure 2.3 The levels and ranks of a lesson
Figure 3.1 Speech function (semantic) network for dialogue
Figure 3.2 Relation of text, context of situation and the linguistic realization
Figure 3.3 Hasan's (1981) social relations network
Figure 3.4 Ratios of interrogatives in 'non-hierarchic' verbal interactions
Figure 4.1 Question percentages in parent/adult and child talk
Figure 4.2 Question ratios in five sub-genres of institutional dialogue
Figure 4.3 The ratios of Wh-questions and Yes/No questions by powerful participants in five sub-genres of institutional dialogue
Figure 5.1 Move in dialogue
Figure 5.2 The speech function network in a dialogue
Figure 5.3 Genre in relation to register and language
Figure 6.1 Interdiscursivity and intertextuality

Table2.1 Grammatical categories, situational categories and discourse categories
Table 3.1 Speech functions and their responses
Table 3.2 Speech functions and typical mood types
Table 3.2 A statistics of questions in institutional dialogue
Table 3.3 The relation between social roles and the choices of interrogatives

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库

Table 4.1 Question ratios in five sub-genres of institutional dialogue

Table 4.2 The ratios of Wh-questions and Yes/No questions by powerful participants in five sub-genres of institutional dialogue

Table 5.1 The judgement system in English (Martin, 1997, 2000)

Table 5.2 The appreciation system in English (Martin, 1997, 2000)

Table 5.3 Value degrees of some modal expressions

Table 5.4 The relation between value degrees and degrees of politeness of modal expressions

Table 5.5 The summary of speech functions in Dialogue 5.37

Table 5.6 The summary of speech functions in Dialogue 5.40

Table 5.7 The summary of speech functions in the court cross-examinations

Table 5.8 The summary of speech functions in a news interview

Table 5.9 The summary of speech functions in a medical encounter

Table 5.10 The summary of speech functions in the talk among friends

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库

Introduction

In this part, we will present the background knowledge of the present study, the objectives to achieve, the research methodology adopted, the data collection and the general outline of the dissertation.

1. Background

As social men, we spend much of our lives talking. Talk is what moves the world, no matter in the private life or public fields. Undoubtedly talk is a prominent and necessary part of our everyday activities. With regard to a face-to-face interaction, several terms are used alternatively. Van Dijk (1985, iii) regards a face-to-face verbal interaction as spoken discourse, whose alternatives include such forms as talk, conversation, and dialogue. Yet, he favors dialogue for the title of his paper as a form of discourse and interaction. Cameron (2001) argues that the use of different terms like conversation, talk and spoken discourse refers to the same thing. There are numerous literatures adopting dialogue, talk, spoken discourse, verbal interaction and conversation interchangeably, namely Linell's (1998) *Approaching Dialogue*; Eggins & Slide's (1997) *Analyzing Casual Conversation*; Thornborrow's (2001) *Power Talk*; Coulthard's (1992) *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*; Ventola's (1987) *The Structure of Social Interaction* and so on.

The reason that dialogue[1] rather than talk or conversation is chosen as the title of this dissertation mainly lies in the fact that dialogue has a wider coverage than talk or conversation in terms of its data sources because it can involve talk and conversation both in spoken and written forms. Owing to the fact, the dissertation is concerned with two kinds of dialogue, that is, institutional dialogue

[1] Dialogue used in this dissertation is limited to face-to-face verbal interaction, which is defined by Linell (1998: 9) as any dyadic or polyadic interaction between individuals who are mutual co-present to each other and who interact through language.

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库

and casual conversation. In accordance with Burton's (1980) viewpoint, drama dialogue bears some similarities to naturally occurring conversation. It can be inferred that fictional, dramatic and screen dialogues in one way or another resemble to real conversations despite the subtle differences between them. Such a reason is the main support for the data collection in this dissertation, which covers dialogues in novels, dramas, film scripts and textbooks.

Questions[2], as a basic and indispensable linguistic form in a dialogue, have drawn much attention for a long time. Due to their anticipation and expectation of answers, questions are regarded as the key and obligatory element in a dialogue. Patterson (1988:38) once stresses that questions are the life of dialogue; dialogue is the source of meaning; meaning is the substance of life. It has been said that when dialogue ends, everything ends. Here let it be added that when the question ends, everything ends. It is obvious that questions have been the major concern of scholars. Roughly speaking, the previous studies of questions primarily concentrate on the dual characteristics of questions, i.e. syntactic forms and semantic meanings of questions. The syntactic research on questions has been carried out from two perspectives, i.e. traditional syntactic approach to questions and contemporary syntactic research on questions. The traditional syntactic research on questions focuses on the formal or syntactic classification of questions. Contemporary syntax highlights transformational grammar, which expounds in detail how surface structures of questions are generated from their deep structures by way of a set of transformational rules.

The semantic research on questions has been developed into two general orientations, i.e. the linguistic semantics of questions and the functional studies of questions. The linguistic semantics of questions is basically associated with the elaborated denotation of propositions that constitute possible answers. The

[2] Questions locate their habitat in dialogues or conversations. According to Biber *et al*.'s (2002: 211) findings, there is on average one question per every 40 words in conversation and questions are many times more common in conversation than in writing.

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库

functional studies of questions have been undertaken from three perspectives, i.e. the pragmatic approach to questions, CA approach to questions and the structural-functional approach to questions.

Despite the merits that these studies have achieved, their drawbacks can be detected without difficulty. First, the syntactic research on questions mainly concentrates on the form or the syntactic structure of questions and how surface structures of questions are generated from their deep structures, but it pays little attention to the semantics of questions. Secondly, as to the semantic research on questions, the linguistic semantics or pure semantics of questions is chiefly associated with the elaborated denotation of propositions that constitute possible answers to questions and disregards functions of questions. Thirdly, the functional studies of questions likewise remain deficient. Although the pragmatic approach to questions regards questions as not a set of sentences containing only sound and meaning rather as speech acts to produce effects on our action and to suggest concrete conversational implicatures, the exploration of functions of questions from this perspective is preliminary and very limited. Concerning the CA approach to questions, as Coulthard (1977) points out that the analytic methodology and the categories of CA remain informal and imprecise, the CA approach does not provide a precise and operational way to analyze questions. Although the structural-functional approach reaches the peak in the functional studies of questions, there is something neglected by the Birmingham School, that is, the failure to disclose the reason that within a classroom a teacher has the right to elicit questions whenever s/he wants to, while students are obliged to contribute to answers when asked.

In general, the most distinct drawback of these studies is that questions as a linguistic form and a social act fail to reflect social role relations and social identities between participants in communication. According to Halliday (1978), language is a product of social process and a means to reflect and influence things.

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库

Language not only can mirror but also can change social and individual ideology. On the basis of the systemic - functional theory and critical linguistic theory, this dissertation attempts to analyze questions from a new perspective, i.e. the critical semiotic perspective in order to disclose the close connection of questions with ideology and power and to reveal power hidden in question-laden dialogues, which are often taken for granted, however.

To analyze questions from a critical perspective is necessary not only for our further and thorough understanding of the nature of questions, but also for the perfection of analytical tools of critical discourse analysis (henceforth CDA) per se. Such an argument embodies two sides. One is that CDA has put many efforts on written texts and produced many effective approaches to attain the demystification of power and ideology in written texts. However, its exploration of spoken texts is virtually scarce and neglected. The other is that CDA has paid certain attention to spoken texts, and yet, its analytical approaches appear unsystematic and vague.

As a critical approach of discourse analysis, CDA aims to unmask power relations hidden in discourse and how discourse is shaped by way of its relations with power and ideology. In fact, Halliday's systemic-functional grammar has been the main tool for critical discourse analysts to make a fruitful analysis of written texts. Some major linguistic tools of written texts include 'transitivity', 'modality', 'classification', 'coherence' 'syntagmatic models', 'passivization', 'nominalization' and so on. However, critical discourse analysts rarely pay attention to spontaneous and naturally occurring spoken texts except Fairclough's (1992) deficient description.

Fairclough (1989, 1992, 1995) has mentioned some analytical approaches to spoken discourse. In particular, he (1992: 138) has proposed some analytical tools of spoken discourse after analyzing three samples, such as "interactional control (including turn-taking, exchange structure, topic control, control of agendas,

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库

Degree papers are in the “Xiamen University Electronic Theses and Dissertations Database”. Full texts are available in the following ways:
1. If your library is a CALIS member libraries, please log on http://etd.calis.edu.cn/ and submit requests online, or consult the interlibrary loan department in your library.
2. For users of non-CALIS member libraries, please mail to etd@xmu.edu.cn for delivery details.

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库