

УДК 811.112.2

Towards Evaluation in Scientific Reviews (Based on German Linguistics)

Sergey T. Nefedov*

*Saint Petersburg State University
7/9 University Embankment, St. Petersburg,
199034, Russia*

Received 20.09.2019, received in revised form 30.09.2019, accepted 07.10.2019

The present paper considers evaluative aspect of a German linguistic review as a certain type of expert text. Expert evaluation is regarded in the context of its role in collective intersubjective process of verification and critical review of knowledge aimed at implementing it in the scientific scope of the subject. Special focus is put on regulatory character of expert evaluation. When exercising evaluation, reviewers as representatives of the scientific expert community united by its aims and tasks, rely on collectively elaborated and shared criteria of scientific rationality. The article also identifies the key role of institutional, sociocultural and internal verbal context when revealing means of expression of evaluative meanings and axiological contrast of evaluation in the text structure. Major ways of implicit display of evaluation are categorized in the concept of cognitive strategy; typical strategies are illustrated by examples of their context realization. Methods involved in the study (structural and propositional text segmentation, component analysis of lexical units, contextual and linguo-epistemic analysis) being the elements of complex methodology allowed to produce general evaluative profile of scientific reviews in German linguistics.

Keywords: linguistic discourse, scientific review, expert evaluation, explicit evaluation, implicit evaluation.

Research area: Germanic languages.

Citation: Nefedov, S.T. (2019). Towards evaluation in scientific reviews (based on German linguistics). J. Sib. Fed. Univ. Humanit. Soc. Sci., 12(10), 1868–1886. DOI: 10.17516/1997–1370–0494.

1. Introduction

Studies of scientific communication consider the notion of evaluation differently. The most wide-spread approach to evaluation regards it as expression of essential feature of

© Siberian Federal University. All rights reserved

* Corresponding author E-mail address: nefedovst@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000–0002–0719–7702

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

cognitive activity. Indispensable part of cognition is critical evaluative reflection about the information perceived (Vorobyeva, 1985; Bazhenova, 2001; Longino, 1990; Hunston, 1994; Weinrich, 2006; Kulikova, Burmakina, 2016 et al.). This approach to evaluation as a professional imperative was concisely and expressively formulated by German linguist Harald Weinrich. According to him, general norms for all representatives of scientific community in scientific communication are two complementary maxims (cf. German *das Gebot* — commandment). On the one hand, it is a compulsory requirement for everyone to publish their research findings as knowledge itself does not possess any value if no one knows about it («*das Veröffentlichungsgebot*»). On the other hand, being aimed at a certain recipient and critically assessed by the colleagues in the professional field are of vital importance (cf. «*das Rezeptions- und Kritikgebot*») (Weinrich, 2006: 210). Pragmatics- and discourse-oriented works stress a different meaning of evaluation. They point out functional aspect of evaluation, its role in the structure of scientific argumentation. Evaluation is viewed thus as a pragmatic tool which is used by the researcher to obtain elements of new knowledge based on critical reasoning and value judgements on the prior, already implemented in the academic scope or actively disputed knowledge (Hyland, 2004; Swales, 2004; Chernyavskaya, 2017; Nefedov, 2017; Beliaeva, Chernyavskaya, 2019). Moreover, a completely different — teleologic — angle is given to this concept. In this case evaluation is seen as a key pragmatic objective in axiologically oriented texts (Arutyunova, 1999: 197; Krasilnikova, 1999; Riefel, 1998).

Consequently, the first meaning of evaluation mentioned above describes it as a universal category and unites all scientific texts, whereas two other views allow to differentiate text types by dominant function of evaluative expressions. Scientific-theoretical (monographs, research articles, theses, etc.) and scientific-informational (review) texts use evaluation as a tool of providing persuasive arguments, grounds of scientific value of the writer's claims in the context of critical (positive or negative) evaluation of the other researchers' viewpoints. In contrast, in scientific-expert texts evaluation naturally becomes the aim of communication and is directly involved in the collective critical review, search and selection of research outcomes which play a major role in the development of the corresponding subject area. In this aspect, expert-evaluative texts are seen as secondary in concept-content regard as they are already correlated with the issues discussed beforehand and their solutions (Heinemann, 2000: 705). However, they appear to be communicatively primary in the progressive development of science and constituting new knowledge.

Socio-communicative function of evaluation discussed above is associated with a specific practice in science — expert review. To provide expert evaluation scientific community has elaborated special text types such as reviews of scientific monographs and articles, reviews of scientific graduation theses, reports on research grants implementation, research recommendations, and a wide range of other expert evaluative texts. Evaluation acts as a major text forming feature of such texts. It sets the framework and outline of cognition in the corresponding subject area by regulating a general course and vector of knowledge structures movement following epistemic path *verifiable — verified — primary (axiomatic) knowledge* (Ilyin, 1989: 95–99).

Evaluation of scientific texts has not been fully considered in linguistics: both in text typology relation and concerning specific languages data. Most of papers refer to evaluation in general without discussing its realization in different types of scientific texts. However, if specific use of evaluation is regarded, central text types of scientific discourse, mainly research articles are analyzed. Evaluation of these kinds of texts is conceptualized in terms of ‘cognitive evaluation’ which is used to express axiological activity of the researcher when interpreting old knowledge, new elements of knowledge or method (Chernyavskaya, 2017). Followers of interaction approach to evaluation foreground cooperation in communication and intersubjectivity in producing knowledge. In this case pragmatic categories are mainly used like the writer’s ‘stance’ and the addressee’s ‘evaluative orientation’ (cf. *stance* and *engagement* by K. Hyland (Hyland, 2004: 14)); ‘status of proposition reliability’ (cp. *status of a proposition* by S. Hunston (Hunston, 1994: 194–196)) and others.

In this concern evaluation of a scientific review proves to be generally less studied. As far as I can judge, in German linguistics of the last 10–15 years this issue received little attention. Papers of the earlier period traditionally discussed general issues: semantic grounds and aspects of evaluation of the works reviewed (Zillig, 1982: 202–205); general or dominant role of evaluation among other functions of reviews (Pätzold, 1986: 101); intentional structure of evaluative speech acts (Riefel 1998: 490) and some others.

What follows from this premise is — the purpose of the present paper is to present current evaluative profile of the German linguistic review. It is possible to achieve this objective only by investigating the following issues: complex analysis of value-laden means taking into account their form, meaning and function; ways of expressing evaluative meanings in the linguistic structure of the review considering all types of context; integration of cognitive aspect of scientific institutional discourse with its

steady norms, standards and scholarly criteria in the undertaken analysis. Therefore, the present paper seems to contribute to the study of evaluative aspect of the scientific review by modeling text typology, linguistically determined evaluative profile of the review of linguistic papers through the language.

2. Material and method

The data analyzed in the present paper includes text corpus of 30 German reviews on Germanic philology published between 2013 and 2018. All the reviews were found in German online journal ‘Zeitschrift für Rezensionen zur germanistischen Sprachwissenschaft’ (ZRS), which quickly posts reviews of German linguists of newly published (no longer than three years ago) scientific works (monographs of some writers, collective monographs, monographs based on doctoral theses). The reviews can be found on the website of the journal and are in open access following the link: <https://www.deepdyve.com/browse/journals/zeitschrift-f-r-rezensionen-zur-germanistischen-sprachwissenschaft/>.

Major method involved in the study included quantitative and qualitative content analysis. Quantitative data were obtained as a result of preliminary segmentation of the texts into predications. The notion of predication is understood in the paper as a two-piece text structure which implies dynamic linear development of the meaning and includes the subject (predicately determined component) and the predicate (predicated feature). In general, the amount of text predications proves to be equal to the number of verbs in the conjugated form. Thirty reviews under discussion contain 4,252 predications.

In order to model evaluative profile of the review, this structural method was accompanied by meaning-oriented methods which allow to conduct qualitative analysis of text propositions: component analysis of lexical units, contextual and linguo-epistemic analysis. All these methods present a complex methodology which allows to model evaluative profile of the linguistic review: to differentiate descriptive and value-laden text propositions, to set the method of marking evaluative meanings, to reveal or specify evaluative polarity of linguistic units, to interpret implicit evaluative meanings.

3. Results and Discussion

The very general evaluative profile of the linguistic review can be presented as a ratio of value-laden predications to their total amount. From the total number of

predications found in the corpus out of 4,252 predications there are 723 evaluative ones. This accounts for 17 % of the total amount of predications, i. e. approximately one in six predications in the scientific review is evaluative. Let us illustrate the most characteristic features of both explicit and implicit expert evaluation in the text corpus under analysis.

3.1. Explicit expert evaluation

The results show that explicit positive and negative qualification is realized in the review by integrating lexical means in the propositions:

1) adjectival lexemes (adjectives, qualitative adverbs, adjectival participles):
 a) positive value-laden lexemes: *ausführlich, überzeugend, sinnvoll, konsequent, wichtig, neu, aktuell, innovativ, originell, klar, systematisch, aussagekräftig, interessant, nachvollziehbar, wichtig, relevant, wesentlich, wertvoll, plausibel, fundiert, deutlich, konzis, stichhaltig, präzise, prägnant, ordentlich, umfassend, umfangreich, detailliert, differenziert, profund; übersichtlich*, etc.; b) negative value-laden lexemes, including those with explicit negation *nicht* or negative prefixes *un-*, *ir-* added to originally positive evaluative lexemes: *fragwürdig, falsch, vage, problematisch, apodiktisch, fehlend, präventiös, rätselhaft; unklar, unverständlich, unbefriedigend, irritierend, irrelevant, nicht überzeugend, nicht vertrauenswürdig, nicht deutlich, nicht klar, nicht korrekt, nicht nachvollziehbar, nicht angemessen, nicht aussagekräftig, nicht zielführend* etc.

2) abstract nouns (denoting quality; the so-called *nomina qualitatis*): a) positive appreciation: *Schlüssigkeit, Stringenz, Klarheit, Deutlichkeit, Ausführlichkeit, Verständlichkeit, Prägnanz; Genauigkeit*, etc.; б) negative appreciation: *Haupt(Problem), Widerspruch, Schwäche, Schwachstelle, Redundanzen, Inkonsistenz, Ungenauigkeit*, etc.

Semantic diversity of expert evaluation can be demonstrated relying on various qualification grounds: 1) the degree of generalization of evaluative feature; 2) outer source of evaluation motivation; 3) subject-meaning reference of evaluation; 4) axiological polarity of evaluation. Let us now give a brief characteristic of these semantic types of expert evaluation based on the language data.

General and specific expert evaluation

Expert evaluation qualification occurs when reviewing through semantically specific appreciation. General evaluation is hardly ever used in the review. Lexemes *richtig* and *falsch* conveying general evaluation were found only in one or two contexts respectively,

though being expected in scientific discourse aimed at searching the truth and rejecting the false claims. However, instances of quite frequently used adjective *gut* including its comparative form *besser* which convey general appreciation were found 23 times in the texts under analysis. In reality, in its meaning of general evaluation, i. e. to make axiological conclusion, this lexeme was found three times only: *ein gutes Handbuch, eine gute Idee, ein gutes Vorbild*. In other cases *gut* is used to express specific appreciation in order to specify cognitive actions of the author reviewed: *gut durchdenken, gut argumentieren, gut begründen, gute Antworten liefern, eine gute Orientierung geben, gut nachvollziehen lassen*, etc. Axiological conclusion in its turn is made by the writers of reviews by incorporating into propositions of lexemes which invoke specific evaluation. Significance and novelty of the obtained result for linguistics are thus focused: *ein wichtiger und origineller Beitrag, ein relevanter Beitrag, wertvolle Aufsätze, qualitativ hochwertige Beiträge; Der Band diskutiert viel Relevantes*, etc.

Rational and emotional expert evaluation

Evaluative dimension of reviews is characterized by prevailing rational appraisal. It reveals direction of mental activity of the reviewer towards intellectual sphere rather than to emotional processing of scientific results and procedures of their justifying from the perspective of logical rationality. It is well known that in science rationality is measured by the degree of its conforming/non-conforming to the so-called ‘absolute scholarly criteria’. The latter are regarded as conventional discursive norms of science work and presenting the results of the conducted research to scientific community: current interest in the questions raised, novelty of the solutions offered and the result obtained, verification (proof given) and credibility and testability of the results, appropriate use of methods to the objectives set, logic and consistency of argumentation provided, factual accuracy and clarity, etc.

Analysis of the corpus data revealed that the most frequently used semantic types of rational appreciation are those bearing the meaning of: 1) plausible, valid (*überzeugend, plausibel, fundiert*) / problematic (*problematisch, nicht vertrauenswürdig*); 2) clear, accurate (*klar, deutlich*) / not clear, inaccurate (*unklar, nicht klar*); 3) detailed (*ausführlich, umfassend*) / brief, piecewise (*knapp, punktuell*); 4) relevant (*wichtig, wesentlich, relevant*) / irrelevant (*irrelevant*). The most frequently used lexemes are put in brackets.

As far as emotional appreciation is concerned, the data corpus contains 36 instances which accounts for about five percent of the total amount of evaluative

predications. In the course of reviewing experts mainly express regret (*leider, schade*), interest (*interessant, spannend*), astonishment (*beeindruckend*), shock (*überraschend, irritierend*), joy (*erfreulich*), skepticism (*skeptisch*).

Subject-denotative types of expert evaluation

In denotative regard, semantic multidimensionality of expert appreciation results from oppositely-directed character of expert evaluation. The object of this evaluation is various aspects of the reviewed work. Despite potentially large number of dimensions and aspects of both the scientific result and the process of its production, object field of evaluation in the scientific review is focused on four major target areas:

(1) conceptual meaning of the reviewed work: the author's claims, conclusions and summarizing, interpretation of language data, etc.: for example: *Die Ergebnisse sind entweder sehr grob ... oder ... nicht sehr vertrauenswürdig* [Bücking IV, 205] — The **results** are either too rough or unconvincing.

(2) process of new knowledge acquisition, i. e. analysis procedure and methodology presented in the reviewed work, their accordance with the hypothesis formulated and aims set; for example: *Die Mischung von kategorialer und funktionaler Aspekte führt zu verschiedenen Problemen ...* [Bücking IV, 206] — **Blending of categorical and functional aspects** leads to different problems.

(3) language form of presenting the scientific result and argumentation process; for example: ... *das die empirischen Fallstudien einleitende Kapitel 10 ... benennt sehr breit angelegte Fragen, aber keine klaren Hypothesen* [Bücking IV, 205] — ... chapter 10, preceding analysis of empiric data, **fully** outlines the research questions, but **does not clearly formulate** the hypothesis.

(4) professional qualities of the author; for example: ... *diskutiert Felfe die (auch kontroversen) Standpunkte der Konstruktionsgrammatik ausführlich und kenntnisreich ...* [Gerdes XVII, 148] — ... Felfe discusses premises of structures' grammar, including disputable ones, in a **thorough and professional** manner.

As for evaluation of the reviewed work's author, besides direct appreciation like in the above mentioned example (4), expert evaluation provided in a specific review is indirectly related to the author. In this regard, one can speak about double referential attribute of evaluation of the indicated above (1)-(3) target object areas. When evaluating various aspects of the reviewed text content, analysis procedure and method, language and style of scholarly writing, the author of the review simultaneously appreciates professional competence of the researcher as well. Look at the examples provided above (1)-(3): they illustrate evaluation of not only the results of the study as not meeting

scholarly standards, eclectic methodology, unclear manner of linguistic expression. They also demonstrate evaluation of the researcher who selected the data, conducted the research and expressed the ideas unprofessionally.

Positive and negative explicit expert evaluation

Several scholars claim that positive value-laden means prevail in scientific discourse texts including reviews (Troyanskaya, 1985: 77; Swales, 2004: 34). These conclusions made by linguists are confirmed by the data obtained when analyzing the review corpus. It is clearly seen that on average explicit means with positive appreciation semantics constitute 5:1. Detailed investigation of linguistic reviews reveals 340 instances of explicit positive evaluation or 47 % from the total amount of evaluative meanings and 72 instances of explicit negative evaluation that amounts to 10 % from the total number of evaluative meanings. Major grammatical ways of expressing expert appreciation were outlined at the beginning of the present section.

However, it should be noted that in some cases axiological polarity of explicit evaluation is strongly affected by the context. Context can have such a strong impact that lexemes which originally bear positive meanings are recontextualized and may acquire contextual meanings with an opposite polarity for example:

(5) *Der Verfasser formuliert, dass eine Bibliographie nicht beabsichtigt sei, „da diese anderswo leicht zu finden ist“ (S. 522). Gut. Allerdings wird man denken noch erwarten dürfen, dass das, was zu finden ist, korrekt und aktuell ist: Beim Überfliegen fällt auf: S. 523 ... fehlt ein beschließender Punkt; S. 528 Gesichte > (statt — S.N.) Geschichte; S. 223 ...das ... Wörterbuch genannt, nicht jedoch ... die Neubearbeitung ... [Wich-Reif XI, 192] — The author points out that bibliography lies beyond the scope of the paper as “it can be easily found in a different place“ (p.522). Right. However, it seems natural to expect that what we have here is **consistent and relevant**. When taking a closer look at the text though it is evident that on page 523 ... there is no full-stop at the end of the sentence; on page 528 we find *Gesichte* instead of *Geschichte*; on page 223 the dictionary is named but edition is not new.*

In the extract (5) provided the reviewer definitely sounds ironic about frivolous attitude of the researcher to making the reference list. This attitude as it is presented by the expert with exact reference to page numbers of the monograph reviewed contradicts with conventional institutional norms: reference list is a compulsory part of professionally done research, it has to reveal relevant theoretical framework of the issues under discussion and it should be properly organized. In this context explicitly

positive lexeme *gut* is used ironically by the reviewer, and like any irony, it tends to bear the opposite meaning. However, lexemes of positive evaluation *korrekt* and *aktuell* refer not to the issue under discussion but to the norms of the scholarly writing. Generally, all these lexical choices illustrate discrepancy between the research which was actually done and collectively shared norms. As a result, these lexemes do not express positive evaluation, but rather act as triggers of negative appreciation.

Therefore, context in all its forms (co-text, situational communication context, general cultural context) proves to be a timeless and key factor any time when linguistic analysis of language facts is conducted in real usage (Nefedov, Chernyavskaya, 2019, in print). The task of the linguist then is to reveal how context affects the process of generating text meaning and its components. From this perspective let us now consider major ways of expressing implicit evaluation in greater detail.

3.2. *Implicit positive and negative expert evaluation*

Taking into consideration all denotative aspects discussed above (content, method, structure and style, professional qualities of the author-researcher), expert evaluation appears to be highly correlated with collectively shared, common aim of scientific (in the present paper — linguistic) community. The aim is to produce elements of new knowledge based on strict institutional collectively ratified criteria which are set to theoretical scientific-cognitive activity and its result. This means that positive or negative appreciation of validity, novelty, relevance of the outcomes obtained are present when propositions of the reviewer contain no evaluative or even qualificative lexemes which trigger inductive process of evaluative interpretation in the addressee's mind. From this perspective some researchers claim that all propositions which are related with collective objectives of the community appear to be evaluative proves to be fair (Hunston, 1994: 197; Molodychenko, 2015: 57). Therefore, appreciation can be found both in propositions with explicit evaluative elements and in implicit forms affected by interaction of the reviewer's claims with the context of professional scientific communication. The following example can serve as an illustration:

(6) *Der Versuch, die Beiträge ... in thematische Einheiten zusammenzufassen, wirkt ... etwas gekünstelt, zumal die Überschriften dieser Kapitel nicht besonders aussagekräftig sind und die Zuordnung der Beiträge zu einzelnen Kapiteln nicht ganz überzeugt. Während der erste Beitrag von Clemens Knobloch keiner thematischen Einheit zugeordnet ist, gibt es gleich drei Kapitel, die nur einen einzigen Beitrag enthalten ... der Versuch einer thematischen Strukturierung nicht*

zu überzeugen vermag ... [Frick X, 40–41] — An attempt undertaken to unite articles into topical sections appears to be **rather artificial** as the chapter titles are **quite inexpressive** and referring papers to separate chapters is **not very convincing**. However, report by Clemens Knobloch is **not added to any section**, there are at once three chapters, **containing just one article**... This attempt of topical structuring **cannot be convincing**...

This small extract from the review by Karina Frick on collective monograph about ellipsis edited by Matilda Henning criticizes the structure of the monograph: incorrect section structuring and unconvincing reference of some papers to different chapters.

Instances of negative evaluation literally form here ‘value-based conglomerate’, following one another. Thus, ‘pot shot’ effect is produced. In addition, the extract given illustrates a typical feature of expressing negative appreciation in scientific reviews covertly rather than in an overt manner.

Half the instances of text propositions in this extract do not contain words which bear evaluative meanings. For example, word-combinations like “to be artificial”, “to contain just one article” or “not to refer to any section” do not bear any evaluative meanings. They acquire value-laden meanings in the context of the demonstrated scientific-cognitive activity and indicate inconsistency of shown facts with standards of scientific research.

The results of the contextual-semantic analysis reveal basic cognitive strategies of evaluative meanings implication.

1) *Implication of positive or negative evaluation through information sharing, statement of facts*

Facts considered in the review acquire evaluative (positive or negative) meanings in the framework of absolute scholarly criteria and standards of scientific argumentation. In such cases implicit evaluation is completely based on common professional knowledge shared by all representatives of scientific community. Evaluation cues are covert, contextual and are revealed on the cognitive level of discourse interpretation. Any compliance with the norms is seen positive and deviation from the norms is regarded as negative. For example:

(7) *Köller lässt zwei Welten sich aufeinander zu bewegen: die Welt der Sprache und die der Bilder. Zwei sinnstiftende Bereiche werden hier miteinander in Beziehung gesetzt, die ... medial-strukturell und funktional-kommunikativ, phänomenologisch, erkenntnistheoretisch und kulturhistorisch ergründet werden* [Jacob XIV, 175]. — Köller makes two worlds move toward one another: the world of language

and the world of images. Between these two meaning-generating spheres specific relationships are established. They are interpreted structurally and medially and functionally and communicatively, phonemologically, theoretically-cognitively and culturally-historically.

(8) ... *Daneben gibt es mehrere illustrierende Grafiken und Karten* [Wich-Reif XI, 189]. In addition, numerous charts and maps are present in the paper.

Examples (7) and (8) report facts but actually they convey assessment. The reviewers refer to comprehensive character of the conducted research in example (7) and to illustrative way of providing evidence in example (8). This is indicative of compliance with commonly adopted scientific norms and thus invokes positive evaluation. Cf. the following example (9) with inappropriate presenting arguments in the reviewed paper in terms of institutional norms: the author claims adopting one approach (semantic) whereas he/she relies on a different method (structural). As a result, negative evaluation is construed:

(9) *Der Autor erkennt an, dass es sich bei Modifikation um ein primär semantisches Phänomen handelt, seine basale Modifikatordefinition ist allerdings rein strukturell; auch der Großteil der Diskussion dreht sich um morpho-syntaktische Fragen wie etwa der nach adäquaten Wortartkriterien* (Bücking IV, 205). — The author admits that modification (meanings of linguistic units — S.N.) is understood primarily as a semantic phenomenon. However, his major definition of the modifier is completely structural. Moreover, most part of the discussion is centered around morphosyntactic issues such as criteria of words classification.

2) *Implication of positive evaluation through alignment with the viewpoint of reviewed paper's author*

Explicit token of demonstrating alignment in German reviews is expression *zu Recht* (*having a solid grounding, convincing, justified*). Alignment with the author's position implies positive evaluation of some statements which have been considered by the reviewer and are regarded as crucial; for example:

(10) *Haas mahnt, völlig zu Recht, die Verantwortung der Gesellschaft an, Lesekompetenzen auszubilden* [Fix II, 143] — Haas **fairly reminds** of the responsibility of the society for the formation of reading skills.

(11) *Hierbei konstatiert der Autor zu Recht, dass die Kompetenzen im Bereich der sprachlichen Interaktion wichtiger Bestandteil der Sprachkompetenz der Lernenden seien* [Schneider IX, 99] —

By saying that the author **convincingly states** that language interaction skills are a key aspect of the student's language competence.

3) *Implication of negative evaluation through presenting the proof by contradiction*

Disagreement with the author-researcher is often expressed in scientific reviews by criticism based on proof by contradiction. Omission of some aspects in the reviewed paper is regarded as deviation from the norms of scholarly writing, and thus seen as negative. For example:

(12) *Höflichkeit wird ... als Mittel (oder Ressource) zur Konstruktion eines Konsenses verstanden. In den theoretischen Ausführungen **bleibt** aber **eine Lücke**, welchen Stellenwert Höflichkeit im Spannungsfeld zwischen Sprache und Kommunikation ... einnimmt und wie sie genau bestimmt werden kann. ... **fehlt dem Buch** ... die Anknüpfung an die breite und differenzierte Diskussion zur sprachlichen Höflichkeit. In der Bibliographie werden zwar viele einschlägige Arbeiten aufgelistet, im Text werden sie aber so gut wie gar **nicht diskutiert** ... (Ehrhardt VII, 74). — Politeness is understood as a tool (or resource) of reaching a consensus. In theoretical section, however, there **remains a gap** about what role politeness plays in the language and communication interaction field, and how it can be precisely defined. ... the book **lacks** addressing to a broad and comprehensive discussion on the issues of language politeness. Although some specific works are listed in bibliography, they are **hardly considered** in the text.*

As it can be seen from this extract, negative appreciation is textured following the scheme “this aspect is omitted, but it has to be included in the scientific paper”. Use of explicit and implicit negation means in the propositions is of crucial importance for implication of evaluation; note use of *nicht* and implicitly negative words like *Lücke* and *fehlen* in example (12). Negation in this case signals of deviation of the situation under discussion from conventional norms. It also highlights contrast between what is present and what is needed and thus triggers the process of evaluative deduction.

In negative appreciation stretches of reviews implication of evaluative meanings is often done by using various means simultaneously: through statement of facts and presenting the proof by contradiction, for example:

(13) *... die Logik des Aufbaus ist manchmal schwer nachzuvollziehen, **der Titel von 2.5 fällt beispielsweise mit dem Titel von Kapitel 2 zusammen**. In anderen Teilen **passen die Überschriften nicht zum Inhalt der Kapitel** ... [Ehrhardt VII, 73] — ... it is sometimes hard to understand the logic of*

the book arrangement: **the title of section 2.5, for instance, coincides with the title of chapter 2.** In other sections **headings do not correspond with the content of the chapters...**

4) *Implication of negative evaluation through recommendation*

The reviewer, in the course of constructive criticism conducting distance dialogue with the author under review, often introduces suggestions about correcting inaccurate or incorrect statements, adding omitted analysis aspects, reconsidering too categorical claims made by the author, etc. Cooperative manner of the reviewer and the wish to collaborate on the issue are always interpreted as a covert imperative aimed at the author of the paper under discussion. Signals of shifting the angle of review and switching from criticism to recommendations in similar contexts are adverbs ending in *-wert* conveying modal deontic meaning *wünschenswert* (desirable), *empfehlungswert* (advisable), *überdenkenswert* (worth reconsidering) and conjunctive forms of the verb mood. These enable the reviewer to shape imaginary plane of missed opportunities, desirable actions and more consistent or correct presentation of the arguments. Consider the following examples:

(14) *Wünschenswert wäre in diesem Zusammenhang eine zusätzliche Ordnung nach dem jeweils zugrundeliegenden Konzept gewesen ...* (Vogel XXIV, 61) — In this regard it **would be desirable** to provide additional arrangement (of terms — S.N.) in accordance with the given conception...

(15) *Strenggenommen wären hier in Situationen, in denen mehrfach Tests über dieselbe Stichprobe ausgeführt werden, striktere Signifikanzniveaus empfehlungswert* (Pröll XXVII, 93) — Basically, in cases when several tests are conducted with the same samples, it **would be advisable** to indicate their relevance with greater accuracy.

(16) *Kritisch anzumerken sind lediglich zwei Punkte. Auf der einen Seite wäre es sinnvoll gewesen, in einigen Beiträgen stärker auf die historische Genese des jeweiligen Ansatzes einzugehen. (...) Auf der anderen Seite fällt auf, dass die Beiträge ... teilweise heterogen aufgebaut sind. Hier hätte es die Lektüre ein Stück weit erleichtert, wenn sich die Beiträgerinnen bei ihren Darstellungen an einer einheitlichen Struktur orientiert hätten* (Walczak I, 109–110). — Critically, only two aspects are to be mentioned. On the one hand, it **would be sound** to consider historical background of the corresponding approach in greater detail (...). On the other hand, it should be noted that papers are frequently arranged in an inconsistent manner. In this regard it **would be much easier** to perceive them if the authors would always follow the same structure.

The analysis of examples indicates that semantics of preterit forms of the conjunctive accounts for the description of the situations which can be referred to as

unreal. Contrast shown by the reviewer between the unrealized author and the norms of scientific communication invokes negative appreciation of the unpleasant situation occurred.

5) *Implication of positive evaluation through opposing the scientific result in different periods of the issue consideration*

Contextual, implied evaluation here is always of positive polarity. The author's contribution is assessed by the reviewer according to the temporal scale of the consideration of the corresponding issue in the course of history of some linguistic subject. In addition, it is retrospectively compared with the scope of work done by previous researchers. For example:

(17) *Alfred Lameli hat eine Arbeit vorgelegt, die die dialektale Variation in Deutschland ... mit bisher nie dagewesenem Aspektreichtum beleuchtet* (Pickl XXV, 77) — Alfred Lameli presented the work in which dialect diversity in Germany **hadn't received** so much attention **before**.

Positive evaluation in example (17) is invoked as implication resulting from comparison and contrast of the contribution of the given author and that made by all other scholars before. Hence, by explicating elements of new knowledge (*Aspektreichtum*) and their covert assessment in the context of comparison, incremental cognitive process can be reconstructed in dialectology of the German language.

4. Conclusion and Implications

The reviewer is considered as a competent participant of the discourse, specialist dealing professionally with research and expert work who occasionally performs the role of an expert of the paper which appears to be within the scope of his scientific interest. However, he is always tightly integrated in the scientific community as a whole and some subject discourse in particular. He realizes his close and global professional setting and can both retrospectively and prospectively evaluate the state of investigations in the corresponding subject area. Moreover, he is familiar with the present theoretical background in which some part of scientific issues is collectively considered, uses common terminology and appropriate analysis methods. By carrying out expert work he contributes to the common goal of proving the quality and significance of new solutions, analysis procedures and elements of new knowledge offered in the colleagues' papers. The reviewer is guided by his own research experience and knowledge about the conventional criteria used to assess the scientific result. These

were elaborated in the history of science by typical patterns of presenting the scientific result and its consistent grounding, by institutional standards of scientific formulation of the obtained results in an appropriate linguistic form. Ideas about these fundamental elements of scientific process form the system of universal values. The framework of these values is used to consider and critically evaluate (positively or negatively) any published investigation.

This discursive-analytical approach to scientific reviews as a specific type of expert-evaluative text allows to reveal and take into account a wider range of both implicit and explicit types of appreciation than in traditional linguistics. In the present study a general evaluative profile of linguistic reviews has been modeled relying on both ways of expressing appreciation: explicit and implicit. Contextual and linguo-epistemic discursive analysis of the text content of reviews allowed to specify and provide a more accurate description of this profile. On the whole, ratio of different kinds of evaluation in the review corpus under analysis is as follows.

The undertaken analysis revealed 412 instances of positive evaluation (57 % of the total amount of evaluation tokens), with 340 (47 %) instances of explicit evaluation, 72 (10 %) tokens of implicit appreciation. The number of negative evaluation instances totaled 311 (43 % of the total amount of evaluation tokens), with 167 (23 %) explicit instances and 144 (20 %) implicit tokens. The given statistics provides significant data on the linguistic review as a type of expert-evaluative scientific text as well as highlights the trends in interactional dynamics in the given discourse type. Furthermore, the data used for the study seem to change to some extent shared opinion in the linguistics based on investigating explicit evaluation means about prevailing character of positive appreciation in reviews; cf. Troyanskaya (1985), Krasilnikova (1999). When taking into consideration implicit contextual evaluation, this tendency no longer seems to be absolute. It is a rather disputable issue (see the given above ratio of 57 % and 43 %). The results also show a large amount of implicit evaluation: 216 instances (30 % of the total number of positive and negative evaluation instances). This corresponds with the generally accepted concept of linguistics about persuasive character of scientific communication aimed at convincing in credibility of the claims, cognitive procedures and evaluation (Overington, 1977: 155). Convincing the reader is mainly possible through communicating, to be more exact through presenting facts in cause-and-effect relationship. This is why as S. Hunston admits evaluation should be largely implicit (Hunston, 1994: 193). Moreover, the results of the research indicate a clear pattern of implicit expression of negative evaluation: 144 tokens out of 311 instances. The

percentage of negative implicit appreciation tokens is thus almost a half: 46 %. This figure can be explained pragmatically as the use of indirect, implicit means (through facts, negation, based on the proof by contradiction, recommendations, comparison) significantly mitigates criticism and matches the politeness principles accepted in the scholarly writing.

The undertaken quantitative-qualitative analysis of expert evaluation in respect to the reviews under consideration allows to set the criticism level of the reviewer and general axiological polarity of the review. In 17 reviews positive appreciation dominate while three of them convey completely positive meanings and do not bear any negative meanings. Negative evaluation prevails in 8 reviews, and one of them is absolutely negative. In other five reviews both kinds of evaluation are equally presented: they both contain positive appreciation and constructive criticism.

The complex analysis procedure of evaluative aspect of German reviews adopted in the present paper seems to have an excellent linguo-cultural ground for further studies of expert appreciation. Contrastive studies based on different languages data will help to explore how reviewing in various linguo-cultural scientific communities is carried out, for instance in Russian and German cultural fields. It can be assumed that national expert review traditions and traditions of specific and final appreciation will notably vary.

References

- Arutyunova, N.D. (1999). *Yazyk i mir cheloveka* [The language and the world of man]. M.: Yazyki russoj kul'tury [Languages of Russian Culture], 896 p.
- Vorobyeva, M.B. (1985). *Osobennosti realizacii ocenocnyh znachenij v nauchnom tekste* [Features of the implementation of estimated values in a scientific text]. Nauchnaya literatura. Yazyk, stil', zhanry [Scientific literature. Language, style, genres.]. M.: Nauka, P. 47–56.
- Bazhenova, E.A. (2001). *Nauchnyj tekst v aspekte politekstual'nosti* [Scientific text in the aspect of polytextuality]. Perm': PGU, 272 p.
- Beliaeva, L., Chernyavskaya, V. (2019). Technical writer in the framework of modern natural language processing tasks. J. Sib. Fed. Univ. Humanit. soc. sci., 12(1), 20–31. DOI: 10.17516/1997-1370-0377.
- Chernyavskaya, V. (2017). Towards methodological application of Discourse Analysis in Corpus-driven Linguistics [Metodologitscheskie vosmoznosti diskursivnogo analiza v korpusnoi lingvistike]. In *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo*

universiteta. Filologiya [Tomsk State University Journal of Philology], 50, 135–148.
DOI: 10.17223/19986645/50/9

Heinemann, M. (2000). Textsorten des Bereichs Hochschule und Wissenschaft. K. Brinker, G. Antos, W. Heinemann, S.F. Sager (Hgg.). In *Text- und Gesprächslinguistik. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung [Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft]*. Bd. 16, 1, Halbband. Vol. 1, Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 702–709.

Hunston, S. (1994). Evaluation and organization in a sample of written academic discourse. Coulthard M. (ed.). In *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London; New York: Routledge, 191–210.

Hyland, K. (2004). Engagement and Disciplinarity: the other side of evaluation. G. Del Lungo (ed.). In *Academic Discourse: new insights into Evaluation*. Amsterdam: Peter Lang, 13–30.

Ilyin, V.V. (1989). *Kriterii nauchnosti znaniya*. M.: Vysshaya shkola, 128 p.

Krasilnikova, L.V. (1999). *Zhanr nauchnoj recenzii: semantika i pragmatika*. M.: Dialog-MGU, 137 p.

Kulikova, L.V., Burmakina, N.G. (2016). Construction of Credibility in the Genre of Scientific Articles. In *Pragmalinguistica*, 24, 122–132, <https://doi.org/10.25267/Pragmalinguistica.2017.i25>

Longino, H.E. (1990). *Science as Social Knowledge. Values and Objectivity in Scientific Inquiry*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 280 p.

Molodychenko, E.N. (2015). Aksiologiya diskursa konsyumerizma: o roli yazykovoy otsenki v zhanre layfstaylaxiologicheskogo [Dimension in the Discourse of Consumerism: The Role of Evaluative Language in the Lifestyle Genre]. In *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Filologiya [Tomsk State University Journal of Philology]*, 6 (38), 55–66. DOI: 10.17223/19986645/38/5

Nefedov, S.T. (2017). Restriktivnaya argumentatsiya: modal'nyye slova somneniya i obshcheyznachimosti v nemetskoyazychnykh lingvisticheskikh stat'yakh [Restrictive Argumentation: Modal Words Of Doubt And Shared Knowledge In Academic Linguistic Writings]. In *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo Universiteta-Yazyk I Literatura [Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Language and Literature]*, 14. Issue 4, 599–610. DOI: 10.21638/11701/spbu09.2017.408

Nefedov, S.T., Chernyavskaya, V.E. (2019). Kontekstualizatsiya v lingvisticheskom analize: pragmaticheskaya i diskursivno-analiticheskaya perspektiva [Contextualisation in linguistics: pragmatic and discourse analytical dimension]. In *Vestnik Tomskogo*

gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Filologiya [Tomsk State University Journal of Philology] (in print).

Overington, M.A. (1977). The Scientific Community as Audience: Toward a Rhetorical Analysis of Science. In *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 10 (3), 143–164.

Pätzold, J. (1986). Beschreibung und Erwerb von Handlungsmuster. Ein Beispiel: Rezension wissenschaftlicher Publikationen. In *Linguistische Studien, Reihe A, Arbeitsberichte 138*. Berlin, 1–147.

Riefel, M. (1998). Fachtextsorten der Wissenschaftssprachen II: die wissenschaftliche Rezension. H. Steger, H.E. Wiegand (Hgg.). In *Fachsprachen. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Fachsprachenforschung und Terminologiewissenschaft [Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft]*, 14, Bd. 1, 488–493.

Swales, J.M. (2004). Evaluation in Academic Speech: First Forays. G. Del Lungo (ed.). In *Academic Discourse: new insights into Evaluation*. Amsterdam: Peter Lang, 31–53.

Troyanskaya, E.S. (1985). Nauchnoe proizvedenie v ocenke avtora recenzii (k voprosu o specifike zhanrov nauchnoj literatury) [Scientific papers in the assessment of the author of the review (towards the specifics of the genres of scientific literature)]. In *Nauchnaya literatura. Yazyk. Stil'. Zhanry*. M.: Nauka, 67–81.

Weinrich, H. (2006). *Sprache, das heißt Sprachen*. 3. Aufl. Tübingen: Narr, 413 p.

Zillig, W. (1982). *Bewerten: Die Sprechakttypen der bewertenden Rede*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 317 p.

Об оценке в научной рецензии (на материале немецкой лингвистики)

С. Т. Нефедов

Санкт-Петербургский государственный
университет
Россия, 199034, Санкт-Петербург,
Университетская набережная, 7/9

В статье анализируется оценочный план немецкоязычной лингвистической рецензии как определенного типа экспертного текста. Экспертные оценки рассматриваются с точки зрения их роли в коллективном intersubъектном процессе верификации и критической проверки знаний с целью их включения в научный оборот дисциплины. Акцентирована нормативная основа экспертных оценок, при вынесении которых рецензенты как представители интегрированного по целям и задачам научно-экспертного сообщества исходят из коллективно выработанных и разделяемых всеми критериев научной рациональности. Показана ведущая роль институционального, социокультурного и внутреннего вербального контекста при выявлении способов выражения оценочных смыслов и аксиологической полярности оценок в их текстовой реализации. Основные способы скрытого, имплицитного индицирования оценок категоризованы в понятие когнитивной стратегии; типичные стратегии проиллюстрированы конкретными примерами их контекстной реализации. Задействованные в исследовании методы (метод структурно-пропозициональной сегментации текста, семный анализ лексических единиц, контекстуальный и лингвоэпистемический анализ) как элементы комплексной методики позволили по данным языка воссоздать общий оценочный профиль научных рецензий в немецкой лингвистике.

Ключевые слова: лингвистический дискурс, научная рецензия, экспертная оценка, эксплицитная оценка, имплицитная оценка.

Научная специальность: 10.02.04 — германские языки.
