

Марковська А.В.  
к.філол.н., доцент  
Саламатіна О.О.  
к.філол.н., доцент

Миколаївський національний аграрний університет

**MODERN PUBLICISTIC INTERVIEW ON MATERIAL OF THE  
ENGLISH-LAGUAGE PRESS  
(RESPONDENT'S STRATEGIES)**

*The article reveals the communicators' interaction specificity in modern publicistic interview. The article analyzes linguistic specificity of interview in press as a speech genre; to determine and characterize the respondent's speech tactics, aimed at realizing his communicative intention and pragmatic objective with the help of English-language press.*

**Key words:** *publicistic interview, English-language press, respondent's strategies.*

Nowadays in spite of different linguistic researches of separate features in publicistic interview the problem of analysis of linguistic specificity of interview in press as a speech genre, taking into account its communicative pragmatic signs, remains unsolved. This fact stipulated the choice of theme of this work which is based on material of the modern English-language press.

As interviewer and respondent pursue obvious and hidden aims in texts of interview, they are forced to use the certain pragmatic strategies, each of which consists of different speech tactics, that help to use these strategies during the interview. Pragmatic strategy is determined as planning of construction of speech interaction process depending on the certain conditions of dialogue, interviewer's and respondent's personalities [3, p. 107].

The tactics of speech interaction is expressed by the certain speech actions which have for a purpose realization of influence on the other participant of communication on the certain stage of interaction. The orientation of various tactical receptions on achievement of certain pragmatic objective lines up in speech strategy [1, p. 163; 2, p. 96; 4, p. 99].

By analysis of interviews in the modern English-language press the respondent's speech strategies are determined: the speech strategy of information granting and the point of view expression.

The peaceful speech strategy of information granting is connected with respondent's desire to give information to interviewer. For realization of this strategy interviewer uses several tactics.

The tactics "direct answer" is used in all researched interviews of the modern English-language press, for example:

– *Last week Prime Minister Netanyahu unveiled a new peace plan. What do you think of it?*

– *It's a flagrant breach of the peace agreements signed with the Israelis* (Newsweek, 16.06/2007).

In this example respondent has chosen the tactics "direct answer" for realization of his pragmatic strategy. In this case it is a reaction on interrogative speech act which is actually an inquiry of information.

In some cases respondent can't or does not want to answer "yes" or "no" on the interviewer's question. That's why he uses the tactics "unwrapped answer", answering more thoroughly, for example:

– *Have the World Wide Web and MTV made us incapable of dealing with any idea that cannot be expressed in 20-second bursts?*

– *In the 18th century we used to sit on wooden benches in unheated churches to listen to five-hour sermons on divine inspiration. If today some of those messages can be imparted and absorbed in 30 minutes or even 30 seconds, I appreciate that opportunity. Those who still wish to get the full five-hour version can find it in its fullness. Thanks to the Internet* (Newsweek, 08.11/2009).

In this example respondent elects the tactics "unwrapped answer" which is the ground of negative answer of the interviewer's question. Respondent says that in the 18th century people sat on wooden benches in the unheated churches and listened five-hour sermons about divine inspiration. He values possibility to expound and perceive information for 30 minutes or even for 30 seconds. Those, who wish to get a

complete five-hour version, in respondent's opinion, can get it in full due to the Internet.

Using the explaining answer, respondent enables interviewer to estimate the propositional content of the question from point of reality or authenticity. The tactics “**disagreement explanation**” of respondent explains, why exactly respondent disagrees with the interviewer's claim, for example:

– *You have spoken too much about death.*

– *You have misunderstood me. I have only mentioned that I am afraid of death. I'm not going to die, I'm happy to live* (The Times 30.05/2001).

In this example respondent also uses the tactics “disagreement explanation”. Respondent was not understood, it is supported by the arguments: *I have only mentioned that I am afraid of death*. He did not say, that he wanted to die he remembered only, that he was afraid of death. He is very happy to live.

So, the article reveals the communicators' interaction specificity in modern publicistic interview.

### Literature

1. Семенцова І. М. Комунікативна стратегія як елемент теорії комунікації / І. М. Семенцова // Мовні концептуальні картини світу : зб. наук. пр. – К. : Прайм-М, 2002. – № 6. – С. 161–166.
2. Сысоева Т. А. Реализация стратегий автора в текстах массовой коммуникации / Т. А. Сысоева // Стратегии коммуникативного поведения : междунар. науч. конф., 3-4 мая 2001 г. : тезисы докл. – Минск, 2001. – С. 95–99.
3. Тарасова И. П. Речевое общение, толкуемое с юмором, но всерьёз / Тарасова И. П. – М. : Высшая школа, 1992. – 174 с.
4. Ухванова И. Ф. Тематические коммуникативные стратегии в дискурсе печатного издания Европарламента “Tribune Pour l'Europe” / И. Ф. Ухванова, А. А. Маркович // Стратегии коммуникативного поведения : междунар. науч. конф., 3-4 мая 2001 г. : тезисы докл. – Минск, 2001. – С. 94–104.