

2. Афоризмы: По иностранным источникам / сост. П. П. Петров, Я. В. Берлин. 3-е изд., перераб. и доп. М.: Прогресс, 1985.
3. Витражи мудрости: Афоризмы, крылатые слова, изречения / сост. М. В. Король. Мн.: Полымя, 1987.
4. Жадан А. А. Предисловие // Жемчужины мысли. 3-е изд., перераб. и доп. Мн.: Беларусь, 1991.
5. Ожегов С. И. Словарь русского языка: Ок. 57 000 слов / под ред. Н. Ю. Шведовой. 17-е изд., стер. М.: Рус. яз., 1985.
6. Стародубцева З. Г., Интымакова Л. Г., Дудникова Е. Е. Своеобразие синтаксического поля антитезиса в современном русском языке // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. 2017. Т. 2. № 12. С. 147-150.
7. Чаша мудрости: Афоризмы, изречения, высказывания отечественных и зарубежных авторов. М.: Дет. лит., 1978.

УДК 81-119

*O. V. Kisel (Magnitogorsk, Russia)*  
*Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University*

### **Interview Texts: the Role of Initiative Replies**

Объектом данного исследования являются реплики интервьюера как структурное начало текстов интервью. В работе рассматриваются несколько типов речевых стратегий журналиста: стратегия положительной самопрезентации, стратегия вежливости, а также стратегия установления позитивного контакта с интервьюируемым. Основной целью данных стратегий является получение новой информации о респонденте.

**Ключевые слова:** иницирующие реплики, речевые стратегии, интервью, респондент, тексты интервью

The interviewer replies as the structuring beginning of interview texts are the study subject of the article. Positive self-presentation and positive contact with an interviewee, as well as politeness are journalists' speech strategies that the paper presents. The main goal of these strategies is getting new information about the respondent.

**Keywords:** initiating replies, speech strategies, an interview, a respondent, interview texts

Currently the question about the dominant role of the interviewees (a journalist and interviewee) is resolved in different ways. There is no doubt that the respondent determines the content, imagery, and emotionality of the material presented in the interview. Especially when it involves a public person, the impression of which is formed by others from various information sources: it can be both information pre-

viously available in the media, and information provided by the person himself during communication (interview) [3]; [8]; [13].

An interview is a kind of mass-media discourse, where operations with information are carried out in a chain “interviewer – interviewee – audience” [7, c. 62].

Getting quality material during an interview also directly depends on a journalist’s professionalism. A journalist selects topics for conversation, sets the order of questions and thus determines the structure of the interview [3, c. 80]; [6]. The interviewee, responding to the questions posed, can offer his own plan for the conversation course. An interview will achieve its goal (find a response from the audience) if it contains questions, reflecting addressees’ views on the proposed topic, and the information provided by an addressee will meet the expectations of the mass recipient [10, c. 61–62].

Many scholars engaged in the research of dialogical communication give the leading position to initiating replies, recognizing their priority in the formation and structuring of dialogue [1]; [2]; [4]; [10].

In a question-and-answer dialogue, questions that act as initiating replies are characterized by a greater importance of verbal means in transmitting the speaker's communicative attitude in comparison with answers. The interlocutor's response can often be realized through a gesture, a certain look, facial expressions or other non-verbal means, which leads to a deeper penetration of researchers into the nature of questions than answers.

N.I. Golubeva-Monatkina talks about unequal “communicative sovereignty” of questions and answers, since the form and content of the answer is influenced by the question posed, and for the next question the answer does not play such a role [4, c. 131].

In the work of A. N. Baranov and G. E. Kreidlin [2, c. 84-99] it is noted that in dialogical communication, a recipient’s and addressee’s replies and the corresponding speech acts are characterized by a special type of attitude – “illocutionary compulsion” [2, c. 86], in which one reply illocutionarily forces another. When interviewing, we observe the forcing of a respondent's answer by a journalistic reply. The answer is required, otherwise the interviewing process turns into a pointless exercise.

This study focuses on the interviewer's speech strategies. T.A. van Dijk’s works describe in detail such strategies characteristic of interviews as the strategy of getting information (its goal is to obtain maximum information), the strategy of politeness (its goal is to determine the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the semantic content in speech acts and the creation of positive contact between interview participants) and the strategy of positive self-presentation (the goal of this strategy is to avoid negative conclusions from what is said about the personality of the interlocutors) [5, c. 201]. These strategies are implemented in speech actions of both in-

interview participants. A thorough analysis of the texts in various interviews with an emphasis on speech actions of the interviewer makes it possible to identify another strategy that is often used by the interviewer – the provocation strategy. In addition, it seems that the second part of the politeness strategy – creating a positive contact between interlocutors – is worth noting and can be singled out as an interviewer's separate strategy, since it is he who must create the appropriate contact that ensures successful communication.

The positive contact strategy is usually implemented at the beginning of an interview. Its goal is to establish mutual understanding and trust between the interlocutors. The interviewer, wanting to show his disposition, respect for the interlocutor or interest in him, builds his speech in such a way as to maximally dispose the interlocutor to himself, to challenge him to frankness. Such a goal setting determines the semantic content and linguistic design of the interviewer's speech at the beginning of the conversation: as a rule, the interviewer expresses his, for the most part, a positive opinion about the respondent's activities, creativity, etc., asks questions of a personal, even everyday nature, calls him by name, thereby making it clear that their communication is built not only on a professional, business basis, but also on personal sympathy. At the beginning of the interview, there is often the presence of words with a positive connotation, clichéd phrases about well-being, success, achievements, etc. The interviewer's questions at the beginning of the conversation do not lead to the emergence of cognitive structures in the interlocutor's answers and, in fact, do not have such an illocutionary purpose: they are not aimed at getting new information about the respondent [9]; [12]. The beginning of a conversation, as well as the stage of finishing an interview, is metacommunication, the implementation of the phatic function of language.

The provocation strategy has as its purpose to get information, one way or another concealed by the interviewee, and also to provoke him with the help of appropriate questions (which can be both direct and indirect speech acts) to the answer known in advance to the author of the interview. This is a way to start a conversation about a scandalous or unpleasant topic. At the same time, the respondent either evades the answer, or answers the question posed, depending on his personal qualities. Thus, this strategy is the basis of a kind of psychological test for endurance, tact and the interviewee's ability to manage a difficult situation [12].

If the interviewer resorts to the strategy of establishing a positive contact, as a rule, at the very beginning of the interview, then the provocation strategy is implemented at the subsequent, later stages of the interview. The use of this strategic move at the beginning of the conversation would conflict with the principle of politeness, would create antagonism between the interlocutors, which would not contribute to a successful interview.

Both the strategy of establishing positive contact and the provocation strategy are closely related to the interviewer's main strategy – the strategy of getting information, since they both pursue one goal – to obtain new information about the respondent [8]; [11].

### *References*

1. Арутюнова Н. Д. Язык и мир человека. М.: Языки русской культуры, 1999. 896 с.
2. Баранов А. Н., Крейдлин Г. Е. Иллокутивное вынуждение в структуре диалога // Вопросы языкознания. 1992. № 2. С. 84-99.
3. Бутова А. В. Роль иницирующих реплик в организации текстов интервью // Libri Magistri. 2017. № 4. С. 79-83.
4. Голубева-Монаткина Н. И. Классификационное исследование вопросов и ответов диалогической речи // Вопросы языкознания. 1991. № 1. С. 125-134.
5. Дейк Ван Т. А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация. М.: Прогресс, 1989. 312 с.
6. Дубских А. И. Реализация коммуникативной стратегии самопрезентации личности в масс-медиаальном дискурсе (на материале «звездных» интервью): автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.19. Челябинск, 2014. 24 с.
7. Дубских А. И., Бутова А. В., Севастьянова В. С. Средства вербализации оценки в «звездном» интервью // Вестник Томского государственного педагогического университета. 2017. № 6(183). С. 61-65.
8. Дубских А. И., Бутова А. В., Залавина Т. Ю. Средства вербализации положительной самопрезентации в «звездном» интервью // Вестник Томского государственного педагогического университета. 2018. № 4(193). С. 53-58.
9. Залавина Т. Ю. Когнитивные и прагматические аспекты фразеологизмов со значением «порицание»: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.19. Челябинск, 2007. 25 с.
10. Кибрик А. А. О некоторых видах знаний в модели естественного диалога // Вопросы языкознания. 1991. № 1. С. 61-68.
11. Кисель О. В., Дубских А. И., Бутова А. В. Мотивы самопрезентации личности в интернет-пространстве посредством никнейма // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. 2019. Т. 12. № 5. С. 222-225.
12. Линёва А. С., Залавина Т.Ю. The Inner Form of Phraseological Units and the Linguistic Picture of the World // Актуальные проблемы современной науки, техники и образования. 2013. Т. 2. № 71. С.132-134.
13. Севастьянова В. С., Дубских А. И., Харитонова С. В. Изучение архетипических структур в языковой и ментальной картинах мира (на примере романтического и символистского дискурсов) // Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. 2017. № 1(50). С. 33-38.