INTerview GENRE IN MODERN NEWSPAPER (THE EXAMPLE OF NEWSPAPER "ARGUMENTS AND FACTS"): LANGUAGE MEANS OF DIALOGICS

The paper is devoted to the study of dialogism means in one of the most popular genres of journalism today – interviews. The dialogue form of this journalistic text type determines the choice of language means, which allows us to talk about the general principles of communication between the journalist and the interviewee. At the same time, the peculiarities of language means functioning are caused by other factors: the information policy of the publication, the author’s (interviewer’s) intentions, the conversation topic, the respondent’s personality. Comparative analysis of interviews published in “Arguments and facts”, one of the most popular Russian publications, allows us to determine different types of dialogism in media linguistics aspect. Particular attention is paid to the so-called two-level dialogues: the first level is the question-answer format of communication between the journalist (interviewer) and the interlocutor (interviewee); the second level is a more complex communicative act – the dialogue with the audience.
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Interviews today can be called one of the most popular types of media text, both in traditional media and in new media. No newspaper, no magazine is complete without an interview. The most rated programs on television and radio are also interviews. This genre is necessarily included in the structure of the program – “Pozner”, “Evening-time Urgant”, “Night is coming”, “Tet-a-tet with everyone” on the First channel; “Inner circle”, “Meanwhile”, “2 Vernik 2”, “White Studio” on “Russia – Culture” channel; “Special opinion”, “Temporarily available”, “Personally yours”, “In the circle of light”, “Amateurs” on “Echo of Moscow” radio and many others. Another proof is the phenomenal number of views of the interviews on the YouTube channels “VDud’”, “Noy yet Pozner”, “Editorial office”, “What about talking...” and others.

The interview, which is originally an English word, was fixed in the Russian language as the name of a method (in sociology and journalism) and of a genre. The Oxford dictionary offers the following interpretation of the term: “A conversation between a journalist or radio or television presenter and a person of public interest, used as the basis of a broadcast or publication” [23]. The authors of the dictionary entry primarily pay attention to the principle of obtaining information and its social significance.

In Russian dictionaries, the terms “conversation” and “interview” are often considered synonymously, which is especially characteristic of the official business style, while in the conversational style the most popular synonym for “interview” is the word “talk”. This functioning of the concept is fixed in dictionaries: “interview is a conversation of the press representative with some public figure on topical issues of public interest” [21]; “Interview in journalism is a genre, which is a journalist’s talk with a socially significant person on topical issues” [19. P. 502]; “it’s a conversation with any person, designed to print (or broadcast in radio, television)” [17]. It is worth noting that the synonymous nature of “interview” and “conversation” lexical units, traditional for dictionary entries, does not occur in modern scientific and educational literature: theory of journalism describes conversation as a kind of interview genre [9; 15; 20].
G. A. Shmakova defines several approaches to interviews: «In some studies, the purpose of communication, general principles and attitudes are taken as the basis, strategy is formed on (N. D. Arutyunova, I. N. Borisova, T. van Dyck, O. S. Issers, N. V. Maksimova, etc.). Other studies define a set of rules (algorithms) (V. A. Agranovskiy, G. V. Lazutina, M. Lukina, A. A. Tertychniy, T. V. Shumilina, etc.). In accordance with this division, we agree to call «...» approaches to the study of the effectiveness of communication between a journalist and his interlocutor in an interview as “strategic” and “algorithmic”» [22. P. 143]. In the concept of media linguistics, the interview is studied as a kind of journalistic work, as a special speech genre: specific organization of the text at the levels of content and form.

From the point of view of language presentation, interview is an interpersonal verbal communication aimed at obtaining information and creating a publication intended for replication. B. N. Lozovskiy defines the interview genre as follows: “Newspaper material outlining the content of such a conversation. The main feature of the genre is the direct allocation of journalist’s questions and his interlocutor’s answers” [14. P. 85–86]. Another dictionary gives three interpretations of the term: “1) the genre of journalism, involving the conversation between the journalist and the interviewee; 2) a meeting, conversation, intended for press, radio, television (mainly in the form of questions and answers); 3) a correspondent’s conversation with authority or public figure, an individual on issues, representing public interest” [10. P. 17]. It is important to make the emphasis on the types of interviewees, which is essential in the context of the studied problem, as the interlocutor’s personality largely determines the speech interview strategy, and the choice of language means.

The most detailed description of the term “interview” is presented in the dictionary-reference book “Media-linguistics in terms and concepts”: “interview – a journalistic genre, which is based on the dialogical form of presentation. The center of the dialogue can be an event or an interesting person, so the interview can be of two types – a message about the event or about a person” [16. P. 213]. The author of the dictionary entry, L. R. Duskaeva, focuses on the principles, methods and forms of dialogism in the interview, characterizes the rules of “dialogue drama” in this popular form of media text.

L. E. Kroichik also indicates dialogic activities as a generic feature of journalism: “A journalistic word has to be targeted. The following truism is widely known: a publicist deals with anonymous audience. That may be so, but the author of a journalistic work does not throw his/her words to the wind: in his mind, the journalist forms the audience for which his/her speech is formulated «...» in journalism, the author needs the response of the audience «...» Formally, the anonymous audience is the audience that is “invented” by the author, which he composed in his imagination and which he conducts a dialogue with “ [11. P. 141]. L. R. Duskaeva, in her book “Dialogical nature of newspaper speech genres” describes the speech genre as “a sustainable model of interaction between semantic positions of the journalist and the recipient” [5. P. 64]. The effectiveness of the dialogue directly depends on the “addressee’s target setting, psychological and extra linguistic factors” [18], communication conditions and the chosen and then implemented speech strategies: “the strategy is a cognitive communication plan through which the optimal solution of the speaker’s communicative tasks is controlled in conditions of lack of information about the partner’s actions” [7. P. 100].

As you know, the interview refers to the journalistic style in terms of functional style [8]. As a working definition of the interview genre in journalism, we shall take the L. E. Kroichik’s characteristics: he believes that “the specificity of the interview as a genre is that its text externally dominated by the viewpoint of the author, and the interlocutor of the journalist. This does not mean that the interview author’s voice is not heard: first, the conversation course is skillfully directed by the journalist (the communication content and structure are rigidly subordinated to the author’s tasks). Secondly, demonstration of point of view on the person under discussion implies, suggests, reveals (sometimes directly, sometimes indirectly) the correspondent’s position as well. The art of interviewing is that the audience always gets the opportunity to correlate the publicist’s opinion with the interlocutor’s viewpoint” [12. P. 145]. S. N. Ilchenko considers an interview as “an integral act of communication, involving dialogue between the journalist and the respondent in a situation of sequential alternation of questions and answers in order to obtain information, opinions or judgments of public interest” [6. P. 16]. Scientists pay attention to the presence of two positions in the interview and to the relevance of the issues discussed.
The study of various definitions of interviews allows us to identify key components: “topical issue”, “public interest”, “a journalist’s conversation with a socially significant person”. This, in turn, explains the presence of three participants in any journalistic interview: journalist (interviewer), interlocutor (interviewee), audience. E. I. Golanova introduces the concept of “dual target”: “purposefulness of this information, addressing a “dual” addressee, focus on mass audience – these are the general starting positions which define a number of similarities in the linguistic form of different types of public dialogue (addressing and contact maintaining formulas, the language choice, expressive techniques, statements interconnection types)” [3. P. 256]. Therefore, the interview language structure should be considered at two levels: at the level of direct dialogue of two (sometimes more) participants and at the level of dialogue with the mass audience.

It is important that both the journalist as the questions initiator and author, and the interviewee as the carrier of actual socially significant, interesting (ideally exclusive) information realize presence of the third, most important, participant of communication – the recipient. In the preparation of questions and in the formulation of answers, of course, they take into account the speech culture, the language portrait of this collective recipient, which can be called both a potential, “hypothetical” (L. R. Duskaeva) and a perfect one. The “journalist (interviewer), referring to his/her direct target (interviewee), builds special journalistic drama of the conversation based on the future reader’s perception” [13]. It is the choice of language means and their system that allow, on the one hand, to characterize all participants in the dialogue as linguistic personalities, with two of them real, and one – typical and ideal, from the point of view of the first two, at the same time.

The category of dialogism is considered in the works of L. R. Duskaeva, who defines it as “the versatility of speech communication expressed in the text (as a manifestation of the sociality of speech and thinking), implemented in the actual dialogic texts, in the dialogue between texts, in monological texts saturated with the means of both oral dialogue and written speech” [4. P. 18]. The researcher introduces the concepts of “internal dialogism” and “external dialogism”, the latter is most typical for the interview. On the basis of the publicist texts analysis, L. R. Duskaeva identifies linguistic means of dialogism: motivational and interrogative sentences; different ways of conveying another’s speech; question-and-answer constructions; addressing segments; constructions of oral dialogic speech; “introductory words conveying the modality of consent”; pronouns and verbs in the forms 1 and 2 of question-and-answer constructions; addressing segments; constructions of oral dialogic speech; “introduction words conveying the modality of consent”; personal and possessive pronouns: “I worked myself, we went further, We understand; we are on the right track; all our efforts; I speak about it openly and honestly” (Alexander Beglov. “Arguments and facts”, № 26 of 19.06.2019); “our society; our interest; makes me; we are not evolving; we are promised; it seemed to me; you did it; I did not feel; Personally for me; little me; a huge success of my destiny; If we now felt; the characters of my novels” (Alexei Ivanov. “Arguments and facts”, № 8 of 20.02.2009); “my future husband; I perfectly remember; our girls will go through this too; We dream; I am not so often dedicated poems; for us to win the gold” (Natalia Bestemianova. “Arguments and facts”, № 12 of 20.03.2009).

Comparative analysis of interviews with politicians, cultural figures and athletes published in the “Arguments and facts” newspaper highlighted different principles of dialogue. By the method of continuous sampling, interviews published from January to July 2019 were selected; 29 texts were analyzed. The most popular means of dialogue in all interviews were the following:

1) Personal and possessive pronouns: “I worked myself; we went further; We understand; we are on the right track; all our efforts; I speak about it openly and honestly” (Alexander Beglov. “Arguments and facts”, № 26 of 19.06.2019); “our society; our interest; makes me; we are not evolving; we are promised; it seemed to me; you did it; I did not feel; Personally for me; little me; a huge success of my destiny; If we now felt; the characters of my novels” (Alexei Ivanov. “Arguments and facts”, № 8 of 20.02.2009); “my future husband; I perfectly remember; our girls will go through this too; We dream; I am not so often dedicated poems; for us to win the gold” (Natalia Bestemianova. “Arguments and facts”, № 12 of 20.03.2009).

2) Introductory words and constructions: “Take, for example, the rules; and the Parliament, in its turn, threatened with blocking; of course, the problem of trust exists; as it seemed to me” (Andrei Klishas. “Arguments and facts”, № 6 of 06.02.2019); “In my opinion, he has a very unusual actor’s personality; I met outstanding people, such as, for example, Oleg Ivanovich Borisov; He was, by the way, the one who easily went to the role; First, I know everyone, and, secondly, I love everyone” (Alla Sigalova. “Arguments and facts”, № 27 of 03.07.2009); “unfortunately, the result is not achieved; of course, we all want; Evgeniya Vyacheslavovna, certainly, has every right; And you know, in my experience” (Andrei Kirilenko. “Arguments and facts”, № 27 of 03.07.2009).
3) Particles and conjunctions, including the conjunctions with adversative, adversative-negative separation values: “But far from all; Yet I will repeat; But we won’t act like bandits; However, knowing that...; Such figures are unlikely to reflect” (Sergei Lavrov. “Arguments and facts”, № 29 of 17.07.2009); “No, it doesn’t influence the flow of students. Yes, movies, TV series create some impression about the profession – by the way, not always correct. But, when you communicate with children (and I do it constantly), two things surprise; well, who can be a more Moscow ballerina; after all, for many years; And when he became the rector” (Nikolai Tsiskaridze. “Arguments and facts”, № 27 of 03.07.2009); “Of course not; But you do understand; Probably, yes. But it should be decided by the athlete himself; No, to give up is not my character; And in sports one can not do this” (Elena Vyalbe. “Arguments and facts”, № 8 of 20.02.2009).

The operation of these linguistic resources in the interviews demonstrates a variety of the interviewee’s intentions. In their speech, politicians normally use personal pronouns of 1 plural person, since it is important for a government representative to present the position of the state, not his personal, in addition, the use of pronouns “we”, “our” is a method of solidarity, when a politician declares his position as the position of the majority. Athletes and cultural figures are much less likely to use personal and possessive pronouns in this function, and even if being addressed, they associate themselves with a certain social group: their generation, colleagues, members of a sports or creative team. Their speech is dominated by the form of lst person singular, which is explained by both the journalist’s tasks, and the request of the audience: athletes, actors, writers, artists are interesting as personalities, individualities, above all. The same principles make the base for the inclusion of introductory structures into the speech: it is important for politicians to convince the audience, each recipient of the validity of their position as a government representative. For athletes and cultural figures it is much more important to show the discussion and ambiguity of the problems discussed, to emphasize that this is their subjective point of view, and another opinion is quite acceptable.

In interviews with politicians, rhetorical questions and exclamations play a special role, “as a rule, the politicians’ speech is emotional, evaluative” [1. P. 144]. The main functional tasks of these language tools are the following two.

First, open polemics, that is, debunking the opponents’ position, which, according to the politician, the audience is familiar with: “So you mean, international terrorists who wielded and killed policemen in my country, who are Muslims by religion – are they our brothers really? And those who cut off people’s heads in Syria, are they my brothers because of the fact that they were shouting “Allah Akbar!”?” (Yunus-Bek Evkurov. “Arguments and facts”, № 12 of 20.03.2019); “Why do adoptive mothers need to suffer, to run, to find the centers and professionals who will help them in a difficult situation? Why don’t they call the guardianship right away?” (Anna Kuznetsova. “Arguments and facts”, № 22 of 29.05.2019); “How many Russian accounts were affected, when the USA suddenly decided that they were-created for intervention into the presidential election? <...> Where are the guarantees that tomorrow Russia will not be disconnected? Or Europeans?” (Dmitry Peskov “Arguments and facts”, № 3 of 16.01.2019); “Then why in the Internet, you can sling mud at the person, draw offensive cartoons about him or otherwise humiliate him for his opinion?” (Andrey Klishas. “Arguments and facts”, № 6 of 06.02.2009).

Secondly, it is attracting the audience’s attention to the most pressing issues, and the rhetorical construction allows us to present the only true point of view, from the addresssee’s position, to this or that acute question of our time: “What can you feed a child with for this money?!?” (Anna Kuznetsova. “Arguments and facts”, № 22 of 29.05.2019); “Girls, young women – smart, educated, purposeful, yet beautiful and feminine! And all were united in their opinion that the road is open for women to participate in this competition, and other similar contests” (Valentina Matvienko. “Arguments and facts”, № 23 of 05.06.2019); “And how did we live without a phone before? Indeed, the head of state can not have a smartphone, because it means that the person agrees to full transparency <...> Sanctions did not change anything!” (Dmitry Peskov. “Arguments and facts”, № 3 of 16.01.2019); “Is abuse possible? Yes, it is. But our work isn’t only about adoption of bills” (Andrey Klishas. “Arguments and facts”, № 6 of 06.02.2009).

In the politicians’ speech, similar functions are performed by such means of dialogue, as verbs of imperative mood, as well as directives expressed by the so-called “lazy imperative”: “So, dear women, act, achieve, prove with practical results the legitimacy of your claims to the successful advancement in the political, state, business, scientific and other career <...> We need to find, grow, help them to
reveal their creative abilities as fully as possible “ (Valentina Mattvienko. “Arguments and facts”, № 23 of 05.06.2019); “Do not forget that Russia has been living under various restrictions for more than 40 years” (Dmitry Peskov. “Arguments and facts”, № 3 of 16.01.2009); “I am convinced that only residents should make decisions about how the urban environment will develop” (Alexander Beglov. “Arguments and facts”, № 25 of 19.06.2019); “the Ukrainian government should ‘face’ its own citizens: abandon the policy of economic strangulation of Donbass, recognize the right of Donetsk and Luhansk citizens to speak their native language, celebrate their Holy dates and festivals, to honor their national heroes” (Sergei Lavrov. “Arguments and facts”, № 29 of 17.07.2019). O. V. Agafonova explains the frequent reference to this form of the verb: “Politician is a leader for voters. By means of dialogic expression, he can show both symmetric and asymmetric attitude to them. Using the imperative verbs in his speech, the politician invites people to perform this or that action” [1. P. 145].

In their interviews, cultural vultures often use such means of dialogism as intextualization, personifying nomination, exclamation and interrogative constructions:

- Intertextuality: «the land of the Hyperboreans”; to soak the terrorists in the outhouse; And the essence of Sluzhkin, the geographer, is the refusal to participate in the everyday evil” (Alexei Ivanov. “Arguments and facts”, № 8 of 20.02.2009); “No man – no problem; As Stanislavsky says, there are no small roles, there are small actors; children recognized me: “Oh, Mr. Fix! Do I have a plan?”” (Leonid Kanevsky. “Arguments and facts”, № 18-19 of 08.05.2009); “Leaving the stage, leave a piece of your heart there,” – said the great actress Vera Pashennaya” (Yuri Solomin. “Arguments and facts”, № 15 of 10.04.2009); “So, Professor Higgins is me; As Oleg Nikolaeевич Efremov used to say, theater is a wonderful place for charging the heart muscle” (Alla Sigalova. “Arguments and facts”, № 27 of 03.07.2019); “One day in class I cried, “I’m not guilty! He came himself!” It is not even necessary to mention the fact that the basis of this quote is “Resurrection” by Leo Tolstoy. But none of the disciples guessed — no laughter of recognition followed — that phrase is from the famous “Diamond arm” film; nowadays, teachers should be familiar with the Saga of hobbits, Harry Potter, “Game of thrones”” (Nikolai Tsiskaridze. “Arguments and facts”, № 27 of 03.07.2009).

- Personifying nomination: “Yuri Sokolov, Director of “Eliseevsky” supermarket, who was executed for embezzlement, I worked with Efros, talk about Leonardo da Vinci, the premiere of this comedy by Gaidai, we play with Lyonya Filatov, Lyudmila Gurchenko, Yuri Yakovlev” (Leonid Kanevsky. “Arguments and facts”, № 18-19 of 08.05.2009); “their teacher is a singer, Lyudmila Senchina; on the birthday of John Lennon Yoko Ono; we performed with musicians Janis Joplin and other legends, in Santa Barbara – with Kenny Loggins, at the UN in New York – with Peter Gabriel; there was no Pugacheva or “Pesnyary”; no Tukhmanov, while Okudzhava, Vysotsky, and even more – Galich were declared illegal; in the period from Lenin to Brezhnev; among Castro, Kennedy and Khrushchev” (Stas Namin. “Arguments and facts”, № 11 of 13.03.2019).

- Exclamation and question marks: “What do you mean – did they work?”; Strongly disagree! Don’t exaggerate! How do we pay for our health? Giving up bad habits. Is that wasteful? Or is it an exorbitant price?” (Alexey Ivanov. “Arguments and facts”, № 8 of 20.02.2009); “And what else is the beauty of our project?: Is everything cheap in Moscow?; Why scold the time in which you live?” (Leonid Kanevsky. “Arguments and facts”, № 18-19 of 08.05.2019); “What do you mean “a modern variation of the classics” can anybody answer me?! And what does it mean to “play love a new way”, does anybody know?!; And I have never really understood: why change the author’s name?; Of course! If you could see how the audience reacts there! And I know I can’t resist taking someone, and I’ve already got three dogs and four cats, you know?”(Yuri Solomin. “Arguments and facts”, № 15 of 10.04.2019); “They don’t watch the golden fund of Soviet and world cinema!; They are not competitors, no way! These are the inventions of journalists who have nothing to write about! Talking about it is ridiculous!”(Nikolai Tsiskaridze, “Arguments and facts”. № 27 of 03.07.2019).

The functions of these linguistic means are primarily expression, emotional evaluation, which are necessary for establishing contact and effective communication based on co-creativity. The recipient is considered as a thinking, experiencing person, whose background knowledge largely coincides with the interviewee, so all of the above language tools involve building complex associative links.

In the athletes’ speech, dialogism is created with the help of personifying nomination, exclamatory and interrogative sentences. Here are examples of information personification: “Let’s compare the loudest fights of this sort: for example, Mayweather with McGregor” (Nikolai Valuev. “Arguments and
facts”, № 31 of 31.07.2019); “acquisition, which the club did in the winter – Azmoun, Rakitskiy and a couple of other people; I worked with the great Alex Ferguson” (Andrei Kanchelskis. “Arguments and facts”, № 21 of 22.05.2019); “Even Kobzon, whom we were friends with” (Alexander Tikhonov. “Arguments and facts”, № 10 of 06.03.2009); “Most of them were invited to a festive celebration: Vyacheslav Fetisov, Alexander Yakushev, Alexander Mostovoy, Yuri Loza, Victor Saltykov, Vadim Kazachenko” (Evgeniy Lovchev. “Arguments and facts”, № 5 of 30.01.2019). Question-exclamation constructions usually end with a summary statement: “Better. Why? Every single way better; I don’t understand how it is possible not to follow such things! No conclusions are done, they are getting away with everything; Read his interview! I remember only Chernomyrdin to be so tongue-tied; Look, when in 1996 I came to the leadership of biathlon, do you know what Russia had? One silver medal (in 1995). That’s all!” (Alexander Tikhonov. “Arguments and facts”, № 10 of 06.03.2009); “But it’s ok, we pulled it off! Our girls will survive that too. But it’s just not necessary to fan the flames on the Internet because of each of their failures, falling!. Men’s singles skating? If we get just some prizes – it will be a great success; You say, the coach is a tyrant! But the coach has to be tough! Remember Stanislav Zhuk. He was tough. Really. It is impossible to stroke athletes on the head, we’ll not get any result this way” (Natalya Bestemyanova. “Arguments and facts”, № 12 of 20.03.2019).

At the same time, special attention should be paid to the fact that the important means of dialogism in the interview with the athlete are structures that establish a causal connection at the level of syntax, and elements of conversational style at the level of vocabulary.

The syntactic type of dialogism is necessary as a system of argumentation in the dialogue not so much with the journalist as with the recipient: “The truth is that such diseases are quite rare... it’s just that I was “lucky”, nature has rewarded me; It says that the popularity of boxing is still higher, the TV companies collect more money for the display of boxing matches; He learns what you will not tell anyone, hesitate or find it unnecessary to report. For some reason, in personal communication, we often conceal much, and leave the subtext while we demonstrate almost everything in the social network” (Nikolay Valuev. “Arguments and facts”, № 31 of 31.07.2009); “It is clear that the English players are a class higher, but not 4.5 times higher, that’s for sure. Russia also has strong players. And the salary figures are just an indicator of the League’s financial capabilities” (Andrei Kanchelskis. “Arguments and facts”, № 21 of 22.05.2019); “Those who could qualify for “gold” didn’t go to Korea. Just because someone somewhere decided they didn’t belong there. But you know how short the athletes’ peak form is” (Elena Vyalbe. “Arguments and facts”, № 8 of 20.02.2009).

Elements of conversational style create the illusion of oral speech, which enhances the effect of dialogism: “Oh, well, once here we are on all fronts messed with, I’d rather sit at home and let someone else sort it out” (Elena Vyalbe. “Arguments and facts”, № 8 of 20.02.2009); “Listen, I have already been bullied on this topic; all his excerpt, unfortunately, was gone down the drain; Look at the youth, who is showing off today; children whitefish from the 6th or 9th floors” (Nikolay Valuev. “Arguments and facts”, № 31 of 31.07.2019); “It’s not the national team, it’s Chernomyrdin to be so tongue-tied; Look, when in 1996 I came to the leadership of biathlon, do you know what Russia had? One silver medal (in 1995). That’s all!” (Alexander Tikhonov. “Arguments and facts”, № 10 of 06.03.2009); “But it’s ok, we pulled it off! Our girls will survive that too. But it’s just not necessary to fan the flames on the Internet because of each of their failures, falling!. Men’s singles skating? If we get just some prizes – it will be a great success; You say, the coach is a tyrant! But the coach has to be tough! Remember Stanislav Zhuk. He was tough. Really. It is impossible to stroke athletes on the head, we’ll not get any result this way” (Natalya Bestemyanova. “Arguments and facts”, № 12 of 20.03.2019).

Thus, an interview is always a dialogue in which not only the journalist and the interlocutor, but also the society manifest themselves as subjects of social reality. The dialogue provides new important and interesting information presented by a particular person to a mass audience. An interview as a professional communicative event and a special kind of media text has the following characteristics: publicity and publicism, audience orientation, pre-defined roles of the interviewer and the interviewee, the focus on relevance, dialogism and intentionality. The success and effectiveness of the interview depends on the choice of speech strategy and language means: obtaining socially significant, relevant, important information, presenting this information to the recipient in the most interesting and meaningful format.

It is no accident that S. N. Ilchenko sees the interview as “a way to satisfy a person’s thirst for knowledge (in other words, curiosity) with the help of another person” [6. P. 9]. Journalists face a difficult task – to find the most effective ways of obtaining and disseminating information, to learn and disseminate socially important information. To solve these problems, they have verbal and non-verbal means, the choice of which is due to the type of audience, that is, the type of recipient, the language personality of the interviewer, intentions and speech strategies of the interviewer.
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