

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2018.18.03>

UDC: 81'42'44: [811.111+811.161.2]



Oleksii O. Borysov

T. H. Shevchenko National University
"Chernihivskyi Kolehium", Chernihiv, Ukraine

CONTRASTIVE PARAMETERISATION OF THE INTERVIEW AS A GENRE OF BRITISH AND UKRAINIAN MEDIA SPACES

Bibliographic Description:

Borysov, O. O. (2018). Contrastive Parameterisation of the Interview as a Genre of British and Ukrainian Media Spaces. *Scientific Journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development*, 18. 33–45. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2018.18.03>

Abstract

This typological study presents a contrastive parameterisation of the dialogue in the form of the interview within modern British and Ukrainian media spaces. It has proved to be effective if conducted as a complex investigation facilitated by the achievements of Comparative, Structural, Cognitive and Communicative Linguistics. The parameterisation of the dialogue is seen as a polyparadigm methodological procedure of decomposition and taxonomy of the dialogue systems within the British and Ukrainian lingual cultures. A definite discourse practice is considered to form with the help of mode, genesis and genre filtering. In general, the first one results in oral or written practices, the second reveals itself in natural everyday and social (everyday and political) varieties, and the latter shapes primary and derivative genres of the dialogue. All these use the language and speech means of their own to embody themselves in the appropriate surface forms. In the framework of the created theoretical platform the interview is defined as an oral derivative genre of the socio-political dialogical interaction between the journalist and the respondent. This talk is both personal and institutional; it unfolds itself in a "question – answer" form and aims at generating facts, ideas and opinions stirring up public interest.

The parameterisation of the interview has embraced its ontological, structural, lexical, syntactical, lingo-cognitive, non-verbal and communicative-pragmatic facets. It has become clear that within both British and Ukrainian media spaces the TV interview incorporates the same intrinsic features and composition. This results from the uniformity of the Action and Possession Frame networks that shape the conceptual bases of the interview – the INTERVIEW / ІНТЕРВ'Ю concepts – in the discourse spaces under analysis. The salient features of the British and Ukrainian interviews are the abundant use of terminology, preference for simple sentences as well as prevalent stylistic employment of homogeneous parts of the sentence and repetition. The ethnic varieties of the interaction are both of cooperative nature, but the Ukrainian one is more emotion saturated and apt to reveal its collaborative character than the British one.

Keywords: communication, dialogue, interview, parameterisation, mode, genesis, genre, lingual culture.

1. Introduction.

Modern contrastive explorations held in the framework of cognitive-discursive paradigm continue to deal with different aspects of communication and discourse. Among the other phenomena of social and psychological existence of the person, they focus on the dialogue looking into its multiple facets (Antaki, 2008; Langlotz, 2015; Linell, 2015; Norrick, 2016; Robinson, 2014, etc.).

The dialogue exists as an invariable and embodies itself in all sorts of dialogues within ethnic lingual cultures. Such dichotomy between the cognitive model and its specific representations in discourse reveals itself in the ability of the members of the society to contact each other and create an interactive space of mutual intelligibility, which provides the background for pursuing individual or common communicative and objective goals. It also manifests itself in different kinds of the dialogue embodied in various situations of everyday and institutional interaction. The above mentioned brings up the necessity for parameterisation of the ethnic varieties of the dialogue (Bergqvist, Kittilä, 2017; Jakubowska-Branicka, 2014; Mallinson, 2011; Nitoiu, Tomic, 2015; Reiter, Kádár, 2015; Reuzel, 2013; Shatalova, Vararut, 2014; Wodak, Meyer, 2015, etc.). It may be useful for both theoretical and practical purposes, particularly for the purpose of specifying common and distinctive features of the dialogue kinds and genres as well as establishing the guidelines for cross-cultural communication.

2. Aim and Objectives.

The study is devoted to the parameterisation of the interview, a dialogue genre usually transmitted by mass media and aiming at the mass addressee (Apalat, 2013; Ipatova, Rogozin, 2014; Linell, Keselman, 2012; Maier, 1976; Mann, 2010; Mel'nik, 2008; Tomaschuk, 2015, etc.), which plays an important part in the social interaction of the British and Ukrainian communities (Denyskina, 2005; Djakiv, 2018; Kochubej, 2015, etc.). To achieve the goal set it was necessary to accomplish a number of objectives: to define the terms “dialogue”, “interview”, “parameterisation” in the framework of modern linguistics; to establish the intentional component of the interview; to conduct an ontological, structural, linguo-cognitive, lexical, syntactical, stylistic, non-verbal and lingo-pragmatic contrastive parameterisation of the British and Ukrainian interview.

In linguistics, parameterisation is generally viewed as a process of formation and verbalization of the parts of national pictures of the world represented by different language units (Boldyrev, 2000: 92–93; Dem'jankov, 1996: 118–121; Kuzina, 2010: 194; Mallinson, 2011: 88–89; Yule, 2006: 66–105). This process is triggered by the basic mechanism of a person's constant cognitive orientation in the objective-reality and social environments. The cognition of their fragments takes place and the number of their parameters tends to increase due to the regular satisfaction of the basic human need to possess up-to-date information (Langlotz, 2015: 84–91; Preston, 18: 2017). Thus, specific parametric pictures of the world are distinguished. They superimpose on the conceptual linguocultural fields and discretise them in a nationally predetermined way (Dem'jankov, 1996: 120; Fillmore, 2003: 250; Jakubowska-Branicka, 2014: 30–31; Shatalova, Vararut, 2014: 210–213; Zhabotynskaja, 2009: 3–4).

We believe the parameterisation of the dialogue by ethnic community to account for a standard set of different language and non-verbal elements used in this or that personal or institutional interaction. Such language and speech differentiation results in various dialogical types and genres creation. The dialogue is viewed as a universal complex dynamic cognitive-communicative-discourse construct that finds its realization in different social situations of information exchange between language speakers and gets its cultural colouring in discourse practices of ethnic lingual communities (Borysov, 2017: 7). Thus, the dialogue

parameterisation as a linguistic method helps to model its national varieties of realization, define their intrinsic features, elaborate a scheme of these interactions and find out the means of their different stages running (Hisamova, 2013; Kuzina, 2010; Vorozhbitova, Potapenko, 2013, etc.).

The topicality of the article is determined by the general anthropocentric character of modern linguistics and substantiated by consideration of the dialogue and its types as an indispensable part of both individual and social being of the person and lingual community. That leads to understanding that such a complex and multifaceted object should be studied first and foremost in the perspective of cognitive-discourse studies theory and methodology. This scientific research is connected with such topical problems of modern linguistic science as the investigation of people's communicative activity in various everyday institutional and personal situations, highlighting discourses with intentional meanings, categorization and conceptualization of dialogical interactions with the establishment of typical verbal and non-verbal means of their ethnic realization.

Thus, our investigation has been conducted with the help of the general scientific methods of induction, deduction, synthesis and analysis as well as such specific linguistic methods as parameterisation, the componential and conceptual analyses of the meanings of the lexemes that denote the interview in English and Ukrainian.

Besides, we used linguopragmatic analysis aimed at establishing typical speech acts, strategies and tactics used by interlocutors, the method of statistics to get the objective results of this or that unit frequency followed by the descriptive method, and contrastive analysis for establishing allomorphic and isomorphic features of the genre within British and Ukrainian ethnic media spaces.

3. The Essence and Principles of Dialogue Parameterisation.

In the study, the parameterisation of the dialogue is a methodological procedure of decomposition and taxonomy of the dialogue systems within the discourse spaces of British and Ukrainian cultures. The term has got the new meaning within a cognitive-discourse paradigm (Dem'jankov, 1996: 118), which treats the language as a system of human cognition. This means that the dialogue parameterisation presupposes not only its taxonomy according to the language strata, which enables the researcher to establish its morphological, lexical and syntactical features, but also reveals the relations that make the language a system. The language used by native speakers taking part in discourse practices is constrained by the type of interaction, namely the mode (oral or written), genesis (natural everyday or social (everyday or political) varieties) and genre (primary or derivative) (Borysov, 2017: 27). Such complex comparative scrutiny of different ethnic varieties of the dialogue turns parameterisation into an important tool that provides an opportunity to determine the diagnostic properties of genres and their ethnic markers in British and Ukrainian discourse practices.

We believe the parameterisation method to be in accordance with the very nature of the dialogue as a structured, operational, cognitive, verbal and non-verbal, interactional and synergetic system. It is because each time the dialogue as a universal cognitive model stored in the human's mind embodies itself in a definite discourse practice, it undergoes parameterisation in accordance with language code used. In particular, the language means used to embody the ideas constrain the fragmentation of the data whole into pieces of information able to become the meanings of the words and idioms we use. Thus, parameterisation as a method of scientific investigation is in tune with the "natural" parameterisation as a cognitive process engaged in communication. In this paper the peculiarities of parameterisation of the interview as a communicative event are considered.

4. The Parameterisation of the Interview.

The contrastive parameterisation of the British and Ukrainian interview embraces ontological, structural, lingo-cognitive, lexical, syntactical, stylistic, non-verbal and lingo-pragmatic dimensions.

4.1. Ontological Parametrisation of the British and Ukrainian Interviews.

The ontological parameterisation of the interview presupposes the identification of the intrinsic features that differentiate this genre from the others and provide the ground for singling out its different types. In the British and Ukrainian media spaces the interview genre shapes the instances of public inquiries about professional or personal issues aiming to present a piece of hot news and influence public opinion (Denyskina, 2005; Djakiv, 2018; Kochubej, 2015, etc.).

The first lexico-semantic variant (LSV) of the lexeme *interview* represents the interview as “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”. This definition is a basic one if one deals with mass media communication as the other variants demonstrate other references, e.g. LSV2: “An oral examination of an applicant for a job, college place, etc.” (Interview. 2018 URL: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/interview>). In Ukrainian the interview as a media communicative event is also presented by the LSV1 of the lexeme: “Призначена для опублікування в пресі, передачі по радіо, телебаченню розмова журналіста з політичним, громадським або яким-небудь іншим діячем”, whereas it is the result of the dialogue that is stored in its LSV2: “Газетна стаття або передача по радіо, телебаченню, що містить виклад такої розмови” (Interv'ju. 2018 URL: <http://sum.in.ua/s/interv.ju>).

The main common feature of the key definitions is that the interview is understood as a ‘conversation’ / ‘розмова’. The other isomorphic features are presented by the semes ‘journalist’ / ‘журналіст’, that give the profession of the person who conducts the interview. The difference lies in the additional semes a ‘radio presenter’ / ‘television presenter’ that serve as differential semes of the equal rank to the parameter ‘journalist’ being absent from the Ukrainian definition. These semes, however, together with the component ‘publication’ correlate with the Ukrainian ‘преса’, ‘радіо’, ‘телебачення’ which testifies to the fact that these dialogues are used as a means of mass influence by the mentioned media. The features that differentiate the meanings of the units compared are the attributive semes ‘of public interest’ / ‘політичний’, ‘громадський’, ‘який-небудь інший’ that capture the characteristics of the respondent presented by the semes ‘person’ / ‘діяч’. In its turn, ‘діяч’ turns out to be a complex seme consisting of the components ‘person’ and ‘активний’ and ‘енергійний’.

The componential analysis proves the fact that the British and Ukrainians parameterise the interview on the basis of the conversation, an oral and natural for everyday life dialogical genre, and consider it to be a part of the institutional discourse. The formal character of such a conversation is revealed in the following. The communicative roles of the interlocutors are set and functionally predetermined: the journalist produces a number of questions and the respondent produces the answers. So it is the interviewer who generally conducts the interviewee. Being the guest of the studio, the latter has to obey a suggested scenario, which is not typical of a natural everyday interaction (Apalat, 2013: 36; Langlotz, 2015: 16; Mel'nik, 2008: 128). The situation in which a huge amount of specific personal information emerges under such a “social pressure” in no time can be classified as a highly asymmetrical communicative event (Linell, Keselman, 2012: 160). While communicating, the participants tend to cling to the literary language norm as the situation of interaction is official. Its institutional nature is also determined by the complicity of the issue discussed, set time

limits, recording equipment, indirect address to the target audience and. Nonetheless, personal discourse elements are the components of this genre too. They are the intonation of natural excitement not peculiar of the even speech tones of interlocutors, the usage of colloquial elements, rhetorical questions and questions to the interviewer asked when an exchange of communicative roles takes place: G. Anderson: *What roles of women particularly were amazing this year?* Z. Ball: *Well, that was Key Benchers that was amazing! Oh, what are great roles that are played by women?* (Bafta, 2014) and М. Княжицький: *А зараз Ви з кимось листуєтесь?..* О. Забужко: *Ну, хто вже зараз пише листи такі, як писалися раніше?* (TVi, 2011, March 11).

This enables us to present a media interview as an institutional conversation (mingled with the elements of the personal discourse) between the journalist and respondent in the “question-answer” form in order to get facts, ideas and opinions that are of some social interest. The parameters of the mode, genesis and genre create a basis for qualifying the interview as an oral sociopolitical derivative dialogical genre.

The next step of the interview parameterisation is the establishing of typology of its subgenres based on a number of various features. The parameter *the channel of information transmission* results in division of the interviews into *audio* (TV, the radio, the phone) and *visual* (the Internet, the press) (Apalat, 2013: 35; Ipatova, Rogozin, 2014: 21–22). We define the printed interviews as *derivative* ones as opposite to the *primary* broadcast by TV and Internet technologies. The criterion of *spontaneity* helps to classify interviews as *formalized* (which means the compliance with the plan) and *non-formalized* (depending upon the situation, introduction of new topics, etc.) (Mel'nik, 2008: 124). A set of other criteria enable the linguists to distinguish *free, analytical, qualitative, thematic* as well as *portrait, protocol, problem* interviews (Denyskina, 2005: 3; Mann, 2010: 6–7; Mel'nik, 2008: 100–102). Together with it, we created a new typology based on the *functional* parameter. We distinguish the *information* (an event highlighting), *problem* (a discussion of some problem or phenomenon of public interest) and *portrait* (a conversation with a famous personality aiming at revealing some facts of their personal life) *interview*, which can be found in both ethnic media spaces.

4.2. Structural Parameterisation of the British and Ukrainian Interviews.

The British and Ukrainian interviews under analysis reveal the same structural components. They correspond to the subsequent stages of the interview unfolding. The first phase is *the beginning*. Its purpose is to break the ice between the interviewer and interviewee; the journalist creates a positive psychological climate in the studio, introduces the respondent and the topic / problem planned to be discussed, e.g. D. Frost: *We'll join some of the key individuals of the present day ... and now as promised... Good morning, Elton!* E. John: *Good morning, Dave!* (EltonStuff, 2013) and В. Гайдукевич: *А говорити ми будемо з людьми, які були там і можуть висловити свою позицію щодо цієї події. Активіст громадянського руху “Спільна справа” Сергій Тищенко* (TVi, 2013, February 21). This stage is of high importance for the whole interview and to get the most from it the host ideally should produce some facts from the biography of the guest followed by their positive evaluation.

The second phase is the *body of the interview*, its information nucleus, in which the topic unfolds and facts, views, ideas are presented, e.g. D. Cameron: *Well, you know all the forecasters are forecasting growth for this year, but frankly the job of the government is not to sit back and hope that happens. The job of the government is to roll up its sleeves and do everything possible to help businesses to do that* (Crane, 2012) and І. Луценко: *ці два роки розлуки, два роки між тюрмою, домом і судом, такий цей бермудський трикутник, дали можливість все-таки зрозуміти, що найцінніше – це сім'я* (TVi, 2013, April 8).

The success of the whole interview depends upon this phase. The aim of the journalist is to lead the dialogue in order to produce a desired impact on the target audience.

The third stage is the *end of the interview*. It's meant for making conclusions, expressing gratitude and warm wishes before the dialogical contact is over, e.g. J. Vine: *Chuka Umunna, Shadow Business Secretary, thank you very much indeed!* С. Umunna: *Thank you!* (Phelps, 2013) and М. Княжицький: *Дякуємо, що Ви до нас прийшли!* О. Забужко [smiles]: *До побачення!* (TVi, 2011, March 11). Thus, each interview phase has got a purpose of its own but the main one is to get necessary opinions and to influence mass audience in order to form the planned thoughts and attitudes.

4.3. Cognitive Parameterisation of the British and Ukrainian Interviews.

The investigation of the dialogical interaction peculiarities can't avoid the reconstruction of socially and culturally relevant conceptual models structured as frames used in the lingual culture (Croft, 2004; Fillmore, 2003; Fodor, 1998; Minsky, 1983; Zhabotynskaja, 2009, etc.). Frames are multidimensional conceptual schemas storing declarative and procedural knowledge of typical situations of personal interaction. They are responsible for orientation within prototypical events as they facilitate an adequate interpretation of other people's behavior, which is necessary for planning what to do in a definite environment (Goffman, 1974: 81–82; Jakubowska-Branicka, 2014: 32; Yule, 2006: 13).

To elaborate the conceptual models of dialogical genres we use a system of basic frames: the Thing Frame, the Action Frame, the Possession Frame, the Identification Frame, and the Comparison Frame (Zhabotynskaja, 2009) that capture the relations between the reality objects (Bergqvist, Kittilä, 2017: 21). There are two steps of the analysis. The language data analysis gives the ground for invariant interview frame modelling. It analyses the definitions of the words *interview* and *інтерв'ю* presented in the dictionaries. The analysis of interviews that have taken place within the British and Ukrainian discourse spaces lets us expand the models and present contextual details.

The conceptual analysis of the definitions of the *interview* and *інтерв'ю* revealed the following. The meanings of these language units are based on the common Action-Possession conceptual model that determines the organizational, regulative and dynamic peculiarities of interaction (Borysov, 2017: 8). The frames of the concepts *INTERVIEW* / *ІНТЕРВ'Ю* possess an isomorphic form:

[[THERE-place / THEN-time] SOMEBODY /SB/1,2-agent [is SUCH-quality] acts SO1 (*verbally/formally*) [*with* SOMETHING /STH/1,2-instrument [is SUCH]] upon / for SB2,1-patient/benefactor [is [THAT MANY-quantity] SUCH] *because of* STH2-goal].

The proposition [SB2,1-affected/patient/benefactor [is THAT MANY (*two/more*) / SUCH] stores information about the *journalist* and *respondent* (SB1,2-agent) who interact *formally* (SO1) both for the sake (STH2-goal) of each other and other people (THAT MANY (*public*)) thus acquiring a set of new semantic roles (*patient / benefactor*). The proposition [*with* STH1,2-instrument is SUCH] contains the knowledge of the verbal character of communication (*words*) and the medium that delivers the news (*press / TV / radio*). This proposition together with the slots THERE / THEN is important in several aspects: 1) it implies that the target audience is at some distance and get the news later than the interlocutors who communicate face-to-face; 2) this communication with the public is indirect; 3) the professional type of the interviewer is revealed. Allomorphic is the fact that slot SUCH of the frame *ІНТЕРВ'Ю* is more information saturated than the corresponding one of the *INTERVIEW*. It gives the information about the type of SB2-agent (*respondent*) and their characteristics (*політичний, громадський, який-небудь інший; активний, енергійний*).

The study of the videomaterials has contributed to the expansion of the common frame network *INTERVIEW / ІНТЕРВ'Ю*. The slots *THERE / THEN* become more elaborated as the time and place (e.g. the studio) of the interview is highlighted. The slot *SB2,1* gets a new semantic role (*SB2,1-affected*) as interlocutors can get emotionally excited during the interview. The number of participants is also increased when, for instance, two or more guests are invited (*THAT MANY (more than two)*). More than that, the semantic role of *owner* is activated as the partners have got some problem / problems to solve and topic / topics (*STH3-owned*) to discuss: [*SB1,2-owner has STH3-owned (problem) [is [THAT MANY] SUCH]*]. The success of the event is captured in the slot *SO2 (positively / negatively)*. The slot *SO1* (together with the slot *THERE*) is filled with the information absent from lexicographical sources, namely 1) non-verbal behavior of the interview participants (proxemics, phonetics, kinesics, tacesics, etc.), 2) the style of socio-political interaction (non-formal); 3) the intellectual efforts of the communicators made to find the necessary solutions or to develop the topic suggested.

The expanded frame of *INTERVIEW / ІНТЕРВ'Ю* possesses the isomorphic structure:

[[*THERE / THEN*] *SB-agent1,2* [*is SUCH-quality*] *acts* *SO1 (verbally / non-verbally; (non-) formally; intellectually)* [*with THAT MANY STH1,2-instrument [is SUCH]*] *upon / for SB2,1-affected/patient/benefactor/owner* [[*is [THAT MANY] SUCH*] *has STH3-owned (topic/ problem) [is [THAT MANY] SUCH]*] *because of STH2-goal [SO2 (positively / negatively)]*].

This model varies structurally and semantically in both cultures depending on the type of the interview, its topic, problems, etc.

4.4. Lexical Parameterisation of the British and Ukrainian Interviews.

The lexical aspect of parameterisation was discussed in detail in (Borisov, 2016: 17–18). In this paper only the most essential issues will be presented. So, the Ukrainian interview participants may employ the Russian language to express themselves clearer, more vividly or emotionally, specifically while producing a quotation referring to an original precedent text, e.g. О. Забужко: *Вони вийшли в люди як Проня Прокопівна, яка чотири місяці була в пансіоні і всі науки “превзошла”* (TVi, 2013, July 17). Allomorphic is the fact that language switching is not peculiar of the British.

A common feature of the British and Ukrainian interviews is the active usage of contact-establishing verbs that perform a metacommunicative function and contribute greatly to the coherence and speech etiquette of the interaction, e.g. *(you) know, let (me) listen, look* and *пробачте, перепрошую, бачите, розумієте*, e.g. D. Cameron: *Look, I'm in favour of people setting up great businesses in Britain* (Crane, 2012) and Є. Чечеринда: *От давайте про висування в президенту трошки пізніше* (TVi, 2013, August 5).

To characterize events, phenomena, situations and underline the ideas expressed both British and Ukrainian interlocutors are apt to employ: 1) evaluative adjectives of different degrees of comparison, e.g. C. Flint: *And, of course, our electricity pool will make that easier* (BBC, 2014) and М. Томенко: *Найбільша проблема трапилася в перші дні* (TVi, 2013, August 5), and 2) evaluative adverbs: М. Gove: *Yes, I think she's done a really good job!* (Leeves, 2009); J. Stirrup: *That's exactly right!* (BBC, 2010) and К. Бондаренко: *Тим більше, Москва чудово розуміє, що підписання Угоди...* (TVi, 2013, August 27); В. Брюховецький: *Ці тести... є абсолютно не досконали* (TVi, 2013, July 31).

The usage of *stylistically colored vocabulary* is predetermined by the formal style of speech. The units found refer to two categories. The first group of words belong to the literary vocabulary; they are mostly *terms (meltdown, price freeze, private consumption / маржа, прайм-тайм, таблоїдизація* (Engl. 75,7% / Ukr. 64,4%)) and *bookish words (en masse, whilst / пролеткульт, штиблету* (Engl. 2% / Ukr. 7,4%)). Another group consists

of the *colloquial* vocabulary, namely *low colloquial* (*yeah, chunk, damned, gonna / люди добрі, пристібатися, прикольно* (Engl. 21% / Ukr. 27,1%)) and *slang* words (*crack/ to take crack, honcho / лох, мороз, бомба* (Engl. 1,3% / Ukr. 1,1%)). The literary vocabulary frequency is 5,9% higher in the British interviews (cf. 77,7% / 71,8%), while colloquialisms predominate in the Ukrainian ones (cf. 22,3% / 28,2%).

4.5. Syntactical Parameterisation of the British and Ukrainian Interviews.

It is common for the media interview interlocutors of both cultures to use more *simple* sentences (Engl. 51,7% / Ukr. 57,2%) than the *composite* ones (Engl. 48,3% / Ukr. 42,8%), though this tendency is more vivid in the speech of Ukrainians. As for the types of syntactical structures *compound* sentences (Engl. 73,3%; Ukr. 86,9%) are commonly used in contrast to the *complex* ones (Engl. 26,7%; Ukr. 13,1%). The composite sentences are mostly used by the respondents who produce a lot of information and ground their thoughts thoroughly whereas the journalists widely use simple sentences as they try to formulate their questions as neatly as possible.

If the criterion the *purpose of the utterance* is taken into consideration, then the interview participants of both ethnic communities, naturally, mostly use declarative sentences (Engl. 81,2%; Ukr. 81,5%), while the percentage of the usage of interrogative ones is lower (Engl. 17,9%; Ukr. 15,7%), and that of imperative sentences is the lowest (Engl. 0,9%; Ukr. 2,8%). The Ukrainian dialogues are more emotion saturated if we speak of the number of *emotional utterances* in the dialogues (4,4%, cf.: Engl. 4,7% / Ukr. 9,1%).

The analysis of syntax *stylistics* revealed the following. The British interviews are characterized by more intensive usage of such stylistic elements, as 1) *repetition* (Engl. 23,6% / Ukr. 20,9%), e.g. J. Vine: *I mean just to be clear. Just to be very clear!* (BBC, 2014, May 19) and Т. Шевчук: *Мене всі там знають уже! І навіть більшість працівників "Беркуту" я бачила 25-го числа. Вони мене теж знають!* (TVi, 2013, February 21); 2) *detached constructions* (Engl. 18,1% / Ukr. 11,2%): Ch. Umunna: *But can I just say, you know, a word of caution here, we've got to be clear, of course we need a properly managed migration system* (Phelps, 2013) and І. Луценко: *Те, що це два роки тому вважалося важливим – боже, я цього не зробила! якісь справи по роботі, по фірмі, – це були інші пріоритети* (TVi, 2013, April 8).

This is also true of *emphatic sentences* in general (9,2%, cf. Engl. 23,6% / Ukr. 14,4%), though 1) *inversion* dominates in Ukrainian discourse (Engl. 2,8% / Ukr. 7%), e.g. С. Carlisle: *...and it definitely is a possibility!* (BBC, 2012) and В. Ярема: *Затримувати людей, які не вчинили адміністративного правопорушення, міліціонер не має права!* (TVi, 2013, February 21). The other components of emphatic sentences are 2) *lexical repetition* (cf. Engl. 11,8% / Ukr. 5,3%), e.g. D. Cameron: *What I think is wrong is pay going up and up and up when it's not commensurate with the success* (Crane, 2012) and М. Томенко: *...що це її хрест, який вона мусить нести, на собі нести* (TVi, 2013, August 5), and 3) *emphatic constructions proper* (Engl. 9% / Ukr. 2,1%): А. Marr: *That is quite a big chunk!* (BBC, 2014) and О. Забужко: *Ну, ніяк він не працює!* (TVi, 2013, July 17).

In its turn, the Ukrainian interview is marked by the usage of the following stylistic units, e.g. 1) *elliptical sentences* (Engl. 11,1% / Ukr. 17,6%): J. Stirrup: *Reductions in number of fast jet aircraft, reductions in numbers of ships, reductions in equipment within the army* (BBC, 2010) and Ю. Луценко: *Триста книжок прочитав!* (TVi, 2013, April 8); 2) *homogeneous parts of the sentence* (Engl. 18,8% / Ukr. 21,9%): С. Flint: *And some of our package around breaking up the generation supply, the pool, the regulator, that's not new* (BBC, 2014) and В. Гайдукевич: *Чи можуть вони як громадські активісти наступного разу ... прийти підготовленими – шоломи, налокітники, наколінники?* (TVi, 2013,

February 21); 3) *parceling* (peculiar of Ukrainian speech only (1,6%)): I. Луценко: *І я відповіла коротко – я буду гордитися своїм чоловіком! І собою!* (TVi, 2013, April 8), and 4) *break-in-the-narrative* (Engl. 2,8% / Ukr. 10,2%): E. John: *Well, I think, I don't know if it's going to be number one for Christmas but I think it will be number one this afternoon judging by the mid-week figures, so...* D. Frost: *I think all the people are going to rush into the shops at eleven a.m. this morning* (EltonStuff, 2013) and М. Барчук: *Двадцять років... двадцять років покоління міняється, і ми переживаємо те саме* (TVi, 2013, July 17).

The common feature is the same frequency of *rhetorical questions* (2,1%; 2,1%), e.g. A. Marr: *You won't? Okay* (BBC, 2014) and В. Єшкілев: *Бо що може бути жахливіше, ніж рожевий смартфон?* (TVi, 2013, December 16).

4.6. Non-verbal Parameterisation of the British and Ukrainian Interviews.

The peculiarities of non-verbal behaviour of the British and Ukrainian interview interlocutors are predetermined by the formal character of interaction and existing ethnic stereotypes. The British are more reserved socially (Miall, Milsted, 1999), than the Ukrainians who are more emotional in everyday situations (Denyskina, 2005); though in both cultures the participants demonstrate an unhurried way of behavior to prove the significance of the information presented. The looks of the partners are locked creating the sincerity of communication and genuineness of their words. The serious tone of conversation underlines the importance and truthfulness of both questions and answers. The speakers actively employ *logical* or *emphatic stress* to attract each other's attention, e.g. M. Gove: *And I think it's wrong to try to argue that this government is favouring one group of individuals over another in public appointments!* (Leeves, 2009) and М. Белкін: *Але так масово активістів, які не... ну, то, що я бачив!* (TVi, 2013, February 21).

The proxemics of the interaction, when the journalist and respondent are at some distance at the table, proves the official communication to take place. The typical modest and elegant clothes, make-up, hair-do that correspond to the simplicity and exquisiteness of the studio serve as a background for the positive perception of the information by the target audience.

4.7. Pragmatic Parameterisation of the British and Ukrainian Interviews.

The analysis of the *speech act* component of the British and Ukrainian interviews has established a general tendency towards the predominant usage of constatives (Engl. 82,6%; Ukr. 82,8%), as well as the minimal usage of performatives (Engl. 2,3%; Ukr. 1,6%) and promissives (Engl. 0,2%; Ukr. 0,5%), while menaces are completely absent. There is a slight difference in the activity of the quesetives (Engl. 14% / Ukr. 12,5%) and directives (Engl. 0,9% / Ukr. 2,6%) usage.

The study of the *strategic* line of communicative behavior of the interviewer and interviewee found out the following tendencies. In general, the Ukrainian interviews are more of a cooperation type (Engl. 79,3% / Ukr. 94,6%). During the interviews the British journalists implement more cooperative tactics than confrontational ones (Engl. 58,8% / Ukr. 41,2%), the fact concerns the respondents as well (Engl. 89,8% / Ukr. 10,2%). Similarly, both Ukrainian journalists (Engl. 92,1% / Ukr. 7,9%) and their guests (Engl. 94,6% / Ukr. 5,4%) involve more tactics of cooperation. The common feature of these conversations is that the scope of interviewee's tactics is larger than that of the journalist a little bit limited by the goal of getting new information. For instance, the interviewer has to use a number of such typical cooperation tactics, as the tactic of support and tactic of the opinion enhancement: B. Johnson: *There's a billion pounds being lost...* A. Marr: *People are evading stamp duty by companies abroad* (Crane, 2012) and I. Луценко: *... протягом цих двох років пізнала його як мужнього чоловіка, як людину з величезною силою волі,*

втримки. І. Довгань: *Ви мусите дружину зрозуміти, бо коли жінка щаслива, її зупинити важко* (TVi, 2013, April 8), the tactics of agreement: С. Umunna: *We may have that important... very important symbiotic relationship*. J. Vine: *Hugely ... sensitive to the economy!* (Phelps, 2013) and О. Забужко: *Це епіграф, у якому все видно і більше нічого не треба про наш час говорити. Одного цього епізоду досить! Розкішна метафора!* М. Барчук: *Країна все більше зникає до абсурду. Де є точка неповернення? У мене враження, що ми стаємо все менш чутливими до цього* (TVi, 2013, July 17), etc.

The unique feature of the British interviews is the participants' employment of some communicative tactics of explicit confrontation never found in the Ukrainian ones, e.g. the tactic of sheer sarcasm: С. Flint: *No, we're supporting ...* A. Marr [interrupts]: *You won't? Okay*. С. Flint: *... we are supporting the contract* (BBC, 2014); the tactic of mockery: М. Gove: *And if it's the case that there's an outstanding candidate ...* A. Marr [interrupts]: *Tory donor called Mr Agnew!* (Leeves, 2009), the tactics of language aggression, non-cooperative interruption and mockery: J. Hunt: *That's what the BBC are saying. I think if you actually look at...* J. Vine [interrupts]: *I've just asked it! Just answer it here!* J. Hunt: *Well, if you look at the policy issue of substance...* J. Vine [interrupts]: *Have you seen the papers today?* (BBC, 2014, May 19). The establishment of these tactics testifies to the fact that the style of conducting the interview by the British journalists is more aggressive in comparison to the communicative behaviour of their guests: the journalists being aware of the presence of the target audience try to make their guests answer their questions directly, using the tactics that are not peculiar of the Ukrainian journalists. Nevertheless, the amount of such tactics and their contextual implementation is regulated by the following principle: to reach the planned goal of the interview one should get as much information as possible from the respondent without any useless assaulting of one's dignity and social status.

5. Conclusions.

The contrastive parameterisation of the British and Ukrainian media interview allowed to establish the following. The interview consists of a number of common components, such as the journalist / respondent, the socially approved intentions of the first party to inquire and of the second to give out ideas, facts, views, assessments, emotions, the plan of the conversation, topic / problem, set time and place, mass media coverage, institutionality / personality, distant mass audience, etc. Another isomorphic feature is its composition, namely the beginning of the interview, the main body and the end, being the stages of its unfolding. The common nature of the interview is explained by the existence of the same Action and Possession frame network in the British and Ukrainian ethnic mind that serves as a structural basis for the concepts *INTERVIEW* / *ІНТЕРВ'Ю* and their media space realization. This also explains the fact that the same language, speech and non-verbal communication levels are involved in the parameterisation of the genre by the representatives of both lingual communities. Nonetheless, the analysis reveals qualitative and quantitative differences in the use of the units of the above mentioned levels. The British and Ukrainian interlocutors tend to use terminology in simple syntactic constructions, while turning to homogeneous parts of the sentence and repetition as predominant stylistic devices they use. The Ukrainian dialogues are more emotion saturated than the British ones. The ethnic varieties of the interview demonstrate high rates of the employment of the cooperation tactics, but the Ukrainian speakers follow the cooperation strategy more consistently. The results of the research seem to be convincing enough and support the achievements of the other linguists in the linguocultural and communicative fields of studies devoted to the British and Ukrainian communicative behaviour.

Thus, the proposed conception of parameterisation can be employed in thorough contrastive investigations of dialogical interactions of different modes and genres. In

particular, it is possible to proceed with the contrastive parameterisation of the genre of the interview in the other Germanic and Slavic lingual cultures.

References

- Antaki, Ch. (2008). Discourse analysis and conversational analysis. *The SAGE Handbook of Social Research Methods*. eds. P. Alasuutari, L. Bickman, J. Brannen. London: Sage. 431–446.
- Apalat, G. P. (2013). Komunikatyvna strateghija konfliktu v tekstakh-interv'ju suchasnoji anghlomovnoji presy [The communicative strategy of conflict in the texts interview in modern English press]. *Naukovi zapysky. Serija: Filologhichni nauky*. 118. 35–40.
- Bafta. (2014, 16 February). “*Bafta Film Awards Red Carpet.*” [Video file]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ng_UAgoPIK4.
- BBC. (2010, October 31). “*The Andrew Marr Show.*” [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-11660762>.
- BBC. (2014, February 23). “*The Andrew Marr Show.*” [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-26312508>.
- BBC. (2014, May 19). “*The Andrew Marr Show.*” [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b01xyh0r>.
- BBC. (2012, June 10). “*Clarke Carlisle sees racist reality in Polish football.*” [Video file]. [Video file]. Retrieved from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/9727095.stm.
- Bergqvist, H., Kittilä, S. (2017). Person and knowledge: Introduction. *Open Linguistics*. 1.1. 18–30.
- Boldyrev, N. N. (2000). Kognitivnaja semantika [Cognitive semantics]. Tambov: Izd-vo Tamb. Un-ta. 123.
- Borisov, A. A. (2016). Morfologo-stilisticheskie i leksicheskie osobennosti britanskih i ukrainskih televinterv'ju: sravnitel'nyj aspekt [Morphological-stylistic and lexical peculiarities of British and Ukrainian TV interview: comparative aspect]. *Science and Education a New Dimension: Philology*. ed. Dr. Xenia Vamos. 2016. IV (21). 80. 16–20.
- Borysov, O. O. (2017). *Typologhija brytanskykh ta ukrajinskykh dialoghovykh dyskursyvykh praktyk* [The Typology of British and Ukrainian Dialogical Discourse Practices] (Thesis of Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://www.npu.edu.ua>.
- Cortney, D. (2012, March 4). “*The Andrew Marr Show.*” [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ysvyf52x0Lk>.
- Crane, S. (2012, January 8). “*The Andrew Marr Show.*” [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TX0wzOF6eec>.
- Croft, W., Cruse, A. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 356.
- Dem'jankov, V. Z. (1996). Parametrizacija [Parameterisation]. *Kratkij slovar' kognitivnyh terminov*. ed. E. S. Kubrjakova. Moskva: Filologhicheskij fakul'tet MGU im. M. V. Lomonosova. 118–123.
- Denyskina, H. O. (2005). *Strukturni i komunikatyvni parametry zhanru vil'nogho interv'ju (na materialy teleperedach 2000-2004 rr.)* [The structural and communicative parameters of the free interview genre (on the material of TV programmes of 2000-2004)]. (Thesis of Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://www.lib.ua-ru.net>.
- Djakiv, Kh. (2018). Praghmalinhvistychni aspekty interv'ju u medijnij zhanrologhiji na materialy ukrajinskoji ta nimeckoji mov [Pragmalinguistic aspects of interview in the theory of media genres on the material of Ukrainian and German languages]. *Pivden'nyj arkhiv (filologhichni nauky)*. LXXII. 1. 152–156.
- EltonStuff. (n.d.). (2013, November 15). “*Breakfast with Frost.*” [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4hD2ozZ0-KU>.
- Fillmore, Ch. (2003). *Form and meaning in language: papers on semantic roles*. Stanford: CSLI Publications. 311.
- Fodor, J. (1998). *Concepts: where cognitive science went wrong*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 174.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: an essay on the organisation of experience*. New York: Northeastern University Press. 577.
- Hisamova, G. G. (2013). Funkcii dialoga v hudozhestvennom tekste [The functions of the dialogue in the belles-lettres text]. *Vestnik Nizhegorodskogo universiteta im. N. I. Lobachevskogo*. 6 (2). 721–724.
- Interview. (n.d.). Retrieved May 8, 2018, from English Oxford Living Dictionaries online, <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com>.
- Interv'ju [Interview]. (n.d.). Retrieved May 8, 2018, from Slovnuk Ukrainskoyi movy in 11 vol. (1970-1980) online, <http://sum.in.ua>.

Ipatova, A. A., Rogozin, D. M. (2014). Usloviya kommunikativnogo uspeha v standartizirovannom telefonnom interv'ju [The conditions of a communicative success in a standardized phone interview]. *Sociologicheskij zhurnal*. 1. 21–54.

Jakubowska-Branicka, I. (2014). Language as a tool creating and dividing communities. Dangerous use of asymmetric counterconcepts. *Psychology of Language and Communication*. 18. 1. 22–40. doi: 10.2478/plc-2014-0002.

Kochubej, V. Ju. (2015). Zasoby vyrazhennja katehorychnoji i problematychnoji modalnosti v movlenni brytansjkykh politykiv (na materialy teledinterv'ju) [The means of categorical and problematic epistemic modality representation in the interviews of British politicians]. *Naukovi zapysky. Serija: Filologichni nauky*. 138. 97–100.

Kuzina, I. Ju. (2010). O diskursivnoj parametrizacii v lingvisticheskikh issledovanijah [About the discourse parametrisation in linguistic studies]. *Nauchno-tehnicheskie vedomosti SPbGPU*. 2. 194–200.

Langlotz, A. (2015). *Creating social orientation through language. A Socio-cognitive theory of situational social meaning*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia : John Benjamins. 362. doi: 10.1075/celcr.17.

Leeves, M. (2009, November 27). “The Andrew Marr Show.” [Video file]. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UTevt_ZXTPg.

Linell, P. (2015). Dialogism and the distributed language approach: a rejoinder to Steffensen. *Language Sciences*. 50. 120–126.

Linell, P., Keselman, O. (2012). Trustworthiness at stake: Trust and distrust in investigative interviews with Russian adolescent asylum-seekers in Sweden. *Trust and Conflict: Representation, culture and dialogue*. eds. I. Markova, A. Gillespie. London : Routledge. 156–180.

Maier, N. (1976). *The Appraisal Interview: Three Basic Approaches*. San Diego: University Associates. 228.

Mallinson, Ch. (2011). Social Stratification. *The SAGE Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. eds. R. Wodak, B. Johnstone, P. Kerswill. London : Sage Publications. 87–99.

Mann, S. (2010). A Critical Review of qualitative interviews in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*. 32(1). 6–24.

Mel'nik, G. S. (2008). *Obshhenie v zhurnalistike: sekrety masterstva* [Interaction in journalism: the secrets of craftsmanship]. S-Peterburg : Piter. 235.

Miall, A., Milsted, D. (1949). *The Xenophobe's guide to the English*. London : Oval Books. 64.

Minsky, M. (1983). Frame-system theory. *Thinking: Readings in Cognitive Science*. eds. Ph. Johnson-Laird, P. Wason. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. 355–376.

Nitoiu, Ch., Tomic, N. (2015). Introduction. *Europe, Discourse, and Institutions: Challenging the Mainstream in European Studies*. New York : Routledge. 3–7.

Norrick, N. (2016). Narratives in Conversation as Pragmemes. *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use*. eds. by A. Keith, A. Capone, I. Kecskes. Cham: Springer International Publishing. 149–167.

Phelps, J. (2013, March 15). “The Andrew Marr Show.” [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bpDvliNmQdU>.

Preston, D. (2017). The cognitive foundations of language regard. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*. Berlin; Boston: Walter de Gruyter. 53. 1. 17–43. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/psicl-2017-0002>.

Reiter, M., Kádár, D. (2015). (Im)politeness and (im)morality: insights from intervention. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behavior, Culture*. 11. 2. 239–260.

Reuzel, E. (2013). Interactional patterns between staff and clients with borderline to mild intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*. 57. 1. 53–66.

Robinson, S. (2014). Integrity and Dialogue. *Journal of Dialogue Studies*. 2. 2. 49–71.

Shatalova N. S., Vararut T. (2014). Parametrizacija tekstov diskursivnyh praktik [The parameterisation of discourse practices texts]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo lingvisticheskogo universiteta*. 4. 205–214.

Tomashchuk, Y. (2015). Differentiation of communicative strategies and tactics in the Internet Interviews. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology*. III (13). 62. 33–36.

TVi. (2013, July 17). “Homo Sapiens.” [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ko4dg6Hv2yc>.

TVi. (2013, July 31). “Homo Sapiens.” [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1TKDgAv11xw>.

TVi. (2013, August 27). “Okrema dumka.” [Video file]. Retrieved from http://tvi.ua/program/2013/08/27/okrema_dumka_vid_27082013.

TVi. (2014, February 28). “Okrema dumka.” [Video file]. Retrieved from http://tvi.ua/program/2014/02/28/ihor_semyvolos_u_okremiy_dumci.

TVi. (2013, April 8). "Sjoghodni pro gholovne." [Video file]. Retrieved from http://tvi.ua/program/2013/04/08/sohodni_pro_holovne_vid_08042013.

TVi. (2011, March 11). "Vechir z Mykoloju Knjazhycjkm" na TVi. [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1kyd7R7-O8E>.

TVi. (2013, December 16). "Zelena lampa". [Video file]. Retrieved from http://tvi.ua/program/2013/12/16/volodymyr_yeshkilyev_idealnoyu_dlya_ukrayiny_bula_b_rol_zolotoho_mostu_mizh_skhodom_i_zakh_odom.

TVi. (2013, February 21). "Znak oklyku!" [Video file]. Retrieved from http://tvi.ua/new/2013/02/21/scho_robty_postrazhdalym_pid_chas_shturmu_hostynnoho_dvoru.

TVi. (2013, August 5). "Znak oklyku!" [Video file]. Retrieved from http://tvi.ua/new/2013/08/05/mykola_tomenko_tymoshenko_odrazu_vidkynula_propozyciyu_pokynuty_krayinu.

Vorozhbitova, A. A., Potapenko, S. I. (2013). Linguistic and rhetorical paradigm as innovative theoretical methodological platform of studying discursive processes of east slavic and western cultures. *European Researcher*. 61. 10-2. 2536–2543.

Wodak, R., Meyer, M. (2015). Critical discourse studies: history, agenda, theory and methodology. *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies*. London: Sage Publications. 1–33.

Yule, G. (2006). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 273.

Zhabotynskaja, S. A. (2009). Modely reprezentacyu znanyj v kontekste razlychnykh shkol koghnytyvnoj lynghvystyky: yntegratyvnyj podkhod [The models of knowledge representation in the context of different schools of cognitive linguistics: a complex approach]. *Visnyk KhNU*. 848. 3–9.

Bibliographic Description:

Борисов, О. О. (2018). Контрастивна параметризація інтерв'ю як жанру британського та українського медіапросторів. *Науковий часопис Національного педагогічного університету імені М. П. Драгоманова. Серія 9. Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов*, 18. 33–45. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2018.18.03>

Анотація

У запропонованій зіставно-типологічній розвідці здійснено параметризацію діалогу-інтерв'ю в межах сучасного британського та українського етнічних медіапросторів. Обґрунтовано ефективність її проведення у форматі комплексного дослідження із залученням здобутків порівняльно-історичної, структурно-семантичної та когнітивно-дискурсивної парадигм мовознавства. Параметризацію діалогу представлено як методичну поліпарадигмальну процедуру дискретизації та типологізації діалогових систем у комунікативних просторах британської та української лінгвокультур. Доведено, що конкретна дискурсивна практика твориться крізь комунікативні фільтри формату (усний / писемний), генези (природно-побутовий / соціальний, з поділом останнього на соціально-побутовий та соціально-політичний) та жанру (первинний / вторинний), отримуючи відповідний ресурс мовних та мовленнєвих одиниць для своєї реалізації. У площині розробленої методологічної концепції вдалося ідентифікувати інтерв'ю як усний вторинний жанровий різновид суспільно-політичної діалогічної взаємодії, в якій відбувається інституційно-персональна бесіда журналіста і респондента в режимі "запитання-відповідь" та генерується інформація, думки та судження, які становлять суспільний інтерес. Параметризацію інтерв'ю здійснено в онтологічному, структурному, лексичному, синтаксичному, лінгвокогнітивному, невербальному та комунікативно-прагматичному напрямках. Установлено, що телеінтерв'ю в обох етнічних медіа-просторах характеризується як спільними конститутивними ознаками, так і структурно-композиційною побудовою, що зумовлено загальною акціонально-посесивною фреймовою структурою знання концептів INTERVIEW / ІНТЕРВ'Ю. Виявлено, що британські й українські інтерв'ю демонструють тенденції до активного вживання термінології, використання простих речень, а у стилістичному плані – однорідних членів речення та повторів. Етнічні інтерв'ю є кооперативними жанрами, при цьому українські є більш емоційно навантаженими та частотнішими у плані дотримання принципів кооперації, ніж британські.

Ключові слова: комунікація, діалог, інтерв'ю, параметризація, формат, генеза, жанр, лінгвокультура.