



## THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FORMAL AND INFORMAL INTERVIEW IN ENGLISH

**Submission Date:** August 20, 2023, **Accepted Date:** August 25, 2023,

**Published Date:** August 30, 2023

**Crossref doi:** <https://doi.org/10.37547/philological-crjps-04-08-07>

**Journal Website:**  
<https://masterjournals.com/index.php/crjps>

**Copyright:** Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

**Zarnigor Jabborova**  
Independent Phd Researcher, Uzbekistan

### ABSTRACT

In this article one of the rapidly developing forms of mass communication is the interview genre and formal and informal types as well as the specific aspects of them are discussed. The informal and formal interviews in English are defined. The difference between formal and informal interviews is explained from linguistic approach.

### KEYWORDS

Interview, formal interviews, informal interviews, turn-taking, neutralism, adversarial, interrogative form, emotional language units, emotive interjections.

### INTRODUCTION

The interview is an interactive, specialized communication between the interviewer and the interlocutor. The interview is socially communicative unity with having the form of dialogue, but an interview differs from a dialogue in the peculiarity of the figures of the addresser and the addressee. The interview is always directed to the third agent, the reader, the listener

[1,24]. An interview is an interaction of "conceptual systems" of it's participants. When interacting, these systems change each other and creates a single text [2,5].

The interview is one of the fastest growing forms of mass communication. Therefore, the interview is analyzed by the researchers as one of the



journalistic genres. And also it is studied from the cognitive-discursive point of view.

That is why the genre of interview is also analyzed by linguistics: Yu.V.Krasnoperova, O.A.Shevchenko, J.Hentage by the linguistic approach [3,4].

Basically, interviews are categorized into formal and informal interviews. The interview is a complex, psychological interaction of individuals, which has a language (formal) reflection and taking into account many closely interrelated factors[4,3].

Formal interviews involve less personal questions and to be a more formal setting. Formal interviews are organized mainly in the process of job selection and interviews with officials. That is why it requires the usage of special language units.

Informal interviews are in a casual setting and structure is so simple [5,5].

The structure of interview depends on its participant's age, gender, profession and nationality and importantly it's type. Therefore, first of all, it is necessary to study its types and distinguish them from each other.

The given information in below is devoted to classify the differences between formal and informal interviews based on linguistic approach.

## METHODS AND MATERIALS

According to Clayman's linguistic side, the types of interview are distinguished on the basis of following five features.

- Turn –taking
- Neutralism
- Adversarial

- Interrogative form
- Restriction of questions [6].

In formal interviews turn-taking is strictly predetermined with a simple rule: interviewer should restrict asking questions and interlocutor should answer only given questions. But informal conversation turn-taking process is controlled by the respondents' answers. Often, more than one question is asked within a single queue and this is marked as a multiple question. The turn of the interviewer can be more complicated.

-What would your superpower be?

-To make people happy.

-What makes you unhappy?

-Feeling rushed.

-What do you most dislike about your appearance?

-My nose – it's big [7,5].

According to Clayman's explanation for the take-turning feature: take-turning is a process dependent on the responder's responses. But we analyze the turn taking process as controlled based on the following four objectives:

- 1) time management - interview time is limited. To control the time management interviewer may violate the rule of taking turns.
- 2) turn management – in interviews with more than one person, the interviewer may deviate from the order of turn management to control the formation of turn management among the respondents.
- 3) interruption management – interruption takes place when somebody takes the turn while another is already speaking.
- 4) topic management - interruption includes floor taking, disagreement and topic-change. If a



topic change occurs, the interviewer breaks the rule of turn taking and speaks to return to the original topic.

Traditionally, turn-taking refers to turn shifts where speaker B takes over after speaker A give up the floor. Turn-taking can be seen as the method of exchanging the role of utterer in conversation. Turn-taking, is a methodology in conversation, is additionally connected to the topic nomination, since obviously, individuals take a turn at talking when they have something to add to the theme, or when they wish to change the subject [8,303].

Clayman's [6] and Richard's [8,303] analyzes of turn-taking are contradictory. According to Clayman's analysis, the violation of the take-turning rule depends on the type of interview. And informal interviews do not follow the rule of taking turns.

According to Richard's analysis, the turn taking does not depend on the type of interview. It happens When the speaker wants to say something additional and with a desire to change the subject. In contrast to the given analysis, we studied the sequence by linking to the situations: time, topic, turn and interruption management. Turn taking may be violated by the interviewer to check the four given features above.

Neutrality – is consistent with the ideal of objectivity. Formal interviews are directed to remain impartial and stay away from controversial topics. It means prearranged questions with exact answers. The plan of informal meeting may change based on the interlocutor's response and controversial may also be discussed. Neutrality (a

term introduced by Eugene Odum) describes the relationship between two species that interact but do not affect each other. In an interview, this term is neutrality about the topic and the interviewers. We disagree with the analysis of interview neutrality based on interview types: formal and informal. As an interviewer, in both types of interviews, the interviewer must be neutral. Adversarial.

In informal interviews interview's position should be the same as that the opponent as well as the questioner. Formal interviews are organized and the function of interviewer is that giving questions to the respondent.

To be adversarial, the following language units can be used:

☐ Words that absolutely confirm the point of view of the interlocutor. Discourse markers mainly serve to confirm the opinion of the interviewer.

Such as: of course, definitely, sure...

☐ The use of partial confirmation words of the interviewer's idea. It is expressed by "Coordinating conjunctions" and phrases used as partial affirmative words.

Such as: but, no...

☐ Assumption of the correctness of the interviewer. Expressions that assume the correctness of the interlocutor: may be, I suppose, probably... [9,17]

☐ Protest. Expressions expressing dissatisfaction: just the other way round, just the opposite, hold on, I'm sorry, Quite the contrary, wait, I'm sorry...

☐ Ascertaining the wrongness of the interviewer: it's not true, it isn't so, it's wrong...



☐ Categorical objection to formalize its disagreement, the reagent can use various linguistic means, the word-sentence on / no, adverbs not at all, in no way case, by no means, by no means, modal words, words with expressive negative semantics, phrase-sentences with the meaning of negation [10,18].

☐ The expression of the stance of the interviewer in the form of adverbs expressing likelihood i.e., presumably, probably, generally and apparently, hesitation through hedges i.e., slightly, simply, bit, almost, or also stance verbs communicating uncertainty i.e., seems, sounds and appears

☐ The largest groups of keywords seem to be those of adverbs expressing certainty i.e., obviously, absolutely, surely, indeed, undoubtedly, adjectives and adverbs emphasizing the importance of what is being said i.e., importantly, important, extremely, and lastly adverbs marking actuality and evidence i.e., actually, really and fact (in combination with in)[11,12].

When the questions of the same question type are asked at unofficial conversations, without replying full question sentence questioner may say the main words in the sentence or the respondent could answer by incomplete sentence.

For example: if the questions are from the “do you like/do you dislike “ type, after asking about one subject with full interrogative form, the next questions are asked the way by saying the subject name.

- Do you like cooking?
- Yes, I do. I'm really into cooking...

- What about swimming?

Both questions are from the same type and instead of asking with” Do you like swimming?” the main words that express the content of the sentence are used.

At official conversations, questions are given to the respondent with traditional way by complete sentence.

According to Milica Vuković's analysis, questions can be realised subsententially, sententially and supersententially. The missing elements of subsentential questions can be easily inferred from the context. They are typically used as increments (a continuation of the previous turn) or as a dynamical and effective tool to ask a yes-no question.

Sentential questions include grammatical questions (interrogatives: yes-no questions, wh-questions, alternative and declarative questions) and questions substitutes (indirect questions and directives, i.e. questions hidden in commands). The range of question types which are used in formal interviews is not in any way different from the one typical of everyday conversation.

Supersentential questions are not common in everyday conversation, so it is interesting to analyze the linguistic features of this genre. Supersentential questions are most commonly questions introduced by prefatory statements functioning as background, negation, relevance, contrast, riddle, perspective or evaluation.

The categories here presented bear some resemblance to the previously mentioned model derived by Clayman and Heritage[12,160].



The restriction of questions according to the formal conversation structured plan, the opening and closing process of interview are arranged beforehand. They are arranged by avoiding personal questions and also preserve the legitimacy of them.

Although ordinary interviews consist of mainly personal questions, it follows the rule of legitimacy.

Mainly in formal interviews, stylistic neutral words and formal language are used. In informal interviews, emotional linguistic units and emotive interjections are used.

The interview is reviewed as a two stage formation: consisting of the stage of generation – oral communication and the stage of interpretation [13, 5]. Any type of interview's component is in this position. A formal interview could be unstructured if it follows a conversational approach without a pre-set list of questions, though still maintaining a formal environment.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it can be said that although the interview has become very popular in developed countries, it has just entered our country. Although the interview has been analyzed as a journalistic genre, it has not yet been fully studied linguistically. The interview genre has different, colorful forms, which serve to cover social life in a wide and deep way, to inform readers of important facts, events and incidents in it, and to arouse public opinion. It is very important to study the interview and its types and distinguish between formal and informal interviews. As

mentioned above, linguistically, formal and informal interviews are compared and analyzed. This article will effectively help the interviewer and the interviewee to use the correct linguistic units according to the type of interview and organize the correct interview. Understanding the differences can help interviewees prepare effectively and perform their best, regardless of the interview type.

## REFERENCE

1. Inna K.Yu. Modalno-otsenochnaya intervyyu v massavo-informatsionnom diskurse v sovremennom nemestkom yazike. Avtoreferat. Irkutsk: 2004, –24 c.
2. Sak A.N. Lingvo-pragmaticschiy aspekti ispanoyazichnogo gazetno-jurnalnogo intervyyu. Avtoreferat. Moskva: 2005, –28 c.
3. Yuliya V.Yu. Osobennosti maktotekstovoi organizatsi intervyyu. Avtoreferat. Voronej: 2010, – 24 c.
4. Sak A.N. Lingvo-pragmaticschiy aspekti ispanoyazichnogo gazetno-jurnalnogo intervyyu. Avtoreferat. Moskva: 2005, –28 c.
5. <https://worklivion.com/formal-informal-interview/>
6. Clayman S.E. Conversation analysis in news interview . 2012. –630-656 c.
7. Saturday.The Guardian. ISSU E №85 | 13 M AY 2023,
8. Richards, J. (1980). Conversation, TESOL Quarterly. Vol. XIV, No.4, pp. (413-431).
9. Belyaayeva Y. A. Dialog argumentativnogo tipa: kognitivnie aspekti; struktura,





- semantika, pragmatika. Avtoreferat. - Tyumen, 2007. – 25 c.
10. Belyayeva Y.A Osnovniye osobennosti argumentiruyushogo diskurs / / Yazik Kommunikatsiya Kultura sbornik nauchnix trudov. – Tyumen Izd-voTyun-GU, 2007 C.25-35.
  11. Ofer F. Adversarial Political Interviewing. Doshisha University Kyoto, Japan: 2022, – 21 c.
  12. Milica V.The discourse of political interviews: interviewer turns.2013. –159-170 c.
  13. YuliyaV.Yu. Osobennosti makrotekstovoi organizatsi intervyu. Avtoreferat. Voronej: 2010, – 24 c.

