



universität
wien

MASTERARBEIT

Titel der Masterarbeit

“Turn-taking in semi-institutional discourse: an analysis of
selected talk shows”

verfasst von

Ilona Koroljova

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, 2015

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt:

A 066 812

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt:

Masterstudium English Language and Linguistics UG 2002

Betreut von:

Ao.Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Ute Smit

Table of Contents

List of abbreviations	i
1. Introduction	1
2. The talk show	3
2.1 Definition	3
2.2 Classification of talk shows	3
2.3 Talk show and discourse	4
2.3.1 What is discourse?	4
2.3.2 Talk show as a discourse type	5
3. Conversational Analysis and discourse	7
3.1 Ordinary conversation	7
3.2 Conversational Analysis	8
3.3 CA and context	9
3.4 Institutional discourse	10
3.5 What is semi-institutional?	12
3.6 The organization of talk shows	13
3.6.1 Production	13
3.6.2 Setting	14
3.6.3 Infotainment	15
3.6.4 Discourse goals: "fresh talk" vs task-orientation	16
3.6.5 Power relations	17
3.6.6 Real-life vs institutional roles	19
3.6.7 Multiple audience	21
3.7 Conclusion	23
4. Turn-taking	24
4.1 The system of turn-taking in conversation	25
4.2 The system of turn-taking in institutional discourse	25
4.3 The system of turn-taking in the tabloid talk show	26
4.4 Repetition	32
4.4.1 Repetition and discourse	35
4.5 Interruptions and overlaps	35
4.5.1 Interruptions	35
4.5.2 Overlaps	37

5. Corpus	38
5.1 Transcript conventions and symbols	41
5.2 The Analytic Steps	41
6. <i>The Ellen DeGeneres Show</i> and <i>The View</i>	43
6.1 General characteristics of <i>Ellen</i> and <i>The View</i>	43
6.2 The global structure of the interaction process in <i>Ellen</i> and <i>The View</i>	45
6.2.1 The opening	45
6.2.2 The main body	48
6.2.3 The closing	49
7. The Analysis of <i>The Ellen DeGeneres Show</i>	50
7.1 Turn-allocation techniques	51
7.1.1 Current-selects next	51
7.1.2 Self-selection	54
7.1.3 Transitions	55
7.1.4 Continuers	57
7.2 Repetitions	58
7.2.1 Repetition as a confirmative device	58
7.2.2 Repetition as an emphatic device	61
7.2.3 Different types of repetitions in combination	62
7.2.4 Repetition as clarification	63
7.2.5 A dialogue with the audience, or a message-retargeting repetition	65
7.3 The self-referring “we”	66
7.4 Interruptions and overlaps	68
8. The Local Structure of <i>The View</i>	69
8.1 Turn-taking and talk-monitoring	70
8.1.1 Current selects next	70
8.1.2 Self-selection	71
8.1.3 Back-channel responses	71
8.2 Repetitions	74
8.2.1 Allo-repetitions	74
8.3 Interruptions and overlaps	76
8.4 Summary of findings	78
9. Conclusion	80
10. References	82

11. Appendix	86
12. Abstract	88
13. Zusammenfassung	89
14. Curriculum Vitae	90

List of Abbreviations:

CA – Conversation Analysis

Q – question

S – self-repetition

TCU – turn-constructual unit

TRP – transition-relevance place

1. Introduction

Television talk shows have consistently been gaining popularity worldwide and have been categorised on many different bases. It has generally become a 'major arena for the discussion of lay public opinion on a range of issues, from individual, personal dilemmas and family relationships, to broader social problems and concerns' (Thornborrow 2007: 1436) and undoubtedly constitutes discursively distinctive media genre which certainly deserves assiduous attention. Furthermore, it is claimed that the talk show can be regarded as 'a modern Anglo-Saxon version of socio-cultural settings for conversation occurring in semi-institutionalized socio-cultural practices' (Ilie 2001: 215).

What is particularly interesting is that the talk show displays patterns of communicative and social behaviour which can be associated with more than one discourse type (Ilie 2001: 210). In other words, it may be treated as a hybrid of conversational and institutional discourse and labelled as semi-institutional discourse, which also makes a unique form of interaction. To explore functioning of such an interactional event, both ordinary conversation and institutional discourse must be scrutinized and juxtaposed.

The present research is intended to study the tabloid talk show as an instance of a mixed discursive type which combines features of both institutional as well as conversational discourse, with particular reference to American talk shows. One of the purposes is to elucidate conversational and institutional features of the talk show on the basis of the asymmetry of power relations, role-shift and multiple audiences. The **aim** of the research is to explore some essential turn-taking aspects and the reflection of some discursive features in the turn-taking system of the talk show. In other words, the label of semi-institutional discourse will be considered. It will be discussed why the talk show should be referred to as semi-institutional discourse rather than as a subtype of institutional or a subtype of conversational discourse. Also, the analysis will try to show how semi-institutionality of the selected talks show is reflected in its interaction and in turn-taking in particular.

The discourse and turn taking system of the selected talk shows, which is considered as one of the major dimensions of interactional conduct (Drew & Heritage 1992: 25), will be subjected to a conversation analytical approach, since CA has the potential to develop a comparative analysis of institutional (Drew & Heritage 1992: 39) and semi-institutional talk.

The sub-type of the talk show which is to be analysed in the empirical part of the paper is tabloid talk shows, which is ‘the one where celebrities and/or experts, as well as ordinary people are invited as show guests to discuss a topic on current issues of social and/or personal interest’ (Ilie 2001: 210). Although such shows as *The View* and *The Ellen DeGeneres Show* can both be classified as tabloid talk shows, an analysis of their transcripts are expected to exhibit some differences in sequential organization and turn taking systems. The distinctive feature of *The View* is that it has four hosts, which should make some alterations to the organization of the interaction and, as a result, might cause a bigger extent of hybridisation on a scale from non-institutionalised conversation to institutional talk.

2. The talk show

2.1 Definition

According to Danesi (2013: 630), the talk show is a radio or television programme, moderated by a host or hosts, in which an individual or a group of people speak on a variety of topics. As stated by Penz (1996: 55), there are stories presented by “average people”, or “real people”, as opposed to the shows which only invite celebrity guests. Topics mainly deal with personal concerns, such as health, relationship, sex etc. (Penz 1996: 55) and are generally aimed at a female audience (Price 2003: 53). Also, as noted by Price (2003: 53) talk shows are often named after the host, e.g. *The Oprah Winfrey Show*, *The Ellen DeGeneres Show*, *The Jerry Springer Show*, *Katie*. Nowadays, the term tabloid talk show is frequently used. With reference to Gregori-Signes (2000: 196), the tabloid talk show generally deals with “women issues” that are defined as ‘sensationalist, personal, intimate, involving and contentious and highly controversial topics’. Since the practical part is based on the extracts from the tabloid talk shows, the theory part refers to the concept of *tabloid talk show*. Nevertheless, the terms *talk show* and *tabloid talk show* are used interchangeably in this research paper.

2.2 Classification of talk shows

Ilie (2006: 490) has summarised five major criteria that have been used by scholars to differentiate various talk show types: discussion topics, categories of participants, broadcasting time, organizational and interactional frameworks, ethical considerations.

As for the first criterion, American talk shows are generally divided into the news/political analysis talk show, the entertainment talk show, the social issue talk show (Ilie 2006: 491). On the basis of discussion topics, talk shows are also divided into monothematic or polythematic talk shows (Charaudeau & Ghiglione 1997: 135 cited in Mason 1999: 306). The first and the second criteria are often combined and, as a result, personality-type, which is a dyadic conversation, and issue-type, usually as a group-discussion, are distinguished (Carbaugh 1988 cited in Livingstone & Lunt 1994: 38). According to the third criterion, which is broadcasting time, talk shows are distinguished between early morning talk shows (e.g. *Good Morning America*), daytime talk shows (e.g. *The Katie Couric Show*, *The Ellen DeGeneres Show*), late night talk shows (e.g. *Late Show with David Letterman*) (Ilie 2006: 490). Having combined the first three criteria, Timberg &

Erler (2002: 6-7) worked out three major subgenres which capture "specific identities" talk shows have developed over time: the late-night entertainment talk show (e.g. *The Tonight Show starring Jimmy Fallon*), the daytime audience-participation (e.g. *The Phil Donahue Show*), the morning magazine-format talk show (e.g. *Today Show*). Similarly, Haarman (1999: ix cited in Ilie 2006: 49) has divided the talk show on the basis of the three first categories into: the evening celebrity format (e.g. *The Tonight Show starring Jimmy Fallon*, *Jimmy Kimmel Live*), the issue-oriented format (e.g. *The Oprah Winfrey Show*), and the audience discussion format (e.g. Kilroy). Basically, Haarman's evening celebrity and Timberg and Erler's late-night entertainment formats are both based on humorous and entertaining interviews with famous people (Timberg & Erler 2002: 7). In the issue-oriented, or the daytime audience-participation, talk show, people from the studio audience are invited to share their stories and experts (e.g. psychologists, doctors) are asked for professional advice. Also, the host may involve the studio audience members or an expert to discuss a controversial issue. As noted by Timberg & Erler (2002: 7), the format, created by Phil Donahue and later adopted by Oprah Winfrey, made the studio members full participants by involving them 'in direct dialogue with guest experts or celebrities'. Celebrities are occasionally invited to share their problem that may relate to ordinary people. Unlike the late-night entertainment talk show, celebrities are not seen as a source of entertainment but as participants in the discussion. Haarman's audience discussion format also involves the present audience and is thereby similar to his issue-oriented and Timberg and Erler's daytime audience-participation. However, it is a more debate-oriented rather than discussion-oriented format (Thornborrow 2007:1438). The morning magazine-format talk show focuses on the news and the discussions among the hosts (Timberg & Erler 2002: 8).

2.3 Talk show and discourse

2.3.1 What is discourse?

First of all, it is necessary to define what discourse is. Or it seems more reasonable to phrase the question in a slightly different way and ask what *media discourse* is, since the talk show is obviously one of the interests of this field.

Media studies is a multidisciplinary area, and consequently different media disciplines may adhere to different notions of the term *discourse* (Bell & Garret 1998: 2). As Bell & Garret (1998: 2) pointed out, from the point of view of more sociologically oriented areas,

discourse is viewed in relation to social contexts of language use, whereas, in terms of linguistics, discourse tends to focus more on language and its use (Bell & Garret 1998: 2). A fusion of the two traditions is considered as the best option for studying media texts. In this sense, Cook (1992:1 cited in Bell & Garret 1998: 3) rightly emphasizes the idea that discourse is not solely a matter of language but also a matter of the context of communication. In other words, such factors as the participants, their background, the purpose of their communication, situational peculiarities, the medium of communication play a significant role and must be taken into account.

2.3.2 *Talk show as a discourse type*

Studies of television discussion programmes usually make a distinction between institutional programmes and talk shows, since the former mainly based on the elicitation of information, the confrontation of opinions and performative talk, whereas the talk show is also entertainment-orientated and primarily based on narratives (Guillot 2008: 181; Thornborrow 2007: 1437). Covington (1999: 43) has stated that the major motivations for watching television programmes are the acquisition of information, entertainment, inspiration and instruction. In other words, the multi-purposefulness of the talk show appeals to the audience but makes it difficult to label as discourse type. Furthermore, the name *institutional programmes* defines its discourse, whereas the category *talk show* does not explicitly include the belonging to a particular discourse type.

Indeed, the talk show might be difficult to categorize as one discourse type straight away, because it displays patterns of communicative and social behaviour which might be referred to different discourse types (Ilie 2001). Timberg and Erler (2002: 2) have mentioned that scholars have avoided treating the television talk show as a particular discourse type due to its variety in form and at the same time its approximation to normal conversation. Talking about the talk show, Munson (1993: 109-110) has used the term “blurred distinction” which refers to its non-homogeneous nature and is connected to its discursive ambiguity.

The ambiguity has probably led to various scholarly opinions on this issue. On the one hand, it can be argued that due to some similarities with casual conversation the interaction on the talk show can be referred to as a subtype of conversational discourse (Ilie 2001: 218). On the other hand, the talk show as a whole can be equally attributed to a subtype of

institutional discourse, as the talk show is obviously rule-governed and delimited by specific constraints (Ilie 2001: 218).

According to Tolson (2001: 28), the interaction in talk shows ‘unlike ordinary conversation must be understood as “institutional”, that is “talk” produced in an “institutional” setting produced for, and oriented toward, an overhearing audience’. Although Penz (1996: 2) mentions ‘the interplay between fixed elements and parts which are flexible and open to change’, she also considers talk shows as an instance of institutional discourse (Penz 1996: 15). Similarly, Hutchby (2006: 18), one of the scholars who has researched media talk, admits that broadcast talk adopts elements of everyday conversation but treats the talk show as a specific type of institutional discourse. Although broadcast talk is ‘oriented towards an approximation of the conditions of interpersonal communication in everyday face-to-face interaction’, it is still a performance in which some aspects of casual conversation are modified in accordance with the specific institutional context of broadcasting (Hutchby 2006: 12). In other words, the scholars mentioned above consider the institutional setting as a determining factor in the identification of discourse and, therefore, have attributed the talk show to the institutional discourse.

On the contrary, Gregori-Signes (2000) has focused on the interaction itself and labelled the talk show as a ‘quasi-conversational type of face-to-face interaction’. Although the prefix *quasi* hints at some constraints in the context of the talk show, the term does not explicitly include the institutional component which is definitely present. Mühlen (1985 cited in Penz 1996: 11) analysed the German talk show from the point of view of linguistic pragmatics. In her analysis, Mühlen (1985 cited in Penz 1996: 11) labelled talk shows as semi-natural discourse, as spontaneous talk is restricted by the control of an institution and the orientation to an audience. In this sense, the definition of discourse may change in accordance with the shift of focus of investigation.

Ilie (2001) has gone further and has taken into consideration both the discursive and the linguistic aspect. The scholar combines the setting, multiple purposes of the talk show, the form of interaction and the framework and suggests labelling talk shows as semi-institutional discourse. Obviously, the label includes two poles: institutional discourse and ordinary conversation and the talk show is seen as their hybrid. Her analysis has shown that there are various non-linguistic and linguistic features that may pertain to either institutional discourse or conversation (Ilie 2001). Discursively, the interaction in the talk show is constrained by the setting, various procedural requirements, talk monitoring by the

host, i.e asymmetrical relations and changing roles, and multiple audience. In terms of interactional conduct, lexical choice, turn design and turn-taking/sequential organization reflect institutional preparation and role distribution (Drew & Heritage 1992: 28). However, in spite of the institutional framework, the talk show may include conversational chunks and interactional dynamics similar to conversation.

All in all, semi-institutional discourse is proposed by Ilie (2001) as an appropriate term to refer to the talk show ‘as a socio-cultural practice marked by a particular participant configuration and well-established conventions, as well as by spontaneous interventions and unpredictable outcomes’ (Ilie 2001: 218). Moreover, the term gives a more general picture of the talk show, as it encompasses the macro- and the micro level - discursive, situational and linguistic features. Therefore, the term semi-institutional is preferred and is going to be used in the current research paper. It is necessary to study both discourse types – conversation and institutional talk – to find the criteria and define the talk show as their hybrid.

3. Conversational Analysis and Discourse

3.1 Ordinary conversation

Ordinary conversation, or casual conversation (Ilie 2001), or naturally occurring conversation (Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson), or daily conversation (Kong & Ting 2014) may be defined as ‘forms of interaction which are not confined to specialized settings or to the execution of particular tasks’ (Heritage 1998: 2). Goffman's term is "fresh talk" and it refers to ‘extemporaneous, ongoing forms of interaction in which participants' talk are not directly related to completing a task’ (Haslett 2012: 277).

To add to this general definition, it is reasonable to refer to the discourse circumstances of conversation presented by Quaglio (2010: 6-10) and define non-specialized setting. First, conversation takes places in shared context which includes the surrounding physical context as well as the shared background knowledge (Quaglio 2010: 6). Second, as a consequence of the shared context, conversation avoids elaboration of meaning, which is reflected in the frequent use of conversational hedges (e.g. “kind of”, “sort of”) and nouns of vague reference (e.g. “stuff”, “things”) (Quaglio 2010: 7). Third, conversation takes place in real time (Quaglio 2010: 8). As a result, due to the lack of time for the planning of talk, hesitations, repeats, incomplete sentences occur. In this connection, Sacks, Schegloff

and Jefferson (1974) have affirmed that conversations are spontaneous and unpredictable in the sense that the majority of the actions we take or the order of the thoughts we communicate is usually not predetermined. Also, conversation has an interactive nature and expresses stance. In other words, interlocutors are expected to express their feelings, use emotionally loaded language and give their evaluations (Quaglio 2010: 8).

All in all, conversational interaction is not constrained by a formal institutional setting or talk organization, is not necessarily task-driven and might be characterised by spontaneous deviations and on-spot decisions.

3.2 Conversational analysis

When in the early 1960s people's naturally occurring conversation gained the attention of scientific investigation, conversation analysis emerged (Ten Have 1992: 3). According to CA, conversation is systematically organized and ordered and its actual object of study is the interactional organization of social activities (Young 2008: 43-44). For instance, in terms of global structure, it is believed that a complete conversation is composed of opening, body and closing (Kong & Ting 2014: 37). Since the current research deals with interaction in the context of media communication, it is also worth noting that, unlike in other forms of linguistically oriented analysis, in CA the production of utterances is seen not in terms of structure of language but as a practical social accomplishment (Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998: 14 cited in Young 2008: 43).

The generalizations made by CA have also been applied to studying discourse types different from casual conversation. As stated by Ten Have (1999: 164), 'from the late seventies onwards, a large number of CA-inspired investigators have taken up the challenge to study a variety of institution-based interactional forms, implicitly or explicitly comparing these to those found in "ordinary conversation" '. Paul Drew and John Heritage (1992: 19), two scholars who have studied the application of conversation analysis to the interaction in institutional setting, also view casual conversation as 'a kind of benchmark against which other more formal or "institutional" types of interaction are recognized and experienced'. Indeed, conversation analysis is applied as a comparative approach to an interaction in institutional discourse, i.e. 'practices of talk and action from ordinary conversation and their application are adapted to more specialised and constrained speech settings' (Heritage 1998: 2). Also, Hutchby (2006: 15) argues that 'conversation analysis is in fact the most appropriate method for analysing that form of talk because it explicitly

uses the structures and patterns of ordinary conversation as a comparative basis for understanding other, more specialized or institutional forms of talk’.

Thus, despite the name, CA represents ‘a generic approach to the study of social interaction’ (Bell & Garrett 1998: 165). In other words, any discourse may be subjected to a comparative analysis on the basis of the analysis of ordinary conversation which can be seen as a starting point of the spectrum of all possible discourse types.

As a result, CA is expected to contribute to exploring talk shows and their discursive situation. In other words, to indicate some systematic variations, restrictions on actions and the design of institutional talk as well as to contribute to the view of talk show as a hybrid of conversational and institutional discourse types, conversation analysis should be used as the major basis for comparison.

3.3 CA and context

With reference to the interactional framework of conversational analysis, utterances are seen as both context-shaped and context-renewing (Drew & Heritage 1992: 18). Moreover, it has been pointed out that the conception of context includes the local and global dimensions.

First, utterances are treated as context shaped (Drew & Heritage 1992: 18). In other words, the contributions to an ongoing sequence of actions cannot be fully understood and continued without referring to the context in which they participate (Drew & Heritage 1992: 18). It is necessary to mention that the term *context* encompasses both the immediately local environment of preceding activity in which an utterance occurs, and the extended environment of activity within which that configuration is recognized to occur (Drew & Heritage 1992: 18-19). Gregori-Signes (2000: 14) labels it as the local and global dependence of turns adding that some utterances cannot be understood unless they are linked to the global dimension, related to the entire speech act and its topic. In this connection, Ten Have (1999: 10; 162) has also suggested the analytic differentiation between “pure” CA and “applied” CA. “Pure” CA considers procedures of talk-in-interaction independent of any special context, whereas “applied” CA investigates procedures of talk-in-interaction inherent to the institutional specifics which go beyond than just studying talk-in-interaction.

Second, utterances are also seen as context renewing (Drew & Heritage 1992: 18). Since each current utterance will itself shape the immediate context for some next turn in a sequence, it will inevitably have an effect on the contextual framework in terms of which the next turn will be produced and interpreted (Drew & Heritage 1992: 18). In other words, the interactional context is constantly being modified and developed with each ensuing action (Drew & Heritage 1992: 18). Thus, the CA perspective favours ‘a dynamic approach in which “context” is treated as both the project and product of the participants’ own actions and therefore as inherently locally produced and transformable at any moment’ (Drew & Heritage 1992: 18-19).

Due to the fact that the research is limited in space, all contextual dimensions inherent to the turn-taking system in the interactional event cannot be covered. For this reason, a few global aspects will be chosen and their functioning and reflection in the turn-taking system will be analysed. Both local and the global contextual dimensions are going to be included and, consequently, “applied” CA is going to be employed.

3.4 Institutional discourse

Institutional discourse may be basically defined as an interaction with ‘systematic variations and restrictions on activities and their design relative to ordinary conversation’ (Drew & Heritage 1992: 19) and, unlike conversation, is organized to execute particular tasks. Institutional discourse also represents a continuum that includes discourse types with different levels of institutionalization (Ilie 2001: 218). For example, the courtroom can definitely be considered a more institutionalized discursive environment than the talk show, because it is more constrained by power distribution and turn pre-allocation and less prone to unpredictable interventions (Ilie 2001: 218-219).

Therefore, Drew and Heritage (1992: 21) point out that there is not always a quick and exact demarcation between ordinary conversation and institutional talk in all instances of interactional events, nor even at all places within a single communication. Although there are different degrees of institutionalisation of interactional events, a set of ‘family resemblances among cases of institutional talk’ (Drew & Heritage 1992: 21) has been developed and will be referred to in the study.

There are different levels of constraints, or resemblances. First, discursive, organizational and situational constraints, i.e. non-linguistic constraints. Second, there are linguistic indications of the institutional nature of an interaction. Discursively, a set of resemblances

includes setting, task-orientation and preliminary organization of the talk, asymmetry of relations and social roles and an overhearing audience. These aspects will be discussed in subsequent subchapters in more detail. Linguistically, institutional constraints are reflected in lexical choice, sequence organization, turn-taking. On the whole, the discursive has an effect on and is inevitably reflected in the linguistic, which will be discussed and illustrated in the empirical part.

In terms of setting, one of the biggest constraints, institutional discourse can be divided into two categories. As pointed out by Drew and Heritage (1992: 25-28), such subtypes of institutional talk as news interviews, courtroom cross-examination take place in formal setting, whereas medical or business meetings tend to take place in more informal contexts. Thus, informal variants of institutional interaction in an informal setting are said to change the form of interaction and ‘approximate conversational or at least quasi-conversational modes’ (Drew & Heritage 1992: 25-28). Thus, in a formal setting both the setting and the power distribution between the participants are considered as constraints, while in the case of an informal institutional situation, asymmetry of relations is the major constraint.

Indeed, hierarchical role distribution is considered as one of the major features of an institutional interaction. Habermas (1984 cited in Thornborrow 2002: 2) distinguished institutional talk from conversation on the basis of asymmetry of relations. The scholar defined institutional talk as an instance of “strategic discourse” and contrasted it to “communicative discourse”. According to the scholar, the latter is an idealized manifestation of symmetrical participation, while the former is power-laden and characterised by inequality in power distribution.

Indeed, the participants involved in an institutional type of interaction are generally demarcated into the laypeople and the professionals, or the service provider and the client whose conduct is determined by institutional goals and tasks. As pointed out Drew & Heritage (1992: 22), both the laypeople and the professionals ‘organize their conduct by reference to general features of the tasks or functions of particular social institutions as they understand them within either a vernacular or technical competence’.

Institutional participants’ conduct is mostly shaped by ‘organizational and professional constraints and accountabilities which may be only vaguely known or entirely opaque to lay participants’ (Drew & Heritage 1992: 23) and requires institutional preparation. As noted by Heritage (1998: 6), in institutional types of interactions - ceremonies, debates and

various kinds of meetings – contributions and order of speakers is arranged from the beginning in a clear and predictable way.

All in all, unlike conversation, institutional talk is partly pre-planned and organized in advance. Moreover, it is constrained by asymmetrical relations and associated with task orientation, high topic predictability and talk-monitoring.

3.5 What is semi-institutional?

According to Ilie (2001: 219), the talk show manifests the features of semi-institutional discourse, since the interaction may assume a more conversational or a more institutional character depending on the contextual relation between discursive and linguistic aspects. Indeed, Ilie's (2001: 211) study has indicated the interdependence between the controlling role of the host, the reactions of the onlooking audience, the discursive roles assumed by and assigned to the participants and the degrees of argumentative values, the variation of discursive functions of the question-response adjacency pairs, the pronoun shifts, the feedback replies and the metalinguistic utterances.

In other words, the talk show is an interaction monitored by the host in a pre-established setting, on the one hand, and accompanied with naturally occurring conversational chunks, on the other. Thus, it should be justly considered as a mixed discourse that results from the hybridisation between the institutional and non-institutional (Ilie 2001: 224). Since the term suggested by Ilie is not “semi-conversational” but “*semi-institutional*”, the institutional part is viewed as the one that contains the non-institutional. Thus, talk shows can be associated with “embedded intertextuality”, which is ‘the containment of one text or discourse types within the matrix of another’ (Fairclough 1998: 118). The peculiarity of the talk show is that conversational chunks tend to be embedded into an institutionally organized framework. It is also believed that some instances might also be referred to as “mixed intertextuality”, i.e. ‘the merging of texts or discourse types into a more complex and less easily separable way’ between conversational and institutional discourse (Fairclough 1998: 118).¹ However, mixed intertextuality is more likely to be instantiated in talk shows with discussions (e.g. *Good Morning America*) or in some episodes of talk shows where the host may be well acquainted with the guest and, therefore, can switch to casual talking along with or to the detriment of pursuing institutional goals.

¹ There is also “sequential intertextuality” in Fairclough’s classification, which means ‘the alternation of texts or discourse types’.

To evaluate the hybridisation of the tabloid talk show between the institutional discourse and conversation, the theoretical part will be divided into three different levels. First, the macrostructure of the talk show is investigated. To be more precise, the research is focused on the organization and the setting. Second, such institutional discursive features as goal-orientation of the talk, asymmetry of relationships and distribution of roles and multiple audience are scrutinized. Third, the interaction between the host and the guest is discussed on the basis of turn-taking and some instances of repetition, interruption and lexical choice and their functions.

3.6 The Organization of Talk Shows

3.6.1 Production

As Penz (1996: 24) justly noted, ‘whereas everyday talk is characterized by sequences that are achieved interactively by the participants, the structure of talk shows is clearly determined and achieved by the representatives of the institution. i.e. the talk show host and the production team’. Furthermore, without knowing the peculiarities of actual production it is not clear for the viewer how control is allocated between the host and the production team (Penz 1996: 24). Indeed, before moving to the discussion of the interaction process of the talk show and talking about the control of the host over the interaction, it is necessary to draw the attention to what happens behind the scenes, before the interviewing takes place. It is worth noting that the organization and production of the talk show that is not seen to the audience is a quite complicated process which requires a lot of preparation and needs a lot of people involved.

Obviously, talk shows occur in a particular setting and have time restriction, which constrains the interaction and, therefore, requires management and preparation. As a result, a lot of people are involved in the production of a talk show. A high degree of preparation can be seen from program previews, commercials, video and music introductions to the guests, precisely timed introduction and closing parts, surprises, games. It can be observed that episodes of a talk show are organized into segments (Penz 1996: 24) and are highly structured (Timberg & Erler 2002: 5). Also, they have repetitive elements and certain conventions pertinent to a particular talk show that need prior preparation from the production team (Penz 1996: 24).

Indeed, with reference to Musburger & Kindem (2005: 34), the production of talk shows is a multi-staged process and is generally composed three consecutive stages: pre-production, production, post-production.

It is stated that ‘everything from the inception of the project idea to setting up for actual recording’ is part of the preproduction stage (Musburger & Kindem 2005: 34). The preproduction stage includes the writing of a proposal, synopsis, the breakdown of the script in terms of production, budgeting and scheduling (Musburger & Kindem 2005: 34-35). Also, finding collaborations and involving sponsors, negotiating with potential guests, which tend to be carefully chosen (Timberg & Erler 2002: 5), require a lot of time and effort.

In terms of scripting, the talk show is considered as a semi-scripted format, which also hints at the semi-institutional nature, since it leaves some unscripted space for the interactants. According to Musburger & Kindem (2005: 105):

A semiscripted format may consist of a simple run-down sheet which is a basic outline of the show from beginning to end indicating what material or performer is needed at specific time. It is organized on the basis of the running time of each segment and of the entire program. Different electronic sources of material such as remote feeds and videotape playbacks are also specified. A script outline is another semi-scripted format. Portions of a script outline may be fully scripted, such as the opening or closing segments of a news, talk, or game show that remain the same from show to show.

As for the production stage, it ‘begins with setup and rehearsal’ (Musburger & Kindem 2005: 35). The setup of sounds and visual images, camera, microphone placement and movement and set-design compose the production stage (Musburger & Kindem 2005: 35). The post-production stage includes ‘the editing of the recorded images and sounds’ (Musburger & Kindem 2005: 35).

3.6.2 *Setting*

As is known, the talk show occurs in a particular physical setting. It is studio-based (Price 2003: 53). It is also considered an institutional constraint, since the meeting point is not negotiated between the participants but is pre-established by the format of the talk show. Hutchby (2006: 12-14) also points out that the broadcast setting, including the talk show setting, should be viewed as consisting of two types of settings: the studio setting where it is produced and the domestic setting where it is received. Nevertheless, the studio setting is

the one that is regarded as an institutional constraint, since it is the place where the talk is produced.

Scannell (1998 cited in Hutchby 2006: 12) mentions that the talk on television can often be characterized by a sense of inclusiveness and familiarity, which is intentionally organized by the production team. As observed by Gregori-Signes (2000: 210), the tabloid talk show, the popular subtype of the talk show, ‘changes the setting to a more familiar, home scenario, with easy chairs and ordinary, for the most part non-expert participants, presented to the viewing audience in conversational poses’. The physical setting is intended to create ‘the illusion of the present time’, the intimacy level of present tense and contributes to exposure and disclosure of subjects similar to that of casual talk among friends (Timberg & Erler 2002: 5; Gregori-Signes 2000: 210).

All in all, the talk show is constrained by the setting. The artificially organized cosy situation in which the interaction takes place is obviously created to make the interaction more conversation-like.

3.6.3 *Infotainment*

To start with, the talk show has often been referred to as a subcategory of ‘infotainment’ (Ilie 2001, Gregori-Signes 2000), which also hints at the non-homogeneous specifics of the talk show and its various purposes. Indeed, it fulfils both the informative and entertaining functions, which is the core difference from institutional talk.

As a rule, ‘information is provided either directly, simply by breaking the news or by advertising a product, a service or indirectly, by means of the interviewing technique’ (Ilie 2001: 217). Similar to such an institutional interaction as news interviews, ‘talk shows follow more often than not the technique of question-answer sequences, the interviewer being the show host, while the interviewee or respondent is usually a show guest, a member of the studio audience or a calling-in TV-viewer’ (Ilie 2001: 217). However, it has been highlighted that, unlike interviews proper, talk shows are not strictly information-focused and are not only aimed at information-eliciting but are also entertainment-oriented. Indeed, some melodrama or comical and amusing situations that trigger laughter are an essential part of the genre talk shows, which is definitely expected, even though many of the hilarious moments occur spontaneously and are not included in specially allocated time-slots (Ilie 2001: 217). Moreover, evaluative comments are sometimes made by either the show host or by the guest (Ilie 2001: 217). Thus, due to its orientation to entertainment,

there is some space for the personal and even emotional contributions of both the questioner and the respondent.

3.6.4 Discourse goals: "*fresh talk*" vs *task-orientation*

Generally speaking, casual conversation is spontaneous with no particular task-related restrictions, whereas institutional discourse is oriented to fulfilling a particular purpose. Drew and Heritage (1992: 22) have generalized institutional talk as goal-oriented, involving particular constraints on participants' contributions and associated with 'inferential frameworks and procedures' inherent to specific institutional settings. News interviews, courtroom interrogations, public debates could serve as examples of goal-oriented institutional talk constrained by the procedure and topic achieved by means of the question-answer technique. Also, institutional talk normally takes place in a particular setting, whereas casual conversation is normally independent of a setting. Moreover, it occurs between people who do not act primarily in any official or public role. However, it cannot be denied that spontaneous talk may periodically occur in semi-institutional discourse, too. What is peculiar though is that its length depends on the host's personality and strategy and the extent of asymmetry of relations between the participants and the host, which may significantly vary from show to show and even within a single talk show, as well as on the personality, status and involvement of the guests (Ilie 2001: 220).

It might be difficult to determine the extent of spontaneity or preplannedness of a talk in the media context, since there is often a way of censoring and monitoring which must have an effect on both the host and participants of a talk show. Also, for the sake of smooth flow of conversation, guests, who are normally aware of the agenda and are given some guiding instructions, might probably sketch their potential responses, but they do not learn any scripts (Livingstone & Lunt 1994: 164 cited in Gregory-Signes 2000: 207). Also, it has been agreed that tabloid talk shows often depend on the element of surprise that can be induced, for example, by the host's unenvisaged reaction followed by an additional question or a surprise piece of information, which should affirm that tabloid talk show interaction is designed turn-by-turn and not entirely pre-planned (Gregory-Signes 2000: 207). Not to mention that the personal factor and interactional process itself might lead to some unexpected arguments and revelations on both sides, which is not strictly forbidden by the framework of this particular media genre but, on the contrary, might even be provoked for the sake of entertainment. The regular framework of a talk show is often

‘diluted’ by conversational chunks in the form of the so called conversationally-framed questions as opposed to institutionally-framed questions. Ilie (2001: 221) has observed that ‘while conversationally framed questions are not necessarily followed by answers, institutionally framed questions represent more often than not the first element of question-answer adjacency pairs’ used in news interviews and other types of interrogations. In other words, institutionally framed questions function as information-elicitors, whereas conversationally-framed ones are used to elicit arguments. The co-presence of these two and their recurrent nature in the context of talk show might be seen as one of the essential features of the talk show as a media genre and an instance of the interplay of conversation and institutional discourse.

On the other hand, there are a number of institutional prerequisites of talk show that are strictly determined by the production of the talk show, they include a particular setting, the precisely timed beginnings and closings, recurring commercial breaks. Also, the talk show is discursively restricted by such talk-related restrictions as time restrictions, speaker selection restrictions, and turn-taking restrictions. But some talk-related restrictions (excluding the time restriction) may be consciously violated and the interactional process in general can undergo different stages on the relative scale of formal and informal or conversational and institutional depending on the power distribution between the host and the guest and roles of the participants in each particular case.

3.6.5 *Power relations*

As stated by Drew and Heritage (1992: 47) ‘a central theme in research on institutional interaction is that in contrast to the symmetrical relationships between speakers in ordinary conversations, institutional interactions are characteristically asymmetrical’. Unlike ordinary conversation that is normally based on equal participation rights, the talk show is productionally designed to have asymmetrical relationships by allocating the controlling and mediating role to the host. In addition, the form of the interaction, i.e. question-answer sequences, also assumes asymmetry of relationships. As justly noted by Drew and Heritage (1992: 49), ‘an important dimension of asymmetry between the participants in institutional interaction arises from the predominantly question-answer pattern of interaction that characterizes many of them’.

Ten Have (1999: 170) presents asymmetry as a complex phenomenon by suggesting four different types of asymmetry: a) ‘asymmetries of participation’ b) ‘asymmetries of

interactional and institutional “knowhow”; c) epistemological caution and asymmetries of knowledge; d) rights of access to knowledge. Although the approach is focused on agent-client interactions, Ten Have (1999: 170) still considers it helpful in investigating ‘other kinds of institution-bound interactional formats’. Since talk show can be considered as an institution-bound interactional format, the system suggested above could serve as a reference to elucidate the genre’s semblances and discrepancies with institutional talk in terms of asymmetry of participation.

It is stated that ‘asymmetries of participation’ refers to the controlling, task-based and even directive manner which institutional agents often adopt (Ten Have 1999: 170). Doctor-patient talk is given as an instance of this type of asymmetry, which does not seem to entirely correspond to the communicative dynamics between the host and the show guests. In contrast to doctor-patient talk or courtroom procedures or emergency calls, the level of responsibility of the host is significantly lower, since s/he is not supposed to be involved in any matters of life and death or justice. In some cases, in terms of the distribution of power between the host and the other participants, the talk show reminds more of a classroom dialogue (Ilie 2001: 217). Like a teacher, the show host is partly expected to involve the audience and evaluate the life stories elicited and the individual cases presented during the show in order to fulfil an educational function, too (Ilie 2001: 217). Also, despite the fact that the host indeed navigates the flow of interaction by his questions and has some purpose behind them, the entertainment part may occasionally take over and, as a consequence, deviate from the host’s initial intention. Thus, the host’s participation as a mediator might not necessarily be shaped by a fundamental task but driven by the framework of the genre and the interactional process itself.

The second type of asymmetry suggested by Heritage is ‘asymmetries of interactional and institutional “knowhow”’. It refers to ‘the unequal involvement in the case, which is for the professional is generally routine, but for the client unique’ (Ten Have 1999: 170). If we adapt the wordings “the professional” and “the client” to “the host” and “the guest”, then indeed the host is conscious of all production details, has been trained through practice and experience to interview people and to adjust interaction to regular deviations from the plan. Furthermore, he does it on a regular basis. The guests of talk shows are normally informed about the plan of the upcoming interaction in advance, but it is definitely not their daily routine. In case of celebrities, they occasionally guest talk shows, which lets them get used to the interactional and institutional procedure. In such cases, talk shows might have more

conversational features and “mixed intertextuality”, since guests might not feel too intimidated anymore by the procedure. Thus, the guest-host relationship is partly based on ‘asymmetries of interactional and institutional “knowhow” ’, however the professional-client relations assume higher level of asymmetry.

The third point has to do with ‘a tendency of professionals to act cautiously, that is, to avoid taking a firm position on the issues under discussion’ (Ten Have 1999: 170). Similarly, the host is also not supposed to adopt any strong position. However, as regards the professional knowledge about so called “women issues” (Gregori-Signes 2000: 196) which tabloid talk shows usually deal with, there is no obvious asymmetry between the host and the guest. Thus, there is no a professional field involved that distances the guest from the host.

The fourth and final point says that ‘while the professionals are given a large share of “right to know”, at least within their mandate, clients quite often “hide” some relevant knowledge they have, because they do not have the “the right to know” ’ (Ten Have 1999: 170). Basically, the superior knowledge underlies the authority of the professional giving them dominance over the layperson and, consequently, the course of interaction. It is probably the case for a televised therapeutic talk show where doctors or psychologists are involved. Since the host and the guest are not distanced by any professional knowledge, the guest does not need to hide anything. But the guest may need to hide some knowledge of the procedure in front of the audience.

Thus, the approach by Heritage has helped identify one of the distinguishing features of semi-institutional discourse. Indeed, in terms of unequal distribution of participation, of interactional and institutional awareness, it has demonstrated some similarities with institutional talk. It is clear that the gap between the host and the guest is significantly narrowed due to the absence of the professional field where one would have superior knowledge. But the participants share some procedural knowledge. Thus, the guest-host relationship is mainly determined by the first two types of asymmetry and based on the procedural conventions of the talk show as an institution.

3.6.6 *Real-life vs institutional roles*

The idea of hierarchical role distribution in an institutional talk is inevitably characterised and accompanied by certain conventional participant roles, or different discursive identities (Thornborrow 2002: 4). As noted by Thornborrow (2002: 1), ‘power relations emerge in

the interplay between participants' locally constructed, discursive identities and their institutional status'. Since semi-institutional discourse is said to consist of both conversational and institutional interactional patterns, it must allow exercising both institutional and non-institutional, or real-life, roles (such as husband, parent, student, doctor etc.) (Ilie 2001: 249).

To start with, the labels of interactional roles used in institutional discourse and in talk shows as an instance of semi-institutional discourse indicate the difference between institutional and semi-institutional talk. The professional/ the expert/ the professional agent as opposed to the layperson/client or the interviewer as opposed to the interviewee/respondent imply some sort of service provision and difference in the level of professional knowledge and status. Even though the word "the host" implies the some power over the interaction, the word "the guest" might still be associated with a privileged attitude. What is more, the participants can exercise both institutional and real-life roles.

Clearly, the host and the guests assume their roles and are expected to confine to the roles dictated by the genre and adjust to the interactional organization and turn taking system that goes with them. However, both institutional and real-life roles tend to be exercised. As highlighted by Ilie (2001: 231):

Unlike the experts who are being questioned and consulted in news interviews and political interviews and who are expected to act almost exclusively in their institutional roles as professionals, the guests and experts who contribute to talk shows usually assume a somehow different institutional role, acting partly in their professional roles, and partly in their social/personal (non-institutional) roles as ordinary individuals.

A few decades ago, Goffman (1981: 128) introduced the term *footing* and defined his term as 'the alignment that we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance'. Ribeiro & Hoyle (2009:79) define footing as 'the stance that speakers and hearers take toward each other and toward the content of their talk'. According to Goffman (1981: 155 as cited in Ribeiro & Hoyle 2009:79), footings are embedded within one another, so interactants may occasionally switch from one role to another. Thus, there are two sets of roles and two co-occurring turn-taking systems (Ilie 2001).

Role-switching of the participants, its timing and the extent of their role shift is usually initiated and monitored by the host, but also negotiated between the host and the guest (Ilie 2001: 235). A question asked by the host can provoke the occurrence of social and

individual roles of the guest, ‘either interacting, overlapping or alternating with their professional roles’ (Ilie 2001: 235). Ilie’s study has indicated that the process of turn-taking as well as lexical choice and its implied pragmatic meaning reveal the role shift. It is stated that the host’s, and the other participants’ role shifts are ‘signalled by changing the focus of the referential focus of deictic elements, such as personal pronouns and pragmatic expressions, as well as by alternating A- and B-event statements²’ (Ilie 2001: 235).

Also, from a discourse point of view, shifts in the host’s role towards “participant” in question-answer sequences are evidenced by evaluative receipt tokens, or *third-turn response actions*, which tend to be avoided in some types of institutional talk (Guillot 2008: 193; Heritage 1985: 96-97). As noted by Drew and Heritage (1992: 24), expressions of surprise, sympathy agreement or affiliation in response to participants are avoided in institutional talk but are indispensable in a conversational context. The host usually gives evaluative tokens and reacts to the information being said by the guest.

3.6.7 *Multiple audience*

In casual conversation, talk is normally interlocutor-oriented, which means that the audience consists only of the directly addressed audience, whereas turn-taking organizations of institutional talk in formal setting (e.g. courtroom interaction, news interviews, and classroom discussions) are designed for an “overhearing audience”³ (Heritage 1998: 6). Similar to institutional talk in formal setting, talk shows are produced for an audience. However, as justly noticed by Goffman (1981: 133) concerning talk on the radio or TV, the term *audience* must be extended and includes both a broadcast audience, the so-called *imagined recipients*, and a *live audience* who may co-participate and constitute an essential part of the talk show's interaction.

The talk show is audience-oriented and message-oriented. To be more precise, it is targeted at multiple audiences which can be divided into three different types: the *directly addressed audience* (i.e. show guests and experts), the *onlooking audience or present audience* (i.e. in the studio), and an *overhearing audience or non-present audience* (i.e. the TV viewers) (Ilie 2001: 235), which Hutchby (2006: 14) argues should be labelled as

² A-event statements may be defined as statements by the speaker that has primary authority over and access to the events conveyed in the statements, whereas B-event statements communicate that the speaker does not have primary authority and knowledge concerning the event (Labov & Fanshel 1977 cited in Robinson 2006: 27).²

^{3 3} Judging by the examples given, Heritage’s “overhearing audience” includes both present and non-present audience. As far as Ilie (2001) is concerned, in the context of talk shows, “an onlooking audience” refers to the studio audience, whereas “an overhearing audience” refers to the TV viewers.

distributed recipients. The ongoing talk between the participants that address each other directly in the studio is aimed to reach a wide and heterogeneous *present* and *non-present* audience (Ilie 2001: 235).

In this connection, Linke (1985: 42-43 cited in Penz 1996: 25) also points out that talk shows are characterised by two levels of communication: “the inner circle of communication” and “the outer circle of communication”. The former includes the participants interacting in the studio, the latter - the interaction between television audience and the TV screen or studio participants. The “inner circle of communication” also includes the studio audience that is allowed and is expected to make some contributions to the ongoing talk. As mentioned by Penz (1996: 8), ‘the audience may either act spontaneously or on request of the talk show host’. Depending on the format and conventions of a talk show, the audience may ‘interact with the guest by asking questions, giving comments and showing other signs of reaction’ (Penz 1996: 8). Collective audience responses, e.g. applause, laughter, may also be seen as the interaction with the host or the guest. Such non-verbal reactions as applauding, sighing, laughing or booing can be considered as a type of participation. With reference to Young’s (2008: 52) interpretation of Goffman’s (1981) terms, the guest might be considered as an *official hearer*, that is a participant who is overtly addressed by a speaker, while the audience in the studio should be seen as *a ratified participant*, whose presence is acknowledged by a speaker but not necessarily directly addressed.

In some instances, communication with the studio audience can be seen as Goffman’s (1981: 133) “crossplay” between the ratified participants, e.g. the guests and the host, and the bystander that might be equated to the present audience which does not directly participate in the interaction but may influence the talk by its reactions and may occasionally be involved. For example, the host can use his authority to pick out a moment in an interaction and readdress it to the studio audience.

Linguistically, the host’s interaction with the present audience might be illustrated by allo-repetitions, which is the repetition of the interlocutor/guest’s utterance, or expository questions, which are considered to be an institutional feature and are normally posed by the talk monitors, in this particular case the talk show hosts, rather than by any other participants (Ilie 2001: 237-238). To mark the significance and involvement of the studio audience, the host might take the role of a representative of the audience. The host might also distance themselves from the audience by exercising her institutional role. As noted

by Drew & Heritage (1992: 30), ‘the self-referring “we” is used to invoke an institutional over a personal identity, thereby indicating that they are speaking as representatives, or on behalf of an organization’.

As justly noted by Hutchby (2006: 12), the main recipients are not present while the talk is being produced in the studio. Indeed, TV talk is produced for the non-present audience, i.e. those behind the screen (Goffman 1981: 138), since the talk show is a commodity (Timberg & Erler 2002: 5) and the TV audience is the main consumer of talk shows (Penz 1996: 8). The outer circle is basically a non-present audience’s perception of the communication between the participants of the talk show. As stated by Goffman (1981: 138), hearers of radio or TV are significantly different from live witnesses because they are receivers rather than co-participants. Despite the fact that, if the format of the talk show allows, members of the on-looking audience or members of an *overhearing audience* via Twitter or any other social networks may make their contributions by asking questions or expressing their opinion or voting, they do not normally change the flow of the ongoing interaction.

To sum up, the talk show represents the alternating pattern of interlocutor-oriented talk and its retargeting to audience, initiated and monitored by the host. Similar to institutional talk, it is also audience-oriented. However, unlike institutional talk, the talk show has a two-levelled audience. One level, i.e. the present audience should be considered as a co-participant and a ratified contributor to the ongoing interaction, the other level is the ultimate target.

3.7 Conclusion

The talk show has been marked as semi-institutional discourse, since the term encompasses all levels, i.e. the discursive, the situational and the linguistic. Thus, the term coined by Ilie (2001) characterizes the talk show as a whole. Generally speaking, the talk show is referred to as a hybrid of institutional discourse and conversation.

Institutionally, the talk show is characterized by such aspects as the multi-staged production process, the pre-established physical setting and the overhearing audience. Conversationally, the interaction process may deviate from the institutional standard question-answer sequences and may have some instances of the conversational exchange. The hybridisation between the institutional and the conversational can be traced in the production, the purpose of the genre, the hierarchical role-distribution, the pre-established

role allocation and the peculiarities of the audience. In terms of production, it has been discussed that the talk show is normally semi-scripted, which leaves some space for conversational on-the-spot decisions. Also, the talk show is often referred to as ‘infotainment’, which points to its two major purposes. The orientation towards entertainment allows some deviations from the institutional standard. Third, although the roles of interactants are pre-established and the relations are asymmetrical, the degree of asymmetry is smaller as compared to an institutional talk. As a consequence, the guest and the host may occasionally shift from their institutional roles to their real-life identities. Also, an overhearing audience is composed of the studio audience and the non-present audience. The studio is not only a target but also a ratified co-participant that is not necessarily directly addressed but may occasionally have an indirect influence on the ongoing interaction.

On the whole, despite the fact that the production of a talk show is a multi-staged process that requires a lot of preparation and organization, some deviations from institutional discourse can be noticed at the pre-production stage. The semi-scripted format, the interplay between the discursive identities of interactants, the presence of the studio audience as the third party allows some degree of unpredictability. Thus, the institutional framework of the interaction may be permeated with various features pertaining to conversation.

4. Turn-taking

The importance of turn-taking in description of a conversation has been highlighted by many scholars of the field. It is noted that ‘cuando tratamos de esbozar una caracterización pragmática del funcionamiento interno conversacional, la bibliografía se centra en las características de la toma de turno’, i.e. ‘in describing conversation one can focus on sociolinguistic features, all of them context sensitive [...] when we do a pragmatic characterisation of the internal functioning of conversation, the bibliography focuses on the characteristics of turn-taking’ (Gallardo 1996: 49 cited in Gregori-Signes 2000: 195). Kong & Ting (2014: 38) treats turn taking as ‘the most obvious feature of conversation’. As also pointed out by Drew and Heritage (1992: 25), ‘turn taking organizations – whether for conversation or institutional contexts such as courtroom interaction – are a fundamental and a generic aspect of the organization of interaction’.

4.1 The system of turn-taking in conversation

Young (2008: 47) gives credit to Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) for describing the system of turn-taking in conversation in detail and refers to two main questions about turn-taking:

1. How is the next speaker selected?
2. How do participants know when to end one turn and when to begin another?

In terms of speaker selection, the first of the two basic questions about turn-taking, there are two turn-allocational techniques: (a) current speaker selects next; and (b) self selection (Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson 1974: 703). In other words, next turn can be allocated by current speaker's selecting next speaker or by self-selection (Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson 1974: 703). The second question is concerned with how participants know when to stop talking and when to begin speaking again. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974: 704) answered the question by introducing the notions of the turn-constructive unit and transition-relevance place. The turn constructive unit is defined as a possible turn that is not necessarily accomplished (Schegloff 1996: 55). As noted by Young (2008: 48), a transition between speakers does not necessarily occur at the boundary of a turn-constructive unit. Speakers tend to indicate the forthcoming end of a turn and complete the turn (Young 2008: 48). Thus, prediction is an essential part of the listening process, and 'the place in an ongoing turn when participants are able to project the completion of the TCU' is called transition-relevance place (Young 2008: 48).

4.2 The system of turn-taking in institutional discourse

In contrast to ordinary conversation, in institutional contexts, 'turns at talk are pre-allocated according to established distributions of performative roles' (Scannell 1998: 259). 'The audience is co-present and the turn-taking system is designed, at least in part to control and curtail the nature of audience participation in any ongoing exchange' (Drew & Heritage 1992: 27). As a result, the kind of organization involves special turn-taking procedures that can be described as *special turn-taking systems*.

Unlike situationally governed ordinary conversation where both turn-allocation techniques may be exploited in no particular order, many institutional settings are characterised by the "current speaker selects next" turn-allocation technique (Young 2008: 47). It has also been articulated by Heritage (1998) that 'most special turn-taking systems in contemporary

industrial societies exploit question-answer exchanges to form particular turn-taking systems'. As highlighted by Drew & Heritage (1992: 49), the question-answer format itself supports asymmetry of relations between the participants in institutional interaction. Young (2008: 47) has highlighted the interdependence of the turn-allocational technique and the power relations between the speakers:

The selection of next speaker is one way in which participants create a power differential among speakers because, in order for a single speaker to hold the floor, the other speakers must desist from turn-taking and, if there is one individual in a group that can select the next participant, the individual who does the selection has that power.

In other words, institutional talk is often presented as the service provider-client talk (e.g. a doctor and a patient, a teacher and a student), where participants are expected to confine to their institutional roles, and the selection of next speaker is expected to be made by the service provider rather than by the client. However, the client may occasionally switch from their institutional to their non-institutional role and, consequently, change footing by initiating a turn (Young 2008: 53).

4.3 The special turn-taking system in the tabloid talk show

As it has been mentioned above, turn-taking is the foremost aspect of the organization of an interaction. Thus, talk show as an instance of semi-institutional discourse, or "embedded intertextuality", represents a special turn-taking system with some embedded conversational deviations. As noted by Drew & Heritage (1992: 39), although in some institutional settings the question-answer format is not too strictly followed, it is still the skeleton within which the interaction proceeds. However, goal-oriented but non-formal interactions are said to often have distinct transitions from a more "conversational" mode to a series of questions and answers (Drew & Heritage 1992: 39).

In the case of the talk show, Ilie (2001: 227) has observed that 'the communicative interaction in a talk show can sometimes exhibit unpredictability in terms of turn-taking, topic initiation and discursive role-assumption'. Gregori-Signes (2000: 210) supports the idea of turn-taking in talk shows having features of 'ordinary, non-public conversational settings', but it is performed 'amid the competing tensions of conversational verisimilitude and controlled, timed, "staged" broadcast talk'.

In terms of general organization of interaction, turn design and turn-taking, Gregory-Signes (2000: 198) has re-organised the list of twelve key pragmatic features of the speech

act suggested by Sacks et al. (1974: 700-701), which are also generally used as a reference point for comparing with other discourse type. Gregori-Signes (2000: 198) has indicated the features that refer to similar aspects and combined them into seven points with the intention of being relevant to the particular type of talk-in-interaction and not being redundant. Since the first four features provided by Sacks et al. (1974: 700-701) refer to the occurrence of speaker change, the scholar has combined them into one feature (1 in Table 1B). Features (5 and 9 in Table 1A) related to turn order and distribution of turns (5 and 9 in Table 1A) have been grouped into feature 2 (Table 1B). Features related to duration and size of turns (6 and 13 in Table 1A) have been combined into number 3 (Table 1B). Features 7 and 11 (Table 1A) related to length and continuity/discontinuity of talk are blended into Feature 4 (Table 1B). Features 12 and 14 (Table 1A) related to turn-allocation techniques and repair are merged into feature number 7 (Table 1B). Sacks et al.'s (1974) features 8 and 10 are not modified but rephrased into features 5 and 6 (Table 1B).

Table 1

(A) Sacks et al. (1974)	(B) Gregory-Signes (2000)
1. Speaker change recurs or, at least, occurs.	1. How does speaker change occur?
2. Overwhelmingly, one party talks at a time.	2. Is turn order fixed or variable?
3. Occurrences of more than one speaker are common, but brief.	3. Is duration of turns fixed or variable?
4. Transitions from one turn to a next with no gap and no overlap between them are common. Together with transitions characterised by slight gap or slight overlap, they make up the vast majority of transitions.	4. Is length of the encounter fixed or variable?
5. Turn order is not fixed, but varies.	5. Is the content of turns fixed or specified in advance?
6. Turn size is not fixed, but varies.	6. Is the number of parties fixed or variable?

7. Length of conversation is not fixed, specified in advance.	7. What allocation techniques are employed in the system?
8. What parties say is not fixed, specified in advance.	
9. Relative distribution of turns is not fixed, specified in advance.	
10. Number of parties can change.	
11. Talk can be continuous or discontinuous.	
12. Turn allocation techniques are obviously used.	
13. Various "turn-constructural units" are employed.	
14. Repair mechanisms for dealing with turn-taking errors and violations obviously are available for use.	

Each of the features presented by Gregori-Signes is going to be discussed in more detail. To present a more coherent overview of the talk show, such discursive aspects as number of parties and length of the encounter are going to be combined and placed first.

The length of the encounter

In contrast to ordinary conversation, the length of the encounter is fixed by the genre conventions (Gregori-Signes 2000: 203). The talk show is fragmented into openings, closings, commercial breaks, which is the institutional framework of the genre.

The number of parties

According to the research conducted by Gregory-Signes (2000: 198), the primary and secondary participants are pre-specified in advance, whereas the number of guests sitting in the audience who will make contributions might be partially pre-determined but not completely pre-specified.

The speaker change

Generally speaking, the host-guided change might alternate with free speaker change. Similar to some types of institutional discourse, the interaction in tabloid talkshows is defined by the question-answer exchange (Ilie 1999 cited in Gregory-Signes 2000: 201) and, as a consequence, by asymmetry in relations between the host and the participants. Indeed, Gregori-Signes's (2000: 204-205) analysis has confirmed that the guest is not likely to assign the turn to anybody but expects the host to take it. On the whole, status and role, which are external to the basic operation of the turn-taking system, play a significant role, and the variability in turn-taking is usually managed by the host. However, as Ilie (2001: 227) has remarked, the authority of the show host is not absolute, since the talk show guests also initiate a turn without necessarily being prompted by the host. In other words, the format may not always be strictly followed. Gregori-Signes's (2000: 203) analysis has demonstrated that questions, answers and comments are equally distributed in the talk show. Approximately one third of the turns is questions, one third is answers and one third is comments and confrontational sequences. Such features of intervened turn exchange as simultaneous talk, overlaps, and interruptions have been also indicated. The recurrence of these features in the context of the talk show is considered a characteristic that demonstrates the genre's hybridisation between conversation and institutional interaction (Gregori-Signes 2000: 203).

The turn order

Turn order varies between established and spontaneous participation, or the spontaneous is interposed into the established. It is important to point out that conversation is locally controlled, whereas the turn-taking system in talk shows is globally controlled by the agenda and partially pre-specified by the hierarchical relations, i.e. the superiority of the host (Gregori-Signes 2000: 204), which is the talk show's major difference from conversation. The local control of the interaction in talk shows depends on the recognition of the status of the host 'which almost invariably grants him the condition of "next speaker" when current speaker is different from the host' (Gregori-Signes 2000: 205). Thus, due to unequal role distribution in tabloid talk shows, relative distribution of turns can be said to be pre-established to some extent. The analysis conducted by Gregori-Signes (2000: 204) has shown in numbers that the turn order variability is most frequently displayed by the host.

The duration of turns

In tabloid talk shows duration of turns varies and might be predetermined by the content or type of question (Gregori-Signes 2000: 205). Although the interaction is globally restricted by time limitation, different turn sizes are allowed and tend to be controlled by the host.

Usually, the length of turns may be predicted by the type of question asked by the host. Declarative statements, tag questions and yes/no questions are types of questions which are asked to get short answers, such as a confirmation or denial of the proposition (Penz 1996: 112-126). Wh-questions and multiple questions are less length- and content controlling in asymmetrical discourse and have a tendency towards long answers (Penz 1996: 126). Apart from the host, the overhearing audience in the studio may have an impact on the length of turns by their encouraging or discouraging reactions (e.g. booing, applauding, laughter).

Thus, the talk monitor may partially control the length of the turn by question types. The studio audience's reactions may also occasionally have an effect on the length of the participants' turns.

The content of turns

As stated by Livingstone & Lunt (1994: 164 cited in Gregori-Signes 2000: 207), show guests do not learn scripts but are given instructions and indications as a mode of guidance beforehand. The interaction may be unscripted yet highly planned and constantly monitored by a host or team of hosts (Timberg & Erler 2002: 3). A substantial part of the guest's story may be discussed with the production team in advance (Gregori-Signes 2000: 207). Obviously, the host is also prepared for the forthcoming interaction, instructed about the way to handle the interview and the attitude towards a particular guest to be adopted, questions have been negotiated and prepared beforehand, games and surprises have been prepared. Thus, the course of the interaction is pre-planned, but still has some degree of unpredictability.

The content of turns may be indirectly controlled by the host's questions. In other words, different question forms may have different degrees of control over the content of the following turn (Penz 1996: 112). Yes-no questions, tag questions and declarative questions restrict the guest to agreeing or disagreeing with the host's proposition and are often used by the host to bring certain points to the attention of the audience (Penz 1996: 112-125).

These kinds of questions usually show the host's awareness of the guest's situation and, consequently, exhibit the host's high level of control over the content of the following turn. In contrast to yes-no questions, declarative questions and tag questions, wh-questions are considered to be less controlling, since they constrain the respondent's answer to a lower degree and, thus, leave a wider scope for the interviewee's response (Penz 1996: 127). They are often seen as story openers (Penz 1996: 127). There are also multiple questions that are regarded as a good means of content control, since the host presents a narrowed question to navigate the guest in the area of interest and elicit some specific information.

Generally speaking, the content depends on the preliminary instructions and the question types the host chooses to navigate the dialogue. In contrast to yes-no questions, declarative questions, multiple questions and tag questions, wh-questions are considered to be less controlling.

The allocational techniques employed

As observed by Penz (1996: 79), the interaction in talk shows mainly consists of question-answer sequences which might be intermixed with passages of a more conversational nature. In this connection, Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974: 729) imply the semi-institutionality of media genres in their observation on and categorization of the linear array of turn-allocation systems:

The linear array is one in which one polar type (which conversation instances) involves "one turn at a time allocation"; that is, the use of local allocational means, and the other pole (exemplified by debates) involves "preallocation of all turns", and the media types (exemplified by meetings) involve various mixes of preallocational and local allocational means.

The tabloid talkshow displays both types of turn-allocation techniques *current selects next* or *self-selection*. The *current selects next* technique is characterised by addressed questions, nomination, non-verbal selection of speaker, topic-speaker-reference, among others, whereas the examples of *self-selection* include interruptions, overlaps, parenthetical remarks (Goffman 1976: 275).

Similar to ordinary conversation, third-turn responsive actions, or third-turn receipt objects (for example, "oh", "mm", tag questions, such evaluative phrases as "how interesting", "wow", "good") typically follow question-answer sequences functioning as an alignment of 'the questioner to the answerer as a recipient of reported information' or function as "participatory listenership", whereas they tend to be avoided in other forms of institutional

interaction (Heritage 1985: 98). Linke's (cited in Penz 1996: 11-12) analysis has identified that hosts in talk shows as contrasted to hosts in television discussions give more signals of listenership which are also referred to as minimal feedback. Feedback may be defined as the brief response from the listener to the speaker's utterance which intends to encourage the speaker to continue his/her turn (Kong & Su 2014: 38). They are also termed back-channel responses or continuers and are interpreted as 'signals which exhibit the understanding that an extended turn by another person is under way, but not yet complete' (Penz 1996: 99). Although offering no important information, feedback plays a key role since it contributes a lot to a smooth and successful conversation and is considered a conversational feature (Kong & Su 2014: 38). According to Penz (1996: 77), this kind of feedback utterances should not be considered as turns

To sum up, the question-answer format may be intermixed with some conversational interruptions. Both turn-allocation techniques are used in the talk show and the host-guided change might sometimes alternate with the guest's self-selection. The extent of free speaker change and order of turns are usually controlled by the host. The duration and content of turns may also be navigated by the type of question selected by the host. Thus, the talk show is a type of interaction that is partially pre-planned but has room for spontaneous participation. The balance between the pre-allocated and the spontaneous is managed by the superior interactant, i.e. the host.

4.4 Repetition

Repetition is one of the aspects that may perform different functions depending on the discursive environment. In CA, repetition is treated as a kind of economy system that accomplishes social functions as part of our conduct and behaviour in everyday talk-in-interaction (Kim 2002: 52-53). As noted by Kim (2002: 53-54), 'repetition has begun to be investigated in terms of general cognitive and interactional motivations, particularly in the production and understanding of discourse or natural conversation'.

With reference to Kim (2002: 59), "repetition" is also termed as "copy" or "second saying". The utterance that is repeated is called the "repetend", "first saying" or "model".

There are several criteria for identifying forms of repetition. In terms of fixity in form, there are exact repetition, partial repetition, excluding paraphrased repetition (expanded) repetition (Tannen 2007: 58).

According to Schegloff's (1997: 525) definition of repetition, speaker change, transformations of deixis, tense shift, as well as changes of prosody are allowed (Kim 2002: 60). Indeed, Tannen (2007: 63) has indicated that the most common type of repetition is repetition with variation which includes the change of person or tense, the change of a single word or a phrase, the transformation of questions into statements and vice versa. Repetition as any TCU can be lexical, phrasal, sentential or clausal (Kim 2002: 61). In terms of speaker, there is a distinction between the same-speaker and second-speaker repetition (Norrick 1987 cited in Kim 2002: 61), which equals to Tannen's self-repetition and allo-repetition respectively (Tannen 2007: 63).

Kim (2002) has studied the function of repetition in terms of its position. They occur in different sequential positions (Schegloff 1996 cited in Kim 2002: 61):

- In the same turn as contains the model
- In the next turn immediately after the repetend
- In any subsequent turn

Kim (2002: 62) has divided repetitions on the basis of their sequential contexts into two types:

- Second saying that occurs in the immediately next turn to the first saying (A-B type)
- Second saying that occurs in the third position from the first saying in the case where the second position causes the occurrence of the copy in the third position (A-B-A type)

Kim (2002: 63-64) has indicated asking for clarification of what the participant has misunderstood or finds problematic to understand as one of the most prominent functions of repetition in the third turn position, whereas initiating repair or expanding the repetition as a way of providing additional information as one of the major functions of the second turn position repetition.

Tannen (2007: 58) combines the varied purposes behind the use of repetition into the categories of production, connection, comprehension and interaction. And the combination of these four aspects of discourse leads to the establishment of coherence and interpersonal involvement.

According to Tannen (2007: 58-61), in terms of production, repetition enables a speaker to produce language in a more efficient way and gives time to plan and formulate the following utterance or use it as a frame for the piece of information. In terms of comprehension, repetition provides semantically less dense discourse and contributes to quality over quantity. It gives some extra time to the speaker to think over the next utterance, and helps the hearer process what has been said. Also, repetitions can be viewed as a cohesive device which performs referential and tying functions by showing the link to earlier discourse and the interrelation between the ideas. On the interactional level, repetition accomplishes social goals by binding participants with the discourse and with each other. Tannen (2007: 61) has observed such interactional functions of repetition as:

Getting or keeping the floor, showing listenership, providing back-channel response, stalling, gearing up to answer or speak, humour and play, savouring, and showing appreciation of a good line or a good joke, persuasion, linking one speaker's idea to another's, ratifying another's contributions, and including in an interaction a person who did not hear a previous utterance.

All in all, by contribution to production, comprehension, connection, and interaction, repetition creates interpersonal involvement (Tannen 2007: 61).

Johnstone (1994:6) highlights emphasis, clarification, iteration or confirmation as the basic functions of repetition. Norrick (1987 cited in Kim 2002: 54) also presents such a classification of functions as openings-closings, statements-affirmation, questions-answers, statements-disagreements. According to Schegloff (1997 in Kim 2002: 55), the practice of repeating performs the following functions:

- Registering receipt
- Initiating repair
- Targeting a next action

In other words, repetition signals that a misunderstanding has occurred and requires a solution to proceed to further actions. Indeed, Schegloff (1997: 503) defines repair as actions of solving problems in hearing, speaking or understanding what is being said. To put it simply, repair is the treatment of trouble, where trouble is any kind of misunderstanding (Young 2008: 49). Depending on the mode of participants' cooperation, repairs are divided into *other-initiated self-repair*, *other-initiated other repair*, *self-initiated other-repair* and *self-initiated self-repair* (Young 2008: 49-50). Repair that is initiated by a participant whose turn was not the trouble source and completed by the

participant whose turn caused the repair is called other-initiated self-repair. The other types of repair are similarly named in accordance with the interactant who initiates the repair and the interactant who completes it (Young 2008: 49-50).

4.4.1 Repetition and discourse

It is believed that repetition may have different functions in conversational and institutional talks. For instance, it has been indicated that repetitions functioning as “participatory listenership” may be accommodated to an institutional framework (Ilie 2001: 229). According to Tannen (2007: 67-73), functions of repetition in an extended multi-party conversation, which is similar in a talk show aimed at its overhearing audience, can be understood in terms of repetition as participation ratifying listenership, humour, stalling, and expansion. Also, Ilie’s (2001: 236) analysis has indicated that so-called message-retargeting repetitions are usually exercised by the talk-monitor to emphasize the idea to an audience or another speaker.

As for repair as a motivation for repetition, there are also different tendencies in ordinary conversation and in an institutionalized interaction. In conversation, self-initiated repair is more welcome and frequently used, whereas, in institutional setting, other initiated repairs tend to be encountered. Young (2008: 50) has noticed the following: ‘In communicative events where there is a greater social distance between participants and one participant has more power than another, the threat to negative face is mitigated and other initiated repair is more common.’ Also, it has been noticed that confirming repetitions are quite frequently used by guests in institutional settings. For instance, the use of repetitions instead of “that’s right” may function as a means of getting back on track (Nofsinger 1994: 93).

4.5 Interruptions and overlaps

Although the basic feature in participants’ co-construction of talk-in-interaction is “one-at-a-time”, it is not invariably achieved (Schegloff 2000: 2). Any interaction normally includes forms of simultaneous talk such as interruptions and overlaps.

4.5.1 Interruptions

Along with repetitions, interruptions are recurring features of conversation and are also believed to acquire different functions in conversational and in institutional interactions (Ilie 2001: 227). Interruption may be defined as ‘simultaneous speech produced by a speaker who begins to speak in the middle of a current speaker’s turn constructional

component' (Itakura 2001: 1868). It is considered as an interaction strategy that can be used as positive politeness or negative politeness devices (Holmes 1995: 50-51). In other words, interruptions may function as an encouragement, as a controlling action and an indicator of power dominance.

In terms of reasons for interruptions, Goldberg (1990: 890) classified them into power-oriented interruptions and rapport-oriented interruptions. Similar to Goldberg (1990), Holmes (1995: 54) differentiates between supportive and non-supportive (disruptive) interruptions.

Power-oriented, or non-supportive, obstructive interruptions are generally characterised as 'rude, impolite, intrusive and inappropriate' and are viewed as 'conveying the interruptor's antipathy, aggression, hostility, dislike, disdain, apathy etc. towards the interrupted speaker' (Goldberg 1990: 890; Tannen 1994: 60). Power-oriented interruptions are usually understood as a sign of conflict and competition (Goldberg 1990: 890) and mostly occur in debates. Generally speaking, disruptive interruptions are intended to dominate and tend to be employed in an interaction with pre-established hierarchical role distribution or in an interaction where participants fight for dominance.

On the contrary, rapport-oriented, or supportive, interruptions are treated as 'expressions of open empathy, affection, solidarity, interest and concern, etc.' (Goldberg 1990: 890; Tannen 1994: 60). They give the interrupted speaker immediate feedback and elaboration on the topic and are regarded as acts of collaboration and cooperation (Goldberg 1990: 890). Interruptions as positive politeness devices are used to encourage or support contributions from the other speaker (Holmes 1995: 50). Such interruptions are not considered as an act of control and function positively (Holmes 1995: 54).

Since the talk show assumes the pre-established roles, i.e. the guest and the host, interruptions should not be triggered by the competition for the floor. However, interruptions may be used by the host to execute some institutional tasks. Institutionally, host's interruptions are seen as topic or subtopic shifts or are made for argumentation purposes (Ilie 2001: 228). Also, repetition may be a part of interruption (Ilie 2001: 229). According to Penz (1996: 95), interruption may be employed by talk show hosts to emphasize particular elements of a story or make the guest focus on some events by posing a leading question. Also, interruptions may be used as an encouragement to continue a

contribution. As noted by Holmes (1995: 51), ‘a well-timed interruption can effectively halt a speaker in their tracks’. Thus, interruptions may be used for navigation purposes.

4.5.2 Overlaps

Overlap is a type of simultaneous speech which occurs when a speaker self-selects at a very close to a predicted transition relevance place in another speaker’s turn (Itakura 2001: 1868). In other words, an overlap occurs when two speakers speak at a time.⁴

With reference to Schegloff’s (2000: 5) analysis, there are four categories of overlaps. The first type of overlaps is *the terminal overlap*. They are characterized by a speaker who self-selects ‘by virtue of a prior speaker’s analyzably incipient finishing of a turn’ (Schegloff 2000: 5).

The second category is *continuers* (i.e. interpolations such as *uh huh*, *hm*, the so-called context-fitted assessment terms), ‘by which recipients of another’s talk can show precisely that they understand that the speaker is in the course of an extended turn at talk which is not yet complete’ (Schegloff 2000: 5). Indeed, some back-channel responses may occur at the end of the other speaker’s utterance.

Third, Schegloff (2000: 5-6) has indicated various phenomena that he collected under the rubric “conditional access to the turn”, in which ‘a speaker of a not possibly completed turn-in-progress yields to another, or even invites another to speak in his turn’s space, conditional on the other’s use of that opportunity to further the initial speaker’s undertaking’. According to Schegloff (2000: 5-6), the most common instances can be grouped into:

(a) the word search

(b) collaborative utterance construction

The word search is when a current speaker cannot retrieve a word from memory, another speaker may be invited to help the current speaker find the right wording. In collaborative unit constructions, a participant begins an utterance and lets another speaker complete it (Schegloff 2000: 5-6).

⁴ Overlaps may be produced by more than two speakers at a time. However, such instances are excluded from this research paper.

Again, in each case, if the initial and subsequent speakers stops talking at once, this is generally considered as non-competitive (Schegloff 2000: 5-6), which is not considered an interruption.

Fourth, the scholar defines a set of forms of talk which he refers to as “chordal” or “choral”. Schegloff (2000: 6) points out that such forms of talk and activity that are ‘treated by interactional co-participants as not to be done serially, not one after the other, but to be done simultaneously’. The most common reaction in the context of the talk show is laughter, which usually serves as an invitation for others to laugh and may occur simultaneously with others. As pointed out by Schegloff (2000: 6), multi-person settings are characterized by such activities as collective greetings, leave-takings, and congratulations. They are usually produced “chordally,” not serially and are not competitive but consensual (Schegloff 2000: 6).

Overlaps are an integral feature of an interaction in the context of the talk show. Thus, it can be asserted that overlap is a conversational feature embedded in an institutionalized framework that contributes to naturalness in interaction.

5. Corpus

The empirical part will focus on the talk show that generally deals with a great variety of topics and the guests are either ordinary people, or celebrities. The genre has been chosen due to its availability and proximity to ordinary people in terms of content and the fact that it is not constrained by the adherence to a particular topic that would require professional knowledge or the presence of experts. The data for the analysis has been obtained from the transcripts of episodes of two popular American talk shows: *The View* and *The Ellen DeGeneres Show* (often shortened to *Ellen*).

To gain maximally updated findings, the analysis focuses on the episodes from the latest seasons of the talk shows. Since episodes of the same week or episodes of the same day of the week might relate to the same theme (e.g. Halloween Week, 12 days of Christmas Giveaways), the episodes that aired on three different weekdays of three different weeks have been chosen. In other words, to obtain a maximally accurate and updated picture and to avoid any thematic concurrences, data has been collected from the episodes of the latest season aired on different days of the week.

Three episodes which were aired on three different days of three consecutive weeks of the latest season of the daytime talk show *The Ellen DeGeneres Show* have been transcribed. To be more precise, the interviews that have only one guest at a time have been included in the data collection. Additionally, the host's introductory monologues are included to investigate the lexical choice of the host when communicating with the audience. Since my research focuses exclusively on the interaction between the host and the guest, performances, commercials are excluded from the data collection. Games with a third party or the studio audience or games with the use of some technological devices are also excluded, since they are additionally limited by the rules of the games and the involvement of other people. All further details about the interviews transcribed can be found in Table 2 below.

Table 2

Date the episode was aired	Day of the week	Number of interviews	Guests (in consecutive order)	Length of episodes	Overall time of the transcribed material
24.11.2014	Monday	3 (+ the opening monologue)	Gwen Stefani, Katie Holmes, Adria	40 min	4 min 42 sec + 4 min 18 sec + 6 min 45 sec = 15 min 45 sec (+ 1min 30 sec)
02.12.2014	Tuesday	3	Jessica Chastain, Simon Baker, Kerri	40 min	6 min 33 sec + 5 min 24 sec + 3 min 22 sec = 15 min 19 sec

		(+ the opening monologue)			(+3 min 6 sec)
10.12.2014	Wednesday	2 (+ the opening monologue)	Orlando Bloom, Laura Dern	40 min	5 min 03 sec + 9 min 07 sec = 14 min 10 sec (+2 min 30 sec)
					45 min 14 sec (+ 7 min 06 sec) (10 121 words)

Five episodes which were aired on five different days of the latest five consecutive weeks available of the latest season of *The View* have been analysed. It is necessary to mention that the reason why the number of episodes transcribed of *The View* exceeds the number of the episodes of *Ellen* is that some of the chosen episodes of the former contain fewer interviews than the latter. Thus, additional episodes have been added to obtain more material. Since the research focuses on interaction with one guest at a time, all talks with more than one guest at a time in *The View* are excluded from the transcripts. Also, interviews that are conducted by fewer than two interviewers are excluded, since *The View* has been chosen to juxtapose the interaction moderated by the panel of hosts with the interaction controlled by one host in *Ellen*. Discussions between the hosts characteristic to the first half of the episode, performances, commercials are not included, since there is no guest-host relationship. Similar to *Ellen*, games are also excluded from the data collection. All details about the interviews transcribed can be found in Table 3 below.

Table 3

Date the episode was aired	Day of the week	Number of interviews	Guests (in consecutive order)	Length of episodes	Overall time of the transcribed material
21.10.2014	Tuesday	2	Terry Crews, Sarah Hyland	50 min	6 min 12 sec + 4 min 55 sec = 11 min 07 sec
29.10.2014	Wednesday	1	Taylor Swift	50 min	11 min 34 sec
06.11.2014	Thursday	1	Cedric the Entertainer	50 min	5 min 19 sec
14.11.2014	Friday	1	Drew Barrymore	50 min	6 min 16 sec
17.11.2014	Monday	2	Steve Harvey, Brooke Shields	50 min	4 min 58 sec + 6 min 20 sec = 11 min 18 sec
					45 min 34 sec (9 817 words)

5.1 Transcript Conventions and Symbols

As for the technical part of the transcripts, the symbols are used in accordance with the relevance to the purposes of the analysis. The glosses used in this research are based on the glossary of transcript symbols and descriptions provided by Ten Have (1999: 213-214). The conventional symbols are supplemented with some individual symbols. The complete list of all the transcript symbols and their descriptions can be found in Table 4 in Appendix.

Apart from the symbols that are designed to render details of the vocal production of utterances, the names of the numerous speakers are abbreviated. In the transcribed excerpts provided, all utterances by the host of *The Ellen DeGeneres Show* are preceded by “Ellen”.

Since there are four co-hosts and guest hosts in *The View*, abbreviations are used to avoid the repetitive use of long full names and save space in the text. The permanent hosts are indicated by the first letter of their first names. Since there are two hosts with the same first name, both their first name and second name are abbreviated, i.e. Rosie Perez is indicated as “RP” and Rosie O’Donell as “RO”, respectively. A guest host is marked as “GH”. Due to the mismatch between the audio and the video or due to the loud audience reactions that mute the speaker, some utterances cannot always be placed to the right host. In such cases, “H” is used to indicate one of the host’s utterances. As for the guests, their names are fully written. The full list of the abbreviations used in the analysis can be found Table 5 in Appendix.

5.2 The Analytic Steps

To start with, general characteristics of the two talk shows are provided. Then, the major steps of the global structure of the talk shows are described and illustrated by the examples obtained from my analysis. Afterwards, the analysis of the local structure of the talk shows is presented. First, some generalizations on the turn-taking system in the selected episodes have been made. The form of turn-taking in the interaction in a talk show has been analysed. In other words, turn-taking and talk-monitoring are analysed in terms of turn-allocation techniques. Then, the types and functions of repetitions and interruptions have been indicated and investigated in the context of the talk shows. Also, the opening monologues have been included in the corpus to investigate the self-referring “we” and the communication with the present audience.

The aim of this research paper is going to find answers to the following questions: What is the relation between the conversational and the institutional in the talk shows? How the conversational and the institutional co-exist and how are the transitions between the conversational and the institutional executed? To be more precise, the interplay between the turn allocation techniques is going to be studied. How do the host in *Ellen* and the panel of hosts in *The View* monitor the flow of the interaction and manage the transitions from conversation to institutional talk? What the role of the host in *Ellen* and the panel of hosts in *The View*? What forms and functions do repetitions have in the context of the selected talk shows? What functions do interruptions and overlaps have? How are the interaction monitored by one host and the interaction monitored by several co-hosts different in terms of the interplay between the conversational and the institutional?

In total, there are fifty-six illustrative excerpts. Fifteen extracts are used to exemplify the global structure of the talk shows. Forty-one excerpts have been selected to illustrate the features chosen for the research. The analysis of the selected sequences has been performed on the basis of the major steps used in conversational analysis (Pomeranz & Fehr 1997: 71-74 cited in Ten Have 1999: 105):

1. A sequence or an excerpt which includes both the start and the end of the selected action is chosen. The selected excerpt serves as an example of a particular generalization made on the basis of the collected data.
2. The actions in the excerpt are characterized. An excerpts's actions are described on a turn-by-turn basis. It is argued whether third response actions should or should not be considered turns (Penz 1996: 77). In my analysis, continuers are organized as separate turns for illustrative purposes. Since there are long excerpts too, a more generalized approach is occasionally taken. The extracts that exemplify the peculiarities of the global structure or the lengthy excerpts with continuers are described on a general basis.
3. The form chosen to produce the action and turn-allocation techniques and their significance for understanding of the action performed are scrutinized.
4. It is observed how relationships and identities of the interactants are reflected in the action performed and the general function of the action is emphasized. All excerpts are interpreted in terms of the guest-host relations and their identities in the context of the talk show.

The analytical steps enumerated above are not necessarily performed in the same order. Some steps may overlap and may occasionally be combined.

6. *The Ellen Degeneres Show and The View*

6.1 General characteristics of *Ellen* and *The View*

The Ellen Degeneres Show (often shortened to *Ellen*) is a 40-minute daytime personality-type talk show whose host is the famous comedian Ellen Degeneres. With reference to the data from one of the websites of the talk show (<http://degenerous.weebly.com/structure.html>), which has been confirmed by the current analysis, the show is segmented into the following steps.

First, the host starts with a monologue that is basically directed to the present audience. Second, Ellen dances through the audience, which has become a signature of the host and is a convention of her talk show. After a commercial break, a celebrity guest is introduced by the host. Apart from an interview part, there is also a part where the host plays entertaining and amusing games with the guest and/or the audience members. There are occasional guest performances by singers or dancers on the show. In the past few seasons it has become a tendency to invite and interview people with interesting and deserving stories which have been sent to the host or have gained popularity in the media and give them financial help. Thus, the show promotes charity.

Generally speaking, the popular talk show broadcast in syndication, includes ‘a mix of celebrity interviews, musical performers, audience participation games, and segments spotlighting real people with extraordinary stories and talents’ with a great variety of topics (*International Movie Data Base*).

The View has been chosen on the basis of its focus on a panel of four female co-hosts. The format is also called panelist talk show. *The View* is a one hour daytime talk show that is broadcast by ABC. The talk show deals with ‘current issues and news items ranging from social and political issues to tabloid headlines and celebrity news, which provides a contrast from the other talk shows’ (*Wikipedia. The Free Encyclopedia*). With reference to the official website of the broadcast channel (ABC), the talk show is characterised as ‘hot topics in the news, the best experts in their field, celebrity interviews and general entertainment are all part of *The View*, now in its 18th season on ABC’.

According to Tennant (2014), the talk show is normally segmented into the following parts. It normally starts from the video overview of the episode. Then, the hosts enter and take their seats at their table. Thereafter, one of the four hosts begins ‘discussion about the topics of the day, with conversation steered by a moderator’ (Tennant 2014). Then, the first guest is introduced. However, the guest may not always be interviewed but asked to join the discussion of the so called “Hot Topics” and express their opinion on a controversial issue. Then, a discussion between the hosts may follow. After the discussion with the first guest or the discussion between the hosts, the second guest is introduced. The second guest may be followed by the third guest. A guest may be interviewed by either a selected host, two or three selected hosts or all the hosts. The show ends with a closing. Similar to *Ellen*, there are occasional performances and games.

However, what is peculiar about *The View* is that some episodes have more than one segment that may be dedicated to one particular guest or the entire episode may be allocated specifically to discussing “Hot Topics”, during which the hosts discuss headlines in the news for the entire hour (Tennant 2014).

Thus, the two talk shows are similar in the range of issues discussed and exhibit some general discursive features described below. Similar to *Ellen*, *The View* contains interviews, performances and games. Unlike *Ellen*, *The View* also has discussions of current interest between the hosts as an essential part of the talk show. Moreover, as contrasted to *Ellen*, there are four co-hosts. Since the two talk shows differ in the number of moderators, some dissimilarity in the organization of the interaction may be indicated.

6.2 The global structure of the interaction process in *The Ellen DeGeneres Show* and *The View*

Before moving to the analysis of the local peculiarities of the shows it is necessary to have a better understanding of the general organization of the interaction process and its major steps. According to the analysis conducted by Kong & Su (2014: 38), the interview process with the guest in *Ellen* consists of the three-step opening, the interaction-oriented body and the three-step closings. Similarly, my research has indicated that the interaction with a guest in *The View* can also be divided into three major stages, e.g. the opening, the interaction-oriented body and the closing. However, there might be some slight differences caused by the format and the number of co-hosts.

6.2.1 The opening

As observed by Kong & Su (2014: 38), the three-step opening in *Ellen* includes some background introduction presented as a monologue by the host, guest’s appearance, and phatic communion between the host and guest(s). As compared to *Ellen*, the opening in *The View* follows a similar pattern. My analysis has indicated that it also consists of three parts. It includes some brief introduction on the guest’s achievements presented by one of the hosts, the guest’s appearance, and some brief phatic communion between the hosts and guest.

My research has also demonstrated that the first step of an interview in *Ellen* is the host's monologue, usually with the help of visual aid, which is aimed to introduce the visiting guest and to give the background information about the guest to the overhearing audience.

(1)

Ellen: our next guest is a grammy award winning international superstar, a fashion mogul, a couch on the voice and one of the coolest moms in the world. please welcome my friend gwen stefani

(2)

Ellen: our next guest is returning to the middle earth one last time in the hobbit: the battle of the five armies. take a look ((video clip)). please welcome the very handsome orlando bloom

Similarly, one of the hosts in *The View* introduces the guest to the studio audience by enumerating her achievements and giving the name of the guest at the very end of the introductory monologue. The example (3) below illustrates the first part of the opening, which is the audience-oriented introduction to the guest's appearance.

(3)

RO: she's won seven grammies, (she's one of the most amazing and) influential people in the world, her album 1989 is number one in eighty-eight countries right now, and she's not even twenty-five yet. please welcome taylor swift

Then, the guest will come out. As noted by Kong & Su (2014: 38), the majority of guests in *Ellen* will greet the audience and the host briefly in verbal or non-verbal ways. The example below (4) is the verbal greeting of the studio audience in *Ellen*. The guest linked his greeting of the audience to Ellen's introduction (2) about his upcoming movie. On the whole, the first two steps of the opening in *Ellen* are considered audience-oriented.

(4)

Orlando: so I am riding north to gundabad. anyone coming?

The guest in *The View* will greet all the hosts by hugging. It must be pointed out that guests in *The View* do not usually greet the audience but the hosts.

The last step of the opening in *Ellen* and *The View* is phatic communication before the formal conversation that 'sets up a communicative bridge and creates a harmonious

atmosphere to make good preparation for the following formal interaction' (Kong & Su 2014: 38).

(5)

Ellen: you look fantastic

Katie: thank you

Ellen: how are you?

Katie: I am great

Ellen: it's been like I don't know years since you've been here. I haven't seen you. I have seen you around other places but I haven't seen you here. so thanks for coming back

Katie: thank you for having me. it's always so much fun.

In example (5), Ellen is giving a compliment to the guest and they are thanking each other to gradually and comfortably move to the main part of the conversation.

In *The View*, one of the hosts may ask some general question or give a compliment to create a welcoming atmosphere. Normally, the guest is greeted by the host whose question will follow afterwards. And yet, it must be noted that the phatic part of the opening is usually shorter in *The View* than in *Ellen*.

(6)

W: hey baby

Drew: how are you?

W: it's nice to see you. last time you were here I don't think you know you've just given birth

(7)

W: darling I'm so glad you're here because there've been terrible awful rumors for years about your mom in tabloids, and you've taken your mom out of the tabloids and made her your mom again. so why do you think people had such a disconnect with terry?

As can be seen in the example (6) above, the host greets the guest and quickly moves to the discussion of the guest's family. In example (7), the host welcomes the quest with 'darling I'm so glad you're here' and switches straight away to the main topic of the interview in the same turn. The reason for shorter phatic chunks might be longer greetings of the hosts at the guest's entrance stage and their phatic exchanges muted by the applause of the audience.

(8)

RP: ok, me and the audience are like this now ((standing up)). and they just wanted to send you a message about your ex-man

Audience: ((singing a piece of the guest's song))
Taylor: oh my god look look at all I'm recognizing a lot of people
((APPLAUDING))
Taylor: wow
H: [it was amazing]
H: [congratulations]
RO: all I can say congratulations, the record is getting unbelievable reviews
across the board and it's sold out everywhere

However, the phatic phase of the opening in *The View* may occasionally be organized and the audience may be involved, as it is illustrated by example (8). The guest is welcomed by the audience singing her song, which is also a part of the introduction to the first topic to be discussed. Then, one of the hosts smoothly proceeds to the discussion of the guest's record.

6.2.2 *The main body*

With reference to the analysis of the show conducted by Kong & Su (2014: 39), the interaction in *Ellen* unfolds mainly in the question-answer format between the host and the guest and consists of several topics. Although questions are previously designed, the guest's unexpected answers may trigger unplanned questions (Kong & Su 2014: 39) or lead to a "conversation-like" deviation from the agenda. Conversational chunks are also caused by self-selection are also a part of the interaction process in *Ellen*.

According to my analysis of *The View*, the interaction is also organized into question-answer sequences. Unlike the host in *Ellen* who is the only moderator of the interaction, there are normally four hosts. The hosts have notes in their hands with the questions allocated to them. Thus, questions are previously designed and the order of questions is pre-established. Moreover, the pre-established questions are divided among the hosts. It is worth noting that the other hosts do not usually interfere when it is their colleague's turn to ask questions. Occasionally, the participants may deviate from the pre-established course to briefly comment on or make a joke about something related to the topic being discussed.

All in all, the interaction-body in *Ellen* mostly depends on the control of turns and topics by the host. The interaction in *The View* is mostly based on the organizational efficiency among the hosts and their control over turns and topics. The form of the interaction of the talk shows on the basis of turn-allocation techniques, talk-monitoring, repetitions and overlaps will subsequently be analysed in more detail.

6.2.3 *The closing*

The closing part in *Ellen* normally follows the three-step sequence (Kong & Su 2014: 39). First, the host raises a topic that may lead to a possible end and the guest(s) also agrees to it. My analysis has shown that giving a present to the guest may be the first step of the closing part.

(9)

Ellen: right. we have a going-away gift for you

Simon: no

Ellen: yes it's a wrap gift cause [cause I like to give] this you can surf

Simon: [you are too much] that's is just

Ellen: isn't that fantastic?

Simon: fantastic. ((APPLAUDING)) yeah, I can wear it to the wrap party.

Ellen: I hope you will

Simon: I I

Ellen: go to the wrap party and you send me a photo of that, ok?

Simon: I am I am gonna go and put this on and send you. I am gonna just instagram the crap out of this.

Second, 'the host emphasizes the reason for guest(s)' visiting or expresses thanks to the guest(s)' (Kong & Su 2014: 39). In example (10), the guest thanks the host for the gift, whereas the host thanks the guest, a soldier's wife, for her family's effort. But my analysis has indicated that this part may be omitted.

(10)

Ellen: and and thank you your husband for us for what he does [thank you so much

Kerri: oh my gosh [thank you

Ellen: thank you so much

As seen in the examples (11) and (12) below, the reason for the guest's visit, such as the discussion of his upcoming movie, may also be included in the farewell turn. Finally, 'the host ends the conversation formally by broadcasting the next guest or just with farewells' (Kong & Su 2014: 39), as in the example (11) below, or saying "bye-bye" and "see you tomorrow" (Kong & Su 2014: 39), as shown in the example (12) below.

(11)

Ellen: the hobbit: the five armies is in theatres since december the seventeenth. we'll be back with laura dern after this.

(12)

Ellen: I wanna thank jessica chastain, simon baker, the clues, the bleachers. see you tomorrow. be kind to one another. bye bye

In contrast, the closing part in *The View* is normally quite abrupt and not multistage. One of the hosts, the same one that makes the introduction to the guest's appearance, takes the turn to end the interview. The host thanks the guest, tells the audience about the gift all the audience members get from the guest. The gift is something that has been one of the topics of the interview (e.g. a CD, a fragrance, a book). Then, the host ends the closing part with "we'll be right back".

As illustrated by the examples below, the host is thanking the guest (13) or expressing affection to her (14), telling them what gift they are getting and finishing the closing monologue by the standard "we'll be right back" phrase.

(13)

W: listen we're gonna say thank you to drew barrymore cause we love her. the members of this audience are going home with one of the new fragrances that this created. that's for you that's for you. we'll be right back

(14)

W: she's coming. we love her. she's going to be back. we love brooke. members of our audience you're lucky cause you're taking the book home with you. ((APPLAUDING)) we'll be right back

All in all, in terms of global structure, *Ellen* consists of three parts. The opening part and the closing part have a particular three-staged structure. The core part of an interview has the question-answer format. However, some parts of an interview may depict the interplay between the standard question-answer format and conversational chunks. *The View* also consists of three distinct parts, i.e. the opening, the main body and the closing. Similar to *Ellen*, the opening consists of three stages. The main body of the interaction is mainly organized in question-answer sequences. Since there are four hosts, the interaction is more organized and has fewer conversational chunks. Unlike *Ellen*, the closing part does not necessarily have preparatory stages and usually contains only the farewell part.

7. The Analysis of *The Ellen DeGeneres Show*

7.1 Turn-taking and talk-monitoring

As has been discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, the interaction process between the guest and the host in talk shows includes various features pertaining to either institutional talk or conversation. To find out how the conversational and the institutional co-exist in the talk show, I am going to investigate turn-allocation techniques, the role of the host and how transitions between *self-selection* and *current selects next* are achieved. To understand how the host positions himself in the context of the talk show, the function of the pronoun “we” is studied in the opening monologues. To indicate the functions that repetitions acquire in the context of the talk shows, various types of repetitions encountered in the corpus are analysed. The functions of interruptions and overlaps are also presented in the analysis. All the linguistic features are analysed with regard to such discursive features of the tabloid talk show as asymmetry of power relations, multiple audience and role-assumption of participants.

7.1.1 *Current selects next*

According to various sources mentioned earlier (Penz 1996; Gregori-Signes 2000; Ilie 2001), the interaction between the participants of the talk show mainly takes place in the question-answer format and is monitored by the host. As a consequence, the turn-allocation technique “the speaker selects next” must be predominant. The analysis has confirmed that the question-answer sequences are a big part of the talk show interaction.

(15)

Ellen: so. I know you had to beg for the job you had. you begged for that job. and you are struggling, right? and you barely have enough food. and you go hungry at nights you wanna make sure your kids fed so you go to bed hungry.
(a) **and how old are your kids?**

Adria: ten, nine, and four

Ellen: and you stay so positive. this letter was amazing to me. (b) **what keeps you moving forward?**

Adria: just the fact that I am a mother, above anything else I am a mother and when you're a mom there's no such thing as you're not being able to provide, there is no such thing as what you can't do. so my daughters they are my inspiration, they are everything to me I have them but I still owe them everything you know. they believe in me to them. I am super mom there is

nothing I can't do and that's just basically enough for me
 Ellen: you are not letting them down you are super mom
 Adria: thank you
 Ellen: super mom
 Adria: thank you
 Ellen: listen carefully all you moms out there (c) **she has the best way to get the kids to do their homework and their chores, right?**
 Adria: yes=
 Ellen:= (d) **tell them what you do.**

As can be seen from the example (15) above, the interaction is mainly based on the question-answer format where the host as the talk-monitor asks either direct or indirect questions and thereby selects the speaker. The guest embraces her institutional role of the respondent by answering the questions posed by the host.

In terms of talk-monitoring and control over the length and content of turns in particular, the examples illustrate the significant role of question types. The wh-question (15b) and indirect wh-question (15d) are followed by more lengthy turns than the question on factual information (15a) and the declarative question (15c). As a consequence, the host has less control over the guest's answers to the questions (15b) and (15d). In terms of the content, it can be seen that the host's question (15a) is preceded by giving a brief overview of the guest's situation that starts with "I know". Thus, it indicates the preliminary preparation and the familiarity with the story of the host. In addition, the brief overview of the guest's situation might be a consequence of time-management. Due to the limited time allocated to the segment with the guest, the host has time to ask only a limited number of questions which, nevertheless, may not always provide a full picture of the situation. Therefore, some information is given by the host herself rather than elicited from the guest. The introductory phrase "listen you all moms there" to the declarative question (15c) is probably intended to draw the attention of the audience to the question that will immediately follow. In the extract chosen, the host also expresses her admiration by repeating the guest and naming her a 'super mom'. In other words, the host gives her evaluation of the story, which is generally considered as a conversational feature.

Generally speaking, the turn allocation technique in excerpt (15) demonstrates that the interactants adhere to their institutional roles of the talk mediator and the guest. It can be seen that the host is familiar with the story and, apparently, has planned her questions in advance. Also, the introduction to the question (15c) also provides linguistic evidence of

the orientation of the talk show towards audience and message. All in all, the current excerpt can serve as an instance of institutional nature of the talk show with a conversational feature embedded.

As for the role of question types, it has been indicated that the host occasionally selects the speaker by posing multiple questions. They are considered a good means of topic-control.

(16)

Orlando: I know I missed you there. did you? how is your back? you're in great shape I saw you dancing you look fantastic

Ellen: I am hanging in there **are you still going there? are you still working out?**

(17)

Ellen: yeah **what would you do afterwards? do you have plans? will you ever work again?**

((LAUGHTER))

Simon: I don't I don't know I kind of sort of a little bit like maybe it's not kind of a bad thing not to work

As demonstrated by the examples (16) and (17), the host selects the speaker by posing a few questions that address the same subject. In example (16), the guest also uses this technique to address the host. However, the first question in both instances is more general, whereas each subsequent question narrows down the guest's potential answer. As can be seen in example (17), the first general question is a wh-question and the second and the third are the so-called polar interrogative questions. In the case of example (16), both questions are polar interrogative questions, where the second question can be labelled as a clarification question to the first one.

It may also happen that the guest's answer makes the host ask an additional question that is not included in the host's agenda for clarification purposes. Example below (18) demonstrates that utterances in the talk show may be context renewing. Some guest's comments or answers may cause a question that has an effect on the subsequent turns.

(18)

Katie: yeah and we are getting ready for Christmas in my house in you know my daughter is eight years old and she already has her Christmas list ready

Ellen: **is that written out?**

As can be seen in the example (18) above, the host takes the turn to ask a clarifying question. In other words, Ellen adjusts to the guest's utterance and navigates the guest by asking for clarification. On the one hand, the additional questions posed by the host are also a part of talk-monitoring and the institutional role of the host. On the other hand, an on-the-spot question is a way of adjustment to the co-participant that may have an unpredictable effect on the following turns. Thus, the conversational is embedded in the institutional.

7.1.2 *Self-selection*

The data has shown that although the host-controlled question-answer format is the skeleton of the interaction, there are quite a few spontaneous deviations towards conversational mode and some space for self-selection, especially as regards the celebrity guests in *Ellen*. There can be quite long conversational chunks, exchange of turns between the questions posed by the host that do not necessarily follow "the current selects next" allocation technique.

There are parts which seem to be a natural conversation where the guest and the host self-select rather than the host selects the speaker. The host may just give a topic or comment on a topic she expects the guest to elaborate on or express their opinion and the guest does so at a transition-relevance place. Thus, the guest and the host may occasionally switch their social roles.

(19)

Ellen: well, you should move to this side of the country because I know you are in new york and that's why I never see you on the show but emmm it's cold there

Katie: yes. well, I mean we're kind of in both places because last winter was particularly really freezing

Ellen: california has the best weather this is the place to live ((APPLAUSE)). it's fun. new york is fun for the holidays. I mean the christmas.

Katie: yeah. and we are getting ready for christmas in my house in, you know. my daughter is eight years old and she already has her christmas list ready.

(20)

Ellen: I've always said that all three of them are smart. and ((LAUGHTER)) ehh the smartest boys I've ever met.

Gwen: I think I think you you held zuma when he was only like ten days old.

Ellen: yeah I think zuma and and kingston I think was on the show.

As can be seen in example (19), the host comments on the weather and the guest elaborates

on the topic given. In example (20), the guest continues the topic of her kids introduced by the host by self-selecting and addressing a declarative question to the host with reference to their private experience. Thus, the interactants may briefly turn the host-guest relationship into a conversation of two friends.

The next example (21) demonstrates the interruption of the institutional authority of the host. In other words, the switch to the conversational part is initiated by the guest.

(21)

Ellen: right are you stealing stuff from the set?

Simon: yeah I've got a couple of warehouses full of stuff that I've stolen since the first season and

Ellen: you started ear[ly

Simon: [I haven't stolen anything

Ellen: oh you should I am sure o[ther people would **(a)**

Simon: [what would you take? if you would you take this big wooden ball thing over there? **(b)**

Ellen: no I have wooden balls at home. let's see I don't know I would probably take the dj booth I think that would be a good reminder you know **(c)**

As can be seen in example (21) above, the guest challenges the host by readdressing the question to the host and consequently avoiding answering the question himself. The guest self-selects by interrupting the host's turn (21a) and asking the multiple questions (21b). In this particular case, the guest is the one who selects next. The host accepts the transition initiated by the host and switches the conversational mode (21c).

All in all, the guest switches from his institutional role of respondent and the institutional question-answer format to his real-life self. The guest's self-selection results in a conversational bit between the interactants. Thus, it can be seen that Ilie's (2001: 227) claim that the authority of the host is not absolute finds its confirmation in the analysis.

7.1.3 Transitions

Generally speaking, question-answer sequences are mixed with conversational chunks. Similar to some other specialized but informal interactions, the dialogue between the host and the guest usually involves discernible transitions from question-answer sequences into a more conversational style and the other way around (Drew & Heritage 1992: 39-40). With reference to the analysis conducted, the transitions may either be implicit or expressed explicitly in words.

(22)

Ellen: please welcome my second favourite australian simon baker
 ((APPLAUSE))
 Ellen: you are wearing ellen socks
 Simon: I am
 Ellen: where did you get those? you had them for a whole?
 Simon: no these one I just stole it's from one of the closets back there
 Ellen: that's ok you can take whatever you want
 Simon: good I should take undies too I do love these undies
 Ellen: I know they are good undies. I will give you as many as you want you know I love you like crazy and I am happy to have you **(a)** did you have a good Thanksgiving?

In the following example (22), the transition from the funny opening part into the interview part can be indicated by the question (22a) about Thanksgiving posed by the host. Thus, after having a brief introductory conversation with the guest, the host takes the role of the talk-monitor and selects the speaker to answer the pre-screened question relevant to the season (the same question was posed to both celebrity guests in the same episode).

Unlike the previous example, some transitions are explicit. They are marked by some key phrases used by the host.

(23)

Ellen: you know what's kids love is my holiday cd if you wanna give one of my holiday cds
 ((APPLAUSE))
 Katie: that's what I gonna do this thank you
 Ellen: children love it that' the only holiday album you'll ever need volume one
 Katie: I love it
 Ellen: it's impressive, isn't it? **let's talk about** miss meadows this character is a it's hilarious not judging the book by its cover she is very prim and proper

(24)

Ellen: no I am not gonna sing to you
 Jessica: are you really?
 Ellen: no I am not ((LAUGHTER)) I want to so badly ((LAUGHTER)) **let's talk about** interstellar [...]

(25)

Ellen: you're not gonna get too far with just this amount of water
 Simon: listen I was almost flying
 Ellen: yeah? really?
 Simon: up out of the water by about three inches
 Ellen: **so** you're finishing the mentalist and and is it weird bitter-sweet that it's ending?

In examples (23) and (24), the transition from a conversational chunk to a relevant topic that might even be a part of the promotion of the movie and is linguistically marked by

“let’s talk about”. Similarly, in the example (25), the host waits for the guest to finish his comment and switches back to the main topic of the series that the guest has been starring. In this case, the shift is linguistically marked by “so”.

7.1.4 *Continuers*

The use of continuers, or third-turn responsive questions, is considered a conversational technique that keeps the conversation going (Section 4.3). This conversational technique also matches the institutional function of encouraging the guest to continue their narrative.

(26)

Kerri: =he is in army he’s in special forces

Ellen: **(a)** right

Kerri: so there are guys that wear the green brace and emm

Ellen: **(b)** right

((APPLAUDING))

Kerri: yeah emm it’s a lot what he does it’s really secret and so=

Ellen: =like you don’t know where he is and what he’s doing right now

Kerri: right now I don’t know where he is we call it the woods perfectionally emm so it means that he is off the grids somewhere

Ellen: **(c)** right

Kerri: he’s been in for about ten years and well close to ten years

Ellen: **(d)** aha

Kerri: they’ve got a lot of deployments right now he is training guys to become special forces soldiers

Ellen: **(e)** wow amazing

Kerri: we’re proud of him

Examples (26a) (26b) (26c) (26d) demonstrate that the host uses the so called feedback, or third-turn responsive actions, or continuers, as a part of participatory listenership to keep the conversation going. Since continuers are mostly produced by the host, it may be concluded that they also fulfil an institutional function. Feedback responses might also be used to signal guests that they should continue speaking.

As for example (26e), it may be seen as both a continuer and an expression of admiration, which both contributes to smooth interaction and gives an evaluation of the conversation.

(27)

Laura: well it was amazing actually in that you know cheryl strayed has written the most gorgeous book wild she’s such an incredible beautifully honest author voice [...]

Ellen: that’s fantastic it’s a beautiful story and you’re a beautiful actress. everything you do you’re so authentic and I love watching you act you know that=

Laura:=well no better actress I've ever gotten to work with than ellen degeneres

Similarly, the example above (27) illustrates the lengthy expression of an opinion. Namely, after having listened to the guest's story the host uses her turn to express admiration to the guest and her achievements. The guest self-selects to respond to the compliment by giving a compliment back. Thus, the interactants exchange personal opinions and, consequently, step away from their institutional roles for a moment in favour of their real-life identities.

Despite the fact that continuers and evaluative comments are generally considered conversational features (Section 4.3), it might be assumed that the host switches her real-life self rather than her institutional role to give her assessment. However, it has been noticed that continuers are mostly exploited by the host and might be used to encourage the guest to continue their turn. Thus, the conversational feature is adjusted to the institutional needs and acquires an institutional function.

On the whole, the analysis has shown that the interaction in the talk show is composed of the question-answer sequences and conversational chunks. As a consequence, the turn-allocation technique *the current selects next* tends to be intertwined with *self-selection*. Transitions from the conversational to the institutional can be linguistically discerned and are monitored by the host.

7.2 Repetitions

Generally speaking, the corpus compiled has repetitions made by both the host and the guests. My research has indicated that allo-repetitions are predominant. In terms of position, it has been noted that the majority of repetitions occur in the immediately next turn. In turns of fixity, various types of repetitions are represented. Most importantly, conversational repetitions as well as those that fulfil institutional functions have been found.

7.2.1 Repetition as a confirmative device

In the context of the talk show, allo-repetitions are predominant and may be made by either the guest or the host. The majority of repetitions occur in the immediately next turn and function as confirmation⁵ of the previous utterance. As referred to the taxonomy suggested by Norrick (1994), one of the major repetition types is statement-affirmation. It has been

⁵ Johnstone's (1994) classification also includes emphasis, iteration, clarification

stated earlier that repetition as a confirmation is frequently used in institutional talk. Indeed, the analysis has shown that this particular type of repetition tends to be used by the guests.

(28)

Gwen: they all wanted to come they don't they don't really go to the voice that often but they wanted to come to this. they love you

((APPLAUDING))

Ellen: **they are smart (a)**

Gwen: **they are smart (b)**

As illustrated by example (28), the guest confirms the host's statement by using the exact repetition. In other words, the host's statement (28a) is followed by the affirmation of the exact form (28b). The guest self-selects to repeat the host. The guest's emphasized repetition may also fall under Tannen's (2007: 61) categories of 'providing back-channel response' and 'showing appreciation of a good joke'. Furthermore, humour is considered as one of the major functions of repetitions in an extended multi-party conversation (Tannen 2007: 67-73). Indeed, the host's joke about the guest's children is supported by the guest's repetition. Since the present audience is considered as a ratified but not always addressed participant, it can be concluded that the guest's repetition (28b) is a way of addressing and ratifying the audience. At the same time, the repetition may be interpreted as "right", which is believed to be typical of feedback responses in some institutional settings (Nofsinger 1994: 93). In other words, the conversational device acquires an additional function in the institutionalized setting. Being aware of her institutional role and the features of the institutional setting, the guest uses the repetition to express agreement and add emphasis to the host's humorous statement.

(29)

Ellen: you bought her **a food track (a)**

Jessica: **a food track** it's called seed on the go **(b)**

In example (29a), the host selects the speaker by revealing a negotiated piece of information. The guest takes the turn and repeats the end of the host's utterance (29b). The exact repetition in the immediately next turn after the model shows the guest's confirmation of the information. As can be seen, the repetition is followed by the elaboration on the subject. As noted by Tannen (2007), expansion is one of the motivations behind the use of repetition in a multi-party conversation. Indeed, the guest repeats what the host has said to confirm her statement (29a) and expand it. Thus, the repetition in (29b)

may be considered audience-oriented or audience-ratifying. Similar to the previous extract (28), the confirmative repetition (29b) is also used in place of “yes” or “that’s right”, which tends to be used in some institutionalized settings (Nofsinger 1994: 93). All in all, the repetition (29b) is used to start discussing the negotiated topic introduced by the host and is done so with the awareness of the presence of the studio audience as a ratified participant. It can be concluded that the conversational device (29b) has an institutional function.

(30)

Katie: yeah and we are getting ready for Christmas in my house in you know my daughter is eight years old and she already has her Christmas list ready

Ellen: **is that written out? (a)**

Katie: **it's written out. [...](b)**

As demonstrated by the example (30), the repetend (30a) and the repetition (30b) refer to the question-answer type (Norrick 1994) and the confirmation type (Tannen 2007). The host selects the speaker by asking a yes/no question for clarification and receives a confirmative repetition in the immediately next turn. In other words, the guest makes grammatical alternation to the host’s question (30a) and transforms it into the affirmative statement (30b). In this instance, the repetition (30b) seems to perform a conversational function of saying “yes” (Nofsinger 1994: 93).

In the example below (31), it can be seen that repetition of the repetend (31a) occurs twice and is produced by both the guest and the host. Thus, the extract (31) exemplifies both allo-repetition and self-repetition.

(31)

Gwen: I try but I hardly ever get (a) **I love sleeping** so much but I never get to

Ellen: Isn't that great to sleep?

Gwen: (b) **I love sleeping**

Ellen: (c) **I love sleeping.** sleeping is one of my favourite things to do and I can't nap but I love to sleep I got you something so that you could nap easier i got you the most comfortable chair

In terms of sequential context, the current extract (31) demonstrates both types suggested by Kim (2002). First, repetition (31b) occurs in the third position from the model. Second, repetition (31c) occurs in the immediately next turn with respect to repetition (31b). Thus, both A-B-A type and A-B type are illustrated.

The host poses a question. The guest responds to the question affirmatively by means of the partial repetition (31b) from her previous turn (31a). The host agrees with the guest by

means of the exact repetition (31c), but does so to move to the gift giving, which had been prepared in advance. In other words, the host uses the repetition to elaborate further. Thus, the conversational function of repetition is additionally used for institutional purposes.

On the whole, repetition as a confirmative device is commonly used in a multi-party conversation. Thus, statement-affirmation or question-answer repetitions might be produced for the third party, i.e. the audience.

7.2.2 *Repetition as an emphatic device*

It has been discovered that emphatic repetitions are usually produced by the host. The emphatic repetition performs institutional function of intensifying the message in the context of the talk show.

(32)

Gwen: ((lookig at the photo on the screen)) **oh that's Apollo** ((to the audience))

Ellen: **that's Apollo**

In example (32), the guest self-selects and the host uses the emphatic repetition in the immediately next turn. Here, the guest addresses the audience herself and the host seems to use her authority to intensify and emphasize the information conveyed. In this particular case, the host's repetition is not message-retargeting (Ilie 2001: 227) but message-intensifying. Here, the host's institutional role is exemplified, since the host uses her superior institutional role to intensify the guest's words. Thus, the guest's conversational deviation is re-addressed to the audience by the host.

(33)

Ellen: you can have the water then it feels good

Adria: it does

Ellen: it's fancy

Adria: (a) **in an Ellen mug**

Ellen: (b) **in an Ellen mug**, you take that home

In example (33), we can see the emphatic exact allo-repetition in the immediately next turn. The host repeats the first saying (33a) to emphasize to the audience what has quietly been said and adds some new information on the subject. In this particular case, repetition performs an institutional task of re-emphasizing and retargeting of the utterance. Thus, the host takes her institutional role of mediator to convey the repetend further.

Similar to the repetition as a confirmation device, the emphatic repetition is expected to be

used in a multi-party conversation. Thus, emphatic repetitions by the talk-mediator are a way of ratifying the audience as a third party of the conversation.

7.2.3 *Different types of repetitions in combination*

As for talk-monitoring and talk-mediating, the host may use repetition to link ideas together, make generalizations or even help the speaker to express an idea. In this sense, repetition helps the host exercise her institutional role and exert control over the interaction.

(34)

Ellen: **and you stay at home and take care of them (a)**

Kerri: **I am a stay at home mom (b)**

Ellen: what did you do before?

Kerri: I was a kindergarten teacher and after we had a little one Jackson my teacher salary just couldn't cover to **take care for both (c)**

Ellen: right

Kerri: **so I stay at home and= (d)**

Ellen: **= you stay at home and take care of them (e)**

Kerri: yeah run after them all day long you know

The repetition in the extract above (34) is a complex example of different types of repetitions which illustrates a mixture of conversational and institutional functions. First, the host makes a statement (34a) which gets an affirmative answer in the form of paraphrased repetition (34b). Thus, repetition (34a) and repetition (34b) make a statement-affirmation pair that has a conversational function. In two of the guest's subsequent turns, the guest uses a partial repetition (34c) of the first saying (34a) and a partial repetition (34d) of the first saying (34a) to continue the topic introduced by the host. In the immediately next turn after the guest's last allo-repetition (34d), the host decides to get the floor by means of repeating the model (34a) previously produced by herself and simultaneously completing the guest's turn. On the one hand, the host's statement (34a) and the exact self-repetition (34d) can be seen as an instance of opening/closing self-repetition in Norrick's (1994) classification. On the other hand, self-repetition (34d) may be viewed as confirmation of the host's statement (34a) that has been found in inbetween turns (34b)-(34d). Here, we can see that the repetition (34e) functions as both a closing and a confirmation. Moreover, the host as a talk-monitor helps the speaker to generalize the situation and avoid the guest's unnecessary repetitions. All in all, in the example given, repetition (34d) fulfils an institutional function of talk-monitoring.

(35)

Ellen: emm you you did you are a good person **you rescued a three legged dog**= (a)

Jessica: =or **he rescued me** (b)

Ellen: **he rescued you** (c)

Jessica: yeah

Ellen: **chaplin?** (d)

Jessica: **chaplin** (e)

The excerpt above (35) is also an instance of various repetitions combined. First, the host makes a statement (35a) that is partially repeated (35b) by the guest in the immediately next turn. By means of changing deixis, the guest produces the partial repetition (35b) to give a different emphasis to the host's statement. Apparently, Jessica's emphasis-shifting repetition has not been planned and is made with no regard to the host's privileged position, so the instance (35b) can be considered a conversational device. The guest's repetition (35b) becomes repetend (35b), as it is immediately followed by the emphatic exact repetition (35c) made by the host. It can be assumed that the host's repetition (35c) also serves as an intensifier for the audience and a ratifier of the guest's contribution. Then, Ellen continues the subject by posing an elliptical question (35d). The guest gives the affirmative answer in the form of exact repetition. Thus, the repetend (35c) and the repetition (35d) make a question-answer pair that functions as a conversational device. However, despite the conversational function of the repetition (35d), the repetend (35c) reveals the host's awareness of the given subject and, consequently, the host's institutional role.

As demonstrated by the examples above, repetitions may be exploited in various ways. In other words, this conversational feature may acquire some additional function in the discourse of the talk show.

7.2.4 Repetition as clarification

One of the prominent functions of repetition is asking for clarification which tends to be exercised by the host in talk shows. Generally, the host transforms a phrase into a question either linguistically or intonationally.

(36)

Katie: yeahh ((LAUGHING)) then like then I want **a purple clip**. like it's all very detailed= (a)

Ellen: =**a purple clip for the puppy?** (b)

Katie: yeah

As can be seen in the example above (36), the host transforms the key words of the guest's utterance into the clarification question by repeating them with the addition of 'for the puppy'. By means of the interrogative extended repetition, the host links the guest's idea to one of her previous turns, which is one of the functions of repetition listed by Tannen (2007). In this particular case, it may be assumed that the host asks for clarification for institutional purposes to make it clear to the audience. As far as Schegloff (1997) is concerned, example (36) can be viewed as repair initiated by the other, the so called other-initiated other repair, which tends to be used in an institutional context (Young 2008).

Similar to example (36), excerpt (37) also contains a clarification repetition initiated by the host. In this particular case, an overlap makes the host initiate a repair.

(37)

Ellen: **it's a sweet thing to do it is crazy it is crazy but it is a sweet thing to do** that you care about someone's spirit [oh good for you (S)]

Laura: yes [**crazy-sweet (a)**]

Ellen: **crazy-sweet? (b)**

Laura: yeah

Ellen: You can be **crazy-sweet (c)** [it's not hurting anybody] there's nothing wrong with what you're doing

Ellen produces two self-repetitions 'it is crazy' and 'it's a sweet thing to do' in one turn (37S). The guest combines Ellen's self-repetitions into utterance (37a) which becomes the trouble source turn and the model for the host's subsequent turns (37b) (37c). To repair the overlap and to ask for clarification, the host uses the exact repetition (37b) with interrogative intonation. Other-initiated other repair is used by the host as an institutional representative to avoid threat to negative face. After the successful repair, the host uses her power superiority and expands the model (37a) into (37c) to elaborate on the subject and express her opinion. The sentential expanded repetition (37c) may be viewed as the ratification of the guest's contribution.

It may be seen that the use of some repetitions tends to have an additional function conditioned by the talk show specifics. The host as a mediator usually is the one who self-selects to initiate a repair in order to clarify a troublesome utterance. Thus, this type of conversational device may adjust to an institutional specific of the talk show.

7.2.5 *A dialogue with the audience, or a message-retargeting repetition*

Ilie's (2001: 237) observation about message-retargeting repetitions has found confirmation in the current analysis as well. Despite the fact that the research deals with two-party interviews only, the studio audience as the third party may occasionally be involved in the interaction by the host. In other words, the present audience is also a ratified participant that can occasionally be addressed. As a result, message retargeting repetitions might be a necessary interactional device in the dialogues where the audience is involved.

(38)

Orlando: I think so I don't [know] if I am getting compared to Harry Styles then I [need] a- **what does anyone else think by the way? (Q)** because this is a problem ((SCREAMING, APPLAUDING, THUMBS UP)) **keep the hair?**

(a)

Audience: ((SCREAMING, APPLAUDING, THUMBS UP))

Orlando: keep the hair (b)

Ellen: **keep the hair or cut? (c) keep the hair, yes? (d)**

Audience: ((SCREAMING, SHOWING THUMBS UP))

Ellen: **or or cut the hair? (e)**

Audience: ((APPLAUDING))

Ellen: the majority says **keep the hair (d)** so regardless of what you think **you're keeping the hair (f) ((LAUGHTER)) you must keep the hair (g)** what are you doing for the holidays?

The excerpt (38) above, the guest uses his turn to address the audience with the question (38Q). Since collective reactions of the audience can either provide positive response or negative feedback, the guest poses a reduced yes/no question (38a). After having received the collective response, the guest considers the overall feedback as positive, self-selects and repeats "keep the hair" in the affirmative way. Thus, (38b) is a confirmative self-repetition of the question-answer sequence. The host decides to use her authority and ask the audience herself and retargets Orlando's question to the audience to get more convincing result. Ellen uses the expanded repetition (38c) of the repetend (38a) and expands the first saying (38a) to the declarative question (38d) in the same turn. The host's repetition (38c) and (38d) can also be seen as multiple questions where the second one is more specific and lets the host control the collective response of the audience. After the audience's response the host uses her expansion of the repetition (38c) as a yes/no question, which is the semantic opposite of the model (38a). Then, we can see a series of the host's self-repetitions (38d) (38f) (38g). The repetition (38a) is the exact repetition of the first saying (38a) and the repetitions (38f) and (38g) are its expanded versions used in

different verb forms. The two final repetitions function as a confirmation to the model/question (38a) and an intensifier of the studio audience's response.

Thus, the repetitions presented above are used as question/answer and opening/closing pairs. They fulfil the institutional functions of message-retargeting and involving the present audience in a conversational manner.

To sum up, it has been discovered that the host's and the guest's motivations for repeating are different. The host mainly uses such an interactional device as repetition to emphasize a piece of information uttered by the guest or to ask for clarification. Emphasis is usually made to ratify the guest's contribution and re-convey what has been said to the audience as a third party. So, repetition as emphasis functions both conversationally and institutionally and displays the interplay of the host's social and institutional roles. There are also such instances of the purely institutional use of repetition as message-retargeting and generalizing.

As for the guest, repetition is usually used as an affirmative device or an agreement to the host's statement. It has been indicated that repetitions produced by the guest are affirmative answers to the host's questions or affirmations to her statements. The use of repetitions as confirmation found in the analysis agrees with Nofsinger's (1994) observation. Indeed, it tends to be used as a way of saying "yes" or "that's right". Thus, conversational device acquires an additional function for a participant in an institutionalized discourse.

7.3 The self-referring "we"

It has been discussed earlier in the subchapters on the organization of talk shows (Sections 3.5.1; 3.5.5 and 3.5.7) that due to its multi-staged organization, pre-established setting, overall structure, orientation to an overhearing audience and some degree of asymmetry of relations between the participants the talk show can be defined as an institutional setting. To investigate the host's identity in relation to the institutional organization and audience, one instance of the lexical choice in the monologues and in the dialogues has been analysed.

It has been previously stated that self referring "we" as an indicator of belonging to an organization tends to be used in an institutional setting. Example (39) extracted from the opening monologue presented by the host indicates the demarcation between the audience,

e.g. you, and the talk show as an organization, e.g. we. Similarly, in examples (40) and (41), by using the self-referring “we” the host chooses her institutional role of a representative of the whole production team over her personal identity (Drew & Heritage 1992: 30), since the tasks mentioned would require the team effort.

(39)

Ellen: [...] If more of **you** learn that dance, **we**’ll put together a team we can do like synchronised dancing and **we**’ll have an overhead camera then into () [...]

(40)

Kerri: but I we can’t do so we’ll have some presents under the tree

Ellen: good

Kerri: maybe not the ones they want

Ellen: Right. Well, maybe, maybe not. For you and your husband, I feel like you all should have something. **we** are gonna give you a two thousand dollar nordstorm gift card, so that you can get something for you husband.

(41)

Jessica: oh there's I on the beach ((pointing to the photo on the screen))

Ellen: **we** sent in someone to take a picture ((LAUGHTER)) **we** thought you might be going there and you might talk about it. well you are dressed up to be on the beach

However, it has also been detected that the host uses a different kind of self-referring “we”. In this particular example (42), the host considers herself as one of ordinary people as opposed to an organization that the host refers as “you”. Thus, the host may occasionally desist from her institutional role in favour of her social self.

(42)

Ellen: [...] in case anyone is a is is in the hotel industry and you are watching you know **you** don't have to go crazy like that **we** don't ask for much **we** want like a refrigerator that is big enough to fit more than a can of soda and four grapes that'd be nice for those tiny refrigerators [...].

All in all, the use of the self-referring “we” confirms the institutional identity of the host and her adherence to it. However, the host may occasionally switch from her institutional role to her real-life self and social identity.

7.4 Interruptions and overlaps

Although the talk show is characterised by some degree of asymmetrical power relations, power-oriented, or non-supportive, interruptions are definitely not one of its features. Only one instance of disruptive interruptions is found. However, supportive interruptions and overlaps which function as expressions of solidarity, agreement and cooperation are prevalent. Usually, supportive overlaps are simultaneously terminal overlaps which are mostly produced by the host.

(43)

Ellen: what would you do?

Laura: I roll the window down like oh my god it's such a beautiful day can you believe what an amazing day right? [...] you really seem insane to people

Ellen: yeah

Laura: so I had to shift out of **[that game**

Ellen: **[yeah** you know what it does probably it tries it makes them realize that they are not as crazy as they feel that because you're crazier than them

As illustrated by the excerpt (43) above, the host selects the guest with a wh-question. The guest starts her narrative. After the host's encouraging feedback response "yeah", the guest resumes her turn to give a concluding comment on her story. Since the host understands that the guest has basically finished with her story, she self-selects to express her opinion on the guest's narrative. The host's self-selection causes a terminal overlap with the guest's 'incipient finishing of a turn' (Schegloff 2000: 5). Thus, the host's expression of solidarity with and approval of the guest's actions leads to a short overlap. It may be concluded that supportive overlap (43) might signal the transition from the institutional question-answer chunk to a conversational bit initiated by the host.

(44)

Ellen: and how old is he now he is like (.) **[eight] ?**

Gwen: **[eight].** yeah. that's crazy

As can be seen from the example (44) above, the overlap is caused by the guest's prediction of the end of the host's turn. The host selects the guest by asking the guest a wh-question. Then, the host transforms the wh-question into a declarative question. The guest predicts the end of the host's declarative question and answers the host's question together with the host, which leads to simultaneous talk. It is a form of overlap that might be referred to as chordal (Schegloff 2000: 6). Basically, excerpt (44) may be considered a question-answer sequence with an overlap caused by the guest's early answer. However,

considering a small pause before the overlap and the host's rising intonation, this example may also be viewed as 'collaborative utterance construction' (Schegloff 2000: 5-6). Thus, overlap (44) is a conversational bit that demonstrates the cooperation between the host and the guest. In other words, the host desists from her privileged institutional role and invites the guest to finish her turn. It may be argued that the example given might also be seen as an instance of repetition, where the host's part is the model and the guest's part is the predicted preliminary repetition. Considering some friendly exchanges of the interactants mentioned in the preceding turns and the nature of the overlap, the interactants choose their real-life roles over their institutional roles for a moment.

Similarly, the guest may also intentionally initiate overlaps. As the analysis has shown, guests also tend to express agreement or give supportive comments throughout the interaction process, which often leads to overlaps.

(45)

Ellen: that's I hope everyone is listening to that if you want well-behaved children listen to Adria. she knows they are well-behaved kids. [they get no Ellen] they don't get to watch the show

Adria: [yes, they are]

Here, the host addresses the audience with the tip provided by the guest in previous turns. The guest self-selects to affirm what the host is saying. The guest's utterance overlaps with the host's continuing turn. Thus, the guest takes on her real-life identity and produces a type of feedback response which happens to overlap with the host's utterance.

All in all, the analysis has shown that the interaction has a number of overlaps that illustrate the conversational side of the talk show. It has been indicated that different types of overlaps are represented. Terminal overlaps and feedback overlaps that are usually initiated by the host have been indicated in my database. Also, some "collaborative" overlaps may be encountered. Generally speaking, overlaps may be seen as the interplay between the host's real-life self and the institutional role of mediator of the talk.

8. The Local Structure of *The View*

As has been discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, the interaction process between the guest and the host in talk shows includes various features pertaining to either institutional talk or conversation. The analysis of *The View* is expected to give slightly different results in terms of the co-existence of the conversational and the institutional. Since the talk show in

question has four hosts, it seems reasonable to suppose that the interview should be more institutionalized. To be more precise, there should be two levels of organization: the organization of the interaction between the hosts and the guests and the internal organization among the hosts. The **aim** of the analysis is to explore such features as turn-allocation techniques, overlaps, repetitions in terms of their hybridisation between the institutional and the conversational and compare and contrast the results to the analysis of *The Ellen Degeneres Show*. The functions of the selected features are scrutinized with reference to such discursive features of the tabloid talk show as asymmetry of power relations, multiple audience, role-assumption of participants have been scrutinized.

8.1 Turn-taking and talk-monitoring

8.1.1 *Current selects next*

According to various sources listed earlier (Penz 1996; Gregori-Signes 2000; Ilie 2001) the interaction between the participants of the talk show is mainly expected to take place in the question-answer format and be monitored by the host. As a consequence, the turn-allocation technique “the speaker selects next” must be predominant. Since the talk show in question has four hosts, questions must be pre-planned and pre-allocated among the hosts. Thus, there might be less space for conversational deviations.

Indeed, the analysis has confirmed that the question-answer sequences are predominant in the interaction between the guest and the four co-hosts. It has been indicated that one host usually does the opening and the closing and therefore may be excluded from asking questions. The other hosts have a question or a couple of question to ask. Normally, questions are followed by quite long narrative answers.

(46)

W: I wanted to ask you particularly about the first single shake it off because it's about letting go of negative stuff the people say to you, about you. is there something that really drove you to decide enough with this let's let's really (.)
[shake it off ?

N: shake [it off

Taylor: yeah I think it was the fact that lately I've been spending a lot of time online just ((laughter)) [I've been] because well not in the way you think ((laughter)) [...]

As can be seen in the example above (46), one of the hosts selects the guest by asking a yes/no question. Another host self-selects in order to help her colleague with the name of the song, which leads to an overlap. The guest gives a lengthy answer to the host's question. Despite the fact that a yes/no-question is not expected to be followed by a long response (Penz 1996: 112-126), the guest takes it as a signal to elaborate on the topic. Obviously, the topics are negotiated in advance. The excerpt illustrates that the interactants adhere to their institutional roles of the host and the guest.

8.1.2 Self-selection

There are also instances of self-selection. However, except for one interview, chunks that include self-selection are usually brief and short. As for the hosts, the selection among them seems to be pre-ordered and interventions are rare.

(47)

W: yes yes I think a lot of people think of you as little drew from (word) because-

Drew: we met on the colour purple

W: yes we did. well we met before that. yes

Drew: oh the eighties

((laughter))

Drew: we've known each other forever

W: yeah for really forever [it's kinda] almost almost it's kinda but I wanna show everybody this clip of you because I love it and I love you

As illustrated by the example above (47), while the host is making an introduction to the pre-planned video, the guest self-selects and refers to her friendship with the host. Then, the confirmative response follows from the host. The guest makes two more comments, before the host resumes her turn and finishes the introduction to the clip. As can be seen, the conversational chunk delays but does not change the pre-planned order of the host's action.

Thus, the guest's self-selection leads to a change of footing. The guest chooses her real-life self over her institutional role for a short moment.

8.1.3 Back-channel responses

It is believed that the so called feedback, or third-turn responsive actions, or continuers, is a part of participatory listenership used to keep the conversation going (Section 4.3). This conversational strategy is actively used in the talk show (Linke 1985 cited in Penz 1996: 12). Indeed, the hosts can briefly express their attitude to what is being said.

Similar to *Ellen*, the hosts' feedback responses may be used to encourage the guest to speak or to express agreement with the point made by the guest. It has been noticed that feedback responses tend to come from the host whose question the guest is answering. However, the other hosts may occasionally express their attitude to the matter being discussed by inserting a "right".

(48)

W: darling I'm so glad you're here because there've been terrible awful rumors for years about your mom in tabloids, and you've taken your mom out of the tabloids and made her your mom again. so why do you think people had such a disconnect with terry?

Brooke: I think it's easier to to create a more negative image of somebody. now in the book I don't say that was all untrue though.

W: **right**

Brooke: you know I don't say it's not like I say mommy dearest book, I'm not holding her up on the pedestal, I'm saying that was a complicated woman. we had a complicated relationship. I don't know many mothers and children who don't have complicated relationships.

W: **yeah**

Brooke: emm it's it's a very important relationship and I just wanna people to see both sides of her,

RP: **right**

Brooke: to see how she became terry, and what that meant larger than life. and the highs were very high, and the lows were pretty low and they were dark but she was there was more to her. I think I wanna people at least to be able to appreciate all of it.

W: **yeah**

As demonstrated by the excerpt above (48), the host selects the guest to speak by posing a wh-question, which is considered the least controlling type of questions and, therefore, presupposes a lengthy response. The guest starts her lengthy explanation. Whoopi, the host whose question the guest is answering, facilitates the conversation and expresses her personal agreement with the speaker by inserting three backchannel responses. Also, one of the other hosts also expresses her agreement with the guest. It has been observed that the stopping intonation usually indicates the right place to give a continuer. In other words, the hosts give such feedback responses as "right" or "yeah" between the guest's ideas. Taking into account the fact that the host mentions earlier her friendship with the guest's late mother, it can be concluded that her third-turn responses have a conversational function of expressing her personal attitude to the topic being discussed. Thus, backchannel responses may be viewed as the host's real-life self, especially if they overlap with what the guest is saying. In contrast to *Ellen*, some of the hosts may intentionally withdraw from giving

encouraging minimal feedback not to interfere with the allocated time of one of the other hosts. Thus, it can be seen that even a conversational aspect might be restricted or not fully realized due to the inner dynamics among the hosts. On the whole, judging by third responsive actions, the panel of hosts are constrained by the inner organization between the co-anchors. In other words, when it is their colleague's turn to ask question(s), the other co-hosts should partially desist from the interaction. Thus, institutional character of the interaction in *The View* is stronger.

Another conversational feature embedded in the talk show interaction is an opportunity of expressing an opinion. A host may take a turn to express an attitude or opinion to an issue being discussed. In this particular case, opinions tend to be organized, since free turn-taking among the hosts would violate the pre-established order and their colleague's right to speak.

(49)

RP: **speaking of new york, my home town you have recently moved to.** you said it has been your life long dream
Taylor: I love it here

(50)

R: **listen no one's funnier than you. and you deserve all the success you have.** it's great to see you. steve harvey. fantastic. his show airs weekdays, check your local listing, buy his books, go to his dating site, do everything steve harvey that you can. we'll be right back

As illustrated by the examples above, the host expresses her opinion before switching to her institutional role. In example (49), the host connects the following topic with herself before posing a question and selecting the speaker. In example (50), the host also decides to express her opinion before moving to her institutional task of closing the interview. Thus, due to the fact that there are four hosts, they cannot randomly share their thoughts with each other and, therefore, mostly express their opinion in the turn allocated for fulfilling their institutional task. Thus, the conversational aspect tends to be organized and embedded into the institutional framework of the interaction.

Occasionally, one of the hosts may self-select to express her opinion on the issue being talked about. However, it does not normally happen during an interview but either at the beginning or the end of the interaction or a part of the interaction.

(51)

Taylor: yes that there is not an easy [definition
W: [it's how you feel about yourself before
you can do anything you have to have a positive feel for who you are. no one
completes you. you are already complete so that's what **I love about you.**
((APPLAUDING)) cause you you know I've said it earlier one of the things **I**
love about you you march to your own drama. and that to me is total freedom.
I love it I love it
RO: we're gonna take a break. we'll come back, we'll have more with taylor
swift, so please don't go away ok?

As illustrated by the example above (51), the host self-selects to express her admiration to the guest, which causes overlapping with the guest. Unlike the previous examples, the host's turn does not fulfil any institutional task but only conveys her sympathetic attitude to the guest of the show. It can also be seen that the host repeats herself a few times to intensify her idea. However, as can be judged by the subsequent turn, the host self-selects to give her comment just before the break, so it does not cause any changes in the basic structure of the interaction or interfere with the time of another host. Thus, the host switches her social role in a way that would not affect the institutional structure and order

8.2 Repetitions

8.2.1 *Allo-repetitions*

As compared to *Ellen*, the use of repetition is less frequent, which can be explained by the guests' fewer but longer turns. Moreover, there is no such a big range of types of repetitions in *The View* as there is in *Ellen*. Generally speaking, repetitions are generally used as question-answer or statement-affirmation types, where the guest does the second part of the sequence. In terms of position, it has been noted that the majority of repetitions occur in the immediately next turn. In terms of fixity, there are different types of repetitions represented. Most importantly, conversational repetitions as well as those that fulfil institutional functions have been found.

(52)

N: alright we're gonna get some free advice for the viewers. since you're the
chief love officer at the delightful. you do **the online dating site, right?** (a)
Steve: **the online dating site** (b). it's called delightful, and it's absolutely
wonderful ladies and gentlemen

The excerpt above is an instance of a question-statement sequence. The host selects the guest by posing the declarative question (52a), which also reveals the preparation of the

host. The guest chooses to use the wording of the host and affirmatively answers the question by means of the exact repetition (52b). With reference to the observation by Nofsinger (1994: 93) that, in an institutional setting, repetition as a confirmation tends to be used more often than simple “yes” or “that’s right”, it may be assumed that the institutional role of the guest dominates over his real-life self. Indeed, in ordinary conversation, it would probably sound unnatural to give affirmative answers by repeating the other speaker, unless the speaker has an intention of adding an emphasis to the response. Also, the guest expands on the topic and addresses the audience. Thus, it can be said that this repetition as a conversational strategy is affected by the context of the talk show.

(53)

Kellie: now I first of all I think you’re absolutely wonderful, and I’m so excited just to be in your company, and you’re so beautiful. emm you have a birthday coming up

Drew: I do

GH: **are you excited?** (a)

Drew: **I am so excited** (b) I am gonna be forty. when you grow up and you’re like I just just and growing up it feels like you never gonna get there I just feel I can’t whether I will ever feel like a grownup [...]

Similarly, the example above (53) is a question-statement sequence. As illustrated by the excerpt, the guest host uses her turn to express respect for the guest and makes a statement or a kind of declarative question next. The guest uses the transition-relevance place and confirms the information that have been provided by the host. Then, the host selects the guest by asking a yes/no question (53a) in the immediately next turn. The guest gives the affirmative answer (53b) by partially repeating the host. However, in this particular case, repetition (53b) is not only an affirmative answer to the question but is also serves as an emphatic device. Thus, in this case, it might be difficult to indicate which participant’s role repetition (53b) must be referred to. On the one hand, the intonational stress presumably conveys the guest’s personal attitude to the matter. On the other hand, it is followed by an expansion on the topic introduced by the host, which is one of the motivations of the use of repetition in a multi-party conversation (Section 4.3.1). It might be assumed that excerpt (53) is an example of the interplay between the guest’s institutional role and real-life self.

(54)

W: I’m gonna ask you a dumpy question. someone’s (allured) to the fact that it’s **national cat day** (a)

Taylor: **national cat day (b)** today
 W: **two? (c)**
 Taylor: I have **two cats (d)**
 W: **two cats. (e)** how friendly are they?

The excerpt above contains two examples of repetition. The first sequence is model (54a) and repetition (54b). The host introduces the topic. The guest self-selects to confirm and emphasize the information by means of the expanded repetition (54b). Thus, considering the self-selection and the emphasis, the repetition (54b) may be considered a conversational feature.

The second sequence of repetitions consists of three turns and two repetitions. The host selects the speaker by asking the question (54c). The guest responds with the expanded sentential repetition (54d) of the repetend (54c) in the immediately next turn. Thus, the model (54c) and the repetition (54d) are a question-answer sequence where the interactants adhere to their institutional roles. Then, the host takes the turn and repeats the guest (54e) and asks the next question in the connection with the repetition. Unlike the previous examples, the repetition (54e) cannot be considered part of a statement-affirmation sequence, since the utterance (54c) has previously been confirmed by the guest's repetition (54d). Thus, the host uses the partial repetition of the guest's answer as the introduction to her next question in the immediately next turn. In other words, repetition is motivated by the further expansion. Similar to the previous examples (52) and (53), it might be assumed that the host produces a message-intensifying repetition being aware of the audience as a ratified listener. On the whole, repetition has an institutional function of intensifying and giving an introduction to an expansion on the topic.

8.3 Interruptions and overlaps

Since there is not only the host-guest interaction but also the communication among the hosts, overlaps might be triggered by collaborative efforts of the hosts. Indeed, unlike *Ellen*, a different type of overlaps has been indicated. Supportive, or collaborative, overlaps among the hosts occasionally occur. The hosts tend to help each other to find the right word when one of them is searching for one, which may cause overlaps.

(55)

W: there's I have I have a question I'm supposed to ask you it's a must but I have to ask you this other question so you're in you're doing this show and the

man the wife says what is the thing you would change (.) [about your husband].
 and this woman says ((starts laughing, kneeling))
 RP: [about your husband]

As demonstrated in excerpt (55), the host takes the turn to pose a question. The host makes a brief introduction to the subject-matter of the following question and makes a pause to choose the right wording. Another host self-selects to fill her colleague's pause, which results in simultaneous talking. Thus, the example given falls under Schegloff's (2000: 5-6) category of 'the word search, in which the current speaker-of-record cannot retrieve'.

In this particular case, the overlap also serves as an evidence of the preparation of the hosts and their acquaintance with the topics and the order of topics. Thus, it can be concluded that the overlap is an instance of collaborative effort of two representatives of the institution and, therefore, may have an institutional function.

Similar to *Ellen*, power-oriented, or non-supportive, interruptions are not usually used in *The View*. It can be explained by the fact that the hosts and the guest have the pre-established roles in the talk show and are not supposed to compete with each other. However, there is one instance where the host is trying to stop the guest from talking due to the lack of time.

(56)

W: but the greatest one of the greatest things about this book cause I knew your mom this is yeah this is terry. terry is in here. you wanna know about this girl? who she is?
 B:
 [yeah you all did
 B: this picture there this woman this's sort of [unbelievable beguiling woman somehow made you fall in love with her and you were just heartbroken forever
 W: [we love you] she's fabulous
 fabulous

Here, the host self-selects to give her final comment before moving to the closing part. However, the guest self-selects to add her comment to the book being discussed. The host intentionally starts speaking with the guest to signal the end of the guest's self-selected turn and to move to the closing part. But, after the brief interruption the host still lets the guest finish her self-selected turn. Thus, the guest takes on her real-life role for a moment and gets signalled about the institutional part by means of an overlap.

There is also a number of overlaps of different types which are caused by the specifics of the talk show. "Chordal", or "choral", overlaps (Schegloff 2000: 6) have also been found.

They usually occur between the guest and the hosts at the stage of greetings or congratulations on some achievements⁶. Also, the studio audience may be considered a third-party and their reactions may overlap with the interactants' reactions or utterances. For instance, such a common audience's or host's reaction as laughter may serve as 'an invitation for others to laugh' (Schegloff 2000: 6) and cause result in a simultaneous action.

8.4 Summary of findings

As has been discussed earlier, the host monitors the interaction by selecting the speaker and posing questions to the guest. Although the question-answer sequences are the skeleton of the guest-host interaction, self-selected turns and long conversational chunks have been observed in *Ellen*. Transitions between conversation and institutional talk are achieved either implicitly or explicitly by the host. Unlike *Ellen*, in *The View*, the questions are pre-allocated among the hosts, while the guest's self-selected turns are usually short and brief. In terms of turn-allocation techniques, the host and the guest in *Ellen* have an opportunity to oscillate between the two allocation techniques, *current selects next* and *self-selection*, whereas the hosts in *The View* are supposed to adhere to the pre-established order. Thus, the host and the guest in *Ellen* have more capacity for exercising both non-institutional and institutional roles.

My research has shown that continuers are generally used by the host(s) to encourage the respondents to continue their turn and to express agreement with the guest. The hosts in *The View* do not use encouraging continuers when it is their colleague's turn to interview the guest, but may occasionally use this technique to express strong agreement with the guest. Unlike *Ellen*, the hosts in *The View* also tend to express their opinion in the turn allocated for fulfilling their institutional task. Thus, the hosts do not tend to break their inner organization or interfere with their colleague's part of the interview.

One of the purposes of the analysis is to learn what functions and forms repetition as a conversational device acquires in the context of the talk show. The study has revealed *Ellen* has a wider range of repetition types. Statement-affirmation and question-answer pairs are used as a confirmative device in both *Ellen* and *The View*. The use of statement-affirmation and question-answer sequences shows the participant's awareness of their institutional role. In *Ellen*, emphatic and clarification allo-repetitions acquire an

⁶ Although "choral" overlaps are mentioned in the analysis, I was not able to transcribe all of them.

institutional function of retargeting or intensifying the message for the audience. In *The View*, message-intensifying repetitions have also been observed.

In *Ellen*, overlaps are usually caused by the host's expression of solidarity or the participants' collaborative effort to finish the turn. In *The View*, simultaneous talk may occur between the hosts who try to help their colleague to find the right wording.

To summarize, the analysis of *Ellen* has illustrated that the interaction tends to be intertwined with conversational chunks and has discernible transitions between the two co-existing turn-taking systems. Feedback and terminal overlaps highlight the naturalness of some parts of the interaction. Thus, *Ellen* is an instance of Fairclough's both "mixed" and "embedded intertextuality". *The View* appears to be more institutionalized. Although it has both conversational and institutional features, the conversational part tends to be more organized and ordered and is distinctly embedded in the traditional question-answer format. The interactants have demonstrated awareness of their institutional roles, and they tend to adhere to it to a higher degree. On the whole, *The View* should be referred to as a characteristic example of "embedded intertextuality".

9. Conclusion

Various scholars have approached the talk show from various perspectives. Accordingly, different labels of discourse have been presented. Depending on the approach, the talk show has been viewed either as a subtype of conversation or a subtype of institutional discourse. Ilie (2001) has approached the talk show as an instance of semi-institutional discourse on the basis of a combination of discursive and linguistic features pertinent to the talk show.

This paper set out to investigate whether the label semi-institutional discourse should be applied to the talk show in a corpus compiled of two American talk shows. To achieve this, some basic discursive and linguistic features of conversation and institutional discourse have been singled out. Such aspects as setting, goal-orientation, power asymmetry, multiple identities, and the role of audience have been applied to the analysis. They have in turn been compared and contrasted to the talk show. Two turn-allocation techniques, repetitions and overlaps, have been characterized in both conversation and institutional discourse and, consequently, potential matches and mismatches with the talk show have been predicted.

Indeed, the analysis of *Ellen* has shown that the interaction tends to be intertwined with conversational chunks and has discernible transitions between the two co-occurring turn-taking systems. The use of repetitions in question-answers and statement-affirmation sequences indicates the participant's awareness of their institutional self. The host's emphatic and clarifying remarks in the form of repetition serve as the ratification of the audience as a third party. A great number of overlaps show the talk show strives for natural communication. Having considered all the features analysed, *Ellen's* is an instance of Fairclough's both "mixed" and "embedded intertextuality".

The analysis of *The View* has shown a slightly different dynamics. Since there are four hosts, this talk show has turned out to be more institutionalized. Although it also has both conversational and institutional features, the conversational part tends to be more ordered, limited and organized between the talk-moderators. The participants have demonstrated awareness of their institutional role and tend to adhere to it to a higher degree. On the whole, *The View* should be considered as an instance of "embedded intertextuality" only.

Overall, the label *semi-institutional discourse* appears appropriate and justified on both discursive and linguistic levels. However, some variations in findings are possible due to

the peculiarities of a particular talk show type. Since there are a lot of talk show types and formats, the relation between non-institutionalized and institutionalized features may vary.

10. References

- ABC. 2015. <http://abc.go.com/shows/the-view/episode-guide> (2 Feb. 2015)
- Bell, Allan; Garrett, Peter (eds.). 1998. *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Carbaugh, Donal. 1988. *Talking American: Cultural discourses on Donahue*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Charaudeau, Patrick; Ghiglione, Rodolphe. 1997. *La Parole Confisquée: un Genre Télévisuel: le Talk Show*. Paris: Dunod.
- Cook, Guy. 1992. *The Discourse of Advertising*. London: Routledge.
- Covington, William G. 1999. *Creativity in TV & Cable Managing & Producing*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Danesi, Marcel. (ed.). 2013. *Encyclopedia of Media and Communication*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Drew, Paul; Heritage, John (eds.). 1992. *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional setting*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough, Norman, 1998. *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gallardo-Paúls, Beatriz. 1996. *Análisis Conversacional y Pragmática del Receptor*. Valencia: Ediciones Episteme.
- Goffman, Erving. 1976. "Replies and responses". *Language in Society* 5(3). 57-313.
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goldberg, Julia A. 1990. "Interrupting the discourse on interruptions". *Journal of Pragmatics*. 14. 883-903.
- Gregori-Signes, Carmen. 2000. "The tabloid talkshow as a quasi-conversational type of face-to-face interaction". *Pragmatics*. 10(2). 195-212.
- Guillot, Marie-Noelle. 2008. "Freedoms and constraints in semi-institutional television discussions: the case of mixed format panel discussions". *Journal of Pragmatics*. 40. 179-204.
- Haarman, L. (ed.). 1999. *Talk about shows: La Parola e lo Spettacolo*. Bologna: CLUEB.
- Haslett, Bonniwell Beth. 2012. *Communicating and Organizing in Context: The Theory of Structural Interaction*. New York: Routledge.
- Heritage, John. 1985. "Analyzing news interviews: aspects of the production of talk for an "overhearing" audience". *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. 3. 95-117.

- Heritage, John. 1998. "Conversation analysis and institutional talk: analyzing distinctive turn-taking systems". *Proceedings of the 6th International Congress of IADA (International Association for Dialog Analysis)*, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 3-17.
- Holmes, Janet. 1995. *Women, Men and Politeness*. London: Longman.
- Hutchby, Ian. 2006. *Media Talk: Conversation Analysis and the Study of Broadcasting*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Hutchby, Ian; Wooffitt, Robin. 1998. *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ilie, Cornelia. 1999. "Question-response argumentation in talk shows". *Journal of Pragmatics* 31. 975-999.
- Ilie, Cornelia. 2001. "Semi-institutional discourse: The case of talk shows". *Journal of Pragmatics*. 33(2). 209-254.
- Ilie, Cornelia. 2006. "Talk shows". In Keith Brown (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. (2nd edition). Oxford: Elsevier, 489-494.
- International Movie Data Base*. 1990-2014. <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0379623/> (1 Nov. 2014).
- Itakura, Hiroko. 2001. 'Describing conversational dominance'. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 33. 1859-1880.
- Johnstone, Barbara (ed.). 1994. *Repetition in Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
- Kim, Haeyoon. 2002. "The form and function of next-turn repetition in English conversation". *Language Research*. 38(1). 51-81.
- Kong, Rui; Su, Ting. 2014. "An analysis of conversation structure in Ellen Show". *Studies in Literature and Language*. 9 (2). 37-42.
- Labov, William; Fanshel, David. 1977. *Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Linke, Angelika. 1985. *Gespräche im Fernsehen. Eine diskursanalytische Untersuchung*. Bern: Verlag Peter Lang.
- Liu, Hugo. 2004. *Conversational structure analysis*. Beijing, China: Peking University press.
- Livingstone, Sonia; Lunt, Peter. 1994. *Talk on Television*. London: Routledge.
- Mason, Ian (ed.). 1999. *Dialogue Interpreting. Special Issue of The Translator* 5(2), Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

- Mühlen, Ulrike. 1985. *Talk als Show. Eine linguistische Untersuchung der Gesprächsführung in den Talkshows des deutschen Fernsehens*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag.
- Munson, Wayne. 1993. *All Talk: The Talk Show in Media Culture*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Musburger, Robert B.; Kindem, Gorham. 2005. *Introduction to Media Production. The Path to Digital Media Production*. (3rd edition). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Nofsinger, Robert E. 1994. "Repeating the host: an interaction use of repetition by guests on televised episodes of computer chronicles". In Johnstone, Barbara (ed.). *Repetition in Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex. 84-95.
- Norricks, Neal. 1987. "Functions of repetition in conversation". *Text* 7. 245-264.
- Norricks, Neal. R. 1994. "Repetition as a Conversational Joking Strategy". In Johnstone, Barbara (ed.). *Repetition in Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex. 15-28.
- Penz, Hermine. 1996. *Language and Control in American TV talk shows: an Analysis of Linguistic Strategies*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Pomerantz, Anita; Fehr, Beverly. 1997. 'Conversational analysis: an approach to the study of social action as sense making practices'. In van Dijk, Teun Adrianus (ed.). *Discourse Studies: a Multidisciplinary Introduction*. London: Sage, 64-91.
- Price, John. 2003. *Media Studies*. Cheltenham: Nelson Thornes.
- Quaglio, Paul. 2009. *Television Dialogue: The Sitcom Friends vs. Natural Conversation*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Ribeiro, Branca Telles; Hoyle Susan M. 2009. "Frame analysis". In Brisard, Frank; Östman, Jan-Ola; Verschueren, Jef (eds.). 2009. *Grammar, Meaning and Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Robinson, Jeffrey D. 2006. "Soliciting patients' presenting concerns". In Heritage, John; Maynard, Douglas W. (eds.). *Communication in Medical Care: Interaction between Primary Care Physicians and Patients*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 22-47.
- Sacks, Harvey; Schegloff, Emanuel; Jefferson, Gail. 1974. "A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation". *Language*. 50(4). 696-735.
- Scannell, Paddy. 1998. "Media-Language-World". In Bell, Alan; Garrett, Peter (eds.). *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell, 251-267.

- Schegloff, Emanuel. 1996. "Turn organization: one intersection of grammar and interaction". In Ochs, Elinor; Schegloff, Emanuel; Thompson, Sandra (eds.). *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 52-133.
- Schegloff, Emanuel. 2000. 'Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation'. *Language in Society*. 29. 1-63.
- Schegloff, Erving. 1997. 'Practices and actions: boundary cases of other-initiated repair'. *Discourse Processes*. 23. 499-545.
- Tannen, Deborah. 2007. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. (2nd edition). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ten Have, Paul. 1999. *Doing Conversation Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Tennant, Thomas. 2014. "The View". <http://talkshows.about.com/od/theview/a/ViewOverview.htm> (28 Nov. 2014).
- Thornborrow, Joanna. 2002. *Power Talk: Language and Interaction in Institutional Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Thornborrow, Joanna. 2007. "Narrative, opinion and situated argument in talk show discourse". *Journal of Pragmatics*. 39. 1436-1453.
- Timberg, Bernard. M; Erler, Robert J. 2002. *Television Talk: A History of the TV Talk Show*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Tolson, Andrew. 2001. "Talking about talk: The academic debates". In Tolson, Andrew (ed.). *Television Talk Shows: Discourse, Performance, Spectacle*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 7-30.
- Weebly. "The structure of the show". <http://degenerous.weebly.com/structure.html> (5 Nov. 2014).
- Wikipedia. *The Free Encyclopedia*. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_View_%28U.S._TV_series%29 (5 Nov. 2014).
- Young, Richard. 2008. *Language and Interaction*. London and New York: Routledge.

11. Appendix

Table 4

.	A full stop indicates a stopping intonation
,	A comma shows a continuing intonation, like enumerating or reading from a list
?	A question mark points a rising intonation
=	Equal signs indicate no gap between the lines; it is placed at the end and beginning of the two consecutive turns
[	A single left bracket indicates the beginning of overlap
]	A single right bracket indicates the point where an overlap ends
(word)	Parenthesized words indicate dubious hearings
()	Empty parentheses are used to indicate the untranscribed word that the analyst was not able to hear
(())	Double parentheses contain the reactions of the studio audience or other relevant contextual comments and descriptions. In this particular study uppercase in double parentheses indicates the loud reactions of the studio audience, whereas lowercase describes the reactions of the host/hosts or relevant situational information
<u>word</u>	Underscoring is used to indicate some form of emphasis
WORD	Uppercase letters indicate loud reactions of the studio audience
word	Bold font is used to highlight the utterances that are scrutinized
[...]	Three dots in brackets indicate that some part of the transcript has been omitted in order to avoid redundancy and irrelevance
(.)	A dot in parentheses indicates a very small gap within utterances

Table 5

Hosts	Abbreviations
Whoopi Goldberg	“W”
Nicole Wallace	“N”
Rosie Perez	“RP”
Rosie O’Donell	“RO”
A guest host	“GH”
One of the hosts whose utterance cannot be placed	“H”

12. Abstract

Tabloid talk shows have become popular due to their proximity to ordinary people and their availability in terms of content. The talk show is not constrained by topics that would require professional knowledge. As Ilie has pointed out (2001: 215), the talk show has turned into ‘a modern Anglo-Saxon version of socio-cultural settings for conversation occurring in semi-institutionalized socio-cultural practices’. Ilie (2001) has presented the talk show as a hybrid of conversational and institutional discourse and introduced the label *semi-institutional discourse*.

This research has studied the tabloid talk show as an instance of mixed discursive type that combines features related to both institutional and conversational discourse. The aim of the research is to investigate some essential turn-taking aspects and the reflection of the selected discursive features in the turn-taking system of the selected talk shows. To elucidate the conversational and institutional sides of the talk show, such discursive aspects as asymmetrical power relations, role-shift and overhearing audience and such linguistic aspect as turn-taking have been chosen. The theoretical part of the research is dedicated to the discussion of the discursive aspects and the peculiarities of turn-taking in the talk show. In the empirical part, the co-existence of conversation and institutional talk is explored on the basis of turn-allocation techniques and the functions of repetition and overlaps, with reference to the corpus consisting of the transcripts of two tabloid talk shows, *The Ellen DeGeneres Show* and *The View*. The illustrative excerpts extracted from the selected talk shows have been subjected to conversation analysis and compared and contrasted to each other.

The analysis has shown that *The View*, the talk with with four co-hosts, is more institutionalized and is as an example of Fairclough’s “embedded intertextuality”. Although it has both conversational and institutional features, the conversational side tends to be more ordered and organized among the talk-moderators. The other talk show, *The Ellen DeGeneres Show*, with only one host has more conversational freedom and, therefore, might be treated as an instance of both “mixed” and “embedded intertextuality”.

13. Zusammenfassung

Talkshows wurden wegen ihrer Nähe zu den ordinären Menschen und ihrer Verfügbarkeit in Bezug auf den Inhalt populär. Die Talkshow schränkt Themen ein, die Fachkenntnisse erfordern würden. Wie Ilie darauf hinwies (2001: 215) hat sich die Talkshow zu „einer modernen angelsächsischen Version soziokultureller Einstellungen für Gespräche die in semi-institutionalisierter soziokulturellen Bräuchen vorkommen' verwandelt. Ilie (2001) hat die Talkshow als Kombination von Konversation und institutionellen Diskurs vorgestellt und führte das Label semi-institutionellen Diskurs ein.

Diese Forschung untersuchte die Talkshow als Instanz von einer Mischung diskursiver Art, das die Eigenschaften von institutionellen und dialogbezogenen Diskursen in Verbindung setzt. Das Ziel der Forschung ist es, einige wesentlich abwechselnden Aspekte und die Reflexion der ausgewählten diskursiven Eigenschaften des Sprecherwechsels in den ausgewählten Talkshows zu ermitteln. Um die Konversation und institutionellen Seiten der Talkshow aufzuklären wurden diskursive Aspekte als asymmetrische Machtbeziehungen, Rollenwechsel und das Mithören des Publikums und der sprachliche Aspekt wie Sprecherwechsel ausgesucht. Der theoretische Teil der Forschung wurde für die Diskussion der diskursiven Aspekte und die Besonderheiten des Sprecherwechsels in der Talkshow zugeordnet. Im empirischen Teil wird die Koexistenz vom Gespräch und institutionelle Diskussion auf der Grundlage der wechsel-Zuordnungstechnik und die Funktionen der Wiederholungen und Überschneidungen erforscht, unter Bezugnahme auf den Korpus, bestehend aus den Niederschriften von zwei Talkshows, *The Ellen DeGeneres Show* und *The View*. Die veranschaulichen Auszüge die von ausgewählten Talkshows extrahiert worden sind, wurden einer Konversationsanalyse unterzogen und verglichen.

Die Analyse hat gezeigt, dass *The View*, das Gespräch mit vier Co-Gastgebern, mehr institutionalisiert als zum Beispiel Fairclough's „eingebetteter intertextualität“. Obwohl es interaktive und institutionelle Merkmale hat, die Seite der Konversation neigt dazu, geordneter und organisierter unter den Talk-Show Moderatoren zu sein. Die andere Talkshow, *The Ellen DeGeneres Show* mit nur einem Host, hat mehr Gesprächsfreiheit und daher könnte es als ein Beispiel für beide "gemischt" und eingebetteter Intertextualität" betrachtet werden.

14. Curriculum Vitae

Name: Ilona
Familiennamen: Koroljova
Heimort: Tallinn, Estland
Staatsbürgerschaft: Estland (EU)

Schulbildung

1997-2009

Lasnamae Russisches Gymnasium (Tallinn, Estland)

Ausbildung

2009-2012

Universität Tallinn

Berufsqualifikation: Baccalaureus Grad in Geisteswissenschaften

2012-20**

Universität Wien

Fakultät: English Language and Linguistics, MA.

Tätigkeiten

2010-2011

Vihasoo Noortekeskus,
Koordinatorin der Freiwilligengruppen der Ausländer

Weiterbildung

2009-2011

Jugendaustausch in Italien, Deutschland und Türkei, ESW – Youth Vision

Sprachkenntnisse

Russisch
Estnisch
Englisch
Deutsch
Portugiesisch

Muttersprache
Zweitsprache
Akademisch
Stufe –B2, Universität Tallinn
Stufe A1-A2

EDV-Kenntnisse

MS-Office

Gute Kenntnisse