

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE  
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv  
Institute of Philology  
Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication

**TALK SHOWS IN TERMS OF CONVERSATIONAL ANALYSIS**

*Master's Thesis*  
*written by the 2<sup>nd</sup> year student*  
*of master's programme*  
*“Modern English Communication*  
*and Translation and Two*  
*Western European Languages”*  
*Field of science – 03 “Humanities”*  
*Specialty – 035 “Philology”*  
**Vasko Iryna Anatoliivna**

Supervised by:  
Neborsina Nataliia Pavlivna, PhD

«Допущено до захисту»

Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології  
та міжкультурної комунікації

Протокол № 11 від 24.05.2021

Завідувач кафедри \_\_\_\_\_ проф. Бєлова А.Д.

Kyiv 2021

## CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1. CONVERSATIONAL ANALYSIS AS A MAJOR APPROACH FOR SPOKEN DISCOURSE.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.1. Spoken discourse, its types, features and methods of analysis .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.2. Theoretical basis for conversational analysis and its basic notions .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>1.2.1. Turn-taking .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>1.2.2. Adjacency pairs and preference organization .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>1.2.3. Repair .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>1.3. Talk show as an example of semi-institutional discourse.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 1 .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2. TURN-TAKING AND REPAIR STRATEGIES IN BRITISH AND AMERICAN TALK SHOWS WITH TWO AND MULTIPLE PARTICIPANTS.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>2.1. Turn-taking strategies .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>2.2. Overlap in turn-taking.....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>2.3. Types of repair strategies .....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 2 .....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>CHAPTER 3. ADJACENCY PAIRS IN BRITISH AND AMERICAN TALK SHOWS WITH TWO AND MULTIPLE PARTICIPANTS.....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>3.1. Types of adjacency pairs .....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>3.2. Preference structure of adjacency pairs .....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>3.2.1. Preferred adjacency pairs .....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>3.2.2. Dispreferred adjacency pairs.....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>3.3. Extension of adjacency pairs.....</b>	<b>91</b>

**CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 3 ..... 98**

**CONCLUSIONS..... 100**

**REFERENCES ..... 103**

**ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL..... 111**

**APPENDIX ..... 112**

## INTRODUCTION

Communication studies in modern linguistics are represented by methodologically and theoretically diverse approaches, linguistic schools and individual studies aimed at a comprehensive description and characterization of communication in specific and standard communicative situations taking into account social, cultural, psychological, psychological, cognitive and ethical factors. Conversational analysis, in particular, is one of the main approaches used for the analysis of a non-abstract social interaction in spoken discourse.

The methodological basis of the research includes the principles of conversational analysis of ordinary conversation and institutional discourse, formulated by Sachs [65], [66], Schegloff [67], [68], [69], Drew and Heritage [24], [25], Seedhouse [78], [79], [80], Sidnell [82], Hutchby and Wooffitt [45], [46] etc. The research also uses the system of speech coding proposed by Jefferson [48].

In the Ukrainian academic literature, there are practically no studies of the communicative situation in talk shows in the perspective of conversational analysis. Very little has been written about the method itself. However, the works by O.M. Mramornova [6], L.M. Matiuk and O.O. Selivanova [7] may be mentioned. Russian literature is also poorly represented and is mainly focused on theoretical aspects of the method. These are the works by O.T. Isupova [1], A.M. Korbut [2] and A.M. Ulanovsky [8]. There also are no monographs or textbooks on conversational analysis found both for Ukraine and Russia.

**The topicality of the research** is due to the general focus of modern linguistics on the analysis of various types of discourse, in particular, spoken one, as well as the insufficient level of analysis of communicative interaction in television talk shows in terms of conversational analysis. An important factor is the need to obtain scientifically reliable results on the peculiarities of the structural organization of interaction in terms of conversational analysis in the American talk show *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy*

*Fallon* with two participants and the British talk show *The Graham Norton Show* with multiple participants.

**The novelty of the work:** so far there was no analysis of the aforementioned English and American talk shows with two and multiple participants conducted in terms of conversational analysis, both in Ukraine and abroad.

**The aim of the research:** to study the structural organization of speech interaction in British and American talk show in terms of conversational analysis.

**Research objectives:**

- consider the types of oral discourse, establish its main features and methods of analysis;
- distinguish the main aspects of conversational analysis as one of the main methods of analysis of oral dialogic discourse;
- identify ‘talk show’ as an example of semi-institutional discourse;
- consider the features of the structural organization of interaction in British and American talk shows with two and multiple participants in practice, namely define turn-taking and repair strategies, types of overlap, as well adjacency pairs used by the participants of both talk shows;
- determine whether different numbers of participants affect the structural organization of communication in the analyzed talk shows.

**The object of the research:** British and American talk shows, in particular, a British talk show *The Graham Norton Show* and an American talk show *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*.

**The subject of the research:** structural features of the organization of speech interaction in the situation of talk show, namely turn-taking and repair strategies, overlap, adjacency pairs and preference organization typical for British and American talk shows with two and multiple participants.

**The corpus** consists of 14 segments of interviews, 7 of which are taken from the British talk show *The Graham Norton Show* and 7 from the American talk show *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*. The corpus of data studied is based on the videotape recording and transcription of the analyzed talk shows. The total examined interviewing time is 48 minutes and 14 seconds and 48 minutes and 23 seconds for *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy* and *The Graham Norton Show* respectively.

**Research methods** were chosen in accordance with the aim and objectives of the research. The bibliographical research method was used to study the appropriate scientific sources relevant to the research, the method of analysis of vocabulary definitions was used to clarify the linguistic terms and concepts outlined by the subject of the study; the method of conversational analysis was used for the examination of the structural organization of interaction in the analyzed talk shows. The method of quantitative calculations was utilized to classify the received data.

**The practical significance:** The obtained theoretical and practical results can be used for further research in the field of conversational analysis, as well as in the educational process to study the structural organization of spoken dialogic interaction. The theoretical material presented in the work can be also used in the study of the methodology and methodology of sociological research, sociolinguistics and ethnomethodology.

**The structure** of the research is determined by the scientific logic, the aim of the research and its objectives. The work consists of an introduction, 3 chapters, conclusions, references and appendices. The first chapter is theoretical, while the second and the third are concerned with the practical analysis of the material.

## **CHAPTER 1. CONVERSATIONAL ANALYSIS AS A MAJOR APPROACH FOR SPOKEN DISCOURSE**

### **1.1. Spoken discourse, its types, features and methods of analysis**

Discourse analysis can be defined as the study of language in use [27], [29]. There are numerous approaches to classifying discourse based on different criteria, but the distinction between spoken and written discourse is generally accepted. This type of distinction is associated with the method of communicative transaction: spoken discourse is believed to be carried out through an acoustic channel, while written discourse is transmitted through a visual one [18, p. 33]. The difference in the channel of information transmission is fundamentally important because the generation and understanding in spoken discourse occur simultaneously, and in written vice versa. Moreover, the speed of writing is much slower than the speed of oral speech and therefore, written discourse is characterized by more complex syntactic structures, while spoken one tends to the opposite.

It should be noted that the simultaneous nature of spoken discourse and its acoustic transition complicated the process of spoken discourse examination for quite a long time and most systematic study of language in the West focused on the written language [17, p. 383]. It is only after the 1970s with the advent of various technical recording equipment and the creation of special software that it became possible to conduct a multilateral systematic analysis of different kinds of data in general and spoken discourse in particular.

In addition to the transmission channel, three other major parameters differentiate spoken discourse from the written one. These are preparation, contextualization, and formality. Speech is more likely than writing to be spontaneous, contextualized, and casual, moreover, it is more reciprocal [94, p. 165]. Cutting marks that the main difference between the spoken and written language is that written language is a polished and revised product, while spoken one reflects the process of speech construction. However, the distinction between written and spoken discourse is not that simple since “there is a

cline from spontaneous spoken discourse (unplanned and semi-planned) to non-spontaneous spoken discourse (semi-scripted or scripted) to spontaneous written discourse (unplanned and semi-planned) to non-spontaneous written discourse (polished scripts)” [21, p. 155]. As a result, the following discourse types can be differentiated:

- spontaneous spoken discourse: unplanned and semi-planned;
- non-spontaneous spoken discourse: semi-scripted or scripted;
- spontaneous written discourse: planned or semi-planned;
- non-spontaneous written discourse [21, p. 155].

In this paper, the subtypes of only spoken discourse will be considered in more detail because it is in the centre of our focus.

Taking into consideration spontaneous spoken discourse, it should be noted that it is often unplanned since speakers do not plan their responses but do so in the process of conversation. The most typical type of unplanned spoken discourse is casual conversation, the examples of which are gossip, informal chat or conversation over the phone between friends.

Informal conversation is the most common form of spoken language. Hughes, for example, notes that “the vast bulk of spoken material is spontaneous, face-to-face, informal conversation” [43, p. 13]. Leech defines conversation as “by far the most typical and frequently encountered variety both of spontaneous speech and of spoken discourse in general” [49, p. 719]. Furthermore, casual conversation is a basic human interaction in which people are engaged on a regular basis, and it is essential for the formation and maintenance of human relationships [83, p. 82].

One of the most defining features of conversation is that it takes place in a shared context; it also can be characterized as informal; interactive; and interpersonal. Moreover, it often contains expressions of attitudes, thoughts, wishes, feelings, and judgements [89, pp. 8–25]. The more interactive the conversation is, the more control speakers have over topic development, words selection and the course of the conversation.

Spoken discourse can also be semi-planned, i.e. speakers form ideas about what they are going to say in advance. This category includes complex conversations that need either rehearsed or carefully chosen words. The examples are serious conversations between parents and children; marriage proposals; job interviews; some public speeches; interactive learner-centred classes, etc. [21, pp. 156–157].

The spontaneous spoken discourse will be analysed in this paper.

The next distinctive type of spoken discourse is non-spontaneous. Its subtype semi-scripted spoken discourse resembles a semi-planned one in a way that some words are pre-planned; however, they are not spoken but written down. It allows some amount of creativity therefore it is different from the scripted discourse. Semi-scripted spoken discourse presupposes that speakers use certain basic formulas, i.e. utterances that are repeated in different conversations and can be guided by some notes. For example, if the lecturer uses a PowerPoint presentation or the TV host has some written notes, it is semi-scripted.

Scripted spoken discourse is quite similar to written discourse with the only difference that written words are read aloud. Examples of this type of discourse include recorded telephone messages, TV or radio news reports, films, plays, lectures or speeches that are read out, etc. They belong to the spoken discourse since they are supposed to be heard, listeners can receive some additional information through intonation and stress, moreover, there is a possibility of different types of disfluencies (e.g. mispronunciation, stumbling, repetition of certain words, etc.) [21, p. 157].

Since there are different subtypes of spoken discourse it is quite hard to differentiate its universal distinctive features. Moreover, borders of these subtypes are not distinct but rather blurred.

The other factor that does not facilitate the process of spoken discourse characterization is that there is no unified terminological basis. There are different classifications of spoken discourse proposed by various researchers, for example, Biber et al. [12], Cutting [21], Thornborrow and Slade [89], Carter and McCarthy [57] and Huddle-

ston and Pullum [42]. All of these classifications differ in terms of naming variations. In this paper, the classification proposed by Cutting will be considered since it is the newest and most systemized. The researcher differentiated lexical, syntactical and disfluency features typical for spoken discourse:

### 1. The lexical features include:

- **Vague words**

- **general nouns** that include superordinate nouns that are semantically empty and dependent on the context for meaning;
- **general noun clusters** which are fixed vague expressions;
- **general verbs:** these are superordinate verbs (e.g. do or happen) that are empty-semantically and dependent on the context for meaning;
- **general extenders** that include vague endings;
- **vague quantifiers** that are non-specific expressions of quantity.

- **Informal words:**

- **short names** which include nicknames and informal forms of address;
- **delexical verbs:** common verbs (e.g. give, have, make) used in noun combinations to describe actions;
- **basic adjectives and adverbs:** high-frequency adjectives and adverbs used in everyday conversation;

- **Interactional word chunks:**

- **discourse markers:** words that mark boundaries between topics and stages, these are words to indicate opening, closing, or sequencing;
- **fillers and hedges:** words and sounds that fill pauses or mark hesitation;
- **communication checks, confirmations and backchannels:** expressions that keep the channel of communication open, ;
- **expressions of politeness:** different forms of polite address.

### 2. The syntactical ones include:

- **Vague references:**

- **indefinite pronouns;**
- **deixis:** determiners ('this', 'those', 'here', 'then') and personal pronouns ('I', 'we', 'him', 'us') pointing to a referent in the situational or background context;
- **general noun clauses:** vague expressions that are empty-semantically.
- **Incomplete utterances:**
  - **initial clausal ellipsis:** omission of subject and/or verb;
  - **stand-alone subordinate clauses:** subordinate clause expressed as a separate utterance;
  - **unfinished utterances:** with the omission of the end of the utterance;
- **Informal grammar**
  - **short clauses:** joined by 'and', 'but', 'then' and 'because'.
  - **headers:** fronted adjuncts, objects and complements or noun phrases before the pronoun;
  - **tails:** noun or prepositional phrases cohering with the pronoun, after the clause;
  - **vernacular grammar:** systematically used spoken grammar that breaks written grammar rules.

### 3. The disfluency features are:

- **repetitions;**
- **recasting** which includes repairs and reformulations in the middle of the utterance;
- **pauses** which are unfilled hesitations of half a second or more;
- **overlaps** which include the simultaneous speech of two and more speakers;
- **interruptions** which can be identified as a simultaneous speech when the first speaker does not complete their utterance [21, p. 158–160].

Though initially these features were thought to be representative for only unplanned spoken discourse, later it has been found that they are typical for all kinds of

spoken discourse. However, the least planned the spoken discourse is, the more aforementioned features mentioned above will be found in it.

Discourse analysis, being a young discipline, is very heterogeneous, and there is no single approach shared by all specialists in discourse. The approaches to the analysis of written and spoken discourse also differ. Spoken discourse can be analysed from several theoretical perspectives. These include:

- systemic-functional linguistics;
- exchange structure theory;
- **conversation analysis** (on which this paper is concentrated);
- pragmatics;
- critical discourse theory.

**Systemic-functional linguistics** (devised by Halliday) provides a great insight into spoken discourse since one of its concerns is the description of differences and similarities between spoken and written language. It also provides a language model that accentuates the socially functional nature of language and explains how lexical and grammatical choices that speakers make are connected with the cultural and social contexts in which language is used [35, pp. 22–24].

Although pieces of connected spoken discourse can be transcribed as a static text, spoken interactions between people are not static. The use of language in the spoken discourse can be characterized as unfolding and dynamic. The **exchange structure theory** provided by Berry allows analysing the dynamic moves made by speakers during interactions. The conversation is seen as a series of moves Berry [11, pp. 135–139]. Therefore, spoken discourse within this method is analysed in terms of how series of conversational moves are structured and executed.

**Conversation analysis**, according to Burns et al., is associated with the North American discourse analysis tradition [15, p. 18]. It is concerned with conversational norms and patterns that emerge as an interaction unfolds. The main objective of the CA is to show the orderliness of conversation in relation to the participants' sociolinguistic

competence and reasoning. It can be achieved with the help of various micro-structural patterns such as turn-taking procedures, adjacency pairs, repairs, different types of sequences and preference organization. A detailed analysis of CA will be provided in the next chapter. However, it should be noted that the emergence of CA in the 1970s gave a powerful impetus to the analysis of spoken interaction.

**Pragmatics** is concerned with how context contributes to meaning and analyses the intentions and meanings of speakers in different social settings of language interactions based on various situational contexts [52]. Pragmatics encompasses the speech act theory of Austin and Searle, the conversational maxims of Grice and his cooperation principle, conversational implicature, politeness etc.

**Critical discourse analysis** states that language use is not neutral but is determined by differences in the speakers' age, race, gender, world views, social purposes, intentions, educational level, etc. Discourse, spoken one, in particular, is treated as a form of social practice. It is understood through social structures that both shape it and are shaped by [15, p. 22–23].

All the aforementioned theoretical approaches provide different perspectives on the analysis of spoken discourse. However, the analysis in this paper will be conducted in terms of conversation analysis.

## **1.2. Theoretical basis for conversational analysis and its basic notions**

Conversation analysis is an area of study that examines the practices and competencies on which the organization of social interaction is based. In spite of its name, CA is concerned not only with the conversation, but also with all forms of spoken discourse including ordinary conversations between friends and acquaintances (Atkinson and Heritage [9]; Lerner [50]; Schegloff [71]; Drew and Heritage [24]), institutional interactions in medical, educational, mass media, social or legal contexts (Boden and Zimmerman [13]; Drew and Heritage [23]; Arminen [8]; Richards and Seedhouse [78]; Gardner [28]), monologic interactions such as, for instance, lectures and speeches, and also tech-

nologically complex interactions such as web-based multiparty communication (Meredith [58], Licoppe and Morel [54]; Reeves, Greiffenhagen and Laurier [61]). Though initially CA was used to study only oral spontaneous and interactive discourse, however, its scope was gradually expanded.

Hutchby and Wooffitt define CA as the “systematic analysis of talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction” [44, p. 11]. According to Ilie, CA deals with the way “talk is structured and socially organized through the interactants’ joint coordination” [46, p. 213]. Sidnell notes that CA “aims to describe, analyze and understand talk as a basic and constitutive feature of human social life” [82, p. 1].

CA as a separate field of linguistic studies was developed in the 60s and 70s of the XX century by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson as a “naturalistic observational discipline that could deal with the details of social action rigorously, empirically and formally” [66, p. 289]. The method is also rooted in ethnomethodology that allows it to be used for the examination of any kind of human action [79, p. 13]. However, CA is based on a specific set of procedures and principles that deal only with actions that are manifested through talk. It should be noted that non-verbal communicative means are not excluded if the analysis is based on video recordings.

According to Seedhouse, the basic principles of CA can be defined the following way:

- Talk-in-interaction is a principal means for accomplishing social actions. It is also a generally accepted term used to refer to the object of CA [23, p. 4].
- Contributions to interaction are context-shaped and context-renewing, that is, they can be adequately understood only in a specific environment. Moreover, talk-in-interaction is produced in specific interactional contexts, and this context defines to a large extent the way people talk.
- Talk and interaction are structurally organized. There is an order at all points of interaction. Systematic patterns and structures can be found in any means that people use

to interact. As Heritage notes, “No order of detail can be dismissed a priori as disorderly, accidental or irrelevant” [41, p. 241].

- Analysis is data-driven and bottom-up, i.e. no prior theoretical assumptions should be made before the analysis of the data [77; 166–67].

It is worth adding the methodological principles of CA formulated by Heritage and Clayman. The researchers noted that first, the ordinary conversation is the central domain for analysis through its practices can be represented in institutional contexts; second, the best way to analyse talk is by looking at recordings of naturally occurring interaction, these recordings serve as the empirical basis for the analysis and third, participants of social interaction tend to organize communication structurally, though this sequential organization is not determined by any motivational, psychological, and sociological factors [82; 20–33]. Drew and Heritage emphasize that the most characteristic feature of CA, which distinguishes it from the other methods to study discourse, is its focus on participants’ understanding of each other’s behaviour [23; 17].

Schegloff et al. note that it is possible to distinguish two types of CA: first, ethnomethodological conversation analysis that is concerned with the study of ordinary conversation and is associated with the works of such authors as Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson and Pomerantz and second, CA in a broad sense that includes both “the study of talk and other forms of conduct (including the disposition of the body in gesture, posture, facial expression, and ongoing activities in the setting) in all forms of talk in interaction” [69, p. 3]. It should be noted that CA emerged from ethnomethodology as the study of the social organization of ordinary conversation, or talk-in-interaction, which was carried out through a comprehensive examination of tape recordings and transcriptions made from these recordings. However, CA nowadays is a study of all types of spoken discourse that also deals with other forms of conduct.

In this relation, it is also worth mentioning the classification of CA by Heritage who distinguishes two forms of the method that are practised nowadays, namely basic and institutional. Basic CA examines conversation as an institution and identifies the

normative structuring of particular series of social actions and their organization into systems through which participants manage turn-taking, repair, and formulate adjacency pairs. Institutional CA is based on the basic CA and investigates the operations of social institutions in talk. Social institutions that can be investigated are law, medicine, the police, education, mass media, etc. The works and findings of institutional CA are quite permanent since they are related to the processes of social change which affect the mentioned institutions [39, pp. 104–106].

The other important point to be made is that it is possible to differentiate several analytic levels of CA. At the first level, CA is concerned with the systematic patterns of conduct that exist in social interaction and constitute specific practices. To be classified as a practice, elements of conduct need to be distinguished from other similar practices by repetitive and specifically situated elements. The analysis of practices used to perform certain social actions is carried out through the analysis of other people's responses.

At the second level, CA deals with sequences of actions. Participants usually project empirically and require normatively the creation of a next or a number of potential next acts to be produced by another participant when undertaking a current action. By producing subsequent actions, participants demonstrate an understanding of previous actions. Thus, CA is therefore concerned with the analysis of action, context control, and intersubjectivity.

At the third level, CA focuses on the systemic organization of different practices. For instance, the turn-taking system in conversation consists of several practices for turn construction and turn allocation [24, pp. 4–7].

Taking into account this paradigm, CA concentrates on a range of domains of interactional conduct, including the turn-taking system that helps to organize sequences in conversation; adjacency pairs that deal with the internal structuring of turns; repair organization that aims to prevent difficulties in speaking and hearing; storytelling and nar-

rative; prosody and body behaviour, etc. In this paper, such domains of CA as **turn-taking, repair and adjacency pairs** will be considered in detail.

### 1.2.1. Turn-taking

According to one of the main postulates of the CA, natural speech is strictly organized, and this organization is socially motivated. Hence, any naturally occurring conversation has a certain axis, which is the basis of its order. According to CA, the central component of any conversation is the change of turns and the order of their sequence.

The systematic analysis of turn-taking in conversation was first proposed by H. Sacks, E. Schegloff, G. Jefferson in the work “A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation” [65]. The researchers noted that ‘the organization of taking turns to talk is fundamental to conversation, as well as to other speech-exchange systems’ [65, p. 696]. A turn is a concept that is used to refer to an utterance from the moment the speaker begins the utterance until the moment when the next speaker enters the interaction. The turn, or a right to speak at a certain moment, is given to the participant of the discussion in accordance with a set of rules and procedures that is called a **turn-taking system**. Turns are not predetermined but are negotiated in the process of communication; therefore their organization in the ordinary conversation has a locally normative character.

Sack defines it as the “speech exchange system” [65, p. 696]. According to Levinson, turn-taking has been described as “a process in which one participant A talks, stops; another, B, starts, talks, stops; and so we obtain as A-B-A-B-A-B distribution of talk across two participants” [52, p. 296]. This explains that only one speaker talks at a time then another when the turn is possible.

**The turn-taking system** consists of turn-constructive components (TCCs), which are minimal turns or unit-types of the speech given to participants; they can consist of a clause, complete sentence, phrase or a simple word. Each of the participants is allocated one such unit. As a result, everyone is involved in an organized collective ac-

tion: the one who speaks in the first place largely sets the interpretive framework for all subsequent statements; however, the next speaker has more power to interpret the previous utterance because he/she responds directly to these words. The transition of turns becomes relevant at any **transition-relevance place**, i.e. the end of any complete turn construction unit, when a current speaker may choose the next speaker (e.g., by specifically identifying the next speaker or asking a question). If the next speaker is not identified or selected by a previous speaker, the next speaker may be self-selected. If there is no self-selected speaker, the current speaker may continue. The following **turn-allocation techniques** (turn-taking options) exist: a) current speaker selects next; b) next speaker self-selects; c) current speaker continues.

The organization of turns also ensures **topic transition**. A gap between turns usually signals the end of a topic. Topic change is a natural phenomenon occurring in conversation that is used to avoid the topic which one no longer wants to talk about [65, pp. 701–705].

The fact that utterances are organized as turns in interactional sequences allows people to systematically maintain and understand the context of the successive conversations. By setting the sequence of utterances, participants demonstrate their understanding of the state of the conversation, which arises as a side product of their sequentially organized speech activity, accordingly, the topic of understanding and determining the actual situation very rarely appears on the surface of the conversation. Turn-taking organization frees participants from the need to constantly affirm and confirm the understanding of each other's actions.

Turn-taking system, according to Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson [65], structuralizes talk-in-interaction and the following characteristics are present in every conversation:

- Speaker-change recurs or at least occurs. The turn-taking system ensures a systematic basis for speaker-change and its recurrence.

- Overwhelmingly, one party talks at a time. This fact can be explained with the help of the following two features: first, single turns are allocated to single speakers and any speaker gets an exclusive right to talk to the first possible completion of the turn; second, the transfer of turns is determined by possible completion points and transition-relevance places.
- Occurrences of more than one speaker at a time are common, but brief. Overlap may occur at transition relevance places in the multi-party conversation since participants often prefer to self-select as next speakers. They monitor the current speaker's utterance-in-progress and try to predict its possible ending. As a result, they may start speaking as soon as possible even when the previous speaker is still talking. Such instances are brief because current speakers exit and overlap disappears.
- Transitions (from one turn to the next) with no gap or overlap are common. They constitute the majority of cases together with transitions characterized by a slight gap or slight overlap. Since the transfer of turns tends to appear exclusively at transition-relevance places, it is possible to avoid gaps and overlaps.
- Turn order is not fixed. However, this order is locally determined and is not random.
- Turn size is not fixed, but varies. The turn-taking system does not define maximum turn size, though the turn-constructive component determines minimal turn.
- Length of conversation is not specified in advance and is not governed by the turn-taking system. It is determined by the internal features of its course of the conversation.
- What the parties say is not specified in advance.
- Turn distribution is not specified in advance.
- The number of parties can vary. Since the turn-taking system was created to organize two turns at a time, current and next, it is aimed at two speakers who ensure the transition of these turns; therefore, the number of speakers is not limited, as long as there

is the current speaker and the next one. Though the system does not restrict the number of participants, it still favours smaller groups of participants as it is easier to organize the turn order.

- Talk can be continuous or discontinuous. When the sequence of turns is not interrupted across transition-relevance places or there is a minimal gap, then the talk is continuous. Accordingly, it is discontinuous when there is quite a long gap between the turns at some transition-relevance place.
- Turn-allocation techniques are used. A current speaker may select a next speaker or parties may self-select while starting to talk.
- Various turn-constructural units are employed. The turn-taking system is primarily created for conversation, i. e. talk-in-interaction.
- Repair mechanisms exist are meant to deal with turn-taking errors and violations; e.g., if two parties are talking at the same time, one of them tend to stop prematurely, thus repairing the trouble source [65, pp. 700–701].

Though Sacks et al. formulated these features to define the ordinary natural conversation; it was later found out by conversational analysts that they are applicable to other types of discourse.

### **1.2.2. Adjacency pairs and preference organization**

Schegloff and Sacks noted that any conversation consists of sequences of two paired utterances referred to as adjacency pairs. The researchers emphasized that they are a fundamental unit of conversation [66, p. 18]. Richards and Schmidt defined adjacency pairs as “utterances produced by two successive speakers in such a way that the second utterance is identified as related to the first one as an expected follow up” [62, p. 128]. Levinson referred to adjacency pairs as paired utterances that are divided into a first pair part and a second pair parts [52, p. 303]. McCarthy stated that adjacency pairs are “the pairs of utterances in talk, [which are] often mutually dependent” [57, p. 119].

Thus, adjacency pairs are sequences of two related utterances produced by different speakers, with the second part being the response to the first. The most typical examples of adjacency pairs are question – answer, greeting – greeting, apology – minimization, offer – acceptance, etc.

Adjacency pairs are closely connected to the turn-taking system and are one of the most essential factors that contribute to the flow of conversation. They are the smallest unit of conversation. In its minimal and unexpanded form, an adjacency pair is characterized by the following features. They are:

1. composed of two turns: first pair part (FPP) and second pair part (SPP);
2. adjacent (i.e. one after the other);
3. produced by different speakers;
4. relatively ordered, which means that first pair parts precede second pair parts;
5. typed, i.e. a certain first part requires a certain second part. First, pair parts initiate some exchange (e.g. question, request, offer, invitation, etc.). Second, pair parts are responsive to the actions in the first pair parts (e.g. answer, grant, reject, accept, decline, agree/disagree, etc.) [66, pp. 295–96].

Taking into consideration these characteristics Schegloff and Sacks proposed a rule that governs the use of adjacency pairs: the current speaker must stop speaking when he/she produced a first pair part so that the next speaker can produce a second pair part at that juncture [66, p. 319].

There are, however, some first pair parts and second pair parts that tend to go together. According to Yule there are 13 main types of adjacency pairs: 1) greeting – greeting, 2) apology – minimization 3) summons – answer, 4) offer – acceptance, 5) request – acceptance, 6) question – answer, 7) blame – admission, 8) assertion – agreement, 9) invitation – acceptance, 10) assessment – agreement, 11) suggestion – acceptance, 12) command – compliance and 13) announcement – acknowledgement [95, pp. 72–73].

Paltridge in turn identified 11 types of adjacency pairs, namely: 1) greeting – greeting; 2) requesting – agreement, 3) question – answer, 4) assessment – agreement, 5) compliment – acceptance, 6) leave-taking adjacency pair, 7) complaint – apology, 8) blame – denial, 9) offer – acceptance, 10) warning – acknowledgement and 11) threat – counter-thread [60, pp. 91–99]. Nevertheless, there are different classifications of adjacency pairs proposed by different researchers. The list of adjacency pairs is not exclusive and may vary.

It should be noted though that not all of the features of adjacency pairs listed by Schegloff and Sacks are always met. The deviations are possible. In particular, strong adjacency is not always required and insertion sequences are possible. As Schegloff notes, “adjacency pair-based sequences can come to have more than two turns (though still two basic parts)” [73, p. 14]. In this relation, Hutchby and Wooffitt note that “there are systematic insertions that can legitimately come between first and second pair parts” that suggests the prevalence of insertion sequences [44, p. 43]. In this relation the criterion of strong adjacency may be replaced with the notion of conditional relevance, i.e. when the first pair part is uttered, the second part becomes conditionally relevant and expectable. Conditional relevance is a vital aspect of adjacency pairs. If the second part does not occur, it becomes noticeably absent [44, p. 45].

The other important issue is the **preference organization** of the second parts of adjacency pairs. Levinson points out that not all of the potential second pair parts of adjacency pairs have equal status; there is a preferred and dispreferred category of response. The notion of preference, however, does not relate to the communicators’ personal preferences, it is a structural concept that corresponds to the linguistic notion of markedness. Namely, preferred utterances are unmarked and structurally simpler, while dispreferred utterances are marked by structural complexity [52, pp. 307–308]. For example, the general patterns are that acceptances of requests and invitations are generally considered to be preferred responses (they are also structurally quite simple),

while refusals are dispreferred (they are usually produced with delays and as non-minimal turns).

Preference organization in terms of adjacency pairs is, according to Paltridge, a pair that gives freedom to responding to some first pair parts with either a preferred or dispreferred response [60, p. 90].

However, preference organization does not solely deal with the construction of the second pair parts of adjacency pairs, it also helps to construct first pair parts, organize subsequent turns and alternative sequences. It also extends far beyond the limits of adjacency pairs [52, p. 345]. Schegloff et al. note that the term ‘preference’ is used technically “to refer not to motivations of the participants, but to sequence- and turn-organizational features of conversation” [68, p. 362]. In other words, it is possible to select a course of action because “choice is possible but alternatives are by no means equal” [25, p. 260]. In a number of cases, communicants are free to use turns that are not as tight together as adjacency pairs.

The other important point to make is that the structures of adjacency pairs may vary from culture to culture since they are influenced by different social settings, e.g. as role relationships, situation, etc. [57, p. 121].

It should be noted that adjacency pairs may (though may not) be expanded in various ways. Though basic two-part sequences are quite common in interaction, there is a need to create sequences involving one or multiple forms of sequence expansion. According to Davis and Elder, basic adjacency pairs can be expanded at any point of interaction: a) before the first-pair part, this is pre-expansion, b) between two pair parts, this is inserted expansion; c) after the second-pair part, and this is post-expansion. Additionally, all of these adjacency pairs can be further elaborated and create sequences of considerable length. It is quite common for a single adjacency pair to last for several minutes [26, p. 273].

To sum it up, the relationship of adjacency between turns is crucial for the organization of talk-in-interaction since it ensures the continuity between first and second pair

parts. Though adjacency pair-based sequences tend to consist of two basic parts, they still can have more than two turns and be separated by intervening talk.

### **1.2.3. Repair**

Repair is another basic mechanism of conversational organization. It was first defined by Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks and used to refer to a set of practices by which a speaker interrupts the ongoing course of action to attend to possible trouble in speaking, hearing or understanding the talk (such as, for example, the use of a wrong word, misarticulating, unavailability of a word when needed, failure to hear or to be heard, incorrect understandings by recipients, etc.) [68, pp. 361–362]. Schegloff defines repair as a number of practices applied by communicants in talk-in-interaction to deal with problems in speaking, hearing, and understanding the talk in conversation [70, p. 207]. Sidnell defines repair as a generic order of organization in talk-in-interaction which is used across linguistic and cultural communities [81, p. 255].

Repair serves as an important communication strategy aimed to maintain communication and prevent breakdowns. It has to ensure that “the interaction does not freeze in its place when trouble arises, that intersubjectivity is maintained or restored, and that the turn and sequence and activity can progress to possible completion” [73, p. xiv]. Thus, repair ensures the continuity of the conversation even when troubles arise so that it can reach completion.

The term ‘repair’ was introduced by conversational analysts in contrast to the term ‘correction’, which they believed referred solely to the replacement of mistakes in an utterance. Repair was considered to be a much broader concept. Repair can be used when there is no error or mistake involved in the utterance. Overall, correction is different from repair, although the correction of mistakes in talk and replacing an incorrect form with a correct one can be a part of the repair itself [68, p. 363].

There are two main types of repair: **self-initiated and other-initiated**. Paltridge defines self-initiated repair as the one done by a speaker about what has been said before. Other-initiated repair, in contrast, is the one caused by someone other than the speaker of the trouble-source [60, p. 95].

The other important point to be made is that conversation analysts distinguish between repair initiation and repair performance. Repair can be initiated by one party and completed by another, i.e. other-initiated repair. When repair is initiated by the speaker of the trouble-source it is referred to as a self-initiated repair. The speaker who self-initiated repair is also the one who completes it by providing a repair solution [68, p. 364]. Therefore, the following repair types based on who initiates the repair and who completes the repair can be identified: a) self-initiated self-completed repair; b) self-initiated other-completed repair; c) other-initiated self-completed repair and d) other-initiated other-completed repair.

The following three points are also worth mentioning in terms of CA's treatment of repair. First, the practices of repair from the CA perspective are not cognitive, but discursive and interactional. Initiation of repair is an action in interaction that states that there is a problem. Delay before the next word is also treated as a move in interaction; it is different from the delay in the speech planning process.

Second, repair in CA involves the parties who have to stop the course of action that is otherwise in progress to address trouble or problem with speaking, hearing or understanding the talk. The course of action is restored only after the repair segment is completed. Nevertheless, it may end with either success or failure.

Third, the trouble with 'understanding the talk' (mainly the just-preceding talk) is different from other problems of understanding (e.g., understanding the events, conduct, etc) [69, p. 7].

Repair consists of three elements: repaired segment, repairing segment and repair initiation. The repaired segment is an utterance or a part of the utterance that is being repaired and contains the repairable element (or the trouble source). Trouble source

is any word, phrase, or utterance that is treated as problematic by the participants' [92, p. 213]. However, it can also be inaudible but inferred from the presence of the repairing segment and the repair initiation [63, p. 48].

The repair initiation is “the practice of signalling or targeting a trouble source” [92, p. 214]. It marks “a possible disjunction with the immediately preceding talk” [Schegloff, 2000, p. 207]. They often contain filler or cut off. However, repair initiations can be non-observable. The repairing segment (or repair outcome) is “the solution to the trouble-source or abandonment of the problem” [92, p. 214].

In relation to the trouble source it is possible to differentiate different positions of repair sequencing: a) first position repair appears within or immediately after the utterance with the trouble source; b) second position repair occurs at the next transition-relevance place after the trouble source or in the subsequent turn that follows the turn with a trouble source; c) third position repair appears after the recipient's response. However, the general tendency is that repairs occur near the trouble source [45, pp. 60–66].

It is also important to clarify such terms as repair operations, repair components, and repair technologies. Repair operations are the repair types that “speakers employ to deal with some putative trouble-source in an ongoing turn-at-talk in conversation or to alter it in some internationally consequential way” [76, p. 43]. Components are repair segments that carry out the repair operations. Technologies are techniques that are used to execute repair operations [76, pp. 44–45].

Thus, repair organization refers to the process of how parties in conversation resolve problems in speaking, hearing, or understanding.

### **1.3. Talk show as an example of semi-institutional discourse**

The distinction between ordinary conversation and institutional talk is an important aspect of CA. Therefore, it is important to define the status of talk shows in terms of their relation to the institutional discourse.

As it has been already noted CA was initially aimed at the analysis of ordinary everyday conversation, which was the term used for the forms of interaction that were not limited to specialized settings and the execution of particular tasks. This applies to the works on CA written in the 1960-70s. It was in the late 1970s and 1980s when the studies of ‘institutional talk’ emerged. They were based on the analysis of communication in the restricted environment of official or semi-official setting, such as law, medicine, mass media, educational settings, etc. [24, p. 5]. In this respect, it seems appropriate to mention the comparison of ordinary conversation and institutional talk proposed by Heritage, who notes that they correlate as a master institution and its more restricted local variations [40, p. 2]. So, conversation in institutional contexts is more restricted due to a large number of rules that regulate institutional settings.

Talk shows, though happen in institutional settings, are an institutional form of communication only partially, since they have a lot of features typical for ordinary conversation, they will be defined and analysed further below. In this paper, the definition of the talk show as semi-institutional discourse, initially proposed by Ilie, will be used.

Television talk shows have become one of the most popular communicative genres that are used for the empirically-oriented analysis of communication. Emerging in the late 60s of the twentieth century in the American media space, this genre has undergone such a dynamic development, popularization and differentiation of the format that the 90s of the twentieth century can be considered “the era of the boom of the talk show genre” [88, p. 1439]. Ilie emphasizes that both British and American talk shows appeared as “public extension of the private sphere of casual conversation”, while destroying the difference between the private conditions of the consumers and the public conditions of the media [46, p. 215].

Ilie defines the talk show as a modern Anglo-Saxon version of conversation occurring in semi-institutionalized socio-cultural practices, as well as “the latest form of revival of the classical art of dialogue”, as well as a “prototype form of expression of

media discourse” [46 , p. 215, 218]. Schegloff defines talk shows as a particular kind of face-to-face conversation [74, p. 186].

Though there were a lot of attempts to define the talk show genre and differentiate its typology, there is no single unified definition of this concept. This can be explained, on the one hand, because of the fact that most media genres are hybrid and, on the other hand, that there is a great variety of different subgenres of talk shows (not to mention that each TV program has its specific features), which complicates the identification of distinctive characteristics of the talk show. Therefore, it is important to analyze this genre from a linguistic and lingo-sociocultural perspective and create a list of criteria that would differentiate this genre from several other typologically similar genres of media communication.

First of all, it is important to note that talk show as a genre combines features of both ordinary conversation and institutional talk that makes it particularly interesting for the analysis in terms of CA. According to the conversational analysis, communication within a certain institutional context is based on language structures and elements of everyday interpersonal communication, which are transformed, while adapting to the formal requirements of the new environment. Despite the fact that talk shows are extremely rich in elements of everyday communication, the discourse that underlies it should still be considered as one of an institutional nature.

The transfer of the communicative situation to the institutional context immediately entails the limitation of the communicative space, the reduction of opportunities for the implementation of any communicative actions, as well as the modification of their interactive functions [59, p. 34]. In general, in contrast to everyday conversation, the institutional discourse has a more pronounced functional direction.

The next feature of institutional communication is a clear, often asymmetric distribution of communicative roles, which, for example, in the genre of talk show, is manifested in a number of clearly defined communicative roles: host, expert, guest, and audience. Cots et al. introduce the concept of ‘communicative agreement’ which is the point

of intersection between discursive (common goals, status, social roles and norms of conducting interaction) and institutional (forms of verbal and nonverbal interaction, communication style and ways of speech expression, etc.) aspects of interpersonal communication [16, pp. 326–330]. However, the peculiarity of communicative roles within the genre of talk show is that, despite the predetermined asymmetric-hierarchical structure, it is not as stable as, for example, in other official contexts. Therefore, directly in the process of verbal interaction, different deviations from certain communicative roles and responsibilities within these roles can be observed.

Talk shows also consist of a different number of parties and are similar to conversation, “in being compatible with differing numbers of participants, it is compatible with varying numbers of participants within any single conversation, since there are mechanisms for entry of new participants and exit for current participants” [65, p. 22]. Any conversation requires at least two participants, however, their number may be extended.

This trend can be clearly seen in the examples of deviations from the normative communicative structure of question-answer when participants in a talk show for a while taking over the functions of a host and perform metacommunicative functions and organize the conversation while involving individual communicators in the discussion, or simply exchanging roles with the moderator, i.e. they take on the function of the interviewer.

The degree of regulation and pre-structuring of communicative roles depends on the format of the talk show and can vary greatly between rigidly formalized and informal communication [4, p. 303]. It is given this characteristic that some linguists consider the genre of talk show as a pseudo- or semi-institutional form of communication. In particular, Ilie considers talk shows to be the newest type of verbal interaction in a semi-institutional socio-cultural context of Anglo-American origin [46, p. 215]. Timberg, while defining the features of talk shows, emphasizes that they are highly structured, though they have to appear to be spontaneous, moreover, they are experienced in the present tense and resemble conversation [90, pp. 3–5]. It should be noted that these

characteristics are mainly applied to the entertaining talk shows type. That is why they were selected as the material for analysis in this paper since they combine both the features of ordinary conversation and institutional discourse.

Ilie differentiates the semi-institutional nature of a talk show as its main distinguishing feature, stating that talk shows “exhibit discursive features characteristic of both casual conversation and institutional discourse” [46, p. 249]. The researcher differentiates both discursive and linguistic features of talk shows that distinguish them from other types of interactional discourse.

Table 1 summarizes the two major categories of discursive features of talk shows, in particular, conversational ones (belonging to non-institutional discourse, such as ordinary conversation) and institutional ones (belonging to institutional discourse, such as news interviews and public debates).

Table 1

*Discursive features of talk shows as semi-institutional discourse*

<b>Conversational features</b>	<b>Institutional features</b>
Private setting (prefilmed scenes in show guests' homes)	Public/institutional setting (TV studio)
Relatively homogeneous form of talk	Non-homogeneous form of talk
Spontaneous talk (less topic-centred)	Purposeful talk (more topic-centred and goal-oriented)
Low topic control and predictability	High topic control and predictability
Goals are communicative and interactional	Goals are communicative, institutional and interactional
No particular talk-related restrictions	Specific talk-related restrictions (time-

(flexible turn-taking, topic and subtopic shifts)	limitations, speaker-selection and turn-taking design)
Spontaneous role-switching (initiated by the show guests)	Monitored role-switching (controlled by the show host)
Equal status of participants	Unequal status of participants
Equal speaking rights	Unequal speaking rights
Interlocutor as both addressee and addresser	Multiple audiences as addressees
Interlocutor-oriented talk	Message- and multiple audience-oriented talks
Non-hierarchical role-distribution	Hierarchical role-distribution
Symmetrical power relations	Asymmetrical power relations
Relatively weak talk/topic control	Strong talk/topic control

The features listed in the table are neither exhaustive, as it is impossible to cover all the features and aspects of talk shows), nor discrete, as they are presented in comparison and indicate a certain degree of a specific characteristic on a scale.

In terms of linguistic characteristics of talk shows, Ilie emphasizes that they have specific features regarding “the discursive organization of talk, the sequence of adjacency pairs and turns, the participants’ question-asking and question-answering roles” [46, p. 242]. These features are partly related to conversational, i.e. non-institutional discourse, and partly to institutional discourse, as shown in Table 2. [46, pp. 240–249].

Table 2

*Linguistic features of talk show as semi-institutional discourse*

<b>Conversational features</b>	<b>Institutional features</b>
No particular talk-framing patterns	Particular talk-framing patterns
No particular role-related openings and closings	Role-related openings and closings performed by the show host
Informal introductions of and by the participants	Formal and semi-informal introductions of the participants by the show host
Non-monitored speaker-selection and turn-taking	Monitored speaker-selection and turn-allocation
Not explicit metalinguistic patterns for various stages of the interaction (negotiated turn-taking, next speaker selection and topic agenda)	Explicit metalinguistic patterns for various stages of the talk show (monitored turn management and next speaker's selection)
Fairly symmetrical question-asking roles	Asymmetrical question-asking roles
No deliberate use of performative utterances for institutional goals	Deliberate use of performative utterances for institutional goals
Conversationally framed questions (primarily interlocutor-oriented)	Institutionally framed questions (primarily audience-oriented)
Argumentatively used non-answer eliciting questions	Evaluative used non-answer eliciting questions
Interlocutor-oriented repetitions	Audience-oriented repetitions

The next defining feature of the communicative genre of talk show is its hybrid or mixed nature. First of all, it means a combination of a number of other genre forms, such as interview, informal conversation, formal critical discussion, etc. Ilie notes that a talk show resembles any entertainment program because of its funny and easy-going general atmosphere; it also has recurring goal-oriented question-response sequences that make it similar with news interviews; the exchange and confrontation of opinions during any talk show are reminiscent of a debate program; a considerable time of a talk show devoted to the casual and spontaneous dialogue fit well in the frame of the conversation. The researcher supports the thesis of the mixed nature of this genre and notes that none of these types of discourse is more representative than the others, though they share some common features with talk shows [46, pp. 210-211]. The researcher also notes small talk is at the communicative core of the talk show, while thematically oriented forms of discussion or interview and at the peripheral level [46, p. 223]. Thornborrow, however, argues that by its nature talk shows are argumentative genres, in which argumentative elements, as well as storytelling and narratives, form the communicative core [88, p. 1439]. Most researchers, however, agree that communicative genres in real conditions of oral communication are rarely autonomous and rarely have a homogeneous nature [91, p. 5]. More often the intertwining and mutual penetration of several genre forms can be observed. This is manifested at the speech level through the use of conventional, often ritualized patterns of communication and appropriate lexical means for each of them.

An important feature of a talk show is also its clear thematic focus. Not taking into consideration different deviations from the main thematic focus of the discussion that may appear, as a rule, there is a host who represents the official institution within which communication takes place and ensures that it takes place in a certain thematic channel. It should be noted that the communicative role of the host is extremely important from a linguopragmatic perspective and performs three different functions. First, he/she acts as a representative of the institution within which the communication takes

place, so the moderator from the beginning is endowed with special means of influencing the course of the discussion, the involvement of individual participants in the conversation, and so on. Second, the moderator is a direct participant in the discussion. Third, the moderator acts as a mediator between the participants in the discussion and a wide audience of viewers [4, p. 305–306].

In the context of the interaction between individual participants of the talk show and the host, it is hardly possible to operate with the normative characteristics of critical discussion, for example, on the model of a pragma-dialectical model. Each of the communicators, depending on their social and institutional role in the context of the talk show pursues specific communicative goals, which can be expressed in speech actions aimed at self-expression, confrontation, discrediting of the interlocutor, or, conversely, at the conflict resolution, cooperation, etc. To achieve this, the interlocutors use a wide range of metacommunicative and specific-discursive means of communication, which is manifested in the use of specific lexical means, various tactics, and strategies of communication and argumentation. In practical oral speech, this is realized through specific illocutionary and perlocutionary speech acts, which often depend on specific cultural or purely contextual institutional factors. Within the framework of conversational analysis, the multi-addressability of a media communicative message can be considered from the perspective of receiving ‘recipient design’, which assumes that the author of oral dialogic speech in producing appropriate statements should take into account cognitive, sociocultural and other psychological characteristics of the recipients’ communicative messages [5, p. 3].

Another important characteristic of the talk show genre is its staging. The dualistic character, expressed by the diachronic relationship between the authenticity/spontaneity of the course of communication and its previous directing / regulation in general, is inherent in many media forms. Larina, for example, identifies drama as a defining characteristic of talk shows [3, p. 4]. Of course, there are a number of ritualized sequential language expressions that can be distinguished within the genre of talk shows,

these are for example expressions used by the host to present guests or the topic of discussion, announce the beginning or end of the program, etc. But still, most communication in the context of a talk show is natural and relatively spontaneous. For instance, frequent elements that accompany spontaneous oral speech present in talk shows are ellipses, pauses and spontaneous stops in speech, the synchronous speech of several participants, etc.

In conclusion, it should be noted that a talk show can be defined as the semi-institutional type of discourse that combines both the features of both ordinary and institutional communication.

## CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 1

The first issue that had been tackled in this chapter is the characterization of different types of spoken discourse. Different theoretical approaches that are used to provide various perspectives on the analysis of spoken discourse are considered, however, special attention is paid to the conversational analysis (CA) since it is at the core of this research. CA is one of the main methods applied for the analysis of spoken discourse. It is also widely used to study the structure of both ordinary conversation and institutional discourse. However, CA is aimed at only naturally occurring communication.

The theoretical analysis of the conversational analysis was the next issue considered in this chapter. Such key components of CA as turn-taking, repair, adjacency pairs and preference organization were defined. Turn-taking refers to the way for the participants to speak alternately and assign turns between each other. Adjacency pairs are paired conditionally relevant utterances. They may not be immediately produced, however, remain relevant and accountable though appear later (e.g. question – answer). A lot of adjacency pairs have alternative second pair parts that may be either preferred or dispreferred. Repair is the process that shows how parties in conversation resolve problems in understanding, speaking or hearing. Overlaps are the period in which the speakers speak simultaneously. They are the main mechanisms of conversational organization that ensure its smooth flow.

It is shown that talk show is a specific form of conversational interaction, which differs from everyday conversation and can be subjected to detailed analysis so that its main conversational patterns can be defined. Talk show is also considered as an example of semi-institutional discourse that combines both features of everyday conversation and institutional interaction. The applicability of the conversational analysis for the analysis of talk show as semi-institutional discourse is also explained in this chapter. Undoubtedly, talk shows can be treated as a specific kind of face-to-face communication, the analysis of which is especially applicable for the conversational analysis.

## CHAPTER 2. TURN-TAKING AND REPAIR STRATEGIES IN BRITISH AND AMERICAN TALK SHOWS WITH TWO AND MULTIPLE PARTICIPANTS

### 2.1. Turn-taking strategies

When two or more people are communicating with each other in a conversation, just one of them talks at a time, that is one of the main rules of CA introduced by Sacks et al. As a result, for a conversation to flow smoothly, participants have to be aware of when they are supposed to speak and when to listen. The process that defines who is to speak next is called turn-taking. Conversational analysis of turn-taking is important to be studied since it covers the organization of conversation.

Though this chapter is concerned solely with the turn-taking strategies that ensure the structural organization of conversation, the other components such as repair strategies, overlap, preference organization and adjacency pairs will be considered further in this work. It should be noted that the analysis is based on the naturally occurring conversation from the entertaining talk shows. All the material was scripted, transcribed and further examined according to the analysed parameter.

The talk shows chosen for the analysis in this paper are *The Graham Norton Show* and *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*. *The Graham Norton Show* is a British talk show; *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* is an American one. The choice of these talk shows was deliberate. First, it allows investigating all English-speaking media rather than focusing on Anglo-Saxon or American perspectives. Second, these talk shows represent two different types of communication, namely two-party and multiparty which will also expand the scope of our analysis.

The corpus of study contains segments of 14 interviews conducted in the analysed talk shows with 14 different quests. In particular, 7 segments of interviews were chosen for *The Graham Norton Show*. These are interviews conducted by the host of the show Graham Norton with such guests as actors Orlando Bloom, Kingsley Ben-Adir and Stanley Tucci, actresses Nicole Kidman and Kate Winslet, comedian Aisling Bea and

writer Stephen Fry. Accordingly, 7 interviews were chosen for *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*, they include interviews conducted by the host of the show Jimmy Fallon with such guests as the 44th President of the United States Barack Obama, TV host John Oliver, actor Tom Hiddleston, the former First Lady of the United States Michelle Obama, actresses Sarah Paulson and Anne Hathaway and film director Quentin Tarantino. 7 separate interviews from 7 different programs were selected for *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy*, while two episodes were selected for *The Graham Norton Show*. Such a choice is due to the structure of the talk shows themselves and the need to select interview segments with approximately the same duration. The total examined interviewing time is 48 minutes and 23 seconds and 48 minutes and 14 seconds for *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy* and *The Graham Norton Show* respectively. These totals are comparable for both talk shows.

Though both talk shows are entertainment ones, they are different in terms of the number of participants. There are usually only two participants on *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*, the host and the guest, while for *The Graham Norton Show* it is typical to include a host and a few guests. Although the talk show host focuses on interacting with one guest, other guests present can also interfere with the conversation.

Turn-taking is one of the most important properties of the structural organization of spoken discourse. It is an important aspect of CA that has drawn the attention of many scholars, for instance, Schegloff [67], [75], Sacks [64], Levinson [53], Ghilzai [30], Heritage [40], etc. However, in this work the attention is paid to the turn-taking strategies applied by the participants of the talk shows *The Graham Norton Show* and *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*.

There are three main turn-taking strategies that determine the organization of conversation: speaker's selection (when current speaker selects next speaker); speaker's self-selection (next speaker self-selects), and speaker's domination (when current speaker continues). This classification is based on the theory proposed by Sack, Sche-

gloff and Jefferson [65]. The speaker and listener have to understand the turn-taking strategy in the conversation for the conversation to run smoothly.

The other important factor connected with turn-taking is turn-changing, which refers to the situation in which speakers change. If the turn-changing fails to occur successfully, unintentional overlap or pause may occur.

Turn-taking differs depending on the number of participants in the conversation. It is generally accepted that the smaller the number of participants is, the smoother the turn-changing happens. In a two-person conversation, one person is a speaker, while the other is a listener. As a result, it is easier to conduct turn-changing since the exchange that alternates between the two roles is quite simple. On the other hand, in a multi-party conversation, while there is only one speaker, there are several listeners who are also potential candidates to become the next speaker therefore the turn-changing is quite a complicated process.

Taking into consideration all of these factors, it is vital to examine how turn-taking is held in the analysed talk shows since there is two-party communication present in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* and multi-party in *The Graham Norton Show*. The aim of this chapter is to consider how the number of participants influences the turn-taking strategies.

- **Speaker's selection**

Speaker's selection is a type of turn-taking strategy in which the current speaker chooses the next speaker to take the turn. The speaker's preference may be indicated by the direct naming, use of pronouns, pointing at the next speaker or eye contact. Namely, the speaker's selection may be conducted with the help of both verbal and non-verbal means. The speaker who is selected is supposed to speak since the current speaker implied that they take the turn.

### **Example 1**

*Graham Norton: Kate, you got us a new series 'Mare of Eastown'. This is on Sky Atlantic on TV on Monday, April 19. So what's all that about?*

**Kate Winslet:** *So it's a seven-part series by HBO called Mare of Easttown... [97].*

In the given example, the host Graham Norton directly states the name of the next speaker. He as the first speaker decides who will speak next and signals that by calling the speaker by name. The actress Kate Winslet then takes her turn as the second speaker.

The speaker's selection conducted with the help of direct address in more come common for the multi-party communication presented in *The Graham Norton Show*. In *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* with two-party or dyadic conversation the current speaker does not have to select the next speaker overtly and use any kind of address since there are no other interlocutors to complete the turn. It is much more common for the host Graham Norton to directly select the next speaker by naming as it is illustrated in example 1.

### **Example 2**

**Jimmy Fallon:** *Did you like working in a video store? I Loved it.*

**Quentin Tarantino:** *Yeah. No, I was. Actually, I think until I was a director. I think it was like the job. I was absolutely the best at this. Like to be sure [103].*

In the example 2, the host Jimmy Fallon as the first speaker directs the question to his guest, film director Quentin Tarantino, with the pronoun 'you'. The director as the second speaker takes the turn and answers the question. It is also worth adding that in the two-party conversation, the speaker does not have to address the next speaker directly because the choice of the next speaker is contextually clear so it is enough to simply use pronouns.

The selection of the speaker with the help of pronoun is a very common means of speaker's selection for both talk shows. However, if in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* pronouns are a permanent means of address, in *The Graham Norton Show* such a form of speaker's selection is used when the current speaker continues the conversation with the same speaker or the pronoun is accompanied by different nonverbal means that signal the speaker's selection. This is illustrated below:

### **Example 3**

(1) **Graham Norton:** *Kingsley, we thought Hollywood had stolen you but no Kentish Town through and through.*

(2) **Kingsley Ben-Adir:** *I'm from Kentish Town. Yeah*

(3) **Graham Norton:** *But you haven't been here the whole time?*

(4) **Kingsley Ben-Adir:** *No, I'm sorry. I came-- I got a plane back. Maybe three or four days before we went into lockdown. I was in LA but I can't--Yeah, I came straight back because I can only get stuck in LA.*

(5) **Graham Norton:** *And also like Americans must be thinking it's so weird when they see **you** on chat shows because they have no idea that **you're** English [97].*

In this situation, there is a turn-taking mechanism illustrated in which the host Graham Norton as the first speaker selects the next speaker and ensures the smooth flow of the conversation. In turn 1 he directly chooses the next speaker by naming and addresses to the actor Kingsley Ben-Adir, in turn 3 and 5, he continues the conversation with the same guest therefore he uses the pronoun 'you' for the speaker's selection since it is contextually clear who is supposed to speak next. Kingsley Ben-Adir in all three cases takes the turn as the second speaker and responds to the host.

Another way to choose a speaker is through various non-verbal means, although this study will not focus on the deep analysis of non-verbal means, they cannot be overlooked, as they are an important part of any face-to-face communication. The examples of how non-verbal means are used for speaker's selection are given below:

#### **Example 4**

**Graham Norton:** *Are-- are you friends with uh Saoirse Ronan? (turns his head to the guest)*

**Aisling Bea:** *Yeah, I love Saoirse. She's brilliant.*

**Graham Norton:** *Because you were-- you were in the paper together [97].*

There are multiple quests in the *The Graham Norton Show*; therefore it is not enough for the host as the first speaker to use only a pronoun to select the next speaker. In this situation, verbal means are combined with non-verbal, in particular, the host Gra-

ham Norton uses both the pronoun ‘you’ and turns his head to the guest who is supposed to respond, in this case, it is a comedian Aisling Bea. She as the second speaker takes the turn and answers the host’s question.

It should be noted that non-verbal means are generally less common than verbal ones. They are rarely used in the talk show *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*. However, the host Graham Norton applied them more frequently to select the next speaker, though he mostly combines them with verbal means.

The conducted analysis shows that *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* with only two participants, the host and the guest, is characterized by infrequent use of direct naming, the communicants mostly use pronouns for addressing, since it contextually obvious whose turn it is to speak. Non-verbal signs are also rarely used for the speaker’s selection. On the other hand, *The Graham Norton Show* that includes multiple participants is characterized by a different distribution of the speaker’s selection means with direct naming and use of pronouns in combination with non-verbal sighs being the most typical instruments for the next speaker’s selection.

Taking into consideration all the examples given from both talk shows, it can be seen that it is mostly the host who is the first speaker that allocates the turn. In this relation, it should be added that hosts play an important role in the next speaker’s selection in both talk shows since they are the ones who direct the conversation and ensure that turn-taking is smooth. Though communication in talk shows is different from news interviews and quite resembles ordinary conversation, there is still a tendency that the host initiates the topic and mostly conducts the role of the first speaker. In a multi-party conversation, the host usually converses with one of the participants, while the others are just observers. For example, Graham Norton uses direct naming to signal the start of the conversation with one of his guests, while he continues the conversation with them he mostly uses pronouns to address them, however, when he wants to shift to the other guest he either uses direct naming again or uses pronouns in combination with non-verbal means to show the change of the speaker who is supposed to answer. While the

host communicates with one of the guests, the others usually remain observers, though their interference in the course of the conversation is permitted and not excluded.

Though the means of speaker's selection differ in the analysed talk shows, the more important point to be made is that the strategy when the current speaker selects the next speaker is the most common way to allocate the turn in both talk shows. It can be concluded that the speaker's selection is equally common for both two-party and multi-party conversations. In multiparty conversations, the first speaker tends to allocate the turn following the same principles of cooperative and constructive communication as he/she would do in a two-party conversation.

According to the conducted analysis, speaker's selection is the most common type of turn allocation in both analysed talk shows. It constitutes 83% out of all the data. However, the way it is distributed for each talk show separately differs. Speaker's selection comprises 90% of data in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*, while it is only 76% of data for *The Graham Norton Show*. This can be explained by the fact that turn-taking strategies are more diverse in the show with multiple participants.

- **Speaker's self-selection**

The turn-taking strategy when the next turn is allocated by the speaker's self-selection. It is the second most common strategy of turn allocation with 13% out of all the data.

#### **Example 4**

(1) *Jimmy Fallon: Where does your love for music come from?*

(2) *Barack Obama: Ah, well, look, I don't. I don't come from a musical family. But I think that partly because I had such a strange childhood, right. I'm hm from Kansas. Dad from Kenya, in Hawaii, lives in Indonesia for a while.*

(3) *Jimmy Fallon: That's an interesting playlist right there. Yeah,*

(4) *Barack Obama: Yeah. Well, exactly. But-- But what it also meant was, I was moving around a lot. I was an only child. So I was nine. And so I think music becomes one of those things that keep you company [102].*

In this situation, there are two types of turn-taking strategies applied, there is speaker's selection in turn 1 and the speaker's self-selection in turn 3. In turn 1, the host Jimmy Fallon asks the question to the ex-president Barack Obama about his love of music. Barack Obama as the second speaker takes the turn in the turn 2 and answers the question, though he does not finish his thought. By using the self-selection strategy in turn 3 the host intends to support the argument previously stated by Barack Obama. In turn 4, the quest proceeds to answer the question asked in the first turn.

### **Example 5**

*(1) Graham Norton: Obviously, there's lots of lots of guards, lots of heroes, but does Queen Atlanta appear?*

*(2) Stephen Fry: I should say, of course. I'm using the word heroes, the gender-neutral word. Atalanta was one of my favourite heroes. Atalanta is in your film Aquaman (turns to Nicole Kidman).*

*(3) Graham Norton: Yes, you are playing Queen Atlanna (directs his gaze to Nicole Kidman).*

*(4) Nicole Kidman: Not my film... [98].*

In the given example, there are two strategies of turn-taking that can be classified, namely speaker's selection is present in turn 1 and 2, while the speaker's self-selection happens in the turn 3. In turn 1, the host Graham Norton continues the conversation with the writer Stephen Fry about his book 'Heroes', though he does not directly address the question it is contextually clear who is supposed to answer, moreover, the host looks directly at the writer, so non-verbal means are also important in this relation. In turn 2, Stephen Fry as the second speaker takes the turn and answers the question. He, however, also initiates the next turn by asking a question to the actress Nicole Kidman. He does the next speaker's selection with the help of non-verbal means, namely the writer turns to the actress. In turn 3, the host Graham Norton self-selects to take the turn and answer the question instead of the actress. Yet he directs his gaze at her showing that he expects her to take the next turn, which she actually does.

The self-selection technique is mostly used to support the argument of the other speaker or add some additional information.

Speaker's self-selection constitutes 8% of data in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* and 18% of data in *The Graham Norton Show*. The difference in numbers is due to the number of participants in the conversation since self-selection is an important means to take the turn.

- **Speaker's domination**

Speaker's determination refers to the turn-taking strategy when the current speaker does not select the next speaker but indicates him/herself to take the next turn. It is the least common type for both talk shows that constitutes only 4% out of all the analysed data. It is mostly applied by the hosts when they want to introduce the new topic or change the previous one. The use of this strategy is exemplified below:

**Example 6**

*Graham Norton: 'Ammonite' is available to read on all digital platforms on the 26th of March and will also be in cinemas as soon as they open. Thank you so much for joining us. Hopefully, we'll see you in the flesh soon. Kate Winslet everybody //*

*Graham Norton: What a time to be Kingsley Ben-Adir. I mean, it. Honestly, well done. I mean, it's amazing, that it's all-- it's all happening. What's the lesson you went from, you know, the classic kind of, you know, working British actor... [97].*

In the given example, the host Graham Norton finishes the conversation with the actress Kate Winslet. There is no speaker assigned to take the turn after the current speaker ends his turn therefore he continues speaking, speaker's domination strategy is applied.

Speaker's domination constitutes only 2% of data in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* and 6% of data in *The Graham Norton Show*. This strategy is used only by the hosts to introduce the new topic. They intentionally do not select the next speaker so that they can continue.

According to the conducted analysis, the most used turn-taking strategy of the participants of both analysed talk shows is the current speaker selects the next speaker (or speaker's selection strategy) technique which is used in 83% of data. The next one is the self-selection strategy which is used in 13% of data. The last strategy is the current speaker continues (or speaker's domination) technique which is used in 4 % of data. The detailed numeric data on the types of turn-taking strategies used in the analysed talk shows is given in Figure 1.

## **2.2. Overlap in turn-taking**

Overlap is an integral part of the turn-taking system, therefore its analysis is important for understanding how two-party or multi-party communication is organized. There are a lot of works that are concerned with the examination of both turn-taking and overlap phenomena, for instance, De Ruiter et al. [22]; Schegloff [67]; Jefferson and Sacks [66], [68]; Levinson and Torreira [51]; Magyari and de Ruiter [56]. However, most of these approaches are based on the model of turn-taking organization proposed by Sacks et al. [65] according to which turns in conversation are separated by a transition-relevance place (TRP) that is located after a complete segment of speech and is a point at which a speaker change is supposed to occur. Consequently, people can easily predict the position of a TRP and thus start their turn around that point. However, this process is not that simple. Because of the fact that natural language is complex and fast-paced people often miss the TRP which causes overlap.

The other important rule of CA should also be mentioned in this relation: during the conversation, one person speaks at a time and the others have to wait until the first speaker has completed his/her turn. According to Stolt, the function of this rule is obvious: to prohibit two or more interlocutors from speaking at the same time, which could lead to conversational disruption [85, p. 6]. However, this rule is not always followed. As a result, such a phenomenon as overlapping occurs.

It should be noted that though both simultaneous speech and long pauses between turns are not desirable in the conversation, overlaps are less noticeable and more tolerated. Overlap can be defined as an instance of simultaneous speech that occurs when the speaker other than the current speaker starts to speak at or very close to a potential transposition place to the current speaker's utterance. Two voices occur at the same time as the first speaker starts to speak and the second speaker covers the first speaker. However, minimal overlap is the fundamental norm in English verbal conversation for turn-taking, as noted by Stivers et al. [84]. The other authors who defined overlap as a frequently occurring phenomenon of human interaction were also Heldner and Edlund [37]; Shriberg et al. [80]; Schegloff [67], [70], [75].

During the analysis of conversations of the chosen talk shows, overlapping was frequently noted therefore it is important to consider in detail the features of its appearance in each of the selected talk shows.

In general, there were 196 utterances with overlap defined in both talk shows from which 84 (43%) data were categorized in The Graham Norton Show and 112 (57%) are from The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon. The data categorization is based on a widely accepted classification of overlaps into competitive and non-competitive with the first being an attempt to grab the floor and the second being an attempt to assist the speaker to continue the turn [85], [70], [75]. Though the distinction of overlap into cooperative and competitive was first proposed by Deborah Tannen in the book 'Conversational Style: Analysing Talk among Friends' [86].

- **Competitive overlaps**

Competitive overlaps refer to the type of simultaneous talk that occurs when the current speaker has not finished his/her turn but the next speaker starts speaking in order to interrupt the current speaker or take his/her turn. The examples of competitive overlaps that occur in the conversations in the analysed talk shows are given further:

**Example 1**

(1) **Kingsley Ben-Adir:** *I uh-- I had a pet tarantula and it sounds like a [ \_\_\_ ] story but the tarantula escaped. It was a bird-eating spider and somehow it got out onto the-- the pavement and I went to [school ---]*

(2) **Graham Norton:** *[I love even] now at your age you're not telling the truth. Somehow it got out.*

(3) **Kingsley Ben-Adir:** *I think what happened was I used to like wake up to watch I was like six or seven I woke up so I wake up and watch cartoons and I'll get the spider out sort of play with the spider as I was watching cartoons... [97].*

The competitive overlap takes place between turn 1 and 2. The host Graham Norton wants to make the comment on the way the actor Kingsley Ben-Adir tells the story about his spider's escape. The host interferes to express his evaluation of the situation since he does not believe that the spider escaped accidentally and presupposes it the actor is responsible for this situation. Therefore, in this case, competitive overlap was used for clarification based on the personal evaluation. However, it does not the course of the conversation, in turn 3, Kingsley Ben-Adir continues his story, while acknowledging that he was most likely to blame for the situation.

## **Example 2**

**Anne Hathaway:** *And so every time, like, I step out in public and someone calls my name, I think they're going to yell at me. [Yeah so --]*

**Jimmy Fallon:** *[My mom would] say my middle name, "James Thomas!"*

**Anne Hathaway:** *So, is -- But I doubt people are just like, James Thomas! How are you? [99].*

In this example, the competitive overlap happens between turn 1 and 2. The actress Anne Hathaway complains that she is often called 'Anne' and she perceives this greeting as two formal and even causes anxiety. The host Jimmy Fallon while wanting to share his experience in this topic interrupts the quest and takes the floor. The host's remark is relevant to the topic and is supposed to give additional information. Though the actress finds being called by her first name as a formal address, for the host it is both

his first and middle name. The host is aimed to take the actress' turn therefore the overlap is competitive and not accidental.

### **Example 3**

*(1) Jimmy Fallon: Let's talk about "Betrayal." This is -- Only two weeks left in this run.*

*(2) Tom Hiddleston: Yes. Two weeks left. We've done it over 200 times. 220, I think.*

*(3) Jimmy Fallon: Wow. Fantastic.*

*(4) Tom Hiddleston: So we close on December the 8<sup>th</sup> at the Jacobs Theatre [on 45th Street].*

*(5) Jimmy Fallon: [What is the story] about? Could [could we --]*

*Tom Hiddleston: [Yeah, loosely,] yes. I play a publisher called Robert. And married to Emma, a gallerist. And there's my best friend, Jerry, who was best man at our wedding. And Jerry and Emma have been having an affair [105].*

In the given example, the host Jimmy Fallon discusses with the actor Tom Hiddleston the latter's new play 'Betrayal'. In the first 3 turns the transition is held smoothly with no overlaps and long pauses. However, there is an overlap both in the TRPs between turns 4 and 5, though the type of overlap is different. In the turn 4, the actor Tom Hiddleston gives a lot of details about the date of the play and the theatre in which it takes place, however, the host Jimmy Fallon uses comparative overlap to take the turn and changes the focus of the conversation. He is more interested in the general idea of the play than its location, moreover, it can be said that the information given by the guest is too specific and too detailed. Comparative overlap is therefore used to smoothly change the flow of the conversation. In the turn 5, however, the actor causes overlapping by starting his turn before the host has finished. But this type of overlap is cooperative; the quest deduces the ending of the host's question and starts answering without waiting for the end of the previous turn. It can be seen as well that the host leaves his turn unfinished to ensure that overlap is minimal.

Competitive overlaps constitute 25 data, from which 18 are from *The Graham Norton Show* and 7 are from *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*. It should be noted that it is mostly the host who uses it in order to change the topic, especially this is relevant for *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*. Competitive overlaps were used to shift the focus of the conversation, prevent the guest from giving too much extra information, change the topic or clarify some details. It also should be emphasized that competitive overlapping is the most apparent example of interlocutor self-selection since it means that the current speaker is not willing to yield the turn.

Competitive overlaps are less common than the cooperative one in both talk shows and they constitute only 13% in general data. This can be explained by the general nature of talk shows that are mostly cooperative in nature. The participants mostly wait for the host to choose the next speaker and wait for their turn. The low frequency of competitive overlaps can be also caused by the general focus of the conversation in these entertaining talk shows. Discussions and conflict situations are often avoided, selected topics are entertaining and not controversial, they relate mainly to the personal or professional life of celebrities. Permitted topics for discussion are often discussed in advance.

Moreover, it should be noted that competitive overlaps are much common in the *The Graham Norton Show*. The number of participants is a crucial moment in this relation. It is indisputable that it is mostly the host who uses competitive overlap to control the conversation, but the participants can also use it. The use of competitive overlap in most cases to add some additional information to the topic discussed though they are not selected. The overlap, however, in this case, is not seen as a problematic issue that disrupts the conversation flow. It is generally accepted since in most cases a participant uses competitive overlap to tell an entertaining story and amuse the audience, besides his/her remark is mostly relevant to the topic.

- **Cooperative overlaps**

Cooperative overlaps are the type of simultaneous talk when the next is not aimed to take the turn of the current speaker but produces a response that is accidentally superimposed on the current speaker's turn. This is a more common type of overlap used in both talk shows. Some examples of cooperative overlaps are given below:

**Example 4**

*Stanley Tucci: Well, yeah, you know-- you know you have to eat well, don't you. [When you are working].*

*Kate Winslet: [You do have to eat well]. You don't want to throw up [97].*

In this situation, the overlap appears between turn 1 and 2. The actress Kate Winslet expresses her attitude to the statement mentioned by the actor Stanley Tucci. Though her utterance overlaps with the previous speaker's utterance, her aim is not to take the floor but simply to respond therefore it is comparative in nature. Moreover, it can be added that the overlap occurs as the result that the actresses wrongly predicts the TRP position, she does not expect the actor Stanley Tucci to continue his utterance therefore she starts answering immediately.

**Example 4**

*(1) Jimmy Fallon: I don't know how you -- I mean, you cry, like, in this play, and you do this every play? Do you cry every [play?]*

*(2) Tom Hiddleston: [Eight shows] a week. Yeah [105].*

In this situation, the host Jimmy Fallon talks with the actor Tom Hiddleston about how often he plays in the theatre. During the conversation the cooperative overlap occurs. The actor can predict the ending of the host's question so he starts answering without waiting till the host finishes. His aim is not to take the host's turn but to give a response as soon as possible.

**Example 5**

*(1) Jimmy Fallon: I wanted to congratulate you because last time you were on the show. I think you had just won the Emmy for...*

*(2) Sarah Paulson: [Uh-huh. Uh-huh. Maybe]*

**(3) Jimmy Fallon:** [...*"People vs. O.J."*][104].

In this example, cooperative overlap is present. However, this example is slightly different from the previous ones since it is quite long. In most cases, overlap is quite brief as one of the speakers stop speaking to give the floor to the other. In this case, turn 2 and 3 are said simultaneously by both the host Jimmy Fallon and the actress Sarah Paulson. Overlap was initiated by the actress she interrupted the host in order to agree with the stated facts and give her attitude to them. Such vocalizations as 'uh huh' are present. Overlap in this situation is used not for taking the floor or disrupting the course of the conversation but to agree with the host's words.

Cooperative overlaps constitute 171 data (or 83%), from which 66 are from *The Graham Norton Show* and 105 are from *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*. They were used to contribute to the flow of the conversation. Cooperative overlaps tend to occur when the speaker shows his/her continued interest in the conversation, expresses the attitude to the stated facts or tries to help the next speaker by completing the turn of the previous speaker. Different types of vocalizations are often used for giving an evaluation of the situation and show engagement in the conversation, these overlaps are, however, quite brief and last for only a few seconds.

It should be noted that cooperative overlap caused by the use of vocalizations, especially 'yeah', 'uh huh', or 'mm hm', is very common to the host Jimmy Fallon. He often uses them to show his continued attention or interest in the stories of his guests. Cooperative overlaps with short vocalizers largely determine the obtained data and mostly because of them *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* is characterized as one with more overlaps.

The other conclusion to be made is that the number of participants is not a decisive factor that increases the number of overlaps. Taking into account the results obtained, it can be seen that there are more cases of overlap distinguished in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* (112 data) where there are only two participants, the host and the guest, while *The Graham Norton Show* with multiple participants is character-

ized by a smaller number of overlaps (only 84 instances defined). Though cooperative overlaps were more common in the latter since cooperative overlap is a useful means of self-selection that allows yielding the turn, which is more important with multiple participants.

Moreover, the conducted analysis showed that a large number of participants does not cause multiple overlapping, i.e. the one that is caused by more than two participants. Based on the analysis of the chosen segments of *The Graham Norton Show* it can be seen that multiple overlapping is not a common phenomenon and occurs only in isolated cases, namely in 10 out of 84. All of these cases belong to cooperative types of overlap, the speakers do not want to take the other speaker's turn but mostly express their attitude or interest. An example of such overlap is also given below:

### **Example 6**

(1) **Stanley Tucci:**... *And so we're staying in these, you know, sort of bungalows that are really beautiful, quite beautiful. And we were next to each other and we worked together all day, then we'd come back at night. And I would cook for both of us.*

(2) **Aisling Bea:** *[Oh].*

(3) **Kingsley Ben-Adir:** *[That's amazing] [97].*

In this example, the actor Stanley Tucci in turn 1 tells about the filming process of the film 'Supernova' and the relationship with his co-partner actor Colin Firth. His statement can be treated as an announcement. It is followed by the overlapped response because both the actor Kingsley Ben-Adir and the comedian Aisling Bea decide to comment on the situation mentioned. Their aim is not to take the turn but to show their attitude toward the situation, therefore this overlap can be defined as cooperative.

However, it should be noted that multiple overlapping is the additional criterion taken into consideration since its selection is not an adequate factor for the comparison of both selected talk shows. It is present only in *The Graham Norton Show*. The detailed

numeric data on the types of overlap used in the analysed talk shows is given in Figure 2.

### 2.3. Types of repair strategies

In contrast to written language, spoken language, excluding its scripted expression, is mostly simultaneous in production and contains more repetitions, rephrasing, interruptions, corrections and broken sentences [33, p. 14]. These conversational phenomena may occur as a result of listening, understanding, or speaking problems. All of these issues can be resolved with the help of repair. As Liddicoat [55, p. 171] states, repair is a process through which a speaker deals with the problems they face during conversation or talk-in-interaction. Repair also allows participants to continue the conversation even when troubles arise and the conversation can be completed [48, p. 229]. The detailed theoretical background on this notion was given earlier in this paper.

Repair is relevant to all levels of conversation analysis from turn-taking to the sequence organization. Conversation repair is an organized set of practices through which participants of the conversation can deal with speaking, hearing, and understanding problems [82, p. 110].

In this chapter, the repair strategies employed by the participants of the talk shows *The Graham Norton Show* and *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* in order to resolve problems in the organization and the allocation of turns in conversation will be analysed. The distinction of repair strategies is based on the theory proposed by Schegloff et al. [68] who differentiated 4 main types of repair strategies: 1) self-initiated self-repair (SISR), 2) self-initiated other-repair (SIOR), 3) other-initiated self-repair (OISR), and 4) other-initiated other-repair (OIOR) [68, pp. 364-365]. According to the obtained results, the participants of the analysed talk shows applied all four types of repair strategies during conversations. The detailed results of the repair strategies realization in the analysed talk shows are shown in **Figure 3**. Examples of the use of each type of repair strategies are given below and further explained.

- **Self-initiated self-repair (SISR)**

Self-initiated self-repair (SISR) occurs when the speaker indicates his/her own mistake in the utterance while conveying the message to the interlocutor. Self-initiated self-repair occurs in the same turn of the current speaker. It should be specified that it is the most common type of repair. The following excerpts exemplify the SISR:

**Example 1**

*Jimmy Fallon: John, we love everything you're doing. We always... um... I personally, I love every single time you come on and thank you for being so funny. And for doing those shows and just getting us through the trickiest political times and making us all laugh really doesn't fall on deaf ears.*

*John Oliver: Appreciate It [100].*

In this example, the host intends to compliment his guest John Oliver. At first, there is no trouble until he discontinues his utterances. The 'um' indicates that the speaker initiated the trouble himself, however, he manages to complete a self-repair by changing the pronoun from 'we' to 'I' and continuing the utterance. It is the example of self-initiated self-repair that occurs in the same turn construction unit (TCU) in which the trouble source appears.

**Example 2**

*Graham Norton: So Kingsley, things are great for you now. You're very, very famous, but you had an early taste of fame, did you not? Because you were in the papers as a child?*

*Kingsley Ben-Adir: Yes, I was [97].*

In this dialogue, the host Graham Norton is not sure whether he formulated the question in the way that it is clear for his quest therefore he specifies and clarifies its initial question by specifically outlining that he wants to know how the actor Kingsley Ben-Adir appeared in the newspapers when he was a child. In this case, the speaker of the trouble source, the host Graham Norton, identifies the possible trouble source and conducts the SISR to avoid possible further misunderstandings.

### Example 3

*Jimmy Fallon: Do you think any change will come from this interview?*

*John Oliver: I don't. I mean, it's hard to say. Isn't it because the-- the royal family, its whole selling point is that it doesn't change. That was kind of the point of it over centuries that you know, times come and go, governments rise and fall but the royal family will always be there. Unyielding, the stiff upper lip that doesn't wobble. So that's their selling point. As... as years go by, you realize that not changing is not entirely a good thing. Because that means the times might be changing around you and you are refusing to evolve. **So I don't think they will change because I don't think they have the capacity to but they obviously should.** The one person who I think has been really happy about all of this is Prince Andrew [100].*

In the given example, the host Jimmy Fallon discusses with his guest John Oliver the recent Prince Harry and Meghan's interview with Oprah Winfrey, in particular, he is interested in the consequences of it and possible changes that will follow after. The guest's initial response is a categorical denial of the host's statement. The adjacency pair of this type can be classified as suggestion-refusal with the dispreferred response. However, the denial is followed by the guest's uncertainty in his own words which can be exemplified with the phrase 'I mean, it's hard to say'. The speaker himself defines the trouble source. John Oliver's further explanation of his vision of the situation leads him to the conclusion that he was initially right. The final explanation of why he believes that change is impossible is an example of self-initiated self-repair when in the result of his thought process; the speaker formulates his final of the situation while supplementing his opinion with arguments.

According to Kitzinger in self-initiated self-repair, the speaker often cuts off his/her utterance to deal with the trouble source [48, p. 230]. It is hard to disagree with this statement since cuts-off are very common with the SISR. This can be illustrated by the following example:

#### Example 4

**Jimmy Fallon:** *Oh, uh, Drake, he recently said that he loved to play you in a movie and you, you gave your stamp of approval. Uh, what would your adv--? What advice would you give Drake in order to nail the performance? What's the key to playing Barack Obama?*

**Barack Obama:** *Well, uh, apparently based on, uh, all the people who do imitations on me, the key is to talk really slowly [102].*

The example above shows that the host Jimmy Fallon cuts off the production of the word ‘advise’ in the first asked question before its completion since he has difficulties with the formulation of the question. He self-repairs in the next utterance by slightly augmenting the question structure and changing the verb ‘advise’ to the noun ‘advice’, reordering happens. However, the host does not complete self-repair with producing the first two questions, he further asks one more question, ‘What's the key to playing Barack Obama?’. Its aim is to specify the information that the host wants to receive since he presupposes that his previous questions were quite vague.

According to the conducted analysis, self-initiated self-repair is the most occurring type of repair used by the participants of both analysed talk shows. It has the highest frequency of occurrence, 78% in total for both talk shows (or 83 out of the 107 total data). The high frequency of this type is attributed to trouble sources that occurred in the talk show. In particular, the findings show that the trouble sources that occurred in the talk shows mostly came from the speaker of the trouble source. The other conclusion to be made is that most of the self-initiated self-repair data from the analysed talk shows deal with the trouble source that comes from the speaker’s mind and is not the result of a syntactic or grammatical error.

Taking into consideration the data separately for each talk show it should be noted that there are more data of SISR found in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* with 49 data, while there are 34 data of this repair type in *The Graham Norton Show*. The difference, however, is not very significant. Moreover, the number of participants is not the

factor that increases the SISR. There are more instances of this type of repair in the talk show with fewer participants.

- **Self-initiated other-repair (SIOR)**

In self-initiated other-repair, the current speaker indicates the trouble source of his/her talk, however, the proper repair is conducted by the other speaker. By using this type of repair, the speaker implicitly requests the other speaker to provide repair [44, p. 60]. For example, SIOR can be used when one speaker does not remember certain details and asks for clarification, as in the examples below:

### **Example 5**

*Jimmy Fallon: Bob Dylan -- I don't really remember the story. Did he not talk to you or something? Or eh--?*

*Barack Obama: That's what happened. He was Dylan-esque. He's exactly how you wanted him to be... [102].*

In this example the host Jimmy Fallon talks with the former of the USA Barack Obama and during the conversation about different musicians he wants to hear the story about Bob Dylan because he knows that there is one, however, he does not know the details, therefore he identifies his lack of information by saying ‘Did he not talk to you or something?’ and initiates the trouble of his words by ‘or eh--’ and leaving the utterance unfinished. Barack Obama in turn clarifies the information and tells the details of the story. Jimmy Fallon acts as the initiator of the repair, he indicates the problem of his talk, however, it is Barack Obama who executes the repair. So, it is an example of SIOR.

### **Example 6**

*Stanley Tucci: It would have been-- it would have been so much more convenient to shoot in Bulgaria. We shot in the Lake District, which actually is so beautiful. It was so beautiful. And I always heard about it. But anyway, yeah. So we were there. And we were staying in like **um a holiday camp or what do you call it like a holiday--?***

*Graham Norton: A holiday camp, yeah.*

*Stanley Tucci: Oh wow, I'm British [97].*

In the given example, the actor Stanley Tucci tells about the place where the film 'Supernova' was filmed. While describing the location, he, however, is not sure how to call the place where the actors of the film stayed, so he initiates the repair by showing his hesitation whether he uses the right word by saying, '...um a holiday camp or what do you call it like a holiday--'. The host Graham Norton conducts the repair and clarifies which word can be used. Therefore, in this case, SIOR is used since Stanley Tucci defines the trouble source and the host repairs it. It is also worth mentioning that there is also the other type of repair that can be identified in this situation, namely the repetition of the construction 'it would have been-- it would have been...' and a pause after it marks the trouble source in the turn 1, however, the actor Stanley Tucci manages to execute SISR and complete the utterance.

Self-initiated other-repair is the second most occurring type of repair in both talk show according to the conducted analysis. It was found that there are 10 occurrences (or 9 %) of this repair type. The data does not differ much for both talk shows, there are 4 data of SIOR in *The Graham Norton Show* and 6 in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*.

It can be seen that self-initiated self-repair and self-initiated other-repair are the most common types of repair employed by the participants of the talk shows. These findings correspond to the ones done by Schegloff [72], who emphasizes that there is a general preference for self-initiated repair because the speaker himself/herself identifies the cause of the problem. Other-initiated repair in which the recipient identifies the trouble source is less common. Similar conclusions were made in the result of this research.

- **Other-initiated self-repair (OISR)**

Other-initiated self-repair (OISR) happens when one speaker identifies the trouble source, and the other speaker repairs it. Other-initiated self-repair always consists of more than one turn of conversation since one speaker has to indicate the trouble source

and the other speaker, the one who caused the trouble, has to resolve it. This type of repair is mostly used right after the turn with a trouble source.

### **Example 7**

(1) **Graham Norton:** *You're now facing your second lockdown birthday?*

(2) **Aisling Bea:** *Yes. Growing up. So obviously it's been more difficult for me than for anyone else.*

(3) **Graham Norton:** *Yes?*

(4) **Aisling Bea:** *My second pandemic birthday. Yeah, we're a small group of people. And we're tough people. Yeah, my first one. I was in Ireland, just as Ireland went into lockdown and my birthday today from St. Patrick's Day. So I went back to get absolutely hammered for St. Patrick's Day with a few of my friends, one of whom his birthday is St. Patrick's Day. And we were like, do you think a cough is going to stop us going on and laugh. And then like Ireland's in lockdown... [97].*

In the excerpt above, the host Graham Norton discusses with the actress Aisling Bea the peculiarities of birthday celebrations during the lockdown since her last two birthdays took place during quarantine. At first, the host asks about her experience, but the actress' answer is not detailed enough and does not satisfy the host so he uses the question word 'Yes' to encourage the guest to continue the story and get clarification. Thus the host identifies the trouble source and acts as the initiator of the repair, while the guest is the one who conducts it by giving all the needed information. This is an example of other-initiated self-repair (OISR). It is also worth noting that the guest repeats the initial question of the host by saying 'My second pandemic birthday...' at the beginning of turn 4 to identify for herself what the trouble source was and what information she was supposed to provide.

### **Example 8**

(1) **Graham Norton:** *Kinsey, do you cook or do-- I know your grandmother Bernie was an amazing cook.*

(2) *Kingsley Ben-Adir: My grandma. She's cooking up a feast.*

(3) *Graham Norton: But you don't?*

(4) *Kingsley Ben-Adir: I go-- go through phases. So sometimes I just feel like-- yeah for a little while it has been a lot of delivery and Caribbean. Always gets to like five, six, seven o'clock and **I'm like I'm not a cook** [97].*

In this example, two types of repair may be differentiated: self-initiated self-repair and other-initiated self-repair. The first one is presented in turn 1 by Graham Norton where he asks the actor Kingsley Ben-Adir about his cooking skills. The host also wants to ask about the cooking talent of the actor's grandmother but he at first is unable to formulate the proper question. After a short pause, however, he does self-repair and makes a statement. The actor gives an incomplete answer to the question in turn 2, he mentions only his grandmother, but omits the part about himself. In turn 3, the host initiates the repair by repeating his question one more time. Consequently, in turn 4, the actor completes other-initiated self-repair by stating that he is not the cook.

It can also be seen that other-initiated self-repair requires a few turns to be completed, while self-initiated self-repair is done within one turn. It is the third most common type of repair employed by the participants of both talk shows with 9 data or 8%. The numbers are almost equal for both talk shows, namely, there are 4 data of OISR in *The Graham Norton Show* and 5 in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*. It should also be noted that the number of instances for OISR is almost the same as for SIOR.

- **Other-initiated other-repair (OIOR)**

Other-initiated other-repair occurs when the interlocutor or recipient identifies the trouble source and completes the repair. Hutchby and Wooffitt note that OIOR performs has three tasks: it indicates, exposes and locates and resolves the trouble source [44, p. 62]. There are also some examples of how this type of repair occurred in the conversation:

### **Example 9**

(1) **Stephen Fry:** *I should say, of course. I'm using the word heroes, the gender-neutral word. Atalanta was one of my favourite heroes. Atalanta is in your film Aquaman?*

(2) **Graham Norton:** *Yes, you are playing Queen Atlanna.*

(3) **Nicole Kidman:** *Not my film.*

(4) **Stephen Fry:** *Well, Marc Evans' film.*

(5) **Nicole Kidman:** *Jason Momoa's film. Yeah. James Wan's film [98].*

In this example two instances of other-initiated other-repair can be defined, the first trouble source is caused by the fact that the writer Stephen Fry mispronounces the name of the heroine of the film 'Aquaman', the second is related to the authorship of the film. In this dialogue, the writer Stephen Fry introduces his book 'Heroes' to the general public on *The Graham Norton Show* and mentions Atalanta as one the heroes. There is also another participant actress Nicole Kidman present in the studio. The writer knows about her experience of playing the queen of Atlantic in the film 'Aquaman' and wants to make a connection between these two heroines, however, he makes two mistakes, which he is unaware of, that need to be repaired. As it can be seen in turn 2 the host Graham Norton pronounces the name of Nicole Kidman's heroine as 'Atlanna' but not 'Atalanta' and in such a way initiates the repair. Nicole Kidman in turn 3, however, also indicated that there was another trouble source in turn 1; she states that the film 'Aquaman' was not hers. Stephen Fry in turn 4 makes effort to conduct a self-repair by naming the director whom he considers involved in this film. So, Nicole Kidman in turn 3 identified the trouble source, and Stephen Fry in turn 4 did the repair, which is an example of other-initiated self-repair. However, the writer is also mistaken, since Marc Evans is not the director of the mentioned film. In turn 5 Nicole Kidman mentions the main hero of the film 'Aquaman' and its director and thus other-initiated other-repair happens.

Other-initiated other-repair is the type of repair which is the least common type of repair employed by the speakers in the analysed talk shows. It constitutes only 5% of all the data (or 5 instances of use out of the defined 107). This can be explained by the fact

that the next speaker's opportunity to initiate and complete the repair is restricted by the current speaker who holds the floor. Though there can be an assumption that there should be more cases of OIOR in the conversations with multiple participants, in practice it has not been confirmed, the data in both talk shows is almost similar, and there are 2 data of OIOR in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* and 3 data in *The Graham Norton Show*.

It can be stated that OIOR is rarely employed in entertaining talk shows. This can be explained by the fact that this type can threaten the speaker's face therefore it is often avoided.

So, all four types of repair structures are represented in the analysed talk shows. Self-initiated self-repair is the most common type with 78%, self-initiated other-repair goes next with 10%, the third is other-initiated self-repair with 9% and other-initiated other repair is the most rarely employed repair with 5%. There is no significant difference between the results in both talk shows therefore it can be concluded that the amount of participants does not play a significant role in terms of repair. The detailed numeric data on the types of repair strategies used in the analysed talk shows is given in Figure 3.

## CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 2

Turn-taking strategies, overlap and repair are integral structural components of the interactional organization. This chapter, however, is based on their analysis in the talk shows *The Graham Norton Show* and *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* with the first being a British talk show with multiple participants and second being an American talk show with two participants respectively. The aim of the research was not only to examine the types of turn-taking strategies, overlap and repair strategies applied by the participants of the aforementioned talk shows but also to consider features of their implementation in two-party and multi-party communication.

Turn-taking strategies were the first aspect of the analysis, in particular, there were three of them identified: speaker's selection (when current speaker select next speaker) speaker's self-selection and speaker's domination (when current speaker continues). The conducted analysis shows all three of them were relatively evenly represented in both talks. The speaker's selection is the most common strategy used by the participants of both talk shows. It constitutes 90% of data in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* and 76 % for *The Graham Norton Show*. The second most popular turn-taking strategy is the speaker's self selection with 8% of data for *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* and 18 % for *The Graham Norton Show*. The least popular strategy is speaker's domination that is only 6% for *The Graham Norton Show* and 6% for *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*. It should be clarified that *The Graham Norton Show* is characterized by a more diverse use of turn-taking strategies. In this relation, the number of participants is important since it complicates the interaction process.

Overlap is the next important component of the turn-taking system that was analyzed in this paper. It a phenomenon that occurred quite frequently in the analyzed talk shows. Generally speaking, there were 196 utterances with overlap defined in both talk shows, 43% of which belong to *The Graham Norton Show* and 57% to *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*. So, the higher frequency of overlap is typical for the talk show with fewer participants. It is possible to conclude that the larger the number of par-

ticipants, the more carefully and efficiently they try to organize turn-taking. Moreover, two types of overlap were defined, namely, competitive and cooperative. It was found that comparative overlap is quite uncommon in both talk shows, but still, its percentage is higher in talk shows with more participants, i.e. *The Graham Norton Show*. Cooperative overlap is much more prevalent in both talk shows.

The third aspect that was considered in this chapter is repair strategies, namely 4 of them were differentiated: self-initiated self-repair (SISR), self-initiated other-repair (SIOR); other-initiated self-repair (OISR) and other-initiated other-repair (OIOR). However, the data concerning the distribution of these strategies in each talk show separately are quite similar with SISR being the most common repair strategy, SIOR being the second, OISR being the third and OIOR being the least represented. It is possible to trace the general tendency of the participants of both talk shows to use self-initiated repair since the speaker themselves often the source of the problem. The number of participants is not the factor that increases the occurrence of other-initiated repair. It can be concluded that the speakers in both two-party and multi-party communication try to avoid other-initiated repair since it can threaten the other speaker's face. Nevertheless, it should be noted that repair strategies were used more frequently in *The Graham Norton Show*, which is a talk show with multiple participants. There are 45 data of repair strategies defined in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* and 62 data in *The Graham Norton Show*. Therefore, it can be argued that there is a direct correlation between the number of participants and the frequency of use of repair strategies.

## **CHAPTER 3. ADJACENCY PAIRS IN BRITISH AND AMERICAN TALK SHOWS WITH TWO AND MULTIPLE PARTICIPANTS**

### **3.1. Types of adjacency pairs**

Adjacency pairs are intrinsically linked to the turn-taking system, since they are one of the basic techniques for selecting the next speaker. The conversation is always adjacent and consists of a series of paired utterances that ensure the continuity of conversation due to the constant exchange of turns. In order to complete an adjacency pair, the pairing of the second utterance should proceed from the pairing of the first utterance. Adjacency pair organization is a fundamental structure through which, as Goodwin and Heritage state, conversational participants display the analysis of one another's actions [32, p. 288].

There are different types of adjacency pairs defined by many linguists, but some of them have similarities. In this research, the classifications proposed by Yule [95], Paltridge [60] and Schegloff [73] were used, they were unified and slightly augmented in a way that alternative second pair parts of adjacency are included (both preferred and dispreferred) where possible.

In this paper, 15 types of adjacency pairs were categorized: 1) greeting – greeting; 2) summons – answer; 3) apology – minimization; 4) question – expected/ unexpected answer; 5) request – acceptance/ refusal; 6) offer – acceptance/ refusal; 7) blame – admission/ denial; 8) invitation – acceptance/ refusal; 9) assessment – agreement/ disagreement; 10) command – compliance/ noncompliance; 11) suggestion – acceptance/ refusal; 12) assertion – agreement/ disagreement; 13) announcement – acknowledgement; 14) compliment – acceptance/ rejection; 15) farewell – farewell. The ones that were identified in the conducted analysis are exemplified below. The others are exemplified below.

#### **Greeting – greeting**

Greeting – greeting is the type of adjacency pair that is commonly used at the beginning of the conversation for salutation and welcoming. The following examples show how the greeting – greeting adjacency pair is applied in the conversation.

### **Example 1**

**Kate Winslet:** *Hello. I'm Kate Winslet and welcome to the Graham Norton show.*

**Graham Norton:** *So welcome to the show and hello to our virtual studio audience. Hello everyone out there... The British star of One Night in Miami Kingsley Ben-Adir is here. Faster winning writer, comedian, star of This Way Up. It's Aisling Bea. The Oscar nominated star of Hunger Games, Devil Wears Prada and Spotlight is Sanni Tucci everybody. Lord of the Rings and Pirate star Orlando Bloom will be going on. And the Oscar winning star of the Reader and Titanic Kate Winslet will be here. Music right here in the studio for soap city featuring Ellie Goulding, everybody. Everyone loves dancing. Welcome all. See you. An American, a Hollywood star in our humble studio... [97].*

In the excerpt above the first participant Kate Winslet introduces herself and greets the audience, while the second participant the host Graham Norton also greets all the participants and the audience and then introduces all the guests of the talk show.

In some cases, greeting can be done in the form of gestures or smiles, this is especially common for the greeting as a response. For example:

### **Example 2**

**Graham Norton:** *It's the British star of 'One Night in Miami'. Kingsley Ben-Adir is here.*

**Kingsley Ben-Adir:** *[smiles and nods]. (1)*

**Graham Norton:** *BAFTA winning writer, comedian, star of 'This way up'. It's Aisling Bea.*

**Aisling Bea:** *[waves with her hand] (2) [97].*

In the given example, the host Graham Norton greets the guests of the show, among which there is an actor Kingsley Ben-Adir and a comedian Aisling Bea, and introduces them to the general public. The guests of the show respond with gestures because the host does not give them the right to speak.

It should be noted that the greeting – greeting adjacency pairs, the second part of which is completed with the help of gestures, are presented only in *The Graham Norton Show*. Furthermore, they constitute the majority of all the greetings distinguished from this show, namely such second pair responses appear in 5 out of 7 instances defined. On the other hand, all the greeting – greeting adjacency pairs differentiated in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* are done in the verbal form. Such a difference can be explained by the fact that there are only 2 participants present in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*, namely the host and guest, so it would not take long to exchange greetings, while there are usually from 3 to 6 participants in *The Graham Norton Show*, including the host, so there is not enough air time for individual greetings. Moreover, the gestures used by the guests for greetings perform the function of identification and help the audience to understand whom the presenter introduces.

In general, there are 12 data of greeting – greeting adjacency pairs found in the analysed talk shows, 7 of them are from the *The Graham Norton Show*, while other 5 are from *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*. While the host Graham Norton used greeting to initiate the conversation with all the 7 participants analysed, in case of Jimmy Fallon this was indeed a preferred way of starting the conversation, however, he also tends to use compliments at the beginning of the conversation. This happened in 2 out of 7 analysed conversations.

- **Summon – answer/ no answer**

Summon – answer adjacency pairs occur when the speaker in the first pair part summons the second pair part. This is quite a common type of adjacency pair used by the participants of the analysed talk shows to manage turns and choose the next speaker,

especially in case with multiple participants of the conversation. Some examples of this type of adjacency pair are analysed below.

### **Example 3**

**Graham Norton:** *Now Kingsley Ben-Adir, you I know are a big fan of Contagion, which has suddenly had this new life. Did you just? Did you only watch it in lockdown?*

**Kingsley Ben-Adir:** *Yeah. It came up as-- like, number one in the world. Most viewed film for that like month, obviously. And yeah. And I watched that I'd never seen it before. But I was trippy going like Oh, they predicted this. It is happening now [97].*

In order to manage the conversation successfully the host Graham Norton summons the next speaker by calling his name to answer a specific question. The reaction of the actor Kingsley Ben-Adir is an expected response that can be also perceived as a preferred second pair part. Since there are a few guests present in the studio, the host uses summons to define the next speaker and direct the conversation.

There are 19 instances that can be classified as summon – answer adjacency pairs in general in both talk shows, however, the distribution of these data differs. There are only 3 instances of summon – answer adjacency pair in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*, while in *The Graham Norton Show* this type is much more common, there are 16 adjacency pairs found that can be classified as summon – answer. In this case the number of participants is important. Graham Norton uses summons as a means to manage the conversation and choose the next speaker.

- **Question – expected/ unexpected answer**

In order to get information in conversation, the question – answer adjacency pair is applied. The first participant is an information seeker and the second participant is an information provider. The answer to the question may be either expected or unexpected. The examples of questions with both expected and unexpected answers are provided below.

#### Example 4

**Jimmy Fallon:** *What are go to movies that you would recommend to everybody all the time?*

**Quentin Tarantino:** *I don't believe in go to movies. Right. Not to everybody, not to everybody. That's right [103].*

Since the guest Quentin Tarantino is a famous director, the host Jimmy Fallon wants to know about his advice on 'go to' films, because his opinion in this aspect is quite authoritative. The guest answers this question; however, not in the way the host expects, therefore this is a question – answer adjacency pair with an unexpected response or dispreferred second pair part.

#### Example 5

**Anne Hathaway:** *Did you like tell your kids everything when they were four like to kind of get them to do what you wanted them to do?*

**Jimmy Fallon:** *Oh, yeah. I mean, yeah, sure. Whatever. I still kind of do it. Yeah, we'll do that and then we'll get this. But yeah, I mean, I I would. I was when they were really babies. I was trying to get Winnie to say dad so hard to make that our first word now [99].*

In the example above the host Jimmy Fallon and the guest actress Anne Hathaway talk about parenting. Since Anne Hathaway knows that the host's kids are older than hers, she asks about his experience to compare if it is somehow different. Jimmy Fallon's answer is an expected response; therefore, it belongs to a preferred type.

#### Example 6

**Orlando Bloom:** *What? You were there? What year were you there? Kingsley?*

**Kingsley Ben-Adir:** *2008 to 2011 (1). When you?*

**Orlando Bloom:** *I finished in 99. Yeah. Okay... (2) [97].*

In the aforementioned example, Orlando Bloom accidentally found out that Kingsley Ben-Adir also finished Guildhall School of Music and Drama and therefore

actors exchange information on when they studied at this institution. Moreover, this conversation consists of 2 question – answer adjacency pairs, both of them are preferred.

It should be noted that it is more typical for a host to ask a question, however, it is no exception that guests ask questions to the host (Example 3) or other participants (in case there is a number of participants like in Example 4).

Question – answer is the most common type of adjacency pair that occurs in the analysed talk shows. It constitutes 81 data, among which 36 belong to *The Graham Norton Show* and 45 for *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*. Since talk shows are mostly based on interviews, the process of asking and answering questions is in their core.

- **Assessment – agreement/disagreement**

This type of adjacency pair is used when the first speaker expresses their evaluation, feelings or judgments about specific events, things or people. The second speaker may either agree with the first speaker's statement or disagree. Agreement, however, is a preferred response, disagreement is a dispreferred one. Some examples of conversations that show judgement about the speakers' understanding of the situation and are categorized as assessment – agreement/disagreement are shown below.

### **Example 7**

*Barack Obama: She, Beyoncé sang, she sang, uh, on, at our inauguration, uh, that was our first dance with, uh, uh, at the very first ball. And it was spectacular. Uh, I mean, her doing the show... was dressed in that white gown. And, and I re as I write in the book, you know, **she was just, um, special.***

*Jimmy Fallon: Yeah. Beautiful. Yep. Just stunning... [102].*

The former president Barack Obama shares his experience about Beyoncé's performance at the first ball after inauguration. He shares his assessment of the singer's show and the host agrees therefore assessment – agreement adjacency pair is applied in this example.

### **Example 8**

**Graham Norton:** *There's something giddy about being here without the audience. You just get a bit giddy.*

**Stanley Tucci:** *It's very freeing [97].*

In this excerpt, the host Graham Norton discusses with the actor Stanley Tucci how the format of the show was changed during the pandemic, in particular there is no audience and only a minimum number of participants is allowed to be in the studio. The host notes that it influenced his way of conducting the show and he became more 'giddy'. By saying that the host assesses the situation, while the guest actor Stanley Tucci agrees with him therefore creates a preferred second turn.

The researcher found 34 data categorized as this type of adjacency pair, 18 of them were found in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*, while 16 of them are from *The Graham Norton Show*. This type is quite typical for all the analysed conversations, since personal judgments allow outlining the attitude to a situation or event.

- **Assertion – agreement/ disagreement**

In this type of the adjacency pair the first speaker informs the second about specific activities, states, or affairs. However, assertion is not any statement produced by the speaker; it is a strong belief or claim. The second speaker may agree (or disagree) with the details provided in the first pair part.

**Example 9**

**Graham Norton:** *Yeah, this is more of the human.*

**Stephen Fry:** *Exactly. By this time, it's getting to be more human, and that clearing up the world, really good monsters, and so on [98].*

The host Graham Norton discusses the release of the book 'Heroes' with its author Stephen Fry. The host presupposes that it is more concerned with humans and the guest agrees and clarifies this information. Such a response is expected and can be classified as a preferred second pair part of this type of adjacency pair.

Assertion – agreement/ disagreement is a type of adjacency pair that appears 13 times in the conducted analysis, 7 of them can be found in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*, and consequently other 6 are present in *The Graham Norton Show*.

- **Command – compliance/ noncompliance**

Command – compliance/noncompliance adjacency pair is applied when the first pair part of an adjacency pair contains a command or order. In the second pair part the next speaker may choose to either comply with the command as a preferred response or not to do so as the dispreferred response. Command and request are not to be mixed since request is politer and less direct.

### **Example 10**

*Graham Norton: Hey. Let's start with Stanley Tucci's new film 'Supernova'. It stars yourself and Colin Firth. So I guess just tell us about it. Tell us about it. You're a couple and you're traveling. That's all we know.*

*Stanley Tucci: Yes. We're a couple who band together for many years. I am Excuse me. excuse me. My character is suffering from early onset dementia. And I know that sounds like not a very fun film, but there is there is a lightness of touch in the film... [97].*

In this extract, the host Graham Norton at first chooses the topic of the conversation and then asks the guest actor Stanley Tucci about specific information connected to this topic. The guest complies with the host's order, which is a preferred response, and provides detailed information about the plot of the film 'Supernova'. It should be mentioned that the first pair part is classified as a command and not as a request since it lacks markers of politeness.

This type of adjacency pair is poorly represented and constitutes only 2 examples, both of them are present in the *The Graham Norton Show*. These commands though are not strict ones.

- **Request – acceptance/ refusal**

Request – acceptance/ refusal refers to the adjacency pair in which the speaker of the first pair part asks the other speaker to do something most often in a polite way. Acceptance as the response in the second pair part is a preferred answer, while refusal is the dispreferred answer.

### **Example 11**

**Graham Norton:** *So series two, is there anything? Tell us about it? Can you tease us what's-- what's happening in season two?*

**Aisling Bea:** *We only finished on Monday. So we only finished shooting the show on Monday. So I can't really tell you anything just in case we forgot to press record... [97].*

This is an example of a request – refusal adjacency pair. The host Graham Norton wants to receive some details about the second season of the series *This Way Up*, however, he does not want to be specific because he takes into account the fact that the actress may not yet be able to disclose information about the series. Aisling Bea chose not to reveal any specific information; however, she does that quite implicitly. She states it is too early for that.

### **Example 12**

**Jimmy Fallon:** *You cry on command? Like right now if I said please cry for us.*

**Tom Hiddleston:** *I can try [105].*

In the given example, the host Jimmy Fallon discusses with the actor Tom Hiddleston the recent works of the latter and notes that he often chooses to play quite dramatic roles and has to cry on command. Therefore, the host asks the actor to demonstrate his talent, if possible. The guest is willing to try and accordingly he accepts the proposal.

There are in general 15 instances of request – acceptance / refusal adjacency pair found in the analysed conversations, 5 of them were present in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* and 10 in *The Graham Norton Show*. It should be noted that in all the cases it was one of the hosts, but not one of the guests of the talk show, who initiated the

request in order to receive information on a specific issue. It should be also noted that the host Graham Norton tends to initiate such a type of adjacency pair twice as often as the host Jimmy Fallon. However, this type of adjacency pair is not frequently applied. Though hosts can use requests to ask for information politely, questions and announcements are more common means for doing that.

- **Suggestion – acceptance/ refusal**

The speaker that produces the first pair part of this type of adjacency pair puts forward a certain idea or suggestion, the speaker of the second part is to consider the proposal and either refuse or accept. The examples of suggestion – acceptance/refusal adjacency pair with both preferred and dispreferred responses are given below

### **Example 13**

*John Oliver: Yeah, that's right. You've given us this-- this money HBO for a reason. We're gonna use it for something else now is that the definition of fraud? Seems to be. **But let's just let's just assume the charity has happened and not an actual crime.***

*Jimmy Fallon: That's-- that's a better way to put it [100].*

This is an example of suggestion – acceptance adjacency pair. While speaking about the donations to the food banks, John Oliver reveals that money used for charity is actually taken from the budget allocated by the HBO channel for the show ‘Last Week Tonight with John Oliver’. However, he ironically asks not to call the misuse of money a ‘fraud’, emphasizing charity. Jimmy Fallon agrees that it is a better way to look at the situation.

### **Example 14**

*Graham Norton: Presumably you've experienced Stanley's cooking?*

*Kate Winslet: No, I haven't experienced Stanley's cooking, which is a tragedy because clearly you're a marvelous chef [97].*

In this dialogue, the host Graham Norton discusses the culinary talents of the actor Stanley Tucci, who is famous for cooking incredible dishes during the filming proc-

ess, with the other talk show participant actress Kate Winslet who often meets him on set. The host suggests that the actress already had a chance to appreciate the actor's dishes; however, Kate Winslet denies it, which is a dispreferred second part, since this response is not an expected one.

There are 18 data categorized as suggestion – acceptance/refusal type of adjacency pair, that is, 9 examples were found in each of the analysed shows. Moreover, though with all the other adjacency pairs preferred responses are more common, with suggestion preferred and dispreferred responses are almost equal in numbers. This can be explained by the fact that hosts, while asking different questions, often rely on gossip or unverified facts, asking guests to refute the information, confirm it or clarify the details. It is mostly one of the hosts who initiates this adjacency pair. The hosts also often mark their suggestions with different phrases such as ‘can you clarify’, ‘presumably’, ‘supposedly’ etc.

- **Blame – admission/ denial**

Blame is the type of adjacency pair in which one speaker is held accountable for the wrong or unpleasant action that has occurred. The blame can be answered by admitting it, which is the preferred response, or denying it, which is a dispreferred one.

### **Example 15**

*Barack Obama: Are you saying that, uh, that would have affected my legacy because that is a jam and I know that's a jam. Well, uh, no. So, so, uh, now you kept, I'm a little insulted that you didn't think I could pull it off.*

*Jimmy Fallon: You should be about... I saved your legacy, that, that moment in time. And hopefully that makes it in the second volume of the book, uh, that right... [102].*

In this dialogue, the host Jimmy Fallon discusses the slow jam that he conducted with President Obama during his show a few years ago. The host reveals that the initial jam was slightly different from the one that was presented to the public. The host had to change some moments because he did not think they were appropriate for the president

of the USA. The ex-president, however, noted that he would have coped with the original version and it would not have affected his legacy. Jimmy Fallon does not agree with Barack Obama's statement. It can be said that his response is more of a denial, since he believes the final version was better. In this case blame – denial adjacency pair with a dispreferred response occurs.

There are only 3 examples of blame – admission/ denial found. All of them are from *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*. Moreover, all the examples of this type of adjacency pair defined in our analysis contained denial as a response. Though it is dispreferred, denial was produced implicitly and had no negative effect on the conversation. It should be also noted that all the blame – denial adjacency pairs were produced ironically or in a humorous way, there was no negative connotation or insult.

- **Compliment – acknowledgment/rejection**

The first pair of compliment – acknowledgment/ rejection adjacency pair is aimed at praising the other person. It is expected from the next speaker to respond with acceptance, which is a preferred response, however, in some exclusive cases it is also possible to reject the compliment, which is a dispreferred response.

#### **Example 16**

*Barack Obama: Oh, I love, I love “Slow Jam”.*

*Jimmy Fallon: Thank you. Thank you. I appreciate it [102].*

In the given example, the former US president Barack Obama, who participates in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*, compliments the host by saying that he likes the program led by him. The host Jimmy Fallon accepts the compliment.

#### **Example 17**

*Jimmy Fallon: Oh, you look fantastic. It's so great to have you on the show.*

*Michelle Obama: Thank you. I missed being sitting right next to you [101].*

On this data, the first pair part is a compliment produced by the host Jimmy Fallon to the guest of his show Michelle Obama, the second pair part is the acknowledgment of the compliment.

As it can be seen, in example 1 it is the guest Barack Obama who compliments the host Jimmy Fallon, while in example 2 the host praises the guest Michelle Obama. Though both of these patterns are very common in both talk shows it is usually the host who uses compliments and emphasizes the achievements of his guests.

In general, there are 24 compliments classified, 14 in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* and 10 in *The Graham Norton Show*, which makes a compliment quite a common type of adjacency pair used in the conversations.

- **Announcement - acknowledgement**

Announcement as a first pair part refers to the statement that includes the information which can be known publicly. The second pair provides acknowledgement as the preferred form of response. This type of adjacency pair does not presuppose a dis-preferred second pair part. It is a kind of statement that allows a speaker to make certain information publicly known.

### **Example 18**

*Jimmy Fallon: I want to talk about the Disney plus series ‘Loki’. Yes, you're getting your own show.*

*Tom Hiddleston: Unbelievable [105].*

In this excerpt, the host Jimmy Fallon discusses with the actor Tom Hiddleston the upcoming Disney plus series ‘Loki’ in which the actor plays the main role. Though the actor has already played Loki in other films of the franchise, he was just a minor character. The host’s aim is to announce that the actor gets his own show. The actor acknowledges this fact by giving his assessment of the situation.

### **Example 19**

*Jimmy Fallon: No, but then -- so you win the Emmy award, and then from there, you just -- you’ve won almost every award I’ve even -- I’ve never even heard of these awards, and you’re winning them. Seriously, you won the Golden Globe, you won a SAG Award, a Critics Choice, TCA. It... Boom, boom, boom, boom, boom. And you made TV history.*

*You're the only person to win all those awards in one -- in the same year.*

**Sarah Paulson:** *This is so embarrassing! [104].*

In the given excerpt, the host Jimmy Fallon talks with the actress Sarah Paulson. The host announces the award that she won that year and notes that she is the only person in the TV history to get them all in one year. Although the actress' answer shows that she is somewhat embarrassed by the amount of praise from the host, she implicitly acknowledges the host's statement. She doesn't do it directly because she tries to look modest.

There are 67 data in the analysed talk shows categorized as this type of adjacency pair; 37 data are found in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* and 30 are from *The Graham Norton Show*. Announcement – acknowledgement is the second most common type of adjacency pair used by the participants of the talk shows and it goes after question – expected answer/ unexpected answer type. To a large extent, such a distribution of data can be explained by the specifics of the talk shows themselves, as their task is to obtain information about the participants. Both questions and announcements are productive means to give additional information on a specific issue. Moreover, announcements ensure that only well-known facts about the guest are discussed, consequently unwanted or controversial topics are avoided, this guarantees successful communication. The analysed talk shows are entertainment, therefore participants are aimed not to raise awkward questions, this is also facilitated by the choice of topics for conversation, and they are informal and usually not personal.

- **Farewell – farewell**

A farewell is an act of saying goodbye to somebody. It is often present at the end of the conversation.

### **Example 20**

**Graham Norton:** *Good to see you. Good luck with Retaliation. Enjoy your time with Daisy and give our love to Katie. Thank you very much. Orlando Bloom.*

**Orlando Bloom:** *Bye [97].*

In this example, the host Graham Norton uses cliché phrases to say goodbye to his guest famous actor Orlando Bloom. The host also touches on all the topics they discussed during the show, namely the actor's new film *Retaliation* and the birth of his daughter Daisy, to summarize the conversation. Orlando Bloom in turn uses the simple word 'Bye' that signals farewell.

### **Example 21**

**Jimmy Fallon:** *It is so great talking to you. Congratulations again on 'A Promised Land'. I really love speaking with you and I meant it when I said it. I miss you.*

**Barack Obama:** *[nods his head] [102].*

The host Jimmy Fallon finishes the conversation with his guest Barack Obama by expressing the gratitude and mentioning the topics discussed. Barack Obama nods with his head approvingly which is a reciprocal gesture.

There are 9 instances of farewell found in analysed talk shows, 5 are from the *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* and 4 from *The Graham Norton Show*. In most cases the farewell resembles the greeting in a way that the host announces the name of the guest for the audience one more time and thanks him/her for coming. Farewell can also be conducted not in a verbal form but with help of gestures or smile. The farewells done in the talk shows differ from the ones in ordinary conversation, they often lack cliché phrases of saying goodbye, but are more aimed to thank the guest. The host is the one who initiates the ending of the conversation; his farewell turn is rather extensive, while the guest's response tends to be rather limited since farewell also serves as a means to show that screen time has come to its end.

Thus, 12 types of adjacency pairs were classified in the talk shows *The Graham Norton Show* and *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*, namely greeting – greeting; summons – answer; question – expected answer/ unexpected answer; request – acceptance/ refusal; blame – admission/ denial; assessment – agreement/ disagreement; command – compliance/ noncompliance; suggestion – acceptance/ refusal; assertion –

agreement/ disagreement; announcement – acknowledgement; compliment – acceptance/ rejection and farewell – farewell. The detailed data on the adjacency pairs used in the analysed talk shows is given in the Figures 4–6. Moreover, the frequency and the percentage of each category are presented together in order to give more detailed information of the occurrences of adjacency pairs types in the analysed talk shows.

### **3.2. Preference structure of adjacency pairs**

As it has been noted above, adjacency pairs are the automatic sequences that consist of a first part and a second part. When the first speaker produces the turn he/she expects a specific response from the other speaker. Cook states that the answer of adjacency pairs is often a choice of two likely responses [19, p. 52]. The term ‘preference organization’ is allied in this relation and it means that, though the second speaker may construct alternative second pair parts, these responses do not have the same significance, some of them are preferred when the response is expected the others are dispreferred when the response is unexpected or undesirable for the first speaker.

#### **3.2.1. Preferred adjacency pairs**

Preferred second pair parts occur when the response given by the speaker is relevant to the expectation of the previous speaker. The following preferred responses were categorized in the conducted research: 1) greeting for greeting; 2) answer for summons; 3) expected answer for question; 4) acceptance for request; 5) agreement for assessment; 6) compliance for command; 7) acceptance for suggestion; 8) agreement for assertion; 9) acknowledgement for announcement; 10) acceptance for compliment and 11) farewell for farewell. The example of each of the mentioned types is given below and further explained.

#### **Example 1** (greeting – greeting)

*Jimmy Fallon: My first guest is the former First Lady of the United States and the bestselling author of the book ‘Becoming’, which is now available in paperback and young readers’ edition. How cool is that? She also has a brand new*

*show on Netflix called ‘Waffles and Mochi’, which is available now my pleasure to welcome back to the show, Michelle Obama.*

***Michelle Obama: Hey, hey! [101].***

In the given example, the host Jimmy Fallon greets the guest Michelle Obama and introduces her to the audience, while she replies to his greeting with reciprocal interest, which is a preferred type of response.

According to the collected statistics, there are 11 data of greeting – greeting in the analysed talk shows.

### **Example 2 (summons – answer)**

***Orlando Bloom: How did you find yourself quarantining in um in London, Stanley? That’s what I want to know.***

***Stanley Tucci: It's fine. Listen, it's fine. I'm with my family. It's fine. But let's face it, it's time to move on [97].***

In the excerpt mentioned, the actor Orlando Bloom during the conversation on *The Graham Norton Show* summons the other actor Stanley Tucci by directly addressing him by name to make him recognize that he was called. Stanley Tucci in turn gives a detailed answer to the question asked that is an expected and therefore preferred response.

In general, 19 data of summons – answer adjacency pairs were categorized.

### **Example 3 (question – expected answer):**

***Jimmy Fallon: Do you like winning awards?***

***Quentin Tarantino: Yes, I do [103].***

This situation represents the question – answer adjacency pair with expected therefore preferred response. The host Jimmy Fallon talks with the film director Quentin Tarantino about Golden Globes and he is interested in how the guest generally feels about receiving awards. The director's answer is, as expected, yes. It is important to note that the response is not extended and contains a short and precise answer to the question.

There are 58 data of question – expected answer adjacency pairs found in the analysed talk shows. Furthermore, the question – answer adjacency pair with the preferred second part is the second most common pattern and constitute **23%** out of all preferred responses. This can be explained by the fact that the interaction in talk shows is based on the interview structure. Questions asked in such shows are supposed to be interactive and often form the first part of this adjacency pair. When the host asks a question to start a new topic or get additional information, the guest is expected to answer appropriately with the preferred response.

**Example 4 (question – expected answer and request – acceptance)**

***Jimmy Fallon:** (1) I've known you for a pretty long time now. I've heard people call you Annie. Like your good friends. Do I call you Ann or Annie?*

***Anne Hathaway:** Call me Annie. Yeah, everybody. Everybody call me Annie please. It's good. (2) Can we talk 'bout my name for a second?*

***Jimmy Fallon:** Yeah [99].*

In the given example, there are 2 types of adjacency pairs that can be differentiated, (1) question with expected answer and (2) request-acceptance, both of which are with preferred responses. The first one is a question that is followed by an expected answer. The host Jimmy Fallon starts the conversation with his guest actress Anne Hathaway and decides to clarify the appropriate form of appeal. Since they are well acquainted the host asks if he can address her less formally. The actress clarifies this information and also notes that in this way she can be addressed not only by the host but also by everyone else. Then she initiates the next turn by asking if it is possible to clarify the issue with her name. The guest knows that this is a departure from the theme of the show, so she needs the host's consent to continue the story. Jimmy Fallon allows her to do it by saying 'yeah'. Thus, there is a request with further acceptance. Taking into account the first and the second preferred responses, the first one is more complex and consists of a few utterances, while in the second case only one word is applied.

There are 11 data of request – acceptance adjacency pairs found in both talk shows.

**Example 5 (assessment – agreement)**

*(1) Sarah Paulson: It's an incredibly glamorous... Like, it was a very exciting night. You walk in this giant red carpet, ascending the stairs of the Metropolitan. It's really crazy. But it's all about your picture being taken in the gown that you're wearing. That's sort of the thing...*

*(2) Jimmy Fallon: Yeah.*

*(3) Sarah Paulson:...besides raising money for the museum, obviously. But it's about the dresses, too.*

*(4) Jimmy Fallon: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. Exactly [104].*

In this conversation, the actress Sarah Paulson shares her experience of attending the Met Gala with the host Jimmy Fallon. In turns 1 and 3, the actress gives an assessment of this event with the help of descriptive adjectives ‘incredibly glamorous and ‘really crazy’ and providing evaluative judgments about the whole situation. The host agrees with her statements, which is a preferred response.

According to the conducted analysis, there are 27 data of assessment – agreement adjacency pairs categorized in the analysed talk shows.

**Example 6 (command – compliance)**

*Graham Norton: That's the near future. So tell us about the overall idea of ‘Soulmates’ and your -- your particular piece of the anthology.*

*Kingsley Ben-Adir: We're 15 years in the future and there's technology that exists called the test where you-- you know, scientific technology has arrived where you can find your perfect soulmate by putting DNA from your eyeball into a database and providing your perfect soulmate has done the same thing. You can be matched with someone on Earth who is like your soulmate. And each episode explores a different relationship within that world... [97].*

In the conversation above, the host Graham Norton in the first part asks the guest of his show the actor Kingsley Ben-Adir to tell about the new anthology series ‘Soul-mates’ in which the latter was filmed. The use of imperative mood and lack of politeness markers allow classifying this turn as a command. In the second pair part, the actor fulfils the request by giving the overall idea about the series, therefore this turn is categorized as compliance, which is a preferred response.

According to the data, there are 2 examples of the command – compliance adjacency pair differentiated in the analysed talk shows.

**Example 7 (suggestion – acceptance)**

*(1) Graham Norton: Talking about you. You cooked for uh Colin in your holiday camp.*

*(2) Stanley Tucci: Yeah.*

*(3) Graham Norton: But didn't he make the rookie error of trying to cook for you?*

*(4) Stanley Tucci: Yeah, he did. He did. The first. One of the first nights we were there. He said, ‘Oh, I've made a shepherd's pie’. I love shepherd's pie, actually. But I said, ‘You know, I made something’. You know, I can't remember what it was. And he said, ‘Oh, well just freeze it’. And I was like, ‘Yeah, freeze it’. And then that was it. Then I cooked from then on [97].*

The actor Stanley Tucci is known to be a great chef and he often cooks for the film crew on set. The host Graham Norton in this conversation wants to ask about the cooking skill of the actor’s co-partner in the film ‘Supernova’ Colin Firth, however, he initiates this discussion by announcing that it is often Stanley Tucci who cooks. Turns 1 and 2 can be defined as pre-expansion since they provide background information. The suggestion as the first pair of the adjacency pair appears in turn 3, in which the host presumes that Stanley Tucci’s co-partner Colin Firth tried to cook for him, though it was not successful. In turn 4, the guest agrees with the host’s statement, which is a preferred form of response.

There are 13 data of the suggestion – acceptance adjacency pairs categorized in the analysed talk shows.

**Example 8 (assertion – agreement)**

*(1) Quentin Tarantino: I mean-- I think it's one of the greatest documentaries ever made.*

*(2) Jimmy Fallon: With a Snickers bar?*

*(3) Quentin Tarantino: Yeah, yeah, exactly. Yeah. The guy eats the Snickers bar, says, 'I have the energy'. And the thing about you that it was a movie that if you commit to it, you're going to love it.*

*(4) Jimmy Fallon: Yes, I totally agree. Yeah, that was yours go to [103].*

In the given example the host Jimmy Fallon and film director Quentin Tarantino discuss their favourite documentaries. In turn 1, Quentin Tarantino makes an assertion that 'Hands on a Hard Body' is one of the greatest documentaries that he has ever seen. However, turn 2 and 3 are an inserted question – answer sequence aimed to show that the host understands what film the guest is talking about. It is only in turn 4 that the host agrees with the assertion stated by Quentin Tarantino in the turn 1. Though there is an insertion this adjacency pair can still be classified as assertion – agreement with the preferred response.

9 data of the assertion – agreement adjacency pair were categorized in the conducted analysis.

**Example 9 (announcement – acknowledgement)**

*Jimmy Fallon: I was gonna say I know the way Marvel plays it. You're not allowed to tell me anything I know. But you-- you were telling me backstage that when you auditioned for Thor, you actually auditioned for Thor.*

*Tom Hiddleston: I did? Yes, I did. Um, they were basically at the time--. They were-- they were looking for sort of less well established actors, so that the audience didn't have an association. They were like um they just wanted people to see these new characters, these new actors in the pan and I -- they will pay the remit*

*wise if you're over six foot, and you've got blonde hair. And you know, you can come and have a pop at it. So I actually never auditioned for Loki. I only ever auditioned for Thor which is nuts [105].*

In this example, the host announces to the general public the fact about the actor Tom Hiddleston that he knows is true, namely that the latter initially auditioned for the role of Thor, not for the role of Loki, as they discussed this backstage. Tom Hiddleston agrees with the host's statement and gives further details of the situation, which is a preferred response as the second speaker agreed with the acknowledgement of the first speaker.

Announcement – acknowledgement is the most common data of all preferred responses that constitute 67 instances of use or 27%.

#### **Example 10 (compliment-acceptance)**

*Jimmy Fallon: Fantastic, I think.*

*Tom Hiddleston: Thank you very much. You--- you're really are too kind [105].*

In the given example, the host **Jimmy Fallon** evaluates the acting skills of the actor Tom Hiddleston and states that he is fantastic. The actor politely accepts the compliment, which is a preferred response.

According to the analysis, there are 21 data of the compliments with acceptance differentiated in the analysed talk shows.

#### **Example 11 (farewell - farewell)**

*Jimmy Fallon: John Oliver everybody. 'Last Week Tonight with John Oliver' airs Sundays at 11pm on HBO.*

*John Oliver: Buy [nods his head] [100].*

In this conversation, the host Jimmy Fallon initiates the ending of the conversation by once again introducing his guest, the host of another show 'Last Week Tonight with John Oliver'. The guest also responds with a farewell, which is a preferred second pair part.

9 data with the farewell – farewell adjacency pair were categorized in the conducted analysis.

According to the analysis conducted, preferred responses are dominant ones in both talk shows and constitute the vast majority of all second pair parts, namely 83% of all second pair parts, while the dispreferred responses are only 17%. Separately for each talk show, the data are as follows: there are 87% of preferred second pair parts in *The Graham Norton Show* and 79% in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*.

### 3.2.2. Dispreferred adjacency pairs

The results of this research have shown that there are 7 types of adjacency pairs with dispreferred responses found in the talk shows. These are 1) question with unexpected answers; 2) request with refusal; 3) blame with denial; 4) assessment with disagreement; 4) command with noncompliance; 5) suggestion with refusal; 6) assertion with disagreement and 7) greeting with impolite greeting and 8) compliment with rejection.

The notions of dispreferred second parts have been mentioned in the previous chapters, however, this section provides further explanations of the data. The most interesting cases of dispreferred responses are given below.

#### **Example 1 (question – unexpected answer)**

*John Oliver: Can you believe what Megan did? Hmm. Can you believe it? Dragging this family's name into disrepute shaming us.*

*Jimmy Fallon: Everyone's talking. Everyone's talking about this and only this [100].*

In this excerpt, the guest John Oliver expresses his assessment of the actions of Megan, namely her statements in an interview with Oprah. He also wants to hear the position of the host Jimmy Fallon on this issue. However, the host answer is rather unexpected. The way Jimmy Fallon says that everyone is talking about the situation with Megan and Prince Harry's interview with Oprah is a hedge to give the feedback to John

Oliver's question. As a host, Jimmy Fallon does not want to state his personal opinion on this issue, therefore his answer is vague. Therefore, this is an example of question-unexpected answer adjacency pair, since Jimmy Fallon does not answer the way John Oliver expects from him.

Another type of dispreferred social act found in talk shows is the dispreferred social act of suggestion which is followed by a refusal.

**Example 2 (suggestion with refusal)**

*Graham Norton: And also like Americans must be thinking it's so weird when they see you on chat shows because they have no idea that you're English.*

*Kingsley Ben-Adir: Well, I've never been on a chat show. That's the first chat show [97].*

In this example, the host Graham Norton puts forward a consideration that it is unusual for Americans to see the actor Kingsley Ben-Adir on British chat shows (British way to call talk shows) since he is believed to be an American but not British, who he actually is, by most people. The actor, however, does not agree with these suggestions because it is the first time he has ever been on a talk show and the host's statement is wrong. The second pair part is therefore a refusal, which is a dispreferred response.

**Example 3 (greeting – impolite greeting)**

*Jimmy Fallon: Welcome back, everybody. I am here with John Oliver, the host of 'Last Week Tonight with John Oliver'. I always love having you on the show. And thank you for doing 'Hey Robot'.*

*John Oliver: It was, I was gonna say a pleasure, but, but it wasn't... It wasn't... [100].*

This is an example of greeting – greeting adjacency pair with the dispreferred second turn. It was expected from the guest John Oliver to use one of the cliché phrases that are used for greeting at the beginning of the conversation. However, his answer is not quite conventional and is completely contrary to the idea of a polite greeting. However, the guest uses this form ironically and for a humorous effect, so, although such a

second turn is unexpected and dispreferred, it does not interfere with successful communication and does not create problems in further conversation.

It can be seen that dispreferred responses do not affect the success of communication and do not lead to misunderstandings, pauses or breaks in the conversation. This can also be explained by the general specifics of entertaining talk shows, as participants try to be as cooperative as possible and ensure a smooth conversation. The topics that are raised are not controversial or unpleasant, and therefore do not cause any negative outcomes even if dispreferred responses are used

According to the data analysed, it was also concluded that dispreferred second pair parts are in most occur immediately after the first pair part and therefore they can be categorized as mostly direct. Moreover, dispreferred responses tend to be more structurally complex and consist of more utterances than the preferred ones, which are generally quite simple.

There are, in general, 50 adjacency pairs with dispreferred responses found in both talk shows which constitute 17 %. Thus, dispreferred ones are less represented in comparison with preferred responses. From 7 types of adjacency pairs with dispreferred responses, the unexpected answer for the question is the main type of dispreferred response which was regularly used by the participants of both talk shows. It constitutes 46% out of all dispreferred responses. The second most popular dispreferred response is disagreement for assessment with 14%.

As for the data separately in each of the talk shows, there were more cases of dispreferred responses used in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*. From 50 data of dispreferred responses, there are 31 data in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* and 19 data in *The Graham Norton Show*. The difference in numbers was mainly caused by the greater number of unexpected answers found in the talk show *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*. Therefore, it can be also concluded that the number of participants does not affect the preference organization, because the distribution of preferred and dispreferred responses is not very different in both analysed talk shows. Moreover,

more dispreferred second pair parts were recorded in the talk show with fewer participants. Detailed numerical data on preferred and dispreferred second pair parts is given in the Figures 7–10.

### 3.3. Extension of adjacency pairs

Although two parts of adjacency pairs tend to be located next to each other, strict adjacency is not necessarily required to achieve coherence. It is possible for systemic insertions to occur between the first and second pair parts of the adjacency pair. There are three possible ways to further extend an adjacency pair:

- Pre-expansion is the expansion of the first-pair part.
- Insert expansion occurs between two pair parts.
- Post-expansion is the expansion of the second-pair part.

All of these types are further analysed and exemplified below.

#### • Pre-expansion

Pre-expansions lay the groundwork for subsequent responses and determine what type of adjacency pair may occur in the next turn. Pre-expansion is often used to give the next speaker some additional details and helps them to avoid dispreferred second pair parts. Pre-sequences are aimed to minimize the number of dispreferred actions and maximize the occurrence of preferred actions in the upcoming turns (Levinson, 1983, p. 89). This was also confirmed in our analysis. The following data are examples of pre-sequence used in both of the analysed talk shows.

#### Example 1

*Jimmy Fallon: I want to talk about some topical things if you don't mind. Something everyone's talking about this past week. It's Prince Harry and Megan's interview with Oprah. Did you watch this?*

*John Oliver: I did. I did watch it. Um, the whole. The whole. I watched it soup to nuts, the whole thing. And yeah, it was. It was amazing. I mean, I will say I didn't*

*find any of it surprising. That was kind of what I felt like, sadly, her experience was going to be going in because you know, I grew up. I know the royal family from a distance. And they seem like flawed people. That's literally the kindest way I could possibly put it [100].*

In this instance, the first part of the adjacency pair of the question-expected answer includes pre-expansion, since the host Jimmy Fallon gives background information before asking the question. Based on the aforementioned, this type of pre-expansion can be classified as a pre-sequence of a question type. There is also a post-expansion in the second pair-part since the guest John Oliver does not only give the expected answer to the host's question but also extends his answer by expressing his general attitude to Prince Harry and Megan's interview with Oprah.

### **Example 2**

**Graham Norton:** *Now Kingsley Ben-Adir, you-- I know are a big fan of 'Contagion', which has suddenly had this new life a lot. Did you just-- did you only watch it in lockdown?*

**Kingsley Ben-Adir:** *Yeah. It came up as... like, number one in the world. Most viewed film for that like month, obviously. And yeah. And I watched that I'd never seen it before. But I was trippy going like, 'Oh, they predicted this. It is happening now' [97].*

In this example, the host Graham Norton before delivering the base utterance uses the pre-sequence that is the additional information about the film 'Contagion' that the host wants to discuss. This type of pre-expansion can be classified as a pre-question as it is used to create a basic idea of the situation so that the question asked would be clear not only to the guest and the host but also to the other guests and the general public. The actor Kingsley Ben-Adir produces the preferred second pair part which is an expected answer. The given example therefore may be defined as a question – expected answer adjacency pair with pre-expansion.

Pre-expansion is the second most common type of expansion used by the participants of the analysed talk shows. It constitutes 16 data from which 9 belong to *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* and 7 to the *The Graham Norton Show*. In most cases, pre-expansion is used by one of the hosts (in 14 out of 16 cases) whose intention is to give the background information of a particular situation and ensure that all the participants, including both the guests and the audience, are familiar with it. Moreover, pre-expansion is meant to direct the next speaker and reduce the number of dispreferred responses.

- **Insert expansion (or insertion)**

When the first pair part of the adjacency pair is produced, the second pair may not be produced in the next turn but still remain relevant. As Yule notes (1996, p. 78), an insertion sequence, is often one adjacency pair within another. The examples of insert expansions are given below:

### **Example 3**

*Jimmy Fallon: Yeah. And you get run into people who probably haven't seen you in a while?*

*Quentin Tarantino: No. It's really, really No, that's really, really cool. It's like there's some people that-- Yeah, exactly. I bumped into, at one of the parties. We were going to. I haven't seen Tom Hanks in about like five or six years, you know? And then we have a really groovy Converse conversation. And it was really neat. Yeah, it was really cool [103].*

In this example, the question – answer adjacency pair is divided with the insert expansion that is the second speaker's assessment of the situation. The host Jimmy Fallon and the film director Quentin Tarantino talk about the Golden Globe Awards. The host notes that it is possible to meet a lot of acquaintances at this event and instead of answering the question directly, he at first states that in general, he likes such a state of affairs.

### **Example 4**

(1) **Jimmy Fallon:** *I want to talk about your new movie, ‘Locked Down’ because it’s so--*

(2) **Anne Hathaway:** *You are saying that very well.*

(3) **Jimmy Fallon:** *Thank you. Well I don’t want to say [‘lockdown’]*

(4) **Anne Hathaway:** *[It’s not ‘lockdown’, it’s ‘locked down].*

(5) **Jimmy Fallon:** *It’s ‘Locked Down’. I just want to make sure people can hear the title.*

(6) **Anne Hathaway:** *Honestly have a glass of wine before you watch the movie. It will be ‘Lockdown’.*

(8) **Jimmy Fallon:** *[Laugh] ‘Lockdown’.*

(9) **Anne Hathaway:** *Honey, let’s just watch it [99].*

Given example contains a request – refusal adjacency pair with the first pair part being the turn 1 where the host Jimmy Fallon wants to find some additional details about the film ‘Locked Down’ in which the actress Anne Hathaway was filmed; the second pair part in turn 9 where the actress decides not to fulfil the host’s request to share information about the film by offering to just watch it, which is an indirect request. The turns 2 – 8 can be classified as an insertion sequence since the actress repeatedly emphasizes how to pronounce the title of the film. It is worth noting that the host does not make a mistake in the title of the film, so there no repair mechanisms can be defined in this segment of the conversation. However, the confusion is quite possible, therefore the host wants to clarify that the film is ‘Locked Down’ but not ‘Lockdown’ for the audience.

Insertion is the least common type of expansion used in both talk shows. There are in general only 8 data with insertion sequence defined, 5 of them are found in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* and 3 in the *The Graham Norton Show*. This can be explained by the fact that insertions can complicate the smooth flow of the conversation as they are often quite complex and can consist of many turns. Therefore, it is more convenient for the speakers to organize conversations so that adjacency pair parts go one

after another and are not separated by other sequences. However, it is still possible that second pair parts are not the next turn in the series of turns and may be produced after the insertion.

- **Post-expansion**

Post expansions may be of two types: minimal and non-minimal, while minimal consist of one turn, non-minimal include more than one turn. Non-minimal turns are analysed in examples 5 and 6, while minimal post-expansion is given in example 7:

### **Example 5**

*Graham Norton: You were filming in the real places? You were down there in Lyme Regis and the Channel coast?*

*Kate Winslet: Yes, we were. I mean, it was-- it was incredible to be able to film in Lyme Regis. It really was. And, you know, I was trained-- I was trained as a palaeontologist, I was taught by a brilliant expert named Patty Howe, who's a wonderful, wonderful man. Hi, Patti. I'm sure you're watching. And he really helped me so much. I mean, not just in terms of how to identify fossils, but-- but how to crack open nodules to find Ammonites inside and make sure that you do it in a certain way so that you don't shatter the Ammonite and working with all the old tools, and it was definitely very helpful to me. Yeah [97].*

In the given example, the question – answer adjacency pair is produced. The first speaker, the host Graham Norton produces a general question to ask the second speaker, the actress Kate Winslet, about the locations where she was recently filmed. The actress subsequently responds to these questions, however, she does not only answer ‘yes’ but also expands her response with additional details. The information about the actress being trained as a palaeontologist is an additional post-expansion that closes the question – answer sequence.

Although in most cases post-expansion tends to be the expansion of the question – answer adjacency pair, it is also commonly used by the speakers with the announcement – acknowledgement. The example of post-expansion that appears in combination with

the announcement – acknowledgement adjacency pair is given below. This post-extension contains more than one utterance; therefore, it is non-minimal.

### **Example 6**

**Graham Norton:** *And now, Stephen Fry, Stephen Fry brings us well-- I say sequel... it's more of a continuation of your bestselling book of Greek mythology 'Mythos'. This is 'Heroes'. It's out now. And I mean, the first one was such a huge hit.*

**Stephen Fry:** *It was when there was a big surprise to me, I was delighted. But I've always loved Greek myths. And I actually started-- I found myself a year and a half ago with guys around the table at someone's house. And we-- we were just talking about creation myths and where they come from. And I started telling the story of the early Greek gods, the first ones and where Zeus came from. And everyone's heard certain names, but they don't necessarily know how they go together. And someone said, well, you should write them. So I started to, and now this one is carried on to the 'Heroes' [98].*

In the first turn, the host Graham Norton announces the release of Stephen Fry's book 'Heroes' noting that the book is a sequel to the book 'Mythos' that has become a real hit. Stephen Fry confirms the correctness of this statement in the second turn; however, he also provides some additional information about the reasons why he decided to write the book. This is post-extension since it goes beyond simple acknowledgement. This post-extension consists of more than one turn; therefore, it can be classified as non-minimal.

### **Example 7**

(1) **Graham Norton:** *So have you been in London? I know you live here, but have you been here for the whole lockdown?*

(2) **Stanley Tucci:** *Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah.*

(3) **Graham Norton:** *Oh, yeah [97].*

In this example, the question – expected answer adjacency pair is followed by post-expansion. The host Graham Norton asks the actor Stanley Tucci if the latter was in London during the lockdown. The actor answers in the affirmative and that is a preferred response. However, the host then produces another turn by saying ‘Oh, yeah.’ This short response is a minimal post-expansion that closes the question – expected answer adjacency pair. Its purpose is to indicate that the host received the information needed from Stanley Tucci’s answer to his question.

It should be, however, noted that non-minimal post-expansion is produced by the quest of the talk shows, while minimal one is typical for the hosts.

Post-expansion is the most common type of expansion used in both talk shows. There are 39 data of post-extension defined in both talk shows, among which there are 25 non-minimal post-expansions and 14 minimal ones. Non-minimal post-expansions are usually used as a continuation of the question-answer or announcement-acknowledgement adjacency pairs. In most cases speakers of talk shows are not limited to strict and precise responses, on the contrary, a detailed answer to the question is encouraged and welcomed, additional information or a slight departure from the topic does not greatly affect the success of the conversation, therefore non-minimal post-expansion is used more often than a minimal one. On the other hand, minimal post-extension indicates that the speaker has received all the necessary information and is ready to start the new topic. Taking into account each talk show separately, there are 24 post-expansions in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* with 8 minimal and 16 non-minimal and 15 in the *The Graham Norton Show* with 6 minimal and 15 non-minimal post-expansions. The data is not drastically different with non-minimal post-expansion being a more common type.

The detailed data on the types of extinction of adjacency pairs is given in the Figure 11.

### CONCLUSIONS TO CHAPTER 3

The overall sequential organization of social interaction is impossible without adjacency pairs. They are also basic turn-taking units that determine the course of the conversation. This chapter is aimed to identify the peculiarities of their distribution in the talk shows *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* and *The Graham Norton Show* while taking into account the difference in the number of participants in both talk shows

First, multiple classifications of types of adjacency pairs were analysed and unified, namely, 15 types of adjacency pairs were identified from which 12 were found in the analyzed talk shows. These are: 1) greeting – greeting; 2) summons – answer; 3) question – expected answer/ unexpected answer; 4) request – acceptance/ refusal; 5) blame – admission/ denial; 6) assessment – agreement/ disagreement; 7) command – compliance/ noncompliance; 8) suggestion – acceptance/ refusal; 9) assertion – agreement/ disagreement; 10) announcement – acknowledgement; 11) compliment – acceptance/ rejection and 12) farewell – farewell. While providing the categorization of adjacency pairs both preferred and dispreferred second pair parts were considered.

There were no examples of apology – minimization, offer – acceptance/ refusal and invitation – acceptance/ refusal adjacency pairs found in both talk shows.

Most of these adjacency pairs are represented in both talk shows. However, there is no example of blame – admission/ denial adjacency pair found in *The Graham Norton Show* and no command – compliance/ noncompliance found in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*.

In general, there are 297 data classified in the analyzed talk shows. The data in both talk shows are relatively similar with 147 data in *The Graham Norton Show* and 150 in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*. Question – answer (expected/ unexpected) is the most common type of adjacency pair in both talk shows, announcement – acknowledgement is second in number also for both talk shows. It proves that the hosts of the analyzed talk shows, despite the different number of participants, use the same tactics of turn-taking managing with question and announcement being the most typical

means of turn initiation. The biggest difference in statistics between the two talk shows concerns summons – answer adjacency pair. It is almost 5 times more represented in *The Graham Norton Show*, which is a talk show with multiple participants. Thus, the number of participants increases the occurrence of summons – answer adjacency pair since it allows the host to determine the next speaker and manage the conversation successfully.

The preference organization of the second pair parts was also examined in detail. It should be noted that dispreferred responses are not common for both talk shows. However, they are slightly more common for *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*. However, it is not the number of participants that increases the dispreferred responses but a topic of conversation since the participants of both talk shows are generally aimed to cooperate and try to produce preferred second pair parts. In general, preferred responses constitute 83% for *The Graham Norton Show* and 79% for *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*.

The next point to be considered is the extension of adjacency pairs. The most common type is post-expansion, pre-expansion is second in number and insertion is the least common for both talk shows. Notably, post-expansion was mostly used by the guests of the talk shows while pre-expansion was typical for the hosts. Extension, however, is generally more common for the talk show with fewer participants, namely *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* with 38 data, while there are 25 data in *The Graham Norton Show*.

The other important conclusion to be made is that TV hosts in both talk shows play an important role in the turn-taking process. They mostly are the first pair speakers who initiate the turns and manage the flow of the conversation.

## CONCLUSIONS

In accordance with the set goal, we carried out a theoretical analysis of conversational analysis as one of the main methods used for the analysis of spoken discourse. Such structural components of interaction as turn-taking, adjacency pairs, preference organization, overlap and repair were defined and further analyzed in terms of their implementation in the British talk show with multiple participants *The Graham Norton Show* and the American talk show with two participants *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*.

In this paper, the following objectives were fulfilled: first, different types of spoken discourse were considered, the relationship between spoken and written discourse was outlined on the basis on which main features of the spoken discourse were defined. The approaches from which spoken discourse may be analysed were mentioned, however, the main attention was given to conversational analysis as one of the most essential approaches to the study of spoken interaction. Then, the main aspects of CA were defined. Special attention was given to turn-taking, overlap, repair, preference organization and adjacency pairs as they are key structural components of communicative interaction. Moreover, talk show was identified as an example of semi-institutional discourse that combines the features of both ordinary conversation and institutional discourse.

Taking into consideration the practical part of the research, it was aimed to examine the features of the structural organization of interaction in British and American talk shows with two and multiple participants in terms of CA.

First, turn-taking strategies were analyzed. It was found that more diverse use of turn-taking strategies is common for the talk show with multiple participants, namely *The Graham Norton Show*. However, the general distribution of turn taking-strategies is similar in both talk shows with the speaker's selection being the dominant strategy, the speaker's self-selection being the second and the speaker's domination being the least used strategy. The talk show with multiple participants has also a more complex turn-taking structure.

In terms of overlap, it was more common for *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*, which is a talk show with two participants. It can be concluded that the number of participants does not increase the occurrence of overlap. It should be noted that the general data on overlap in both talk shows do not differ dramatically; the cooperative overlap is generally more common than the competitive one. However, the number of utterances with competitive overlap is still higher in a talk show with more participants, i.e. *The Graham Norton Show*.

While considering the distribution of repair strategies in both talk shows, it should be noted that they were used more often in the talk show with multiple participants, namely, *The Graham Norton Show*. So, the number of participants and a higher need for repair in communication are interrelated. However, the data concerned with the distribution of these strategies are quite similar for both talk shows, self-initiated self-repair is the most common strategy, self-initiated other-repair is second; other-initiated self-repair is third and other-initiated other-repair is barely represented. In this relation, it is worth noting that self-initiated type of repair is generally more common in the analysed talk shows.

Adjacency pairs are the next aspect that was analysed. It should be noted that the number of adjacency pairs found for both analysed talk shows separately is almost even, so this allows comparing the data in detail. First, 12 types of adjacency pairs were differentiated for both talk shows. Question – answer (expected/ unexpected) and announcement – acknowledgement are the most common adjacency pairs used in both talk shows, this is determined by the general structure of these talk shows. The biggest difference in numbers between the two talk shows concerns summons – answer adjacency pair, it is nearly 5 times more represented in *The Graham Norton Show* since it allows the host to manage the turn allocation successfully which is harder in the multi-party conversation. In addition, dispreferred second pair parts are less represented in comparison with preferred responses in both talk shows. However, there are more cases of dispreferred responses used in *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*, which is a talk

show with fewer participants. However, it is the topic of the conversation that may cause the higher number of dispreferred responses and not a number of participants. Finally, the extension of adjacency pairs is more common for the talk show with fewer participants, namely *The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* since the speakers generally have more time to complete the turn.

Thus, the talk show with multiple participants has a more complex turn-taking structure with the higher risk of overlapping during turn-taking. Besides the higher number of repair strategies needs to be applied. The extension of adjacency pairs and longer turns are typical for the talk show with two participants. However, the data do not differ dramatically and the participants of both talk shows put a lot of affords into the structural organization of interaction to make it run smoothly.

Since the focus of the research was limited to turn-taking, repair, overlap and adjacency pairs in the entertaining British and American talk shows, it only included a small part of the media discourse. The machinery of CA also allows conducting the analysis from other perspectives. It is recommended to conduct the similar research with different focus while paying attention to the wider scope of material.

## REFERENCES

1. Исупова О.Т. Конверсационный анализ: представление метода // Социология 4М. № 15, 2002. С. 33–52.
2. Корбут А.М. Говорите по очереди: нетехническое введение в конверсационный анализ // Социологическое обозрение. Т. 14. № 1, 2015. С. 120–141.
3. Ларина Е. Г. Лингвопрагматические особенности ток-шоу как жанра телевизионного дискурса (на материале американских телевизионных программ). Автореферат. Волгоградский государственный университет. Волгоград, 2004. 22 с.
4. Маленький Б.І. Німецьке телевізійне ток-шоу суспільно-економічної тематики: прагмалінгвістичний аналіз жанру / Б. І. Маленький // Мовні і концептуальні картини світу. Вип. 51, 2015. С. 301–309.
5. Матіюк Л. М. Сутність та прояви адресатності у сучасній німецькій мові. URL: <http://lib.chdu.edu.ua/pdf/novitfilolog/20/8.pdf>
6. Мраморнова О. М. Соціологічне дослідження мовленнєвої взаємодії: метод конверсаційного аналізу. Актуальні проблеми соціології, психології, педагогіки. Вип. 12, 2011. С. 32–35.  
URL: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/apspp\\_2011\\_12\\_9](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/apspp_2011_12_9)
7. Селіванова О. О. Методологічні проблеми дослідження діалогу. Одеський лінгвістичний вісник. Вип. 1, 2013. С. 144–158.
8. Улановский А. М. Феноменология разговора: метод конверсационного анализа. Вопросы психолінгвістики. Т. 27. № 1, 2016. С. 218–237.
9. Arminen I. Institutional Interaction. London: Ashgate: Aldershot, 2005. 269 pp.
10. Atkinson J. M. and Heritage J. Structures of social action: studies in conversation analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, 1984. Pp. xvi + 446.

11. Bernsten S. G. Using Conversation Analysis to evaluate pre-sequences in invitation, offer and request dialogues in ESL textbooks. University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign, 2002.
12. Berry M. Systemic linguistics and discourse analysis: a multi-layered approach to exchange structure. In Malcolm Coulthard & Martin Montgomery (eds.), *Studies in discourse analysis*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981. P. 120–145.
13. Biber D., Johansson S., Leech G., Conrad S. and Finegan E.: *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*, Harlow: Pearson Education, 1999. xxviii + 1204 pp.
14. Boden D., Zimmerman D. *Talk and Social Structure*. Cambridge: Polity Press 1991. P. 139–155.
15. Brown G., Yule G. *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1983. 288 pp.
16. Burns, A. J., Gollin, S. H. *I see what you mean: Using spoken discourse in the classroom: a handbook for teachers*. North Ryde, N.S.W: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research. 1996.
17. Calsamiglia C., Lorda L., Nussbaum, L. et al. Communicative strategies and socio-cultural identities in talk shows. *Pragmatic 5s*: 3.32-53 39. International Pragmatic Association. P. 325–338.
18. Chafe D., Tannen D. The Relation between Written and Spoken Language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 16. P. 383–407.
19. Chafe W. Integration and involvement in speaking, writing and oral literature. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Spoken and written language. Exploring orality and literacy*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex, 1982. P. 35–53.
20. Cook G. *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
21. Coulthard M. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman Group Limited, 1985.

22. Cutting J. *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge, 2002.
23. de Ruiter J. P., Mitterer H., Enfield N. J. Projecting the end of a speaker's turn: a cognitive cornerstone of conversation. *Language* 82, 2006. P. 515–535.
24. Drew P., Heritage J. *Analyzing Talk at Work: An Introduction*: Cambridge University Press, 1992. P. 3–65.
25. Drew P., Heritage J., eds. *Conversation Analysis (4 Volumes)*. London: Sage, 2007.
26. Duranti A. Intentions, self, and local theories of meaning: Words and social action in a Samoan context. San Diego, CA: Center for Human Information Processing, UC San Diego. [Technical Report No. 122.], 1984.
27. Elder C., Davies A. Assessing English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 2006. P. 282–301.
28. Flowerdew J. *Discourse in English language education*. New York: Routledge, 2013.
29. Gardner R. Classroom Interaction research. *The State of the Art. Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 52(3), 2019. P. 212–226.
30. Gee J. P. *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. New York: Routledge, 2011.
31. Ghilzai S. Conversational analysis of turn taking behavior and gender: Differences in multimodal conversation. *European Academic Research*, 3(9), 2015.
32. Goodwin Ch. *Co-Operative Action*. N.Y. : Cambridge University Press, 2018. 521 pp.
33. Goodwin Ch., Heritage J. Conversation Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 19, 2003. P. 283–307.
34. Gottlieb M., Ernst-Slavit G. *Academic language in diverse classrooms: Definitions and contexts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press. 2014.

35. Gumperz J. J., Kaltman H., and O'Connor M. C. Cohesion in Spoken and Written Discourse: Ethnic Style and the Transition to Literacy. Ed. Deborah Tannen. Coherence in Written Discourse. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1984. P. 3–19.
36. Halliday M. A., Matthiessen C. Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar (4th ed.). Oxon: Routledge, 2014.
37. Hammersley M. Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: methods or paradigms? *Discourse and society*. Vol. 14, 2003. P. 751–781.
38. Heldner M., Edlund J. Pauses, gaps and overlaps in conversations. *Journal of Phonetics*, 38(4), 2010. P. 555–568.
39. Heritage J. C. and Clayman S. *Talk in action: Interactions, identities, and institutions*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
40. Heritage J. Conversation analysis and institutional talk. In *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction* / ed. by Robert Sanders, Kristine Fitch, Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2005. P. 103–146.
41. Heritage J. Conversation Analysis and Institutional Talk: Analyzing Distinctive Turn-Taking Systems. *Proceedings of the 6th International Congress of IADA (International Association for Dialog Analysis)* / ed. by Cmejrkova S., Hoffmannova J., Müllerova O. and Svetla J. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1998. P. 2–17.
42. Heritage J. *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1984.
43. Huddleston R., Pullum G. In *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language* (pp. I–IV). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
44. Hughes R. *Teaching and Researching Speaking*. Warlow: Longman, 2002.
45. Hutchby I., Wooffitt R. *Conversation Analysis* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008. 256 pp.
46. Hutchby I., Wooffitt R. *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002.
47. Ilie C. Semi-institutional discourse: The case of talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(2), 2001. P. 209–254.

48. Jefferson G. Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed). *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2004. P. 3–31.
49. Kitzinger C. Repair. *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, 2012. P. 499–556.
50. Leech G. Grammars of spoken English: new outcomes of corpus-oriented research. *Language Learning*, 50(4), 2000. P. 675–724.
51. Lerner R. M. *Liberty: Thriving and civic engagement among American youth*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2004
52. Levinson S. C., Torreira F. Timing in turn-taking and its implications for processing models of language. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, Article 731, 2015.
53. Levinson S. C. *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
54. Levinson S. C. Turn-taking in human communication—origins and implications for language processing. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 20(1), 2016. P. 6–14.
55. Licoppe Ch., Morel J. Visuality, text and talk, and the systematic organization of interaction in Periscope live video streams. *Discourse Studies*. 20, 2018.
56. Liddicoat A.J. *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. Great Britain: Atheneum Press Ltd, 2007.
57. Magyari L. and de Ruiter J. P. () Prediction of turn-ends based on anticipation of upcoming words. *Front. Psychology* 3, 2012. 376 pp.
58. McCarthy M. *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2002.
59. Meredith J. *Conversation Analysis and Online Interaction*. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 52(3), 2019. P. 241–256.
60. Mühlen U. *Talk als Show: eine linguistische Untersuchung der Gesprächsführung in den Talkshows des deutschen Fernsehens*. Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang, 1985.
61. Paltridge B. *Making Sense of Discourse Analysis*. Queensland: antipodean Educational Enterprises, 2000.

62. Reeves S., Greiffenhagen C., Laurier E. Video gaming as practical accomplishment: Ethnomethodology, conversation analysis, and play. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 9(2), 2017. P. 308–342.
63. Richards J. C., Schmidt R. *Conversational Analysis*. In J.C. Richards and Schmidt (eds.), *Language and Communication*. London: Longman, 1983.
64. Rieger C. L. *Self-repair Strategies of English–German Bilinguals in Informal Conversations: The Role of Language, Gender and Proficiency*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 2000.
65. Sacks H. *Lectures on conversation*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1992.
66. Sacks H., Schegloff E.A., Jefferson G. A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, 50, 1974. P. 696–735.
67. Schegloff E. A. and Sacks H. Opening up closings. *Semiotica*. 7, 1973. P. 289–327.
68. Schegloff E. A. Overlapping Talk and the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language in Society* 29(1), 2000. P. 1–63.
69. Schegloff E. A., Jefferson G., Sacks H. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53, 1977. P. 361–382.
70. Schegloff E. A., Koshik I., Jacoby S., Olsher D. Conversation Analysis and Applied Linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 2002. P. 3–31.
71. Schegloff E.A. *Accounts of Conduct in Interaction: Interruption, Overlap, and Turn-Taking*, 2001.
72. Schegloff E.A. Interaction: The infrastructure for social institutions, the natural ecological niche for language and the arena in which culture is enacted. In N. J. Enfield and S. C. Levinson (Ed), *The Roots of Human Sociality: Culture, Cognition and Interaction*. New York, Berg, 2006. P. 70–96.
73. Schegloff E.A. Practices and Actions. *Boundary Cases of Other-Initiated Repair*. *Discourse Processes*, 23, 1997. P. 499–547.

74. Schegloff E.A. *Sequence organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis Volume 1*. Cambridge, England, Cambridge University Press, 2007.
75. Schegloff E.A. Discourse as an interactional achievement III: The omnirelevance of action. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*: 28(3), 1995. P. 185–211.
76. Schegloff, E. A. Accounts of Conduct in Interaction: Interruption, overlap and turn-taking. In Jonathan H. Turner (Ed.), *Handbook of Sociological Theory*. New York, Plenum, 2002. P. 287–321.
77. Schegloff, E.A. Ten Repair Operations in Self-Initiated Same-Turn Repair. In *Conversation Analysis and Human Understanding*, 2013.
78. Seedhouse, P. Conversation Analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching*. 38(4), 2005. P. 165–187.
79. Seedhouse, P. Conversation analysis as research methodology. In K. Richards and P. Seedhouse (eds.), *Applying Conversation*, 2005.
80. Seedhouse P. *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2004.
81. Shriberg E., Stolcke A. and Baron D. Observations on overlap: findings and implications for automatic processing of multi-party conversation. In *Interspeech*, 2001. P. 1359–1362.
82. Sidnell J., Stivers, T. *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis. The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, 2012.
83. Sidnell J. *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
84. Slade D., Gardner R. *Teaching Casual Conversation: The Issue of Simplification*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED: 371579, 1993.
85. Stivers T. Et al. Universals and cultural variation in turn-taking in conversation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 2009. 106 pp.

86. Stolt M. *The many Faces of Overlap: Non-Competitive Overlap in Conversations between Finnish and British Speakers of English*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 2008.
87. Tannen D. *Conversational Style: Analyzing Talk among Friends*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1984.
88. Thornborrow J. *Approaches to Discourse*. Cambridge, MA & Oxford: Blackwell, 1994. Pp. x 470. *Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 31, no. 1, 1995, P. 193–194.
89. Thornborrow J. Narrative, opinion and situated argument in talk show discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 39, 2007. P. 1436–1453.
90. Thornbury S., Slade D. *Conversation: from Description to Pedagogy* Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom, 2006.
91. Timberg B.M. *Television Talk: a history of the TV Talk show*. New York: The University of Texas Press, 2002.
92. Wodak R., Busch B. *Approaches to media text*. P, 2004. P. 105–122.
93. Wong J., Waring H. (2010). *Conversation Analysis and Second Language Pedagogy: A Guide for ESL/EFL Teachers*, 2010.
94. Wooffitt R. *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction*. London, England: Sage, 2005
95. Yule G. *The Spoken Language*. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, V.10, n. 2, 1989. P. 163–173.
96. Yule G. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1996.

## ILLUSTRATIVE MATERIAL

97. The Graham Norton Show 26/2/2021 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access :  
URL : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K8Cr2mk7ff0&t=1517s>
98. The Graham Norton Show. Nicole Kidman Is Blown Away By Stephen Fry’s Intelligence [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : URL :  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9KK2OBZICRw>
99. The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon. Anne Hathaway Has Regrets About Her Name [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : URL :  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zbBIjp9szE0&t=216s>
100. The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon. John Oliver Found Meghan Markle’s Revelations to Oprah Unsurprising | The Tonight Show [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : URL :  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hqo9tdYRs18>
101. The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon. Michelle Obama Reveals the Secret to Getting Her Daughters to Spill the Tea [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : URL : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cv3XAOHLVky&t=23s>
102. The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon. President Obama Has Some Tips for Drake Portraying Him in a Movie [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : URL : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kqWQLr3Rj6U&t=453s>
103. The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon. Quentin Tarantino Recommends the Greatest Documentary Ever Made [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : URL : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=099x2ybC7p8&t=31s>
104. The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon. Sarah Paulson Got Caught in a Madonna and Rihanna Red-Carpet Sandwich [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : URL : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mp8TaA3CkJO>
105. The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon. Tom Hiddleston Reacts to Unreleased Footage of Him Auditioning as Thor [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : URL : <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BTGxm6gFdsE&t=204s>

## APPENDIX

Figure 1

*Frequency of turn-taking strategies used in British and American talk shows*

<b>Turn-taking strategy</b>	<b>The Graham Norton Show</b>	<b><i>The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon</i></b>	<b>Average number</b>
<b>Speaker's selection</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>83%</b>
<b>Speaker's self-selection</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>Speaker's domination</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>4%</b>

Figure 2

*Types of overlap used in British and American talk shows*

<b>Types of Overlap</b>	<b>The Graham Norton Show</b>	<b><i>The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon</i></b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Competitive overlap</b>	18	7	25	<b>13%</b>
<b>Cooperative overlap</b>	66	105	171	<b>87%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>196</b>	

Figure 3

*Repair strategies used in British and American talk shows*

<b>Types of Repair Strategies</b>	<b><i>The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon</i></b>		<b>The Graham Norton Show</b>		<b>Total</b>
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	
<b>Self-Initiated Self- Repair</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>78%</b>
<b>Other-Initiated Self- Repair</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>Self-Initiated Other- Repair</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>Other-Initiated Other- Repair</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>5%</b>
	<b>45</b>		<b>62</b>		

Figure 4

*Types of adjacency pairs used in British and American talk shows*

<b>Adjacency pair</b>	<b>The Graham Norton Show</b>	<b><i>The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon</i></b>	<b>Total amount</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Greeting – Greeting</b>	7	5	<b>12</b>	4,04%
<b>Summons – Answer</b>	16	3	<b>19</b>	6,4%
<b>Question – Answer</b>	36	45	<b>81</b>	27,27%
<b>Request - Acceptance/ Refusal</b>	10	5	<b>15</b>	5,05%
<b>Blame - Admission/ Denial</b>	0	3	<b>3</b>	1,01%
<b>Assessment - Agreement/ Disagreement</b>	16	18	<b>34</b>	11,45%
<b>Command - Compliance/ Noncompliance</b>	2	0	<b>2</b>	0,67%
<b>Suggestion - Acceptance/ Refusal</b>	9	9	<b>18</b>	6,06%
<b>Assertion - Agreement/ Disagreement</b>	6	7	<b>13</b>	4,38%

<b>Announcement – Acknowledgement</b>	30	37	<b>67</b>	22,56%
<b>Compliment – Acceptance/ Rejection</b>	10	14	<b>24</b>	8,08%
<b>Farewell – Farewell</b>	5	4	<b>9</b>	3,03%
<b>TOTAL</b>	147	150	<b>297</b>	

Figure 5

*Types of adjacency pairs used in the talk show The Graham Norton*

<b>Adjacency Pairs</b>	<b>Total number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Greeting – Greeting</b>	7	4,76%
<b>Summons – Answer</b>	16	10,88%
<b>Apology – Minimization</b>	–	–
<b>Question – Expected/ Unexpected Answer</b>	36	24,49%
<b>Request – Acceptance/ Refusal</b>	10	6,8%
<b>Offer – Acceptance/ Refusal</b>	–	–
<b>Blame – Admission/ Denial</b>	–	–
<b>Invitation – Acceptance/ Refusal</b>	–	–
<b>Assessment – Agreement/ Disagreement</b>	16	10,88%
<b>Command – Compliance/ Noncompliance</b>	2	1,36%
<b>Suggestion – Acceptance/ Refusal</b>	9	6,12%
<b>Assertion – Agreement/ Disagreement</b>	6	4,08%
<b>Announcement – Acknowledgement</b>	30	20,41%
<b>Compliment – Acceptance/ Rejection</b>	10	6,8%
<b>Farewell – Farewell</b>	5	3,4%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>147</b>	

Figure 6

*Types of adjacency pairs used in the talk show The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon*

<b>Adjacency Pairs</b>	<b>Total number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Greeting – Greeting</b>	5	3,33%
<b>Summons – Answer</b>	3	2 %
<b>Apology – Minimization</b>	–	–
<b>Question – Expected/ Unexpected Answer</b>	45	30%
<b>Request – Acceptance/ Refusal</b>	5	3,33%
<b>Offer – Acceptance/ Refusal</b>	–	–
<b>Blame – Admission/ Denial</b>	3	2%
<b>Invitation – Acceptance/ Refusal</b>	–	–
<b>Assessment – Agreement/ Disagreement</b>	18	12%
<b>Command – Compliance/ Noncompliance</b>	–	–
<b>Suggestion – Acceptance/ Refusal</b>	9	6 %
<b>Assertion – Agreement/ Disagreement</b>	7	4,67%
<b>Announcement – Acknowledgement</b>	37	24,67%
<b>Compliment – Acceptance/ Rejection</b>	14	9,33%
<b>Farewell – Farewell</b>	4	2,67%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>150</b>	

Figure 7

*Adjacency pairs with preferred and dispreferred second pair parts used in British and American talk shows*

First pair part	Second pair part		Total
	Preferred	Dispreferred	
Greeting	Greeting	Unexpected greeting	<b>12</b>
Summons	Answer	–	<b>19</b>
Question	Expected	Unexpected Answer	<b>81</b>
Request	Acceptance	Refusal	<b>15</b>
Blame	Admission	Denial	<b>3</b>
Assessment	Agreement	Disagreement	<b>34</b>
Command	Compliance	Noncompliance	<b>2</b>
Suggestion	Acceptance	Refusal	<b>18</b>
Assertion	Agreement	Disagreement	<b>13</b>

Announcement	Acknowledgement	–	<b>67</b>
Compliment	Acceptance/ Rejection		<b>24</b>
Farewell	Farewell	–	<b>9</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>297</b>

Figure 8

*Adjacency pairs with dispreferred second pair parts in British and American talk shows*

First pair part	Second pair part			
	Preferred		Dispreferred	
Greeting	Greeting	11	Unexpected greeting	1
Summons	Answer	19	–	–
Question	Expected	58	Unexpected Answer	23
Request	Acceptance	11	Refusal	4
Blame	Admission	–	Denial	3
Assessment	Agreement	27	Disagreement	7
Command	Compliance	2	Noncompliance	–
Suggestion	Acceptance	13	Refusal	5
Assertion	Agreement	9	Disagreement	4
Announcement	Acknowledgement	67	–	–
Compliment	Acceptance	21	Rejection	3

Farewell	Farewell	9	–	–
	<b>Total amount</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>Total amount</b>	<b>50</b>
	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>17%</b>

Figure 9

*Adjacency pairs with preferred and dispreferred second pair parts in The Tonight Show  
Starring Jimmy Fallon*

First pair part	Second pair part			
	Preferred		Dispreferred	
Greeting	Greeting	4	Unexpected greeting	1
Summons	Answer	3	–	–
Question	Expected	31	Unexpected Answer	14
Request	Acceptance	3	Refusal	2
Blame	Admission	–	Denial	3
Assessment	Agreement	14	Disagreement	4
Command	Compliance	–	Noncompliance	–
Suggestion	Acceptance	6	Refusal	3

Assertion	Agreement	5	Disagreement	2
Announcement	Acknowledgement	37	–	–
Compliment	Acceptance/	12	Rejection	2
Farewell	Farewell	4	–	–
<b>Total amount</b>		<b>119</b>		<b>31</b>
<b>Percentage</b>		<b>79%</b>		<b>21%</b>

Figure 10

*Adjacency pairs with preferred and dispreferred second pair parts used in The Graham Norton Show*

First pair part	Second pair part			
	Preferred		Dispreferred	
Greeting	Greeting	7	Unexpected greeting	–
Summons	Answer	16	–	–
Question	Expected	27	Unexpected Answer	9
Request	Acceptance	8	Refusal	2
Blame	Admission	–	Denial	–
Assessment	Agreement	13	Disagreement	3
Command	Compliance	2	Noncompliance	–
Suggestion	Acceptance	7	Refusal	2
Assertion	Agreement	4	Disagreement	2
Announcement	Acknowledgement	30	–	–

Compliment	Acceptance/	9	Rejection	1
Farewell	Farewell	5	–	–
<b>Total amount</b>		<b>128</b>		<b>19</b>
<b>Percentage</b>		<b>87%</b>		<b>13%</b>

Figure 11

*Extension of adjacency pairs in British and American talk shows*

<b>Extension of adjacency pairs</b>	<b><i>The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon</i></b>	<b>The Graham Norton Show</b>
<b>Pre-expansion</b>	9	7
<b>Insertion</b>	5	3
<b>Post-expansion</b>	24	15
<b>Total number</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>25</b>