Journal of Language and Literature
Vol. 22 No. 2, October 2022, pp. 306 – 317
DOI: 10.24071/joll.v22i2.4365
Available at https://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/JOLL/index



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Talk Show Hosting Turn-Allocation Techniques in *Jimmy Kimmel Live*

I Gusti Ngurah Ratnadi, Putu Nur Ayomi*, Putu Devi Maharani
putu.nur.a@unmas.ac.id
Faculty of Foreign Languages, Universitas Mahasaraswati Denpasar, INDONESIA

Abstract

Engaging in a conversation is crucial to people as social beings, in which turn-taking is one of its core elements. As a cooperative activity, it requires an orderly turn distribution, especially in TV talk shows where the host and the guests cooperate to distribute turns led by the host. This phenomenon can be observed in Jimmy Kimmel Live, a late-night talk show that highlights conversational activities to incorporate its entertainment bits. This study investigates turn-allocation techniques used by Jimmy Kimmel as the host of the talk show to manage a multiparty conversation with the Avengers: Endgame cast. The analysis is based on Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson's theory concerning the systematics for turn-taking organization along with Lerner's elaboration on Sacks et al.'s turn allocation. To extract the data, Jeffersonian conventions are used, then the descriptive qualitative method is exercised to analyze the data in two levels: providing context and theoretical elaboration. It is found that the host only uses current-selects-next techniques (i.e., gaze, addressing, context-tied), in which context-tied becomes the most common technique practiced creating an exclusive connection that effectively allocates turn to the prospective speaker. Other techniques: gaze and addressing are also used by mutual gaze and address term positioning. Meanwhile, self-selection techniques (i.e., starting first and overlapping talk) are absent because of the unequal share of power and role of the host compared with the guests.

Article information

Received: 8 February 2022

Revised: 17 May 2022

Accepted: 22 June 2022

***Keywords**: talk show; host; turn allocation; conversation analysis*

Introduction

Participating in a conversation is considered a crucial ability attributed to people as social beings. In many ways, it plays as a tool for people to maintain their social existence among the community. It is used to show one's power, domination, and identity, as well as to show social connections, e.g., pathic communication, respect, and tolerance, which

connect to the role of a conversation participant in an institutional and/or casual language interaction. Since talking is a natural skill that human possesses, it tends to be taken for granted; in fact, it is something more than just a phenomenon where people exchange speech sound, rather, an instrument to accomplish larger purposes (Cameron, 2001). Researchers in social and language sciences attempt to advance this particular understanding through conversation analysis (CA).

In CA, turn-taking, which is an act to transform speaking opportunity into play as conversation participants take turns, plays a major role in organizing a conversation. Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) describe the importance of this element to locally manage the exchange of speech talk-in-interaction as "regulating traffic in intersections." However, turn-taking cannot stand alone in creating an orderly conversation since it only realizes a slot to speak (Hayashi, 2013). In fact, a conversation is about cooperative activities where participants should give and take in terms of opportunities to speak. Therefore, an understanding of how turns should be orderly allocated is highly necessary to unfold.

Turn allocation is the practice of providing distribution for an opportunity to construct a turn in a conversation (Hayashi, 2013) and when it comes into play, TV talk show conversation is the concrete practice of allocating turn. In this conversation format, there is a party called "host(s)" and another party called "guest star(s)," where the host would likely hold the power to control the conversation flow by providing an orderly distribution of turn among the guest stars. This practice can be found in an American late-night talk show called *Jimmy Kimmel Live*. Unlike other talk shows in this time period, it focuses more on conversation rather than games or non-conversational variation. However, the show is captivating since the entertainment bits are included in the conversational interaction like in a session that invited four actors of the *Avengers: Endgame* cast to promote their about-to-premiere movie.

Previously, Wang and Chen (2016) compare and explore two TV talk show conversations with different cultural backgrounds: American and Chinese, in a perspective of turn-control strategy (i.e., turn-claiming, turn-holding, turn-yielding). Lee (2017) covers turn allocation in a multimodal perspective toward English-as-a-second-language students. It mainly focuses on the distribution of turn through body-conducts such as gaze, gesture, touch, and other body-fueled resources. Ibraheem (2017) highlights turn-taking strategies in English language teaching, in which he compiles a wide range of turn-taking strategies and turn-allocation techniques as methods to share turn distribution in the classroom that help students become more active in pedagogical activities. Furthermore, Ali (2018) points out TV talk show conversations of two different cultural backgrounds: American and Iraqi by comparing their broad features in global structure and local structure to which culture affects the turn-taking patterns. Finally, Auer (2020) investigates a multimodal resource of turn allocation focusing on gaze, through a technological method employing eye-tracking tools. He reveals that eye movement is a pervasive technique in selecting the next speaker which also collaborates with and enhances other techniques.

Previous studies show turn allocation plays a major role in managing turn distribution and transfer in a multiparty conversation. Even though studies on talk host's turn allocation techniques have been partially conducted in previous works (Ali, 2018; Wang & Chen, 2016), they explore the techniques on a broad level and incorporate them into a superordinate classification (Ibraheem, 2017). Furthermore, specific exploration at a formal level, i.e., turn-constructional unit (TCU), has also been conducted (Auer, 2020; Lee, 2017), but they focus on isolated resources, i.e., gaze only. Therefore, this study attempts to fill those gaps by investigating turn allocation techniques conducted by a TV talk show host in five resources upon the host's TCUs, as seen in an episode of *Jimmy Kimmel Live* mentioned previously. This particular talk show and episode are chosen since it highlights conversational activities which suit the study.

In addition, this study focuses on identifying and elaborating the turn-allocation techniques based on Sacks et al. (1974) along with Lerner (2003) which point out two distinctive groups of techniques. The first one is "current-selects-next" which consists of 1) directing gaze, 2) addressing, and 3) context-tied. Then, 4) starting first and 5) overlapping talk that are included in "self-selection."

Methodology

This study is a CA that employs a descriptive qualitative approach. The data of this study was taken from a 17-minute-long recorded multiparty conversation discourse in an episode of *Jimmy Kimmel Live* talk show program hosted by Jimmy Kimmel (JK) himself. The episode invited the *Avengers: Endgame* cast such as Robert Downey Jr. (RD), Scarlett Johansson (SJ), Chris Hemsworth (CH), and Paul Rudd (PR) as the guest stars that talked about the *Avengers: Endgame* movie and the cast's personal stories. The solid clip of this episode was uploaded on *Jimmy Kimmel Live*'s YouTube channel on April 9, 2019 (see at https://youtu.be/5ljluGA4dQU).

To extract the data from the recorded conversation, basic conversational conventions based on Jefferson (2004) were applied to the whole conversation episode. Not all convention symbols were applied but only those which were relevant to the data analysis of this particular study (see Appendix). Then, the transcribed data source was classified into the types of turn allocation techniques by generating codes and colors as seen in Table 1 below. Furthermore, data analysis is conducted based on the theory by Sacks et al. (1974) concerning systematics for turn-taking organization and elaborative discussion concerning Sacks et al.'s current-selects-next techniques by Lerner (2003). Two levels of discussion were exercised upon the findings. First, the findings are described naturally concerning the participants' activities that occurred in the conversation in order to provide the context of the conversation. Then, it is theoretically elaborated to reveal the techniques in in-depth discussions.

Table 1. Colors and codes of the classification

No	Colors	Classification	Codes
1		Directing gaze	<GZE>
2		Addressing	<ADD>
3		Context-tied	<CXT>
4		Starting first	<STF>
5		Overlapping talk	<OLT>

Results and Discussion

This section describes how turn-allocation techniques are organized in the talk shows. The findings are presented as the statistics shown in Table 2 below. After the findings are explained, each technique is discussed separately in sub-sections according to the descriptive qualitative approach.

The findings show that only current-selects-next techniques are implemented by the host in distributing the opportunities to take turns for the conversation participants, namely, context-tied, directing gaze, and addressing. Among those techniques in the current speaker selecting the next speaker, JK seems to be keen on conducting contextual resources for generating slots to construct turns for the conversation participants or the talk show guest stars. Furthermore, the techniques used are not always working exclusively, for that, JK apparently constructs a minor share of alternative mechanisms by collaboratively conducting certain techniques in the current-selects-next group such as gaze with context-tied and context-tied alongside addressing. However, there is no single technique in the self-selection group is used in this particular focus.

Table 2. Turn-allocation techniques conducted by the host

No	Techniques	Occurrences
1	Context-tied	20
2	Addressing	8
3	Directing gaze	8
4	Gaze and context-tied	2
5	Context-tied and addressing	1
6	Starting first	0
7	Overlapping talk	0



Figure 1. Strength of next speaker allocation highlighting gaze technique (Auer, 2020, p. 17 modified)

It is required to note that gaze could be a pervasive practice since it nearly always presents on most occasions in a talk-in-interaction. In other words, it is (not necessarily always) an inevitable practice since any participant would be visible to one another. Thus, the directing gaze techniques in this classification are only the significant eye movements that affect the technique formation and/or enhance other techniques. It is in line with the "strength of next speaker allocation" dimension proposed by Auer (2020, p. 17) which shows in Figure 1 above. The figure has been adopted and modified accordingly to clarify the gray area in classifying and defining gaze as an allocation technique and when it is not considered a technique. The original figure comprises two axes: the horizontal axis for the "degree of projection" dimension and the vertical one for the allocation strength. In this study, only the incipient speaker allocation parameter is used. Hence, the figure is respectably modified without eliminating its importance. By this parameter, it can be measured that if gaze appears but the contextual attributions and addressing practices have been sufficiently solid in a particular TCU, then its practice can be ignored.

Turn-allocation Techniques in Talk Show Hosting

The distribution of opportunities to convey turns conducted by JK as the talk show host is majorly practicing the three main techniques, in which the current speaker allocates a turn for an incipient speaker. The occurrence of these techniques is indeed a representation of the host's involvement in controlling or managing the flow of the conversation since it is practiced to select who to speak next. Thus, the clash between participants in constructing turn could be minimized. This is in line with Ali (2018) that unfolds a higher number of turns by a talk show host in certain circumstances is an effort to direct the talk, to shift topics, and to give a sufficient share of turns to all conversation participants. Furthermore, an older study, Oyeleye & Olutayo (2012) suggests current-selects-next techniques represent restricted conversation and uneven turn distribution. However, it seems irrelevant on most conversation occasions. It is necessary to note that talk show is considered "hybrid" or semi-institutional (Ilie, 2001) since its atmosphere in talking activities is conversational or has loose topics to discuss but at the same time, it is restricted by certain rules such as whole episode duration and the length of a certain topic to talk about. The later feature is

represented by the talk show host's control over the discussion flow and turn-allocation techniques discussed below are part of its institutional genre to run the show manageably. In the following sub-sections, only the majorly exercised techniques are discussed, those are directing gaze, addressing, and context tied.

Directing Gaze

Gaze direction is a basic practice in selecting the next speaker through the method of gazing at a conversation participant. This technique is considered significant in face-to-face conversation (Novick, Hansen, & Ward, 1996) which is explicitly used to send a signal of speaker selection to the gaze-at participant (Lerner, 2003; Sacks et al., 1974). The effectivity of this particular technique depends on mutual gaze between the current speaker and the gaze-at participant, in which the non-gaze-at participants also need to receive the signal that someone has been selected (Hayashi, 2013; Lerner, 2003). In this particular discussion, first, the context of the conversation activities would be given in to which extent the talk is about. Then, the gaze technique utilization in transferring turn to the incipient speaker would be unfolded.The talk-in-interaction in Excerpt 1 below is conducted around a topic about having the *Avengers* tattoos on the cast's body. In the previous thread, which is not presented in this excerpt, SJ revealed that Mark Ruffalo who was one of the movie actors as the *Hulk* (but was not in the program) did not have the tattoo, and consecutively RD added the information to reveal that he declined to draw the tattoo on his body. The statements are then reconfirmed by JK in his TCU in line 214. The turn which asks for confirmation is tacitly answered by the two previous speakers, RD and SJ, in different manners. RD answers the question by looking away from JK, specifically to audience position, whereas SJ moves her eyes to JK while she responds to the request. This particular context is depicted by snapshot (a) in Excerpt 1 below. Furthermore, as JK continues his role as the host, in which to dig the information deeper, he starts a TCU in line 217. When he begins at "Did you," JK directs his gaze briefly to SJ and at the same time, RD who looks away from JK immediately redirects to the speaker. Then, as JK continues on the rest of his utterance, he locks his gaze on RD until he approaches a turn-relevance place (TRP) or a turn completion where a next turn is possible to construct as seen in snapshot (b).

Excerpt 1. Peer Pressure (05:17-05:27—214-220)



(a) **(b)**

```
214  JK  : Did he really?
215  RD  : Yeah. At his own peril.
216  SJ  : Yeah. ((glances at JK))
217  JK  : Did you apply peer pressure to Mark? ((gaze to RD))<GZE>
218  SJ  : [Yes.] ((looks toward JK))
219  RD  : [N-  ] well, no. We're not like some psycho:, you
220         know, marine squa:d ((looks toward JK))
```

The phenomenon depicted above is similar to Auer (2020), Lee (2017), Ibraheem (2017), Wang and Chen (2016), and Oyeleye and Olutayo (2012), in which gaze plays the role as a device to select and claim an incipient speaker through mutual eyes-direction. In this particular excerpt, gaze has a significant effect on the success of turn allocation done in hosting a talk show. The allocation of turn from the host to a guest star in this context occurs as JK pins his gaze on RD and it is also noticed by RD which creates a mutual gaze between the speaker and the incipient speaker. Around this phenomenon, other participants have also acknowledged the activity and received a signal that someone is selected as the next speaker. Therefore, after JK reaches TRP, RD responds to the signal by conveying his TCU in lines 219 and 220 smoothly without interruption from other participants.

On the contrary, if there is an absence of gaze in JK's TCU in line 217, this may cause problematic circumstances among the conversation participants. The fact that in sequential position, line 217 is still related to the previous TCUs in terms of elaborateness, but the information brought by the line is ambiguous. This particular problem is signified by the use of "you" as a second-person pronoun (Auer, 2020) or unknown recipient indicator (Lerner, 2003). It becomes unknown since the previous sequence following a sequence-initiating action or the first TCU in the first pair-part or adjacency pair that triggers follow-up TCUs has been dismantled in line 216. Thus, when JK starts a TCU after a final sequence, it can be addressed to the prior interlocutor or to the other. In other words, line 217 would be relevant to be addressed to any participants other than RD, especially SJ, moreover, she is involved in the prior thread of utterances. Hence, a start of a new sequence with an unknown recipient indicator requires a device to specify the ambiguity. Hanna and Brennan (2007) suggest that a participant can examine the speaker's eye direction to clarify an ambiguous referring expression. Considering these circumstances, JK's gaze works productively in two different matters which later helps turn transition. Besides selecting next via mutual gaze, it shows that JK's gaze also disambiguates and specifies who "you" is by governing his visual direction that anchors on RD.

Addressing

Addressing here means the use of address terms such as endearment, categorical attribution (e.g., occupation, rank, etc.), or simply stating personal names (Hayashi, 2013). Talk show in a multiparty conversation arrangement sometimes uses guest stars' first names to exclusively select him or her as the next speaker. However, it is obliged to note that the talk show program used in this study is in semi-institutional discourse, in which it observably tends to be more conversational; meaning the interaction atmosphere is casual with mixed of entertainment and information or "infotainment" (Ilie, 2001). It would be different if the format is, for instance, news interview or other formats in institutional settings, which is formal and rule-governed (Greatbatch, 1988; Ilie, 2001). In Excerpt 2 below, the address term in form of the participant's first name is used by the host to transfer the next turn to the addressed person.

The conversation that occurs in Excerpt 2 below is still related to Excerpt 1 but this excerpt appears priorly in the conversation corpus. Hence, the context of the conversation below is about the cast on having the *Avengers* tattoos. In lines 176 and 177, the host allocates a turn technically to SJ by gaze direction with a gesture of pointing to SJ and RD as seen in snapshot (a) which responded verbally by SJ through her turn-terminal overlapping TCU in line 178 and RD's gesture by raising his right hand which is not transcribed in the excerpt below since it is out of this study's focus. While JK constructs the turn in line 176, only CH looks away since he gazes toward PR, in which PR locks his eyes on JK as also seen in snapshot (a). Then, in line 179, JK starts another sequence by launching a first pair-part, a question, which contains a participant's first name, "Chris" of CH. CH who looks away before, immediately switching his eyes direction to JK as he starts on "Does" before CH's first name is even revealed as seen in snapshot (b). However, CH's eyes observably become wider as JK calls his first name signaling his alertness that he is being addressed. Soon after JK reaches his TRP, CH

responds with his TCU in line 180 which is immediately followed up by JK in the next line.

A similar finding is also found in Ibraheem (2017), where he categorized it into "naming" to which the current speaker selects the next speaker through names or titles. It is also classified into a different term in Wang and Chen (2016), in which they sorted this particular technique into "nomination." Despite its diverse terms of category, the substantial element is all the same; using address term to allocate a turn to the incipient speaker. In addition to the use of address term, Lehtimaja (2011) explains that the position (i.e., initial, middle, final) of address term in a particular turn gives different effect to the TCU.

Excerpt 2. The *Avengers* tattoo (04:34-04:42—176-182)



(a) **(b)**

```
176  JK  : Who has the Avengers tattoo? You guys have it
177        [right? ((looks toward SJ))
178  SJ  : [Yep. ((looks toward JK/CH))
179  JK  : Does Chris have it? ((looks toward CH))<ADD>
180  CH  : I have a scratch and sniff of Paul Rudd's face
181        ((looks toward JK))
182  JK  : (You do?)
```

At the beginning of a TCU, it can be a summon when there is a space between the address term and its main TCU. This poses as a next speaker's availability checker, or as an attention catcher toward the progressed turn as it is incorporated with the whole TCU (Lehtimaja, 2011; Lerner, 2003). In this particular case, as found in line 179 above, the address term is considered in the turn-initial position since it stands near the beginning of the TCU but still prior to the main body or the substant of the utterance (Clayman, 2012). This reasoning is strengthened by CH's reaction as he hears his first name included in the host's TCU; he becomes alert and notices the ongoing turn is prospected for him, which is signified by his eyes turning wider. Therefore, when JK finishes his turn and reaches completion, CH adds his turn to the sequence.

In addition to an attention drawer, it is worth noting about the way JK allocates turn to CH seems to be done in a unique style. The TCU in line 179 is not an apparent behavior in using address terms to transfer a turn. Here, JK treats his co-participant and his prospective next speaker as he is a third person by adding CH's first name in an interrogative utterance replacing common second-person pronoun. However, employing a second-person pronoun may require additional effort as discussed in the previous technique. For instance, "Does you have it, Chris?", where the address term stands at the turn-final following the second-person pronoun. This position urges the speaker to add gaze first to clarify who "you" is since the definitive recipient is revealed at the last of the TCU as opposed to Excerpt 2 above. Therefore, it is known that JK's TCU in line 179 has worked efficiently. Instead of separately generating the address term from its main utterance which only functions as summon, it is merged and inclusively functioning as an attention drawer as well as a device to personalize the utterance to CH.

Context-tied

The context-based technique is the major practice in this study. The talk show host exercises this technique to distribute turns by contextual relations which relevant to a particular participant. Thus, a participant who has knowledge about certain entailment is tacitly selected as the next speaker. Lerner (1993, 2003) states that context-tied can be conducted if particular knowledge is eligible to a single participant, then he or she has been tacitly selected as the next speaker. Furthermore, certain entailments such as situatedness, social identities, and specification of the topic are devices to allocate turn in this particular method (Lerner, 1993, 2003; Sacks et al., 1974). This sub of sub-section shows how the talk show host manages to allocate turns to his co-participant by employing first pair-part, questions, that are limited and relevant to a particular guest star. Please note that no snapshots are presented in this particular discussion since it does not give a significant difference toward this particular discussion.

The conversation in Excerpt 3 below depicts a talk-in-interaction that discusses a topic about the *Avengers: Endgame* screening party. Previously, JK scans each of the participants about whether they have seen the movie. This movement signals that JK expects responses from each of them. After several follow-ups turn in relation to JK's question which is not shown in the excerpt below, it is RD's turn to start a talk in line 85 by self-selection. He reveals that he is about to hold a screening party during Easter Friday. Then, in line 89, JK again throws a simple question without explicit personalization toward a certain participant, which tacitly responded by RD's overlapping talk in the next line. As soon as RD finishes his TCU in lines 90 through 92, once again, JK throws a similar form of a question to the previous one, in the next line. The question, then, again, is tacitly answered by RD through the short affirmation "yeah" followed by additional information in lines 94 and 95, which later overlapped by SJ.

Excerpt 3. Easter Screening (85-96)

85	RD		Er: yeah, there's kind of a: you know, we're not
86			supposed to see it, and they're show little pieces,
87			but then er: (0.2) I'm doing an Easter screening.
88			((glances to SJ, looks toward JK))
89	JK	:	Easter? [on Easter Sunday?<CXT>
90	RD	:	[Yep. ((looks toward JK))
91			Yep (.) Up in Malibu, the day before the premiere.
92			We'll have it on a loop. ((looks toward JK))
93	JK	:	Oh, in your house? ((looks toward RD))<CXT>
94	RD	:	Yeah. This is not [a:, this is not an open
95			invitation ((stares at SJ))
96	SJ	:	[You guys are all invited

The phenomenon displayed above is the heuristic practice of allocating turns through contextual relations in terms of topical specifics and social identities. It is known that before JK questions RD in line 89, which results in a thread of utterance follows, RD talks about his plan to hold an Easter screening for the movie. This particular topical context is used by JK in his TCU to tacitly select RD without explicit attribution that is personalized to him. In the following follow-up question, JK constructs a turn with limited information if it is seen loosely without contextual relations or as an isolated sentence. Schegloff (as cited in Goodwin & Heritage, 1990) states that in CA, sentences are never treated as isolated form, rather it is situated within a specific context and background of that context. Hence, the loose question is

responded to by RD without trouble as it is surrounded by contextual features.

In this circumstance, both JK and RD share social identities, in which they are acquaintances rather than a host and a guest star. In lines 90 through 92, RD only provides such general spatial information to JK, "Up in Malibu" which is later known it is the geographical area where RD resides and JK has knowledge about this information since they are acquaintances. Another social identity used is RD's role as the host of the screening party to which he is responsible for providing information concerning the event which makes the questions are eligible limited to him. By employing these contextual items, JK and RD have shared mutual knowledge and with that, turns produced by JK within that particular knowledge is limited for them. The involvement of social identity in turn distribution is also discussed by Auer (2020), he found that a participant's criticism toward people in certain geographical areas could tacitly trigger a co-participant who has attribution to it for taking a turn to respond to the distribution of turn in a negative fashion.

The Absence of Self-selection in Talk Show Hosting

TV Talk shows have been regarded as a semi-institutional discourse, in which it is loose in terms of talking but restricted by certain rules in terms of its program code of conduct (see Ilie, 2001). Loose talking means it is like the conversation that most people do daily without being constrained by topic-centered discussion as opposed to news interviews, meetings, or political debates. However, a talk shows as a program broadcasted by a TV station has a specific allocated duration to run from the opening, body, and closing, as well as turn management for each participant. Furthermore, it has an individual who is in charge of managing and monitoring the conversation (Ilie, 2006), which is commonly known as the host. Due to the dominant role of the host in a talk show conversation and uneven share of power, Ilie (2001) compares talk show with the classroom interaction, in which a teacher possesses greater rights in the classroom participation than the students (McHoul, 1978) in terms of turn sharing. Furthermore, McHoul (1978) adds that in an institutional setting, each participant has a role. In a setting such as a classroom (i.e., TV talk show), the teacher (i.e., host) plays the role of the head of the institutional setting. In relation to those backgrounds, it unfolds that the absence of self-selection techniques in the host's method to distribute turn has come to light.

Since self-selection is not discussed previously in this study, it is necessary to present a glimpse of this group of techniques for a common perception. Self-selection techniques are an effort to the self-provide allocation of turn since the prior speaker does not allocate a turn to a particular incipient speaker. Self-allocation can be done by "starting first" or simply starting a TCU as early as one could after a TRP from the previous speaker is apparent, then the first turn-constructor would have the right to convey the turn until he or she reaches a TRP. Besides, self-selection also can be achieved by overlapping the current speaker at a possible TRP, where the current speaker may complete his or her turn. This technique occurs as a failure in predicting a TRP or done deliberately through openers such as "wait," "but," etc. to interrupt the current speaker at turn-terminals.

Considering these characteristics of self-selection and the role and power held by the host in a talk show program, this group of techniques may be mostly conducted by the guest stars (Hamo, 2006) instead of the host in this particular context. In some cases, there is talk show host(s) who clearly interrupts guests and overtakes the turn (see Khan, Qadir, & Aftab, 2019). However, that is for the sake of host-monitoring upon the conversation to which it should fit the rules such as agenda, topic, duration, and turn-distribution management since it is broadcasted on TV which evaluated by the audience (Ilie, 2001, 2006). Moreover, only the host has the right to select and manage who to speak. A participant who is selected by the host has an obligation to receive the allocation and construct his or her utterance. When a participant has completed his or her turn, the right to speak next automatically goes back to the host.

Therefore, there is the least possibility for a talk show host considered self-selects.

The discussion above shows that TV talk show hosting as a heuristic example of turn distribution practice that takes place in semi-institutional setting employs three primary techniques as a mechanism to allocate turns for the next speaker. Directing gaze employed by governing eyes direction to a particular guest star, in which both the gaze-at guest and other participants must notice the practice in order to accomplish the turn transfer. Then, addressing is done to select the next speaker through a personalized turn that contains the co-participant's attribution of the address terms. Meanwhile, contextual features are used in the context-tied technique to give an eligible knowledge that is limited to a co-participant, so that, only qualified co-participant could respond to the allocation. Furthermore, the second group of techniques is not apparent in talk show host's practice to self-allocate turn. It is because of the unequal share of power between the guests and the host, in which the host's role is to manage the whole process of conversation in the program. Thus, he has never been considered doing self-selection in any way.

Conclusion

This study highlights investigating, and elaborating turn-allocation techniques used by Jimmy Kimmel as the host of the *Jimmy Kimmel Live* talk show program, based on Sacks et al.'s theory along with Lerner's elaboration upon Sacks et al.'s current-selects-next techniques. The study focuses on conducting the analysis at a formal level of the host's TCUs implementing the turn-allocation techniques and contexts that surround them. Out of five resources in allocating turns, only technique resources in current-selects-next occur in the conversation corpus. Whereas the absence of self-selection resources correlates with the nature of a talk show as a semi-institutional discourse.

There are three primary techniques that are exercised by the host following the current-selects-next, in which the contextualization of TCUs becomes the most common method. The practice of this technique involves social identity that attributes to the co-participant which creates a connection limited to the host and the prospective speaker. The generated connection significantly eliminates other participants from the sequence of turns since only the co-participant is capable to receive the allocation. This pattern manages to design an effective practice of turn distribution and transfer. Furthermore, two other techniques, namely, gaze direction through mutual gaze and addressing via address terms placement are also used by the host in managing turn transition during the multiparty conversation.

This study has managed to reveal the talk show host's TCUs and contexts that entail them implemented in coordinating turns. The results contribute to the previous works that only examine allocation of turn as partial analyses to a more superordinate classification which based on broad level of the techniques. The broad level analyses only answer why such an utterance is categorized or named such a technique, but they do not answer how the utterance and its units work to conduct and form such a technique, which is usually viewed from TCU-based analysis. Moreover, this study has also added two resources to two prior works that slightly share common model of analysis, besides the gaze resource. However, this research is not a closed-ended paper. Since a formal level analysis has been demonstrated here, further studies on comparative perspective are interested to conduct in terms of how turn allocation from current study's perspective differs based on cultural backgrounds, settings, speakers' gender, or other extensions related to conversational activity.

References

Ali, H. K. (2018). Conversation analysis of the structural units of interaction in American and Iraqi TV talk shows: The Doctors and Shabab Wbanat. *International Journal of Language Academy*, *6*(2), 311–333. https://dx.doi.org/10.18033/ijla

Auer, P. (2020). *Turn-allocation and gaze: A multimodal revision of the "current-speaker-selects-next" rule of the turn-taking system of conversation analysis* [Unpublished manuscript]. Department of German, University of Freiburg.

Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with Spoken Discourse*. London: SAGE Publications Limited.

Clayman, S. E. (2012). Address terms in the organization of turns at talk: The case of pivotal turn extensions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *44*(13), 1853–1867. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.08.001

Goodwin, C., & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversation analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *19*, 283–307. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.an.19.100190.001435

Greatbatch, D. (1988). A turn-taking system for British news interviews. *Language in Society*, *17*(3), 401–430. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500012963

Hamo, M. (2006). Caught between freedom and control: 'Ordinary' people's discursive positioning on an Israeli prime-time talk show. *Discourse and Society*, *17*(4), 427–445. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506062361

Hanna, J. E., & Brennan, S. E. (2007). Speakers' eye gaze disambiguates referring expressions early during face-to-face conversation. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *57*(4), 596–615. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2007.01.008

Hayashi, M. (2013). Turn allocation and turn sharing. In J. Sidnell, & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (1st ed., pp. 167–190). West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing Limited.

Ibraheem, S. J. (2017). Turn-taking strategies in English language teaching (ELT). *Dirasat Tarbawiya*, *10*(40), 291–308. Retrieved from https://iasj.net/iasj?func=fulltext&aId=135181

Ilie, C. (2001). Semi-institutional discourse: The case of talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *33*(2), 209–254. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00133-2

Ilie, C. (2006). Talk show. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd ed., Vol. 12, pp. 489–494). Oxford: Elsevier.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In J. M. Atkinson, & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Khan, S. A., Qadir, S. A., & Aftab, R. (2019). Managing agenda setting in Pakistani political talk-shows: A functional analysis of interruptions. *Global Regional Review*, *4*(1), 43–54. https://dx.doi.org/10.31703/grr.2019(IV-I).05

Lee, J. (2017). Multimodal turn allocation in ESL peer group discussions. *Social Semiotics*, *27*(5), 671–692. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10350330.2016.1207353

Lehtimaja, I. (2011). Teacher-oriented address terms in students' reproach turns. *Linguistics and Education*, *22*(4), 348–363. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2011.02.008

Lerner, G. H. (1993). Collectivities in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined participation in conversation. *Text*, *13*(2), 213–245. https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1993.13.2.213

Lerner, G. H. (2003). Selecting next speaker: The context-sensitive operation of a context-free organization. *Language in Society*, *32*(2), 177–201. https://doi.org/10.1017/S00474045032202X

McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society*, *7*, 183–213. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500005522

Novick, D. G., Hansen, B., & Ward, K. (1996). Coordinating turn-taking with gaze. *Proceeding of Fourth International Conference on Spoken Language Processing*, *3*, 1888–1991. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSLP.1996.608001

Oyeleye, A. L., & Olutayo, O. G. (2012). Interaction management in Nigerian television talk shows. *International*

Journal of English Linguistics, *2*(1), 149–161. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v2n1p149

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, *50*(4), 696–735.

Wang, J., & Chen, M. (2016). Turn-control strategies in TV talk show. *Canadian Social Science*, *12*(5), 68–73. http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/8375

Appendix

The transcription symbols below are taken partially from Jeffersonian conversational conventions.

(.) : Short pause under 0.2 seconds
[: Overlaps initial
] : Overlaps final
: : Previous sound stretching
= : Run-on utterances intra or inter TCUs
(0.0) : Interval within tenth of seconds ≥ 0.2 seconds
( ) : Inaudible units of turn
(( )) : Additional description or notes
u- :Dropping out units of turn