

# Dynamics of Turn-Taking in Digital Talk Shows: A Discourse Analysis of SourceFed Nerd’s “Table Talk” Series

Yue Qin<sup>1</sup>, Beixian Gu<sup>2,\*</sup> and Yang Li<sup>2</sup>

*Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, Liaoning, China*

*\*Corresponding author: Beixian Gu.*

---

## Abstract

This study explores the dynamics of turn-taking in digital talk shows, taking the example of the program table talk on YouTube channel SourceFed Nerd. Drawing on Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson’s turn-taking system, the research identifies and analyzes turn-constructive and turn-allocation components in conversations. The finding reveals the interplay between turn construction and allocation. Additionally, the study highlights how the relationship between participants influences turn-taking strategies and the distribution of moderating roles. This research contributes to understanding how turn-taking mechanisms operate in the context of network culture, emphasizing the fluid and dynamic nature of digital talk show discourse.

## Keywords

turn-taking, digital talk shows, discourse analysis

---

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Language, Discourse, and Interaction in Contemporary Communication

Language is fundamentally a social phenomenon, and its primary function is to facilitate communication among individuals within specific social contexts. In linguistic research, this communicative function is often examined through the lens of discourse analysis, which focuses on language use beyond the sentence level. As noted by David Crystal [1], discourse refers to coherent stretches of language that form meaningful units such as conversations, narratives, and arguments. This perspective emphasizes that meaning is not only encoded in linguistic structures but also constructed through interaction, context, and shared knowledge.

Within this framework, spoken discourse occupies a central position, as it represents the most immediate and interactive form of communication. Unlike written texts, spoken interaction is dynamic, collaborative, and context-dependent. Participants must continuously negotiate meaning, manage turn-taking, and respond to each other in real time. These features make spoken discourse particularly valuable for investigating the mechanisms underlying human communication.

In recent decades, the study of discourse has expanded to include various forms of mediated communication. With the development of mass media and digital technologies, communication is increasingly conducted through platforms that extend beyond face-to-face interaction. These mediated contexts introduce new dimensions to discourse, including audience design, technological affordances, and hybrid communicative practices. As a result, traditional models of interaction must be reconsidered and adapted to account for these changes.

## 1.2 Talk Shows as a Site of Discourse Analysis

Among the many forms of mediated discourse, talk shows represent a particularly rich and complex genre. Talk shows are typically characterized by extended spoken interaction among multiple participants, often centered on specific topics or issues. They combine elements of conversation, performance, and institutional communication, making them an ideal site for discourse analysis. Edgerly, Gotlieb, and Vraga [2] noted that talk shows primarily aim to investigate current issues from various perspectives of individuals involved.

From a theoretical perspective, talk shows can be understood as a form of semi-institutional discourse, a concept proposed by Cornelia Ilie [3]. This concept highlights the dual nature of talk shows, which incorporate both conversational and institutional features. On the one hand, talk shows exhibit characteristics of everyday conversation, such as spontaneity, informality, and interpersonal engagement. Participants often express personal opinions, share experiences, and engage in humor, creating a sense of authenticity and immediacy.

On the other hand, talk shows are shaped by institutional goals and constraints. These include the need to attract and retain an audience, maintain a coherent structure, and adhere to production requirements. As a result, interaction is often guided by a host or moderator, who plays a central role in organizing the discourse. The host typically introduces topics, allocates turns, and manages the flow of conversation, thereby exerting a degree of control over the interaction.

This hybrid nature makes talk shows particularly interesting for the study of turn-taking. Unlike purely casual conversation, where turn-taking is relatively unconstrained, talk shows involve a balance between spontaneity and structure. Participants must navigate both interpersonal dynamics and institutional expectations, resulting in a complex interactional environment.

## 1.3 Limitations of Traditional Talk Show Research

While talk shows have been widely studied in discourse analysis, much of the existing research has focused on traditional television formats. These programs are typically produced within a highly structured and regulated environment, where interaction is shaped by factors such as time constraints, editorial control, and audience expectations.

In traditional television talk shows, the host-guest structure is usually clearly defined. The host assumes primary responsibility for managing the interaction, including selecting speakers, controlling topics, and maintaining coherence. Guests, in turn, are expected to respond to the host's questions and contribute to the discussion within the given framework.

This structured format has important implications for turn-taking. Because the host controls turn allocation, the interaction tends to follow predictable patterns. For example, the host may ask a question, a guest responds, and the host then selects the next speaker. While interruptions and overlaps may occur, they are generally managed in a way that preserves order and coherence.

Although this structure provides valuable insights into institutional discourse, it also limits the extent to which traditional talk shows can be used to study natural conversational processes. The presence of a dominant moderator and the influence of production constraints may reduce spontaneity and restrict the range of interactional behaviors. As a result, researchers may not fully capture the dynamic and negotiated nature of turn-taking as it occurs in less regulated contexts.

## 1.4 The Rise of Digital Talk Shows

The rapid development of digital media has led to significant changes in the production and consumption of talk shows. Platforms such as YouTube have enabled the emergence of new forms of talk-based content that differ markedly from traditional television formats. These digital talk shows are often produced independently, with fewer institutional constraints and greater flexibility in both content and format.

One of the most notable features of digital talk shows is their informal and spontaneous nature. Unlike traditional television programs, which may involve scripting or rehearsal, digital talk shows often rely on unscripted interaction. Participants engage in conversation in a more relaxed environment, which encourages natural speech and genuine interaction.

Another important feature is the fluidity of participant roles. In many digital talk shows, the distinction between host and guest is less clearly defined. While certain participants may take on leadership roles, the responsibility for managing the conversation is often shared among all participants. This distributed form of moderation contrasts with the centralized control observed in traditional formats and has important implications for turn-taking.

The reduced level of institutional control also affects the interactional dynamics of digital talk shows. Participants are more likely to engage in overlapping speech, interruptions, and rapid turn exchanges. These features reflect a more dynamic and participatory style of interaction, where speakers actively negotiate their turns rather than relying on predefined structures.

Furthermore, digital talk shows are situated within a broader context of network culture, characterized by interactivity, participation, and audience engagement. Although the audience is not physically present, participants are often aware of an invisible audience and may adjust their communicative behavior accordingly. This awareness introduces a performative dimension to the interaction, as participants balance the need to engage with each other and to entertain or inform the audience.

## 1.5 Turn-taking as a Core Mechanism of Interaction

At the heart of conversational interaction lies the organization of turn-taking. Turn-taking refers to the systematic way in which speakers coordinate their contributions to a conversation, ensuring that communication proceeds in an orderly and coherent manner. It is one of the most fundamental mechanisms underlying human interaction and has been extensively studied in conversation analysis.

The most influential account of turn-taking is provided by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson [4]. Their model describes turn-taking as a rule-governed system composed of two main components: turn-constructive units and turn-allocation techniques.

Turn-constructive units (TCUs) are the building blocks of turns and can take various forms, including sentences, clauses, phrases, and even single words. These units are characterized by their projectability, meaning that listeners can anticipate when a unit is likely to be completed. This allows participants to coordinate their turns effectively and minimize gaps or overlaps.

Turn-allocation techniques determine how the next speaker is selected. These include current-speaker selection, where the current speaker explicitly selects the next speaker; self-selection, where participants initiate a turn without being selected; and continuation, where the current speaker continues speaking. These techniques operate in accordance with a set of rules that guide the transition between speakers.

While this model was originally developed based on face-to-face conversation, it has been widely applied to various forms of mediated discourse, including talk shows. However, the applicability of this model to digital talk shows remains an open question. Given the informal setting, fluid participant roles, and increased interactional intensity, it is possible that turn-taking in digital contexts may exhibit unique characteristics.

## 1.6 Challenges of Turn-taking in Digital Contexts

The transition from traditional to digital talk shows introduces new challenges for the organization of turn-taking. In the absence of a clearly defined moderator, participants must rely more heavily on

interactional cues to coordinate their turns. This can lead to increased competition for the floor, as well as greater reliance on strategies such as overlap, interruption, and backchanneling.

At the same time, these features should not be viewed solely as disruptions. In many cases, overlap and interruption serve important interactional functions, such as signaling agreement, expressing enthusiasm, or contributing to humor. These functions highlight the complexity of turn-taking as a dynamic and context-dependent process.

Another challenge arises from the ambiguity of turn boundaries. In fast-paced and highly interactive conversations, it may be difficult for participants to determine when a speaker has completed their turn. This ambiguity can lead to misunderstandings and requires participants to continuously monitor and interpret each other's behavior.

Moreover, the presence of an invisible audience adds an additional layer of complexity. Participants may adjust their speech not only in response to their co-participants but also in anticipation of audience reactions. This dual orientation can influence turn-taking behavior, as speakers balance the need for interactional coherence with the desire for performative impact.

### **1.7 Research Gap and Objectives**

Despite the growing importance of digital talk shows, research on turn-taking in this context remains relatively limited. Much of the existing literature focuses on traditional television formats, which may not fully capture the dynamics of interaction in digital environments.

Furthermore, previous studies on turn-taking have often focused on specific features or strategies, such as interruption or overlap, without examining how these features interact within a broader system. In particular, there is a lack of research that integrates the analysis of turn-constructive and turn-allocation components in real-time interaction.

In addition, the role of participant relationships and interactional context in shaping turn-taking behavior has not been sufficiently explored. In digital talk shows, where roles are more fluid and interaction is more collaborative, these factors may play a significant role in determining how turns are managed.

In response to these gaps, the present study aims to investigate the dynamics of turn-taking in a digital talk show context. Specifically, it seeks to:

- 1) Identify the turn-constructive and turn-allocation components in the interaction
- 2) Examine how these components align with the turn-taking model proposed by Sacks et al. (1974)
- 3) Analyze the strategies used by participants to manage turn-taking
- 4) Explore the influence of participant relationships on interactional dynamics

### **1.8 Significance of the Study**

This study contributes to the field of discourse analysis in several ways. First, it extends the application of conversation analysis to digital media, addressing a gap in the existing literature. By focusing on digital talk shows, the study provides insights into how conversational practices adapt to new communicative environments.

Second, the study integrates the analysis of turn-constructive and turn-allocation components, offering a more comprehensive understanding of turn-taking as a system. This approach moves beyond the identification of individual features and highlights the interactional processes that underlie conversational organization.

Finally, the study emphasizes the role of context and participant relationships in shaping turn-taking behavior. By examining how these factors influence interaction, the study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of discourse as a socially embedded phenomenon.

## **2. Literature Review**

## **2.1 Discourse Analysis and Mediated Interaction**

Discourse analysis, as an interdisciplinary field, is concerned with the study of language in use, particularly how meaning is constructed through interaction in specific social contexts. According to David Crystal (1992), discourse refers to stretches of language that extend beyond the sentence level and form coherent communicative units such as conversations, narratives, and arguments. This definition highlights that discourse is not only about linguistic structure but also about the contextual and interactional processes that shape communication.

Within this framework, mediated discourse—language used in media contexts—has attracted increasing scholarly attention. Media discourse differs from everyday conversation in that it is often produced for a wider audience and shaped by institutional, technological, and cultural factors. Talk shows, as a form of mediated discourse, occupy a particularly interesting position because they combine elements of spontaneous conversation with structured communication.

Talk shows are characterized by extended spoken interaction, multiple participants, and a focus on opinion exchange. These features make them an ideal site for discourse analysis. At the same time, their mediated nature introduces additional layers of complexity, including audience design, performance, and institutional control. As a result, talk shows provide valuable insights into how conversational practices are adapted to public and semi-public contexts.

## **2.2 Talk Shows as Semi-institutional Discourse**

One of the most influential perspectives on talk shows comes from Cornelia Ilie (2001), who conceptualized talk shows as a form of semi-institutional discourse. This concept captures the hybrid nature of talk shows, which incorporate features of both everyday conversation and institutional interaction. Bilal [5] explored the tactics used to gain social power and political dominance in a political TV talk show through critical discourse analysis. In his study critical discourse analysis was used to unravel the manipulation of consideration and to learn how certain elements have helped in analyzing their positions as a powerful body.

On the one hand, talk shows share characteristics with casual conversation, including spontaneity, informality, and interpersonal engagement. Participants often express personal opinions, tell stories, and respond to each other in real time. These features create an impression of authenticity and immediacy, which is central to the appeal of talk shows.

On the other hand, talk shows are shaped by institutional goals and constraints. These include the need to attract and retain an audience, adhere to broadcast schedules, and maintain a coherent structure. As a result, interaction is often guided by a host or moderator, who is responsible for introducing topics, allocating turns, and managing the flow of conversation. This institutional dimension distinguishes talk shows from purely casual interaction.

The concept of semi-institutional discourse has important implications for the study of turn-taking. It suggests that turn-taking in talk shows is neither entirely free nor entirely constrained but operates within a framework that balances spontaneity and control. This balance may vary depending on the specific format and context of the talk show.

## **2.3 Traditional Talk Shows and Interactional Structure**

Much of the existing research on talk shows has focused on traditional television formats. These programs typically feature a clearly defined host–guest structure, where the host plays a central role in organizing the interaction. The host is responsible for selecting topics, asking questions, and allocating turns, thereby exerting a significant degree of control over the conversation.

Studies have shown that turn-taking in traditional talk shows tends to be relatively structured and predictable. For example, hosts often use questions to select the next speaker, and guests typically wait for their turn before speaking. Interruptions and overlaps may occur, but they are generally managed in a way that maintains order and coherence.

This structured interaction is partly a result of institutional constraints. Television talk shows are produced within a highly regulated environment, where factors such as time limits, audience expectations,

and editorial control influence the organization of discourse. In some cases, interactions may be partially scripted or rehearsed, further reducing spontaneity.

While these features make traditional talk shows useful for studying institutional discourse, they also limit their relevance for understanding natural conversational processes. The presence of a dominant moderator and the influence of production constraints can obscure the underlying mechanisms of turn-taking, making it difficult to observe how participants negotiate speaking rights in less regulated contexts.

## 2.4 Digital Media and the Transformation of Talk Shows

The rise of digital media has fundamentally transformed the landscape of talk shows. Platforms such as YouTube have enabled the emergence of new forms of talk-based content that differ significantly from traditional television formats.

Digital talk shows are typically produced in informal settings and involve smaller production teams. They are often less constrained by institutional norms, allowing for greater flexibility in both content and interactional style. Participants may speak more freely, use informal language, and engage in spontaneous exchanges.

One of the most notable features of digital talk shows is the fluidity of participant roles. Unlike traditional formats, where the host has a clearly defined role, digital talk shows often involve a more collaborative approach to interaction. Participants may share responsibility for managing the conversation, leading to a more dynamic and decentralized interactional structure.

This shift has important implications for turn-taking. In the absence of a dominant moderator, participants must rely more heavily on interactional cues to coordinate their turns. This can result in increased overlap, interruption, and self-selection, as speakers actively negotiate their participation in the conversation.

At the same time, digital talk shows are embedded in a broader context of network culture, characterized by interactivity, participation, and audience engagement. Although the audience is not physically present, participants are often aware of an invisible audience, which may influence their communicative behavior. This dual orientation—to co-participants and to an imagined audience—adds complexity to the organization of discourse.

## 2.5 Turn-taking in Conversation Analysis

Turn-taking is one of the most fundamental aspects of conversational organization and has been extensively studied within the field of conversation analysis. Saraswati and Hamsia [6] discovered that there were three types of turn taking, namely speaker's selection, speaker's self-choice, and speaker's determination. Several strategies used by the speakers were also identified, including overlap, interruption, back-channel, and silence. The seminal work of Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson (1974) provides a comprehensive framework for understanding how speakers coordinate their contributions in conversation.

According to their model, turn-taking is organized through a system of turn-constructive units (TCUs) and turn-allocation rules. TCUs are the building blocks of turns and can take various forms, including sentences, clauses, phrases, and single words. These units are characterized by their projectability, meaning that listeners can anticipate when a unit is likely to be completed.

The completion of a TCU creates a transition-relevance place (TRP), where a change of speaker may occur. At each TRP, participants orient to a set of rules that determine how the next speaker is selected. These rules include current-speaker selection, self-selection, and continuation by the current speaker.

This model highlights the systematic nature of turn-taking and demonstrates how participants are able to coordinate their interaction with minimal gaps and overlaps. At the same time, it allows for flexibility and variation, as participants can adapt their behavior to the specific context of the interaction.

## 2.6 Turn-taking Strategies in Talk Show Discourse

Building on the foundational model of turn-taking, subsequent research has examined the specific strategies that speakers use to manage turns in different contexts. In talk show discourse, several strategies have been identified as particularly important.

One such strategy is interruption, where a speaker begins to speak before the current speaker has completed their turn. While interruptions are often associated with competition for the floor, they can also serve cooperative functions, such as signaling agreement or enthusiasm.

Overlap, which occurs when two or more speakers talk simultaneously, is another common feature of talk show interaction. As noted by Fauzi Habibi et al. [7], overlap can serve multiple functions, including backchanneling, collaborative completion, and turn-taking negotiation.

Backchanneling refers to the use of short responses, such as “yeah,” “uh-huh,” or laughter, to signal attention and engagement. While backchannels do not typically constitute full turns, they play an important role in maintaining conversational flow and supporting the current speaker.

In addition to these strategies, speakers may use repetition, pauses, and prosodic features to hold or yield the floor. For example, elongation of sounds or repetition of words can signal that a speaker intends to continue their turn, while questions can be used to allocate the next turn to another participant.

## 2.7 Limitations of Existing Research

Despite the extensive body of research on talk shows and turn-taking, several limitations can be identified. First, much of the existing research focuses on traditional television talk shows, with relatively little attention given to digital formats. This represents a significant gap, given the growing importance of digital media in contemporary communication.

Second, many studies focus on identifying specific features or strategies, such as interruption or overlap, without fully integrating these features into a comprehensive analytical framework. As a result, the relationship between turn-constructive and turn-allocation components is often overlooked.

Third, there is a tendency to treat turn-taking as a static system, rather than as a dynamic and context-dependent process. In reality, turn-taking is shaped by a range of factors, including participant relationships, communicative goals, and interactional context. These factors are particularly relevant in digital talk shows, where interaction is more fluid and less constrained.

## 2.8 Research Gap and Significance

In light of the above discussion, it is clear that further research is needed to understand how turn-taking operates in digital talk shows. Specifically, there is a need to:

- Examine turn-taking in less regulated, more spontaneous interactional contexts
- Integrate the analysis of turn-constructive and turn-allocation components
- Explore the role of interactional strategies in negotiating speaking rights
- Consider the influence of participant relationships and digital context

By addressing these issues, the present study aims to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of turn-taking as a dynamic and adaptive process. In doing so, it extends the application of conversation analysis to digital media and provides insights into the evolving nature of discourse in contemporary society.

## 3. Methodology

### 3.1 Data Selection and Context

The data for this study is drawn from an episode of the “Table Talk” series produced by the YouTube channel SourceFed Nerd, hosted on YouTube. This series features informal discussions among participants

on topics suggested by viewers, making it particularly suitable for analyzing spontaneous conversational interaction.

The selected segment spans from 2:54 to 8:32 of the episode, during which three participants—Maude Garrett (M), Ashley Esqueda (A), and Sam Bashor (S)—engage in a discussion based on the prompt: “*Would you rather have your favorite villain or superhero fighting beside you in a fight?*” Ashley appears as a guest, while Maude and Sam are regular members of the channel. An additional participant, DJ (D), is present off-camera but minimally involved in the interaction.

This specific segment was selected for several reasons. First, it contains a high density of interactional features, including overlaps, interruptions, and rapid turn shifts. Second, the topic encourages personal expression and imaginative responses, which contribute to a more dynamic conversational environment. Third, the relatively informal setting reduces institutional constraints, allowing for more naturalistic data.

### 3.2 Data Transcription

The transcription follows the convention proposed by Sacks and colleagues (1974) in their study “A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation”. The specific transcription markers are as follows:

The double oblique (\\) indicates the point at which a current speaker’s talk is overlapped by the talk of another. The overlapped parts correspond to each other in vertical position (i.e. they start in the same position vertically on the transcript).

A single right-hand bracket (]) indicates the point at which two overlapping or simultaneously started utterances end, if they end simultaneously, or the point at which one of them ends in the course of another.

The equals sign (=) indicates “latching”—i.e., no interval between the end of a prior and start of a next piece of talk. When used at the start of line it means that it is in the same utterance as the above utterance of the speaker but through-produced or interrupted.

Colon (:) indicates that the prior syllable is prolonged.

Underscoring ( \_ ) indicates various forms of stressing.

The short dash (-) indicates a ‘cut off’ of the prior word or sound.

### 3.3 Analytical Framework

The analysis is based on the turn-taking model proposed by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson (1974). Specifically, the study focuses on two core components:

- Turn-constructive component (TCC): how speakers construct turns using linguistic units
- Turn-allocation component (TAC): how speaking rights are distributed

In addition, the analysis considers how these components align with the established rules of turn-taking, including current-speaker selection, self-selection, and speaker continuation.

### 3.4 Analytical Procedure

The analysis was conducted in several stages:

1. Identification of turn-taking instances

Segments involving clear turn transitions, overlaps, or interruptions were selected for detailed analysis.

2. Classification of turn-constructive units (TCUs)

Each turn was examined to determine its structure (e.g., sentence, clause, phrase) and its degree of projectability.

3. Identification of turn-allocation techniques

Instances of current-speaker selection, self-selection, and continuation were identified and categorized.

4. Examination of rule alignment

Each instance was analyzed in relation to the turn-taking rules proposed by Sacks et al. (1974).

5. Interpretation of interactional strategies

Strategies such as backchanneling, repetition, humor, and prosodic emphasis were analyzed to understand how participants manage turn-taking.

### 3.5 Reliability and Limitations

To enhance reliability, the transcription and analysis were conducted with careful attention to detail, including repeated verification of ambiguous segments. However, the study has certain limitations. The dataset is limited to a single episode, which may restrict the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, the analysis focuses primarily on verbal interaction, without systematically incorporating multimodal features such as gesture or gaze.

Future research could expand the dataset and adopt a multimodal approach to provide a more comprehensive understanding of turn-taking in digital discourse.

## 4. Findings and Discussion

The topics they discussed coincides with their shared interest which accounts for the excitement they have shown, leading to frequent and quick shift of turns. It typically features a high density of spoken language, intense discussions and frequent overlaps and backchannels.

Example 1

89 S: There you go (pointing to Maude)  
 90 M: I want-I mean my favorite villains Harley Queen but I don't I think she'd  
 91 be great to fight with \\she'd be like zoinks zoinks uh-huh and it's like  
 92 come on-no like stop going around with a hammer and just blinking  
 93 things like this more you need to-\\I need your eyes on the quite there]

This example is typically aligned with rule 1a. Sam was selecting Maude to be the next speaker using “current speaker selecting” technique as the turn-allocation component. Maude, being the one selected, was obliged to take the turn to speak and she naturally took the floor.

Example 2

28 S: Oh:::Damn I'm such a nerd \\yeah I was gonna say reverse flash That's a  
 29 lame answer. \\That's a-that's a lame answer lame answer=  
 30 M: \\DJ who's your favorite villain]  
 31 A: \\Get out]=  
 32 M: Hold on=DJ your favorite superhero is-superman? \\You got a  
 33 supervillain?  
 34 S: \\Superman]  
 35 D: (Remains silence)



- 9 and then we need to weigh it up=
- 32 M: Hold on=DJ your favorite superhero is-superman? \\You got a  
33 supervillain?
- 89 S: There you go (pointing to Maude)
- 133 S: Alright now in some really super nerdy Star Wars things Did you know  
134 that the original \\actor did
- 163 M: Alright so we've got everyone here

From the perspective of the discourse, a moderator is needed to lead the flow of the communication. In this case, Maude took initiative to notify the process of discussing the topic and later selected speak. And then Sam became the one guiding turn shifting and selecting speak. The one playing the role of moderator switches between Maude and Sam, possibly due to the fact that Ashley was the guest of this episode.

Therefore, the relationship between the interlocutors can influence the distribution of the role guiding turn shifting. Moreover, it can also affect the strategies in turn taking used by the speakers. For example, the number of backchanneling for Ashley (line 2, 5, 6, 25, 65, 66, 69, 72, 74, 76, 104, 148) the guest is higher than that for Maude (line 48, 94, 109, 144) or Sam (line 135, 141, 154) which belong to the crew of the channel.

#### Example 6

- 28 S: Oh:::Damn I'm such a nerd \\yeah I was gonna say reverse flash That's a  
29 lame answer. \\That's a-that's a lame answer lame answer=  
30 M: \\DJ who's your favorite villain]  
31 A: \\Get out]=
- 61 A: Hero? Favorite hero um:::god that's hard for-I'm like a villain \\girl]  
62 M: \\yo-]  
63 A: =I lo::ve villains so for me I would say and this is sort of weird and like of  
64 course Disney like I love Maleficent=

However frequent backchannels, which often cause excess overlaps, may confuse the speaker—sometimes they could misunderstand backchannels and take them as the action of self-selection for taking the floor, and sometimes it may be the other way around. In this case for example, at line 29 Sam repeated his words to hold the floor because he thought that Ashley's backchannel at line 31 was self-selection technique for turn-allocation component. At line 63 Ashley prolonged and stressed the intonation of the word "love" for holding the floor because she's not sure about the overlaps Maude initiated at line 62.

## 5. Conclusion

This study set out to examine the dynamics of turn-taking in digital talk shows through a discourse-analytic approach. By analyzing interactional data from the “Table Talk” series, the study demonstrates that the fundamental principles of turn-taking, as outlined by Harvey Sacks and colleagues, remain relevant in digital contexts. However, their realization is significantly shaped by the informal, participatory, and dynamic nature of online discourse.

The findings reveal that turn-taking in digital talk shows is characterized by flexibility, negotiation, and strategic interaction. Participants actively employ a range of linguistic and interactional resources to manage speaking rights, including overlap, backchanneling, repetition, and humor. These strategies not only facilitate communication but also contribute to the construction of social relationships and participant identities.

Furthermore, the study highlights the importance of contextual factors, such as participant roles, topic selection, and platform affordances, in shaping turn-taking behavior. In particular, the distribution of moderating roles and the influence of interpersonal relationships underscore the socially embedded nature of conversational organization.

Despite its contributions, this study is limited by its relatively small dataset and focus on a single digital talk show. Future research could expand the scope by analyzing multiple programs or incorporating multimodal analysis to explore the role of visual and embodied cues in turn-taking.

In conclusion, this study contributes to the growing body of research on digital discourse by demonstrating that turn-taking is not a fixed system but a dynamic and adaptive process. As communication continues to evolve in the digital age, further investigation into these interactional mechanisms will be essential for understanding the complexities of human communication.

#### Transcript:

- 1 A: This is from Andrew Osnundson \\I'm sorry but thank you  
 2 M: \\Let's see]  
 3 A: =Ah: would you rather have your favorite villain or superhero fighting  
 4 besides you in a fight=  
 5 M: \\Wo::w]=  
 6 S: \\Wo::w]=  
 7 A: It's a really good question=  
 8 M: First of all we need to know who everyone's favorite hero is and villain  
 9 and then we need to weigh it up=  
 10 A: oh man so many options here=  
 11 S: \\I-]  
 12 M: \\Would you rather the fla:sh(gesturing to Sam)=  
 13 S: I wha-wha-why \\would you ever say-]  
 14 M: \\Show the tatoo Show the tatoo  
 15 M: \\Show it  
 16 S: \\I have a flash tatoo  
 17 M: Show the tatoo=  
 18 S: I have a fla-=  
 19 A: Is it too fast to see=  
 20 S: Oh my god that'd be-that's a really good line damn it I should've done

21 that should've=-  
22 A: Sorry I tried to se-I tried to set that up for you but it's too late=  
23 S: I'm sorry I'm t=-  
24 A: You're too quick just like the flash=  
25 M: Yea::h (claps)=  
26 S: But yeah so I would like the flash that'd be pretty good but for a villain::  
27 M: Who's your favorite villain=  
28 S: Oh:::Damn I'm such a nerd \\yeah I was gonna say reverse flash That's a  
29 lame answer. \\That's a-that's a lame answer lame answer=  
30 M: \\DJ who's your favorite villain]  
31 A: \\Get out]=  
32 M: Hold on=DJ your favorite superhero is-superman? \\You got a  
33 supervillain?  
34 S: \\Superman]  
35 D: (Remains silence)  
36 S: Lex Luthor?=  
37 M: =Get out of here  
38 A: Think about it okay?  
39 S: Okay I like Lex Luthor I'll go with Lex Luthor as like a: supervillain  
40 M: How would him help you in a fight?  
41 S: He's got a supersuit. He's got a supersuit and he's the smartest dude on  
42 the planet or at least he pretends to be.  
43 M: But I mean like-say \\he saved the world whatcha gonna do—not make  
44 out:  
45 S: =\\And- arrow dynamics]  
46 A: And say like there's a lot of people who pretends to be the smartest person  
47 on the planet=  
48 S: =Of course=  
49 A: =I don't know if I'll go-I don't know if I go with Lex Luthor  
50 S: Poinson Ivy is pretty good.  
51 M: She's she for sure  
52 S: Oh she died though::you know  
53 M: Only she-  
54 A: He's weak. \\He'll never stand up to that]  
55 S: \\I am not strong. I'm not I am very weak though  
56 A: Not in a face like poison ivy  
57 S: No

- 58 A: What man is? what man is? some women too
- 59 S: Yeah what are you guys?
- 60 M: (pointing to Asheley)
- 61 A: Hero? Favorite hero um::god that's hard for-I'm like a villain \girl]
- 62 M: \yo-]
- 63 A: =I lo::ve villains so for me I would say and this is sort of weird and like of
- 64 course Disney like I love Maleficent=
- 65 M: \oh:okay]
- 66 S: \wo:::]
- 67 A: =not actually Joe Lee Maleficent like sympathetic Maleficent but
- 68 Maleficent Maleficent like real Maleficent here=
- 69 M: hardcore evil=
- 70 A: =hardcore evil-evil cool Maleficent um yeah I would want Maleficent
- 71 funny because she got Diavolo get the crow got \little minions]
- 72 M: \and the dragons?]
- 73 A: =she can turn into a dragon=
- 74 M: there it is=
- 75 A: =she can cast spells on you I mean really for-you can't really go wrong=
- 76 S: No of course not
- 77 A: =I just have to show up at my archnemesi's' Bir-day of birth at her
- 78 chris—at their christening and cast an evil spell on them and then problem
- 79 solved I wouldn't actually have to lift a finger it seems really easy
- 80 S: Th-That's a lot of setup. \so you're just-]are you planning for that person
- 81 to be your enemy when they're born or \you're going back in time
- 82 A: \Yeah That's a long game I play
- 83 A: \a hundred percent]
- 84 A: this is like my whole life is a long game to destroy someone else's life=
- 85 S: yeah At like eight years old I made friends or I became friends with
- 86 maleficent and I was like god Timmy is a real piece of shit=
- 87 A: It's like in twenty years I'm gonna need you to show up at this baby's
- 88 house curse it but for now let's go to Taco Bell=
- 89 S: There you go(pointing to Maude)
- 90 M: I want-I mean my favorite villains Harley Queen but I don't I think she'd
- 91 be great to fight with \she'd be like zoinks zoinks uh-huh and it's like
- 92 come on-no like stop going around with a hammer and just blinking
- 93 things like this more you need to-\I need your eyes on the quite there]
- 94 S: \She's crazy]



- 131 M: He got cooler when he became a Kiwi in my opinion I would that-the  
 132 would be fun to go up against wait boba wait mate wait cuz
- 133 S: Alright now in some really super nerdy Star Wars things Did you know  
 134 that the original \actor did
- 135 M: \yes]=
- 136 S: =Probably yes but the original actor who do—uh I’m sorry uh obi wan  
 137 Kenobi who’s the original actor?
- 138 M: Alec Guinness=
- 139 S: =Alec Guinness uh and uh Ewan McGregor both have voices in force  
 140 awakening
- 141 A: They do=
- 142 S: =That was really cool I lit—I listened to the interview=
- 143 A: They like merged the word afraid
- 144 S: Yeah=
- 145 A: =and then like and the word Rey I think was the thing it’s like they were-  
 146 they found a clip Alec Guinness saying word Rey, they merged it with  
 147 Ewan McGregor. That was:-like \Rey you’ve taken your first steps
- 148 S: \ re:ally cool]
- 149 M: I didn’t know that=
- 150 A: Oh my god Maude didn’t know a Star Wars fact?=
- 151 S: We uh we have a host named Steve and he’s brilliant to Ghostbusters  
 152 when I told him that Ron Jeremy the porn star is in the first movie he’s  
 153 in the movie
- 154 A: Yeah he’s in it=
- 155 S: =Yeah he’s in the crowd //when the uh::: when the //marshmallow is  
 156 muffin]
- 157 A: //He’s in the crowd] //steve puff shows-yeah  
 158 yeah yeah
- 159 M: Did he try to run away and fell over
- 160 S: hmm?
- 161 M: =Well you know cuz-
- 162 A: Well he’s used to being around a lot of melty white stuff
- 163 M: Alright so we’ve got everyone here

## References

- [1] Crystal, D., *Introducing linguistics*, London: Penguin English; 1992.

- [2] Edgerly, S., Gotlieb, M., Vraga, E., “That show really spoke to me!”: The effects of compatible psychological needs and talk show host style on audience activity. *International Journal of Communication*. 2016; 10: 21–40.
- [3] Ilie, C., Semi-institutional discourse: The case of talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2001; 33(2): 209–254.
- [4] Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*. 1974; 50(4): 696–735.
- [5] Bilal, H. A., Ahsan, H. M., Gohar, S., Younis, S., Awan, S. J., Critical discourse analysis of political TV talk shows of Pakistani media. *International Journal of Linguistics*. 2012; 4(1): 203–219.
- [6] Saraswati, N., Hamsia, W., A study of turn taking used in radio talk show under the topic “Gender equality and women’s empowerment”. *TELL: Teaching of English Language and Literature Journal*. 2017; 5(2): 60–70.
- [7] Habibi, F., Hidayat, D. N., Alek, A., Turn-taking in Mata Najwa talk show “Ragu-Ragu Perpu” episode: A conversational analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*. 2020; 2(1): 80–96.

### **Funding**

This research received no external funding.

### **Conflicts of Interest**

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

### **Acknowledgment**

This paper is an output of the science project.

### **Copyrights**

Copyright for this article is retained by the author (s), with first publication rights granted to the journal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).