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Chapter 1 – Introduction

1 Introduction

My dissertation is about television talk shows. When we turn on our TV’s, it is very likely that we come across one. Indeed, over the past decades, talk shows have become an indispensible part of the television landscape. From an interactional perspective, they are a very intriguing phenomenon. Although television talk shows are evidently set in an institutional setting, the talk in these shows is less regulated and more spontaneous than is the case for other interactional activities which are typically set in a television studio, e.g. political debates and news interviews. The interaction in talk shows shares some of the traits of everyday conversation that are not present in other types of broadcast talk such as debates or news interviews. My focus, then, is on the interactional course of two television talk shows and, in particular, on the role of the host. By examining the individual interactional characteristics of the selected hosts, I would like to find out what type of host they are and how the distinct nature of talk show interaction is oriented to by the host’s way of interacting.

I will concentrate on talk shows in English, but from an international perspective. I will use video data from both a British and an American talk show. The selected talk shows are *The Jonathan Ross Show* and *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*. These talk shows are selected on the basis of the talk show hosts and the type of talk show. Both shows are evening celebrity talk shows and feature very popular hosts. I opt for an international perspective as I wish to examine English-speaking media rather than limiting my scope either to an American or British perspective. In addition, the talk show data will be discussed from a comparative point of view. Since the talk shows are of the same type, a comparison between them is valid. The main focus of this comparison will be on the two hosts. The analysis of the talk show data will happen within the theoretical framework of conversation analysis (CA). CA theory was pioneered by Harvey Sacks and revolves around the systematic analysis of talk-in-interaction. The theory established by CA and its elaboration of concepts such as turn-taking, adjacency pairs, topic organisation, response tokens and story-telling are crucial for my analysis.
In my opinion, an analysis of talk show interaction is particularly interesting for two reasons. First of all, the way in which the interactional characteristics of a talk show host are influenced by the interplay of spontaneous talk and an institutional setting can reveal some interesting findings. Secondly, until recently, the field of talk show interaction has been insufficiently explored from a CA perspective. Only a couple of decades ago, CA started to expand its scope to include talk recorded in institutional settings. Earlier, its main focus was on informal conversation. Consequently, an exhaustive body of CA literature on media talk does not as yet exist and further research in this field is definitely desirable. Furthermore, most CA research on media talk is on news interviews (cf. Clayman & Heritage 2002; Greatbach 1988) rather than on talk shows. A possible explanation for this may be that the news interview is a less hybrid genre. Talk shows exist in all shapes and sizes. Therefore, research within this area is often speculative (Tolson 1991: 4). To avoid the risk of being speculative, more recent research on talk shows has illustrated specific aspects of talk show interaction and limited its scope to specific talk shows (cf. Ilie 2001, Thornborrow 2001; Blum-Kulka 2001). This will also be part of my method.

This dissertation not only connects with the range of studies on talk show interaction (cf. Ilie 2001; Tolson 2001), it also seeks to enrich the field of study on talk show interaction in a number of ways. First of all, the existing literature on The Jonathan Ross Show and The Tonight Show with Jay Leno is very limited. The majority of academics seem to prefer a show like Oprah for their analysis (e.g. Ilie 2001; Norrick 2010; Haarman 2001; Shattuc 1997). Consequently, this dissertation aims to shed some new light on this particular field of study by comparing talk shows that have never been compared to each other before. Secondly, existing literature typically focuses on American talk shows (Ilie 2001; Norrick 2010) or on British talk shows (Thornborrow 2001). A comparison from an international perspective is not that common. Finally, my analysis includes both a quantitative and a qualitative analysis. The former type of analysis is innovative, as CA research is traditionally qualitative in its orientations.

This dissertation consists of four chapters. In the first chapter, I will introduce key insights from CA and discuss its specific contribution to the study of talk show interaction. This is followed by a discussion of the concept of a talk show. Here, I will elaborate on the position of the talk show in the media landscape by stressing its semi-institutional character and its differences from the news interview. The last section of this chapter, then, introduces the actual
comparison that will be elaborated in the next two chapters. The second chapter presents a quantitative analysis of the talk show data, in which five different parameters will be discussed. These parameters include the number of words per minute, the number of turns per minute, the turn length, the use of question turns and the use of response tokens. The parameters are chosen on the basis of their ability to reveal some of the key interactional characteristics of the hosts. In addition, these parameters clearly illustrate how the hosts differ from each other. The third chapter presents a qualitative analysis of the talk show data. As is typical in CA, I will make use of transcriptions of the talk show data. The main focus here is on the ways in which the turn-taking system is organised in both talk shows and on how the transition of topics is typically managed in these talk shows. The results for these two features will further highlight some of the differences between the two talk shows. The third chapter ends with a summary of these differences, before arriving at the general conclusion presented in chapter four.
2 Conversation analysis

The talk show data in this dissertation are interactional data. From the 1960s onwards, interactional data began to be studied in a methodological way. The method that is used for the study of spoken interaction is called conversation analysis (CA). Sociologists Hutchby and Wooffitt define CA as “the systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction: talk-in-interaction” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 11). CA is a non-interventionist approach. This means that researchers do not intervene in the data, neither do they invent examples. The study object of CA is spontaneous tape-recorded spoken interaction between people. CA starts from the premise that spoken interaction is ordered and has a special focus on the “turn by turn unfolding of talk-in-interaction” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 138).

2.1 Preliminaries

The work of sociologist Harvey Sacks and his co-workers lies at the very foundations of CA. In the 1960s, Sacks gave a series of lectures at the sociology department of the University of California in LA (Sacks et al. 1992). These lectures were the first steps towards a new approach for the analysis of spoken interaction. Sacks’ first lectures focused on telephone calls to the Suicide Prevention Centre in San Francisco. Hutchby and Wooffitt write that it was “during these calls that a question occurred to him which turned out to be the starting point of conversation analysis” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 16), they recount Schegloff’s account of this occurrence:

It was during a long talking walk in the late winter of 1964 that Sacks mentioned to me a ‘wild’ possibility that had occurred to him. He had previously told me about a recurrent and much discussed practical problem faced by those who answered phone calls to the Suicide Prevention Center by suicidal persons or about them – the problem of getting the callers to give their names... On the one hand, Sacks noted, it appears that if the name is not forthcoming at the start it may prove problematic to get. On the other hand, overt requests for it may be resisted. Then he remarked: Is it possible that the caller’s declared problem in hearing is a methodical way of avoiding giving one’s name in response to the other’s having done so? Could talk be organised at the level of detail? And in so designed a manner? (Schegloff, 1992a: xvi-xvii, as cited in Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 16-17)

In those days, spoken talk was generally seen as arbitrary. Whilst doing his analysis of calls to the Suicide Prevention Centre, however, Sacks acquired the insight that spoken dialogue was far
from disorderly or spontaneous. He discovered that is was in fact organised in a particular, systematic manner.

With this belief, Sacks positioned himself directly opposite to the prevailing linguistic theories of his day. He was especially opposed to Noam Chomsky’s Generative Grammar (1965), which was the dominant linguistic theory in the 1960s. While Chomsky studied “invented examples of language for their formal properties, without paying attention to how language is actually used in interaction” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 21), Sacks studied exactly this field of talk-in-interaction. He was interested in how people negotiate patterns of turn-taking, claiming that the turn-taking system was rule-governed, rather than arbitrary. Chomsky, on the other hand, did not study ordinary talk since he thought of it as defective. Sacks, then, produced pioneering work in a field that was until then fairly unexplored. Hutchby and Wooffitt call him “a highly original, often iconoclastic thinker” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 2) and point out that he has been very influential in many fields.

2.2 Influences

Sacks, however, was influenced by others’ work as well. Especially the theoretical perspectives of the American social scientists Harold Garfinkel and Erving Goffman had a significant influence on him. Heritage and Clayman note that Garfinkel and Goffman “dissented from the view that the details of everyday life are an inherently disorderly and unreachable mess” (Heritage and Clayman 2010: 8). They, too, believed that there was order to be found in spoken interaction. From Garfinkel, Sacks took “the notion that shared methods of reasoning are implicated in the production and recognition of contributions to interaction” (Heritage and Clayman 2010: 12). This means that participants display their shared understanding of the interaction when they communicate. From Goffman, then, he took the idea that “talk-in-interaction is a fundamental social domain that can be studied as an institutional entity in its own right” (Heritage and Clayman 2010: 12). These ideas may need some further explanation.

Harold Garfinkel is especially known for his ethnomethodological approach. Ethnomethodology is a sociological perspective from the 1950s-1960s. According to Liddicoat, “[e]thnomethodology (…) studies the common sense resources, practices and procedures through which members of a society produce and recognize mutually intelligible objects, events and
courses of action” (Liddicoat 2007: 2). Garfinkel tried to expose these common sense resources in his ‘breaching experiments’ (Garfinkel 1967). These ‘breaching experiments’ included e.g. that he would ask his students to behave as a guest when they got home or that on the question ‘how are you’ they would respond by asking what they mean; how they are financial, emotional, etc. (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 28). These experiments expose the ‘seen-but-not-noticed’ (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 28); members of a society orient to procedures of which they are not aware.

According to Garfinkel, the members of a society do this by means of ‘the documentary method’. Liddicoat describes this method as “the way in which individuals bring order to, or make sense of, their social world” (Liddicoat 2007: 3). It is explained by Garfinkel as follows:

The method consists of treating an actual appearance as ‘the document of’, as ‘pointing to’, as ‘standing on behalf of’ a presupposed underlying pattern. Not only is the underlying pattern derived from its individual documentary evidence, but the individual documentary evidences, in their turn, are interpreted on the basis of ‘what is known’ about an underlying pattern. Each is used to elaborate the other. (Garfinkel 1967: 78).

The documentary method consists of treating certain facts as conforming to a pattern. Liddicoat comments; “[o]nce the pattern has been established, it can be used as a framework for interpreting new facts which arise within the situation” (Liddicoat 2007: 3). Liddicoat concludes that “people constantly make use of the documentary method in their daily lives to create a taken-for-granted understanding” (Liddicoat 2007: 3). Utterances can index particular understandings by the participants. These taken-for-granted understandings, then, may be challenged by Garfinkel’s ‘breaching experiments’.

Sacks’ affiliation with the ethnomethodology of Garfinkel shows in his own work. According to Slembrouck, CA shares with ethnomethodology the “premise that social order is to be understood as an ongoing accomplishment of everyday actions and their mutual recognition” (Slembrouck 2009: 56). This means that social order is displayed and produced in an individual’s behaviour in everyday actions and that it is recognized as meaningful by those observing. For example, a promise is a promise because it is recognized in the next turn as a promise. Slembrouck further notes that ethnomethodology and CA have in common the “assumption that interactional meaning is contextually and sequentially made available” (Slembrouck 2009: 56). ‘Contextually’ means that the action or sign is interpreted by reference to a context, it indexes circumstances. ‘Sequentially’ points at the inter-dependent actions, for example, a response to a
previous question raises expectations for a next question. Slembrouck finally mentions the common “insistence on detecting the perspective of the competent participant” (Slembrouck 2009: 56).

However, CA deviates from ethnomethodology as well. Slembrouck lists some differences. As was already mentioned earlier, CA is limited to recorded and transcribed talk; it has less interest in understanding professional or institutional specific forms of cognitive reasoning than ethnomethodology. Instead, CA is concerned with formal patterns, only that which is apparent from the surface of recorded data. It is not interested in how utterances are heard from a particular point of view. Hutchby and Wooffitt discuss the problems that come with the ethnomethodological method:

The main problem here is that the analysis is based on the researcher’s own account, generated in fieldnotes after the event, rather than the natural, situated actions of participants. Hence, the analytic account is not only post hoc, but also a reconstructed version of what actually happened in the setting. (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 29)

Hutchby and Wooffitt think of Sacks’ method as more effective as he avoids these pitfalls by focusing on recorded data (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 29). Additionally, Slembrouck points out that CA does not come with the imperative to immerse oneself in a situation so as to acquire and observe the competencies of an insider. These differences all add up to the same idea of CA as a non-interventionist method.

Sacks was not only influenced by Garfinkel’s ethnomethodology, but also by Erving Goffman. Goffman’s influence was not as substantial as that of Garfinkel, though. According to Heritage and Clayman, Goffman’s fundamental achievement was “to establish that social interaction is a form of social organisation in its own right” (Heritage and Clayman 2010: 8). Hutchby and Wooffitt write:

At the core of [Goffman’s] work was the ritual nature of face-to-face interaction. His argument was that we ‘perform’ our social selves, managing the ways we appear in everyday situations so as to affect, in either overt or tacit ways, how others orient to us. At the same time, a person’s self becomes treated as a ‘sacred’ object, which is shown by the ways we establish boundaries around our physical bodies and possessions, ‘territories of the self’ (Goffman, 1971) which we expect others to respect. The originality in Goffman’s thinking came from his view that this domain of everyday interpersonal interaction, which was seen as deeply trivial and arbitrary by mainstream sociology, was a site of social order and should be the subject of structural sociological investigation. (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 24)
Goffman’s idea that we perform our social selves and that we affect how others orient to us, implies that we are able to design our talk and that this talk, therefore, is structured. This idea influenced Sacks, who was one of Goffman’s students. However, Hutchby and Wooffitt conclude that “although Sacks undoubtedly drew from Goffman in his interest in the orderly properties of face-to-face interaction, his approach was ultimately very different to Goffman’s” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 24).

Hutchby and Wooffitt point out two main differences between them. First, Goffman makes a distinction between ‘system properties’ and ‘ritual properties’ of talk-in-interaction. They explain system properties as “features ensuring basic intelligibility, such as orderly turn-taking” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 25), ritual properties are described as “such things as the protection of ‘face’ – the ways in which we tend to avoid giving offence to others – politeness, and the many other ‘ceremonial’ aspects of interaction” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 25). Sacks does not make this difference. The second difference is related to the methodology. Hutchby and Wooffitt write that Goffman “tended to eschew systematic methods of data collection and analysis in favour of a magpie-like selection from whatever materials he could find” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 25-26). These materials were selected on the base of their appropriateness to illustrate his theoretical point. In other words, Goffman used data largely illustratively; he used his data to support the theoretical point that he wanted to make. Sacks, on the other hand, argues that “theory ought to be data driven, rather than data being used to support theory” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 26). Sacks, then, both drew on and moved away from Garfinkel and Goffman when establishing his own approach.

Sacks died a young death and did not publish many influential papers himself. His co-workers Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson collected and expanded his work. They published his lectures in ‘Lectures on Conversation’ (1992) since the core of his ideas and method was expressed during his lectures at the university. Hutchby notes that many of the studies in early CA were co-authored by Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson. He argues that their studies had “an enormous influence among researchers investigating the practices of human communication” (Hutchby 2006: 18).
2.3 Principles

Principles on what the core of CA is about, return in almost any of the books or articles on CA. Seedhouse summarizes CA in four principles, Hutchby in five. Hutchby’s first principle of CA is that “[t]alk is a principal means for *accomplishing social actions*” (Hutchby 2006: 24), his second is “[t]alk is produced in specific *interactional contexts*, and how people talk is highly *sensitive* to that context” (Hutchby 2006: 24). This principle will return in the fourth section of this chapter when discussing institutional talk. Hutchby’s third principle is “[t]alk and interaction are *orderly*; that is, we can find systematic *patterns* and *structures* in the ways that people use talk to interact” (Hutchby 2006: 24). This principle once again points out that talk is ordered and reflects Seedhouse’s first and third principle. Seedhouse’s first principle is that “there is order at all points of interaction” (Seedhouse 2004, as cited in Slembrouck 2009: 57); at all the levels of interaction (higher, lower, micro etc), there is order. His third principle follows from the first one; “no order of detail can be dismissed as disorderly, accidental or irrelevant” (Seedhouse 2004, as cited in Slembrouck 2009: 57). CA supports the view that seemingly disorderly or defective speech still can be explained. Liddicoat writes that the “deviant case is in some way orienting to the normal course of action” (Liddicoat 2007: 12), he continues that deviant cases who do not, are “evidence that the account is not yet maximally generalizable rather than being a deviant or defective instance” (Liddicoat 2007: 12).

Seedhouse’s second principle responds to Hutchby’s fourth: “[c]ontributions to interaction are both context renewing and context shaped”. A turn is a response to the preceding turn and therefore context-shaped. In addition, it is an anticipation of the kind of talk that is to follow and is, therefore, context-renewing as well. Hutchby phrases this as follows:

> Talk is organized *sequentially*; that is by focusing on how people take turns at talking we can understand how they interpret the immediate interactional context, since turns are *related together*. (Hutchby 2006: 24)

This idea, that speakers show an understanding of the preceding turn and reveal expectations about the next turn is termed ‘sequential implicativeness’ (Slembrouck 2009) and is one of the, if not the, most important insights of CA. Hutchby’s fifth principle is on CA’s way of analysing data. This was already mentioned when discussing the differences with ethnomethodology. The fifth principle runs as follows:
The best way to analyse this is by looking at recordings of naturally-occurring interaction, rather than using fieldnotes, as in ethnography, or intuition, as in many kinds of linguistics. (Hutchby 2006: 24)

This principle reflects Seedhouse’s fourth principle: the analysis is bottom-up and data-driven. The analysis is both positivist and phenomenological. This means that the analysis is always related to the transcription and that, through the analysis, aspects are shown to be relevant. CA revolves around “actual talk in actual contexts” (Liddicoat 2007: 8), recorded on video or tape. The recorded talk is usually transcribed by means of a transcription system that was devised by Sacks’ co-worker Gail Jefferson.

By focusing on what is apparent from the surface of the recorded data, CA rejects the so-called ‘bucket theory of context’. Heritage and Clayman describe this theory as follows: “the bucket theory assumes that interaction accommodates to fit the context rather as water does the bucket” (Heritage and Clayman 2010: 21). They continue “at any rate the bucket is not significantly altered by the interactions it contains” (Heritage and Clayman 2010: 21). The bucket is filled up with context. Heritage and Clayman introduce the following example:

If we consider an institutional setting like a university lecture theatre, the participants – professors, students, teaching assistants, etc – enter the institutional space and behave in accordance with the norms appropriate to a lecture. The lecture, like the bucket, contains the actions and it does not seem to be affected by them. (Heritage and Clayman 2010: 21)

The ground of CA to reject the bucket theory of context is that CA supports the view that context emerges out of the participant’s own actions which are produced locally and can be transformed at any moment. Heritage and Clayman support ‘the yellow brick road theory of context’. Its name is inspired by The Beatles’ Yellow Submarine movie and the theory expresses that “social context is never independent of actions” (Duranti and Goodwin 1992 in Heritage and Clayman 2010: 21). Heritage and Clayman once again state that “actions are reflective, dynamic and context-renewing” (Heritage and Clayman 2010: 21).

In sum, CA studies spoken interaction via tape recordings. It argues that there is order at all points and pays special attention to turn-design when explicating this. When analyzing the talk itself, concepts like adjacency pairs, overlapping talk, repair and story-telling are used to account for the turn-design. The most important concepts for this study on talk shows are turn-taking, adjacency pairs, topic organisation, response tokens and story-telling. These concepts will be discussed in the next section.
3 Objects of CA study

CA has delivered pioneering work as to the organisation of specific features of spoken talk. This section will provide an introduction to those elements that will be used later in this dissertation to analyse talk show interaction.

3.1 Turn-taking system

In 1974, Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson published the article *A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation*. In this pioneering work, Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson establish a systematic method for analyzing turn-taking. In their introduction, the authors list a set of facts that can be observed in any conversation:

1. Speaker-change recurs, or at least occurs
2. Overwhelmingly, one party talks at a time
3. Occurrences of more than one speaker at a time are common, but brief
4. Transitions (from one turn to a next) with no gap and no overlap are common. Together with transitions characterized by slight gap or slight overlap, they make up the vast majority of transitions
5. Turn order is not fixed but varies
6. Turn size is not fixed but varies
7. Length of conversation is not specified in advance
8. What parties say is not specified in advance
9. Relative distribution of turns is not specified in advance
10. Number of parties can vary
11. Talk can be continuous or discontinuous
12. Turn-allocation techniques are obviously used. A current speaker may select a next speaker (as when he addresses a question to another party); or parties may self-select in starting to talk
13. Various ‘turn-constructional units’ are employed e.g., turns can be projectedly ‘one word long’, or they can be sentential in length
14. Repair mechanisms exist for dealing with turn-taking errors and violations; e.g., if two parties find themselves talking at the same time, one of them will stop prematurely, thus repairing the trouble

(Sacks et al. 1974: 700-701)

The systematics that is proposed by the authors accounts for all the facts that are described in this list. In their article, the authors establish a systematic method for describing how turn-taking is
managed in ordinary conversation. The central aim of their article is stressed by Hutchby and Wooffitt:

(...), to provide a technical description of the structural characteristics of ordinary conversation as a specific type of ‘speech exchange system’; that is, as a system of conventions regulating the exchange of turns and management of speaker roles among participants (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 49).

The authors distinguish two components and a set of rules. The two components are (i) the turn constructional component and (ii) the turn allocational component. Turn-constructional components are the ‘various unit-types with which a speaker may set out to construct a turn’ (Sacks et al. 1974: 702). The authors continue that “[u]nit-types for English include sentential, clausal, phrasal and lexical constructions” (Sacks et al. 1974: 702). Turn-constructional components have two features which are summarized by Hutchby and Wooffitt:

First, they have the property of ‘projectability’. That is, it is possible for participants to project, in the course of a turn-construction unit, what sort of unit it is and at what point it is likely to end. This leads to the second feature, which is that turn-construction units bring into play ‘transition relevance places’ at their boundaries. In other words, at the end of each unit, there is the possibility for legitimate transition between speakers. (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 50)

Liddicoat defines transition relevance places as “points where a speaker’s talk is possibly complete and that at points of possible completion, speaker change is a possible next action” (Liddicoat 2009: 90). Liddicoat uses the word ‘possible’ a few times in his definition; this suggests that speaker change need not occur at these places.

The second component is called the ‘turn-allocation component’ and deals with the distribution of the turn. According to Jeffries and McIntyre, “[t]he turn allocational component regulates turn change and assumes that only one speaker may speak at a time” (Jeffries and McIntyre 2010: 102). Sacks et al. divide the turn-allocational techniques in two groups; “those in which a next turn is allocated by current speaker’s selecting next speaker; and (...) those in which a next turn is allocated by self-selection” (Sacks et al. 1974: 703). Sacks et al. propose a set of rules that accounts for the allocation of turns at transition relevance places:

---

1 Therefore, this component is also referred to as ‘turn distribution component’ in more recent literature (e.g. Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008).
(1) For any turn, at the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn-constructional unit:
   
   (a) If the turn-so-far is so constructed as to involve the use of a ‘current speaker selects next’
       technique, then the party so selected has the right and is obliged to take next turn to speak;
       no others have such rights or obligations, and transfer occurs at that place.
   
   (b) If the turn-so-far is so constructed as not to involve the use of ‘a current speaker selects
       next’ technique, then self-selection for the next speakership may, but need not, be
       instituted; first starter acquires rights to a turn, and transfer occurs at that place.
   
   (c) If the turn-so-far is so constructed as not to involve the use of a ‘current speaker selects
       next’ technique, then current speaker may, but need not continue, unless another self-
       selects.

(2) If, at the initial transition-relevance place of an initial turn-constructional unit, neither 1a nor 1b
    has operated, and, following the provision of 1c, current speaker has continued, then the rule-set
    a-c re-applies at the next transition-relevance place, and recursively at each next transition-
    relevance place, until transfer is effected.

   (Sacks et al. 1974: 704)

This rule-set comprises instances of what may happen at transition relevance places: either the
next speaker may be selected or the next speaker may self-select. If none of these options
happens, the current speaker may continue. The same rule-set applies at the next transition
relevance place. These rules, then, explain how the conversational floor is managed during a
conversation.

3.2 Adjacency pairs

Conversational actions that are paired are called adjacency pairs. The turns in an adjacency pair
stand in a particular relationship of functional appropriateness. The first turn makes the second
relevant and the second is seen as brought about by the first turn (Liddicoat 2007: 139). Examples
include greeting-greeting, farewell-farewell, question-answer and summon-answer. Liddicoat
offers a description of the core features of adjacency pairs. He argues that adjacency pairs consist
of two turns which are expressed by two different speakers. In addition, adjacency pairs are
placed next to each other in their basic minimal form. However, they need not be ‘adjacent’ in the
strictest sense of the word. ² Liddicoat further argues that adjacency pairs are ordered; one turn
always comes first and one turn always comes second. The first turn is designed to initiate next
actions, the second to complete the initiated action. Liddicoat finally stresses that adjacency pairs
are closely linked to the turn-taking system. Once a first pair part is produced, the current speaker
should stop and the next speaker should produce a second pair part (Liddicoat 2007).

² This point is also indicated by Hutchby and Wooffitt (2008)
A further distinction is related to ‘preference’. Hutchby and Wooffitt point out that “certain first pair parts make alternative actions relevant in the second position” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 46). Second turns can be preferred or dispreferred. For example an invitation can be accepted (preferred) or declined (dispreferred). Hutchby and Wooffitt acknowledge that the alternative seconds are not equivalent; acceptances are produced in systematically different ways than declinations (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 46). Schegloff notes that “preferred responses are likely to be short and to the point, while dispreferred ones are more elaborated” (Schegloff 2007: 67). To recall the example of the invitation, accepting an invitation is to the point whereas declining it often includes excuses, disclaimers, hedges, hesitation or delay. Adjacency pairs will return in the section on turn-taking in the third chapter.

3.3 Topic organisation

According to Linell, “[t]opics are always in motion, in a constant flux” (Linell 1998: 188). Topic organisation is built on the idea of a ‘responsive-initiative principle’ (Linell and Korolija 1998). This is explained as follows;

At each point in time interlocutors are expected to say something which ties up with, is relevant with respect to, what has been said before, or is otherwise given in the present micro-situation, i.e. the current, local contexts. At the same time something new should be introduced (Linell and Korolija 1998: 171).

This means that topics, like single turns, both have a responsive and an initiatory aspect. These two aspects are related to respectively the ideas of ‘topic maintenance’ and ‘topic progression’ (Bergmann 1990 in Linell and Korolija 1998: 171). Within CA, Sacks was the first one to explore the domain of topic. According to Heritage, Sacks initially proposed that topics were organised by “procedures that work to ensure that topics ‘flow’ into one another without discrete boundaries” (Heritage 1989: 28). Sacks, then, initially only recognized a gradual way of shifting topics. However, later he modified his theory; he came up with the distinction between ‘stepwise topical movement’ and ‘boundaried topical movement’. This distinction is now widely used when examining topic management.

Stepwise topical movement reflects Sacks’ original idea of topics flowing into each other, e.g. on the basis of a common class-membership between the two (Sacks in Svennevig 1999:
Grenoble comments on stepwise topical movement that “[t]his kind of conversation is characterized by topical coherence; one topic seems to naturally follow from another” (Grenoble 1998: 158). She continues; “[o]n a local level, the topics are related to one another by a high degree of lexical and referential cohesion” (Grenoble 1998: 158). Indeed, Linell and Korolija comment: “[i]f participants succeed in developing topics in this stepwise manner, the resulting discourse may look like a seamless web in which topics shade into each other” (Linell and Korolija 1998: 171). Therefore, stepwise topical movement is also called ‘topic shading’ (Sacks and Schegloff 1973) or ‘topic drift’ (Hobbs 1990). It should be noted, that this does not mean that the topic cannot change radically here. Svennevig indicates that these kind of transitions “may well change the topic quite radically, but the process goes over so many turns that each turn is focally coherent with the preceding” (Svennevig 1999: 209). This is what differentiates stepwise topical movement from boundaried topical movement.

According to Atkinson and Heritage; boundaried topical movement implies that “the closure of one topic is followed by the initiation of another” (Heritage and Atkinson 1984: 165). In the case of boundaried topical movement, topics are changed rather abruptly. Consequently, there are “some sort of boundaries, i.e. (at least partial) discontinuities or fractures within discursive flow” (Linell & Korolija 1998: 171). However, the change of topic usually happens not that abruptly. Linell argues that, “actors try to avoid clearly abrupt shifts with very sharply boundaried topic spaces” (Linell 1998: 189). He continues that “when abrupt shifts (...) do occur, they are often signalled by discontinuity or boundary markers” (Linell 1998: 189). The examples that are given are amongst others ‘by the way’, ‘that reminds me of ...’ and ‘before I forget’. This results from the idea that topic drifts are preferred and topic breaks are dispreferred. Since abrupt topic breaks are dispreferred, they will usually be toned down in one or another way.

Two important contributions to the field of topic organisation are the works of Button and Casey (1984, 1985) and Jefferson (1984). Button and Casey (1984) looked at boundaried topical movement and more in particular at the use of topic initial elicitors. They examined three-turn sequences that consisted of an inquiry, a response and a topicalizer. In their work, they identified different procedures for the introduction of a new topic. Jefferson (1984) studied boundaried topical movement as well. She examined the transition of talk that concerns ‘trouble’ to a new topic. In other words, she focused on an interactional environment in which one of the participants has been describing a ‘trouble’ and was particularly interested in the kind of turn that
typically follows a turn that contains troubles-telling. The works of Button & Casey and Jefferson have enriched the literature on topic management considerably. However, although the transition of topics is a very important feature of interaction, it has been studied little by CA. Heritage acknowledges this;

Although the domain of topic organisation might appear to be a relatively straightforward and high-priority area for the employment of conversation-analytic techniques, research has in fact proceeded relatively slowly and cautiously thus far. Topic maintenance and shift are exceptionally complex matters and (...) there are no simple routes to the examination of topic flow. (Heritage 1989: 29)

Heritage stresses the complexity of topic organisation and concludes that “the analysis of topic organisation may prove to be among the most long-term projects of conversation-analytic study” (Heritage 1989: 29).

The studies of Button & Casey and Jefferson have already indicated that topic organisation is usually examined within the field of conversational discourse. The ways in which topics shift in talk shows is different from conversational discourse. The topic organisation of talk shows is much more tightly regulated than in ordinary conversation. According to Ilie, “conversational topic shifts follow a more or less predetermined, but not exactly a timed, topic schedule” (Ilie 2001: 225). By contrast, the talk show is subjected to the restrictions that come with the broadcasting format. The ways in which topic transition happens in talk shows will be examined in the third chapter. Attention will be drawn to the ways in which topic drift and especially topic breaks are managed.

3.4 Response tokens

Heritage argues the interest that CA has shown for response tokens such as ‘yes’, ‘oh’ and ‘really’:

Not only are these objects exceptionally prevalent in ordinary conversational interaction (though, interestingly less so in talk in many institutional settings), they are also objects whose role in interaction is almost purely sequential. In many cases these objects are non-lexical and they gain much of their interactional significance from their specific placements in sequences of talk. Thus the preoccupations of conversation analysts, which are focused on sequential considerations, are perhaps uniquely fitted to shed light on the role of response tokens in talk. (Heritage 1989: 29-30)
Heritage highlights the range of different tasks that are fulfilled by these tokens. Indeed, a lot of research within CA has focused on the intricate relationship between the function and the placement of these tokens. According to Schegloff, it is the placement of response tokens “by reference to the boundaries of turn-constructional units within a segment of talk which permits them to be heard as ‘continuers’, ‘acknowledgements’, ‘agreements’, etc” (Schegloff 1982 as cited in Heritage 1989: 30).

Therefore, small interactional response tokens should be examined in relation to the turns by which they are preceded and followed. Pomerantz (1984) delivered pioneering work on the specific features of turns that express agreement or disagreement with the assessment turn that precedes them. In addition, Goodwin (1986) examined among other things the differences in sequential placement between assessments and continuers. In this analysis, I solely focus on continuers that signal passive recipiency, or listenership. According to McCarthy, research on listenership is desired as most research in the past focused on speaker turns. McCarthy comments on the notion of ‘good listenership’ that it is “an important area of spoken discourse analysis and one that linguists have often downplayed in favor of a concentration on speaking turns” (McCarthy 2003: 36).

Schegloff explains continuers as “behavioural tokens – such as uh huh, mm hm, and yeah – that recipients regularly produce at transition relevance places during the course of extended units of talk.” (Schegloff 1982 as cited in Greatbach 1988: 411) These tokens are preceded and followed by turns reporting a story. Continuers indicate that the hearer is listening and that he or she does not intend to take the conversational floor. The term ‘back-channel’ (Yngve 1970) is also often used to indicate response tokens that do not at any point aim for speaker incipiency.

Yngve has argued that listeners display ‘behaviour in the back-channel’ (Yngve 1970: 574). He looked at responses such as ‘uh huh’; ‘yes’; ‘okay’ and brief comments. McCarthy argues that the notion of back-channel has informed many subsequent studies. He notes, however, that “what has been included within back-channel behaviour (...) in subsequent research varies considerably from study to study” (McCarthy 2003: 38). This is because ‘back-channel activities’ has become an umbrella term for many feedback activities. McCarthy argues that back-channel behaviour is “opposed to turns that assume speaker the speaker role” (McCarthy 2003: 38). He continues that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish back-channel activities which
do not presuppose the role of the speaker from feedback turns in which the role of the speaker is desired. Consider the following example from McCarthy (2003):

B: (1.0) she’s one of the job share but she’s, we couldn’t all get involved with dealing with them+
A: No.
B: | so she she does all the dealing and we she feeds back to us.
A: Oh, right.
B: And then we, we you know we have meetings and feed back to them sort of the, yeah it’s dual.
A: That’s great.
B: It’s good, yeah.

(McCarthy 2003: 41)

According to McCarthy “the first two responses, “No” and “Oh, right,” seem to be received by the speaker as back-channel” (McCarthy 2003: 41). He observes that the third response does not. The third response could be seen as “A’s assessment and B’s “second assessment” (in Pomerantz’s, 1984, terms) of the report, thus rendering the notion of back-channel as less than helpful in this case”.

As the tokens that are included in backchannel behaviour vary from study to study, I prefer the term ‘continuer’ for my analysis in the next chapter. In the first citation in this subsection, Heritage pointed out that response tokens would not occur frequently in institutional talk. However, in talk shows, they do occur frequently. This has to do with the role of the audience. In news interviews, the audience is primarily addressed; therefore, news interviewers do not tend to use response tokens. They occasionally use minimal responses such as ‘noddy shots’ to indicate to the interviewee that he or she is “in fact talking to someone and not thin air” (Lorimer and Scannell 1994: 197). The audience is not primarily addressed in talk shows. Consequently, response tokens occur more frequently. These points will be further explained in the next section on talk shows.

3.5 Story-telling

Story-telling happens frequently on talk shows. The recognition that stories are being told is not only apparent from the content of what is told but also from the inherent structure of the turns. Because of its interesting and at first sight problematic turn design, storytelling has been widely
addressed by conversation analysts. The turn design of stories is initially problematic as “the
teller possesses the conversational floor for longer than the basic rules of turn-taking ordinarily
allow” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 126) and “the recipient does not take the floor at transition
relevant places” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 126). Nevertheless, “conversation analysts have
stressed the way stories are structured with respect to the contingencies of the interactions in
which they are embedded” (Goodwin and Heritage 1990: 299).

It is of interactional importance how these stories come to be told. According to Goodwin
and Heritage; “Sacks observed that a systematic solution to [the problems mentioned] is found in
a two-move sequence that occurs just before the multi-unit story” (Goodwin and Heritage 1990:
299). In a first turn, a story preface is produced. In this story preface, “the story-teller projects a
forthcoming story and indicates his position in the conversation as a possible story-teller”
(Liddicoat 2007: 283). The second turn, then, is a response to this story preface. Either this is a
request to hear the story or a decline of the story offer. A story may be declined when it is already
known or not of particular interest (Liddicoat 2007). However, usually it is accepted, certainly in
talk shows since these shows are to a great extent structured around stories told by the guests.
Goodwin and Heritage conclude that “[t]his sequence permits the participants to propose and
ratify a suspension of the ordinary turn-taking procedures for the duration of the story” (Goodwin
and Heritage 1990: 299). The story is, however, followed and preceded by turn-by-turn talk
(Liddicoat 2007). The story recipient can express continuers at transition relevance places to
indicate his or her attentiveness but need not do so.
4 The Talk Show

This section will provide an introduction to the concept of the talk show by giving an overview of its socio-historical background. In addition, it will explain the interactional nature of a talk show by focusing on its semi-institutional character and by comparing it with the news interview.

4.1 Socio-historical background

Ilie argues that the talk show as a setting for conversational interaction is similar to the Italian academy in the sixteenth century, the French salon in the seventeenth century and the English coffee-house in the eighteenth century. She supports this view by the idea that “[t]alk shows can be regarded as a particular kind of face-to-face conversation” (Ilie 2001: 214). This face-to-face conversation, then, is characterised by its setting. It takes place in a specific socio-cultural setting, as was the case in the academy, salon and coffee-house. The talk show further shares with these its sense of being live. The television talk show is a live medium. Scannell notes that “although today many programmes are prerecorded, they are recorded in such a way to preserve the effect of liveness” (Scannell 1991: 1). He further argues that, “the liveness of broadcasting (...) is a pervasive effect of the medium” (Scannell 1991: 1). According to Scannell, broadcast talk is “intentionally communicative” (Scannell 1991: 1). Therefore, “[a]ll talk on radio and TV is public discourse, is meant to be accessible to the audience for whom it is intended” (Scannell 1991: 1). Scannell’s insights on present-day broadcasting may account for Ilie’s claim that talk shows bear traits of previous public forms of interaction.

The talk show itself is a product of the twentieth century. The broadcasting landscape in Britain moved from authoritarian to more populist and democratic in the 1960s (Scannell 1991). The talk show went through a similar development. Martínez (2003) notes that the talk show developed from a chat between the host and a celebrity to a show where there was more room for audience discussion. In the 1980s, a subsequent development surfaced: the talk show hosts became more aware of the potential of the ‘chat’ on a talk show and “the talk show attained new heights of sophistication, both in Britain and the USA” (Tolson 1991: 181). Tolson refers to David Letterman in America and Terry Wogan in Britain; “[b]y the mid-1980s the BBC’s prime-time Saturday night show Wogan had developed ‘chat’ to the point where it was virtually an art
form” (Tolson 1991: 181). Tolson explains this in an analysis of Wogan from which he concludes that “a key generic development has taken place in the history of the talk show interview” (Tolson 1991: 187); there is a shift towards an “institutional ‘mixing of genres’, where the talk show interview meets stand-up comedy” (Tolson 1991: 187). This development has added largely to the popularity of talk shows. Shattuc notes that the talk show was one of the most popular genres on American TV in the 1990s (Shattuc 1997 in Tolson 2001: 1).

However, although the British and American talk shows are often mentioned in the same breath, there are significant differences. A first discrepancy is related to their popularity and scale. In the 1990s, talk shows were not as popular in Britain as in America. Tolson notes that in those days, “in Britain, soap operas and drama series still command the highest ratings” (Tolson 2001: 2). The popularity of talk shows in America was noticeable in the television landscape; talk shows were broadcast and produced by different channels. In contrast, “in the United Kingdom, only the major terrestrial (public service) channels produce their own talk shows; all the rest (...) are imported from the United States”. (Tolson 2001: 3) It may well be acknowledged that America takes a pioneering function when it comes to the production, development and distribution of talk shows. Today, it is still the case that America produces more talk shows than Britain. Furthermore, the labels for talk shows differ in both countries. Britain speaks of ‘talk shows’ whereas America speaks of ‘chat shows’ (Tolson 1991). A second difference is related to the cultural aspects of talk shows. Ilie argues that “there are definitely personal, as well as intra- and inter-cultural variations in the ways a talk show is staged, carried out and finally rated” (Ilie 2001: 215). She argues that cultural differences may relate to different broadcasting personalities. Ilie illustrates this by the comparing the different ways in which Oprah and Kilroy take up their ‘therapist-role’ (Ilie 2001: 215). It is, then, useful to bear in mind that although the English-speaking media are often generalized, America’s and Britain’s television cultures do differ from each other.

The involvement of the audience in talk shows and the shift towards a mixing of genres has lead to diversification. The talk show is no longer a hybrid genre. This is one of the reasons why there has been little detailed research on talk shows. Indeed, Tolson notes that “much academic debate about talk shows has been very generalized and often highly speculative” (Tolson 2001: 4). For this and other reasons, Tolson even calls the genre notorious (Tolson 2001). The television medium has witnessed the emergence of a wide range of talk shows with
different focuses. Haarman points out that there is “an immense variety in the performers, the content and style (...), the procedures followed, and the characteristics and interventions of the participation and/or overhearing audiences” (Haarman 2001: 31). The different types of talk shows may be classified according to the time of the day they are broadcast e.g. breakfast talk shows, daytime talk shows, evening talk shows or late night talk shows. In addition, they can be classified according to their content, e.g. issue-oriented talk show, trash talk show, celebrity talk show or current affairs talk show. However, a combination is also possible e.g. the evening celebrity talk show. Consequently, it is difficult to pin down the characteristics of a talk show as such. Nevertheless, it is possible to derive some of basic features of a talk show by looking at its semi-institutional character and at the way in which talk shows deviate from the typical news interview.

4.2 Semi-institutional character

Talk is not isolated; it is situated in a particular context. Talk shows are set in the institutional setting of a television studio. However, talk shows are, unlike news interviews or other talk in institutional settings, only semi-institutional. In order to explain this, it is useful to understand what characterizes institutional talk. It was only in the 1970s that CA started to analyse dialogue in institutional settings. In its first decade, CA focused solely on everyday conversation. In the 1970s, then, the analysis of talk in institutional settings began to be studied. Indeed, Hutchby and Heritage & Clayman argue that the scope of CA expanded from everyday interaction to, increasingly, institutional interaction and mass communication. From the end of the 1970s onwards, conversation analysts studied courtroom interaction (Atkinson and Drew 1979), 911 emergency calls (Zimmerman 1992), classroom lessons (McHoul 1978), clinical interviews (Drew 1992) and news interviews (Clayman and Heritage 2002, Greatbach 1988).

Hutchby and Wooffit correctly point out that Sacks and Schegloff, too, analysed talk in institutional settings in the 1960s. Sacks was analyzing phone calls to the Suicide Prevention Centre and Schegloff studied phone calls including calls to an emergency service and a police

---

3 In this dissertation, I will use Ilie’s term ‘semi-institutional’ to refer to the non-homogeneous character of talk shows. Ilie proposes the term semi-institutional to refer to talk shows as “a socio-cultural practice marked by a particular participant configuration and well-established conventions, as well as by spontaneous interventions and unpredictable outcomes” (Ilie 2001: 218).
station (Schegloff 1968). However, they stress that “these early investigations did not pay any systematic attention to the ‘institutional character’ of the talk” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 137). Sacks and Schegloff were examining the calls on turn-taking, adjacency pairs and story-telling in order to indicate that these conversations were ordered according to the rules they established. Heritage argues that “it was not until the late 1970s (...) that researchers began to examine institutional interaction for its distinctive features as institutional talk” (Heritage 2005: 103). Whereas later study was distinct for its “willingness to explore the connections between talk and its social contexts” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 138), Sacks and Schegloff were concerned with the talk itself rather than with the participant’s orientation towards the institutional context in which it was used.

Sociologists often attempted to define institutional talk solely on the base of its context. For example, the talk in a courtroom is institutional because it is set in an institutional setting. This is what is called the conception of context as ‘containers’. Hutchby and Wooffitt describe this conception as “containers, which people enter into and which, at the same time, exert causal influences on the behaviour of participants within them” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 139). This viewpoint, however, neglects the participant’s orientation to the context. This is what Garfinkel has called the problem of the ‘cultural dope’ (Garfinkel 1967: 68); “the ‘container’ view of context fails to pay sufficient attention to the active knowledge that participants have of the production of their behaviour” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 139). It is very hard to conceptualize institutional talk when only regarding the influence of the context on the participant. This is why the sociological container view is not sufficient for conversation analysts.

CA starts from the participant, rather than from the context. Conversation analysts “see participants as knowledgeable social agents who actively display for one another (...) their orientation to the relevance of contexts” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 139). The institutional context is apparent from the way participants orient to it in their talk. CA looks for example at what happens with the turn-taking system in institutional settings. Often this is done by comparing this turn-taking system to the turn-taking system in ordinary conversation. Hutchby and Wooffitt argue that the turn-taking system of everyday conversation is one in which “the order, size and type of turns are free to vary” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 139). They conclude that this is not the case for institutional talk as these forms of talk “involve either the reduction or the systematic specialization of the range of practices available in mundane conversation”
(Hutchby and Wooffitt 2008: 139). Clayman and Heritage add that institutional talk further differs from ordinary talk in, among other things, turn design and lexical choice (Heritage and Clayman 2010: 36). Participants orient their talk to different norms than they would in everyday conversation.

As will become clear from the next and more extensive section, talk show interaction does not always align with institutional talk. Talk shows also have characteristics of ordinary conversation and are, therefore, only semi-institutional. The talk show proves that the CA-approach has an added value as from the container point of view, it cannot be explained why the interaction in a talk show, although happening in an institutional setting, is not fully institutional. The talk-show is referred to by Ilie as a subcategory of ‘infotainment’ (Ilie 2001: 211). It is a genre “designed both to inform and to entertain” (Tolson 1991: 178). This is why it shares characteristics of both institutional and ordinary conversation. Tolson argues that the talk show is “[l]oosey based upon a set of protocols for the television interview” (Tolson 1991: 178), but that it “nevertheless frequently transgresses those protocols” (Tolson 1991: 178). This idea will be explained in the next section by means of a comparison with the news interview.

4.3 Comparison with the news interview

The news interview has been studied more widely from a CA perspective than the television talk show has. Therefore, it is useful first to focus on this research before moving on to a comparison with the talk show. As mentioned in the previous section, from the 1970s onwards, institutional interaction became a field of study within CA. It was especially from the 1980s that the interactional aspects of the news interview began to be studied. Especially David Greatbach (1988), Steven Clayman and John Heritage (2002) published important work on the news interview. Greatbach studied the turn-taking system of the news interview and Clayman and Heritage looked among other things at its openings and closings. Greatbach’s study clearly points out the differences between the turn-taking systems of ordinary conversation and news interviews. The study of Clayman and Heritage, then, offers a good starting point for a comparison with the talk show.

Greatbach (1988) analysed the turn-taking system for British interviews. An important insight concerning this turn-taking system is that turn-types are ‘pre-allocated’. Greatbach explains that the system of turn-taking “pre-allocates particular types of turns to speakers with
specific institutional identities” (Greatbach 1988: 404). Pre-allocation is typical for courtroom interaction and news interviews. In both cases, the different parties are allocated particular types of turns. In courtroom interaction and news interviews, one party asks questions and one party answers them. Greatbach comments that in the news interview “[the] constraints on the production of types of turns operate with respect to the institutional identities interviewer (IR) / interviewee (IE)” (Greatbach 1988: 404). That is to say, in the news interview, the interviewer (IR) is allocated to asking questions, the interviewee (IE) to answering them.

Greatbach discusses the implications of this ‘turn-type pre-allocation’; some of them are listed below:

IRs and IEs systematically confine themselves to producing turns that are at least minimally recognisable as questions and answers, respectively.
IRs systematically withhold a range of responses that are routinely produced by questioners in mundane conversation.
Although IRs regularly produce statement turn components, these are normally issued prior to the production of questioning components.
IEs routinely treat IRs’ statement turn components as preliminaries to questioning turn components.
Interviews are overwhelmingly opened by IRs.
Interviews are customarily closed by IRs.
Departures from the standard question-answer format are frequently attended to as accountable and are characteristically repaired

(Greatbach 1988: 404)

These implications clearly indicate the differences between talk in news interviews and ordinary conversation. The turn-taking system of ordinary conversation is not preallocated; participants of ordinary conversation are not restricted to giving answers or asking questions. In addition, participants of ordinary conversation will not withhold responses; on the contrary, they will provide assessments or comments. Clayman and Heritage point out that “[i]n conversation, topics can emerge freely, the participants are free to make diverse contributions to the subject at hand” (Clayman and Heritage 2002: 97) they continue that “in the news interview, by contrast, the participants are fundamentally constrained” (Clayman and Heritage 2002: 97). Furthermore, in news interviews it is the interviewer who decides when to start or end the conversation; in ordinary conversation either party can take this decision. Greatbach’s analysis of the turn-taking system in British news interviews allows a useful distinction between the interaction in a news interview and in ordinary conversation.
Clayman and Heritage (2002), then, offer a description of the prototypical news interview. This description enables them to distinguish the news interview from other types of interviews such as the talk show interview. Although Clayman and Heritage are aware of the hybridity of the genre and the fuzziness of its boundaries, they offer a description of the participants, subject matter and form of a prototypical interview:

The interviewer is known as a professional journalist rather than a partisan advocate or celebrity entertainer. Interviewees have some connection to recent news events, either as primary actors (e.g., government officials) or as informed commentators (e.g., certified experts). The audience plays no active role in the interaction. The discussion normally focuses on matters related to recent news events, is highly formal in character, and is managed primarily through questions and answers. (Clayman and Heritage 2002: 7)

This discussion of the aspects of the news interview is a good starting point for a comparison between the news interview and the talk show. From this comparison, it will be clear that if we would put everyday conversation and news interaction at the two end of a continuum, the talk show would be somewhere in between. Although the talk show is still closer to the news interview, talk shows share traits with ordinary conversation as well.

When discussing the differences, it is appropriate to distinguish two levels of analysis: the setting of the interview and the structure of the talk itself. The setting includes the professional role of interviewer and interviewee, the role of the audience and the type of atmosphere. When looking at the structure of the talk itself, then, differences in the turn-taking systems are noticed. The openings and closings differ as well as the engagement of interviewer and interviewee with the talk. These two levels are in line with the distinction that was made in the previous section. The first level is similar to the sociological conception of context and focuses on the setting; the aspects that one will find when entering the container of a talk show. The second level, then, focuses more on the orientation of the participant.

As already mentioned by Clayman and Heritage in their description of the prototypical news interview, the interviewer of a news interview is a professional journalist. This is not true in the case of talk show hosts. Talk show hosts usually are TV-presenters or comedians, e.g. Jonathan Ross is a television and radio presenter and Jay Leno a stand-up comedian and television figure. They are more connected to the world of entertainment than to the world of information. Consequentially, the interviewees differ as well. News interviewers typically
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4 Cf. the development in the 1980s towards a mixing of genres in the talk show (supra)
interview a colleague journalist who joins in the studio or is on the spot to report a news story. In addition, the interviewee can also be a politician, professor or critic who is asked for his or her professional opinion on a news story. A common characteristic of this latter group is that they are people who have an authoritative function.

Often a member of this group of people appears on a talk show. However, the atmosphere is different from that in a news interview. Ilie writes:

Unlike the experts who are being questioned and consulted in news interviews and political interviews and who are expected to act almost exclusively in their institutional roles as professionals, the guests and experts who contribute to talk shows usually assume a somehow different institutional role, acting partly in their professional roles, and partly in their social/personal (non institutional) roles as ordinary individuals (Ilie 2001: 231)

In the news interview, professors, politicians and critics are asked for their opinion on a news story. In talk shows, they are also asked for their professional opinions; however, in addition they are invited to talk about matters of human interest such as their private lives and their current activities. Examples (1) and (2) below illustrate this:

(1) The Jonathan Ross Show, interview with Brian Cox, 07/01/12 (0:42)

JR: Euh so here’s the thing euh it’s 2012 okay and some people are concerned because there is this thing going around about this Mayan calendar and their calendar ends in 2012 I don’t know if it ends on a particular month or date and some people are saying that means that’s the end that is when it’s going to end do you is there’s anything in that at all there’s anything in physics that would bear that up

BC: It’s catastrophic drivel of the worst possible kind

JR: So so why did they stop in 2012 why did they stop do you know why why is that for

BC: They they had a complex calendars these interlocking cycles and they were very good at maths and so their calendars would last for 10 000 20 000 years and they started one on some arbitrary day in the past and it rolls over on December 31st 2012 some some people believe it

Fragments from The Jonathan Ross Show and The Tonight Show with Jay Leno will here be used as an illustration of the points that are made. The points that are made are, however, general remarks that apply to other types of talk shows as well. These examples are, then, arbitrary and can be replaced by examples from other talk shows.
Fragments (1) and (2) are transcriptions from an interview with Brian Cox on *The Jonathan Ross Show*. Brian Cox is a Physics Professor at the University of Manchester. In (1) he is asked for his professional opinion on the end of the Mayan calendar. Fragment (2) is taken from a story that he is telling about his youth and is more about his role as an ordinary individual. The atmosphere in a news interview is highly formal (Clayman and Heritage 2002) whereas the atmosphere in a talk show is more informal and entertaining. The talk show guests are often quite acquainted to the world of entertainment. The majority of them are working as actors, directors, stand-up comedians, presenters, musicians, sport’s people and so on.

What is within the framework of CA, however, more interesting is that the structure of the talk in news interviews differs from that in talk shows. Hutchby insightfully notes that CA shows that the mediation of broadcast talk “is the active work of broadcast talkers, whether lay or professional, accomplished in and through the design of turns and sequences of talk” (Hutchby 2006: 163). As it was mentioned before, the turn-taking system of news interviews is pre-allocated: interviewers are restricted to asking questions, interviewees to responding to them. Talk shows consist of questions and answers as well, but the turns are designed differently. Interviewer and interviewee are less limited in their talk.

According to Greatbach, this is due in large measure to the different audience conventions. This point was already briefly explained in the section on response tokens. Whereas the audience in the news interview are primary recipients, “talk show interviews are often designed to cast the television or radio audience in the role of eavesdroppers” (Greatbach 1988: 424). Heritage and Clayman also refer to this idea when expressing that in news interviews, it is the audience “for whose benefit the interview is being conducted” (Heritage and Clayman 2010: 90).
They explain that the interviewer can’t add statements or assessments, as this would take away the illusion that the audience is primarily addressed, and they acknowledge that the reverse is going on in talk shows. Obviously, the different role of the audience in talk shows has some consequences.

One of these consequences is the use of continuers. News interviewers do not make use of them whereas talk show hosts do. This point was already briefly discussed in the section on response tokens as well. The use of continuers has a twofold purpose: firstly, talk show hosts use continuers to establish their role of primary recipients. Secondly, hosts show that they are paying attention to what the guest is saying. That is to say, they produce these tokens at transition relevance places to indicate that they are still following and that the speaker can continue his or her story.

This brings us to the next point; guests on a talk show very often produce stories of personal experience. In the previous chapter, we saw that stories are “multi-unit, extended turns at talk” (Liddicoat 2007: 279). It is true that multi-units at talk occur in news interviews as well e.g. when an interviewee recounts an event that has happened. However, these turns are not comparable to the way in which stories are told in talk shows. Stories occur frequently and they narrate some kind of personal experience. Or as Thornborrow puts it; “one of the distinguishing features of television talk shows is the narrativization of lay experience” (Thornborrow 2001: 117). Consider examples (3) and (4)

(3) *The Jonathan Ross Show*, interview with John Bishop, 07/01/12 (09:52)

JR: But you’ve got you see you have a line you have a tan line there what’s

JB: haha yeah so what happened what happened that was with Jamie the day before and he the day before Jamie Redknapp had a bush of hair all over him

(4) *The Jonathan Ross Show*, interview with Emma Thompson, 14/01/12 (03:03)

JR: I didn’t realise your mom’s Scottish

ET: Yah she’s from Glasgow

JR: So -

ET: So we live in half in Scotland half in London so all the holidays I I that’s what I had growing up in London (.) Scotland for me has saved my life really cause the first
seven years we lived in a little flat so the idea of trees and and and and lochs and mountains and everything

JR: And everything yeah

ET: → I used to dream about going to Scotland when I was little o god actually this is a good story it just comes to me getting older about getting older euhm

JR: Hahaha

ET: =which I’m noticing more and more frequently we were we were there last summer and euhm (.) and Gaia and I were on our own for some reason Greg must have been working and we were so we were in the big bed together in flannel late nineties and you know cause obviously I know how to live

JR: Yeah

Fragment (3), from an interview with comedian John Bishop, illustrates how the host in his first turn invites the guest to tell a story by asking a question. Fragment (4) is from an interview with actress Emma Thompson. Jonathan Ross’s turn ‘I didn’t realise your mom’s Scottish’ invites Emma Thompson to tell something more about this. However, the host is not explicitly asking for the story that Emma Thompson starts to tell; she is suddenly remembered of it when answering the question. In these examples, the guest does not produce a story preface first. Talk show interaction differs from everyday discourse in that it is a more common practice on talk shows not to produce a story preface first. A possible explanation may be that the guests assume they can tell their stories as this is what they are there for. As was mentioned in the section on story-telling, talk shows are to a great extent structured around stories told by the guests.

Consequently, talk show hosts use “not only continuers, but also assessments and the like” (Greatbach 1988: 425). Hosts tend to produce assessments and comments when stories of personal experience are shared. However, “when matters of public policy and public controversy arise (...) they are generally more guarded in their use of these objects” (Greatbach 1988: 425). This is not surprising, though, when stories of personal experience are told, the speaking situation is close to that of everyday conversation, this is a situation in which participants produce this kind of comments and assessments as well. A situation in which matters of public policy are discussed reflects institutional talk and if interviewers would produce assessments in these kind of situations, it would “compromise their professional integrity” (Greatbach 1988: 425). Greatbach
points at the fact that the use of continuers is largely neutral whereas assessments are not; they involve personal opinions and these are not expressed in just any situation.

Another matter relating to the structure of news interviews and talk shows becomes apparent when comparing the openings and closings of news interviews to those of talk shows. Clayman and Heritage write “[r]ather than interactional exchanges between interviewers (...) and interviewees (...), openings normally consist of an extended monologue produced by the IR alone” (Clayman and Heritage 2002: 59), they continue “the opening spate of talk is addressed explicitly to the audience rather than to the IE” (Clayman and Heritage 2002: 59). Something similar is going on in a talk show. Consider fragment (5) from The Tonight Show with Jay Leno:

(5) The Tonight Show with Jay Leno, interview with Michelle Williams, 05/01/12 (0:01)

JL: Alright about my first guest a two time academy award nominated actress she’s likely to receive another one for her stunning portrayal of Marilyn Monroe euh in the film my week with Marilyn this is a terrific film it’s one of those little movies you know they make everybody works hard and there’s a great script I thought it was just wonderful Rolling Stone called it one of the best movies of the year take a look take a look

(Video excerpt)

XXX

JL: Please welcome Michelle Williams

In (5), Jay Leno is producing an extended monologue addressed to the public as an introduction to his interview with actress Michelle Williams. He touches on her importance and mentions the reason for her visit. This is all happening before she enters the studio. In the next chapters, a clear comparison between Jonathan Ross and Jay Leno will be made. In the light of this comparison and with regard to this point, it is already useful to indicate that the introductions of Jay Leno are remarkably longer than those of Jonathan Ross, who does not mention the reason for the guest’s visit and stays brief on his or her importance.

When further describing the openings of the news interview, Clayman and Heritage argue that “only rarely do the parties to an interview exchange greetings – hellos and good evenings are almost entirely absent” (Clayman and Heritage 2002: 66), they add that also personal inquiries such as ‘how are you’ are also absent. From an analysis of the openings of The Jonathan Ross
Show and The Tonight Show with Jay Leno, it proves to be the case that the hosts exchange these greetings and personal inquiries a few times. However, other greetings are more common. In The Tonight Show with Jay Leno, non-verbal signs such as shaking hands and giving kisses are often exchanged. The participants are often saying some words to each other but this is not audible because the introductory music is overruling the conversation. In The Jonathan Ross Show, then, the participants are also shaking hands but they hardly say ‘hello’ or ‘hi’. In both talk shows the first things that are being said on camera are things like ‘good to have you here’ or ‘you look great’ rather than ‘how are you’. Nevertheless, the openings of talk shows are much more personal and informal than those of the news interview.

As to their closings, then, talk shows relate closely to news interviews. Clayman and Heritage remark that news interviews have “the need to end the encounter at or near a prespecified point in time” (Clayman and Heritage 2002: 73). This is because news interviews “are constrained by the scheduling requirements of broadcasting” (Clayman and Heritage 2002: 73). This is no different in the case of talk shows. Talk show hosts display their awareness of the time limits of broadcast talk when announcing commercial breaks and the end of an interview. Indeed, also in news interviews, it is the interviewer who determines when the talk will end. This stands in contrast to ordinary conversation, where the conversational ending “is not normally determined in advance” (Clayman and Heritage 2002: 73).

The closings of ordinary conversations are “accomplished by exchanging ritualized farewells such as “goodbye” or its equivalents” (Clayman and Heritage 2002: 74). This is not the case for news interviews, as Clayman and Heritage remark: “[n]ews interview closings, in contrast, are distinguished by the wholesale absence of ritualized farewells” (Clayman and Heritage 2002: 74). So are talk shows, at least partly. Talk show closings resemble those of news interviews in which “an expression of gratitude – that is responsive to and evokes (...) their role-based identities and the task in which they have been engaged” (Clayman and Heritage 2002: 74). Consider the next excerpts from The Jonathan Ross Show (6) and The Tonight Show with Jay Leno (7):

(6) The Jonathan Ross Show, interview with Michael Sheen, 22/10/11 (07:23)

JR: Alright Michael I loved having you on the show thank you so much you are you are a terrific actor but also what a what a splendid man to spend some time with mister Michael Sheen ladies and gentlemen

XXX
Fragments (6) and (7) illustrate the expression of gratitude by the host which is similar to a news interview. However, the kind of gratitude differs from news interviews. In a news interview, the interviewer usually thanks his interviewer very briefly. This is not the case here; Jay Leno and Jonathan Ross praise their guests. Another feature that distinguishes the ending of talk shows from that of news interviews is that host and guest often shake hands. This is not common in news interviews. Another feature that is again similar to news interviews, then, relates to the reaction of the guest. The reaction of the guest is usually very limited. This is because the interviewer or host has indicated that the talk has come to its end.

In short, talk shows differ from news interviews in a number of ways. Talk shows are a type of entertainment. Consequently, the talk show host is not a professional journalist, the talk is entertaining and the guests are figures from popular culture. The audience is not primarily addressed in talk shows; therefore, the interviewer uses continuers and produces assessments when appropriate. The turn-taking system is not pre-allocated in its strictest sense and includes more often multi-unit turns that are translated as accounts of personal experiences. Unlike news interview openings, talk show openings tend to be rather personal. Like news interview openings, the talk shows commence with an introduction that is directed to the audience. Unlike news interview closings, then, hosts praise their guests and shake hands. Like news interview closings, the host thanks his guest rather than exchanging ‘goodbyes’ and the guest’s reaction is limited.
5 Introducing the comparison

This section introduces the study that is reported in chapters two and three. In a first section, the data are presented. After that, the assumptions and objectives of the study will be discussed and in a last section the method that is used will be explained.

5.1 Data

Tolson claims that talk shows are “crucial to the landscape of popular television” (Tolson 2001:3). Tolson’s claim dates from a decade ago. Nevertheless, not much appears to have changed in the past ten years; the talk show has remained popular among TV audiences. In the previous section, it was explained how this popularity lead to a diversification of the talk show landscape. My analysis in the next chapters focuses on two evening celebrity talk shows. This type of talk show is centred on the host and the celebrity. It is important to note here that in this type of talk shows, the audience members are not given a significant interactional role: they are not expected to get involved in the discussion. This is something which does happen in other types of talk shows, especially in issue-oriented talk shows such as The Oprah Winfrey Show and The Geraldo Rivera Show. In these cases, “[t]he host then typically acts as a mediator between the guests and the studio audience, often moving around studio spaces with a mobile microphone” (Tolson 2001: 3). This is to a large extent due to the focus of the talk. Haarman comments:

According to the type of talk show, the focus for talk may be simply chat (agreeable talk ostensibly for its own sake) typical of the evening celebrity talk show, or an issue or theme ranging from political and social matters and current events to topics pertaining more strictly to the private domain, like jealousy or infidelity. (Haarman 2001: 34)

The audience is more likely to respond when political or social matters or topics pertaining to the private domain are discussed. Consequently, they get a role in the kind of talk shows that address these kinds of issues (e.g. issue-oriented talk shows or trash talk shows). Since the audience is not likely to have a pronounced opinion on chat between a celebrity and a host, they are not given a role in the interaction.

---

6 See Ilie (2001) for a discussion of these talk shows
The talk shows discussed in this dissertation are *The Jonathan Ross Show* and *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*. *The Jonathan Ross Show* is a British talk show; *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno* is American. The choice of an international perspective was a deliberate one. This study investigates English-speaking media rather than narrowing down to an Anglo-Saxon or American perspective. As was mentioned in the previous chapter, there are differences between American and British talk show formats which may relate to their different cultures. If these differences are apparent in the interaction, they will be mentioned briefly. The intention here, however, is rather to widen the scope of this interactional study by including both British and American talk shows. The choice of the specific talk shows, then, is based on the host. A comparison between Jonathan Ross and Jay Leno is a valid one because they have a similar profile. Both of them are popular media figures who host a popular TV talk show in which they are not afraid of transgressing the boundaries of stereotypical broadcast talk.

Although both talk shows are evening celebrity talk shows, the formats of *The Jonathan Ross Show* and *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno* are somewhat different. *The Jonathan Ross Show* started in September 2010 on Saturday nights on the major commercial public service TV network ITV. An episode of *The Jonathan Ross Show* consists of a five-minute introduction by Jonathan Ross followed by three interviews; it is closed by a musical performance. Jonathan Ross is a popular figure in Britain; next to being a talk show host is he also a radio presenter and a film critic. He started out working for the BBC where he hosted *Friday Night with Jonathan Ross*. After his transfer to ITV in 2010, Graham Norton took over his place as talk show host on the BBC. This transfer is still pretty recent and often serves as an occasion for jokes or comments on *The Jonathan Ross Show*. Moreover, his interviewing style has often been criticized; Jonathan Ross has got himself talked about more than once for things he has said in his talk shows.7

Jay Leno hosts *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno* on NBC, which is part of the Big Three Television Networks (ABC, CBS and NBC). The show runs on weeknights at 11.35pm. This time slot differs from *The Jonathan Ross Show*, which is broadcast on a prime time slot. This difference may lead to a different conception of these talk shows by the public. *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno* is more a routine show while *The Jonathan Ross Show* may be the highlight of the evening for the public. *The Tonight Show* is a concept that started in 1954. Jay Leno hosted it

---

7 Source: The Guardian  
(last access: 25 May 2012)
from 1992 until 1999, when Conan O’Brien took over from him. When O’Brien left the show in 2010, Jay Leno came back. The Tonight Show with Jay Leno and The Jonathan Ross show are, in their current formats, fairly recent concepts. An episode of The Tonight Show with Jay Leno looks a bit different from The Jonathan Ross Show. The introduction by Jay Leno takes about 10 minutes and is followed by a comedy segment. Jay Leno starts interviewing his guests only in the middle of the show. He interviews two guests; the third guest is a performer or stand-up comedian. Having a Tonight Show band, online shop and games, The Tonight Show with Jay Leno is more commercialized than The Jonathan Ross Show.

The corpus of this study contains twelve interviews. Half of them are from The Jonathan Ross Show and half of them from The Tonight Show with Jay Leno. In order not to complicate things, the selected guests on The Jonathan Ross Show are all British and those on The Tonight Show with Jay Leno are all North American. Figure (1) offers a schematic overview of the guests, their profession and the interview length:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Jonathan Ross Show</th>
<th>The Tonight Show with Jay Leno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guest</td>
<td>Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda Hart</td>
<td>Comedian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Sheen</td>
<td>Actor – Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Gallagher</td>
<td>Musician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bishop</td>
<td>Stand-up comedian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Cox</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Thompson</td>
<td>Actress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Overview of the guests and their respective professions and interview lengths

---

8 In their current formats, both talk shows started broadcasting only in 2010.
9 In their order of appearance in the transcriptions in the third appendix
Figure (1) indicates that the corpus consists of a varied group of interviewees, both with regard to their profession and their sex. The total interviewing time examined is 62 min and 23 secs and 60 min and 3 secs for respectively *The Jonathan Ross Show* and *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*. These totals are comparable for both talk shows. The selected episodes were aired between October 2011 and the end of January 2012. Appendix 1 includes a CD with the video data. Appendix 2 includes the transcription conventions that were used when transcribing the data. The transcriptions of the data were not available in advance and can be found in the appendix 3.

5.2 Assumptions and objectives

The analysis in the next chapters is informed by two assumptions. The first assumption is that talk shows are profoundly interactional in nature. In the light of this idea, I would like to find out what the interactional course of the two selected talk shows looks like. In other words, I will focus on the interactional characteristics of the host and the guest. The focus of attention is, however, on the host and in particular on his steering role in the interaction. This steering role of the host constitutes the second assumption. It is generally accepted that the hosts are the ones in control of the talk show; “they introduce the object of discussion, present the guest and experts, and direct the proceedings” (Haarman 2001: 32). This means that, on an interactional level, the hosts “open, frame and close the talk, selecting the topic, allocating turns, soliciting and guiding interventions through, for example, questions, interruptions, and formulations” (Haarman 2001: 32). The ways in which the talk is managed is usually the work of the host and this particular interactional style is what attracts the audience. Tolson rightfully notes that “the controversy and the popularity of talk shows is fundamentally rooted in the pleasures of watching and listening to people talking in particular ways” (Haarman 2001: 3). So starting from these two assumptions, the analysis in the next chapters will examine how Jonathan Ross and Jay Leno shape the interaction and what characterizes their individual ways of interacting. I expect these characteristics to differ for the two talk show hosts. On a more general level, I expect to find how these characteristics are indicative of the host’s orientation to the semi-institutional character of talk shows that was discussed in the previous chapter.
5.3 Method

The research method used in this dissertation draws evidently on research in and concepts from CA. In addition to these insights, some sections draw on theory from discourse analysis, pragmatics, sociolinguistics and media studies. This dissertation connects with the range of studies on talk shows (e.g. Tolson 2001; Thornborrow 2001; Blum-Kulka 2001; Ilie 2001). The actual analysis of the talk show data that is presented in the next two chapters consists of two parts: a quantitative chapter and a qualitative chapter. In the quantitative chapter, the data are examined on the basis of five different parameters. The numerical findings of these parameters reveal some of the key interactional characteristics of the hosts. The five parameters include: (i) the number of words per minute, used by the host and the guest (ii) the number of turns per minute, taken by the host and the guest (iii) the average length of the turns (iv) the percentage of the total number of turns that consists of turns expressing a question and (v) the percentage of the total number of turns consisting of turns that comprise isolated response tokens. The parameters indicate how the hosts differ from each other with concrete figures. In addition, it will become apparent from the analysis that these parameters are to some extent interrelated.

The qualitative chapter will consider what is behind the numerical findings by turning to the transcriptions of the talk show data. This chapter focuses on (i) turn-taking and (ii) topic management. The section on turn-taking explains the most common patterns in the turn-taking systems of the talk shows. These patterns are similar for the two talk shows, although they each have their own preferences. These preferences account for some of the characteristics that were established in the quantitative chapter. In addition, as it appears that these common patterns do not hold for any of the turns in the interviews, the section on turn-taking also addresses the most important deviations from these patterns. Both the common patterns in the turn-taking system and the most important deviations from them will be illustrated by means of examples from the data. The section on topic management, then, focuses on the way in which topic transition happens in the two talk shows. Topic drift occurs, on the whole, frequently on talk shows; however, at some moments in the interaction, the host returns to his pre-established agenda by means of a topic break. I am particularly interested in how these topic breaks happen. The central focus of the section on topic management is on the typical structure and placement of these topic breaks. Finally, it should be noted that the findings of my analysis are limited to *The Jonathan Ross Show*
and *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*. One must be cautious when generalizing from those results to interactions between hosts and guests in other talk shows.
Chapter 2 – Quantitative analysis

This chapter presents a quantitative analysis of the talk show data. This means that it involves the statistical analysis of elements from the data. The main focus of this chapter is to analyse the data so as to provide an overview of the specific interactional characteristics of Jonathan Ross and Jay Leno. The most efficient way to analyse the data is on the basis of five parameters. I expect that the results of these parameters will especially show how the talk show hosts differ from each other. In the previous chapter, I motivated my choice of talk show hosts on the basis of their similarities to each other. Now, I would like to focus on where they differ. I expect this study to specify the host’s individual interactional style. This quantitative analysis, then, focuses on the interactional characteristics of the hosts and additionally looks at where the hosts differ from each other. How the semi-institutional character of talk shows is reflected in the interaction will be focused on more in the next chapter.

As was mentioned at the end of the previous chapter, the parameters include (i) words per minute, (ii) number of turns per minute, (iii) turn length, (iv) question turns and (v) response tokens. Each section of this chapter analyses the numerical findings of one of these parameters. Parameter (i) indicates the pace at which the participants talk. Parameter (ii) shows where speaker change or self-selection occurs most frequently. Parameter (iii) examines how much is being said in a turn and will show which host takes the longest turns. Parameters (iv) and (v) are concerned with the kind of turns that are taken. They indicate which of the two hosts is asking the most questions and which of them is signalling his listenership regularly. The sum of these parameters indicates how the interaction in each of the talk shows is structured.

In addition, they reveal what kind of host Jonathan Ross and Jay Leno are. It will become clear throughout this chapter whether they are active hosts or not and how active they are in relation to each other. The parameters will each time first be analysed for the individual talk shows, followed by a comparative discussion of both talk shows. The numerical findings of the parameters will be displayed by means of tables and/or diagrams that were processed in Excel. The model of the diagram is selected on the basis of its appropriateness to show the results.
1 Words per minute

This section discusses the results of the words spoken per minute by the host and guest. The results of this parameter indicate the pace of the speech. A high number of words per minute indicates that the speech is going quite fast during that minute. In addition, a significant difference in the number of words per minute by the host and the guest will say something about who keeps the conversational floor for longer during that minute. My guess is that the pace of the speech might be related to the interview length. Speech in a shorter interview will probably be faster as a lot needs to be said in relatively little time. The numerical findings in subsections one and two will be displayed in a table. In addition, their averages will be displayed in a diagram to acquire a better overview of who speaks more.

Before showing the numerical findings in the subsections, some general comments on them need to be made. Firstly, talk that was unintelligible is not included in the word count. Secondly, contractions were counted as one word. Thirdly, only finished minutes are included in the table. None of the interviews took a round number of minutes. Consequently, the last seconds that do not yet make up a whole minute were left out of the word count. Finally, the minutes that include introductions, video excerpts or extended turns by other parties were left out when calculating the average. The deviant word counts of these minutes would bias the average result. The word counts that were used for the calculation of the average are indicated in bold.

1.1 The Jonathan Ross Show

Table 1 shows the number of words per minute by the host and the guest on The Jonathan Ross Show:
Table 1. Number of words per minute on *The Jonathan Ross Show*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>JR</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>JR</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>JR</th>
<th>NG</th>
<th>JR</th>
<th>JB</th>
<th>JR</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>JR</th>
<th>ET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first row gives the initials of the interviewer and the interviewees. JR refers to Jonathan Ross, MH to Miranda Hart, MS to Michael Sheen, NG to Noel Gallagher, JB to John Bishop, BC to Brian Cox and ET to Emma Thompson. In the first column, the minutes are displayed. The minutes should be interpreted as follows: in the first minute, Jonathan Ross spoke 54 words and Miranda Hart none; in the second minute, Jonathan Ross spoke 76 words and Miranda Hart 104. From table 1, we learn that Jonathan Ross reaches the 100 word mark per minute usually a couple times within an interview. An exception is the interview with John Bishop, in which he only reaches this mark once. The table also indicates that the number of words spoken by both the host and the guest vary according to the kind of guest that sits down with the host.

What is more, this table clearly shows the minutes during which the pace was high. Both host and guest reach the 100 word mark a couple of times in a row during the interviews with Miranda Hart, Michael Sheen and Emma Thompson. These minutes are marked in green in table 1. In addition, the table indicates that the guest uses, on the whole, more words per minute than the host. Noel Gallagher and Michael Sheen even reach the 200 word mark. In the third section of this chapter, it will be clarified whether this higher number of words per minute implies that the guests are taking longer turns.

To give a more convenient image of the interplay between host and guest, it is useful to calculate the averages of the figures in table 1. These averages are shown in diagram 1:
Diagram 1 gives the average number of words per minute spoken by the host and the guest. The shape of the lines is of no particular importance since the guests were ranked in an arbitrary order.\textsuperscript{10} The guests’ initials are on the x-axis and indicate the interview; the number of words is indicated on the y-axis. Diagram 1 clearly shows that the guests use more words per minute than the host. It is, however, not clear whether these results imply that the host takes fewer turns or that he uses fewer words per turn. The next parameters will provide more clarity as to this point. The only exception is the interview with Miranda Hart. In this interview, Jonathan Ross uses on average more words per minute than Miranda Hart. In fact, Jonathan Ross reaches his maximum average number of words during this interview. These results probably have influenced each other; I will return to this point in the next section.

Now, when focusing on the results of the other interviews, two trends become apparent. Firstly, the guest may unquestionably use more words per minute than the host, as is the case in the interviews with Michael Sheen, John Bishop and Emma Thompson. This result indicates that the guest keeps possession of the conversational floor for longer, rather than that s/he talks that

\textsuperscript{10} This goes for all the diagrams in this chapter.
much faster. This would then imply that the guest’s turns would be longer. Whether this is also the case will become clear in section three of this chapter.

Secondly, the host’s and the guest’s averages may be much closer to each other, as in the interviews with Noel Gallagher and Brian Cox. The fact that the results lie so close to each other indicates that both participants use about the same number of words in the same time. This means that no one of them is speaking that much faster or that much longer than the other. It is remarkable however that the host and the guest are producing about the same number of words. In a standard interview, one would expect that the interviewee produces more words than the interviewer. Here, the words per minute produced by the host and the guest lie close to each other. On the basis of this result, it may be carefully suggested that Jonathan Ross is a rather active host.

In addition to a comparison between the host and the guest within one interview, the interviews as a whole can be compared to each other. From this comparison, it will become apparent which interviews have the fastest pace and which ones the slowest. The pace of the speech in the interview with Michael Sheen goes the fastest, followed by the interview with Brian Cox. These results were suggested from the green figures in table 1 as well. The slowest interview is not that easily determinable as the other results lie close to each other. It should be noted that the fastest interviews in this corpus are the interviews with the shortest length. This observation implies that the interview length probably has something to do with the pace of the speech in the interview. I will return to this point in the next subsection.

1.2 The Tonight Show with Jay Leno

Table 2 shows the number of words spoken by the host and the guests on The Tonight Show with Jay Leno:
Table 2. The number of words per minute on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>JL</th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>JL</th>
<th>MJ</th>
<th>JL</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>JL</th>
<th>JR</th>
<th>JL</th>
<th>GC</th>
<th>JL</th>
<th>MW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, the first column contains the minutes; the first row the host’s and the guests’ initials. JL refers to Jay Leno, EL to Evangeline Lilly, MJ to Magic Johnson, DC to Dana Carvey, JR to Jason Reitman, GC to Glenn Close and MW to Michelle Williams. From this table, we can derive a couple of things. First of all, Jay Leno does not reach the hundred word mark very often. What is more, the guests reach the hundred word mark regularly. This means that, on the whole, the guests produce more words than the host. The gap between the words per minute spoken by host and guest is larger in this case than in *The Jonathan Ross Show*. Next, pronounced examples of instances where the interview is going very fast cannot be detected that easily as on *The Jonathan Ross Show*. Nevertheless, the hundred word mark is reached one time by both host and guest during the interviews with Evangeline Lilly and Michelle Williams, as indicated in red. However, it is never reached two times in a row.

The observations that were made in the previous paragraph will be shown more clearly in diagram 2, which gives the average number of words per minute by the host and the guest:
Diagram 2 clearly shows that, in all the interviews, the guest uses more words per minute than the host. Jay Leno reaches his maximum average number of words per minute during the interview with Michelle Williams. His minimum average number of words per minute is obtained during the interview with Dana Carvey. The results of the average number of words per minute roughly indicate three different trends with regard to the interplay between host and guest.

Firstly, the difference between the average words per minute produced by the host and the guest tends to be comparable in four of the interviews. During the interviews with Evangeline Lilly, Jason Reitman, Glenn Close and Michelle Williams, the guest uses on average about 50 words more than the host. It seems fair to conclude that the guests keep possession of the conversational floor for longer than the host. This would indicate that the guest’s turns are longer as well. Since the majority of the interviews fall under this trend, it may be believed that this trend would also occur in other interviews on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno* that were not analysed in this dissertation. However, I remain cautious when it comes to this kind of generalizations.

Secondly, the average number of words per minute produced by the host and by the guest lies very close to each other during the interview with Magic Johnson. The difference is only 12 words. Consequently, Jay Leno and Magic Johnson are speaking about equally fast and equally...
much. In addition, Jay Leno uses more words here than in most of his other interviews. This may again be influenced by the lower number of words per minute produced by Magic Johnson (cf. Miranda Hart).

The third trend describes just the opposite. The difference in the average number of words per minute produced by the host and by the guest is undeniably large during the interview with Dana Carvey. The difference is about 100 words, which is twice as many as the number that was suggested as a general trend. The large difference in the average number of words produced by the host and the guest during the interview with Dana Carvey indicates clearly that Dana Carvey keeps the conversational floor longer than the host, which would result in longer turns by the guest. This result, then, does not mean that Dana Carvey is also talking faster.

My argument for claiming that Dana Carvey is not necessarily speaking faster here is based on a comparison with the results of the interview with Michelle Williams. Dana Carvey produces on average as many words per minute as Michelle Williams, but the average number of words by the host in these interviews is not comparable at all. During the interview with Michelle Williams, Jay Leno produces about twice as many words per minute as in the interview with Dana Carvey. This observation indicates that the interview with Michelle Williams moves faster because the host talks faster. This means that the interview with Dana Carvey moves slower because of the host rather than because of the guest.

It is appropriate to consider the total length of the interview to explain why Jay Leno talks more and faster during the interview with Michelle Williams than he does during the interview with Dana Carvey. The interview with Dana Carvey takes about 11 minutes and a half. The interview with Michelle Williams, by contrast, only takes about 8 minutes. The approximate length of an interview is determined in advance. Before the talk show starts, the host already has an idea of the amount of time that he wants to spend with a guest. Nonetheless, the host wants to get as much as possible out of these shorter interviews. Consequently, the pace of the interview will be higher. This was also clear for the interviews with Michael Sheen and Brian Cox in the previous subsection.
1.3 Comparative discussion

The comparison between *The Jonathan Ross Show* and *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno* was already initiated in the previous sections. This section will continue this comparison. Diagrams (1) and (2) are displayed as (3) and (4) in order to compare the two efficiently:

![Diagram 3. The Jonathan Ross Show](image)

![Diagram 4. The Tonight Show with Jay Leno](image)

Diagram 3 displays the results for *The Jonathan Ross Show*, diagram 4 those for *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*. This subsection comprises three main points. First, the average number of words per minute by the guests on both talk shows will be compared to each other. I would especially like to find out whether there are differences in the number of words per minute that are spoken by the guests across the talk shows. Secondly, I will compare the average number of words by the hosts of the two talk shows. I expect these comparisons to show how fast the guests and host speak compared to each other. These two comparisons enable to move to the third main point. This point concerns the interplay between the host and the guest and focuses more on the management of the conversational floor.

On *The Jonathan Ross Show*, the least words per minute are spoken by Miranda Hart; on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno* the least words are by Magic Johnson. Both of these guests have an average number of words per minute that lies below 100 words per minute. All the other guests on both shows speak on average more than 100 words per minute. Michael Sheen uses the most words per minute on *The Jonathan Ross Show*, Dana Carvey and Michelle Williams use the
most words per minute on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*. The difference in the average number of words per minute by Miranda Hart and Magic Johnson and by Michael Sheen and Dana Carvey and Michelle Williams is only one word. This implies that the minimum and maximum averages by the guests lie very close to each other for both talk shows. In fact, when considering the other results as well, it is fair to conclude that no real difference between the average number of words per minute by the guests is apparent across both talk shows. However, to be entirely sure, the average of these averages can be calculated. This results in an average of 125 words per minute for the guests on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno* and an average of 120 words per minute for the guests on *The Jonathan Ross Show*. This means that, although the difference is small, the guests on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno* speak slightly faster than those on *The Jonathan Ross show*.

When comparing the average number of words by the hosts to each other, a clear difference does become apparent. Jonathan Ross unmistakably uses more words per minute than Jay Leno. While the line on diagram 3 reaches the average number of 100 words in half of the cases, the line on diagram 4 never does. What is more, whereas Jonathan Ross only goes below 90 words per minute twice, Jay Leno does not reach 90 words per minute once. Jonathan Ross uses his maximum average number of 117 words during the interview with Miranda Hart. His minimum average number of 71 words occurs during the interview with John Bishop. Jay Leno then reaches his maximum average of 86 words per minute during the interview with Michelle Williams. He reaches his minimum average of number of 42 words per minute during the interview with Dana Carvey. These figures indicate that, in contrast to the guests, the maximum and minimum averages of Jonathan Ross and Jay Leno are further apart from each other.

This means that Jonathan Ross uses more words per minute than Jay Leno, even though the words by the guests are comparable for both talk shows. From this observation, it is fair to conclude that the pace of the speech on *The Jonathan Ross Show* is faster than on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno* and that this is due to the host, rather than to the guests. In the previous discussion, we already saw how the host influences the pace of the speech according to the length of the interview. We saw that, although both guests use a similar number of words, Jay Leno uses twice as many words during the interview with Michelle Williams, which is shorter, than he does during the interview with Dana Carvey. A similar trend is apparent on *The Jonathan Ross Show*. Here too, Jonathan Ross uses more words during shorter interviews; especially in interviews with
Michael Sheen and Brian Cox. In general, this trend is apparent in those interviews in which the number of words per minute by the guest is also quite high.

The trend discussed in the previous paragraph does, however, not apply to every interview. The interview with Emma Thompson, for example, is rather short as well but Jonathan Ross is not using that many words here, at least not compared to his other averages. The same is happening during the interview with Jason Reitman. This interview is also quite short; nevertheless, Jay leno is using his second lowest average here. The trend applies for some of the shortest interviews in the corpus but it does not necessarily apply to all the short interviews. An analysis of the way in which the pace of the speech and the interview length correlate with each other is favourable but it is beyond the scope of this dissertation. Besides, the corpus should have been larger in order to reach a clear consensus as to interview length. Nevertheless, my argument would be that we cannot ignore how interview length has aided to account for some of the results. Also, the discussion on interview length indicated that the host is the one who shapes the interview.
2 Number of turns per minute

This section discusses the number of turns that were taken per minute by the host and the guest. This parameter is particularly interesting as it shows how many turns the host takes. I expect this number to indicate to what extent the host is interfering in the speech. The main focus of this section is to discover in which talk show turn change occurs most frequently.

Also here, before displaying the numerical findings in the subsections, some general comments on them will be made. Firstly, the turns in which the talk was unintelligible were included; even though the talk is unintelligible, it is still clear when a turn is being taken and when it is not. Secondly, turns that may not have been included are what Norrick calls ‘visual back-channel activities’ (Norrick 2010: 525). An example of a visual back-channel activity is nodding. Nods by the host that occurred when the camera was filming the guest are not included in the table. This also goes for nods by the guest that occurred when the camera was on the host. Thirdly, very silent turns may not be heard and are not included in the table. Finally, the calculations were done analogously to those in the previous subsection. This means that the turns that occurred in the last seconds were left out. Also, the averages were calculated on the basis of the figures in the table. The minutes in which the bold figures occur, correspond to those in the previous subsection. The figures that are left out when calculating the average are left out for the same reasons as those in the previous subsection.

2.1 The Jonathan Ross Show

Table 3 shows the number of turns per minute that were taken by the host and the guests on The Jonathan Ross Show:
According to this table, the maximum difference in turns between the host and the guest is two. The most common difference is a difference of one or no turns. Furthermore, the host usually takes more turns than the guests. This makes sense as he is the one who is in control of the conversation as was argued by Haarman and cited in the previous chapter. The host not only uses more words than the guest in the first minute of the conversation, he also, for the same reason that he is introducing the guest, takes more turns than the guest in this first minute. The difference in the number of turns taken between host and guest is due to the fact that the host or guest can self-select at transition relevance places instead of passing the conversational floor on to the other. In these cases, they take two (or more) turns in a row. For example, the host may self-select again after a short interruption such as cheering or applause by the audience or a question by a third party. However, from the figures in table 3, it can only be guessed how a difference in turns arises. The exact ways in which the turn-taking systems are organised can only become clear from a study of the transcriptions of the data.

In addition, table 3 indicates that in the majority of the cases, the number of turns per minute remains under ten. The highest number of turns per minute by Jonathan Ross is 16 and occurs during the interview with Miranda Hart. This indicates that during this minute, speaker change occurred frequently. This result may to some extent explain the lower number of words per minute by Miranda Hart and the higher number of words by Jonathan Ross in the previous
section. From this result, it looks as if Miranda Hart did not have the chance to use more words as she was interrupted often by Jonathan Ross. Another possibility is that Jonathan Ross had to use more words and turns because Miranda Hart did not provide long answers. Both of these possibilities would result in shorter turns by Miranda Hart, so section three cannot bring any more clarity as to this point. However, as this is the only case in the corpus, the second possibility is more likely than the first. The first possibility would indicate that Jonathan Ross is a host who interrupts his guest quite often. If this would indeed be the case, it would also be apparent for the results of the other interviews. This is, however, not the case. Therefore, it is more likely that the source for the deviant result of the interview with Miranda Hart lies with Miranda Hart.

Table 3 further indicates that minutes during which the number of turns is rather low imply that speaker change did not occur frequently during these respective minutes. This means that one of the participants was keeping the conversational floor for quite a long time.

Diagram 5 shows the average number of turns per minute taken by Jonathan Ross and his guests during the interviews:

![Diagram 5. Average number of turns per minute on The Jonathan Ross Show](image)

The lines of the host and the guest on this diagram are located close to each other. In addition, all the averages of host and guest lie fairly close to each other, with no real peaks. That is to say, the number of turns per minute varies not that much across the six interviews. This diagram also shows more clearly that the host’s average number of turns per minute is below ten in the
majority of the interviews. The minimum average of turns per minute is six, during the interviews with Noel Gallagher and Brian Cox and the maximum average number of turns is ten, during the interview with Miranda Hart.

2.2 The Tonight Show with Jay Leno

Table 4 displays an overview of the number of turns per minute taken by the host and the guests on The Tonight Show with Jay Leno:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>JL</th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>JL</th>
<th>MJ</th>
<th>JL</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>JL</th>
<th>JR</th>
<th>JL</th>
<th>GC</th>
<th>JL</th>
<th>MW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table indicates that the number of turns by the host and the guest are also relatively parallel in this talk show. According to table 4, the maximum difference in turns between host and guest is three. A difference of one turn or no turns is, however, most common.

In addition, from a quick scan of the table, it is apparent that most of the figures are above ten. The highest number of turns is 17 and occurs once in the interviews with Evangeline Lilly, Magic Johnson and Glenn Close. In the previous section, we saw that Jay Leno uses one his second highest average number of words per minute during the interview with Magic Johnson, while Magic Johnson used the least words per minute of all the guests. This result indicates that speaker change happened quite often during this interview. This means that the results for this interview are somewhat similar to those of the interview with Miranda Hart. Analogous to this interview, Jay Leno may either not give Magic Johnson the chance to speak that much or Magic
Johnson may not speak that much which would result in Jay Leno using more words to compensate this. Considering that this is also the only interview in the corpus in which this happens, it might also be concluded that the second possibility is more likely.

An average of the turns per minute gives a more clear-cut overview of to what extent speaker change occurs on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*:

**Diagram 6.** Average number of turns per minute on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*

Diagram 6 indicates that some difference in turns per minute is apparent as to the individual interviews. The turns vary from seven to fourteen. This does, in comparison to the results for *The Jonathan Ross Show*, not allow us to predict in advance how many turns per minute there might approximately be. The number of turns per minute is rather low in the interviews with Dana Carvey and Jason Reitman and rather high in the interviews with Evangeline Lilly and Magic Johnson. In the majority of the cases, Jay Leno takes ten or more turns per minute.

### 2.3 Comparative discussion

The overview of the turns per minute that was offered in the previous subsections shows us that the host and the guest take a similar number of turns per minute on both talk shows. A difference in the number of turns is usually translated in more turns by the host. This may happen when the
host self-selects again after a side exchange with the audience or a third party. Also, the host usually takes more turns than the guest during the first minute, in which he is responsible for the introduction of the guest. When comparing the average turns per minute by Jonathan Ross to those by Jay Leno, it becomes apparent that Jay Leno unmistakably uses more turns than Jonathan Ross. This means that speaker change occurs more frequently on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*.

In the previous section, it was illustrated that Jonathan Ross is more active as he uses more words per minute than Jay Leno. When looking at the turns that are taken by both hosts, the opposite can be noted. Jay Leno takes more turns than Jonathan Ross. This would mean that Jay Leno is more active as he intervenes more in the talk. The sum of the results of the first and second parameter indicates that Jay Leno would take a lot of turns that do not typically consist of many words. Jonathan Ross, on the other hand, would take fewer turns but his turns contain more words. The next section on turn length will give a definite answer as to this hypothesis.
3 Turn length

This section concentrates on turn length; this means that the number of words spoken per turn will be analysed. I counted the words in every turn in the host guest dyad and made a diagram of the averages. This section primarily focuses on the host’s turn length; a less active host will produce shorter turns whereas a more active host will produce longer turns. On the basis of the results of the previous sections, it was suggested that Jay Leno would be a host who takes more but shorter turns while Jonathan Ross would rather take fewer but longer turns. The veracity of this claim, however, can only be demonstrated by actually computing the host’s turn lengths. In addition, this section also takes the turn length of the guests in consideration, as this gives a more valid account of the interplay between host and guest.

The average turn lengths are displayed in a diagram. For each interview, the average turn length of the guest and the average turn length of the host are given. Only the averages are concentrated upon, as the individual results are too unorganised. Some interviews consisted of more than hundred turns, others of less than fifty. A table that lists each turn and its length would not give the overview that is desired. Furthermore, unlike in the previous sections, the turns were not counted per minute but for the whole interview. This means that the turns in the last uncompleted minute are counted as well. From this section onwards, the focus will be on the design of the turns, rather than on their frequency, as it was in the previous section.

3.1 The Jonathan Ross Show

Diagram 7 shows the average number of words per turn on The Jonathan Ross Show:
Diagram 7. Turn length on *The Jonathan Ross Show*

Diagram 7 indicates that Jonathan Ross produces shorter turns than his guests in all but one of the interviews. The exception is again the interview with Miranda Hart. In this interview, Miranda Hart produces shorter turns than Jonathan Ross, albeit that the difference is not that big. This result was already predicted from the results in the previous two sections.

In addition, Jonathan Ross produces the longest turns in the interview with Brian Cox. This means that he is speaking more during this interview than he is during the other interviews. He produces his shortest turns during the interview with Emma Thompson. The guest who speaks the most is Michael Sheen; the guest who speaks the least is Miranda Hart.

Turn length clearly correlates with pace and turn change. In the first section, we saw that the guests use more words per minute than the host. The results of this parameter reveal that this also implies that they will be taking longer turns than the host. In addition, the interviews in which speaker change occurs frequently, e.g. the interviews with Miranda Hart and Emma Thompson, have shorter turns. Interviews, in which speaker change occurs less often, e.g. the interview with Brian Cox, consist of longer turns. This goes for both the turns of the host and the guest. However, at least two of these parameters are needed to get to these interrelations. If a guest produces more words per minute in the same time as a host, it is not yet clear whether this
happens by using more or longer turns. The second parameter was necessarily to shed a light on this issue and the third to confirm the results of the previous parameters.

3.2 *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*

Diagram 8 shows the average number of words per turn on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*:

![Diagram 8. Turn length on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*](image)

Diagram 8 shows results that are similar to those in diagram 7. The host uses shorter turns than the guest. This means that the guests are talking more than the host. This happens in all but one of the interviews; the interview with Magic Johnson. This result was already clear from the conclusion on this interview in the previous section as well. In addition, Jay Leno uses the longest turns during the interview with Michelle Williams. This means that he is speaking the most during this interview. He speaks least during the interview with Dana Carvey. These interviews are also the interviews during which Jay Leno used respectively the maximum and the minimum number of words per minute. The length of the interview provided a valid explanation for this observation. The guests who respectively speak the most and the least are Jason Reitman
and Magic Johnson. These results also indicate the correlations between pace, speaker change and turn length.

### 3.3 Comparative discussion

From the discussion in the previous two subsections, it is clear that both Jonathan Ross and Jay Leno use shorter turns than their guests. To find out on which talk show the guest take longer turns, the average of the averages in diagrams 7 and 8 will be computed. The average number of words per turn for the guests on *The Jonathan Ross Show* is about 17, that of the guests on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno* is about 14. This means that the guests on *The Jonathan Ross Show* speak slightly more.

Now, if we compare the turn length of both hosts to each other, we immediately see that Jonathan Ross takes longer turns than Jay Leno. Jonathan Ross uses in almost all interviews an average of more than 10 words per turn, while Jay Leno on average never uses 10 words per turn. To find out the exact difference between the hosts, the average of the averages in diagrams 7 and 8 will be computed. This results in almost 14 words per turn by Jonathan Ross and almost 8 words per turn by Jay Leno. These figures reveal that Jonathan Ross uses almost twice as many words per turn as Jay Leno. In addition, they confirm that Jonathan Ross takes fewer turns than Jay Leno but that his turns are longer and his pace faster. Jonathan Ross seems to be an active host as it comes how much he speaks in an interview. Jay Leno, then, seems to be an active host in that he takes more turns.

At this point, it is appropriate to move on to the type of turns that are produced by the hosts. Starting from the premise that hosts typically ask questions and listen to the answers; the next two parts examine the occurrence of question turns and turns consisting of response tokens that signal listenership.
4 Question turns

This section looks at how many turns out of the total number of turns are turns containing questions. To be able to count the question turns within the interview, it is first necessary to determine which turns count as questions. Clayman and Heritage correctly indicate that linguists make a distinction between ‘declarative’ and ‘interrogative’ on the one hand and ‘statement’ and ‘question’ on the other hand (Clayman and Heritage 2002: 99). The first distinction describes the grammatical form of an utterance, the second distinction relates to the actions that come with the utterance type (Clayman and Heritage 2002: 99-100). Clayman and Heritage point out that “[t]his distinction is important because there is not an absolute one-to-one correspondence between the grammatical form of an utterance, and the action it performs” (Clayman and Heritage 2002: 100). In other words, a declarative utterance can function as a question and an interrogative utterance can be formulated as a statement. Consider examples (1) and (2):

(1) *The Jonathan Ross Show*, interview with Miranda Hart, 22/10/11 (09:21)

    JR: \(\Rightarrow\) You weren’t allowed to call it but presumably one half of it would have crumbled immediately anyway wouldn’t it

    MH: Satire

(2) *The Jonathan Ross Show*, interview with Michael Sheen, 22/10/11(0:53)

    JR: \(\Rightarrow\) And I saw pictures of you about the recently you set up like the most incredible experience the the passion play

    MS: Euh yeah

The utterance in example (1) is formatted interrogatively but functions as a statement. That in example (2) is formatted declaratively but functions as a question. Therefore, it is important not only to evaluate questions on the basis of their grammatical form but also on the basis of the functional value that they carry. All utterances that express a request for information are questions.

Clayman and Heritage give a description of the variety of forms that a question can take. The main types that they list are ‘wh’ questions and ‘yes/no’ questions (Clayman and Heritage 2002: 100-101). In addition, they distinguish what they call ‘polar alternatives’; this category includes tag questions, question-intoned utterances and so-called ‘B-events’ (Clayman and
Heritage 2002: 101-102). Ilie describes ‘B-events’ as “utterances by a speaker on matters to which the hearer has primary access” (Ilie 2001: 234). She adds that these are most of the time utterances by the talk show host in the case of a talk show. Ilie contrasts B-events to A-events, which are “statement[s] about matters to which the speaker, but not the hearer has primary access” (Labov and Fanshel 1977: 100 as cited in Ilie 2001: 234). A concrete example of a B-event is offered by Clayman and Heritage and is here repeated in example (3):

(3)  

UK BBCTV Newsnight: 29 Sep 1981: Labour Party Split  
IR: John Tusa IE: David Owen  
IR: → So in a very brief word David Owen, = you in no  
→ way regret what you did er despite what has  
(happened) in Brighton this week in the Labour Party  
IE: n- In no way do I regret it.=

(Clayman and Heritage 2002:102)

B-events are declarative utterances that function as a question. In this study, the types of questions as listed by Clayman and Heritage were counted as questions as well as any other declarative sentence that expresses a request for information.

The main focus of this section is on the number of turns that contain questions. This parameter is interesting because it indicates the share of questions in the turns of the host. Before moving on to the numerical findings of this parameter, some general comments will be made. Firstly, one question can be asked over more than one turn. Consequently, the number of turns containing questions will be slightly higher than when counting the number of questions without considering turns. Secondly, the choice to count question turns rather than questions as a whole is motivated by the previous sections that considered turns as well. Thirdly, the question turns are not counted per minute. Instead, they are counted for the whole interview, including the last seconds. The final comment is on the presentation of the results; the results will each time be presented in two diagrams. The first diagram shows the number of question turns in relation to the total number of turns. The second diagram shows the same result in percent. The first diagram is visually very clear. The second diagram is important because of its numerical data.
4.1 The Jonathan Ross Show

Diagram 9 expresses how many of the total number of turns that were question turns in figures, diagram 10 illustrates the result in terms of percentage.

At first sight, there does not really seem to be a clear-cut pattern in the relation between the question turns and the total turns. However, it is apparent that in the interviews with Michael Sheen and Brian Cox, almost half of the turns by the host are question-turns. In the other interviews, about 30% of the total turns are question turns. The fact that the number of question turns is higher on the interviews with Michael Sheen and Brian Cox may relate to their turn lengths. From diagram 7 in the previous section, it was clear that both the host and the guests produce long turns in these interviews. Diagram 5 indicated that there was not that much speaker change during the interviews. We concluded that fewer turns lead to longer turns. Since there are not that many turns on these interviews, more of the turns will be question turns. The fact that these are the shortest interviews probably also will have to do with the result. In these interviews, there is just not that much time for the host to depart too much from the traditional question-answer adjacency pair.
4.2 The Tonight Show with Jay Leno

Diagram 11 displays the relation of question-turns to the total number of turns in The Tonight Show with Jay Leno in numbers; diagram 12 shows this in terms of percentage:

![Diagram 11. Question turns in figures](image1)

![Diagram 12. Question turns in terms of percentage](image2)

Also in this case, a pattern is not immediately apparent from the results. The interview with Dana Carvey contains the least question-turns, the one with Magic Johnson the most. The other interviews all contain around 25%-30% question turns. High percentages of question turns are also apparent in the interviews with Jason Reitman and Michelle Williams. Along with the interview with Magic Johnson, these interviews are the shortest of the corpus. This means that here, too, the interview length may explain the high frequency of question turns. In these interviews, not that much time for the host to vary a lot on the traditional question-answer pair is available as well. Unlike in the interviews with Michael Sheen and Brian Cox, no clear link with the turn length and speaker change is apparent for these interviews. The high results of these interviews are then not that explicit as for the interview with Michael Sheen and Brian Cox.

The number of question turns is remarkably low in the interview with Dana Carvey. From diagram 8, we learned that Jay Leno on average takes very short turns in this interview and diagram 6 illustrated that speaker change did not occur as frequently as in the other interviews. This result is quite striking as from the results of the other parameters; we would actually expect a high number of question turns. At this point, it can only be guessed what is going on. My
argument would be that the fact that Dana Carvey is a stand-up comedian has a lot to do with the result. Jay Leno may be expecting humour from a stand-up comedian, rather than authentic answers. As a result, it may be the case that Jay Leno limits his numbers of questions. This point will be picked up again in the section on turn-taking in the next chapter. In this section, it will be explained by means of the transcription what causes Jay Leno’s low number of question turns in this interview.

4.3 Comparative discussion

The results of the analysis of the question-turns in the interviews reflect a general trend. Interviews that take less time tend to take relatively more words per minute and fewer and more lengthy turns. Of these turns, a large number are typically question turns. This trend again indicates the value of interview length should be considered when analyzing the interactional course of talk shows. In addition, the average of the percentages gives an impression of the question turn percentages per host. The average percentage of question-turns by Jay Leno is 27.2% and by Jonathan Ross 37.8%. As to the interviews in my corpus, Jonathan Ross is producing more question turns than Jay Leno. Since the difference is not that substantial, I remain cautious as to generalize this result for all the interviews on these talk shows.
5 Response tokens

In this section, the number of turns that consist of response tokens will be counted and analysed in relation to the total number of turns. This parameter explains to what extent listenership is signalled by the host. According to Norrick, “[i]nterviewers do not simply ask questions and listen to answers; they are active listeners” (Norrick 2010: 525). Talk show hosts will typically signal their listenership. Norrick continues; “[l]ike listeners in regular conversation, they do not inertly and silently receive responses. They signal uptake, understanding, agreement or disagreement, emotional involvement and so on” (Norrick 2010: 525). McCarthy argues that the evaluative actions of listeners in a conversation are often overlooked. He notes that “[b]ecause many studies of small talk (and talk in general) focus on the input of main speakers, the verbal behaviour of listeners is often underrepresented in descriptions of interaction” (McCarthy 2003: 33). McCarthy claims that this may be because “the items involved are themselves ‘small’” (McCarthy 2003: 33). This section will solely focus on those ‘small’ interactional response tokens that signal listenership, and not desire speaker incipiency. These tokens were referred to as ‘continuers’ in the first chapter.

Norrick draws a useful distinction between tokens in free-standing position and tokens in the initial position of a turn (Norrick 2009). In my analysis, only the tokens in free-standing position (‘okay’) or in combination with other tokens (‘okay yeah’) are counted. The tokens in turn-initial position are not counted because they do not solely signal listenership. Accompanied by a comment or question, they often signal incipient speakership.

My expectation is that Jay Leno will use more continuers as his turns are shorter. Response tokens will more likely be used by a less active host who lets his guests speak. He will use response tokens to signal not only that he is listening, but also that he does not intend to take the conversational floor. A more active host will rather use assessments.

The number of turns that contain response tokens will be counted and analysed in relation to the total number of turns. This share will be expressed in terms of percentage. In addition, the different kind of response tokens are counted and displayed in a pie chart. The latter shows how many response tokens the hosts use and how much variation there is in his use.
5.1 *The Jonathan Ross Show*

Diagram 13 and diagram 14 show respectively how many percent of all the turns were turns that contained response tokens and the kind of tokens that were used:

**Diagram 13.** Response tokens in percent

**Diagram 14.** Different response tokens

Diagram 13 shows that Jonathan Ross uses most response tokens during the interviews with Brian Cox and Noel Gallagher; he uses the least during the interview with Miranda Hart. On average, about 13% of his total number of turns are turns that signal listenership. This means that Jonathan Ross uses fewer of these tokens than he uses question turns, of which he used 37, 8%. This result might have been predicted from high use of words per minute and rather long turns.

Diagram 14 displays the kind of words that are used. Jonathan Ross used throughout the six interviews 9 different response tokens. ‘Yeah’, ‘okay’ and ‘wow’ are used most frequently. ‘Yeah’ is used in about half of the cases, ‘okay’ and ‘wow’ in about a quarter. The other tokens are used less frequently. In short, Jonathan Ross’s use of response tokens is not that frequent and not that varied.

5.2 *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*

Diagram 15 and diagram 16 show respectively how many percent of all the turns were turns that contained response tokens and the kind of tokens that were used:
The percentages in diagram 15 are very different from those in *The Jonathan Ross Show*. Jay Leno uses undoubtedly more response tokens than Jonathan Ross. He uses most response tokens during the interviews with Michelle Williams and Evangeline Lilly; he uses least during the interview with Jason Reitman. Jay Leno’s average use of response tokens is about 41% of the total number of turns. This is unquestionably higher than his percentage of question-turns, which was only 27.7%. Considering his lower use of words and higher use of turns, it is not surprising that he uses this many response tokens.

In addition, Jay Leno uses a wide variety of different response tokens, as displayed in diagram 16. He uses 10 different tokens in total. Of these tokens ‘yeah’ is used the most frequently. ‘Right’ is the second most frequent token. In short, Jay Leno uses many turns that consist of response tokens and he uses a relatively wide variety of these tokens.

### 5.3 Comparative discussion

Diagrams (13) (14) (15) and (16) clearly indicate that Jay Leno uses more response tokens than Jonathan Ross. The most frequently used token is ‘yeah’, both for Jonathan Ross and Jay Leno. This result accords with the results of Norrick. He argued that ‘yeah’ was the most frequent token used in ordinary conversation (Norrick 2009: 868). Hence, this parameter clearly marks the conversational aspects that are present in talk shows.
In addition, Jay Leno uses not only more tokens than Jonathan Ross; he also uses one of these tokens on a very regular basis. ‘Right’ is used as the second most frequent token by Jay Leno, but does not occur in any of Ross’s turns. The turns that are used frequently by Jonathan Ross besides ‘yeah’ are also used on a regular basis by Jay Leno. The results of this study confirm what might have been expected in advance. Jay Leno does not use as many words per minute as Jonathan Ross but he does use more turns and his turns are also shorter. Therefore, a high percentage of his total number of turns is response tokens that signal his listenership. The reverse can be said for Jonathan Ross: he uses more words per minute and fewer turns than Jay Leno. His turns will be longer and, therefore, free-standing response tokens occur less frequently.

Finally, the results of this parameter modify the conclusion that was drawn in section two. In this section, it was inferred from the results that Jay Leno is an active host as he frequently takes the conversational floor at transition relevance places. However, this parameter has indicated that he does this in almost half of his turns to produce a continuer. Therefore, it would be wrong to conclude that Jay Leno is an active host on the base of the frequency of speaker change in his show, as he is in almost half of the cases solely signalling his listenership at transition relevance places.
6 Concluding notes – towards a qualitative approach of the data

The previous subsections reported and discussed the numerical findings of five parameters. The first parameter was the number of words that was used per minute by the host and the guest. The results clearly indicated that Jonathan Ross uses more words per minute than Jay Leno. Both hosts, however, do not use as many words per minute as their guests do. We further saw that the host may adapt the pace of the talk to the length of the interview. The main trend is that the pace of shorter interviews will be faster. It should be noted, though, that this trend did not hold for every interview in the corpus. Nevertheless, it was useful to involve the interview length to account for some of the most remarkable results. In addition, the fact that the host adapts the pace of his talk to the kind of interview highlights the very fact that the host is the one who shapes the interaction. In short, the pace of the guests on both talk shows was roughly similar. Jonathan Ross’s speech had a faster pace; Jay Leno’s speech had a slower pace.

The second parameter concerned the number of turns that were taken per minute by the host and the guest. The upshot here was to discover to what extent speaker change occurred at transition relevance places. The results of this parameter indicated that Jonathan Ross uses fewer turns per minute than Jay Leno. This means that speaker change occurs less frequently on The Jonathan Ross Show than that it does on The Tonight Show with Jay Leno. This result may also explain why the pace on The Tonight Show with Jay Leno is faster. Both participants will speak faster when speakers change frequently. By contrast, when the same speaker possesses the conversational floor for longer, it is more likely that the talk of this speaker will slow down. In addition, the general trend for the interviews in this corpus is that the host takes on average the same number of turns or one turn more than the guests. This trend also highlights the shaping role of the host as he can more easily self-select again during the interview.

The third parameter focused on turn length. The words per turn were counted in order to find out the length of the turns. The upshot was here to discover which one of the two hosts talks the most and how much the host talks in relation to the guests. The most valid insight with regard to this parameter was that Jonathan Ross on average takes longer turns than Jay Leno. This means that he speaks more than Jay Leno. In addition, both Jonathan Ross and Jay Leno produce shorter turns than the guests. This means that the guests on average speak more than the host. The only exception was the interview with Miranda Hart, in which Jonathan Ross takes longer turns than
Miranda Hart. Lastly, the turn lengths of the guests lie close to each other in both talk shows. The guests on *The Jonathan Ross Show* use slightly longer turns than those on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*, this may be due to the fact that turn change occurs less here. On the basis of the results in the first and the second section, this section indicated how turn length, pace and number of turns correlate with each other.

The fourth and the fifth parameter will be discussed together. The fourth parameter focused on the percentage of the total number of turns that consisted of question turns. The fifth parameter looked at how many percent of the total turns were turns that contained response tokens. The results of these two parameters were slightly predictable from the results of the previous three parameters. Jonathan Ross uses fewer turns than Jay Leno but his turns are longer, therefore, it is not surprising that he uses more question turns and fewer response tokens than Jay Leno. As to the question turns, it may be suggested that Jonathan Ross’s questions are longer than those by Jay Leno. This suggestion is supported by two matters we saw previously. First of all, the fact that Jonathan Ross’s turns in general are longer also implies that his question turns will be longer. Secondly, in the previous chapter, we saw that Jay Leno’s introductions are longer than those of Jonathan Ross as he already provides a lot of context on the guest’s latest projects and the reason of their visit. These matters are not yet mentioned by Jonathan Ross in his introduction. As a result, Jonathan Ross probably incorporates them in his questions, which will, therefore, be longer. The length of the questions will return in the next chapter. A short comparison with regard to the results of all of these parameters is provided in the next paragraph.

A quantitative analysis of the data has shown that the pace of the interviews on *The Jonathan Ross Show* is higher than the pace of the interviews on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno* and that this is to a great extent due to the host. Also, speaker change or self-selection at transition relevance places occurs less frequently on *The Jonathan Ross Show* than it does on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*. This result relates to the fact that the turns of the host on *The Jonathan Ross Show* are longer than the turns on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*. In addition, of Jonathan Ross’s total number of turns, the percentage of question turns is higher than the percentage of turns comprising response tokens. The reverse is true for Jay Leno; of his total number of turns, the percentage of turns containing response tokens is higher than the percentage of question turns.
In brief, this quantitative analysis has given valid insights about the interactional characteristics of both of the hosts. In addition, the results shed a light on how active both hosts are. Jonathan Ross is a rather active host; he uses quite a lot of long turns in his interviews and he often desires speaker incipiency. About 38% of his total number of turns consisted of questions and 13% were response tokens. This means that about half of his turns involve other actions. These actions may include e.g. joking, agreeing, assessing. Jay Leno, on the other hand, uses quite a lot of turns. At first sight, this may point towards an active host. However, the results of the other parameters have indicated that his turns are rather short and that in about 40% of his turns, he solely signals his listenership. In comparison to Jonathan Ross, he expresses other actions than questions or response tokens only in 30% of his turns. Therefore, it is fair to conclude that Jay Leno is not that active after all. At least he is not as active as Jonathan Ross.

The fact that Jonathan Ross is more active than Jay Leno in his interviews seems to indicate that *The Jonathan Ross Show* is to a greater extent also a show centred on the host. However, from a closer look at the formats of these two shows, this proves not to be the case. In the previous chapter, it was explained that the formats of these two talk shows differed. It is here important to recall that Jonathan Ross spends more time on interviewing his guests than Jay Leno does. By contrast, Jay Leno’s introduction at the very beginning of the show is longer than Jonathan Ross’s. As this introduction is already centred on Jay Leno, he can leave more room for the guests during the actual interviews. This explains why Jonathan Ross is still more active during the interviews.

After the analysis in this chapter, still some matters remain unsolved. At some points in this analysis, it was already indicated that transcriptions are needed to account for what is exactly going on in the interaction. Indeed, as discussed in chapter 1, CA traditionally works with transcriptions. In the next chapter, I will turn to the transcriptions for my qualitative analysis of *The Jonathan Ross Show* and *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*. The central focus of this chapter is on the turn-taking system and topic organization in both talk shows. In addition, some of the more problematic matters in this chapter will be addressed in the course of the third chapter, e.g. Jay Leno’s remarkably low number of question turns in the interview with Dana Carvey.
Chapter 3: Qualitative discussion

The last section of the previous chapter indicated that it is not sufficient to restrict ourselves to a quantitative analysis. This chapter contains a qualitative discussion of the talk shows. The points that will be made will be substantiated by examples from the interviews. This chapter, then, draws more on the theory of CA as explained in the first chapter than the previous one did. The upshot of this chapter is to find out how the turn-taking system of The Jonathan Ross Show and The Tonight Show with Jay Leno is organised and how topics are managed during the interview. This chapter will especially reveal further aspects of how the semi-institutional nature of talk shows is oriented to in the talk. This aspect was apparent less in the quantitative chapter as the focus was more on the interplay between host and guest and the interactional differences across the different talk shows. This does however not mean that this chapter leaves the comparison between the hosts out of the picture. I expect this analysis to provide additional insights as to the interactional course and the – different – characteristics of the talk show hosts as well.

1 Turn-taking system

In this section, I will look more closely into the organization of the turns and the allocation of firsts and seconds. First, the common patterns within the turn-taking system of both talk shows will be listed. Next, some examples will be given to illustrate how and where the turn-taking system deviates from these general patterns.

1.1 Most common patterns

According to Ilie, in comparison to prevailing forms of institutional discourse, “the question-response adjacency pairs that occur in talk shows are less predictable and less norm-regulated” (Ilie 1999: 978). Nevertheless, it is possible to detect some patterns in the data. I will differentiate four patterns. The first pattern is the question-response adjacency pair as it occurs in institutional discourse ‘proper’. In the second, third and fourth pattern, then, a third turn is added to the adjacency pair. The third turn varies for the different patterns.

The first pattern revolves only around the question-answer pair and is typically associated with an interview. First a question is initiated by the interviewer, the host in this case, then an
answer is provided by the guest and subsequently this process is repeated. Examples (1) and (2) illustrate this pattern for, respectively, *The Jonathan Ross Show* and *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*:

(1) *The Jonathan Ross Show*, interview with Michael Sheen, 22/10/11 (0:31)

JR: So you’re back in the UK for a while now did you catch the rugby being a Welshman did you see the rugby going on

MS: I did I caught the first twenty minutes until Warburton got sent off

JR: And did you then would you have to go for work or you just couldn’t watch it anymore

MS: Then I had to go and rehearse

(2) *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*, interview with Glenn Close, 06/01/12 (02:25)

JL: Isn’t it weird when you get the life time achievement when I’m not done yet () I’m doing more movies

GC: I know

JL: Now I read something about you you keep all the wardrobes from your films

GC: Uh huh

Examples (1) and (2) indicate two different trends. In example (1), the second question that is asked probes more deeply into the answer that was given by Michael Sheen. The second question in example (2) does not. In example (1) topic drift can be noticed, in example (2) a topic break is apparent. This break is clearly marked by the use of the word ‘now’, which indicates a change of subject. The most common trend for both talk shows is topic drift. Topic break also occurs in the interviews, but less frequently than topic drift. These issues will be discussed further in the second section of this chapter on topic management.

The second pattern is a variant on the first pattern. The first question-response adjacency is maintained but it is followed by a third turn. This third turn was referred to as response token in the previous chapters. As it was illustrated there, it is not only common for participants of ordinary talk to signal listenership, it also happens very frequently in talk shows. The second
pattern, then, comprises a question-response adjacency pair followed by a continuer that indicates that the host is not aiming to take the conversational floor. The third turn is frequently followed by a story and more continuers as in example (4). Although continuers amply occur in both talk shows, it is clear from the previous chapter that they are more common on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*. Examples (3) and (4) illustrate examples for both talk shows:

(3) *The Jonathan Ross Show*, interview with Miranda Hart, 22/10/11 (05:28)

JR: Do you think of you just said that sitcom Miranda so do you differentiate in your head you think sitcom Miranda real Miranda

MH: Yeah in meetings I can now talk about this Miranda person as if it’s not me

JR: → Yeah

MH: = so I don’t think Miranda would do that and-

JR: Yeah and that’s not you being granted the third person

MH: No

(4) *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*, interview with Evangeline Lilly, 03/10/11(05:23)

JL: Now when were you a flight attendant

EL: I was a flight attendant when I was eighteen for all of two months

JL: and wh-what happened ()

EL: I hated it

JL: → Yeah

EL: =I hated being a flight attendant so much

JL: → Ooh

EL: =actually one day I showed up for a flight to Germany and

JL: → Yeah

EL: =euh I forgot to bring my passport

JL: → Ooh

EL: =so they were gonna scold me and tell me I was in a great big load of trouble

JL: → Yeah
EL: and I said I’m gonna save you the trouble I’m just gonna quit

JL: → Wow

EL: =like I’m done I don’t think this job was kind of being for me

JL: So did you dream of being a flight attendant and then you got it and you didn’t like it what happened

In example (3), the third turn is a continuer. After Miranda Hart has completed her answer, a new question is asked in the fifth turn. In example (4) a question-response adjacency pair is followed by a new question-response adjacency pair in which the question ‘what happened’ in the third turn invites an extended narrative. The host produces a request to hear the story. The subsequent turns by Jay Leno are continuers by which he signals his listnership and allows Evangeline Lilly to continue. These continuers moves can occasionally also be produced by the guests to signal their continued attention to a more extensive question by the host, as in (5):

(5) The Tonight Show with Jay Leno, interview with Michelle Williams, 05/01/12 (05:46)

JL: Yeah and this this movie is based on a book with a true story about a a young man who was like an intern on the movie

MW: → Uh huh

JL: =and Marilyn took a liking to him

MW: → Uh huh

JL: =so it is based on the real movie that she did with euh Laurence Olivier

MW: → Uh huh

JL: =and you filmed it was it filmed in the same studio where Laurence Olivier and Marilyn also filmed

MW: It was it was on the same we filmed on the same lot on the same stage

JL: Wow

MW: =and my dressing room was her dressing room
The third pattern consists of a third turn that is a feedback move. This feedback move is termed ‘follow-up’ by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and ‘third-turn receipts’ by Heritage (1985). In her article on discourse in talk shows, Ilie defines follow-up as “[a] type of verbalized feedback that plays a significant role in talk-shows” (Ilie 1999: 983). She further argues that a follow-up is typically repetitive as in example (7) below. In addition, Ilie claims that ‘follow-up in talk shows is not always a mere repetition of the preceding response, it can also be evaluative’ (Ilie 1999: 984). Examples (6) and (7) are examples of the third pattern:

(6) *The Jonathan Ross Show*, interview with John Bishop, 07/01/12 (01:46)

JR: [any family traditions you have]

JB: well not really well you keep on thinking you’ve got a family tradition and then it changes cause the kids grow up we’ve got one we maintained which is to try and not have an argument before two o’clock and euh

JR: → O-on Christmas day itself

JB: Yeah Christmas day not have a fight before two o’clock but you can feel at half one the tension building cause everyone’s thinking I could punch someone

(7) *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*, interview with Magic Johnson, 03/10/11(01:46)

JL: Do you think this season will happen can you even say that

MJ: I I hope so

JL: → You hope so

MJ: Yes

As examples (6) and (7) illustrate, the first turn is a question, the second an answer and the third a follow-up. This third turn asks for clarification. Consequently, the turn that follows this evaluative turn usually clarifies or reinforces that which has been said by the guest in his previous turn. The subsequent turn by the host is not predictable; the answer of the guest may be further extended or a new question may be asked by the host.

---

11 Ilie’s examples of evaluative follow-up may look like longer backchannel turns (e.g. Oh, good). These turns, can, however, be distinguished from backchannel in that usually a longer statement or question follows the follow-up, this indicates that the speaker incipiency is sought for. This is never the case during backchannel turns. Also, backchannel turns are not evaluative.
In the fourth pattern, the third turn is an assessment. In the first chapter, it was argued that talk show hosts produce assessments in addition to continuers. The third turns in the previous patterns were fairly innocent. Continuers are rather neutral and a follow-up turn - even though it is evaluative - does not express value judgement. Assessments, then, are far less neutral. Ilie comments: “unlike interviews proper, talk shows are not strictly information focused and do not claim maximum objectivity and impartiality either” (Ilie 2001: 217). Talk show hosts are, unlike news interviewers, not supposed to be neutral on everything. In the fourth pattern, the third turn by the host is less merely evaluative and more personal. It can be a joke or a comment but also a personal opinion or characteristic. In examples (8) and (9) a humorous comment is expressed in the third turn:

(8) The Jonathan Ross Show, interview with Emma Thompson, 14/01/12 (02:33)

JR: What did he what happened to him
ET: He just I don’t know I think he I think he wasn’t well
JR: I think we can safely assume that yeah haha
ET: Yeah
JR: Euh you know I always thought of you as being the super-English okay about as English as English can be maybe it’s because you speak so well and because I know-

(9) The Tonight Show with Jay Leno, interview with Evangeline Lilly, 03/10/11 (04:11)

JL: [Now what’s dialect training for an elf I I
EL: Well I’m learning I’m learning a language of elvish
JL: [[Which is
EL: [[Which was invented by J.R.R. Tolkien
JL: Okay there’s no Keebler people involved
EL: Hahaha

In example (8), Jonathan Ross initiates a question and Emma Thompson answers it. The third turn by Jonathan Ross is the initiation of a comment on this answer. This is followed by a

---

12 This pattern differentiates itself from the previous one in that the third turn here often includes the personal insights or feelings of the host. By including the personal pronoun ‘I’ occasionally, these turns are highly subjective. Follow-up, then, does not include personal comments by the host; its main function is to express a request for clarification. Follow-up turns remain far more objective than the turns in this fourth pattern.
reaction by Emma Thompson. After that, Jonathan Ross initiates a new question. Example (9) starts with a question-answer adjacency pair as well. It is followed by another question-answer adjacency pair. This is followed by a third turn expressing a comment. In the next examples, a personal characteristic of the host is displayed as a third turn:

(10) The Jonathan Ross Show, interview with Miranda Hart, 22/10/11 (02:40)

JR: Should we give him away Malteser well we have Malteser’s euh friend in we have-

MH: [that’s for you] it’s your gift

JR: → Well I’m allergic to guinea pigs

MH: Oh c’mon

(11) The Tonight Show with Jay Leno, interview with Glenn Close, 06/01/12 (03:16)

JL: So are you a hoarder would you say you’re a hoarder

GC: (.) Look who’s talking

JL: → Well I I I admit it XXX at least I admit it I admit to being a hoarder (.) I I save up everything I have shirts from the 8th grade I still have

The personal statements by the host that are found in examples (8), (9), (10), and (11) are intended to create a funny effect; they render the host more like a full conversational partner.

The four patterns that have been described in this section are common patterns, both on The Jonathan Ross Show and The Tonight Show with Jay Leno. They are built on the question-answer adjacency pair that is central to interviews. The question-answer adjacency pair can be followed by a new question-answer adjacency pair, or by a third turn. This third turn can be a continuer, a follow-up, a humorous comment, personal quality or opinion. Whereas continuers indicate that the speaker can continue his or her talk, follow-up desires speaker incipiency as it asks for clarification. Jokes, comments and opinions, then, are more subjective than the latter two. The second, third and fourth pattern indicate that the host on a talk show differs from for example a news interviewer. The host’s use of continuers, follow-up and assessments enable him to create what Tolson calls his ‘synthetic’ personality (Tolson 1991). Tolson draws attention to the fact that the talk show hosts self-consciously convey a television personality (Tolson 1991).
Aspects of conversational discourse are of key importance when conveying their television personality.

The four different patterns occur in combination with each other throughout the interviews. These patterns are present in all of the interviews in the corpus. They are not restricted to the interviews from which the illustrative examples are taken. To find out the proportional distribution of these patterns for each talk show as well as the proportional distribution of third turns, further research is needed. What can, however, be concluded from the previous chapter is that the second pattern occurs more frequently in *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno* than in *The Jonathan Ross Show*.

1.2 Deviations

The patterns established in the previous section indicate the most common trends in the turn taking systems of the talk shows in the corpus. However, deviations from these patterns also occur. These deviations will be explained by means of the four observations below. The first part of these observations is derived from the general patterns in the previous section; the second part highlights the aspect of deviation:

a) The guest normally does not initiate firsts, but sometimes s/he does
b) The guest normally answers questions, but sometimes s/he does not
c) The host determines who takes the floor, but sometimes he does not
d) The host does not tell stories, but sometimes he does

a) In the previous part, it was argued that the host initiates the firsts - the questions - and the guests answer them. However, once in a while, spontaneous role-switching occurs in talk shows, as in the following example:

(12) *The Jonathan Ross Show*, interview with Miranda Hart, 22/10/11 (01:43)

MH: ➔ Jonathan
JR: Yes
MH: I did ask for this whole set to be a hutch
JR: Yes
MH: Like Lady Gaga got her hay bale here
This example is taken from the second minute of the interview between Jonathan Ross and Miranda Hart. This extract clearly shows that Miranda Hart is initially in control of the conversation as she initiates a first twice. The first two turns of this example are a summon-answer adjacency pair initiated by Miranda Hart. It is, then, not always the host who initiates the firsts, as was suggested in the previous section. Spontaneous role-switching is apparent when guests initiate firsts. In this example, Miranda Hart initiates a question as well. However, ultimately the roles are restored. In the 10th turn, Jonathan Ross, after answering Miranda Hart’s question, produces the first turn of a greeting-greeting adjacency pair. Instances of guests initiating firsts occur a couple of times in the data but one example suffices to make the point.

b) Hosts ask questions in order to get an answer. However, it does happen that guests simply do not answer these questions, as in example (13) and (14)

(13) The Jonathan Ross Show, interview with Emma Thompson, 14/01/12 (02:18)

JR: So what do you do in the queen what’s that g- what’s that gonna be

ET: It’s a short for sky

JR: → O is it the one when you direct

ET: [=and it’s that time when] Michael Fagan you know the intruder got into her bedroom

JR: That was weird

ET: Got in through Prince Charles’s window

JR: → Is that-

ET: His office window apparently
(14) *The Jonathan Ross Show*, interview with Brian Cox, 07/01/12 (06:28)

JR: And it was great fun to be part of but it was great fun to watch it as well I saw somebody cause you really helped popularize that sort of thing but who doesn’t wanna see what’s going on up there and and some of the images you showed us and some of the theories that were put forward were fabulous what’s in store this time what’s this time

BC: we’re doing we’re going we did a lot of solar systems systems where the planet is like

JR: Cause there’s more than one

BC: This time more than one planet yeah

JR: =More than one solar system

BC =More than one solar system there is absolutely there are hundreds and thousands and billions of them we discovered a thousand of them now

JR: → [Where did they come from]

BC: but we’re gonna do distant objects we’re gonna do black holes we’re gonna do things like galaxies we’re gonna do

JR: [white stars]

BC: = we’re gonna do one on the moon and I believe we’re gonna talk to one of the Apollo astronauts

In the first example, there are two turns during which Jonathan Ross is asking a question. During his first question, overlap with what Emma Thompson is saying occurs. She does not answer the question, probably because she did not pay attention to it. It seems that she does not intend to answer questions at this point in the interaction. She interrupts Jonathan Ross during his second question and goes on with what she is saying. Jonathan Ross does not seem to be able to intervene. In the second example, Brian Cox is carried away by his fascination for the universe. In the last turns, he does not answer Jonathan Ross’s question and ignores Jonathan Ross’s comment. In addition, it also occurs that guests refuse to answer a question, as in example (15):
In this example, Noel Gallagher refuses to give an answer to the question that Jonathan Ross has asked. Usually guests on talk shows do answer the questions they are asked since this is the whole reason for his appearance. Nevertheless, Noel Gallagher departs from this format by claiming that he does not have to answer the question. The context, however, is also important. The first turn indicates that Jonathan Ross is trying to get to know whether Oasis will play a reunion anniversary concert of the album *(What’s the story) morning glory*? Considering the fact that Oasis only recently split, it is natural that Noel Gallagher does not want to answer this question. Still, Jonathan Ross is rather pushy; his is using his prerogative as a host to probe here
and Noel Gallagher starts to get a bit annoyed. In addition; in the light of (a), Noel Gallagher initiates a first in this excerpt. He is giving a remark that is interpreted as a question by Jonathan Ross. He probably does this to silence Jonathan Ross a bit. The roles, however, are re-established in the next turn. After Noel Gallagher’s remark, the audience is cheering. Noel Gallagher does not go on about it and Jonathan Ross takes back the conversational floor from the moment the audience is quieter again to further question Noel about the reunion.

c) In her article on discourse in talk shows, Ilie writes that they “take place under the control of a moderator, the show host, who is monitoring most of the conversation by asking questions and by making comments” (Ilie 2001: 226). However, she also argues “[o]ne aspect which has been less highlighted in the literature so far is the fact that the authority of the show host is not absolute” (Ilie 2001: 227). Ilie is here pointing at the fact that guests may initiate firsts as well, as it was in (a). Nevertheless, her argument on the relative authority of the host can also be extended to another aspect. If the host determines who takes the floor, it is likely that he will interrupt. However, from this argument, it is not that likely that he will be interrupted. The examples of Brian Cox and Emma Thompson in (b) already illustrated that the host’s attempt for the floor may be unsuccessful when the guests do not react to his turn. Jonathan Ross is slightly losing his authority at these points.

I noted one example from The Tonight Show with Jay Leno in which Jay Leno lets Dana Carvey determine who takes the floor. Jay Leno gives up his authority for a ‘team performance’ (Goffman 1959) in which he and Dana Carvey collaborate to produce a humorous sequence. This is an interview technique that is not that common in other talk shows. However, it does occur occasionally on The Tonight Show with Jay Leno. Norrick (2010) adds an example of a team performance between Jay Leno and Larry the Cable Guy to his discussion of Oprah and Larry King (Norrick 2010). He explains, with reference to Goffman, that “a team performance occurs when participants subordinate their own personalities and goals to the success of a joint enterprise” (Norrick 2010: 538). Norrick explains Jay Leno’s interview technique during the interview with Larry the Cable Guy as follows:

Jay Leno subordinates his role as host and interviewer to the success of the two-party comedy performance. Far from threatening the face of his guest, Jay essentially accepts an extended threat to his own characteristic face, as he plays the stooge for Larry the Cable Guy. In the parlance of

---

13 Small interruptions fall out of the scope of the point I am making here as they are natural to spoken talk.
comedy teams, Jay acts as the straight man to set up punch lines by the other comedian. (Norrick 2010: 538)

Something similar happens during the interview between Jay Leno and Dana Carvey. In example (16), Jay Leno begins with presumably one of his pre-established questions ‘how was Obama doing’. He is interrupted by Dana Carvey. In the remainder of the example, Dana Carvey continues to interrupt Jay Leno. These interruptions are threatening for Jay Leno’s face. However, he accepts this threat because he is working with Dana Carvey to render the performance as entertaining as possible. Dana Carvey is interrupting Jay Leno because he is echoing President Obama’s insistence on finishing his points:

(16) The Tonight Show with Jay Leno, interview with Dana Carvey, 13/12/11 (02:49)

JL: Yah how was Obama doing how was he –
DC: Well he’s doing pretty good he’s doing pretty good Jay
JL: That this is O-
DC: [Obama is a very clever character he
JL: Yah
DC: =you know he’ll take the Republican positions and make them like theatrical you know and they’re gonna have a tough time beating ‘m cause he’s like they don’t the Republicans don’t think the rich should pay their fair share they want everybody to fend for themselves (0.4)xx they do they do they do now now hold on hold on let me finish (.) they want they want grandma to operate on herself (0.3)x
JL: But Mr. President but
DC: [No no no hold on hold on Jay let me finish my point let me finish they want grandma as if grandma who can’t remember when to take her blood pressure pills could remove her own god blather
JL: See
DC: No no no no let let me finish
JL: Yeah can I can I
DC: [No no no hold on hold on
JL Yah

14 It is usually not a common practice for a guest to interrupt the host repeatedly as the host has a higher authority.
DC: Hold on Jay just let me finish my point. Back in olden times
JL: Yah
DC: When the warriors would go out hunt a wild boar
JL: Yeah
DC: They would kill and clean the wild boar and they would eat most of that boar but they would share the scraps with the less fortunate but the republicans want everyone to fend for themselves as if a baby could actually hunt down a wild boar cook it clean it and skin it
JL: Yah
DC: A baby can barely walk just crawl just a little bit
JL: Yah
DC: Got a weak spine how is it going to hunt a wild boar
JL: Yeah yeah I see I I I understand your point
DC: [no no no no no no]
JL: [I understand your point mister president mister president XXX I now I understand what-
DC: [no no no no I would like to see Obama come out and do some comedy just to lighten things up
JL: Yeah

This example indicates that in the case of team performance, the host lets the guest control the interview. In addition, this example accounts for the remarkable results of the interview with Dana Carvey in the previous chapter. In that chapter, we learned that Jay Leno uses fewer words per minute than Dana Carvey. In addition, we saw that there was not as much speaker change during this interview as during the other interviews. Finally, we saw that the Jay Leno’s turns were much shorter during this interview. The observations in the previous chapter on why this would be can here be completed with some additional insights. Indeed, Jay Leno deliberately speaks less in this interview but this does not only happen because the interview is longer, but also because he is working with Dana Carvey to make the performance even more entertaining.

(d) The last point here is related to the idea that the host does not tell stories. Indeed, most theory on the telling of stories in talk shows (Blum-Kulka 2001; Thornborrow 2001)
assumes that it is the guests who tell the stories. This literature does acknowledge that stories may be co-produced by guest and host. This, however, still suggests that it is the guest’s story. In the next examples, a new anecdote is told by the host:

(17) The Jonathan Ross Show, interview with John Bishop, 07/01/12 (04:56)

J.R.: Well I know you look healthy too I just wonder whether you had whether you got a kind of tofu base that looked like a turkey like a tofurkey
J.B.: [o yeah yeah so we got a lot of tofu and model it to look like a turkey
J.R.: ⇒ [no well] you can buy a tofurkey
J.B.: A t- hahaha
J.R.: ⇒ you can there’s such a thing like a tofurkey
J.B.: No way
J.R.: ⇒ There is my daughter loves a tofurkey
J.B.: [a tofurkey
J.R.: ⇒ [and don’t make a joke about that
J.B.: I’m not saying anything on your daughter a tofurkey there is honestly a tofurkey
J.R.: ⇒ There is a tofurkey she ate she ate a lot of tofurkey and I tried a little bit of tofurkey and I tell you that was really one of the best tofurkeys I ever tried
J.B.: O yeah I’ve gotta be honest I wasn’t expecting a conversation about a tofurkey tonight
J.R.: And I’ll be honest with you
J.B.: the tofurkey market after this show will go through the roof
J.R.: I’ll tell you what you never mind being chicken George you wanna be tofu Tommy

(18) The Tonight Show with Jay Leno, interview with Dana Carvey, 13/12/11 (09:27)

J.L.: How are your kids doing I was just talking with your son backstage
D.C.: Oh
J.L.: =he’s your spitting image hilarious
DC: I know it’s it is a mini-me

JL: [that kid he’s not he’s not adopted that’s for sure

DC: No no not at all children are great because they’re very clever argumentatively they always say you should be happy to the parents you should be happy cause it’s like hey you got a ticket speeding ticket you should be happy I know I could have crashed this car ten times you should be happy

JL: Yeah yeah

DC: Hey you got a D in maths you should be happy I know I got an F in every class his whole life it’s odd

JL: I get that you you always see that tune about a guy gets jumped in New York and he’s stabbed five times and he’s shot in the head but he lived hey you were lucky man

DC: Yeah yeah yeah yeah

JL: What did I do I was just walking down the streets why did

DC: [just be happy

JL: [I just be happy

Example (17) is an anecdote about a ‘tofurkey’ that is narrated by Jonathan Ross. It starts from the fourth pattern of the previous section, but soon deviates from it as Jonathan Ross keeps taking turns to tell about this tofurkey. It is true that the story is co-produced by John Bishop but usually one would expect the roles to be the other way around. In fact, judging only from the third turn onwards, it could be argued that what is said by the host normally is said by the guest. Example (18) is taken from The Tonight Show with Jay Leno and includes Jay Leno telling an anecdote. It is a new anecdote but it is, unlike the example of Jonathan Ross, inspired by the anecdote of Dana Carvey in the previous turn. Nevertheless, Dana Carvey is the one producing continuers and follow-up turns here. These anecdotes indicate that the hosts are not passive; telling these anecdotes is a way for them to cultivate their ‘synthetic’ television personality.

As was argued in the first chapter, the interaction in talk shows is semi-institutional. This meant that both features of conversational discourse and institutional discourse are pertinent to talk shows. According to Ilie, “the semi-institutional nature of this double dependency is what characterizes talk show interaction” (Ilie 2001: 242). Accordingly, any of these deviations from the patterns established in the previous point can be related to an imbalance of this double
dependency. What is happening during these deviations is that the institutional roles and the duties that are accompanied by these roles are abandoned during particular turns in the interaction. The turn-taking system of talk shows usually has both characteristics of institutional talk (question-response as central adjacency pair) and ordinary talk (assessments). In the previous examples, however, the turn-taking system of ordinary talk had the upper hand.
2 Topic management

According to Ilie, “since the talk show is a time-limited speech event, the major discussion topics are pre-established, introduced and controlled by the show host” (Ilie 2001: 225). This stands in contrast to ordinary conversation, in which both participants usually can decide on new topics. In talk shows, it is usually the host who determines the topics that will be talked about. Although the host decides on the main topics of the interview, the guests also have the opportunity to give the topic of the conversation a twist. However, this is, at least in the case of this study, only done by means of stepwise transition. Consider the next example;

(19) The Jonathan Ross Show, interview with Emma Thompson, 14/01/12 (01:35)

ET: Yeah I don’t I don’t tend to watch them maybe it’s that thing of getting older and not wanting to look at yourself in the past somehow it’s a very strange thing if you think about it

JR: okay yeah

ET: =having that is not like having home movies where you look back at yourself that’s strange enough

JR: Because I suppose it is not just the way you your looks have changed it’s the way your acting is changed

ET: Yeah

JR: =and the way you would do stuff so I guess there are

ET: I pl-

JR: =things you would do differently

ET: →I’m playing the queen next week

JR: Wow

In (19), Emma Thompson is answering Jonathan Ross’s question on whether she watches any of her movies on a regular basis. Emma Thompson explains that she does not because she finds it weird to look at herself in the past. As a result, Jonathan Ross provides his evaluative view on this topic in the next turns. This is followed by Emma Thompson announcing that she is playing the queen the next week. In the next part of the transcription, it is described how her acting has changed from what she did the previous time she played the queen. This, then, is followed by talk
on the intruder who got into the queen’s bedroom. Emma Thompson has given the conversation a twist; it is because of her contribution that they are now talking on the queen. However, the topic is still connected to her acting, or as Sacks puts it; “a new topic has not been started, though we’re far from wherever we began” (Sacks 1972: 16, as cited in Jefferson 1984: 198).

Talk shows are built on a structure of questions and answers. As example (20) illustrates, topic drift happens when the host elaborates further on something that was said by the guest. This is usually done by asking a question. Nevertheless, as we saw in example (20), it is also possible for guests to initiate topic drift. A topic break, then, arises when an entirely new topic is started. At this point, the host returns to his pre-established agenda of questions. Therefore, topic breaks are, like topic drift, mostly initiated by the host in my corpus.\textsuperscript{15} The next two points examine the structure of turns in which a topic break is accomplished and the typical placement of topic breaks. In a third point, a comparison between \textit{The Jonathan Ross Show} and \textit{The Tonight Show with Jay Leno} will be made.

\textbf{2.1 Structure}

The structures that will be introduced in this section are the structures that are used most frequently on both talk shows. However, they are not exclusive structures; topic breaks also happen by means of other structures. In addition, the two structures that will be explained here can also occur in combination with each other. The structures are respectively strings of words and single words that occur turn-initial. They are followed by the new topic. According to Jefferson, topic breaks can happen by using a structure that “specifically marks that a new topic is going to be done; something that proposes ‘let’s start a new topic’” (Jefferson 1984: 193).\textsuperscript{16} This is also how it typically happens in talk shows. The first way to do this is by using turns that start with ‘let me ask you about’, ‘let’s talk about’ or varieties on these ones. This technique is used frequently on both talk shows.\textsuperscript{17} Examples (20) and (21) below illustrate this way of introducing a new topic:

\begin{itemize}
\item An exception will be discussed in the third subsection of this part.
\item Jefferson’s work is on transitions from talk on trouble. Nevertheless, the cited insight is also applicable on talk shows.
\item Although it is common for both talk shows, this structure is used most frequently on \textit{The Tonight Show with Jay Leno}.
\end{itemize}
(20) The Jonathan Ross Show, interview with Miranda Hart, 22/10/11 (04:42)

JR: Well
MH: °That’s brilliant°
JR: W-well we’re gonna have to how am I going to break it to them cause you—you gonna
MH: You don’t need to break it to them I’m going
JR: [You can’t go to the you can’t go now you should stay here I’ll fix you up with Jedward
MH: Sure
JR: →Euhm okay huhu let me talk what are you doing now in terms of the sitcom we have the two series
MH: Yes
JR: = they’re out on DVD () fabulous success you’re writing the third one now
MH: I’m gonna start writing the third one in about a month yeah towards the end of the year yes

The transcription in example (20) commences right after a video excerpt. In this video excerpt, Simon Le Bon from Duran Duran addressed a personal message to Miranda Hart in which he asked her to join them on their tour. Since Miranda Hart just admitted that she is not a huge fan of Duran Duran, this video excerpt is meant as a funny intermezzo. The talk in the first turns is still related to this video excerpt. In the indicated turn, there is a topic break; Jonathan Ross changes the topic to her professional career. He indicates that he will start a new topic by using the words ‘let me talk’. The next example is from The Tonight Show with Jay Leno:

(21) The Tonight Show with Jay Leno, interview with Dana Carvey, 13/12/11 (08:22)

DC: Regis Philbin for president because then he could tell amusing anecdotes about international relations that’s where I was I was so cosy at the G20 right XXX so I’m having a tangerine Martini with ()
JL: A what a tangerine Martini
DC: A tangerine Martini yeah look at that when I’m talking to Pot I say what are you a dictator what are you doing over there anyway anyway they’re terrific people Pot and () they’re terrific human beings
JL: Well well
That would be

Let’s talk about our friend Billy Billy Crystal back hosting the Oscars

Crystal the best the best

The transcription starts with an account by Dana Carvey on Regis Philbin. He arrived at this topic through topic drift. The topic break occurs when Jay Leno changes the topic in a question on Billy Crystal that is introduced by ‘let’s talk about’.

The second structure typically found in turns that introduce a new topic are words such as ‘hey’ ‘okay’ ‘so’ ‘now’, or combinations of these words. The talk show hosts have their own preferences; Jonathan Ross especially uses ‘hey’ and/or ‘okay’ and Jay Leno prefers ‘now’, but all of these words are used by both. These words are words that indicate a return to the pre-established agenda of the host:

(22) The Jonathan Ross Show, interview with Miranda Hart, 22/10/11 (02:02)

MH: It’s called Malteser
JR Malteser
MH: [yeah
JR: = what a lovely little thing
MH thanks

JR: Okay hey you look fantastic, what’s going on are you in love are you pregnant or you on drugs what’s going on you you have this glow on you
MH: I’m all those things

(23) The Tonight Show with Jay Leno, interview with Glenn Close, 06/01/12 (02:25)

JL: Isn’t it weird when you get the life time achievement when I’m not done yet () I’m doing more movies
GC: I know
JL: Now I read something about you you keep all the wardrobes from your films
GC: Uh huh
In example (22), the topic is changed from the guinea pig that Miranda Hart brought Jonathan Ross to her looks. In example (23), the topic is changed from talk on the occasion of Glenn Close’s visit - she is nominated for a life time achievement award - to the clothes from her films. In these examples, Jonathan Ross uses the words ‘okay hey’ and Jay Leno ‘now’.\(^\text{18}\) A combination of these structures was already present in (20) and can also be found a couple of times on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*, as illustrated in (24) and (25) below:

(24) *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*, interview with Magic Johnson, 03/10/11 (03:45)

JL: But that’s his name now  
MJ: Yeah  
JL: is it his cheques will say that  
MJ: They have to  
JL: → Yah okay now our next stop you sold all your Starbucks how many Starbucks did you have like a hundred  
MJ: 125

(25) *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*, interview with Magic Johnson, 03/10/11 (04:53)

MJ: The angels we got all the teams we want our own football team  
JL: → Now I wanna ask bout something you bought Soul Train  
MJ: yes

In (24), the topic changes from NBA-player Ron Artest having changed his name to Metta World Peace to Jay Leno asking Magic Johnson about selling all his Starbucks. In (25), the topic changes from Magic Johnson’s football team to his purchase of Soul Train, which is a popular American TV-program of the 1970s.

### 2.2 Placement

Topic breaks can be located anywhere in the conversation. However, some places or occasions in the conversation typically lend themselves to topic breaks. The structures that are used in these

\(^{18}\) Jay Leno uses ‘now’ topic initial for questions during stepwise movement as well.
turns can be those summed up in the previous subsection. In addition, other structures are possible as well. In this section, three typical occasions for topic breaks will be listed. A first occasion is the commercial break. In all but one of the interviews, after the commercial break a new topic was brought about:

(26) *The Jonathan Ross Show*, interview with Michael Sheen, 22/10/11 (02:52)

MS: So I found out my cousin Caroline is not only my first cousin but she’s my fifth cousin as well

JR: Hahaha we will find out some more of that kind of thing after the break don’t go away

(Commercial break)

JR: Welcome back to the show mister Michael Sheen is here and of course to stay for sure with us we got Noel Gallagher coming up chatting and performing (.). Euh never mind all the life stuff it’s good to see you back on screen and you seem to have broken an unlucky streak for Woody Allan because the new movie Midnight in Paris which I saw at Cannes at the Cannes Festival fabulous stuff really good to see him back in form

MS: Uh huh

JR: = great for you to work with Woody Allan was that an exciting thing

MS: Amazing yeah I mean incredible that he you know someone who I’ve grown up with watching his films you know Manhattan Annie Hall those amazing films euh and to get to work with him in Paris beautiful city the w you know the weird thing is that you don’t get the whole script so as an actor that’s a bit strange

Before the break, Michael Sheen was telling about the visit to his home town for a series of the BBC. Although Jonathan Ross announces that there will be ‘more of that kind of thing’ after the break, he immediately closes this topic after the break and moves on to talk about Michael Sheen’s role in *Midnight in Paris*. A second example is taken from *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*:

---

19 The interview with Dana Carvey on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*. Before the commercial break, Dana Carvey was doing an imitation that had to do with Ron Paul. Jay Leno explicitly announces that he is going to ask further on Ron Paul after the commercial break (cf. example 42 (infra))
(27) *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*, interview with Glenn Close, 06/01/12 (05:37)

GC: So I was with in a car with two women with hearing age two parrots and a dog

JL: Yah O () that would make it a little crazy

GC: Yeah yeah

JL: A little crazy okay now look we’ll take a break and look what’s going on after this be right back

XXX

(Commercial break)

XXX

JL: Welcome back I’m talking with Glenn Close (.) Albert Nobbs is the new film that is the project you’ve been working on for thirty years huh

Before the break, Glenn Close was talking about all the animals her family has. After the break, Jay Leno changes the topic to her new movie *Albert Nobbs*. This change happens fairly abruptly. The transition to a new topic happened less abruptly in example (26), where Jonathan Ross quickly refers back to the ‘life stuff’ that was discussed before the break. He may do so while an abrupt topic break is dispreferred, as was explained in chapter 1. The general trend in the corpus is that these topic breaks after commercial breaks happen less abruptly on *The Jonathan Ross Show* than they do on *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*.

Another place at which topic breaks typically occur is after applause or cheering by the audience. This applause usually follows a humorous comment by the host or one of the guests. After this applause, the host takes the chance to return to his pre-established agenda, as in examples (28) and (29):

(28) *The Jonathan Ross Show*, interview with John Bishop, 07/01/12 (02:53)

JB: I’ve gotta be honest that green room there was so funny cause me and Brian sat there trying our best not to be pervs it was

JR: Brian’s gone off to sort himself out ()

JB: Somewhere in the universe Brian is having a brilliant night
JR: We’ll find out we’ll find out ()

[XXX

JR: Euh so but you are you’re a vegetarian aren’t you

In this example, Jonathan Ross changes the topic to vegetarianism after the applause, indicated by XXX in the transcription. This applause followed from the funny sequence on Brian Cox in the previous turns. In the next example, Jay Leno is asking Glenn Close about her experiences working at the reception of Colonial Williamsburg; Glenn Close responds to the question with a humorous anecdote. After the applause of the audience, Jay Leno changes the topic to her movie:

(29) The Tonight Show with Jay Leno, interview with Glenn Close, 06/01/12 (08:39)

JL: [Yah yah but what kind if you ever seen our Jay walking segment that’s pretty much where it bases like what what kind of questions would people ask you so you’re the information lady they come up and say what

GC: Euh is there a bus to take us to Colonial Williamsburg yes the bus you see that sign says bus

JL: Hihishi

GC: Bus downstairs the bus is downstairs yes you see that sign it says bus downstairs do you see the stairs over there yes you see the sign it says bus downstairs (.) so if I go over there and I go down that stairs there’s gonna be a bus there

JL: Yah right yes

GC: And one time I one time I saw I said no maybe if you stay here the bus will drive up the stairs and right here and PICK YOU UP

XXX

JL: Wow wow wow

XXX

JL: Let me ask you about making this movie a- and this is just a little jam of a movie just beautifully beautifully done you shot it in in Dublin in Ireland

GC: Yes yes in Dublin
A third location at which topic breaks occur frequently is after turn exchange between the host and other guests or guests among each other, as in (30) and (31), or turns that follow interaction between the guest and the public as in example (32):

(30) *The Jonathan Ross Show*, interview with John Bishop, 07/01/12 (01:16)

(Jonathan Ross exchanges turns with Brian Cox)

JR: Wow it’s just not this one is it right

JB: [ yeah unfortunately Brian ]I’m not living in it so if you can get me that car back to the future and find me somewhere to park it let me get back there and watch ‘m

JR: ➔haha okay euh how was Christmas for you you were away with the family I guess did you have a good Christmas day any

(31) *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*, interview with Jason Reitman, 13/12/11 (0:36)

JR: Haha I’m very excited to be here

JL: Well we’re excited to have you

(Jason Reitman and Dana Carvey exchanging turns)

JL: ➔Now Young Adult getting great reviews were you nervous

(32) *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*, interview with Evangeline Lilly, 03/10/11 (02:42)

JL: And how many would you like to have how many would you like to have

EL: I don’t know I how many people are on a basketball team

JL: Wow

EL: I know I’m honestly asking the question I don’t know

JL: Yeah yeah well that’s a well wh wh when I grew up –

(Some people in the audience shout how many people there are on a basket team)

EL: (To the audience:) Five and thirteen the person who said the right number is American the other person is from somewhere else in the world

---

20 Guests that are not being interviewed
In example (30), Jonathan Ross directs a question at Brian Cox. Both Ross and Bishop respond to Brian Cox’s answer. After these turns, Jonathan Ross directs his talk again at John Bishop. He immediately changes the topic to Christmas. In example (31), Jason Reitman and Dana Carvey exchange some turns with each other. After this side exchange, Jay Leno changes the topic to Jason Reitman’s new movie. In the last example, then, Jay Leno asks Evangeline Lilly how many children she wants to have. When she admits that she honestly doesn’t know how many people there are in a basketball team, some members of the audience are shouting numbers. Evangeline Lilly reacts to these responses, Jay Leno does not. Instead, he changes the topic. It is interesting to note here that Jay Leno in fact never interacts with the audience and that he will never intervene when two guests are talking to each other.

In sum, topic breaks occur typically after commercial breaks, after applause and after side exchanges. These typically do the ‘breaking’ for the host and allow him to start a new topic. Topic breaks, however, also occur at other moments in the talk; this is when they are typically announced by the structures that were discussed in the previous section. From the examples I discussed, it is clear that there were already small differences apparent in the ways in which Jay Leno and Jonathan Ross manage topic breaks, e.g. their preferences for particular tokens and structures. In the next section, the two talk shows will be compared further.

2.3 Comparison

Jonathan Ross uses an additional way of managing topic breaks that is not used by Jay Leno. A topic break on The Jonathan Ross Show is often accomplished by involving the audience:

(33) The Jonathan Ross Show, interview with John Bishop, 07/01/12 (5:31)

JR: I’ll tell you what you never mind being chicken George you wanna be tofu Tommy

JB: Haha
JR: → you wanna () hey euh congratulations on your Saturday show 
  (to audience:) are you watching John Bishop on BBC on 
  Saturday nights ladies and gentlemen

JB: Yeah yeah

JR: It’s doing great i-i-it’s doing -

JB: It went well it it went very good it was good

(34) *The Jonathan Ross Show*, interview with Michael Sheen, 22/10/11(05:05)

JR: That was Churchill () ((imitates))

MS: ((imitates gesture))

JR: → (to the audience:) Euh so the exciting news if you’re fan of 
  theatre if you’re fan of Michael Sheen if you’re a fan of 
  euh Shakespeare Michael Sheen is about to play Hamlet (to 
  Michael:) Incredible part to to play of course some people 
  have their own definite interpretation of him

MS: well

In (33), Jonathan Ross is not asking John Bishop a question; he is asking the audience. This way 
he also gets Bishop to talk about the subject. In (34), Ross is directing his talk first to the 
audience and then he addresses Michael Sheen. The topic break here does not reside in a question 
to the guest.

In fact, in both talk shows, the questions in topic breaks are usually rather interrogative 
statements then interrogative questions. Structures as ‘let me ask you’ are exemplary for this 
point. In the previous chapter, it was suggested that Jonathan Ross would pose longer questions. 
Indeed, Jonathan Ross’s questions are sometimes quite extensive. These more extensive 
questions typically occur during topic breaks. This makes sense, as the questions that introduce a 
new topic are prepared in advance and, therefore, often longer. An example was already present 
in example (26), in which Jonathan Ross asked Michael Sheen a long question after the 
commercial break. Other examples include (35) and (36):

(35) *The Jonathan Ross Show*, interview with Brian Cox , 07/01/12 (05:05)

JR:                                

BC: =to look for this thing
JR: But you know what here’s one thing I wanna ask you in particular you talk about the size of the parts and I enjoyed the lecture thank you very much and I’ve been enjoying your book I’ve got Brian’s euh and I’m enjoying as much as I understand so far I’ll be honest with you I finished and I read very slowly and I read it a couple of times so I finished the first chapter (.) and I do know so I understand that part but then it gets quite complex it goes on more about qu- and I know you’re trying to simplify it for us but it is hard for me to keep up so when did it become clear to you that you could understand this stuff that even though you know I know I get it probably one day for us it seems hard to make that leap

(36) The Jonathan Ross Show, interview with Noel Gallagher, 22/10/11 (11:02)

JR: Okay so welcome back if you missed it Oasis is back together in three weeks time haha euh alright so euh recently you met that () if we’re talking about the past and moving on from him you met with Damon Albarn

NG: I did yeah yeah oh yeah

JR: = of blur

NG: Yeah

JR: =and in the old days the press kinda stirred up a bit you guys kinda seemed to encourage it seemed to enjoy it there was the great oasis blur rivalry and you both had digs at each other and said things you you were quoted more often than-

NG: [Yeah me yeah mainly me] I have to admit I yeah (.) I did more digging than anybody else yeah

In (35) the topic in the first two turns is on the Higgs-Boson particle. In the third turn, the topic is changed by the host. The topic break happens during a long turn in which Jonathan Ross does ask a question but it is embedded in an account of his personal experiences. The turn in (36) is located after the commercial break. The topic is changed from the reunion of Oasis to Damon Albarn. Here again, Ross appears to be telling things rather than asking things in these longer turns. In The Tonight Show with Jay Leno, the questions tend to be shorter and, therefore, less ‘covered up’. Note also that example (36) again illustrates that topic break does not happen that abruptly on The Jonathan Ross Show.

It happens one time in the data that a topic break is initiated by the guest instead of the host. This happens during the interview of Jay Leno with Dana Carvey:
(37) *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*, interview with Dana Carvey, 13/12/11 (07:53)

DC: Hold on let me finish but euh anyway yeah that’s what’s gonna happen what else do we got

JL: Well we got the euh you live you live you live in the bay area tell me about the the occupy euh -

DC: Oh it’s great they’re occupying parks and stuff let’s not be so hard on them I mean Hitler occupied France so let’s put it in contrast

JL: [Sure yah yah and that went well yeah

This example shows the moment after Dana Carvey has been imitating Ron Paul. His ‘act’ is finished here and he is asking himself for a new topic. He uses the topic initial elicitor ‘what else do we got’ to hand back the floor to the host. Button and Casey argue that this topic initial elicitor is also frequently used in conversational discourse (Button and Casey 1984). Subsequently, Jay Leno introduces a new topic. It is rather exceptional that a guest himself asks for a new topic in any kind of interview. A structured overview of the main differences between Jonathan Ross and Jay Leno as to the organization of topics is provided below in figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jonathan Ross</th>
<th>Jay Leno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often uses the tokens ‘hey’ and ‘okay’ to introduce a new topic.</td>
<td>Often uses the token ‘now’ to introduce a new topic + makes more frequent use of structures like ‘let me ask you’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves the audience</td>
<td>Does not interact with the audience and does not intervene when two other guests speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic breaks are interrogative statements rather than direct questions. Direct questions do occur but are often embedded in a longer account by the host on a topic.</td>
<td>Topic breaks are interrogative statements rather than direct questions. Direct questions, however, also occur on a regular base.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.** Comparison Jonathan Ross and Jay Leno
3 Concluding notes – the talk show as semi-institutional

In the section on turn-taking, four common turn-taking patterns were listed. These patterns can be summarized schematically as in figure 2. A mix of them is used on both talk shows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st turn</th>
<th>2nd turn</th>
<th>3rd turn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment/opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.** Most common patterns in the turn-taking system

The first and third turns are usually turns by the host; the second turn is a turn by the guest. The patterns in figure 2 clearly indicate that the host is in control of the conversational floor. However, we saw that deviations from figure 2 also occur. The most frequent deviations included situations in which the guest initiates the firsts or in which the guest does not answer the question of the host. Equally important were the situations in which the host did not have control over the conversational floor and in which he tells stories instead of the guest.

In three of the four common patterns, the third turn is not a question. The very fact that a third turn in a talk show is regularly a continuer, a follow-up or a comment or opinion is exactly what distinguishes the interaction in a talk show from that in other broadcast interviews, e.g. the news interview. Continuers, follow-up and assessments are more common in everyday discourse than they are in institutional interaction. Moreover, the traits with everyday discourse are even more highlighted by the deviations that were discussed. All of these deviations indicated characteristics of everyday discourse. That is to say, it is common for both parties in everyday discourse to take firsts and to tell stories. In addition, not answering a question in everyday discourse is dispreferred, but it does happen frequently. Also, the conversational floor is usually controlled by both parties in everyday discourse.

This section, then, indicated clearly that the host on a talk show quite often behaves like a conversational partner in everyday discourse. However, he still orient to the topic and time restrictions that are enforced by the television format. This means that hosts are not in a position to ask just anything about the guests. Jonathan Ross, for example, is cautious to broach subjects that are too personal. Consider examples (39) and (40):
(39) *The Jonathan Ross Show*, interview with Miranda Hart, 22/10/11 (09:01)
(my emphasis)

JR: A-and what were you I’m not going to ask you about your politics but were you tempted to put anything special in the dish for him

MH: Haha I don’t know what to say to that

(40) *The Jonathan Ross Show*, interview with Noel Gallagher, 22/10/11 (05:01)
(my emphasis)

JR: Now euh let’s talk then about solo life in general you being now a solo performer and how it differs from you being in Oasis because short you know and I wanna talk to you about your relation with Liam if I can because it is such a weird it seems like such a weird thing from the outside

NG: It is very weird

Fragment (39) is taken from a part in the interview in which Jonathan Ross and Miranda Hart are talking about her appearance on Masterchef for comic relief in the UK. One of her challenges was to cook a dish for Prime Minister David Cameron. Fragment (39) illustrates that Jonathan Ross is not in a position here to ask Miranda Hart about her politics. Miranda Hart is in the studio to talk about her career and recent occupations but not about her politics. The threshold is less high in everyday discourse to ask your conversational partner something about his or her politics. Fragment (40) illustrates how Jonathan Ross asks for permission first before going into a rather delicate subject. Jay Leno, by contrast, does not tend to expand the conversation to topics that are too personal in the first place. In the data of his talk show, orientation to time restrictions is more frequent in the interaction, as in examples (41), (42) en (43):

(41) *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*, interview with Jason Reitman, 13/12/11 (06:42)

JL: Here we go

(Video excerpt)

XXX

JL: Now you’re doing a life show Thursday what what is that tell us about that quickly

JR: Oh I euh started this series of screenplay readings here at Lacma museum in Los Angeles
(42) *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*, interview with Dana Carvey, 13/12/11 (05:49)

DC: And then the Chinese would go yeah but you own us 1.6 trillion what are you bunching my balls for we don’t got it we spent it what are you gonna do you gotta make a move what do you got one submarine we got a lot of fire power you know what I’m saying (.) but we can do other things you want Yankees tickets you want to do Kim Kardashian we can do that

JL: Wow wow

DC: What (0.3) you have to go

JL: We’ll talk when we come back I’ll I’ll ask you about Ron Paul

(43) *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*, interview with Dana Carvey, 13/12/11(10:07)

JL: [I just be happy just be happy

DC: I don’t know if we have time for this but I did do the scariest thing that a human adult can do which is I gave driving lessons to my son

JL: Oh how did that go

In *The Tonight Show with Jay Leno*, video excerpts are usually shown either at the very beginning of the interview or at the very end. The video excerpt in (41) is situated towards the end of the interview. In other interviews (e.g. Glenn Close, Michelle Williams and Evangeline Lilly), the conversation is ended after this video excerpt by thanking the guest. However, in the interview with Jason Reitman, a question follows the video fragment. Nevertheless, Jay Leno knows that the end of the interview is near and asks Jason Reitman to give him the answer ‘quickly’. In (42) and (43), it is the guest who shows his awareness of the time restrictions that come with the broadcasting format.

The fact that the talk show is a time-limited event is also apparent in the way in which the topics are managed. The host has, unlike conversational discourse, a pre-established agenda of questions. He is the one who manages topic breaks. In the previous section, we saw how this is typically done and where the hosts differ from each other. The different ways of managing topic breaks are presented in figure 2. The guests do not initiate topic breaks. Their only way for them to change the topic is by topic drift.
In sum, the previous discussion indicates that the character of the talk show never is entirely institutional or entirely conversational. The two are in constant dialogue with each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) ‘Let me ask you’, ‘Let’s talk about’</td>
<td>a) After commercial breaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) ‘Hey’, ‘okay’, ‘so’, ‘now’ or combinations of the previous</td>
<td>b) After applause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Combination of (a) and (b)</td>
<td>c) After side exchanges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.** General structure and placement of topic breaks
Chapter 4 – Conclusion

The goal of this dissertation was twofold. On the one hand, I wanted to find out the type of host that appears on the selected talk shows. The comparison in my dissertation was initially motivated by the similarities among the hosts and among the talk shows. In my analysis, however, I focused especially on the differences in their way of interacting. The results indicated that Jonathan Ross and Jay Leno are different types of hosts. On the other hand, I was curious to know how the hosts orient to the distinct nature of talk shows in their way of interacting. To describe this, Ilie (1999) proposed the term ‘semi-institutional’, that indicates that talk shows share both features of institutional and conversational discourse.

Jonathan Ross and Jay Leno both orient to this semi-institutional character by involving features of institutional and conversational discourse in the interaction. As is typical for institutional talk, the turn-taking system of the talk shows revolves around the basic question-answer adjacency pair. Additionally, the turn design and lexical choices of questions that mark a topic break reflect that they have been prepared in advance. That is to say, these questions are longer and often formulated indirectly e.g. ‘let’s talk about’, which is less common for conversational discourse. Furthermore, the hosts orient to the time-and topic limits that come with broadcast talk. We saw that they may adjust their pace of speech to the interview and that they introduce commercial breaks and indicate the end of the conversation. In addition, we saw that they do not typically broach topics that are tricky or too personal without showing their awareness of it first. Note that the latter was especially the case for Jonathan Ross as Jay Leno is more reticent about this kind of topics.

As well as that, both hosts are also utilising features of conversational discourse. In addition to the question-answer adjacency pair, they frequently take turns that contain continuers, follow-up and assessments. Furthermore, spontaneous role-switching occurs during the interview; hosts may suddenly be the ones answering questions or telling anecdotes. The argument would be that the conversational aspects in the interaction are related to the entertainment purposes of talk shows. The hosts are trying to reduce the institutional distance to the guests by acting more like a full conversational partner, as this renders the interview more entertaining. In short, both hosts interact according to the norms on e.g. turn-taking that come with the institutional setting of their
talk show. In addition, they make efforts to convey an image of a full conversational partner by also involving features of conversational discourse.

Although both hosts orient in a fairly similar way to the semi-institutional character of talk shows, their style of interacting strongly differs. I propose the terms *dynamic host* and *cooperative host* to describe their different styles. Jonathan Ross is what I would refer to as a *dynamic host*. His main goal is to get the interview as entertaining as possible by actively participating in it himself. This is apparent from his longer turns and the type of turns he uses. Considering the fact that only half of his turns consist of question turns and continuers, it is fair to conclude that he will use assessments and comments on a regular basis. In addition, Jonathan Ross keeps the interview entertaining by posing his guests sometimes tricky or more personal questions. He also interrupts them in favour of his own witty remarks. However, we saw that the guests are aware of Ross’s style and do not always give attention to his turns (cf. Brian Cox, Emma Thompson) or refuse to provide an answer (cf. Noel Gallagher). Furthermore, Jonathan Ross is fairly audience-oriented. He involves the audience in his questions and turns to them for confirmation of his witty remarks. Ross is a host of whom the audience know they will get entertainment.

Jay Leno is then a *cooperative host*. He likes to get as much as possible out of the interview by cooperating with his guests. This is apparent from the fact that speaker change occurs frequently and that he uses relatively short turns himself. Jay Leno works with his guests to make the interview as entertaining as possible. An example is here his team performance with Dana Carvey. However, also in the other interviews, his comments help to get the most out of the story of the guest. Leno’s high use of continuers indicates that he tends to hear his guests out as much as possible. Furthermore, Jay Leno is not that audience-oriented; he never interacts with the audience during the interviews and does not intervene when one of his guests does. In fact, he never intervenes in the talk of two other parties, since he does not intervene when two of his guests talk to each other either. Jay Leno conveys an image of a sympathetic host, a man of the people; someone with whom the guests are happy to share their story.

It remains for future research to reveal the proportional distribution of the four turn-taking patterns that were proposed. Also, systematic research on interruptions and management of humour could enrich the findings of this study. In addition, further research as to how interview length exactly correlates with the pace of speech in talk shows is desirable. Finally, it should be
noted that the current results cannot be generalised to other talk shows. As mentioned earlier, an exhaustive body of CA literature on media talk does not as yet exist. Future study may then shed a light on the interactional aspects of other talk shows, both English-speaking and non-English-speaking.
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Appendix 2: Transcription conventions

The data used in this dissertation comprise transcripts of two television talk shows. The complete transcriptions can be found in the third appendix. The conventions that were used when describing the interviews are listed below. This list of conventions is taken from Hutchby (Hutchby 2006: xi-xii).

Transcription conventions

(0.5) Numbers in brackets indicate a gap timed in tenths of a second.

(.) A dot enclosed in brackets indicates a ‘micropause’ of less than one tenth of a second.

= Equals signs are used to indicate ‘latching’ or absolutely no discernible gap between utterances; or to show the continuation of a speaker’s utterance across intervening lines of transcript.\(^ {21}\)

[ ] Square brackets indicate the points where overlapping talk starts (left bracket) and ends (right bracket). Although the start of an overlap is always marked, the end is only sometimes marked.

[[ ] Double left square brackets indicate turns that start simultaneously.

(()) Double brackets are used to describe a non-verbal activity: for example ((banging sound)). They are also used to enclose the transcriber’s comments on contextual or other relevant features.

( ) Empty brackets indicate the presence of an unclear utterance or other sound on the tape

.hhh h’s preceded by a dot are used to represent audible inward breathing. The more h’s, the longer the breath.

.hhhh h’s with no preceding dot are used in the same way to represent outward breathing.

.huh heh hih Laughter is transcribed using ‘laugh tokens’ which, as far as the transcriber is able, represent the individual sounds that speakers make while laughing.

.XXX Rows of X’s are used to indicate audience applause. Upper-case X’s signify loud applause, while lower-case x’s are used to show quiet or fading applause.

\(^{21}\) Equal signs are in this transcription usually used to indicate the latter purpose.
Colons indicate the stretching of a sound or a word. The more colons the greater the extent of stretching.

A dash indicates a word suddenly cut off during an utterance.

Punctuation marks are not used grammatically, but to indicate prosodic aspects of the talk. A full stop indicates a falling tone; commas indicate fall-rise or rise-fall (i.e. a ‘continuing’ tone); question marks indicate a marked rising tone.

Upward and downward arrows are used to mark an overall rise or fall in pitch across a phrase.

Underlining of a letter before a colon indicates a small drop in pitch during a word.

Underlining a colon after a letter indicates a small rise in pitch at that point in the word.

Other underlining indicates speaker emphasis. Words may be underlines either in part or in full, depending on the enunciation.

Capitals mark a section of speech markedly louder than that surrounding it.

Arrows in the left margin point to specific parts of the transcripts discussed in the text.

Degree signs are used to indicate that the talk between them is noticeably quieter than surrounding talk.

Outward chevrons are used to indicate that the talk between them is noticeably slower than the surrounding talk.

Inner chevrons are used to indicate that the talk between them is noticeably quicker than surrounding talk.
Appendix 3 – Transcriptions talk show data
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1. *The Jonathan Ross Show*

1.1. Interview with Miranda Hart

**Date of airing:** 22 October 2011  
**Interview length:** 12:15 min  
**Comedian**

JR: Let’s bring out my first guest but before we do let’s take a look at her in action her fabulous sitcom euh it’s only been on the screen a couple of years but I think it’s already produced some classic moments like this one

(Video excerpt)

JR: Ladies and gentlemen it’s the funny the fabulous Miranda Hart

XXX ((music))

MH: Come on come on (. ) I bought you a euh come on come on now I bought you a gift cause euh lady Gagar as I call her

JR: Yes she

MH: She bought you a sheep two weeks ago

JR: [That’s right (0.3) Kevin

MH: So I thought well if it’s good enough for Gagar I bring you a guinea pig

JR: Well it’s it’s much smaller of course

MH: The thing is it’s it’s definitely not walking

JR: No

MH: Come on

JR: Come mate come mate

MH: [O can I say

JR: Well bring ‘im over here bring him over and sit down Miranda that’s very kind of you

MH: Jonathan

JR: Yes

MH: I did ask for this whole set to be a hutch

JR: Yes
MH: Like lady Gaga got her hay bale here
JR: Yes she did
MH: Where’s my giant wheel
JR: Well
MH: That’s what I asked for
JR: It’s the end of series we couldn’t stretch to it ↑Hey
MH: Hi
JR: What is the name of your euh is it a gerbil or hamster or
MH: Ha- euh guinea pig
JR: guinea pig okay
MH: It’s called Malteser
JR huhu Malteser
MH: [yeah
JR: = what a lovely little thing
MH thanks
JR: Okay hey you look fantastic, what’s going on are you in love are you pregnant or you on drugs what’s going on you you have this glow on you
MH: I’m all those things
JR: Hahaha
MH: Euh well that’s very kind of you
JR: [()
MH: I’m doing some Pilates
JR: Ooh
MH: I’m all about the corpse strength now
JR: just down in the tummy area
MH: [Yeah
JR: = the abdominals
MH: I can do you know what a plank is
JR: I have seen a plank
MH: No the Pilates manoeuvre the plank
JR: Oo is it (censored) it’s the euh (0.4) If that’s how he treats you you wanna get a new instructor for the pilates cause

MH: Malteser’s moving up

JR: [Ooh

MH: = to a dodgy area

JR: Should we give him away Malteser well we have Malteser’s euh friend in we have-

MH: [that’s for you] it’s your gift

JR: Well I’m allergic to guinea pigs

MH: Oh c’mon

JR: I am don’t laugh I am I come out in sort of euh rashes and things

MH: hhh

JR: Okay hey congrats what incredible year it has been for you I saw you at the very beginning of of this year at the Comedy awards

MH: yes

JR: = and you were the queen of comedy you were crowned the queen of comedy the people’s choice

MH: Oh look it’s me with Simon Le Bon

JR: Well that’s exciting you got to meet the duranist there

MH: hmm

JR: and euh I know you are a big fan you were telling Simon you were a big fan

MH: Well basically he gave me the award and I said I was a massive haha fan I mean I liked them but I just wasn’t a massive Duran Duran I’m a Simon Le Bon fan he’s hoooh

JR: Were you a Simon Le bon fan before though

MH: ((shakes head))

JR: Because that was very much the impression you gave to him (. ) that you’d been a lifelong fan

MH: I became a fan because he presented me with an award

JR: Okay this is now a little bit difficult

MH: Haha oh no

JR: Knowing you we’re coming on today (. ) I gave Simon a call didn’t know that you had been lying to him (0.2) apparently can we show let’s show Miranda this but this is now very awkward for me and probably for you
(Video excerpt)

XXX

JR: Well

MH: That’s brilliant

JR: W-well we’re gonna have to How am I going to break it to them cause you-you gonna

MH: You don’t need to break it to them I’m going

JR: [You can’t go to the you can’t go now you should stay here I’ll fix you up with Jedward

MH: haha (.) sure

JR: Euhm Okay huhu let me talk what are you doing now in terms of the sitcom we have the two series

MH: Yes

JR: = they’re out on DVD fabulous success you’re writing the third one now

MH: I’m gonna start writing the third one in about a month yeah towards the end of the year yes

JR: And do you kind of euh make mental notations just going through the year If something happens you presumably you think well that’s something I could either use as it is or exaggerate and build a point to make a funny sequence in in the sitcom

MH: Yeah I’ve always got a notepad in my bag (.) but I’m not often falling over as much as sitcom Miranda

JR: [Which is] probably just as well

MH: Which is lucky

JR: Do you think of you just said that sitcom Miranda so do you differentiate in your head you think sitcom Miranda – real Miranda

MH: Yeah in meetings I can now talk about this Miranda person as if it’s not me

JR: yeah

MH: = so I don’t think Miranda would do that and-

JR: Yeah and that’s not you being granted the third person

MH: No

JR: You’re talking about her as -
MH: Miranda would now like a glass of water

JR: Hahaha and I guess you know the the devices you use the way that Miranda talks to the audience and everything was that something you were immediately okay with or did you have to sort of persuade them to do it your way

MH: Well my producer said I I’ll pitch something up says the BBC and I said but that’s what I want to do a sitcom with that light entertainment filter look kinda like () Malcolm did

JR: Yeah

MH: = and euh she said well I think that’s very risky I think you should pitch a sketch of something that would be more likely to get made and I said no this is what I want to do this is never gonna happen I might as well aim for my dream and she very kindly come and said well okay I’ll risk it as well and euhm it took a bit of persuading but eventually they went with it

JR: Yeah but it’s what a what a triumph it is and how nice it is for you to overthrow all you must have indicated okay that’s what I wanted to do and I did it and people loved it

MH: Yeah

JR: We have well you have your dog Peggy with you

MH: Yes

JR: = you’re not someone who dresses up their pets are you

MH: No because those people are insane I apologize

JR: [Haha] No b- dogs like to be dressed up

MH: What do you mean dogs like to be dressed up how do you know do they speak to you

JR: Because they look happy when you do it (hahaha) and they look funny when you do it and I think they see you laughing and they think I’m making my master or mistress happy, this is what I’m here for give me a new hat please you don you don so we thought we take a liberty and show you there she is look at that

MH: Is that Michael Sheen dressing up my dog

JR: Yes yes she loves it look how happy she is

MH: MICHAEL STEP AWAY FROM MY DOG

JR: Yeah the weird thing is huhu Michael had that outfit in his bag he’s just happen to have that with ‘em

(Utterance by Michael Sheen)

JR: Yeah see he knows because this way she can be dressed up
MH: What is this sort of Pall thing
JR: She with the-
MH: Is that the costume
JR: No it’s a natural
MH: That’s not her arm
JR: Look ok let’s get this over with we should keep her in clothes on or let her run wild and free during the break we’ll be back in a couple of minutes with Miranda don’t go away

XXX
(Commercial break)
XXX

JR: Welcome back ladies and gentlemen Miranda Hart is still with me ladies and gentlemen, the fabulous Miranda Hart XXX hoping your dog doesn’t run away with Michael Sheen
MH: Yeah
JR: (to the audience) Euhm did you see Miranda Hart taking part in the masterchef thing for comic relief last year
Aud: Yeah
JR: euh this was er it was you Claudia Winkleman
MH: [Winkleman and Ruby
JR: [and euh Ruby Vax
MH: [Vax]
JR: = euhm cooking for David Cameron
MH: Yes
JR: Okay so that’s a kind of unusual position to find yourself in
MH: Very unusual
JR: Did you know it was going to be for number ten for for the prime minister when you w-went in
MH: Yeah we did know euh because we walked into number ten so we kinda
JR: [No I know that but when they asked you did they say it would be for
MH: [had a little euh a little
XXX
JR: you know what I mean
MH: I do know
JR: Did they say you’re going to be cooking for the prime minister
MH: Yeah they did they did said you know this is the scenario
JR: Yeah
MH: = and these are three women who have never cooked
JR: Yeah
MH: = and that’s no word of a lie but and then what we didn’t know was that when we were preparing for our meals not knowing what we were doing I mean really I was making meringues for the first time I was separating eggs for the first time
JR: For the first time on camera
MH: On camera
JR: In number tens kitchen
MH: Yeah we didn’t know that David Cameron was going to come in whilst we were preparing and Ruby got so terrified the crab sort of went everywhere and she knocked it with and nearly hit him
JR: A-and what were you I I’m not going to ask you about your politics but were you tempted to put anything special in the dish for him
MH: Haha I don’t know what to say to that
JR: Hahaha
MH: I I made a coalition pudding
JR: Oh really
MH: =of a trifle and an eaten mess
JR: Yes
MH: =called a trifle mess but we weren’t allowed to call it that
JR: You weren’t allowed to call it but presumably one half of it would have crumbled immediately anyway wouldn’t it
MH: Satire
JR: Take that news nights
MH: Yeah
JR: Euh but it was obviously euh you did it for comic relief it must have been quite exciting as well to be -
MH: It was exciting but also terrifying I realized when he first met me I thought he doesn’t have a clue who I am he didn’t know
JR: [He didn’t know you he didn’t know you}
MH: He didn’t know who I was and I got more and more nervous cause when you have to actually bring your dish into this formal setting in number ten

JR: Yeah

MH: =for the prime minister eum I got so nervous that I sort of turned and there were cameras turned into the sort of sitcom character got more and more extreme and he actually thought I was insane and then I I sort of put the trifle down and said now you need balls and I was getting more and more nervous and more and more extreme so I said so I’ll be back (.) in a joyful

JR: Haha

MH: Isn’t this a terrible joke

JR: And did he

MH: () like this to him (.) and now if he’d seen the sitcom then maybe I could get away with it but if he hadn’t seen the sitcom and he literally I saw him look to the producer and go

JR: But you have been in number ten

MH: [really embarrassing

JR: I have never been to number ten it must be quite euh is it is it lovely place or does it feel like a family home does it feel very low fairly low key when you’re inside

MH: No it’s tardous-like it’s huge inside

(To Noel: Noel you’ve been to number ten why were you there + a few other turns to Noel) (Someone in the public cheering)

JR: No no one bloke does

MH: One man

JR: Nick Clegg what are you doing here XXX

JR: Euh Okay XXX

JR: Eum Miranda is euh Miranda TV Miranda

MH: Yeah

JR: =is known for her clumsiness for her kind of being gosh for being a bit awkward and falling over so there is a lot of falling over you said in real life you don’t so much but there is a lot of falling over that goes on does it hurt or did you study do you kind of rehearse those those falls or do you wait when you have to do it you just go for it

MH: Euh a bit of both I do rehearse I do work out quite technically how I’m gonna fall and what I can do quick one you know take longer to fall what’s gonna be the funniest

JR: [You got a whole whole repertoire of falling over
MH: Well I don’t know you just you ultimately you just have to go for it and let your body be loosen I mean I’m quite sort of long and elasticky so I just use that.

JR: You use that we have we set up I believe when you normally fall over there is a crash mat for you there wouldn’t there.

MH: yeah sometimes 0 look

JR: okay well we have set up come with me here cause we have set up in the band area what we have will be a small Miranda moment you gonna follow me okay ((continues))
1.2. Interview with Michael Sheen

Date of airing: 22 October 2011
Interview length: 7:28 min
Actor - Director

JR: Euhm okay let’s get my next guest out it is of course the unfeasibly talented mister Michael Sheen

XXX

((music))

JR: "Michael well that’s a whole suit I thought that was jeans it’s a I thought you would be doing the denim but it’s kind of a suit you’re looking good" Michael Sheen good to have you here you’re back at you live in LA quite a lot of the time you live abroad is that right

MS: I do I live euh in Los Angeles

JR: So you’re back in the UK for a while now did you catch the rugby being a Welshman did you see the rugby going on

MS: I did I caught the first twenty minutes until Warburton got sent off

JR: And did you then would you have to go for work or you just couldn’t watch it anymore

MS: Then I had to go and rehearse

JR: Okay

MS: = but I couldn’t watch it anymore

JR: And the result did you feel the result was a fair one euh or was it euh

MS: Wales lost how can it be a fear one no of course not

JR: [Hehe yeah Port Talbot that is that where you’re from Port Talbot

MS: Euh yeah port Talbot is my town

JR: [Okay]

JR: And I saw pictures of you about the recently you set up like the most incredible experience the the passion play

MS: Euh yeah

JR: That you lead you took part in that you were you were creative director of as well
MS: Yeah I worked on it for two years and euh-

JR: So what have you done () I’m not that familiar what is a passion play they have it in Germany

MS: Well when I grew up in port Talbot there was a passion play done in Margam park which is a park nearby and it’s basically the story of the Easter story and so I grew up watching this passion play being done in the park and the National Theatre Wales asked me If I wanted to do something in my hometown so I thought I try and do a sort of modern version of the story of the passion but not about Jesus or or but based on that story it’s a story about the town about the people of the town and and nowadays

JR: So kind of the elements of the story of Christ and his resurrection but transposed

MS: yeah

JR: = to modern day world

MS Yeah those so you know vaguely what the story was but actually it was more a story about a town and what it lost and what matters to it and about community really and so it we ended up with it was continuous non-stop for three days (.) and euh and it took place all over the town and two thousand people from the town were involved in it in one way or another and euh and we started off on the Friday morning at dawn at the beach and there were about two hundred people watching what I was doing there-

JR: So a fairly big crowd but not huge

MS: Yeah not huge

JR: [massive]

MS: = but it ended Sunday night with 12 000 people standing around the roundabout watching me being crucified

JR: Wow must have been incredible must have been incredible

MS: [It was it was amazing

JR: But you went back there a short while ago you filmed this thing coming home didn’t you you were back in the town of your family

MS: Oh yeah yeah yeah

JR: = [for the BBC] What did you find there anything cause I guess the whole point of these shows is we hope we can find out something unexpected is it

MS: Yeah

JR: any real surprises in your

MS: Well the pressure you feel is that they kinda want well whether it is this or not I felt like what they want you to do is to cry
JR: Yeah

MS: They wanna go look Michael here’s something about your family from fifty years ago bluuah

JR: Yeah yeah

MS: and euh so you feel this kind of pressure and they took me to the place that used to be the workhouse and all that but I I basically found out that there’s euh a huge amount of bigamy and euh incest in my family

JR: Wow

MS: which is not really what you’re expecting

JR: What a what a lovely surprise for you

MS: Yes

JR: = that must have been

MS: so I came home to my mom and dad and they were like o so what did you find out about us

JR: haha

MS: So I found out my cousin Caroline is not only my first cousin but she’s my fifth cousin as well

JR: Hahaha we will find out some more of that kind of thing after the break don’t go away

XXX

(Commercial break)

XXX

JR: Welcome back to the show mister Michael Sheen is here and of course to stay for sure with us we got Noel Gallagher coming up chatting and performing (. ) Euh never mind all the life stuff it’s good to see you back on screen and you seem to have broken an unlucky streak for Woody Allan because the new movie Midnight in Paris which I saw at Cannes at the Cannes Festival fabulous stuff really good to see him back in form

MS: Uh huh

JR: = great for you to work with Woody Allan was that an exciting thing

MS: Amazing yeah I mean incredible that he you know someone who I’ve grown up with watching his films you know Manhattan Annie Hall those amazing films euh and to to get to work with him in Paris beautiful city the w you know the weird thing is that you don’t get the whole script so as an actor that’s a bit strange

JR: Why does he not let you see it all

MS: Well I I I think that it might be partly because euhm he likes the actors not to know anything more than their characters would know
JR: Which is fair enough you can justify that

MS: Yeah yeah but I did find out after we’d finished filming that me and another character in the film had had an affair (.) but because it wasn’t in any of the scenes I was in where anyone mentioned it I didn’t know about it

JR: So so you missed out on all the fun

MS: So I missed out on all the fun yeah

JR: Yeah yeah (.) euh can you tell that you presumably about some scripts you know they will be good like when you did euh when you did the queen you must have known that that was going to be a movie people would like

MS: Well I I you know I wish I could say that’s the case but euh no on the whole I I read the script and if I like reading it then I think well chances are that people like to watch it but as you know so much happens in the process that you can never tell so like with something like Frost Nixon when I did Frost Nixon I did the play of it first when I first read the play I thought no one’s gonna be interested in this

JR: Yeah

MS: And it went on to become one of the most successful plays and you know euh and went on to be a film that was nominated for an academy award so there’s no telling really

JR: Do you dust off the Frost voice do you still do it occasionally just to amuse people

MS: Well I do my version like I say if I work on for a long time then I can get somewhere close but you know I’ve got my like lazy version so I just go in this sort of David Frost

JR: Hahaha

MS: So it’s not very good as those days but I enjoy doing it

JR: That was Churchill () ((imitates))

MS: ((imitates gesture))

JR: Euh so the exciting news if you’re fan of theatre if you’re fan of Michael Sheen if you’re a fan of euh Shakespeare Michael Sheen is about to play Hamlet ((to Michael:)) Incredible part to to play of course some people have their own definite interpretation of him

MS: Well

JR: =do you can you is there a short hand of how you would describe of how you gonna play him or is it just really ()

MS: Completely (censored) mental

JR: Okay the best way as Shakespeare intended

MS: Well I think it’s a play about euh about many things but one of the things is about is about madness and the mind and what is madness and
what’s not and dream and fantasy and all those sort of things so a lot of that will come out in this production

JR: Which theatres when -

MS: It’s at the young vic theatre

JR: The young vic theatre

MS: Yeah

JR: starts on next Friday I believe

MS: It starts next Friday to the end of January we are sold out but you can get day if you come down to the box office on the day euh you can get day seats for like ten pounds

JR: Do you know what dressing room you’re in back there cause I know that headed quite well 1A is really nice but 2B is great and -

MS: Not 2B

JR: well 2B or not to be is euh (to audience: don’t grown) is euh is that the challenge or one of the challenges is is doing that-

MS: [well that’s the scary thing you like you read the play and you go whoo there’s a lot of famous lines in this isn’t it

JR: Yeah yeah

MS: Euhm and euh you sort of worry about people kind of saying the words with you I the first time I say the speech that begins with to be or not to be on stage you know you hear about other actors who played Hamlet saying and as I said it I could hear (. ) 500 people going to be or not to be that’s the question

JR: Hahaha euh

(Jonathan Ross exchanges some turns with Miranda Hart and Noel Gallagher)

JR: Alright Michael I loved having you on the show thank you so much you are you are a terrific actor but also what a what a splendid man to spend some time with mister Michael Sheen ladies and gentlemen

XXX
1.3. Interview with Noel Gallagher

Date of airing: 22 October 2011
Interview length: 14:17 min
Musician

JR: Euhm My next guest is quite simply a world class musician before he comes out let’s remind ourselves this is him in action check this out

(Video excerpt)
XXX

JR: Noel Gallagher back in the Oasis days he’s going solo now Mister Noel Gallagher
XXX

((music))

JR: “Noel Gallagher Noel good to have you here”
NG: “Thank you very much”

JR: Noel Noel Noel

JR: Great to see you Noel thank you for coming on
NG: Thank you very much

JR: Euh man you’ve written some great songs
NG: Indeed

JR: Euh but before we talk about what you’re doing now and all that I read this in the papers this week and I wanna check if it’s true Simon Cowell phoned you up offered you the job

NG: yeah

JR: =euh as to be one of the X-factor judges in this kind of series
NG: Yes he did to replace him yeah

JR: What are we what a I imagine an unexpected phone call to receive
NG: Yeah well d- we cause he’s so much so do with Sony records and I’ve got friends there and somebody phoned me and said Simon Cowell is after your number shall I give it to him and I said okay well whatever and euh and euh
JR: Did you think what he might have wanted it for? What do you think he wanted it for?

NG: Euh I thought initially he might have wanted a song.

JR: Yeah.

NG: =Song description which is what I do you know.

JR: Yeah.

NG: =and I was like you know alright.

JR: Okay.

((laughter))

NG: And euh and then I thought euhm he might want us to sit in on you know like they do those where they have a guest in for one show like in Manchester so much.

JR: Ow yeah and they’re gonna cover the music that you wrote maybe.

NG: I thought I do that I just put those fat people through or something like that.

((laughter))

JR: That’s good of you that’s good of you.

NG: Turns out he calls anyway and says oh Noel we’re rebranding the show next year and euh you know we need an alpha male and I was like okay and euh he said we need someone to replace me and your name has come up in the you know in the meetings and I was no you don’t really want me there and he was very very insistent for a good twenty minutes but I was I was eating our meal with my four year old son Donovan euh and he was kinda watching something on the telly and he was following me around the kitchen going can I speak to Simon.

JR: Hahaha.

NG: =and I was kinda on the phone going play with your pirates let’s go and he was going and in the end he was crying going I wanna speak to Simon.

JR: Hahaha.

NG: =and Simon Cowell’s going have I called you in a bad moment.

JR: Hahaha you make Simon Cowell a lot posher than he actually is.

NG: But he is posh but then when I told him obviously I couldn’t do it and I didn’t want to do it and and

JR: [Were you tempted though were you tempted for a little]

NG: No no I they don’t want me on that show I’m I’m useless at that.

JR: You like the show though don’t you.
NG: Yeah yeah well it’s the one shared experience of me and my imaginary
eleven year old daughter who was sitting here we are having a side diner
I don’t mind it people take it too seriously about its effect on music I
think

JR: ((nods))

NG: But euh my eleven year old she freaked out when I told her I wasn’t
going to do it she was like cause she told all her mates at school you
know

JR: Oooh

NG: =And euh she was just like well you’re gonna do it and I was like aa no
so when I came blue out she was went BUT IT’S THE X-FACTOR

JR: Hahaha presumably I mean she she

NG: [And I said I know but Louis Walsh

JR: Hahaha

NG: You know

XXX

JR: Even an eleven year old has no argument to that euh for her (.).
g- does
she like your music or does she prefer the music she hears

NG: It’s kind of a rule in my house

JR: Haha

NG: You got to at least faint some kind of interest in it

JR: Yeah

NG: =my my my my yeah she kind of (.).
yeah she don’t like it she doesn’t
like it

JR: She’ll like it when she gets a bit older

NG Euh she’s more into pop I wouldn’t really expect her to

JR: Yeah

NG: = be into kind of my stuff but she does like I say it’s kind of a rule

JR: Yeah

NG: =have you listened to the new album have you listened to it

JR: yeah yeah

NG: =what do you think you know

JR: Euh hey euh okay new album out Noel Gallagher first solo album euh so
sort of a surprise as your first solo I know you’ve always had a band
but a lot of the time people are in bands and they still do a solo
project on the side anyway
NG: Yeah

JR: and carry on in the band but you waited until the band was over and you here it is now Noel Gallagher’s high flying birds euh I’ve been listening to it a lot XXX people don’t buy the physical things so much anymore they just download it don’t they

NG: Well they can whether they buy it or download it it doesn’t really matter it’s still bloody good

JR: [Now euh] so euh let’s talk then about solo life in general you being now a solo performer and how it differs from you being in oasis because short you know and I wanna talk to you about your relation with Liam if I can because it is such a weird it seems like such a weird thing from the outside

NG: It is very weird

JR: Yeah cause I’ve met Liam and he seems perfectly nice

NG: I’ve met him too

JR: And I’ve met you and you seem perfectly nice

NG: I am brilliant

JR: And you both seem fairly reasonable but obviously -

NG: We are we are and the sad thing is we are both reasonable guys and he’s really funny (.).

JR: [So what happens when you get together and why is there not some kind of euh euh common sense voice inside either of you that says okay that’s kinda kinda pushed his buttons to the wrong way pull back a little bit now because there must be something where you both and I don’t think it’s just him and I don’t think it’s just you clearly you can’t just be -

NG: Who is it then (.). if it’s not me and it’s not him

JR: haha it’s that bone-head bloke

JR: No you know what I mean though there is a kind of a it’s something that happens it’s something that happens when you’re together

NG: Yeah it’s you know back in the days it was a little bit different and I don’t I don’t I don’t know I don’t know why we don’t get on we just don’t get on and let’s be thankful for that

JR: But there’s obviously a regret because in the interviews I have read with you since then you obviously miss maybe not him as you know like a kind of participant in you musical ventures but at the same time like the idea of Oasis and you like the idea of the legacy of Oasis

NG: Yeah I love being in a band you know there’s no greater feeling in the world than walking on a sta on a stage with your kind of with your mates and you know I was in ((coughs)) you know we used to get out at the back
of cars at Wembley stadium and there would be like a hundred articulated lorries all there for you and I was coming out of rehearsals the other night from my () and how many trucks were there

JR: I don’t know

NG: One

JR: Hahaha

NG: One pathetic little truck about this big

JR: [So you so you so you miss the scale

NG: I miss the scale of it and I miss the camaraderie of it but you know we were out for eighteen years

JR: yeah

NG: and we from to flags on the council estate with a bad acoustic guitar and we went we took it around the world we went everywhere

JR: One of the biggest bands in the world yeah

NG: Yeah and it can’t things just don’t last forever it’s just

JR: No

NG: =as simple as that and it the way that it ended is horrible

JR: This is what I found strange because you only had like four five gigs or something left in that in that tour

NG: I think it was three

JR: Three gigs left so if you could have just got through those three gigs

NG: Yeah

JR: = it would have been a quite clean break

NG: Yeah (1.5) but he he he threw fruit at me (0.2) and I’m sorry but once

JR: Well there’s no coming back from that

NG: Once the fruit basket is been tampered with

JR: Yeah

NG: =I’m out of here (.) the end

JR: I have read you speaking about euh what’s the story morning glory and saying it’s a shame because it would have been great in 2015 the anniversary of that album coming out it would have been great to maybe maybe go out and play that whole album for yourself and for the fans euh and now I I hear that Liam has come out he’s read those comments and said you know what I wouldn’t be averse to that

NG: Yeah (0.5) see I don’t believe he said that
JR: He said it it’s-
NG: No no no I know him better than you do(.) he said it just so you could bring it up tonight on this show on national television
JR: Well which I have-
NG: He’s a very very very very clever man
JR: Maybe you didn’t say that to him often enough
NG: (0.5) No that’s true no no no no no ()
JR: He tweeted as well he’s on Twitter isn’t he
NG: Aren’t you all XXX
JR: Are you euh (. ) are you not tempted to join the twittoaty
NG: No nobody needs to know what colour of socks I’m wearing
JR: Okay
NG: = black by the way but nobody needs to know what colour socks that I’m wearing I don’t need to be on Facebook I’ve got six friends trying to get rid of one those
JR: Hahaha
NG: I can count them all
JR: Okay
NG: on one hand and that all that’s need to be done then
JR: So(.) so if Liam isn’t just saying it for a fact are you going to do it are you going to say okay let’s put this let’s have no food backstage nothing that can trigger into him and let’s do what’s the story morning glory cause I have never seen you do that live the whole album I’d love to see that
NG: I fear that you are not going to let me go without me saying yes are you
JR: Well what’s the answer though is it what’s the answer morning story morning glory
NG: It would be it would be nice but we spl but we’re not together anymore
JR: [But hold it but
NG: [we’re not together anymore
JR: [but you say yeah
JR: no I know you are not right now but listen
NG: well you don’t go along with your ex-wife do ya
JR: *no*
NG: well
JR: But but you didn’t record loads of great albums with your ex-wife so he said he will you said you want to
NG: Right
JR: can we expect it
NG: I’m not under hold here I don’t have to answer this question
JR: You do have to answer it but you don’t have to necessarily stick to it in three years time
NG: [I will I will] stray about this all night I can stay here all night
JR: Just a simple yes or no will put us all out of misery and I can go out and do a wee so (0.1) and I’m telling ya your right in the line of fire so it’s in your best interest to settle this once and for all XXX it would be great wouldn’t it
NG: It would be it would be great yes
JR: Well then just say yes
NG: Jonathan “Jonathan”
JR: Yes Noel I’m here for you
NG: Okay I’ll tell you what I’ll do it on the day that you go work for the BBC again
XXXX
JR: Well well hold on (to audience:) before you get carried away I’m actually doing a film show for them in about three weeks time so
NG [no no no no no
JR: [we’ll take a break more on that news when we come back
NG: [no no no haha
XXX
(Commercial break)
XXX
JR: Okay so
XXX
welcome back (0.2) if you missed it oasis is back together in three weeks time haha euh alright so euh recently you met that () if we’re talking about the past and moving on from him you met up with Damon Albarn
NG: I did yeah yeah oh yeah
JR: = of Blur

NG: yeah

JR: =and in the old days the press kinda stirred up a bit you guys kinda seemed to encourage it seemed to enjoy it there was the great Oasis Blur rivalry and you both had digs at each other and said things you you were quoted more often than

NG: [Yeah me yeah mainly me] I have to admit I yeah (.) I did more digging than anybody else yeah

JR: Yeah and do you and do you enjoy that do you like that kind of conflict

NG: I was high as a kite to be honest

JR: Okay so to summon up you should say something crazy

NG: I don’t know what was going on about half of the time

JR: Yeah hahaha

NG: = it was good though

JR: huhu but you did you like the whole Blur versus Oasis thing going on

NG: Euh At the time it was quite exciting and euh I kinda have backed literally bumped into him in a in a club the other night I haven’t seen him or spoke to him for fifteen years and euh we kinda walked round the corner there and bang there he was and it was kinda and I was just saying () great wasn’t music exciting at that at that time you know what I mean with the-

JR: Hold on the first time when you saw each other was there a moment when you were like o god what am I to say

NG: No because I kind of wanted to wanted to say look about all that kind of thing ((gesture)) you know what I mean and euh we had a good we had a good old chat we had a beer together and it was actually it was a it was a relief I’ve gotta say

JR: And looking back now I mean did you like Blur you just didn’t want to admit it at the time

NG: Well you know like I said like I said to him (0.5) you can go around the world and euhm you know say that you respect an artist a thousand times a day in a hundred different magazines and it won’t get printed call somebody a (censored word) once

JR: Euh would you you know what because I loved both bands and the music was it was an exciting time I would love to see you guys collaborating on something would that happen could that happen

NG: well me and Damon

JR: Yeah

NG: I’m (0.5) you know single and ready to mingle (0.6) musically speaking of course
Euh hey great to have you here (to the audience:) we’re gonna have some music now ladies and gentlemen I’m very excited euhm XXX it’s from Noel’s first and current solo album high flying birds (to Noel:) why is the band called high flying birds just out of interest just euh

Euh I was at home doing the washing up euh and euh Peter Green’s Fleetwood Mac man of the world was on the radio and euh I thought what if I just call it Noel Gallagher’s something and then (0.1) there is a track on the Jefferson aeroplane album called high flying bird and I like a genius put the two together (.) bingo

"That’s a genius" hahaha

Euh you’ve done a few warm-up gigs already you –

No this is our first ever life performance we’ve done in XXX we’ve done one in a little country called France which doesn’t but euh ostensively this is our first ever British life performance

Wow

It’s called aka what a life he’s going to perform life for you now but ladies and gentlemen will you join me and say thank you to the famous mister Noel Gallagher
1.4. Interview with John Bishop

Date of airing: 7 January 2012
Interview length: 11:07 min
Stand-up comedian

JR: Okay let’s get our first guest out ladies and gentlemen he is the hardest working man in Liverpool and that’s not a () joke he does work very hard the magnificent John Bishop

XXX

((music))

JR: () °you brought your supporters here°

JR: Yeah I did I honestly if I see a red football shirt I would think-

JB: oh yeah yeah of course

JR: [it looks the same to me a Liverpool shirt and a Manchester united shirt

JB: yeah

JR: = looks more or less the same and I don’t understand why you get so upset about that kind of nonsense

JB: Because I’m childish

JR: Yeah well what -

JB: Because it is I’ll tell you what it is with football and if you d if you don’t follow football it is ridiculous because you start believing it’s more important than what it is

JR: but you cause you’re passionate about it aren’t you

JB: Yeah well kind of kind of yeah (0.2) you because I keep on trying I’m chatting there with one of the cleverest men in Britain and you think rationally it’s stupid to invest so much of your time watching millionaires run around kick a ball and do the things that you wish you could do it’s like it’s like a sporting version of porn really cause you’re watching it and thinking I could do that I’m sure it’ll be better than him

JR: Hahaha

JB: =but underneath you know you wouldn’t be
JR: Euh but he’s euh from Manchester and I guess euh

(Jonathan Ross exchanges some turns with Brian Cox)

JR: Wow it’s just not this one is it right

JB: [ yeah unfortunately Brian ]I’m not living in it so if you can get
me that card back to the future and find me somewhere to park let me get
back there and watch ‘m

JR: Haha okay euh how was Christmas for you you were away with the family I
guess did you have a good Christmas day any

JB: [yeah yeah it was good

JR: [any family traditions you have

JB: euh well not really well you keep on thinking you’ve got a family
tradition and then it changes cause the kids grow up we’ve got one we
maintained which is to try and not have an argument before two o’clock
and euh

JR: 0-on Christmas day itself

JB: Yeah Christmas day not have a fight before two o’clock but you can feel
at half one the tension building cause everyone’s thinking I could punch
someone

JR: Yeah hahaha

JB: =so we’ve kept that going but now you know what it’s like we were
talking before you got teenage kids

JR: Yeah

JB: = Christmas isn’t the same I mean I I come downstairs and there’s just
there’s just people in the house I’ve never seen before

JR: Hahaha

JB: =they just seem to stay for days

JR: yeah yeah

JB: =eat stuff and then piss off ()

JR: yeah yeah

JB: =and none of them none of them ever sit there and when you walk in the
living room they never say hiya or how are you or thanks for having us
they just sit there watching your telly

JR: Yeah

JB: Huh huh and that’s I mean they don’t all do that some of them are girls

JR: Yeah

JR: (to Lana Del Rey: Lana if you didn’t shake hands with John this () I’d
I’d leave it for a couple of hours)
JB: Haha I’ve gotta be honest that green room there was so funny cause me and Brian sat there trying our best not to be pervs it was

JR: Haha Brian’s gone off to sort himself out ()

JB: Haha somewhere in the universe Brian is having a brilliant night

JR: Hahaha we’ll find out we’ll find out ()

[XXX

JR: Euh so but you are you’re a vegetarian aren’t you

JB: I am a vegetarian

JR: You’re a vegetarian so euh wow that’s a lot of love for the vegetarians tonight euh

JB: [Yeah yeah it is] well that’s a couple of horses who’ve come in

JR: Haha you euh so what do you do on Christmas day cause a-are your boys vegetarians

JB: No no no we euh because I’ve been vegetarian now for twenty six years

JR: So what turned you what made you decide not to eat meat -

JB: I was euh I was working in a hamburger shop

JR: Is this gonna be upsetting for the rest of us

JB: No no no it’s not it’s not I was working in a hamburger shop in Guernsey called Chicken George so

JR: You’ve really got around a bit

JB: Oh I was living the life

JR: Working in Chicken George

JB: No no no I wasn’t working there Jonathan I was running it I was chicken George I was the manager

JR: Hahaha

JB: = which meant that was that was there in Guernsey at that time you phoned up the farm on Monday and collected the meat on Wednesday and I basically walked into the wrong room at the wrong time on the wrong day

JR: So so you saw the pile of the food chain that most of us try to avoid

JB: [Yeah I saw yeah] I saw the bit where where I saw the bit just after a cow had been killed

JR: Yeah yeah

JB: =but it still had enough life in its eyes to look at me and go this was your fault
JR: Oh (0.1) did it know you were Chicken George do you think

JB: I had the T-shirt on

JR: Hahaha

JB: It wasn’t you I came for the chicken

JR: Hahaha so what do you eat Christmas day what do you have

JB: [So so basically what I’m having on Christmas day was a () and they’ve done a great a great spread and and and I had a sort of filo pastry with

JR: Wow

JB: =with cheese and spinages

JR: That sounds nice

JB: Yes yes

JR: that sounds like you that sounds like you had the better deal

JB: [Yeah you know we don’t go out eating grass you know

JR: Well I know you look healthy too I just wonder whether you had whether you got a kind of tofu base that looked like a turkey like a tofurkey

JB: [o yeah yeah so we got a lot of tofu and model it to look like a turkey

JR: [no well] you can buy a tofurkey

JB: A t- hahaha

JR: you can there’s such a thing like a tofurkey

JB: No way

JR: There is my daughter loves a tofurkey

JB: [a tofurkey

JR: [and don’t make a joke about that

JB: I’m not saying anything on your daughter a tofurkey there is honestly a tofurkey

JR: There is a tofurkey she ate she ate a lot of tofurkey and I tried a little bit of tofurkey and I tell you that was really one of the best tofurkeys I ever tried

JB: O yeah I’ve gotta be honest I wasn’t expecting a conversation about a tofurkey tonight

JR: And I’ll be honest with you
JB: the tofurkey market after this show will go through the roof

JR: I’ll tell you what you never mind being chicken George you wanna be tofu Tommy

JB: haha

JR: you wanna () hey euh congratulations on your Saturday show (to audience :) are you watching John Bishop on BBC on Saturday nights ladies and gentlemen

JB: yeah yeah

JR: It’s doing great i-i-it’s doing -

JB: It went well it it went very good it was good

JR: And the tours are doing great as well you’re doing a bigger one this year is that right

JB: Yeah I mean what happened is I did the tour last year the sun shined so I finished it and I was and I wanted to take time off but then it’s just stand up is just what I do

JR: I didn’t see euh the new tour I’ve got the DVD okay

JB: Yeah

JR: and so much with the end is that dance you do you do a choreographed dance routine and you you I—I didn’t think you were the type who would wanna end the show on a dance so I love the idea but w—what’s -

JB: Choreographs a stretch euh I had an argument with my sons about Saturday night fever (. Saturday night fever being the brilliant film that it was and and for our generation fantastic film you see John Travolta moving so I had this big argument with them and that’s part of the show euh when you do shows in arenas you wanna finish off on something good so

JR: Yeah a a big show stop right there

JB: Yeah so so I thought we’ll finish it with me doing Saturday night fever wh what was brilliant about it is that when we were doing the arenas I got twenty dancers in it

JR: ((nods))

JB: =and one of my sons the fifteen year old he was one of the dancers

JR: So cause he dances then he is a -

JB: He does dance and it it’s been brilliant really cause I’ve got three boys and the other two play football and so as a dad I’ve always been engaged with them

JR: ((nods))
JB: but because he dances I’ve never had that same connection with ’m and and which is difficult cause you can’t I mean as a dad you can’t go watch your son dance and go GET YOUR LEG UP

JR: Hahaha

JB: PIROUETTE PIROUETTE

JR: Haha

JB: You can with football so you never you never have that engagement with him so when I’ve got this opportunity to to see if he wants to do it so he did it and so he danced with the professional dancers in front of euh you know 10 10 000 people

JR: Wow wow

JB: =and he was brilliant

JR: And how was your dancing on stage it is

JB: = terrible

JR: Yeah okay (. ) you are I think a a fit looking guy for your age y you keep yourself in pretty good shape

JB: I I’m doing a bit yeah I’m doing a bit

JR: Okay (. ) cause you’re training for s’thing I know you can’t give too many details away but you’re training for something pretty big this year

JB: Yeah and I’m doing a I’m doing a challenge for sports relief which euh (0.5) hhh

JR: It’s a big thing innit

JB: It is and and obviously w w w we’re not saying anything until it it’s officially launched because it gives us a little bit longer to see if I can actually do it (. ) euh but it’s a challenge and it came about because euh James Corden actually phoned me up for six months ago and said do you wanna do something for sports relief next year (. ) so I said yeah yeah yeah let’s have a chat with them we had a chat with them we came up with a challenge the challenge was looked great looks like a bit of an adventure and then unfortunately well unfortunately James’ play is really taking off

JR: Yeah yeah cause

JB: [So he’s not going to be around

JR: cause he’s gone to New York in the prime week

JB: Yes he’s gonna be over in Broadway so I said to sports relief well that’s obviously we’re not gonna do it and so they said well unfortunately we’ve got a commission from BBC one we’ve got a sponsor euh we’re gonna put the money towards these vaccines five pound vaccines which euh save children’s lives euh we’re hoping that we might raise somewhere close a million pounds which will be about 250 000 kids’ lives saved so euh (. ) but you don’t have to do it if you don’t want to
JR: Hahaha

JB: And it’s just like it’s just like saying

JR: Yeah yeah

JB: =you know how big a twit do you want to be

JR: yeah yeah

JB: So I said alright I’ll do it so at the moment we’re moving towards and hopefully we’ll make it

JR: But you’ve done a lot of euh on league of their own euh

JB: yeah

JR: =you do they every week they they make you do some kind of challenge

JB: [yeah yeah] [yeah]

JR: =and there’s we’ve got a picture of you here and you see you’ve done some pretty good shape this is you swimming you do the diving shape although you can see

JB: [Haha yeah yeah let’s have a look at that picture

JR: Which of those three may be sucking his gut in the moment

JB: [hahaha that was so

JR: [you can see hahaha

JB: = unfair that picture cause I’ll tell you what they said do you wanna come and do this ten metre dive at tom daily and Jamie Redknapp was just like saying do you wanna show the world how fat you really are

JR: But you’ve got see you have a line you have a tan line there what’s

JB: Haha yeah so what happened what happened that was with Jamie the day before and he the day before Jamie Redknapp had a BUSH of hair all over him and I and I I I said there’s not a chance he said he said it might be there tomorrow it might not so but I was staying at a hotel and the hotel had this spa so I went in and said listen love I never had a spray tan I said look I said I look white as a sheet and I’m going to be standing there next to Jamie Redknapp do your best so when you get one of these spray tans blown they put you in these Bermuda shorts so I stood there in these Bermuda shorts so they gave me that ()don’t I I look like a button bear cake ()

JR: Hey good luck with the tour the tour is not until September though is it

JB: No not till September so I’m starting ()

JR: [()
JB: [all the little clubs pulling there which is brilliant]

JR: And euh best of luck with with sports relief cause that’s a it’s a

JB: Well thank you

JR: = lovely thing you’re doing it’s a real challenge and I know they do just like they did with David Wallin they take you right outside your comfort zone

JB: Yeah yeah

JR: and I know it’s it’s a a big thing to commit to so well done for saying yes and the best of luck with it mister John Bishop ladies and gentlemen

((Shake hands))

XXX
1.5. Interview with Brian Cox

Date of airing: 7 January 2012
Interview length: 08:30 min
Physics Professor, television figure

JR: Welcome back ladies and gentlemen let’s get my next guest out he’s made all of this marvel and beauty of the cosmos in his brilliant TV-series Wonders of the universe It is the enthralling professor Brian Cox ladies and gentlemen

XXX

((music))

JR: °Professor how nice to meet a professor again°

JR: That’s cause so you can insist people calling you professor I guess couldn’t you

BC: If I were that way inclined

JR: Yeah

BC: = it would be ridiculous though wouldn’t it

JR: Yeah yeah it would be quite ridiculous I guess euh so congratulations you’re professor Brian Cox OBE22

BC: Yes

JR: Wow

BC: Yeah last year

JR: That’s a wonderful thing

XXX

BC: Thank you

JR: Euh so here’s the thing euh it’s 2012 okay and some people are concerned because there is this thing going around about this Mayan calendar and their calendar ends in 2012 I don’t know if it ends on a particular month or date and some people are saying that means that’s the end that is when it’s going to end do you is there’s anything in that at all there’s anything in physics that would bear that up

22 Order of the British Empire
BC: It’s catastrophic drivel of the worst possible kind

JR: So so why did they stop in 2012 why did they stop do you know why why is that for

BC: They they had a complex calendars these interlocking cycles and they were very good at maths and so their calendars would last for 10 000 20 000 years and they started one on some arbitrary day in the past and it rolls over on December 31st 2012 some some people believe it

JR: Yeah

BC: And I actually get quite a lot of e-mails from teachers saying can you just tell my class that you know they’ve stopped working they think

JR: Haha you know what I don’t need this there’s not going to be any work after December anyway

BC: It’s the worst kind of pseudo scientific shit and that’s the last thing I’m gonna say about it

JR: euh you know you mentioned you said the Mayans were great at maths but you you weren’t great at maths were you you failed your maths you were a maths failure didn’t you

BC: No not a failure I’ve got a D which is -

JR: [that’s a fail a D means you didn’t pass]

BC: I mean the thing was when I was 18 I already joined a rock band and I was just kind of crawling into my A-levels and I thought I’m not gonna I love doing physics but I’m not going to really do it I wanna be a musician

JR: So you didn’t think that

BC: and I just-

JR: =you didn’t think that was your future then cause that’s you euh which one of you where were you in there

BC: That would be Tony Blair me me on the left I think I look a bit chubby there don’t I enjoying the rock and roll lifestyle

JR: And did you enjoy the rock & roll lifestyle did you enjoy it to its fullest

BC: huhuh I don’t know we were that’s not my first band the first band was a rock band from Oldham

JR: They were called Dare Dare

BC: Dare although we had a member Thin Lizzy in it so it was kind of always semi-professional but we were just lads from Oldham I mean we got a record deal we recorded an album in Los Angeles at Joni Mitchell’s house

JR: Wow
BC: We toured with Jimmy Page Gary Moore so so we had a good time we were a bit innocent we were a bit you know ()
JR: [O well cause how old were you then you were 17 18
BC: 18 19 20 that kind of age
JR: And so physics loss could well have been the world of rocks (.) not necessarily a big gain but it would have been cause you cause you are okay but you weren’t spectacularly gifted were you
BC: [No Dare] Dare were a bit late we were we were what is this 1988-
JR: so Dare were a rock band but a new romantic sort of a rock band
BC: No we were we were like sort of the Oldham Bon Jovi is the best way you could describe it
JR: Well well hold on let’s let that last inkling because that sounds
BC: [that’s
JR: [that’s what we’re missing right now
BC: [that’s
JR: [that’s
BC: [the Oldham Bon Jovi
JR: Yeah we were it was hairspray leather jackets jeans but it is this time you remember 1988 when it was the Happy Mondays and it was you know it was the whole sort of renaissance music in Manchester
JR: Uh huh
BC: And we were just about two years behind I think so we were an early 80s kinda hair rock-
JR: But I love how pro Manchester you are
BC: band
JR: =because you are the professor of Physics from Manchester University is that right
BC: One of them
JR: One of them okay but you have other jobs as well you you are doing the stuff for the BBC
BC: yeah
JR: = you do a lot of TV-stuff now and it’s always great and we’ll talk about stargazing in a minute but you’re also involved with CERN with the Hadron Collider
BC: Yeah
JR: =which is the big underground funfair just outside the system

BC: Look at that picture

JR: = there we go that’s wow look at that

BC: That that’s actually the the end of one of the detectors that’s a camera a digital camera it’s twenty meters high and forty metres long

JR: Wow

BC: It’s the and it’s one of the the who big cameras that take pictures of these collisions which we create the conditions that are present less than a billion of a second after the universe began

JR: And these are neutrinos crashing together is that right or

BC: Protons

JR: protons protons okay and they recently they think they may have discovered something you’ve been looking for physicists have been looking for for a long time

BC: Yeah

JR: =it’s called the Higgs Boson particle

BC: It’s an incredible story I mean this thing was was first dreamt of as a theory back in the 1960s by Peter Higgs who’s euh he’s a Scottish physicist he’s still there in Edinburgh and euh it was just the mathematical reasons aesthetic reasons a sense that the universe should be beautiful in some sense but I don’t think even he thought that it it was just an observation of some beautiful part of physics

JR: And could you put it in laymen’s terms what that observation was

BC: Well it it’s to do with the universe is full of a field called the Higgs field it’s this stuff you can imagine I always call it cosmic treacle people’s lab but that’s essentially what it’s like everywhere in this universe full of this stuff and all these particles get there match by just interacting with it as they move through the universe it sounds bizarre what I find amazing about CERN is that we take those theories so seriously that we built 88 countries around the world get together and build the biggest machine ever build 27km in circumference

JR: [Wow

BC: =to look for this thing

JR: But you know what here’s one thing I wanna ask you in particular you talk about the science of the parts and I enjoyed the lecture thank you very much and I’ve been enjoying your book I’ve got Brian’s euh and I’m enjoying as much as I understand so far I’ll be honest with you I finished and I read very slowly and I read it a couple of times so I finished the first chapter and I do know so I understand that part but then it gets quite complex it goes on more about qu- and I know you’re trying to simplify it for us but it is hard for me to keep up so when did it become clear to you that you could understand this stuff that
even though you know I probably get it one day for us it seems hard to make that leap

BC:  It was it was way back I mean I’ve always always been interested in I didn’t know it was called physics but science the stars astronomy as far back as I can remember and I think you know the great astronomer Carl Sagan once said that that if children always ask these questions why why is there a universe what is time where did the universe come from and then the- they’re miseducated in a way they’re told that these are childish questions and that they should leave them alone and adults don’t think about those things-

JR:  I guess because we can’t change them

BC:  but they’re real but they’re real questions I think and we are beginning to answer them

JR:  Euh I’m excited about I was lucky enough to be invited along last year when Dara O’Briain and Brian Cox were doing a stargazing live on the BBC yes an inferior channel but it’s worth watching it for that one thing euh and you’re doing it again is it January the 16th

BC:  [Yeah 16th 17th and 18th]

but it’s an hour and a half of life astronomy

JR:  And it was great fun to be part of but it was great fun to watch it as well I saw somebody cause you really helped popularize that sort of thing but who doesn’t wanna see what going on up there and and some of the images you showed us and some of the theories that were put forward were fabulous what’s in store this time what’s this time

BC:  [This year we’re doing we’re going we did a lot of solar systems systems where the planet is like]

JR:  Cause there’s more than one

BC:  This time more than one planet yeah

JR:  =More than one solar system

BC  =More than one solar system there is absolutely there are hundreds and thousands and billions of them we discovered a thousand of them now

JR:  [Where did they come from

BC:  but we’re gonna do distant objects we’re gonna do black holes we’re gonna do things like galaxies we’re gonna do

JR:  [white stars

BC:  = we’re gonna do one on the moon and I believe we’re gonna talk to one of the Apollo astronauts

JR:  Wow

BC:  euh which will be brilliant so because that’s one of the things that I grew up with it inspired me to go into science
JR: Euh so star- we have a clip from stargazing this is back in January on BBC2 we did see it last year but I know it was very very popular for them so most people did but if you didn’t get a chance to see it euh make sure you watch this year take a look at this

(Video excerpt)

XXX

JR: You know I euh I love watching the show I love hearing you talk about it I’ve been enjoying trying to understand the book after the break Brian will be you gonna be electrocuting me essentially

BC: Yeah I’m gonna describe how the hadron collider works by passing about half a million volts through your hair

JR: Okay well after the break then Brian will be electrocuting me we’ll have music from the fabulous Lana Del Rey and as I said Brian and John Bishop and me will be fighting to the death with Olympic hopeful Jade Jones don’t go away
1.6. Interview with Emma Thompson

Date of airing: 14 January 2012
Interview length: 08:37 min
Actress

JR: Let’s bring my final guest out she is one of our finest writers and actors will you please welcome the incomparable Emma Thompson

XXX

((music))

JR: The one and only
JR: “Lovely to see you”
JR: How great to have Emma Thompson on this
ET: [Miles it’s miles back there
JR: Well euh happy New Year to you
ET: Thank you
JR: =let’s start with that now you look euh I get the feeling maybe I’m wrong you’re the sort of person you got focus you got resolve if you make a new year’s resolution I imagine you would stick to it

ET: 0 yeah (0.5) yeah no I think I think there’s very little that can’t be clarified or illuminated by you know a run a good run of about an hour and a half which is why I’m very much still in the dark

JR: So so this is this is a new year’s resolution -

ET: [See he’s not even listening he’s not even listening that was quite a good joke and I was working that I was working that while you were talking to Brooke23 I’m a little grumpy about her

JR: Why why

ET: Because she’s so nice and you would think that looking like that she would have the decency to be unpleasant

JR: You think she would (0.2) and Paddy24 is instantly dislikeable

23 Brooke Shields
24 Paddy McGuinness
ET: Instantly
JR: Instantly instantly nothing nice about him euh he’s lovely hey what a remarkable career and euh obviously it is far from over but I wonder you watch any of your movies on a regular basis
ET: [I never watch them no I never do
JR: Why not
ET: They hhh I just think oh god o o I could have done that better
JR: Even really
ET: [that’s hhh ()
JR: even one the one you won Oscars and you even think that
ET: Yeah I don’t I don’t tend to watch them maybe it’s that thing of getting older and not wanting to look at yourself in the past somehow it’s a very strange thing if you think about it
JR: Okay yeah
ET: =having that is not like having home movies where you look back at yourself that’s strange enough
JR: Because I suppose it is not just the way you your looks have changed it’s the way your acting is changed
ET: Yeah
JR: =and the way you would do stuff so I guess there are
ET: I pl-
JR: =things you would do differently
ET: I’m playing the queen next week
JR: Wow
ET: and what’s odd about that is the first time I did the queen it was the sketch and it was Frankie Howard’s speech so it was the queen’s voice and everything but it was the o no titties not () and no knickers
JR: Hahaha
ET: =and I thought god I hope I don’t slip into that
JR: Hahaha
ET: =You know sketch sketch comedy which is what I started you know
JR: yeah
ET: = is very
JR: So what do you do in the queen what’s that g- what’s that gonna be
It’s a short for sky

O is it the one when you direct

[and it’s about that time when] Michael Fagan you know the intruder got into her bedroom

That was weird

Got in through Prince Charles’s window

Is that-

His office window apparently

And then he stood at the end of the bed-

Picture the scene

What did he what happened to him

He just I don’t know I think he I think he wasn’t well

I think we can safely assume that yeah haha

Yeah

Euh you know I always thought of you as being the super-English okay about as English as English can be maybe it’s because you speak so well and because I know-

I don’t speak well I’ve got a very nasal London glottal accent

But you do speak well

Well I do speak well when I’m being paid to speak well

[When you can speak when you need to]

Yes

Euh on the screen you speak very very well

Yes

But euh you’re is it you’re half Scottish or

I’m half Scottish my mom’s Scottish

I didn’t realize your mom’s Scottish

Ay she’s from Glasgow

So -

So we live in half in Scotland half in London so all the holidays I that’s what I had growing up in London (.). Scotland for me has saved my life really cause the first seven years we lived in a little flat so the idea of trees and and and and lochs and mountains and everything
JR: And everything yeah

ET: I used to dream about going to Scotland when I was little o god actually this is a good story it just come to me getting older about getting older euhm

JR: Hahaha

ET: =which I’m noticing more and more frequently we were we were there last summer and euhm (. ) and Gaia and I were on our own for some reason Greg must have been working and we were so we were in the big bed together in flannel late nineties and you know cause obviously I know how to live

JR: Yeah

ET: And suddenly there is this incredible kind of ((stamps her foot on the floor)) real loud banging on the door and I thought o my god we’re alone up the glen

JR: That’s scaring

ET: = I thought huh so I went down and there was this massive policeman in the porch huge and I thought strange so I opened the door and said hello and he said euhm oh hello I’m sorry to bother you very difficult to find up here and I said hm yes that’s the idea

JR: Hahaha

ET: =and and he said we just had we just had euh somebody ring up and say that euh you’ve had an intruder on your land and I said an intruder so of course picturing immediately

JR: Yeah

ET: =x-man behind bush

JR: Scary

ET: =and I said really when what sort of intruder well he said it was a dog walker coming out through the path there saw a naked man about fifty years old coming through your field and I said really naked x-man behind bush immediately you know Christ and I was really worried cause I I it was sort of terrifying you know that feeling when there’s burglars in your house and everything and I said what time you know well it was during the day it was sometime in the afternoon and she rang us later on and I just wonder if you were alright from behind me on the stairs Gaia in her p’jays going wasn’t that about the time that you came up from the river mom

JR: [Hahaha Oo

ET: [so because down the house there’s a field there’s a pond and I there’s only sheep in the field and they don’t mind if I walk up the field naked at least I don’t think they do they probably just say she’s coming keep eating just keep eating don’t look (makes eating sounds)
JR: Hahaha

ET: and and I thought o my god and I made the connection and I could see the same thing happening to the policeman and I could see him as he backed off thinking he’s gonna go back to the station he’s gonna say she’s that Emma Thompson she her her tits must be so low that from a distance they read as testicles

JR: Haha o o

ET: I nearly lifted up

JR: I’m sure I’m sure -

ET: [The thing so if they’re not

JR: I’m sure they’re proud -

ET: They’re fine they’re not

JR: I’m sure they’re splendid

ET: [they’re not that proud they’re slightly shamed

JR: Buhm let me ask you about your writing because E-Emma has won an Oscar not just for her acting but she won an Oscar for writing as well

ET: Uh huh

JR: = it’s incredible for Sense & Sensibility

ET: Uh huh

JR: = for the screenplay of that congratulations it was yeah it was -

ET: It’s only about a hundred years ago

JR: So it’s incredible () how was then the performance

ET: Yeah

JR: =of sense and sensibility the screenplay

ET: Yeah

JR: =euh so we phoned to check we phoned the Oscar academy and they said absolutely yeah the closest anyone ever got was Charlie Chaplin years ago

ET: O really

JR: =was given the () Award for writing but it wasn’t specifically for screenplay so you’re the only human being on the planet who’s achieved that

ET: .hhhh

JR: =that is quite something but you’re writing still

ET: Yes
JR: =you wrote the Nanny McPhee films and now here something you f if I got this correct is this right you’re adapting Annie

ET: Yeah

JR: =so the musical Annie which was initially many years ago it was a Sunday newspaper strip in America euh and you are adapting this with the possibility of Will Smith’s daughter Willow

ET: It’s for Willow Smith yeah

JR: For Willow who whips her hair back and forth ()

ET: [I whip my hair back and forth

JR: And here’s the super-exciting thing I think is already a great collision we euh the scoy is being provided by

ET: Jay-Z

JR: Jay-Z XXX Euh and cause he already did the euh he did a rap over

ET: He did a rap for

JR: [hard knock life

ET: Hard knock life

JR: It’s a hard knock life

ET: Yeah

JR: =boem pa and the songs are gonna be some new material

ET: Some some new material some of the old one

JR: [But rap is it going to be the music they call rap

ET: Yeah some of it might be

JR: and and

ET: [I think I don’t know

JR: Do you do you enjoy the music they call rap are you o-fay with the sound of the rap generation

ET: [I am I mean I am I am sometimes I like it

JR: [whose your favourite

ET: have got a tiny bit

JR: [whose your favourite rapper apart from Jay-Z

ET: Okay alright you’ve got me alright I don’t listen to the modern music except for Florence & the machine because she’s on but actually I still listen to her
JR: What about what about DMA

ET: =I’m not just saying it because she’s there and nice

JR: Okay she is terrific

ET: really nice

JR: She’s not rap though

ET: She’s absolutely brilliant she’s not a rap artist but I get I do like some rap I like Eminem I think he’s absolutely brilliant

JR: Yeah

ET: =did I say that right did I say

JR: Yes haha

ET: But every song now seems to have a bit of a tune and then someone

JR: raps

ET: raps in the middle and then there’s another bit of tune and they all seem to be am I right in thinking that they are all the same shape so there’s a bit of a tune and then ((imitates rap)) and then there’s another bit of tune and I

JR: Is that how it sounds to you Emma it is time to interrupt I can’t argue

ET: but it’s true

JR: I can’t argue with that I can’t argue

ET: I mean it’s true

JR: Yeah

ET: Because we’re old farts now Jonathan

JR: Yes

ET: That’s there’s no

JR: Wouldn’t deny ya it’s true (.) euh how lovely to have you here I think you agree what a splendid person to spend time with the lovely Emma Thompson ladies and gentlemen

XXX
2. The Tonight Show with Jay Leno

2.1. Interview with Evangeline Lilly

Date of airing: 3 October 2011
Interview length: 11:23 min
Actress

JL: Welcome back my first guest tonight got out started on the hit TV lost she now stars after Hugh Jackman in the x-movie Real Steel fun movie it opens this Friday please welcome Evangeline Lilly

XXX

((music))

JL: You look great
EL: Thank you
JL: And you seem real happy
EL: [I feel great
JL: I met your baby boy
EL: Yes that’s why I’m so happy
JL: I know it’s fantastic
EL: I have a baby boy huhuhuh
JL: I know hihi no that’s () I can see you glowing you got the whole glowing thing going
EL: Thank you I thought the glowing went away after pregnancy
JL: No no no no it’s it’s it’s still there
EL: [O good I’m still caring it look at me
JL: Now were you in the hospital a long time tell me about the whole
EL: Well I actually just skipped the hospital and I had the baby at home
JL: You had it at home
EL: Yeah
JL: Okay wow
EL: It wasn’t because it came so quickly though
JL: =No health care
EL: [it was a planned thing no health care
JL: Hihiihi
EL: No it was a planned thing
JL: Yah
EL: We decided to have the baby at home because we wanted it to be a natural birth
JL: Okay
EL: =and it turns out that is was euhm thirty hours of natural
JL: Thirty (0.2) see for me that’s use anti-conception thirty hours
EL: Yah yah
JL: but that’s just me (0.5) Wow wow but I mean that’s a long time thirty hours
EL: You can continue to wish Jay
JL: Yeah I know I know
EL: Eight hours of pushing
JL: Wow
EL: =that’s the part that men don’t understand and women go oh dear
JL: Yeah
EL: =O dear god eight hours of pushing and the men are like okay eight hours-
JL: [Well here’s here’s a dumb question
EL: Okay
JL: If you were in the hospital would it have been quicker than that I don’t know how those things work I don’t know it
EL: [You know it k it probably would have
JL: Yah
EL: =because I well after about five hours of pushing
JL: = [Uh huh
EL: my midwife and my birthing assistant said you know we have a few suggestions (.). and I was like really after five hours of pushing you have a few suggestions.

JL: [Yah yah yah no no]

EL: You couldn’t have told me that five hours in

JL: Wow

EL: and we could have had this baby out by now

JL: Wow

EL: yeah

JL: Well that’s well that’s very exciting

EL: Yah

JL: Okay so now so do you get a lot of advice now do you have people giving you just all this kind of euh

EL: Well I don’t know everyone has has things to offer but I think probably one of the strangest things that I was told once in Hawaii was euh from the moment they’re born feed them poi which is

JL: What is that exactly

EL: ground harrow root

JL: Oh

EL: and you know I have always known that new born babies drink breast milk

JL: Right

EL: but apparently in Hawaii they eat poi from the minute they’re born

JL: and that’s did you get him some poi ()

EL: No we waited a couple of months he’s eating poi now

JL: O Okay

EL: He’s a big boy

JL: Okay

EL: And poi is like to it beefs up the Hawaiian man

JL: Okay

EL: It makes them big and strong and tough and sexy

JL: [So we have brothers and sisters still we’re gonna do or is it a little early for that]

EL: Ow if I wasn’t working right now
JL: Yeah
EL: I would be trying
JL: Really wow
EL: Hm I want a brood
JL: Really is that
EL: [Yeah
JL: and how many would you like to have how many would you like to have
EL: I don’t know I how many people are on a basketball team
JL: Wow
EL: I know I’m honestly asking the question I don’t know
JL: Yeah yeah well that’s a well wh wh when I grew up -
EL: (To the audience:) Five and thirteen (. ) the person who said the right number is American the other person is from somewhere else in the world

(Someone in the audience is shouting how many people there are on a basket team - Evangeline Lilly listens to them - Jay Leno does not go along with this)

JL: Let me ask you no you just got back from where were you New Zeeland
EL: Yes
JL: didn’t take any time off from lost
EL: hhh I was supposed to take time off
JL: Yeah
EL: =in fact I was I was supposed to just you know sort of abandon ship for a little while
JL: Right
EL: =or for a long while
JL: Okay
EL: =and then euhm this film with Hugh Jackman came up and and
JL: Right
EL: =and I decided that I really really really had always wanted to work with Hugh Jackman so I did it but that was like two or three weeks
JL: Okay
EL: =and that was no big deal it was the summer after Lost ended and then I was sitting with my new born baby he was about a month and a half old and Peter Jackson called
JL: Right

EL: and he said would you like to be an elf on the hobbit and I said yes I really do

JL: Yah yah

EL: I really do want to do that so I’m I’m sort of strapped into as it turns out four movies now

JL: But wouldn’t you be like the world’s tallest elf you’re not really a small elf like I mean you’re-

EL: hahaha I’m the world’s shortest elf

JL: Aren’t elf’s-

EL: apparently in Tolkien’s world elf’s were like ((making movement)) no fairies are like ((making movement))

JL: Fairies of course I get the I -

EL: [elf’s are big and tall and willowy and elegant

JL: [Again I’m sure - [you know Cate Blanchett

EL: [Yeah yeah that kind

JL: and and and is there a special training for elf stuff is there an elf language

EL: [I did I had a very special training I arrived and had to do stunt training I had to do dialect training I had elvish training movement training

JL: [Now what’s dialect training for an elf I I

EL: Well I’m learning I’m learning a language of elvish

JL: Which is

EL: Which was invented by JRR Tolkien

JL: Okay there’s no keebler people involved

EL: Hahaha

JL: this is not no this is not this is separate okay

EL: No it’s different slightly different

JL: [now how did your baby see you in the elf costume

EL: My baby saw me in the elf costume and I euh he tr you know my my partner brings him to work everyday
JL: "Uh huh"

EL: =and I’m supposed to feed him at lunchtime

JL: Right

EL: =and he came to the trailer and I put him to my breast

JL: "Yeah"

EL: =and he screamed his head off

JL: Wow

EL: =staring at this thing up at this strange pointy eared whigged massive person that was not his mother

JL: Yeah

EL: =and then that night I was feeding him at home and he was perfectly fine

JL: Yah

EL: =and my partner said to me you know his internal dialogue right now is mom you wouldn’t believe what happened to me today

JL: Wow

EL: huhuhu

JL: Yes he’s gonna say yeah he’ll be in parent need for quite a while

EL: Yeah exactly

JL: (. ) Evangeline be right back right after the break

XXX

(Commercial break)

XXX

JL: Welcome back tonight with Evangeline Lilly from Real Steel now we were talking you were a flight attendant I didn’t know this

EL: I was a flight attendant

JL: Now when were you a flight attendant

EL: I was a flight attendant when I was eighteen for all of two months

JL: and wh-what happened ()

EL: I hated it

JL: Yeah

EL: =I hated being a flight attendant so much

JL: Ooh
EL: =actually one day I showed up for a flight to Germany and
JL: Yeah
EL: =euh I forgot to bring my passport
JL: ooh
EL: =so they were gonna scold me and tell me I was in a great big load of trouble
JL: Yeah
EL: =and I said I’m gonna save you the trouble I’m just gonna quit
JL: Wow
EL: =like I’m done I don’t think this job was kind of being for me
JL: So did you dream of being a flight attendant and then you got it and you didn’t like it what happened
EL: [I I kinda did
JL: Yah
EL: When I was eighteen I thought this is gonna be the best job ever I’m gonna fly around the world for free and it’s gonna be glamorous and really
JL: and what was the bad part
EL: It’s horrible it’s you breathe recycled air for like thirty hours straight you’re on your feet
JL: Yeah
EL: = on a flight all that time it’s tiring you work through the night you deal with jerks all the time
JL: Did you get a lot of jerks
EL: [Oh my people who are miserable and the thing is that people don’t realize about flight attendants is that they have a lot of power over your
JL: Yah
EL: =flight experience and one time there was this guy he was really awful to me and I was really struggling that day cause I really had really bad gas
JL: Bad gas
EL: =and as a flight attendant you do not let that go
JL: You know
EL: =when you’re in a plane
JL: [as as almost anyone
EL [really inappropriate
JL: [you don’t let it go really
EL: [yeah it would be really rude
JL: = it’s not just really not just flight attendants
EL: Yah so this guy got under my skin to the point where finally I decided to save it all up (0.5) and I was walking past him and I got to row forty-eight
JL: Wow
EL: I let him rip right in his face
JL: Wow
EL: Yeah (0.1) and I kept walking as if nothing happened tuturututu
JL: Wow
EL: Coffee tea
JL: Wow (.) I can see every guy whatever fantasy he had going well that’s it we’re out of here
EL: [Not gone huhuhu
JL: So much for that one ¡yah that’s a lovely lovely story
EL: Well thank you thank you
JL: Yah lovely story
EL: Yeah
JL: So when you’re on vacation where do you go what do you do
EL: [huhuhu
JL: You’re in New Zealand () Hawaii where do you go
EL: [I’m really I’m sort of the typical actress
JL: Uh huh
EL: =very glamorous the places I go to
JL: yah
EL: = and the things I see in fact when I had this time off between lost and
JL: Yah
EL: =the hobbit I went on a 45-day road trip
JL: Okay

EL: in the back of an old 1992 Volkswagen van that had no seats no bed no fridge no oven no heating

JL: Were you kidnapped or what happened

EL: hahaha

JL: I mean

EL: No me and my partner I was seven months pregnant

JL: Right

EL: =so I was like this ((gesture))

JL: Yah

EL: =and we decided to go see America and drove all over America in the back of a van in the middle of winter

JL: [W W W Well you’re not even supposed to be walking around I mean seven months in a van doing this for seven months okay

EL: Yeah yeah and in the middle of winter euh which wasn’t the wisest choice

JL: Yah

EL: =because I was pregnant so at night time I would be sleeping in the back of the van and had to go to the bathroom like two or three times a night

JL: Right

EL: =so I had to get out and crawl you know over my partner into the snow and you know squad in the snow

JL: You know I’m learning so much about you that it really (0.2) anything happened above the waist in the last couple of months

EL: [I’m a really glamorous person what can I say

JL: Yeah yeah I saw wow it’s really yah

EL: Huhuhu

JL: Just a glamorous person yah so tell people about Real Steel I love this movie I thought it was great it is it is it is fighting robots it sound silly but it’s a real story

EL: Yah

JL: No it’s a really good story tell people what it’s about

EL: It’s it’s about euhm it’s really it’s about it’s a redemption story should I tell people hi people

JL: Yah yah
EL: Hi XXX (.)

EL: Let me tell you a story it’s about euhm a father son pair who euh were estranged at birth because father ran out on son and father needs to make good by son and euhm so it’s this great story with robot boxing and these two go on a journey together and ultimately what happens is the son sort of plays the father role to the father this is getting confusing and and actually helps the father redeem himself and so although (to Jay Leno:) it’s like a you know beat him up box him up kind of movie

JL: Yah

EL: =it’s a movie with a lot of heart and it’s just sweet -

JL: Kinda like rocky with robots almost that same type of movie

EL: Yeah yeah yeah exactly

JL: It takes place well about seven Gene years in the future or something like that

EL: Yeah about that ten tenish

JL: Yeah yeah okay right

EL: So not too far in the future

JL: Right

EL: We’re not talking aboutaco euh apocalypse or anything like that

JL: Right right

EL: It’s just you know new cars and cool robots

JL: So how was Hugh to work with did you got along and everything

EL: Hugh was so delicious

JL: Yeah he’s a nice guy

EL: Aah he was so

JL: Delicious I wasn’t even thinking

EL: [he was delicious

JL: [I wasn’t even thinking I was thinking nice guy

I wasn’t thinking delicious

EL: [huhuhu you wouldn’t no you wouldn’t no

JL: No I wouldn’t what does that mean delicious I I

EL: Well he’s he’s humble and he’s gracious

JL: Yeah

EL: =and he’s so hardworking
JL: Yeah
EL: =and he was so he really helped me as an actor
JL: Yeah
EL: =and you know it makes it sort of sounds a little bit silly but like there would be times that I was struggling with something
JL: Yeah
EL: =and he would just throw me off every time I was on set
JL: Right
EL: =until I was great
JL: Right
EL: You know and he was good that way
JL: Well he probably knew what you would do to him if he treated you bad
EL: huhuhu
JL: yeah yeah so he didn’t want that XXX alright so what is this clip we’re gonna see what’s happening in this clip
EL: Euh in this clip you’re about to see the star of the movie who is a robot called Adam come to live
JL: Yeah
EL: He’s been dug out of a graveyard euh a robot graveyard by the young boy Dakota and and he just falls in love with him
JL: He was good too that kid was terrific
EL: Oh he’s amazing
JL: [Take a look Real Steel](Video excerpt)
XXX
JL: Real Steel opening this Friday be right back with Magic Johnson Evangeline thank you congratulations ((shake hands))
2.2. Interview with Earvin ‘Magic’ Johnson

Date of airing:  3 October 2011
Interview length: 07:57 min
Former basketball player

JL: Alright and my next guest a true sports legend new video game coming out tomorrow called NBA 2K12 also the nicest guy you’ll meet please welcome one of the greatest basketball players of all time Earvin Magic Johnson

XXX

((music))

JL: Hey hey hey you look good you slimmed down a little bit
MJ: Yeah I’ve lost about 25 pounds
JL: Yeah very good good for you good for you
MJ: You know yeah thank you thank you

(Magic Johnson exchanging some turns with Evangeline Lilly)

JL: Not at all not at all not at all hey now what is euh what’s going on with the NBA season is it gonna happen do you think would what
MJ: ((gesture))

JL: Well you can’t talk
MJ: Heavy fines if I talk with somebody
JL: Really now be because
MJ: [like a billion dollars
JL: =because you are one of the executives
MJ: Yes
JL: Oh okay

(Evangeline Lilly and Magic Johnson exchange some turns)

JL: Do you think this season will happen can you even say that
MJ: I I hope so
JL: You hope so
MJ: Yes
JL: You think Kobe will play in Italy can you say that
MJ: I think so
JL: You think so
MJ: Huhuhu
JL: Now what is the average salary today for euh NBA
MJ: About four five million
JL: Okay and what was it when you played in your day what was average salary per year
MJ: Ff I made 400 000 dollars
JL: 400 000 and that was as a star player right
MJ: Yes that’s you know-
JL: so that would be equal to what about 800 now would it would it be about
MJ: [Yeah yeah
JL: Okay
MJ: a guy on the bench
JL: Yeah a guy on the bench wow wow okay now let me ask you about Ron Artest
MJ: Huhuhu
JL: Do you think he’d last longer than a week on dancing with the stars
MJ: Huhuhu
JL: Could you talk about that
MJ: I I I thought he would go out sooner
JL: Yah yah (.) really sooner than first
MJ: Yeah because hahaha
JL: [I mean] I mean (. ) he got his ass kicked by Chaz Bono Chaz Bono danced him off the floor
MJ: I know you know I couldn’t believe that he did it Jay
JL: Yeah
MJ: In the first place
JL: Oh really would you ever do it
MJ: Euh they asked me to do it but I wouldn’t do it no

JL: No why ↑not

MJ: That’s a lot of time I love the show

JL: Uh huh

MJ: =but it’s a lot of time

JL: Yeah

MJ: I don’t have that much time

JL: But you you’re you’re a competitive guy right huh

MJ: =very

JL: =right

MJ: =very

JL: =huh

MJ: =very

JL: Think you could take think you could out dance Chaz Bono

MJ: Euh (0.5) I’ll tell you what I would go after him

JL: Yes

MJ: I would I would give him a good run for his money I wouldn’t have been Metta World Peace hahaha

JL: [I think you should do it (to audience: shouldn’t he do it) XXX now I wanna ask you about let’s go back to Ron Artest

MJ: Uh huh

JL: now he changed his name I guess legally changed it to Metta World Peace did he consult did he ask your advice on that before he did it

MJ: I wish he had huhuhu (0.5) what is the announcer gonna say Jay

JL: yah

MJ: how is he gonna announce it I mean euh star guest small four Metta world peace uuh

JL: you know world peace is over it’s out yeah

MJ: He’s falled down

JL: Falled down

MJ: Do you know I mean

JL: “yah”
MJ: Ron come back down to earth please
JL: Yeah
MJ: =this is euh
JL: but that’s his name now
MJ: Yeah
JL: is it his cheques will say that
MJ: They have to
JL: Yah okay now our next stop you sold all your Starbucks how many Starbucks did you have like a hundred
MJ: 125
JL: 125 sold all those
MJ: All of them
JL: You sold all your theatres
MJ: Uh huh
JL: That’s like why what’s what’s
MJ: Well I thought it was time in my contract with Howard shows that Starbucks
JL: Yeah
MJ: = it was time for us to sell them the 125 euh the Lakers was a big that was tough
JL: Yeah
MJ: =because I loved the Lakers been with them for over thirty years
JL: Right
MJ: =but I felt it was time to do something different
JL: Uh huh
MJ: =because euh you know I I wanted to bring help bring the NFL back
JL: Okay
MJ: = to Los Angeles
JL: And how is that going
MJ: That’s going great
JL: Yeah
MJ: =() working at AG’s doing a wonderful job
JL: Yeah
MJ: =the governor just signed all
JL: Okay
MJ: =so I think it’s really going to happen the NFL is really coming back to Los Angeles
JL: Now when when do you think it will happen when do you think it will happen
MJ: I think within the next year or two
JL: Okay
MJ: The team will move here playing either at the colosseum or
JL: Will LA support the team
MJ: Oh LA is supportive yeah we support all the other teams now
JL: Okay
MJ: You know but we want our own team
JL: Yeah
MJ: =we got we got the great Lakers we got the soul soul dodges we we got you know
JL: Angels yeah
MJ: The angels we got all the teams we want our own football team
JL: Now I wanna ask bout something you bought soul train
MJ: Yes
JL: Now tell me wh-what did you buy it so they would take the one off where you were dancing on
MJ: huhuhuhuhu huhuhu
JL: [is that what you just just so you could burn that tape is that how it was you
MJ: Hahaha I need to burn it too
JL: No no you look okay we got ’em we got ’em we gotta show ’em XXX but first but first no no no
MJ: huhuhu don’t embarrass me
JL: before the little treat why did you buy soul train what was the whole reasoning
MJ: [s soul train is a great brand
JL: Right yeah
MJ: and I wanna bring it back to TV we all learnt how the dance
JL: Right
MJ: =watching soul train
JL: Well not all of you learnt but yeah
MJ: huhuhu well I’m one of the black men that don’t know how to dance
JL: Yeah yeah
MJ: =the real
JL: Yeah yeah
MJ: =but I’m still cool
JL: Okay okay (. ) now what is this this is about what 1980
MJ: Yeah at least at least
JL: Let’s take a look here here
(Video excerpt)
JL: Am I doing it right
MJ: You’re doing it right
JL: Yeah
MJ: You know-
JL: trying to get the dog off the couch
MJ: huhuhu so you go left to right Jay
JL: Yeah
MJ: That’s all I can do
JL: [Yeah that’s enough
MJ: [left to right right to left that’s it
JL: Now tell us about this video game what is this some kind of cool here
MJ: [I’m excited I’m excited 2K12 and what’s so great about this is this is they first we’ve got three covers myself Larry Bird and Michael Jordan
JL: Right
MJ: =and they have a contest to see who sells the most
JL: Right
MJ: And then what’s great you can my show time Lakers
JL: Uh huh
MJ: =can actually play against my Lakers today
JL: Okay
MJ: Also if younger people wanna play my Lakers against Le Bron’s euh Miami heat
JL: Oo
MJ: So old school versus new school
JL: Yeah
MJ: You can have the new players play the old players so that’s really great

(Turn by Evangeline Lilly: who would win - Magic Johnson: who would win that’s easy that’s easy ShowTime Lakers would beat everybody )
JL: Really wow wow
MJ: You know Koby () LeBron () It don’t matter nobody can stop Corine
JL: Yeah
MJ: () was awesome no no they can’t handle
JL: Now let me ask you now you mention LeBron that whole thing was when he had that decision with that TV Special I was thinking of you when that was going on
MJ: Yeah
JL: cause I thought what would magic say about this was that handled well was that a good idea
MJ: I think even he admitted now
JL: Yeah
MJ: = that it was wrong euh he’s a good young man
JL: Yeah
MJ: = a great player euh and he he will eventually win a championship but I think he just handled that situation wrong
JL: [Yeah yeah
MJ: = you know and he if he had it over to do today he wouldn’t do that
JL: Yeah yeah okay well here it is NBA
MJ: Yeah
JL: NBA 2k 12 you had a lot of fun you played the old team against the new team
MJ: Exactly
JL: [that’s very cool Magic thank you my friend
MJ: Thank you
JL: Thank you be right back with Jo Koy right after this
XXX
1.3. Interview with Dana Carvey

Date of airing: 13 December 2011
Interview length: 11:47 min
Stand-up comedian

JL: Welcome back everybody on to my first guest Emmy winning actor and comedian who’s appearing in palm springs this Saturday at the spotlight 29 casino if you’ve never seen Dana in person you gotta go he’s just one of the funniest guys around we always have a great time when he’s here please welcome the man the legend Dana Carvey
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((music))

DC: So nice wow

JL: You got it all ()-

DC: [What a crowd what a crowd

JL: Yeah

DC: Thank you for the funky fun

JL: Yeah yeah

DC: Thank you goodnight

JL: There you go

DC: Well Jay how are you

JL: That was a an RSL

DC: That was an () standing revelry

JL: That’s a reluctant standing revelry reluctant standing yah

DC: [What do you mean there were pockets of people going I don’t get it was it a church lady I don’t get it isn’t that special sorry

JL: How you been everything’s good my friend

DC: O I’ve been good
DC: = my goodness what a year what a year

JL: It’s been a good

DC: Yah

JL: = and for you it must be great a-a-re you covering politics in your stand-up

DC: [Yeah yeah I went through the whole thing I mean Donald Trump when he was running for president I was excited you know

JL: Right

DC: =and his hair was running for vice-president you know

JL: Right right

DC: I thought his hair was really preparing to leave this nation and euhm to me Donald Trump he seems like a batman villain doesn’t he he should be in the next batman movie you know be like be like okay Trumpcard you played your last days how do I know you’re really batman you’re fired that was my best Darrell Hamond

JL: [Hihi that’s yeah yeah haha

DC: That’s my best Darrell Hamond

JL: So a-are did you cover all the candidates

DC: Oh all of them it’s been a freak show

JL: Yeah

DC: =what a parade

JL: Yeah yeah

DC: Rick Perry you know my name’s Rick Perry and I wanna be I wanna be euh I wanna (2.5) oh president no it’s only a matter of time

JL: Yeah

DC: before Rick Perry does a mission impossible thing with the mask and its () hey how you doing I’m back XXX ((gestures)) jese I almost pulled my hands straight there

JL: Yeah I gotta say yeah yeah heheh

DC: Newt Gingrich looks like the kid on the birthday party that ate the last cookie like this ((gesture)) haha Mitt Romney had to run for president because he looks like what you think a president looks like

JL: Yeah

DC: =his whole life you look like a president I guess I gotta run
JL: Yeah
DC: = I look like a president
JL: Yeah yeah
DC: I mean the jaw the hair hello I’m the president
JL: Yah how was Obama doing how was he -
DC: Well he’s doing pretty good he’s doing pretty good good Jay
JL: That this is O-
DC: [Obama is a very clever character he
JL: Yah
DC: =you know he’ll take the Republican positions and make them like theatrical you know and they’re gonna have a tough time beating ’m cause he’s like they don’t the Republicans don’t think the rich should pay their fair share they want everybody to fend for themselves (0.4) they do they do now now hold on hold on let me finish (.) they want they want grandma to operate on herself (0.3)
JL: But Mr. President but
DC: [No no no hold on hold on Jay let me finish my point let me finish they want grandma as if grandma who can’t remember when to take her blood pressure pills could remove her own __god blather__
JL: See
DC: No no no no let let me finish
JL: Yeah can I can I
DC: [No no no hold on hold on
JL Yah
DC: =Hold on Jay just let me finish my point back in olden times
JL: Yah
DC: =When the warriors would go out hunt a wild boar
JL: Yeah
DC: =They would kill and clean the wild boar and they would eat most of that boar but they would share the scraps with the less fortunate but the republicans want everyone to fend for themselves as if a baby could actually hunt down a wild boar cook it clean it and skin it
JL: yah
DC: A baby can barely walk just crawl just a little bit
JL: Yah
DC: Got a weak spine how is it going to hunt a wild boar

JL: Yeah yeah I see I I I understand your point

DC: [no no no no no

JL: [I understand your point mister president mister president I now I understand what-

DC: [no no no no I would like to see Obama come out and do some comedy just to lighten things up

JL: Yeah

DC: =tell a joke to create some liberty for the situation Jay did you hear about the mom and the dad who found out their ten year old boy was visiting s & m websites

JL: No I didn’t hear about that

DC: Well the the mom said what are we going to do and the dad said well we can’t spank him (0.3)xxx no no hold on

JL: [But Mr. President but Mr. President

DC: [hold on hold on no no Jay let me finish let me finish

JL: But that was a lame ass joke Mr. President hihhi

DC: Let me finish now a lot of people think I won’t kick your ass but I will

JL: [No I I understand

DC: I will take you to a lonely place

JL: Really

DC: Hold on hold on hold on

JL: [To a ↑lonely place

DC: So anyway that euh that’s my Barack Obama but yeah he’s a 
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JL: Yeah yeah very good very good (.) you know we got euh we got Ron Paul coming here on Friday

DC: Well yeah Ron Paul the funny thing to me is euh I’ll get to him in a sec is that euh the debt you know the debt with China

JL: Right

DC: =Ron Paul’s very upset about it and I just was thinking you know aren’t we the most powerful country in the world do we really have to pay China back I mean do we really I mean can’t we send some guy from the Bronx over hey China how you doing what’s up hey hey you know I was talking to my friend the other day about that 16 trillion dollars we own you (.) I think we’re good
JL: Yah
DC: I think we’re good
JL: Good yeah
DC: And then the Chinese would go yeah but you own us 1.6 trillion what are you bunching my balls for we don’t got it we spent it what are you gonna do you gonna make a move what do you got one submarine we got a lot of fire power you know what I’m saying but we can do other things you want Yankees tickets you want to do Kim Kardashian we can do that
JL: Wow wow
DC: What (0.3) you have to go
JL: We’ll talk when we come back I’ll I’ll ask you about Ron Paul
DC: I’ll finish the second part of my one man show sketch
JL: Ron Paul with Dana right after
DC: [hold on hold on hold on
JL: [hang on what’s that Mr. President
DC: No no no nothing just hold on
JL: Yeah yeah
DC: let’s go right to commercial right now
JL: O right now more with Dana
XXX
(Commercial break)
XXX
JL: Welcome back tonight with Dana Carvey yah and
DC: Right
JL: We were talking about Ron Paul before you so
DC: Well
JL: =rudely got cut off
DC: People who just got here during the commercial break I was doing a Brooklyn guy talk to the Chinese about our debt
JL: Yeah
DC: = you know so the Chinese would retaliate and send over the Chinese mob you know it would be like they sneak in Ben Bernanke’s house you know good evening mister Bernanke how did you got in here well that is not important now what is important is you owe the Chinese government 1
point 6 trillion dollar we don’t have it you expect us to pay no I expect you to DIE

JL: Wow
DC: Say hello to my partner representative Ron Paul
JL: Oo
DC: This debt is simply bringing too much debt we can’t afford all this debt
JL: Hahaha
DC: That’s why
JL: [With the ((movements))]
DC: I didn’t even get to the punch line xxx (.) it was hahaha it’s an abstraction
JL: Abstraction
DC: I was gonna refer to Carol Channing for you youngsters
JL: Alright
DC: =That’s why I talk like Carol Channing so it’s a bit of an ex no no hold on
JL: Yeah
DC: Hold on let me finish but euh anyway yeah that’s what’s gonna happen what else do we got
JL: Well we got the euh you live you live you live in the bay area tell me about the the occupy euh –
DC: Oh it’s great they’re occupying parks and stuff let’s not be so hard on them I mean Hitler occupied France so let’s put it in contrast
JL: [Sure yah yah and that went well yeah
DC: Yeah yeah do well all it was good we did what we could we occupied euhm I don’t know I think this whole political thing we need a we need a third party I think Regis who’s available now
JL: Regis
DC: Regis Philbin for president because then he could tell amusing anecdotes about international relations that’s where I was I was so cowsy at the G20 right so I’m having a tangerine Martini with ()
JL: A what a tangerine Martini
DC: A tangerine Martini yeah look at that when I’m talking to Pot I say what are you a dictator what are you doing over there anyway anyway they’re terrific people Pot and () they’re terrific human beings
JL: Well well
DC: That would be

JL: Let’s talk about our friend Billy Billy Crystal back hosting the Oscars

DC: [Billy Crystal the best

JL: The best the best Oscar host

DC: The best Oscar host

JL: Yeah

DC: And Billy always does he’s great with medleys but this year the movies don’t seem to lend

JL: Yeah

DC: =themselves

JL: No

DC: =to funny melodies you know it’s kinda like Harry Potter Harry Potter trying to find a munitball with Jay Edgar in the eyes of march ((noise))

JL: Yeah yeah

DC: You know I mean it’s not

JL: Yeah was that Al Jolson doing that hihi

DC: Ah I don’t know it’s I’ll do a T-Bow is that what he does like okay

JL: How are your kids doing I was just talking with your son backstage

DC: Oh

JL: he’s your spitting image hilarious

DC: I know it’s it is a mini-me

JL: [that kid he’s not he’s not adopted that’s for sure

DC: No no not at all children are great because they’re very clever argumentatively they always say you should be happy to the parents you should be happy cause it’s like hey you got a ticket speeding ticket you should be happy I know I could have crashed this car ten times you should be happy

JL: Yeah yeah

DC: Hey you got a D in maths you should be happy I know I got an F in every class his whole life it’s odd

JL: I get that you you always see that tune about a guy gets jumped in New York and he’s stabbed five times and he’s shot in the head but he lived hey you were lucky man

DC: Yeah yeah yeah yeah
JL: [What did I do I was just walking down the streets why did
DC: [just be happy
JL: [I just be happy just be happy
DC: I don’t know if we have time for this) but I did do the scariest thing that a human adult can do which is I gave driving lessons to my son
JL: Oh how did that go
DC: [You know he’s going for his permit sixteen years old
JL: yeah
DC: vertically challenged behind the wheels scared gripping it like that and I’m in the passenger’s seat and I’m inside I’m like we’re gonna die you’re going to kill us but outwardly I have to keep him ↑calm right
JL: Right
DC: So we’re just driving along and I’m going yeah yeah you are doing good yeah good okay aah just keep going euhm looks like we’re about to hit the mailbox but euh okay okay we just missed it good so you wanna stay in the road away from the oncoming traffic yeah so the light’s turning yellow so you might slow down yeah just slow down the break just slow down okay we ran a red light
JL: Yeah
DC: euh let’s listen for the sirens okay now we’re gonna merge on the freeway and you are going eleven miles per hour so you might want to kick it up yeah
JL: That’s natural
DC: yeah now you’re going 87 and you’re one two three inches from the bumper in front of you yeah that’s called tail() so here’s our exit you might wanna go oh we got over didn’t we next time you wanna signal and check for blind spot yeah so let’s go to this parking lot and you don’t wanna okay you hear the sound of our tires popping that was from euh () spikes that say do not enter severe tire damage yeah yeah and then I turned to Raymond and said yeah but of course you’re an excellent driver you’re a excellent excellent driver so that was euh
JL: Dana Carvey
DC: [(] theatrical
JL: =spotlight 29th casino Palm Springs good luck my friend go see Dana be right back with Jason Reitman
XXX
JL: My next guest an Oscar nominated writer producer and director his films include Juno and up in the air his new movie young adult starring Charlize Theron is getting great reviews this guy doesn’t make cookie cutter movies really really thought provoking terrific films it’s currently in selected theatres and opens nationwide this Friday please welcome Jason Reitman ↑Jason
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JL: That is the fastest I’ve ever seen anyone get from there to this desk it’s amazing

JR: Haha I’m very excited to be here

JL: Well we’re excited to have you

(Jason Reitman and Dana Carvey exchanging turns)

JL: Now Young Adult getting great reviews were you nervous

JR: yes

JL: =about this at first

JR: A little I mean this is a tricky movie

JL: Yah

JR: =you’re right it’s not a cookie cutter movie but it is funny and

JL: Yah

JR: = it’s always exciting if people seem to respond to what you attempted to make

JL: Cause the last time you were here you were on your way to the Oscars you remember that

JR: Yeah I know

JL: like you were like on Thursday and I think the Oscars were Sunday

JR: are you asking if I remember going to the Oscars yeah
JL: [Well yeah do you remember being here right before]

JR: No no no I do and I remember being really nervous about that

JL: Yah (.) was that a fun night the Oscars you were nominated for Up In The Air was the film

JR: It was Up In The Air yeah yeah

JL: George Clooney
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JR: Thank you it was it was it was a wonderful night I got to take my father to the Oscars

JL: Oh

JR: =which is really exciting I mean it was his first time being nominated he was nominated on up in the air which we made together and (.) euh I went zero for three that night

JL: “Right all you could get”

JR: =and and I went to In-N-Out right after to have euh cheeseburger

JL: [Is that where the big party is now why

JR: Yeah most people go to the governor’s hall

JL: Yeah

JR: but sometimes and I sat down to have a cheeseburger at In-N-Out and I’m still wearing my tox and I look a lot like a guy named Mark Boal who wrote the hurt locker who had won an Oscar that night

JL: Okay

JR: And I (Dana Carvey: that’s not you) euh I yeah there you go

JL: Waw

JR: A a sweet lady came over to me and said didn’t you just win an Oscar

(Turn by Dana Carvey)

JL: Now wow what did you have the regular double or did you have the animal style

JR: I got double double animal style I got fries animal style

JL: O very good

JR: Yeah yeah I’m a euh yeah I’m on a race to my own death

JL: [Wow
JL: So tell me about working with Charlize Theron how does that work do you are you one of these guys hi I like to work with you but there’s some nudity I mean how do you how do you I mean

JR: Haha that’s a very good impersonation of me

JL: Yeah yeah

JR: That’s euh yeah

JL: Hahaha

JR: No I a It was actually at the Oscars when you go to the Oscars you have to get there very early you show up at like 2pm

JL: Right

JR: You have to go through all the security and then you’re in a holding pan with appetisers

JL: A holding pan

JR: Yeah that’s it in the Kodak theatre in the basement of the Kodak theatre and I felt a tap on my shoulder and I turned around and it was Charlize Theron (.) like all six foot six of her

JL: Right right

JR: Euh and she’s gorgeous I mean

JL: yeah

JR: = euh and I was just intimidated and smitten and she said she wanted to work with me

JL: Ooh

JR: =so when I found this script Young Adult I reached out to her and said I found our script and she was intimidated by it at first but then finally said yeah let’s do this movie

JL: Okay tell people what the movie is about

JR: The movie is about a woman who basically had her greatest moments in high school and now she’s trying to she’s been trying to find her way back she writes young adult fiction she’s obsessed with reality TV she finds out that her high school sweetheart has euh got married and has a child and for whatever reason she’s thinks this is the time to go back and reach out and try to get him back

JL: Right yeah see that’s weird enough cause normally you wouldn’t have a years ago you would have a guy high school () but I like the fact that it’s a woman doing essentially bad behaviour like a guy would do

JR: Oh it’s bad behaviour

JL: It’s bad behaviour

JR: She she is pretty nasty in this but it’s pretty funny
JL: Well you had to direct you had to direct her and Patton Oswalt in a love scene tell me about that was that awkward are you

JR: Well you know the trickiest part of that I mean look shooting love scenes to begin with is not fun and Diablo actually Diablo Cody the writer of this movie just pointed out recently to me yeah no kidding euh she pointed out to me that none of the sex scenes in my movies happen in beds (0.1) in Thank You For Smoking they have sex in the closet

JL: Right

JR: = in Juno it’s in the chair and in Up In The Air it’s on the floor and it’s kind of a scary thing to find out about yourself that you only direct sex scenes that don’t take place in beds

JL: Really

JR: (Turn by Dana Carvey: so do they have sex in the pool or what do you do for this movie?) (JR: No this was normal sex in the bed except the guy has a leg that euh doesn’t work so we had to choreograph how to get him on top of her and it’s like it’s almost like twister it’s like left hand blue right leg red it’s euh yah xxx)

JL: well is that awkward no kiss this way no do that I mean is it weird

JR: Oh yeah because you’re telling two people how to have sex

JL: Hihi

JR: I mean is that w yeah it’s strange

JL: Yeah okay

JR: =it’s not it’s not a normal day of work

JL: Right right okay

JR: =even for my business

JL: Now Charlize was here last night telling us about this dog

JR: Haha

JL: and this just struck me as so odd

JR: Right

JL: cause well explain how you found the dog

JR: Well I wanted a Pomeranian because a Pomeranian is the only dog that is genetically always smiling and she treats this dog so poorly and I just loved the idea that all the dog could do is just smile back at her and and of every dog I saw I just didn’t like they were not right and finally my producer was walking down the street in New York saw a Pomeranian took a photo with her Iphone sent it to me I said yes cast that dog and
JL: Well now how do you -

JR: [() discovered it () we made a star out of this dog

JL: [Well but I mean do people believe that I wanna put your dog in the movie I mean who who

JR: I never thought about that that's right it must have been a really weird moment for this woman

JL: [Yeah yeah

JR: Now but we brought the dog to Minnesota I just saw the dog at the premiere the other night euh

JL: Wow

JR: =No the dog’s doing great

JL: Now what’s this clip we’re gonna see what’s happening in this clip

JR: So this is the scene in which Charlize Theron is just arrived back in her hometown and she runs into a guy she went to high school with it’s Patton Oswald while she was the most euh the most liked to most beautiful woman in high school he was the least liked

JL: Here we go

(Video excerpt)
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JL: Now you’re doing a life show Thursday what what is that tell us about that quickly

JR: Oh I euh started this series of screenplay readings here at Lacma museum in Los Angeles

JL: Right

JR: We started with The Breakfast Club we did the apartment last month and this Thursday I have a group of actors and we’re gonna read The Princess Bride for a live audience

JL: Oh very cool big any actors big time actors

JR: Yeah I’m gonna announce nobody knows I’m announcing for the first time right here euh in the lead role of Westley we’re gonna have Paul Rudd on Thursday so that’s gonna be

JL: [O That’s great

JR: Yeah that’s gonna be pretty great

JL: Ooh very cool ooh on Thursday there you go (.) The movie opens on euh this Friday young adult Jason thank you my friend be right back with Lenny Kravitz

XXX
1.5. Interview with Glenn Close

Date of airing: 6 January 2012
Interview length: 12:54 min
Actress

JL: Welcome back my first guest a five time Oscar nominated actress who just received two golden globe nominations for her latest film Albert Nobbs euh what a jam of a movie this is she just does an amazing job a very unconventional very unusual but just a a beautiful little film critics are calling her performance the best of what’s been an extraordinary career here’s some highlights from some films she’s done take a look

(Video excerpt)
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JL: Please welcome Glenn Close

XXX

((music))

JL: Welcome back congratulations and everything

GC: Thank you so much

JL: [Yeah now you’re in town for some film festival being honoured wh-what are you being honoured for

GC: Euhm hahaha it’s a little daunting to say

JL: Yes

GC: For life time achievement at the palms spring film festival

JL: [Oh you c- Oh Oo so life time achievement so that
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GC: Yeah

JL: So that means your career is effectively over

GC: Yes I think it does

JL: [and this is everything

GC: I’ll have to think of something else to do
JL: Isn’t it weird when you get the life time achievement when I’m not done yet () I’m doing more movies

GC: I know

JL: Now I read something about you you keep all the wardrobes from your films

GC: Uh huh

JL: Is that true

GC: Yeah

JL: Really

GC: Yes

JL: Now what do you do with it

GC: (. ) I go in at night

JL: Really wh- do you dress up

GC: I put things on

JL: Yeah yeah

GC: I try to remember

JL: Oh well really

GC: Who I was

JL: Really waw that’s like dangerous Lee where would you wear that dress

GC: [stroke myself euh

JL: Is this from a movie is this from a film

GC: No it’s not

JL: Oh

GC: Which is rare hahaha

JL: Yeah yeah

GC: Some of my costumes would be hard to wear in public euhm I esp I I when you think of some of the characters and some of the amazing costumes I have

JL: Yeah

GC: I mean what the costumes from fatal attraction are their shoulders are ((gesture)) to here

JL: [Oh right yeah that big yeah yeah right

GC: Yeah
JL: So are you a hoarder would you say you’re a hoarder
GC: (0.7) Look who’s talking
JL: Well I I I admit it XXX at least I admit it I admit to being a hoarder (.). I I save up everything I have shirts from the 8th grade I still have
GC: O haha
JL: So see I
GC: No I don’t have shirts from the 8th grade
JL: No okay
GC: but I have I do have some wonderful costumes and I I love them
JL: Okay and where do you keep them do you keep them in your house
GC: No I keep them in a facility (0.2) euh
JL: I think that’s called a storage unit
GC: Hahaha yes
JL: Now yeah you have a daughter does your daughter ever show up in any of your costumes is she going to moms euh
GC: [Euh oh when she was really little and we were
JL: Yeah
GC: =Out here actually doing sunset boulevard
JL: Yeah
GC: =The chores’ girls used to take her into the dressing room
JL: Yeah
GC: =And they would dress her up
JL: Yeah
GC: =And yeah put make-up on her and all these wonderful costumes () great ()
JL: [I I did that with Dorian a little while ago
GC: Huhu yeah
JL: Yeah now besides being a hoarder you’re also a big animal person now your whole family how many animals do you have in your family
GC: Oh my
JL: Yes
GC:  euh (.) well 1 2 Christmases ago there were fifteen dogs in our house when everybody was together

JL:  Okay now that seems like it’s time to call animal control that seems a little okay fifteen how does that work

GC:  Not well

JL:  Yah (.) Just dogs or do you have other animals

GC:  Well this Christmas because euh we all gathered in Bozeman Montana and euhm my nobody brought their dogs but my sister brought her two parrots

JL:  Parrots

GC:  Yeah

JL:  Okay

GC:  She has an African grey

JL:  Okay

GC:  =which is which is a remarkable remarkable bird

JL:  Yah

GC:  Euhm

JL:  [Are they

GC:  a little a little weird because she euh you feel like a voyeur into my sister’s life because this bird talks like my sister does (.) all the time

JL:  that’s flattering yah

GC:  Well

JL:  I mean like I mean it repeats

GC:  [You’re so good you’re so good hahaha

JL:  Wow I feel like I’m in a creepy movie now yeah

GC:  Hahaha digger no digger no haha

JL:  And you were in did they talk while you were in the car when you were travelling with them

GC:  Yes I drove down from Bozeman to Jackson with my mother and my sister I was in this and I they are the most wonderful eccentric fabulous women they’re very hard of hearing

JL:  Yah

GC:  So I was with in a car with two women with hearing age two parrots and a dog
JL: Yah O () that would make it a little crazy
GC: Yeah yeah
JL: A little crazy okay now look we’ll take a break and look what’s going on after this be right back
XXX
(Commercial break)
XXX
JL: Welcome back I’m talking with Glenn Close () Albert Nobbs is the new film that is the project you’ve been working on for thirty years huh
GC: Well I first played Albert euhm thirty years ago on euh off Broadway in New York
JL: Right
GC: Yeah
JL: And Albert is a man obviously and you play the part and he’s a a waiter in a in a r- euh-
GC: Well Albert actually isn’t a man actu Albert is a woman or a girl
JL: Right
GC: Yeah
JL: Yeah
GC: Who has survived for thirty years in disguise of a butler in order to survive and to be able to work in a time when women had absolutely no rights she didn’t know where who she was
JL: Right
GC: Where she was from and who her family was
JL: Have you ever worked as a waitress or euh have you ever done that
GC: Yes I was the world’s worst waitress
JL: Really
GC: Well I say the world’s worst cocktail waitress
JL: Oh you were a cocktail waitress
GC: Yes I was a cocktail waitress
JL: Hihi
GC: in the Ramada inn just outside of Williamsburg Virginia
JL: I thought you looked familiar to me yeah wow
GC: Hahaha well I went to school

JL: [Wow and what was so bad about being d-d

GC: I didn’t know anything about drinks

JL: Haha

GC: huh and euh I came from a family that did we didn’t drink and so I didn’t know the difference between gin and and and euhm scotch or and even the smell

JL: Right right

GC: So I I put the little napkin and I’d say gin with a little arrow to it

JL: Right

GC: And then scotch with a little arrow to it and take my little tray and you know and euh (.I it was also very upsetting to me when somebody was getting really really drunk

JL: Yeah

GC: And it was a time when obviously there were not the laws that we have now and euh I’d I go to the my manager and say well look how drunk he is you know should I keep serving him he said that’s your job

JL: Yeah keep serving him yeah yeah

GC: So I go over literally and this guy would and I would say (.I are you sure you want this

JL: Wow very responsible waitress was that you worst job ever

GC: Euh well I think euh the the most yes a terrible job I had euh was behind the main information desk at Colonial Williamsburg where everybody came when they were trying to decide what to do with their family that they had been in a car with for you know the last ()

JL: [Right now did you have a costume did you have the little hat and the whole

GC: No thank god I didn’t

JL: O no

GC: Not there

JL: Right

GC: And and euh I you know after a summer of that you think -

JL: Like what’s bad wha-

GC: I hate to say it but you think like the basic euhm American tourist has the IQ of a of a newt

JL: Really
GC: Yeah

JL: Well newt’s pretty smart but he has a problem but now -

GC: You’re thinking the gecko that’s different

JL: [Yah yah but what kind if you ever seen our jay walking segment that’s pretty much where it bases like what what kind of questions would people ask you so you’re the information lady they come up and say what

GC: Euh is there a bus to take us to Colonial Williamsburg yes the bus you see that sign says bus

JL: Hihih

GC: Bus downstairs the bus is downstairs yes you see that sign it says bus downstairs do you see the stairs you mean the stairs over there yes you see the sign it says bus downstairs (.) so if I go over there and I go down that stairs there’s gonna be a bus there

JL: Yah right yes

GC: And one time I one time I saw I said no maybe if you stay here the bus will drive up the stairs and right here and PICK YOU UP

XXX

JL: Wow wow wow

XXX

JL: Let me ask you about making this movie a- and this is just a little jam of a movie just beautifully beautifully done you shot it in in Dublin in Ireland

GC: Yes yes in Dublin

JL: [and in in how was it looks like it was pretty cold

GC: It was freezing

JL: Yah

GC: We were we we took over this big country house and we could because it was off-season it was as everybody always says euh the worst winter that they’d had in memory euh terrible snow

JL: Yeah

GC: The whole country shut down I don’t know if you remember that because they only have two ploughs

JL: In Ireland

GC: Yeah and they’re at the Airport

JL: Yeah just two ploughs and both guys are drunk ((imitates Irish accent))
GC: That’s right haha (.) no really and then and then I don’t wanna I don’t wanna because it was an incredible experience but just as a New Yorker where you clear the sidewalks you don’t get sewed right if som

JL: [Right

GC: The sidewalks were literally inches thick

JL: Hihi

GC: in ice for weeks

JL: Yeah well

GC: And people were just the hospitals were bulging with people that had broken their legs and their hips

JL: Yah

GC: That was a mess

JL: And the ice combines with the drinking yeah what a fabulous

GC: And then and then they ran out of sand

JL: They ran out of sand there’s no sand (.) alright (0.3) and you got pneumonia

GC: I got pneumonia o that was terrible

JL: Right

GC: =Cause you here I was I work fifteen years to get this film

JL: Right

GC: =To where we were actually filming it

JL: Right

GC: =And I felt so sick and then I started coughing up stuff and of course my imagination said that looks like it has blood in it (.) and I said I’m (.) I have tuberculosis I’m gonna I’m gonna die

JL: You have tuberculosis

GC: I have tuberculosis and I’m gonna die

JL: Wow

GC: And here I you know what can I do fifteen years everybody’s here I can’t tell anybody (.) I can’t tell anybody that I’m so sick I’m gonna die

JL: Yeah you don’t wanna tell other people you don’t wanna tell other people you have tuberculosis

GC: Hahaha

JL: cause that would be selfish to tell other people you have tuberculosis meanwhile
GC: woow

JL: half of the Irish people are death and you’re here

GC: [[I just had pneumonia

JL: alright so you just had pneumonia now what is this clip we are going to see what is this scene

GC: Oh well the actor is one of the great Brendan Gleeson plays doctor Holloran who lives at the hotel and euh it’s Albert who when you see the movie you’ll see that an idea has been put in her head that she could have a life other than a butler

JL: Let’s take a look

(Video excerpt)

XXX

JL: () on January 27 good luck at the golden globe beautiful piece of work thank you ((shake hands))

GC: Thank you so much

JL: [thank you so much we’ll be right back with Trevor Noah right after this
1.6. Interview with Michelle Williams

JL: Alright about my first guest a two time academy award nominated actress she’s likely to receive another one for her stunning portrayal of Marilyn Monroe euh in the film My Week with Marilyn this is a terrific film it’s one of those little movies you know they make everybody works hard and there’s a great script I thought it was just wonderful Rolling Stone called it one of the best movies of the year take a look take a look

(Video excerpt)

XXX

JL: Please welcome Michelle Williams

XXX

((music))

JL: Hey euh yah

XXX

MW: Are they always this nice

JL: Well congratulations on the golden globe nomination that’s terrific

MW: Thank you

JL: That’s really great before we talk about the movie euh have you had a good do anything over the holiday break

MW: Euh I went on a vacation for the first time in a long while to Mexico

JL: [Ooh] [okay] [Okay]

and how was that was that fun

MW: It w it turned into more of a euhm adventure vacation

JL: Yah

MW: =than a relaxing vacation

JL: Yah
MW: =euhm although you can’t really complain about going on vacation and I’m not complaining about it at all it was very lovely

JL: Yah

MW: And it had relaxing moments

JL: Uh huh

MW: But overall it was more adventurous than ()

JL: [S-So what was the adventure part what did you do

MW: I’m still a little sore

JL: Oh

MW: O no

JL: euh alright let’s well (.) we’ll move on to another what is that I’m not sure what that means

MW: Oh euh horseback riding

JL: Oh horseback riding o I’m sorry I gotta say I did more information than I wanna know I I

MW: No no no

JL: Are you

MW: Yes horseback riding

JL: Are you an experienced horse- I mean what was

MW: I thought I was until I went on this euh trip I thought it was going to be one of those sort of euh euh slow kinda amble through the hills and you take a lot of photos

JL: Right right

MW: Taking like the beautiful scenery we went down ravines we went tracking it was an eight hour horseback ride

JL: Oh waw y- you were in a () essentially

MW: Essentially yeah there were we were with a bunch of friends there were a lot of people and at first euhm well I wanted to turn back

JL: Right

MW: Because we were going down ravines slippery I don’t think that euhm horse’s hooves have traction

JL: Right

MW: But we were going down ravines and like ended to be picky-backed by a drunk person
Wow

MW: =Who had no personal investment in you

JL: Yah

MW: =and will throw you at any time to save themselves

JL: Wow well that would be me

MW: Huhu

JL: = that would be me yeah now we have a photo

MW: [yeah a picture

JL: [let’s take a look act act well It’s looking like you were pretty high there

MW: Well yeah can you tell how high that is

JL: Yeah I don it looks

MW: The man who was leading the tour I didn’t wanna go that sort of like the prime spot to have your vacation photo taken

JL: Right

MW: Is on that kind of cliff and I said no I don’t wanna go over there and he said I promise you there’s no such thing as a suicidal horse so

JL: Oh yeah hihi I guess I guess that’s true I never thought of that so now you live in New York now you used to live here

MW: I did yeah I lived here on an on

JL: Okay so which do you prefer this one of those

MW: Well I love it here I have a lot of friends here

JL: uh huh

MW: =my best friend is here and so I’m always happy to come back

JL: Right

MW: But I do love

JL: So you’re more a New Yorker now

MW: I do love New York I love the subway

JL: Cause you n- now you love the subway

MW: I love the subway
JL: So you enjoy being groped?

MW: It hasn't happened for a long time.

JL: No, no, not for a long time.

MW: No, I love it. I was thinking about it actually the other day the last time I was on the subway I was in kind of like a blue mood and I was feeling sort of down about something and then and then in walked Michael Jackson doing the moonwalk.

JL: Oh alright.

MW: Yeah, and I all of it, the entire train everybody's heads lifted up and we all looked around and smiled at each other and start laughing. You couldn't have a bad day when you see that.

JL: I guess that's true. Yeah, see if they let me drive the train that would be fun. But I just sitting on it. It's a terrific portrayal of Marilyn Monroe, you were fascinating. It really XXX euh the singing and the dancing you did your own singing and dancing is that true?

MW: I've always loved singing and dancing.

JL: Right.

MW: It's sort of how I really started acting. It was like the first thing that I ever really loved but I just haven't done it for such a long time. And Simon, the director, he thought that maybe I could do it and sort of urged me he was the one who told me I could so...

JL: No, he did good. That was fantastic. He did a good job and the walk was it hard to get cause women don't really walk like that anymore.

MW: Yeah.

JL: Did you have to work on it? Was that hard to do?

MW: It was something that I euh, figured out how to do it took me a lot of time.

JL: Uh huh.

MW: I spent almost a year preparing for it. Watching her movies.

JL: Right.

MW: And reading all the books and I'm getting the great thing about playing somebody who was there's a lot of information about them not like another character where it's all up to you.

JL: Yeah.

MW: It's only in your own head euhm so I got to watch her movies studied her movies over and over and I sort of made this kind of euh at home sort of do it yourself. Marilyn Monroe kit.
JL: Right

MW: Which is euh euh a pair of high heels and anyone can do it I’m sure all the ladies have

JL: [A lot of guys have the do it yourself Marilyn Monroe kit at home yeah yeah

MW: High heels

JL: Yeah

MW: =push up bra

JL: Right

MW: =belt around your knees something tight at your waist and you just sort of start embarrassing yourself

JL: Yah

MW: =in the privacy of your own home

JL: So what’s the biggest misconception about her like if you study her life portrait w what

MW: Huu I think probably euh the first sort of big discovery that I came to was that Marilyn Monroe was a character it was a shtick it was like Charlie Chaplin or Groucho Marx with the cigar

JL: Yeah

MW: =that wasn’t who she was it was this euh brilliant character that she invented euh and I think that people sort of expected her to be like that all the time but in fact euh it was something that she could turn on and off

JL: Yeah and this this movie is based on a book with a true story about a a young man who was like an intern on the movie

MW: Uh huh

JL: =and Marilyn took a liking to him

MW: Uh huh

JL: =so it is based on the real movie that she did with euh Laurence Olivier

MW: Uh huh

JL: =and you filmed it was it filmed in the same studio where Laurence Olivier and Marilyn also filmed

MW: It was it was on the same we filmed on the same lot on the same stage

JL: Wow

MW: =And my dressing room was her dressing room

JL: Wow
MW: Yeah

JL: That that’s pretty cool that’s pretty cool

MW: Yeah

JL: Now when did you first became aware because you’re obviously so much younger I mean I remember her cause I’m the old guy but euh growing up I when you were a teenager I don’t know if Marilyn Monroe was sort of in the public eye in terms of

MW: Yeah I knew her she was I don’t know how I I had a picture of her on my wall I don’t even know I hadn’t seen her movies it was really just her image for whatever reason I think that she had a captivating quality for men and for women

JL: Yeah

MW: [But I think it’s different for both

JL: Yeah

MW: Euh but I hadn’t really seen her movies honestly until I was in my twenties

JL: Yeah

MW: But it was really it was just her just her pure image that I was drawn to

JL: Did you ever flirt with guys as Marilyn

MW: Like using it in my own life as a sort of device

JL: [Sure yeah yeah

MW: Euhm I you know I s kind of stayed a little bit in character while I was making the movie

JL: Uh huh

MW: Euh it it makes it easier that way but I yeah I remember sort of experimenting with it early on

JL: Yeah

MW: =and seeing what it was be like

JL: Yeah

MW: =to kind of w what was it like to walk around like that and what were people’s reactions to it but I I don’t really (.) no I think I would have felt silly

JL: Yeah yeah

MW: =to pick up somebody at a bar

JL: Hi Bob now w-what is this clip we are going to see you know what the scene is about
MW:  This I think is euh when a young man Colin first comes over to Marilyn he has been invited euh Marilyn asked him to come over euh

JL:  Uh huh

MW:  And he’s first alone with her

JL:  Okay here let’s take a look

(Video excerpt)

JL  Well my week with Marilyn in theatres right now highly recommended wonderful wonderful job good luck with the Golden Globe thank you Michelle be right back with Josh Lucas right after this