Discourse Strategies Used by Hosts of Malaysian Radio Talk Shows

Esther Lee Soo Yee

Introduction

Phone-in radio talk shows have gained popularity in Malaysia in recent years. It is generally observed that many radio stations have incorporated a phone-in format, whereby callers can phone in and interact with hosts and studio guests. Phone-in radio talk shows in English are broadcast regularly on Radio Four, a radio station owned by Radio Television Malaysia, the national broadcasting body in Malaysia. Among these phone-in talk shows is a particular genre, the expert-advice phone-in. This expert-advice format enables listeners to call in and talk to an expert on a variety of specified topics, ranging from law to health to education. Some of the expert-advice phone-in shows broadcast by Radio Four are, for example, "Radio Doctor", "Law and Us", and "Consumerism"

Radio talk shows have flourished in recent years because of society's increasing orientation towards interactiveness in various aspects of everyday

living, for example, in the access of information and entertainment. The interactive nature of phone-in talk fulfills these changing demands, because it encourages interaction and audience participation. Hence, this interactive broadcasting format may be the very reason behind the widespread popularity of phone-in talk shows.

Talk shows have generated a kind of talk that is distinctly different from ordinary conversation. Therefore, there is a need for competent radio hosts with the necessary skills to handle the interactive nature of such programmes. A successful interaction between the expert and the caller depends to a large extent on the ability of the host to employ appropriate discourse strategies. Furthermore, the hosts must not only be able to foster effective communication among hosts, experts and callers; but they must also be able to do so within the constraints of broadcast talk. This is because, unlike ordinary conversations, radio talk is set apart by two unique features - firstly, the existence of institutional norms that govern radio talk; and secondly, the presence of an overhearing audience. Both of these features exercise a significant influence on the kind of talk that is produced on radio talk shows.

Gumperz & Hymes (1986) describe discourse strategies as interactive tools used by discourse participants in a communicative event. The intention is to achieve certain communicative goals such as achieving coherence, managing turn-allocation and controlling topic. Drew & Heritage (1992) propose that discourse strategies in ordinary conversations such as topic shift, repair and interruption, are used by participants in institutional settings to perform specific role-related activities. These non-specific conversational strategies in ordinary conversations are adapted to perform some specialized role-specific or "strategic" task in institutional settings.

Research on the discourse strategies of radio talk shows is at present limited. Current research on radio talk shows have mainly focused on the construction of talk show host identity (Fairclough, 1995b; Brand & Scannell, 1991; Goffman, 1981); the role of hosts in maintaining neutrality (Hutchby, 1992; Fairclough, 1995a); and audience response (Montgomery, 1988). While some research has been done on the discourse strategies in expert-advice phone-ins, these have focused on agreement and disagreement (Kuo, 1994), and expressing commitment to one's proposition (Pappas, 1988).

However, there is still a scarcity of research on turn-taking and topic management strategies in the institutional context of radio talk shows. To date, only two studies have been found (Hutchby, 1991; Cameron and Hills,

1990) which deal specifically with turn-taking and topic management strategies on radio talk show discourse. Hutchby's (1991) study found that hosts used formulations and adjacency pairs to control conversational topics. Cameron and Hills' (1990) study investigated hosts' strategies in opening and closing telephone calls, as well as in containing inappropriate and offensive calls. Their findings identified an asymmetrical relationship between the discourse participants, with the hosts assuming greater power

This study investigates the discourse strategies used by hosts of local expert-advice phone-in talk shows in English. The objective of the study is to examine the discourse strategies used by hosts of radio phone-in talk shows in Malaysia, with regard to conversational turn-taking and topic-management. The study also seeks to investigate the ways in which these strategies are affected by the institutional nature of phone-in radio talk shows, and the presence of an overhearing audience.

Characteristics of Radio Talk Shows

Several discernible characteristics mark the nature of radio talk shows:

- forum for the exchange of information and opinions
- listener-oriented
- interactive
- communicative
- host-centred
- private and public discourse
- spontaneous yet structured

METHODOLOGY

Three local medical advice phone-in talk shows were selected and transcribed using regular English orthography The shows were selected from two different programmes; "Radio Doctor" and "Healthy Lifestyles" These shows, each lasting an average of 55 minutes, were part of the expert-advice phone-in talk shows aired on Radio Four, R.T.M. A summary of the data of the three talk shows is shown in Table [1].

PROGRAMME	HOST	TOPIC	GUEST
Healthy Lifestyles	Alan Zachariah	Health Screening	Mr. Alburn William
Radio Doctor	Ronnie Atkinson	Food Refrigeration	Dr Beh Chor Khim
Radio Doctor	Zainon Rahman	Common Childhood Problems & Diseases	Dr Zulkifli Ismail

Table 1 A Summary of Data of Three Malaysian Radio Talk Shows

The study takes an essentially qualitative approach to the analysis of data. First, a study was conducted to identify the observable discourse strategies in each of the three recordings. Next, a frequency count was made in order to ascertain the frequency with which these strategies occurred. An interpretative study was then made based on the regular patterns which emerged from the frequency count.

The following abbreviations are used to refer to the hosts:

AZ - Alan Zachariah
RA - Ronnie Atkinson
ZR - Zainon Rahman

FINDINGS

The findings revealed that institutional constraints of radio talk shows and the presence of an overhearing audience, exert a significant degree of influence on the hosts' use of discourse strategies.

Format of Radio Talk Shows

The large volume of broadcast programmes that are produced daily has prompted producers to resort to the adoption of a regular format for such programmes. In fact, Brand and Scannell (1991) stress that the continuous production of broadcast programmes can only be possible, in the long run, by the use of a standardized format. For this reason, the use of a standardized format has become a norm in radio stations. Formatting involves the production of programmes based on a regular layout, whereby the basic structure and content remain the same but the particularities vary from show to show Hence, broadcast programmes often consist of a highly standardized use of elements, examples of which are, signature tunes, standard sequence for the programme content, as well as standardized beginnings and endings.

A comparison made among the three Malaysian talk shows reveal that all the talk shows in the study adopted a standard format. The shows were found to exhibit three phases:

- Opening Phase - Opening and introducing the show
- Medial Phase - Interviewing the expert and taking telephone calls
- Closing Phase - Closing the show

The opening phase involved the introduction of the show, expert and the topic of discussion. The medial phase consisted of the host interviewing the expert on the predetermined topic of discussion, as well as taking telephone calls from listeners who call in with questions for the expert. The bulk of the talk was contained in the medial phase, with the interviews taking up slightly more time than the telephone conversations. A possible explanation for this is that most of the callers' questions were only answered by the expert after the call had been terminated. Therefore, the telephone conversations were seldom lengthy The closing phase involved the rounding up of the show with closing remarks by the host.

Topic Introduction

The radio talk shows in this study were characterized by the preallocation of a conversational topic for the duration of each show. The predetermined topic of a show thus constituted the central topic, around which other related "sub-topics" evolved. The term "sub-topic" (Sigman, 1983; Wilson, 1989) in this study refers to talk on various subjects that can be subsumed under the central topic.

In the data gathered in this study, the following two strategies were used by hosts in introducing the central topics at the beginning of the talk shows; firstly, an overt and direct topic initiation; and secondly, a covert and indirect topic initiation (Wilson, 1989). In giving an overt and direct topic initiation, the host specifies explicitly what the central topic is about, for example, "we're talking about ..." , as shown in extract [1]:

[1] AZ:HL Line 36-40

→	H	:	Alright *now* uh we're talking about uh
	E		((laughs))
	H		Yeah ((laughs)) something which concerns everyone and that is this uh business of health screening.

On the other hand, a covert and indirect topic initiation does not specify explicitly the central topic. This strategy was used by one of the hosts, RA, who avoided a direct mention of the topic. Instead, he produced a lengthy preamble to it. However, although listeners could eventually discern the central topic of the show, such a strategy appears to be less effective in introducing a topic, as compared to an overt and direct topic initiation, which left listeners with no doubt as to what the main topic was. This might suggest why the host, RA, who used an indirect introduction in the form of a preamble, received fewer telephone calls on the show, as compared to the other two hosts. Compared to AZ, who received eight calls, and ZR, who received seven, RA received only five calls. However, the corpus of the study is too small to generalize, firstly, about the hosts' preference for either an overt and direct topic-introduction strategy, or a covert and indirect one; and secondly, the effectiveness of one strategy over another

At the medial phase of the shows, topics were found to be re-introduced explicitly for the sake of listeners who tuned in to the programme midway, and listeners who were already tuned in. AZ was found to reintroduce the topic five times at the medial phase, whereas ZR reintroduced the topic

twice, and RA once. The re-introduction of topics appeared to be especially important in the medial phase of the programmes when hosts invited listeners to phone in with questions for the experts. This was to ensure that callers' questions were relevant to the central topic of discussion.

Management of Sub-topics

The writer has avoided using the term "topic shift" because topics do not shift in expert-advice talk shows, as compared to ordinary conversation. In expert-advice talk shows, only one predetermined topic is assigned to each show Therefore, the term "sub-topic" shift (Wilson, 1989) is perhaps a more accurate description of the kind of shift that occurs in expert-advice phone-ins.

The data revealed that sub-topic shifts were predominantly initiated and controlled by the hosts. It was observed that conversational sub-topics were managed by turn-taking strategies and "topic-bounding devices" (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973) or "transition markers" (Crow, 1983). Table [2] summarizes the strategies used by the hosts in managing sub-topics.

Frequency of Use Topic Management Strategies	HL:AZ	RD:RA	RD:ZR	Total	Average Frequency	Percentage
Continuers	102	60	22	184	61.33	45.77
Adjacency Pairs	36	76	28	140	46.67	34.83
Topic-bounding Devices	22	24	19	65	21.67	16.17
Abrupt Shifts	2	3	3	7	2.33	1 99
Explicit Shifts	2	1	2	5	1.67	1.24
Total	164	164	74	402	134	100

Table 2 : Frequency of Use of Topic Management Strategies

A host's management of topic was facilitated by the institutionally preallocated turn-taking system in the radio talk shows. In the institutional context of radio talk shows, the host is assigned with greater speaking rights, with which he can control the allocation and distribution of turns. Thus, the host can use his turn to elicit talk on the topic concerned, or to place constraints on a listener's response.

Adjacency Pairs

It was found that hosts regularly use adjacency pairs to control the topic in talk shows. This was done by providing the first part of an adjacency pair (Sacks et al, 1974), thereby directing the response of experts and callers to the desired topic. The study found that a total number of 149 adjacency pairs were used by the hosts in the management of sub-topics. The three most common adjacency pairs used by hosts to manage sub-topics were the question-answer, formulation-confirmation/disconfirmation, and comment-response pairs [see Table 3].

Adjacency Pair Types	Frequency of Use					
	HL.AZ	RD:RA	RD:ZR	Total	Average Frequency	Percentage
Question-answer	21	42	16	79	26.33	53.02
Comment-response	6	32	9	47	15.67	31.54
Formulation-confirmation/disconfirmation	9	2	3	14	4.67	9.40
Thanks-Acknowledgement	2	2	2	6	2	1.34
Greeting-greeting	1	1	1	3	1	2.00
Total	39	79	31	149	49.67	100

Table 3 Frequency of Use of Adjacency Pair Types

Question-Answer

The first type of adjacency pair is the question-answer sequence. The question-answer sequence makes up the majority of the adjacency pairs in the conversations. A total of 79 question-answer adjacency pairs were found. This constitutes 53.02 percent of the total number of adjacency pairs used by talk show hosts. The numerous occurrence of the question-answer sequence appears to correspond with the purpose of expert-advice phone-in shows, which is essentially to elicit information from experts through questions from the host and callers. It appears that questions are a popular strategy for hosts; both to maintain, as well as shift a conversational sub-topic.

The study revealed that out of 79 occurrences of the question-answer adjacency pair, 78 were initiated by the hosts. It was found that in all instances, except for one, experts did not initiate any sub-topics. Instead they waited for the hosts to issue the first part of the pair, before proceeding to respond to it. By doing so, the experts demonstrated their awareness of the host's central role in controlling the direction of the conversation. Thus, the experts hardly ever initiated the first part of an adjacency pair

The use of questions in generating talk on a preassigned topic in talk shows has two obvious effects. First, the hosts' questions effectively sort out the mass of information into more digestible blocks for listeners, so that the attention and interest of the audience may be sustained. Second, the use of questions to confirm and clarify an expert's utterances enables the talk to appear as a spontaneous conversation rather than a scripted interview Such spontaneity lends the interview a sense of informality

Comment-response

The comment-response sequence is the second type of adjacency pair used. The data showed a total of 47 instances in which the hosts made comments on what the experts had just said. This figure constitutes 31.54 percent of the total number of adjacency pairs found in the data. These comments by the hosts did not initiate new sub-topics, but they contributed towards the maintenance of the current sub-topic. Although hosts of talk shows are not strictly required to maintain impartiality, the data showed that the hosts in this study generally preferred to adopt the experts' stand. Moreover, hosts tended to avoid making remarks which run the potential of challenging the experts' statements. In extract [2], for example, the repeated use of the opinion markers "I think" [arrows a and b] and "I don't think" [arrow c]

by the host implied that the host's utterances were not exactly assertions. Instead, the host was opening up the possibility for the expert to respond to the former's opinion.

[2]	RD:RA Line 511-547		
[a] →	H	:	Because I *think* in terms of *price* it's *al*so different. It's a different ball game en*tire* | ly
	E		| Yes yes
	H		Um so we're *talk*ing about urban areas
[b] →			and I think if at all it comes *about* it'll take a very very long time
	E		I think so. .
			((The expert talks about the practice of slaughtering fish and chicken in markets in China)).
	H		Mm hm but here again uh I mean in our
[c] →			society I *don't* think we we can put up with this kind of thing.

By avoiding the making of overt assertions, the host was in effect avoiding the possibility of a face loss, in the event that the expert should disagree with his statements. Additionally, the host was maintaining his institutional role as elicitor of information, and was allowing the expert to have the final say on the matter

Formulation-Confirmation/Disconfirmation

The third type of adjacency pair used by hosts to maintain a conversational sub-topic is the formulation-confirmation/disconfirmation adjacency pair. Formulations serve to maintain a sub-topic, since they are a summary of what was said earlier They also serve to elicit further news from a speaker regarding what he had just said. It was found that the hosts initiated formulations in all the cases. This could probably explain why the experts did not initiate formulations: they did not consider it necessary to do so. The formulation-confirmation/disconfirmation adjacency pairs occurred a total of 14 times. This constituted 9.4 percent of the total number of adjacency pairs. The formulations found in the data usually began with expressions such as "so in other words" [arrow a] and "what you're saying is" [arrow b], as illustrated in extract [3], to indicate that the host was providing a summary of what was just said.

[3] HL:AZ Line 745-750

[a] → H Mm hm, so in other words
[b] → what you're *say*ing Doctor Beh is that
you have a *role*, the patient has a *role*
when it comes to the health *screen*ing,
there are certain things you must tell
your doctor
E *That's* right, ...

The host's formulation enabled listeners to encapsulate what the expert had been talking about previously The phrase "what you're saying" further indicates that the host was not taking any position on the matter, but was merely summarizing what the expert had just said.

Continuers

Schegloff (1986) describes continuers as behavioral tokens that recipients regularly produce at transition-relevant places during long turns of talk. He added that continuers are used to indicate that the listener does not intend to assume the speaking turn.

Continuers appeared to be a significant topic management strategy They occurred 184 times in the data. It was found that hosts regularly used continuers, such as "mm hm", "uh huh", "yes" and "yah", as a turn-avoidance strategy in order to encourage experts or callers to continue speaking. Two of the hosts, AZ and RA, were found to have used continuers overwhelmingly. AZ produced 102 continuers within a one-hour show, while RA produced 60. Only ZR produced significantly fewer continuers (22, to be exact), as compared to the other two hosts. Nevertheless, the use of continuers was significant in the management of sub-topics, as indicated by the average frequency of 61.33 per host.

Continuers serve two main interactional functions in the talk shows. First, by producing continuers, the host effectively indicated to the expert or caller to continue speaking on the current sub-topic. However, the frequent production of continuers and the avoidance of full turns by the hosts resulted in long turns by the expert. Second, the use of continuers enabled the hosts to create an appearance of an informal, spontaneous conversation, or fresh talk (Goffman, 1981). The occurrence of continuers in radio talk

shows makes such conversation very similar to the discourse in ordinary conversation. It is this unique feature that sets radio talk apart from other formal institutional talk.

Topic-bounding Devices

The data revealed the frequent use of topic-bounding devices to introduce sub-topics in the talk shows. The purpose of using topic-bounding devices was to smoothen the transition from a current sub-topic to a new one. The topic-bounding devices found in the study were "okay", "alright", "right", "now" and "well" [see Table 4].

Topic-bounding Devices	Frequency of Use					
	HL:AZ	RD:RA	RD:ZR	Total	Average Frequency	Percentage
Okay/Alright/Right	16	12	12	40	13.33	61.54
Now	3	11	5	19	6.33	29.23
Well	3	1	2	6	2.00	9.23
Total	22	24	19	65	21.67	100.00

Table 4 Frequency of Use of Topic-bounding Devices

"Okay", "alright" and "right" have been categorized as one group of markers since there is no obvious semantic difference among them. The data revealed that "okay", "alright" and "right" were the most frequently used topic-bounding devices, with 40 occurrences, or 61.54 percent of the total. The average frequency for the use of these markers among the three hosts is 13.33. Furthermore, all the markers were often accompanied by word stress, and sometimes by increased volume. This was done to indicate a shift, for example, in extract [4].

[4] HL Line 676-677
H Uh huh so you must get a doctor.
RIGHT we have another call coming in here.

Explicit Shifts

The hosts were found to use an "explicit strategy" (Wilson, 1989) to introduce sub-topics. This type of strategy is seldom found in ordinary conversation, but is frequently found in institutional contexts where an asymmetrical power relationship exists. This strategy involves the explicit announcement that a new sub-topic is being introduced in a talk show. Explicit shifts occurred only five times in the talk shows, which is 1.24 percent of the total number of topic management strategies. This strategy is not commonly used by the hosts. However, it represents a unique feature of radio talk discourse that sets it apart from ordinary conversation. The asymmetrical power relation between hosts and experts implies that hosts have the institutional right to direct conversational flow. An example of explicit shift is found in extract [5], in which the host specifically mentioned that the current sub-topic of conversation was going to shift to a new one.

[5] RD:RA Line 267-269

→ H : We come to the part where we discuss
*main*tenance.
E Yes=

Abrupt Shifts

The majority of the shifts that occur in the talk shows were achieved coherently. However, there were a number of occasions when the shifts appeared to be rather abrupt, for example, in extract [6]. Nevertheless, abrupt shifts occurred only seven times, and constituted only two percent of all the topic management strategies. Abrupt shifts and the lack of topic-bounding devices did not seem to pose any problems for sub-topic shifts in the institutional context of the radio talk shows.

[6] RD:RA Line 1236-1240

H : What *mat*ters is the food we buy is
tasty |we're happy with it |right?
E : | ((laughs)) |Yes
→ H Zainon do we have a call Zainon?

Overall, topic management appeared to be a relatively simple task in radio talk shows. The basic job of the host was mainly to get the expert to talk on the preassigned topic and to steer callers in that direction. The data revealed that talk in the radio talk shows was generally coherent. However,

this does not necessarily mean syntactic coherence, but rather coherence in the actions performed by the utterances.

The apparent coherence in the talk is likely to be due to the following four reasons. First, the existence of a central, preassigned topic that sets the agenda for a talk show resulted in the relative ease in shifting sub-topics. Second, the hosts' interviews with the experts were largely scripted. In other words, the host and expert were aware of what the other was going to say. It may be presumed that the host and expert might have discussed the content of their conversation prior to the airing of the show. Third, calls were screened before airing, thus inappropriate and irrelevant calls were not put on the air Hence, the show producer could ensure that only questions relevant to the main topic were forwarded to the expert. Fourth, the asymmetrical relationship between participants meant that hosts had the ultimate right to direct the conversational topic. Thus, conversational shifts that would be considered abrupt and maybe even impolite in ordinary conversation, were acceptable in radio talk.

Opening and Closing of Telephone Calls

In ordinary telephone conversations, the caller-identification and receiver-recognition sequences are often minimized and are normally achieved in three turns (Schegloff, 1979). In institutional talk, for example in phone-in talk radio, these sequences are often further reduced to two turns (Hutchby, 1991) Such minimization is possible in talk radio because self-identification by callers is often not required as they have earlier identified themselves to the programme producers (Hutchby, 1991).

However, the data in this study revealed that the majority of the identification and recognition sequences of telephone calls in the study took between five to seven turns to achieve, which exceeded the number of turns proposed for ordinary conversation (Schegloff, 1979) and institutional talk (Hutchby, 1991) [see Table 5]. The delay in the identification and recognition sequences of Malaysian radio talk shows could be attributed to the hosts' routine practice of identifying callers on the air The result was the occasional lengthy identification sequences, which resulted in the loss of much air time.

Number of Turns for Identification /Recognition	HL:AZ	RD:RA	RD:ZR
Call 1	5	5	N/I
Call 2	7	N/R	5
Call 3	8	3	7
Call 4	N/I	7	5
Call 5	5	5	3
Call 6	12		2
Call 7	6		5
Call 8	7		
Total	50	20	27
Average Number of Turns per Caller	7 1	5.0	4.5

Table 5: Number of Turns for Identification and Recognition Sequences

Note : N/I - No identification or recognition sequence was found.
N/R - Identification was not followed by any recognition.

One reason for the delay in achieving caller-identification and recognition could be the callers' confusion about the interaction context. Callers seemed to be unsure at times as to whom they were addressing in the three-party conversation. Another reason for the delay could be that some callers were unaware of the institutional practice of having to identify oneself on the air, and they only did so when prompted by the hosts. Furthermore, the reluctance of callers to identify themselves upon the opening of a call may be due to their perceived need to engage in small talk, or what Hutchby (1991) refers to as "affiliative openings" The callers may well be adhering to the Asian notion of politeness (Scollon & Wong-Scollon, 1991), by seeking to establish a relationship before starting a conversation.

The closing of telephone calls in the talk shows was not negotiated as in ordinary telephone conversations, but was determined by hosts. The hosts

were found to typically end calls as soon as the callers had asked their question. The closing sequences were fairly straightforward, with hosts producing pre-closing utterances such as "okay then" or "right", followed by closing utterances such as "goodbye", "see you", "thank you" or "thanks for calling" The question of politeness in closing telephone calls did not appear to be an issue here. This could be due to the asymmetrical relationship in radio talk show discourse in which hosts are accorded the right to decide when to terminate a call.

Topic-ending

Topic-endings in talk shows are not negotiated between discourse participants, as they are in ordinary conversation. Instead, they are primarily the task of the host (Hutchby, 1991) It was found that at the end of the three talk shows, the hosts typically ended the topic by giving an explicit reminder as to what the main topic had been. However, other than producing a reminder or summary of the main topic, no other observable topic-ending strategies were found.

No matter how brief, the reference to the main topic at the closing of a conversation is a unique feature that differentiates radio conversation from ordinary conversation. Summarization of the main topic can only occur in institutional talk, such as radio phone-in talk, where a topic is predetermined and where participants are constrained to adhere to the predetermined topic.

Recommendations

From the writer's observation, the main factor which appeared to impede the otherwise smooth flow of discourse in the shows was the delay in the caller-identification stage. The following are some suggestions as to how this waste of broadcast time could be avoided. First, talk show hosts could reduce the number of turns for caller-identification in the opening of telephone calls. The hosts could do this by first introducing the callers, instead of obtaining caller-identification during airtime. This could be done by using the information about the callers' identity which had earlier been given to the show producers.

Second, talk show producers should ensure that callers are aware of the conversational set-up of expert-advice phone-in shows that involve more than two speakers. It was found that some callers displayed confusion when faced

with a three-way telephone conversation as in expert-advice phone-in talk shows. This led to their hesitancy in asking questions, resulting in some waste of time. To avoid such confusion, producers should brief callers about the interactional set-up of phone-in shows. This should be done before the callers are put on the air

Third, hosts could field the callers' questions directly to the experts when there is insufficient time. By doing this, hosts can avoid any possible delay, and thus enable more questions to be asked within the available time left before the end of the show

Conclusion

Many similarities were observed in the discourse strategies employed by the hosts in the organization of turn-taking and topic management. These regular patterns of discourse strategies point to the institutional nature of radio talk shows. The patterns also indicate the central role of the host, both in addressing a silent audience, as well as in facilitating interaction among the discourse participants. It was significant to note that the hosts frequently used adjacency pairs in turn-taking and topic and sub-topic management. The study also revealed a tendency of the hosts to allow callers to take too much time for self-introduction, thereby resulting in an unnecessary waste of time. This practice could be attributed to the Asian notion of politeness, that one should establish a relationship before starting a conversation. In fact, this could even suggest that discourse strategies in radio talk shows reflect, in part, the culture and value system of the hosts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Ms. Lim Soh Lan for her helpful comments in this research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Brand, G & Scannell, P 1991. Talk, Identity and Performance: The Tony Blackburn Show. In Scannell, *P Broadcast Talk.* London. Sage Publications.

Cameron, D. & Hills, D 1990. Listening In: Negotiating Relationships Between Listeners and Presenters on Radio Phone-in Programmes. In McGregor, G & White, R.S. (eds.). *Reception and Response.* London: Routledge.

Crow, B. K. 1983 Topic Shifts in Couples' Conversations. In Craig, R. T & Tracy, K. (eds). *Conversational Coherence: Form, Structure and Strategy.* Beverly Hills, Ca: Sage Publications.

Drew, P & Heritage, J (eds.) 1992. *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fairclough, N 1995a. *Media Discourse.* New York: Edward Arnold.

_____ 1995b. *Critical Discourse Analysis.* London: Longman.

Goffman, E. 1981 *Forms of Talk.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gumperz, J J & Hymes, D. (eds.). 1986. *Directions in Sociolinguistics.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hutchby, I. 1991 The Organization of Talk on Talk Radio. In Scannell, P *Broadcast Talk.* London. Sage Publications.

Hutchby, I. 1992. The Pursuit of Controversy: Routine Skepticism in Talk on "Talk Radio" *Sociology.* Vol. 26, No. 4, p. 673-694.

Kuo Sai-Hua. 1994. Agreement and Disagreement Strategies in a Radio Conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction.* Vol. 27, No. 2, p. 95-121

Montgomery, M. 1988. DJ Talk. In Scannell, P *Broadcast Talk.* London. Sage Publications.

Pappas, J S. 1989 Qualifiers in Patient-Physician Discourse: an Analysis of Interviews from Radio Call-in Programmes. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics.* Vol. 5, No. 2. Microfiche.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. & Jefferson, G 1974. A Simplest Systemics for the Organization of Turn-taking for Conversation. *Language.* Vol. 50, No. 4, p. 696-735.

Schegloff, E. A. 1979 Identification and Recognition in Telephone Conversation Openings. In Psathas, G (ed.). *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology.* New York: Irvington.

Schegloff, E. A. 1986. The Routine as Achievements. In *Human Studies.* Vol. 9, p. 111-151

Schegloff E. A. & Sacks, H. 1973 Opening Up Closings. *Semiotica.* Vol. 8, p. 289-237

Scollon, R. & Wong-Scollon, S. 1991 Topic confusion in English-Asian discourse. *World Englishes.* Vol. 10, No. 2, p. 113-125.

Sigman, S. J 1983 Topic and Topic Drift. In Craig, R. T & Tracy, K. (eds). *Conversational Coherence: Form, Structure and Strategy.* Beverly Hills, Ca. Sage Publications.

Wilson, J 1989 *On the Boundaries of Conversation.* Oxford:Pergamon Press.