Turn Sequences in Host-Host and Host-Caller Talk in a Malaysian Radio Phone-In

Dr. Siti Nurbaya Mohd Nor

Faculty of Languages and Linguistics, University Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Corresponding Author: Dr. Siti Nurbaya Mohd Nor, E-mail: snurbaya@um.edu.my

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT

The study describes the turn sequences in host-host and host-caller talk and the nature of radio phone-in interactions in Malaysia. Based on selected episodes of phone-in interactions from a radio phone-in programme, this study explores the sequential organization of interactions between host-host and host-caller in the development of talk based on topics of discussion. Topics on common issues that generally feed the Malaysian public, such as, on social, relationship, moral and ethical issues are pre-selected for discussion with the hosts and radio callers. Since the radio station is broadcast in English, participants to the radio phone-in interact in English as a second language. The study adopts both Conversation Analysis and Membership Categorization Analysis in analysing turn-design and turn-management in the development of interactions between host-host and host-caller. The paper also illustrates how host and caller orientate to certain membership categories or category work in the sequential unfolding of talk. Findings show that the introductory stage of host-host talk is significant in establishing opinions from the radio hosts, as well as provides a resource for topical content in the development of talk. Both hosts are seen to work collaboratively, in which each conversational turn builds on prior talk, which ultimately develops a scenario for the setting of the topic for discussion. Participants also make reasoned and moral judgements about behaviour based upon the available membership categories in the content of talk.

Introduction

The genre of radio phone-in conversation has held a prominent position in the mass-media market in Malaysia. This type of radio phone-in format has opened a channel for live participation from the public, in which ordinary people could gain direct access via telephone to voice their opinions on various issues with those who occupy an institutional position in the programme. By gaining direct access to the discussion forum, the public has the opportunity to participate in the emerging public discourse.

Radio phone-in discourse is one type of discourse analytic research which has seen a rise in the last few decades. This is seen in the investigation of many aspects of radio phone-ins research, such as, the social organization of talk (Hutchby, 1991, 1992a, 1992b, 1996a, 1996b, 1999; Liddicoat et. Al, 1992; Thornborrow, 2001a; Bell and Garrett, 1998); the categorical organization and construction of public identities (Fitzgerald and Housley, 2002; Ferenčik, 2007; Hutchby, 2001); call sequences and social and moral order (Ames, 2013, 2012); discursive power (Kilby and Horowitz, 2013); and political radio phone-ins, caller types and types of interactions (Dori-Hacohen, 2014, 2012, 2011). With the exception of Ames (2013), most studies have traditionally been conducted in single host scenarios in examining the structural organization of radio phone-in programmes (Hutchby, 1991, 1992a, 1992b, 1996a, 1996b, 1999, 2001; Liddicoat et. Al, 1992; Thornborrow, 2001a; Fitzgerald and Housley, 2002; Dori-Hacohen, 2014, 2012, 2011; Jautz, 2013).

However, there is a dearth of research on radio phone-ins in the Asian context, which particularly deal with the organization of turn sequences in interactions in English as a second language (ESL), in particular which explore the organization of talk between dual-hosts and callers. Thus, this study examines the organization of turn sequences in interactions between hosts and callers in a Malaysian radio phone-in programme which concern topics of discussion on moral and ethical issues.

Literature Review

One of the notable works in radio phone-in research is found in Hutchby's (2001) study on turn sequences in a radio talk show. The study adopted the methodological approach of Conversation Analysis (CA) to explore the discursive devices that were used to legitimate, or authenticate lay speakers' opinions about news in radio discourse. The oriented-to importance of 'witnessing' (i.e. claims to first-hand knowledge) was established to account for the authenticity of an opinion in calls to the radio talk show. Growing interest in radio phone-ins research have also brought about the need to explore the structural organization of phone-in programmes. For instance, Dori-Hacohen (2014) compared the overall structural organization of political phone-in programmes in the USA and Israel and revealed that there were differences in the structural organization of these two programmes. While the USA phone-ins were highly organized, the Israeli phone-ins were found to promote institutional relations that were non-hierarchical between participants.

Extensive studies have been carried out on traditional radio phone-in scenarios which involve a single host and a caller, yet few studies have investigated multi-hosts interactions. Ames (2012, 2013) examined features of dual-host chat-based programmes in Australia by using both Conversation Analysis (CA) and Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA). She demonstrated that in addition to the influence of the radio programme, there were three membership category devices that influenced host-host talk and they include 'telling stories', 'members of a team' and 'members of a community'. It was found that the ways in which hosts and callers aligned to these categories had consequences that might lead to the overt exclusion, or otherwise, of members of the overhearing audience. In addition, the analysis on the type of community also showed how participants familiarize themselves within a particular programme. In another related study, Ames (2013) focused on the sequences of calls in a dual-host interaction which had been designed to develop a sense of conflict in order to entertain the audience.

Another study which combined both Conversation Analysis (CA) and Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA) in exploring phone-in interactions is found in Fitzgerald and Housley's (2002) work on the examination of the sequential and categorical organization in a radio phone-in. The categorical features, together with the sequential organization were explored to identify the ways in which identities were reflexively developed in addition to the sequential flow of interaction. The multi-layered organizational methods used as members were addressed, were considered as part of the on-going flow of interaction. Kilby and Horowitz's (2013) study also highlighted the benefits of using both CA and MCA in their investigation on the sequential and categorical production of discursive power that were demonstrated within the openings of calls to a radio phone-in programme.

Studies on host-caller interactions have also examined turn sequences and the orientation to roles (Fitzgerald, 1999; Fitzgerald and Housley, 2002; Hutchby, 1991, 1996a, 1996b; Thornborrow, 2001a, 2001b); Ames, 2013). These studies have also demonstrated that participants in radio phone-in interactions conform to certain membership categories which sequentially operate in the development of talk (Fitzgerald, 1999; Fitzgerald and Housley, 2002; Kilby and Horowitz, 2013; Ames, 2013).

This study draws upon existing literature that have examined turn sequences in radio phone-in programmes (Fitzgerald, 2001; Fitzgerald and Housley, 2002; Hutchby, 1991, 1996a, 1996b; Thornborrow, 2001a, 2001b); Ames, 2013) by using the combined methodological approaches of Conversation Analysis (CA) and Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA) (Sacks, 1995) in investigating how speakers develop their turns and do category

work that are related to the topics of discussion. Conversation Analysis (CA) describes the norms of the turn-taking structure of casual conversation (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974) which involve the systematic way about how speakers decide when to speak during a conversation, how speakers can be related to each other in sequence or may go together as adjacency pairs. Turns are constructed by participants who orientate to tacit knowledge about how turns operate and a number of maxims operate as general procedures for talk (Sacks, 1992). Among the most basic maxims are, that one person speaks at a time; that conversational turns do not overlap; and that people take turns at producing turns. Other maxims include how participants decide whose turn it is next, when it is their turn, when might be a good time to make a conversational turn, what kind of topics those turns might reasonably deal with, how turns can be organized to bring about an opportunity to talk about something, and so on. In radio phone-in interactions, these basic maxims and conversational mechanisms can be applied to understand the contexts, conversational participants and their interactional intentions. So the ways in which participants organize their talk in phone-in interactions will disclose something about their role in that setting, their expectations of other participants' roles in that setting, their intentions for what the setting should accomplish, and so on. The sequence of conversational turns known as adjacency pairs show how turns are tied to each other, for example, in sequences of greeting-greeting; question-answer; summons-acknowledgement; request-compliance, and so on.

Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA) examines the ways in which members organize their interaction by using categories, devices and predicates, which are mapped onto a category or collection of categories (Sacks, 1995). In Sacks' (1995) famous example "*The baby cried. The mommy picked it up*", the categories of 'baby' and 'mommy' are analyzed by associating them with the membership categorization device 'the family'. Sacks also generated a further set of analytical concepts called membership categorization devices, membership categories and category-bound activities. In radio phone-ins, the membership categories (MCs) such as 'host', 'caller', 'parties to a phone-in' are viewed as membership categories of the membership categorization device (MCD) 'programme relevant category' (Fitzgerald, 2001; Fitzgerald and Housley, 2002). The notion of category-bound activities (CBAs) describes how certain activities are common-sensically tied to specific categories and devices. For instance, the CBAs of 'host' are tied to the activity of introducing the topic, summoning the caller, questioning caller etc.; while that of 'caller' involve acknowledging the host's greeting, answering the question, relaying information etc. (Fitzgerald and Housley, 2002; Fitzgerald, 2001). These ideas of categories or descriptions involved a conception of an array of 'collections' or a shared 'stock of common sense knowledge' which summed up the membership categorization devices (MCDs). These descriptions of a shared 'stock of common sense knowledge' can be applied to radio phone-in interactions, which involve participants' sharing of local or world knowledge on issues of discussions. Therefore, such categorization and their devices formed part of the common-sensical framework of members' methods and recognisable capacities of practical sense making (Sacks, 1995; Fitzgerald and Housley, 2002).

In the sequential aspects of conversation, this common-sense reasoning can be displayed by members when describing the world. Fitzgerald (2007) describes the sequential actions as 'categories-in-action', for instance, in relating to questions by the host in radio talk shows, the host not only occupies the sequential slot of questioner but also produces the question for a particular audience, that is, the radio listeners. Thus, the host who produces such an utterance does not only occupy a sequential position, but also an interactional environment which is filled with their associated predicates and potentially reliable forms of predication. These 'predicates' are not only concerned with knowing how to form a question, but also how to produce 'a recognizably relevant question for the person being addressed' (Fitzgerald and Housley, 2002). The term 'recipient design' is also formulated to include the formation of the question specifically for the particular type of radio audience.

This study attempts to explain how host-host and host-caller in a radio phone-in programme arrived at understandings of one another's action during the exchanges of turns between them, and how turns are

constructed so as to respond to prior turn(s) in the development of talk. Thus, the study attempts to seek answers to the following questions:

1. 1.What are the sequential stages of openings, call validation and closings observed in the Malaysian radio phone-in
2. programmes?
3. 2.How are turns constructed in the development of talk between host-host and host-caller in the programme?

Methodology
Analytical Framework
The application of Sacks' (1995) category work, using both Conversation Analysis (CA) and Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA) serves as the basis of analysis for the study. This article investigates the turn sequences in a Malaysian radio phone-in programme observed in the development of talk between host-host and host-caller. In considering the sequential actions and membership categories that are enacted in the interactions, the study draws upon Sack's (1995) category work on normative reasoning and moral judgements that are developed in talk. The study illustrates the stages of host-host introductions, call validation stage of host-caller and openings and closings of calls. It specifically looks into the stages of host-host talk before the development of host-caller talk and demonstrate the design and management of turns in a Malaysian radio phone-in programme.

Description of Data
The data consist of 9 hours of episodes of talk which involve interactions between host-host and host-caller from a popular English commercial radio station called *LiteFM* that offers light entertainment to radio audiences. The selection of data involves episodes of talk from two chat-based breakfast programmes called *Talk Tuesday* and *Funky Friday,* which are generally renowned for their light-hearted approach in engaging listeners. These programmes offer light-hearted topics of discussion, such as relationship, moral and ethical issues which generally feed the public discourse in the Malaysian society. Apart from offering a form of entertainment to the radio audience, the programmes also need to turn callers into entertainment as part of the show. This in a way helps to improve the ratings for listenership for the particular programmes. Therefore these programmes represent public participation from radio listeners. The standard format involves the host inviting callers (members of the public or listeners) to call in to air their views on pre-selected topics and discuss their viewpoints with the hosts. Twenty topics on relationship, moral and ethical issues were selected for analysis, out of which 104 callers came on the show.

The study adopts a qualitative analysis in exploring **t**he sequences of talk between host-host and host-caller on specific topics in order to demonstrate the sequential organization of the radio phone-in programmes. The analysis also considers the turn management in the development of talk between the participants in relation to a topic of discussion.

Analysis and Results
Stages of host-host talk
The introduction of topics for the day plays a significant role on the development of participation of radio callers in phone-in programmes. The topic of interest or the relevance of the topic to callers gives them a reason to call-in to air their views. Therefore, the introduction stage of host-host talk which precedes host-caller interaction is important as it sets the stage for the discussion and develops the participation of radio callers. This take on two main forms: the duologue, in which both hosts discuss the specific topic; and the other involves the hosts' acknowledgement of comments from social media posts (Facebook and Twitter). Talkback segments on these programmes are always pre-empted by host-host duologue prior to engaging caller response to the topic (Ames, 2013:101). This type of talk is referred to as 'co-text' (Korolija, 1998), which has been studied specifically in

relation to talkback conversations where its use is more common and more highly visible than in ordinary speech. 'Co-text' is defined as "the talk or text preceding a particular unit of discourse under analysis" and "is a recent and locally shared resource for topicality and coherence" (Korolija, 1998:100). It is considered as a contextual resource because not all features of previous conversations become co-text as co-text is recycled in segments or and is actively used by "actors" in a conversation who seek for "shared understanding" and establishing common ground (Korolija, 1998:100). Schegloff (1987) also mentions the aspect of co-text in that the co-text's givenness must be empirically explored rather than simply assumed; and there is a need to look in detail in what interlocutors in discourse single out from co-text and re (activate). Furthermore, the effects of a context in the organization of discourse cannot be simply stated but there is a need to look actively at the ways participants "select and display in their conduct which of the indefinitely many aspects of context they are making relevant, or invoking, for the immediate moment" (Schegloff, 1987:219; Korolija, 1998:102).

The lengthy co-text below shows a duologue between the hosts that precedes host-caller interaction. This co-text is important to consider in interaction as it can establish a pre-requisite for calls as a contextual resource for further interactions. In the data, the hosts are regular hosts of the programme, referred to here as H1 (host 1 - male) and H2 (host 2 - female).

Extract 1: LFM61   H1: host 1 H2: host 2

1	H2:	Okay Richard so (.) interesting article I read the other day about
2		Kareena Kapoor (.) bi:g bollywood actress on the verge of saying I
3		do the happiest day of her life and all that (.) and the article was
4		talking about whether her marriage will hinder her flourishing
5		acting career (.) you know she got me thinking,
6	H1:	Uhuh
7	H2:	I guess marriage can hinder your career if you think about it (.)
8		I'm not saying it always does (.) but you know (.) in times you turn
9		down a promotion (.) because that means you're way more (.) or you
10		might have to move to another country and being married well (.)
11		okay that can be really tough
12	H1:	Okay
13	H2:	You know women uh you know they become working mother and
14		it's very (.) hard (.) to follow a select career path, I mean we work to
15		pay our bills to support our families (0.4) take less risk at work and
16		jobs we weren't happy because you know we have our
17		responsibilities to our family and that is to provide (.) so loving and
18		being in a right job is not so important (0.4) then you know (.) there
19		are the occasions when you know (.) your kids get sick
20	H1:	Ehem
21	H2:	and no one is able to take care of them (.) and one of you has to
22		take time off to nurse them back to health (.) that sort of
23		thing (.) I mean (.) some companies might not want staffs who
24		are constantly have to take time off work because of family issues
25		[so]
26	H1:	[Right] right
27	H2:	and I know some people whose job is to take them far away from
28		their spouses way too much and they start growing apart (.) they
29		start feeling frustrated and all that (.) so definitely yes (.) marriage
30		does hinder your professional growth (0.4) particularly if you both

31		don't share the same priorities (.) but (0.4) who am I saying (.) I am not
32		married (.) let's talk to an expert in this [Richard (.) master Ng tell us]
33	H1:	[@@@@@@]
34	H2:	Does marriage hinder or complement your career?
35	H1:	=ok (.) this is my two cents worth *la*<L1> (.) I know where you are
36		coming from (.) single *la*<L1> went through some (.) trying to adjust
37		and learning to embrace family life *la*<L1> so to speak (.) you know
38		especially so after I got Marissa and my kid (0.4) sure (.) there are
39		few career opportunities that (.) you ↑know (.) I've had to pass *la*<L1> (.)
40		but no regrets you know 'cause (.) I'd be selfish just to think about
41		myself when my family is [involved]
42	H2:	[hmm]
43	H1:	And you know my philosophy nowadays is very simple (.) I have to
44		think as a team every time I'm required to make decisions and
45		then try to find balance between the two *la*<L1> (.) I mean my
46		family itself is the motivating factor you know (.) simply because I
47		need to provide and to have a good balance between work and
48		Family (.) [otherwise]
49	H2:	[yes]
50	H1:	I'll go crazy you know (.) so I think it's about having to (.) prioritize
51		at times (.) it's not a matter of which comes first (.) but how do I strike
52		the balance (0.5) harmoniously *la*<L1>
53	H2:	[Mmm]
54	H1:	[so to speak] that's what we want to find out in this Talk Tuesday,
55		does marriage complement or hinder your career (.) give us a call (.)
56		0-3-9-5-4-3-3-3-3-3 to share your thoughts

One of the features of radio phone-in programmes is an orientation to the personal (Ames, 2012). While the topic concerns '*marriage is a complement or a hindrance to career', it* prioritizes the personal experience of the hosts (lines 35-41 and 43-48), and at the same time it calls for opinion from the listeners (line 54-56). In the first few lines in the interaction (lines 1-5), the host establishes a situation with reference to an *'article'* about '*Kareena Kapoor'* a '*big Hollywood actress'* with regard to *'marriage will hinder her flourishing acting career'*. The reference to the article which then leads to the discussion as observed in H2's speech *'she got me thinking'* (line 5), establishes the initial stage for the topic of discussion. In line 7, H2 strongly offers her opinion that *'marriage can hinder your career'.* This argument is further supported by offering the gender category of *'women'* and a predicate to '*a working mother'.* H2 further develops her opinion by using the first person plural pronoun *'we'* to offer a general collective category of women (lines 13-14). By elaborating further on the general category of 'women', H2 provides predicates of category bound activities (CBAs) such as paying the bills, supporting their families and having responsibilities to their family (lines 13-24). At this stage of the interaction, H1 only offers minimal responses or continuers such as *'okay'* and *'right'* when H2 presents her talk. In line 32, H2 establishes her status as 'a single woman' as seen in *'who am I saying, I'm not married'* and thereby summons H1 to take up the floor, who she claims is *'an expert in this'* (line 32). The topic on *'marriage hinders or complements a career'* (line 34) is then directed to the first host in the subsequent turn. The category membership '*an expert' as* conferred in H2's utterance (line 32) and the more formal address term of *'Master Ng'* associates a person in that particular category. The invitation to address the issue then opens the conversational floor to H1 for his turn at talk. H1 establishes his personal opinion by offering his *'two cents worth'* in relation to the topic (lines 35-41). It is observed that on a number of occasions in the interactions, H1 would offer his personal opinions based on his

own experience as a '*family man'*. This orientation to the personal is considered as a significant strategy to encourage the listeners to share their experiences with regard to the topic of discussion.

It is evident that in the interactions, both hosts work collectively and collaboratively to establish a position on the subject. This feature shows how each conversational turn builds on what was previously generated, which ultimately builds towards the hosts' personal opinions. Thus, each successive turn of both hosts brings towards the focus of the topic for the day which is observed when the first host directs the topic to the listening audience (lines 54-56). In most instances of call openings, the name of the programme '*Talk Tuesday'* is announced followed by the topic of the day, for instance, *'Talk Tuesday.. does marriage complement or hinder your career'* or *'Talk Tuesday.. is age a factor in a relationship'*. It is observed that the opinion called for is directly related to personal knowledge or experience of listeners when H1 invites listeners to call in on the topic *'marriage complements or hinders your career* (lines 54-56). By making reference to the personal pronoun *'your'* in addressing the listening audience, it shows that the topic may target certain category of listeners, who may have experienced the problem in relation to the topic.

Acknowledging comments or opinions from social media posts is another interesting feature of host-host talk. This feature is evident before the lines are opened to callers or until a caller is ready to offer their opinions on air. This is also seen as another type of 'co-text' (Ames, 2013; Korolija, 1998) that is significant in interaction as it can provide a contextual resource for further interactions between the hosts and as a pre-requisite for calls. The acknowledgement of opinions from social media posts are observed in the following examples. In this particular episode, the first caller is only able to get on air after 67 turn-exchanges between host-host.

Extract 2: LFM61   H1: host 1   H2: host 2

```
61    H2:    Ah (.) few things on Facebook (.) Michael says in my opinion it is a
62            complement to our career (.) without it we won't strive hard to excel
63            in our career (.) as we need to support and and the rest of the family (.)
64            that's interesting Richard because that's what you say as well (.) so
65            your family motivate you (.) to work and get money?
66    H1:    No   [choice @@]
67    H2:        [ but your family @@] said so lovingly [@@@]
68    H1:                                              [@@@] yes
69    H2:    but you see (.) your family don't motivate you to get the job that you
70            want necessarily (.) you know because you need to think about
71            your security more so then what makes you happy than your
72            career
73    H1:    Right
74    H2:    so in a way is that kind of like a little [°hindrance is that it?°]
75    H1:                                          [I'm happy        ] in whatever
76            I'm doing (.) I mean this has been like a kind of passion for a lo:ng
77            time and that's why I manage [to stick to it for so long]
```

In lines 61-63 H2 reads out a comment from an FB sender. The host relates this comment to H1's prior opinion (lines 64-65) and seeks clarification from the first host: *'so your family motivate you to work and get money?'.* Nevertheless, H1 only provides a brief response of '*no choice'* to the question. This brief response further allows H2 to continue with her turn to challenge H1 as seen in lines 69-71. In line 73, H1 provides an affirmative response to H2's views, in which H2 further challenges H1 by uttering: *'marriage'* is *'like a hindrance'.* Notice that this speech is audibly quieter than the earlier utterance. The example shows an instance of how the host tries to

create a kind of scenario, of which the co-host takes upon it as a challenge to provide further justifications for his viewpoint. However, H1 is quite firm on his stand when he states that he is contented with whatever he has been pursuing (lines 75-77).

The next example also shows how social media posts can provide a resource for further development of talk between host-host. By establishing views on the topic, both hosts are seen to interact collaboratively with one another before summoning the first caller on air. This seems to be a strategy that is often employed by hosts before it is time for a caller to call-in. The production team will provide the information to hosts when a caller is ready to be on air.

Extract 3: LFM61   H1: host 1   H2: host 2

117	H2:	=Yeah definitely (.) Selena adds marriage may not hinder but once
118		the juniors come along things usually are different (.) usually the one
119		who earns less will give up the career and pay more attention to
120		the little ones
121	H1:	[I think about that also]
122	H2:	[Well you agree] I mean definitely but when the kids come along
123		stuff like [that]
124	H1:	[but] but I wouldn't consider hinder (.) I would consider
125		working together again with your spouse and see (.) you know (0.5)
126		who does the (0.7) bread earning *la*<L1>

Here, it shows evidence that social media comments contribute to the exchanges of opinions between host-host. As seen in lines 117-120, there is an instance of an overlap between the exchanges of turns of H1 and H2 in relation to *'Selena's'* opinion. H1 indicates his agreement with the FB sender as observed in: '*I think about that also'* (line 121). This is further confirmed by H2 as evident in line 122. However, note the disagreement from H1 in the use of the contrastive marker '*but*' in expressing his views that having '*kids*' would hinder a marriage. In relation to the utterance, H1 offers an opinion that working together with the '*spouse*' and considering '*who does the bread earning*' should be a matter of concern (lines 124-126). This example further illustrates how social media posts provide a resource for the development of talk between host-host in establishing views, as well as sharing the views of others in relation to the topic under discussion. The hosts authenticate their views with personal experience on the topic or show relevance to a more general view of the topic.

The following example marks the beginning for the introduction of the first caller on air. It also shows how a comment from an earlier FB sender can provide a resource as context in the development of host-host talk: '*what Nelson said earlier, what kind of person you are'* (lines 136-137).

Extract 4: LFM61   H1: host 1   H2: host 2

133	H2:	yeah definitely you know kids and marriage , definitely if you
134		have a plan or you wanted to go have a career and you get married
135		and you have kids (.) I mean that might just fly out the window, so
136		you know it's up to you, what Nelson said earlier, what kind of
137		person you are, and how're you gonna stick at it, instead of juggle
138		it, finally Kitschen said (0.4) be single if you want a high flying
139		career or no kids,
140	H1:	[@@]
141	H2:	[@@] that's just easy, you know there's no
142	H1:	Yup

143   H2:   no fuss or anything there you you you're free to do anything you
144   want, so there you go
145   H1:   Okay so that's what we're discussing this morning, Talk Tuesday,
146   does marriage complement or hinder you career well, (0.6) feel
147   free to give us your uh cents of the coin, uh, your point of view
148   0394533333 ……

The use of the lexical device *'finally'* in line 138 serves as a cue to indicate that H2 has come to the end of reading social media posts and to reformulate the earlier opinion given (lines 143-144). This receives only a minimal response of laughter and '*yup*' from H1. In the next turn, H2 provides a cue for H1 to proceed with his turn as observed in the phrase *'there you go'* and this then marks the beginning of the introduction of the topic for the day (lines 145-148). H1 begins his turn by introducing the programme '*Talk Tuesday'* which is followed by the topic to invite callers to call in: *'feel free to call in.....gives us your point of view'* and this is then subsequently followed by the phone number to call. Notice the repair sequence in *'cents of a coin'* to a corrected version after the hesitation to *'your point of view'*. It is noticeable that even though the topic has been introduced to the listening audience on several occasions in the stages of host-host talk, the first host takes the role again of introducing the topic before summoning the first caller on air. In the stages of host-host talk, the sequences of activities that are observed include: establishing a situation with reference to an article on a relevant issue related to the topic; establishing opinions by relating relevant experience or offering some justifications on the issue; acknowledging comments from social media posts; and introducing the topic for the day

Stages of host-caller talk
Introducing the calls
In phone-in call openings, the caller is obliged to listen to the host, as the caller is in the position of having to respond to the host's initial identification and greeting. Sacks, Schegoloff and Jefferson (1974) propose four defining characteristics in the organization of the turn-taking structure of adjacency pairs (AP): they are adjacent; produced by different speakers; ordered as a first pair part (FPP) and a second pair part (SPP); so that a particular first pair part provides for the relevance of a particular second pair part. In a phone-in structure, the caller needs to listen to what the host says next, rather than the other way round. For instance, the FPP (a greeting) provides the relevance of an SPP (a greeting). However, in the Malaysian phone-in data, sequences of greetings are absent. In most instances of calls to the phone-in programmes, callers come on air and straight away offer an opinion on the topic under discussion. Host-caller talk begins when either the first host or the second host starts off the discussion on the topic. There are routine patterns observed in the first few turns of call openings and these patterns typify the nature of the programme. These typical turns consist of a two or four-turn sequence, in which each participant takes at least one turn, as exemplified in the following extracts:

Extract 5: LFM16   H1: host 1   H2: host 2   C1: caller 2   C2: caller 2

153 H1:   all right Talk Tuesday (.) does marriage complement or hinder
154   your career (.) that's what we're talking about this morning (0.5)
155   what do you think Arif?
156 C1:   I think it complements
157 H2:   [=you think you don't sound very convinced though]
158 H1:   [@@@@@]
159 C1:   no (.) no I had a streak with career (.) I was working with people for 17 over
160   years

Extract 6: LFM16

```
230    H1:    Talk Tuesday and we're discussing does marriage complement or
231           hinder your caree:r (0.4) and we're coming in with Andy↑
232    C2:    in my case I would say (.) it it did hinder my (.) marriage because I am
233           in the entertainment line and in uh the (.) media (.) industry
```

The examples show that the lead host (H1) will usually take the initial turn in introducing the topic of discussion. In most instances of initial turns of host-caller talk, the male host takes the role in introducing the topic and acknowledging the caller on air rather than the female host. This is subsequently followed by a request of caller's opinion and acknowledgement of caller's name (lines 153-155 and 230-231). However, example 6 shows that when the topic is introduced by the host, the opinion is not called upon from caller. The host provides a cue for the next caller to have a turn at talk with '*and we're coming in with Andy*' (line 231). This illustrates that the function of the host's first turn is to bring the caller into the participatory frame by identifying them (out of a set of possible next callers) by name and to open to the next party. This is considered as a 'channel link' to the next party by giving the cue 'you're on line' (Levinson, 1988). Thus, the sequence between hosts and caller can then proceed thereby bringing all participants into the interactional frame. As illustrated in example 5, four components are evident in the host's first turn: the name of the programme; the topic for the day; the call for opinion and the identification of caller.

When the host identifies the caller's name, this then gives the cue for the caller's turn at talk. However, the ordering of the components may vary and this may affect what happens in the next turn. As seen in example 5, the host's request for the caller's view by asking *'What do you think Arif?'* is subsequently followed by an opinion statement by the caller *'I think it complements'* (line 156). This shows evidence of the AP of FPP (summoning/questioning) and the SPP (answering summon/answering question). The three-turn sequence thus follows in that H1 takes the first turn, followed by the caller's turn which is then subsequently followed by H2's turn.

In the analysis of United Kingdom (Hutchby, 1996; Jautz, 2013) and American (Dori-Hacohen, 2013, 2014) radio phone-ins, the host manages the opening stage of host-caller by presenting the caller by name and location to the audience, and starts talking with the caller by either greeting or summoning the caller. However, in Australian (Ames, 2013) and Israeli radio phone-ins (Dori-Hacohen, 2014), the callers would identify their own locations. The introductory sequences are characterized as "routine" openings in calls in radio phone-ins (Fitzgerald and Housley, 2002; Thornborrow, 2001a; Ferencik, 2007; Dori Hacohen, 2014) The "routine" displays all the features found in the opening turns of radio phone-ins in the literature, but does not imply that the forms are the norm nor the most common.   Some of the sequence types of openings include: summon-answer; identification-recognition; greeting-exchange; and '*how are you*' sequences (Hutchby, 2001; Fitzgerald and Housley, 2002; Thornborrow, 2001a; Hutchby, 2006; Ferencik, 2007; Dori Hacohen; 2014). These studies have shown that there are common norms and features in the opening sequences in radio phone-ins in which the name and the location of the callers are announced, followed with a greeting sequence. However, in the Malaysian phone-in data, the host does not mention the location of the caller unless it is specified by the caller. The host will introduce the caller by their name and then invite the caller to offer their views on the topic. As shown in extracts 5 and 6, the introduction stage of host-caller interactions involves the host prompting the caller to state an opinion about the topic.

Validating the calls
Moving on from the introductory sequence in which the caller is acknowledged for his turn on air, the calls then move to the call validation stage. During this stage, the sequences show the callers offering opinions and experiences and the hosts acknowledging the caller's opinions. The use of acknowledgement tokens and elaborative statements in host-caller interactions can be seen in the following extract.

Extract 7: FM 61   H1: host 1   H2: host 2   C2: caller 2

	H1:	Talk Tuesday and we're discussing does marriage complement or
230		
231		hinder your caree:r (0.4) and we're coming in with Andy↑
232	C2:	in my case I would say (.) it it did hinder my (.) marriage because I 'm
233		in the entertainment line and uh in the (.) media (.) industry
234	H2:	okay
235	C2:	and my line of work definitely does require me to (.) sometimes
236		work late at night (.) you know to be with er the events
237	H2:	entertaining clients and all that sort [of things, yeah]

Here, H1 acknowledges and introduces the next caller: *'we're coming in with Andy'* after the initial introduction to the programme (lines 230-231). C2 begins his turn by making reference to H1's prior utterance on *'career'* and states that it has hindered his marriage. He further justifies his talk by offering occupational membership categories of *'the entertainment line'* and '*the media industry'* (lines 232-233), thus showing the relevance to the topic to authenticate his talk. The acknowledgement token of 'okay' by H2 then allows the caller to continue with his speech. In the next turn, C2 further elaborates on his line of work (lines 235-326). The evidence of social knowledge or moral judgements provided by H2 shows an extension on the caller's prior statement in response to the claims as seen in line 237. H2 offers the category-bound activities (CBAs) which are bound to the occupational category of the entertainment industry. This is observed in the elaborative turn in H2's speech in relation to C2's prior talk (lines 237) and this is reflected in the moral ordering based on category-related actions of '*working late at night'*. 'These actions have made sense of in terms of a generalized category behaviour which then explains or accounts for this individual category action' (Sacks, 1995: 183). In other words, in acknowledging the opinion from the caller, the host offers some moral judgements about a certain occupational category based on social knowledge and the activities associated with the job category.

Extract 8: FM61

238	C2:	[ya entertaining] clients and sometimes (.)
239		it's just difficult for me at that time (.) because I have to constantly
240		get calls or (0.2) answer my wife's calls and it's like (.) sort of like
241		because it's not that I (.) <u>choose</u> to do (.) uh something like this but it
242		is in my line of [work XXX]

In the subsequent turn as seen above, the affirmative '*ya'* in the caller's utterance shows an agreement with H2's elaboration of '*entertaining clients'.* The caller then proceeds with his talk by elaborating on the problems of attending to his wife calls which further justifies his line of work (lines 238-242). The emphasis on the lexical item *'choose'* that is evident in his speech provides a defence for his position. The following example further illustrates how the caller relates his personal experience to authenticate his talk on the topic.

Extract 9: LFM61

243	H1:	[er er and and] you cannot say (.) you don't answer her call and
244		Uh (.) why does she call so much? Doesn't she know you're at work?
245		You know being having to entertain clients and all that?
246	C2:	=well definitely (.) ya obviously she knows I'm at wo:rk but it's just that
247		sometimes they can get a little insecure↑
248	H1:	(.) oh!

249	H2:	ah: right
250	H1	[she gets suspicious though when you're away]
251	H2	[so a lot of trust issues (.) a lot of trust issues] came
252		[up with]
253	C2:	[yeah definitely] yeah because
254		the: for them it's it's it's they will have this in
255		their mind is that why do you have to be out there all the time?
256	H2:	[alright]
257	H1:	[and uh] (.) did your entertaining go till very late in the nigh:t, and all
258		that sometimes (.) you know?
	C2:	Sometimes (.) in order to get things done (.) or you know (.) to make sure you
259		have
260		business continuity (.) definitely need to be there

Here, another collaborative turn is observed. The series of *'and'* that is evident in H2's speech show support for the caller to illustrate some additional points in relation to the caller's prior talk (line 243). This shows a reformulation of the caller's prior talk (lines 238-242) with regard to the nature of his work. Several interrogative statements are also evident in H1's speech with regard to the behaviour of the caller's wife: '*Why does she call so much? Doesn't she know you're at work?' You know being having to entertain clients and all that?'* (lines 243-245). The construction of questions by the host is 'recipient-design', that is, the host specifically forms these questions for the particular type of caller on account of the series of events provided by the caller. The recipient design is both oriented to the co-speaker and the sequence of the interaction. Sacks (1995) argues that hearers are able to make judgements in relation to the person's behaviour despite not having met the people involved. This is further supported by Fitzgerald (2001) who argues that despite 'not being there people are able to make reasoned, moral and normative judgements about behaviour based on the available category memberships and what the category-based actions towards other related categories would, or should expectably be'.

The series of questions posed by H1 then provide a challenge for C2 to respond. However, what is noticeable in the interrogative statements is that H1 has in fact shifted the blame upon *'the wife'* for not understanding C2's '*line of work'*. In a way, this shows support for the caller's position when H1 makes reference to the caller's occupational category (line 245). In the next turn, the response provided by C2 thus places him on the defensive when he claims that his wife knows he is working and offers a justification to his position (lines 246-247). There is a rise in intonation for *'insecure'* to emphasize this element in his speech. In the next turn, the discourse particle '*oh'* in response to the caller's statement allows H1 to expand on caller's talk and this overlaps with the shift in topic on *'trust issues'* as seen in H2's utterance (lines 248-251). This topic on '*trust issues'* is further taken up by C2 in agreement with H2, in which he further extends on the issue of suspicion on the wife's part (lines 254-255). This somehow provides further elaboration on the question of trust from the wife's position. What is interesting here is that the issues of moral reasoning not only come from the caller's position when he defends his stance on the issue but the caller also considers issues related to the second party (caller's wife). It is also noted that C2 frequently refers to his 'wife' by using the third person pronoun *'they'* (lines 247 & 254) to show gender neutral pronouns rather that gender-specific pronouns *'she'* in presenting the account of events related to the wife. It is also interesting to note that questions to the caller are mostly posed by the male host (H1) in this particular episode. Furthermore, the ways in which participants in conversations are able to attribute practical reasoning as being morally organised (Jayussi, 1984) are observed here. These are observed in the series of questions by H1 as evident in extracts 9 and 10: '*Did your entertaining go till very late at night and all that..?'; 'Was there very little time you spend with her as well?'; 'Are you still in the same line after your divorce?'*. These examples again illustrate that the participants attribute practical reasoning questions to seek further clarifications from the caller.

Jayussi (2014) argues that moral talk is not just talk about morals, but is evident in a range of practical activities that occur in talk, such as asking questions, and providing descriptions that demonstrate orientation to a norm. It is also highlighted that the link between 'norms' and moral order could illustrate ways in which participants in conversations are able to attribute practical reasoning as being morally organised. Thus, the series of interrogative statements by H1 require the caller to justify his position. As seen in Extract 9 (lines 259-260), the caller tries to defend his actions by providing reasons for working late (CBAs) in respond to H1's questions. These turn sequences demonstrate the question-answer AP sequences, in which the FPPs (questions) require the SPP (answers).

Extract 10: LFM61

261　H1:　　=Yeah and uh was, was there very little time that you (.) sp- spend with her as well?
262　C2:　　I do (.)try my best to do it and make it up during the weekend
263　　　　　for our own little getaway
264　H2:　　=How did it work out (.) between you and your wife then a:h, Andy?
265　　　　　Have you crossed the bridge now or [are] you guys okay↑
266　C2:　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　[oh]　　　　　　　unfortunately now
267　　　　　ah I I've divorced↑
268　H2:　　Oh↑ so this is a true (.) case that happened to you↑ then?
269　C2:　　Yes (.) it is
270　H2　　[Ah:]
271　H1:　　[Are] you still in the same line↑ (.) after your divorce?
272　C2:　　still in the same line until that now you know (.) I feel like a
273　　　　　huge burden is off my: shoulders?
274　H2:　　=Wow, okay now <u>that</u> is <u>definitely,</u> you know ma:rriage hindering his career↑

The above extract exemplifies further defensive positions established by the caller in response to H1's question (lines 262-263). Notice that only after a series of exchanges of talk between H1 and C2 that the second host (H2) is able to self-select her turn in the interaction. In getting a turn at talk, H2 produces a series of interrogative statements to seek further clarification on the caller's status on his marriage (lines 264-265*).* In clarifying his status, the caller admits that he has *'divorced'* and this is seen in the rise in intonation in his speech (line 267). We see in the next turn how H2 asks for confirmation with regard to the caller's true experience (line 268). This episode shows how the caller uses actions or descriptions of events that are associated with making claims to personal experience in respect of a topic under discussion. Both hosts work collaboratively with each other to seek further clarification on the caller's position by posing a series of questions to the caller and allowing the caller to narrate the events that led to his position.

A further question by H1 to seek clarification on C2's *'job'* after his '*divorce'* is observed in line 271. In the next turn, C2 asserts that he is still in *'the same line'* and further relates his relief of the *'huge burden'*, thus making reference to the MCD *'marriage'* (lines 272-273). The exclamation remark '*wow'* followed by *'okay now'* shows H2 proceeding with an evaluative summary of C2's opinion in a closing sequence (line 274). The indexical expression *'that'* in H2's speech serves to invoke shared knowledge between speaker and recipient and introducing topics in this way "in the public domain is a significant way in which it is constructed as an issue" (Hutchby, 1996a:43)*.* In other words, the issue concerns a caller providing an account of a true experience on the topic *'marriage can hinder a career',* which then establishes the justification of opinion-giving of caller.

Hutchby (1996) argues that the claims to speak are based on a sense of entitlement which involved a number of different techniques, which includes first-hand knowledge. This first-hand knowledge is evident as being relevant in C2's elaboration of statements related to his failed marriage as a result of his career. In the development of

host-caller interactions, various affirmative particles such as *'okay', 'yes'* and *'right'* are used by hosts. These discourse particles serve as an encouragement for the caller to continue with his talk as well as, to acknowledge caller's opinions. These devices are considered as cooperative formulations, in which the 'recipient' can assist a speaker to make his point clearer, or expand utterances to make them agreeable to the speaker (Heritage, 1985). In uttering these affirmative particles, the host gives support to the caller's opinions. As shown in the extracts given, the host does not only acknowledge the caller's views but also initiates further talk on the topic. Thus, it shows attempts by the hosts and caller to ultimately cooperate with one another. In line 274, the formulation device such as '*okay now'* has the effect of terminating the caller's turn at talk, in which we then see H2 ending host-caller turn-sequence by providing an evaluative summary of caller's talk.

Closing the calls
Studies have shown that call closings are usually accomplished by the host as swiftly as possible in order to move on to the next call. A typical call closing shows the host thanking the caller, and then moving on into introducing the next caller (Thornborrow, 2001; Hutchby (2006), Fitzgerald and Housley (2002), Ferencik (2007), Dori-Hacohen (2014) and Ames' (2013). The hosts would either thank the caller, support callers' opinions or summarize callers' opinions and then move on to the next caller. Hutchby (1996) and Dori-Hacohen (2014) observe the closing sequences are sometimes not evident in phone-in interactions as the last turn of an interaction is that of the host, who ends the interaction.

These features of closing calls are also observed in the Malaysian phone-in data. However, out of 104 interactions of host-caller talk, only two occurrences of *'thank you'* sequences are evident. However, the *'thank you'* expression only occurs after several turn-exchanges between the hosts, and does not immediately precede the termination of caller's turn as in an AP of a thanking sequence. The host plays a role in terminating caller's turn, as each caller is only allowed a certain time on air. Thus, once the caller's opinion has been successfully established, the call is terminated. Another occurrence of a 'thanking' sequence appears immediately after the termination of a call. Even though the thanking token is directed to the caller themselves, whatever precedes them shows there is no direct relationship as in an AP of a thanking sequence. For instance, after the host has positively acknowledged the caller on her/his contribution to the talk, the host then shifts focus to the co-host and further addresses the listening audience.

Providing support and summarizing caller's opinions can serve as a cue for a closing or termination of caller's turn on air. These features can be seen in the following extracts.

Extract 11: LFM16

185	C1:	but it doesn't go that way (.) now now she's like she finish her work (.)
186		she comes back at about seven o'clock all right (.) and and and she
187		sits with me and she tells me this is the next step (.) this is what you need to (.) and
188		I feel <u>proud</u> *la*<L1> this person is not only sharing her <u>life</u> with me
189	H2:	Yeah
190	C1:	she's not only happy to be with me but then she's now becoming
191		an an enhancement factor [what I want] to be next
192	H2:	[wow that's]
193	H1:	Arif, I only have one thing to say to you *la*<L1> in e:very
194		successful man there is a woman (.)
195	H2:	@@@ yeah Richard you've been waiting to use [that line all day yah?]

In line 193, H1 addresses the caller by name and recaps caller's prior statements (lines 185-188, 190-191) with a saying *'in every successful man there is a woman'* to illustrate his agreement in support of caller's prior utterances.

Providing a summary of caller's opinions is also a feature in closing sequences. The host uses this strategy to recap the caller's opinion on the topic of discussion. However, on most occasions, the host only provides a summary of caller's opinion after the caller has been taken off air. Thus, the direction of focus on the caller is then shifted to the co-host and the listening audience. This is illustrated in the following extract, which shows an occasion in which the host summarizes the caller's (C3) opinion once the caller's turn has been terminated. This is noticeable in the long pause in line 386 before H2 takes her turn at talk. The use of *'okay'* as a turn-termination device (line 387) is used before H2 summarizes C3's views based on his prior talk.

Extract 12: LFM61   H2: host 2   C3: caller 3

380	C3:	Honestly, no matter what you do, no matter what you try, if your
381		marriage goes to you, no matter what counsel you go to, the fact
382		of the matter is, it's gonna creep into you
383	H2:	Yeah
384	C3:	It's definitely gonna creep, one way or the other so, you cannot
385		really divide
		(0.5)
386		
387	H2:	Ah, okay well there you go there you go another interesting
388		opinion there from u:h from uh Stan what is sort of boil down to
389		is the person, that's the underlying theme, how the person in the
390		relationship prioritizes, how they look at work, how they look at
391		marriage

 Here, in summarizing caller's opinion, the host offers category-bound reasoning attributes. In other words, the attributes refer to the type of 'person' who could prioritize *'work'* or '*marriage*' in a 'relationship' (lines 387-390). This shows how the host offers some kind of moral reasoning when summarizing caller's view as a strategy in a closing sequence. It is evident here that the views of callers can provide a resource or content for talk for hosts to recap and end the talk in closing sequences. One of the striking features of phone-in interactions is the important role that hosts play as 'active listeners' to the views given by the callers and how they are able to provide a summary or recap the caller's position on the topic under discussion. As seen in the data, callers do not indicate that they are coming to a closing of their turn, however, the hosts need to identify or monitor that the callers are coming to the end of their turn and acknowledge the callers' substantial contributions to talk and thereby terminate the call.

Discussion

The analysis of the data has revealed the overall structural organization of the phone-in programmes in that there are three stages of talk involved: the openings, validation of calls and closings. However, the sequences that develop between the participants in each stage of the phone-ins may differ. The number of hosts in the programmes also have an effect on how turns are developed in the on-going interactions. The issue of power symmetry may also be considered, in which each host is given equal opportunity to interact with the callers. For instance, when the lead host develops the topic, the second host will expand on the context or seeks clarification on the issue raised. Such is the key concern in CA whereby participants in conversation create sequences of talk by taking turns at speaking and construct turns by orientating to implicit knowledge about how turns operate. Compared to the traditional radio phone-in format which involves one host and a caller, dual host scenarios may involve host-host talk in the introduction stage which precedes host-caller introductory stage. As shown in the analysis, the lead host will introduce the caller but in closings either one of the hosts closes the call. However, both lead host and co-host play significant roles in validating calls and developing the interaction between host-

caller, such as asking questions or requesting for clarification of the callers' views with regard to the topic of discussion.

The overall sequential organization of phone-ins involves not only the interactions that develop between host-caller from openings to closings, but also the introductory stage of host-host talk. The nature of the programme reveals how hosts develop the interaction between them to entice target listeners who may have experienced the issue to call into the programme. This is seen in the introduction to the topic as well as in the development of topical content and viewpoints. The positions taken up by hosts on the issue act as an invitation for listeners to present their viewpoints and at the same time allow for some concerns to be established within that position prior to requesting calls from listeners. Personal experience also plays an important role in host-host conversations. This is seen when the hosts established their stance on the topics and on how hosts relate accounts of their own experiences. Both hosts collaborate with one another on the topic and provide personal views and contexts of discussion as resources for further discussion before the lines are opened to callers. Topics are not introduced in the initial stages of the programme, rather interactions between host-host are developed in line with the topic that ensues. This is seen when the topic of discussion is only introduced in the later stages of host-host interactions and also after the acknowledgement of comments from social media posts. This indicates an interesting feature of the work of the social media posts, in which they are used to open up a topic from and between the hosts prior to a call. In other words, the discussion on social media posts is much a part of the routine works and allows further development of talk by both hosts. This not only allows both hosts to open up the topic further, but also to control the topic and acknowledge the participation from the social media. Moreover, the opinions established between both hosts are not only evident in the turn-taking exchanges but also noticeable in the responses to the social media posts.

The second phase involves the opening, call-validation and closing stages of host-caller talk. The various ways of developing the sequences of talk in the opening stage of the phone-ins, seem to depend on what the caller has to say on the topic when he/she is first introduced to the show. In the call validation stage, both hosts work collaboratively with the callers in seeking information, clarification or confirmation on the caller's position and these are evident in the series of interrogative statements posed by either one of the hosts. On occasions when relevant information is not evident, the hosts employ a series of interrogative statements to seek further clarification and confirmation on the caller's position. These are notably found in cases of the hosts' 'yes/no' questions put to the callers, which are oriented to as actually requiring somewhat more than a 'yes' or 'no' response or more than a simple statement of a viewpoint. Hosts construct questions that are 'recipient-designed', which are formulated specifically for the particular type of caller based on his/her account of events related to the caller. In providing category-based actions in talk, a person is able to make some moral judgements about the person's behaviour, which then accounts for this 'individual category action' (Sacks, 1995). Thus, callers refer to a range of category-related actions by associating them with claims to personal knowledge, personal experience, or categorical membership in respect of the topic (Hutchby, 2001). The elaboration of statements by caller also shows the authenticity of their opinions which relate to topic-relevance.

In the closing stage, both hosts are also seen to work collaboratively towards a call conclusion. Hosts employ strategies in call closings which range from thanking the caller, supporting caller's opinion, or summarizing caller's opinion. 'Thank you' sequences are not frequent occurrences because the host simply moves into getting the next caller on line. Even when the thanking device is present, it does not appear in a direct sequence upon the termination of caller's turn but only appears after the host has recapped the opinion of the caller. In summarizing the caller's opinions, the host offers category-bound reasoning attributes that are related to the caller's views. Instances in which personal perspectives of the issue are also given by hosts and these reflect a tendency for agreement, as well as to bolster callers' opinions.

The analysis shows how social knowledge and moral reasoning are much a part of what go into the content of talk of host-caller interactions. These specific features support the analysis that the radio programmes target specific listeners, in which callers with experience on the topic would call in to share their experiences in order to authenticate their talk. The development of talk thus centres on the experiences of the callers on the issues under discussion, while hosts offer shared and social knowledge of the issue. These further demonstrate how hosts collaboratively work with the callers to achieve the interactional and entertaining goals of the radio phone-in programme.

Conclusion

This research contributes to conversation analytic and membership categorization research on phone-ins that have been widely explored in different cross-cultural settings (Hutchby, 1996a, 1996b; Thornborrow, 2001a, 2001b; Fitzgerald and Housley, 2002; Ferencik, 2007; Dori-Hacohen, 2012, 2014; Ames, 2013). In view of other studies on dual-host talk (Ames, 2012, Ames, 2013), this type of Malaysian phone-in setting can be internationally applied despite the cultural differences in the content of talk. As demonstrated, the overall sequential organization of phone-ins exist across cultures, it is just a matter of the differences on how they are moulded in each culture. On a sequential level, features of stages in radio phone-in programmes are universal, in that they follow a three-stage format. Even though the features in each stage may differ, the members that occupy the institutional position in the programme play significant roles in developing the interactions with the callers. Future research may take on another perspective in examining the ethnic background of callers or in connecting and comparing the norms of the society or the ethnic identities of diverse cultures in Asia.

Acknowledgment

About the Author

Siti Nurbaya Mohd Nor (PhD) is a senior lecturer in the English Department of Faculty of Languages and Linguistics, University Malaya. Her research interests include conversation analysis and membership categorization analysis in media discourse and pragmatics studies, in the area of speech acts, Gricean implicatures and (im)politeness in different types of discourse.

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS (adapted from Hutchby and Woofitt, 2008)

:   Semi-colons indicate speaker identity or turn start.

=   Equal signs are used to indicate latching or no discernable gap between utterances; or to show the continuation of a speaker's utterance across intervening lines of transcript.

[ ]   Square brackets indicate the points where overlapping talk starts (left bracket) and ends (right bracket)

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

,   Comma indicates a continuing tone.

?   Question marks indicate a marked rising tone.

→   Arrows in the left margin point to specific parts of the transcript under discussion.

XXX   Indicates uncertain hearing or indecipherable syllable from the transcriber's perspective.

@   Indicates laughter

(.)   A dot in parentheses indicates a 'micro-pause', hearable, but not really measurable; ordinarily less than 0.2 of a second

(0.5)   Gaps and overlaps - timed in tenths of a second, done with a stopwatch and inserted at the precise point of occurrence in the recording; within turn or between turns

h   Breathlessness - marked by 'h' for exhalation and '.h' for inhalation; this feature is transcribed because audible in-breaths may be involved with the management of turn-taking, an open-mouthed in-breath may mark a participant's attempt to start a turn

References

[1] Ames, K. (2012). Host/host conversations: Analysing moral and social order in talk on commercial radio. *Media International Australia, Incorporating Culture and Policy.* Issue 42, 112-122.

[2] Ames, K. (2013). Two hosts and a caller: Analysing call sequences in a dual-host radio talkback setting. *Discourse Studies* 15 (3) 263-277.

[3] Bell, A. and Garrett, P. (1998). *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Blackwell.

[4] Dori-Hacohen, G. (2011). "I have a question for you": Practices for achieving institutional interaction in Israeli radio phone-in programs. *Pragmatics*, *21*(4), 527-548.

[5] Dori-Hacohen, G. (2012). "With whom do I have the pleasure?": Callers' categories in political talk radio programs. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *44*(3), 280-297.

[6] Dori-Hacohen, G. (2014). Spontaneous or controlled: Overall structural organization of political phone-ins in two countries and their relations to societal norms. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *70*, 1-15.

[7] Ferenčik, M. (2007). Exercising Politeness: Membership Categorization in a Radio Phone-in Programme. *Pragmatics* 17 (3); 351-370.

[8] Fitzgerald, R. (2001). Method in media interaction: An ethnomethodological analysis of a radio phone-in show. PhD thesis.

[9] Fitzgerald, R. (2007). The role of talkback radio in Hong Kong and Singapore: An initial exploration. Media International Australia. 124: 87-95.

[10] Fitzgerald, R. and Housley, W (2002). Identity, categorization and sequential organization: the sequential and categorial flow of identity in a radio phone-in. *Discourse and Society*, Vol. 13 (5), 579-602.

[11] Hutchby, I. (1991). The Organization of Talk on Talk Radio. In P. Scannell (ed.) *Broadcast Talk*. London: Sage

[12] Hutchby, I. 1992a. Confrontation Talk: Aspects of 'Interruption' in Argument sequences on Talk radio. *Text* 12 (3); 373-371

[13] Hutchby, I. 1992b. The Pursuit of Controversy: Routine Scepticism in talk on 'Talk Radio'. *Sociology* 26 (4); 673-694

[14] Hutchby, I. (1996). Power in Discourse: The case of arguments on a British Talk Radio Show. *Discourse and Society* 7 (4), 481-497.

[15] Hutcby, I. (1999). Frame attunement and footing in the organization of talk radio show. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3,1;41-63.

[16] Hutchby, I. (2001). Witnessing: The use of first-hand knowledge in legitimating lay opinions on talk radio. *Discourse Studies*, Vol 3 (4); 481-497.

[17] Hutchby, I. (2006). *Media Talk: Conversation Analysis and the study of Broadcasting.* Maidenhead: Open University Press.

[18] Hutchby, I. and Woofitt R. (2006). *Conversation Analysis*. Second Edition. Polity Press.

[19] Jayyusi, L. (2014). *Categorization and the Moral Order (Routledge Revivals)*. Routledge.

[20] Jautz, S. (2013). Who speaks and who is addressed in radio phone-ins? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 72, 18-30.

[21] Kilby, L. and Horowitz, A. D. (2013). Opening up terrorism talk: The sequential and categorical production of discursive power within the call openings of a talk radio broadcast. *Discourse and Society*, 1-18.

[22] Korolija, N. (1998). Recycling cotext: The impact of prior conversation on the emergence of episodes in multiparty radio. Journal of Discourse Processes, 25 (1), 99-125.

[23] Liddicoat, A.; Brown, A.; Dopke, S. and Love, K (1992). The Effect of the Institution: Openings in Talkback Radio. *Text* 12 (4); 541-562.

[24] Sacks, H., Schegloff, H and Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-taking for Conversation. *Language* 50 (4); 696-735.

[25] Sacks, Harvey. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation*. Gail Jefferson (ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

[26] Sacks, H (1995). *Lectures on Conversation*, vols I and II. Jefferson G (ed.). London: Blackwell.

[27] Schegloff, E. A. (1987). Analyzing single episodes of interaction: An exercise in conversation analysis. *Social psychology quarterly*, 101-114.

[28] Thornborrow, J. (2001a). Questions and Control: The Organization of Talk in Calls to a Radio Phone-in. *Discourse Studies* 3 (1); 119-143.

[29] Thornborrow, J. (2001b). Authenticating Talk: Building Public Identities in Audience Participation Broadcast. *Discourse Studies* 3 (4); 459-479.