

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGE STUDIES,
JOURNALISM AND COMMUNICATION
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE
GRADUATE PROGRAM**

**COMMUNICATION CONDUCT ON FM ADDIS 97.1's HIV/AIDS
PHONE-IN PROGRAM**

BY

JEMAL MOHAMMED ADAL

JULY 2015

**Communication Conduct on FM Addis 97.1's HIV/AIDS Phone-in
Program**

By

Jemal Mohammed Adal

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Program of the Department of
Foreign Languages and Literature in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Applied
Linguistics and Communication

July 2015

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGE STUDIES, JOURNALISM
AND COMMUNICATION
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE
GRADUATE PROGRAM

COMMUNICATION CONDUCT ON FM ADDIS 97.1's HIV/AIDS
PHONE-IN PROGRAM

BY

JEMAL MOHAMMED ADAL

Approved by Board of Examiners:

_____ Supervisor	_____ Signature
_____ Internal Examiner	_____ Signature
_____ External Examiner	_____ Signature
_____	_____

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to all who contributed in one way or another to the process of getting this dissertation written. My memory is definitely too bad to recall every single one. However, no usual thanks are sufficient to acknowledge my debt to the following people.

Foremost, I owe my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Teshome Demissie, for his invaluable academic guidance and unfailing support over the years. He has given meticulous attention to every draft of this thesis and afforded me the full benefit of his knowledge, experience and critical thinking. I would also like to thank Dr. Haregewoin Abate, my supervisor during the initial phase of this project, for providing me valuable comments as well as encouraging remarks.

I am very grateful to my good friends Setegn Mayaw and Mesfin Demissie for providing me their laptops when mine failed to function in the write-up phase of the project. Had they not taken turns in giving me their laptops in such a decisive moment, this thesis would not have been brought to this stage.

I am also indebted to my friends Ayenew Guadu and Kenaw Gebresilassie for giving me their time and comments in proof-reading the thesis. They have been tirelessly supportive all the way through.

None of this would have been possible without the constant help and encouragement of my parents. Last but not least, I have no words to express how much I owe to my wife, Semira Sima, for standing by my side and providing the support and encouragement I needed throughout my study. She has been phenomenal in shouldering the responsibility of raising our two children (Noor and Mina) and the all daily chores and troubles especially towards the final stages.

Table of Contents

	Page
Chapter One: Introduction-----	1
1.1. Background to the Problem-----	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem-----	5
1.3. Objectives of the Study-----	8
1.4. Significances of the study-----	8
Chapter Two: Literature Review-----	10
2.1. The Role of Mass Media in Health Communication-----	10
2.1.1. Introduction-----	10
2.1.2. Using Radio in Health Communication-----	11
2.1.3. Using Radio Phone-in Communications about HIV/AIDS and Related Issues-----	12
2.2. Overview of Radio Broadcasting in Ethiopia-----	13
2.3. Studying Mass mediated Communication Practice-----	15
2.3.1. Less-discourse Centred Approaches-----	15
2.3.2. Discourse-centred Approaches-----	21
2.3.2.1. Discourse Analysis in Mass Mediated Communication Studies-----	24
2.3.2.2. Review of Radio Phone-in Discourse Analytic Studies-----	27
2.4. Theoretical and Analytical Frameworks-----	33
2.4.1. Radio Phone-in Interaction as Institutional Discourse----	33
2.4.2. Using Integrated Approaches to Analyse Radio Phone-in Interaction-----	34
2.4.2.1. Goffmanian Approaches -----	34
2.4.2.1.1. Participation Framework -----	35
2.4.2.1.2. Footing -----	36
2.4.2.1.3. Face work -----	37
2.4.2.2. Ethnomethodology-based Approaches -----	38
2.4.2.2.1. Conversation Analysis-----	39
2.4.2.2.2. Membership Categorization Analysis-----	45
Chapter Three: Methodological Considerations-----	48
3.1. Design of the Study-----	48
3.2. Source of Data-----	49
3.2.1. Why This Research Context?-----	49
3.2.2. Description of the Research Site-----	50
3.2.3. The Corpus-----	51
3.3. Procedures Followed in the Study-----	52

3.3.1. Transcribing the Audiotaped Data-----	53
3.3.2. Approaching Data Analysis-----	55
3.3.3. Organising and Presenting the Data-----	56
3.4.Ethical Considerations-----	58
3.5.Concerns of Reliability and Validity -----	58
Chapter Four: Organization of Communication-----	61
4.1.Participation Organization -----	61
4.2.Communication Formats -----	83
Chapter Five: Structure of Host-Caller Exchanges-----	97
5.1. Accomplishing Openings -----	97
5.1.1. Announcements -----	98
5.1.2. Pre-greetings -----	101
5.1.3. Greetings -----	105
5.2. ‘Doing’ the Talk -----	116
5.2.1. Talk Initiation -----	116
5.2.2. Follow up Turn Constructions -----	128
5.2.2.1. Mobilizing the Talk around the Callers’ First-hand Experience -----	128
5.2.2.2. Focusing on Advices -----	146
5.3. Accomplishing Closings -----	168
Chapter Six: Summary and Implications of the Findings -----	179
6.1. Summary of the Findings-----	179
6.2. Implications of the Findings -----	187
Limitations -----	195
Direction for Future Studies -----	196
Concluding Remarks -----	197
References-----	198

Abstract

This study examines how communication is conducted in a ‘lived’ radio phone-in program about HIV/AIDS and related matters by narrowing its focus onto the context of the practice in FM Addis 97.1, a broadcasting station in Ethiopia. Previous works on institutional discourse and perspectives from Goffmanian and ethnomethodology-based approaches were drawn on in framing the theoretical and methodological foundations. The data were primarily collected by recording ‘lived’ radio phone-in productions in the target communication setting. The corpus for analysis was assembled by making detailed transcriptions of the recordings of the participants’ speech exchanges on two randomly selected themes: ‘Blood Testing Experience for HIV-antibody’ and ‘Challenges in (to) being Faithful’, which together lasted about fifteen hours.

The analysis of these transcripts reveals that communication is organized in a way that places the program host, the caller, the guest or expert and the audiences in the participation framework. Although the actual speech exchange in the program appears to be made either between the host and the caller or the host and the guest, it seems to be primarily shaped for and by the audience who listen to that program. While interaction between the host and the guest is found to constitute part of the production, the speech exchange of the hosts and the callers appears to be central in the making up of the program. This exchange involves three broader phases: the openings, ‘doing’ the talk and the closure. Each of these phases is observed to have distinctive features. The participants display their orientations to such features through a reliance on predictable combinations of moves, which are realized through a limited range of speech acts and conversational routines. With respect to the construction of roles and identities, it is observed that the participants’ discourse roles appear to be made relevant in many ways, with explicit role definitions by the host and with implicit negotiations by the participants. Their identities are found to be built through a reflexive combination of sequential and categorical methods as the interaction unfolds. Regarding the construction of power relationship, the analysis reveals that asymmetrical power relationship is not that characterize all that is happening in the target site, and that asymmetrical power relationship manifest in this setting tend to be not an outcome of just social structural difference between the participants but (mainly) of an interactional accomplishment which is made evident in and through the joint interaction moves by the parties involved. This study argues that the target radio phone-in participants tend to enact from multiplicity of roles, align and disalign with some form of actions, and position each other symmetrically and asymmetrically to the attainment of the program’s goal: *modeling of a desirable health behavior and stance*.

The study outlines the implications of making a fine-grained analysis of talk in a radio phone-in program to future practices and pre-and in-service trainings of hosts. Finally, the study makes some suggestions as to what the hosts of a radio phone-in program might do to improve the way interactions are managed, and points out areas worth examining in future studies of the sort.

Chapter One

Introduction

This study sets out to examine communication conduct in the context of radio phone-in talks about HIV/AIDS using talk data recorded on FM Addis 97.1, a radio station in Ethiopia, by principally subscribing to the analysis of the participants' language use. It is because undertaking a fine grained analysis with a focus on the participants' language use provides useful insights into the nature of the communication practice and the relationship between the media and the audience as part of our understanding of contemporary media culture (Fairclough, 1995; Hutchby, 2006; Matheson, 2005; Tolson, 2006). This introductory chapter will present the background to the problem with the statement of the problem following it. Then, the objectives the current study purports to achieve will be stated. Finally, the study's significances will be outlined.

1.1. Background to the Problem

The impact mass media have in the lives of human beings has been widely acknowledged in the works of different media discourse analysts. Thornborrow (1999: 46), for instance, states, "The media are always there, and have come to be taken for granted as an integral part of most people's lives." Talbot (2007) also contends that media discourse is of undeniable power and influence as discourse plays a pivotal role in constituting people's realities. Fairclough (1995: 2) adds that mass media have "the power to influence knowledge, beliefs, values, social relations, [and] social identities". It is possible to infer from these researchers' observations that media outputs have immense impact in the lives of people. In spite of this fact, their impacts are likely to be influenced by the public.

It is possible that while the media influence the public's practice, the reverse is also true: the public's practice influence media practice. This can be inferred from Thornborrow's (1999: 47) observation:

We should not be too quick to see the media as all-powerful and the public as mere puppets of media control. The relationship is not a straightforward one. The reading, listening and viewing public can also choose not to buy, listen or watch; they can switch off, change allegiances, and in some cases challenge versions of events.

Of the kinds of mass media, broadcast media would appear to have far more impact on the lives of the mass and yet would tend to be influenced by the public. This seems mainly because that they are not only means of getting access to information but also are assumed to create opportunity to the audience to involve in the production work quite regardless of the audience's literacy background as in (the case of) print media, where the audience are required to have skills in reading and writing. Broadcast media language use, hence, tended to receive attention by different researchers.

Within the area of broadcast media, the commonest programs include Television Talk Shows, News Interviews, and Radio Phone-ins (Hutchby, 2006; Scannell, 1991; Tolson, 2006). Radio phone-ins are one form of broadcast programs whereby audience are invited to call in to the radio studio and take part in discussion on a range of issues with the program host and sometimes with the host along with invited guest(s) (Thornborrow, 2001a). Radio phone-in programs, or 'talk radio' (Hutchby, 1996), are supposed to be an interaction site where individuals can freely air their opinions and views as anonymous speaker and thereby minimize their worry of the consequential effects that are considered to be apparent in a face-to-face mode of social interaction (Geller, 2007). They are believed to create platforms for direct audience participation to exchange views and voice concerns on a range of public issues (Thornborrow, 2001a).

Radio phone-ins are used, among others, to accomplish participatory health communication. Participatory health communication involves community members as participants in the process of meaning construction (Freire, 1997) and development efforts. It constitutes a communicative effort that enables community members to weave together individual and collective discourses on health and living. It has, over the years, been used in communication campaigns, especially in entertainment– education (E–E) programs across the globe (Gumucio- Dagron and Tufte, 2006). Though radio phone-in's

potential for community dialogue and unstructured expression is far greater than in conventional media because of its format, whether radio phone-in allows for the representation of a truly two-way equal interaction needs further empirical observation across contexts for scholars' findings in the area are not devoid of variations.

Different media discourse analysts would appear to reveal contradictory views relating to the space talk shows render to the mass, however. For instance, characterizing such shows, while Livingstone and Lunt (1994) argue that talk shows provide a powerful space for the voices of ordinary members of the public to be privileged over the voices of institutional representatives and experts whose opinions and views usually predominate elsewhere in other forms of media productions, Fairclough (1995) posits that the discourse of 'ordinary' participants is always mediated and constrained within the institutional format; they are structured in such a way that the discourse of the experts and the institution is still the framing, dominant discourse. Hutchby (1996) refutes Fairclough's position contending that it is not the institution that frames the form of the talk but the collaborative effort of the participants in the interaction.

It appears to be demanding to posit that radio phone-in program, one form of talk shows, is an interaction site that renders space to the involvement of the public because of at least two main reasons. For one thing, the site has not received much scrutiny in comparison to such other forms of broadcast talks as news interviews (Clayman 1989; Clayman and Heritage, 2002; van Dijk, 2001; Greatbatch 1988; Heritage, 1985; Tolson, 2006) and audience participating shows (Fairclough, 1995; Hutchby, 2006; Livingstone and Lunt, 1994; Thornborrow, 2001b, 2010; Tolson, 2006) with a perspective from discourse analysis. Secondly, the majority of the studies carried out to explore the interaction practice in the site (Hutchby, 1996, 1999, 2006; Myer, 2004; Thornborrow, 2001a, 2010; Tolson, 2006) tended to confine themselves to understanding the practice in the western setting.

The studies carried out would seem to be less representative of the practice across a range of contexts as researchers in the area relied much on data gathered in nearly similar

duration and from the same interaction setting. For instance, Hutchby's analyses though published at different times: as in 1996, 1999, 2001, and 2006, would tend to base on a similar set of data which he recorded at the turn of 1980's and utilized for his seminal work in 1996. This is evident in the extracts he analysed in his publications on 'Frame Attunement and Footing in the Organization of Calls to a Radio Talk', on 'Witnessing' and on 'Media Talk' in 1999, 2001 and 2006 respectively. Besides, the studies undertaken on radio phone-in programs so far tended to rely much on English data. They seemed to base on talk/interaction data from the practice in the western context, viz. UK and USA. This may, for instance, be inferred from what is explicitly stated in the Editors' Preface of Hutchby (1996: vii): "Hutchby uses conversation analysis to examine verbal confrontation as it occurs in a single context, talk radio shows that are broadcast in England." This might be seen to contribute to the less generalizability of the observations to instances in some other contexts.

What is more, some of the findings reached relating to the communication practice in this site, though based on data from the western setting, tended to reveal variations. While Hutchby (1996, 2006) views radio phone-in talks as sites of confrontation, Tolson (2006) argues that not all practices of interaction on talk radio tend to be identical and characterized as confrontational by demonstrating through the analysis of sports talk data. He states that Hutchby's description of talk radio as 'confrontation talk' hints at only feature of some formats and not phone-in programs in general. Tolson (2006: 96) observes, "... the general structure of the radio phone-in which Hutchby describes may be universal, in that callers firstly make a point to which the host then responds, but ... there are additional features which take the talk beyond confrontation." He points out that the approach to argument on sports talk is rather different from which has been claimed by the previous researchers on phone-in programs. He contends that despite its argumentative aspects, sports talk radio does not appear to deserve the stereotype of being a communicative medium where confrontations routinely erupt.

The other difference the findings of these researchers reveal pertains to power relations between the host and the caller. Hutchby (1996) asserts that there exists an imbalance of

power whereas Tolson (2006) observes that the power situation is less clear cut. Relating to this, Tolson (2006: 98) states, “Of course the host retains the power to initiate and to terminate the call, and Hutchby’s ‘action-opposition’ sequences are evident. However, there is also a more fluid negotiation of roles, as all participants, by virtue of their common interest, have the right to ‘have their say’.”

The variations evident in the findings of these discourse analysts could justify the need to make further investigation across contexts. This is because the reality would seem to reflect that there won’t be identical practice on two different research settings owing to, among other things, the sociocultural variations likely to be apparent. What is more, as phone-in programs are sites where a series of calls from different places by different callers are made, the management of interaction is claimed to be hard (Myer, 2004). In the light of these points, it seems to the current researcher that here is a context in which making a close observation about how radio phone-in talks are accomplished in the Ethiopian context might be of some value.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

As has been pointed out, broadcast media’s profound impact in people’s lives has been widely acknowledged. One of the issues where broadcast media’s impact is apparent in the public sphere is in communication on health matters. Broadcast media play an undeniable role in fostering behaviour change communication endeavours whether the object of change is to build the community’s agenda for prevention, to change public policy, or to educate individuals about specific health behaviour. Broadcast media play a crucial role in health behaviour change because they are ‘key gatekeepers’ (Thornborrow, 1999) for disseminating information in social systems and because, as socializing agents, they have a powerful impact in legitimizing behavioural norms (Scannell, 1991). These kinds of mass media can be used to create positive impact by promoting the culture of free talks or interactions on wide range of public health concerns, HIV/AIDS issues being one. Of the varied forms of broadcast media productions, radio phone-in talks are the ones that are produced towards such an end.

In the Ethiopian context, as access to varied forms of radio broadcasts is widening, radio phone in programs on various kinds of public concerns – amongst which talk about HIV/AIDS and related issues is one – are being dedicated to the voices of the people. The setting up of radio phone-in programs which enable citizens to freely talk, share opinions and experiences relating to HIV/AIDS has been one of the responses made to curb the expansion of the health threat.

HIV/AIDS has been identified as one of the threats to the nation's developmental endeavour. The first case of AIDS was reported in 1984 (Ministry of Health, 2010). It gradually expanded and reached a stage that puts the lives of millions in danger. As reaction to this, the state has been engaged in implementing as varied strategies to combat the spread of the threat, communication campaign being one (ibid). Communication about the nature and effect of the pandemic has been emphasised for it has a big role to play in efforts to curb the spread of HIV/AIDS menace (Silverman, 1997). It has the potential to provide information, knowledge, attitude and skills that will inform and lead to positive moral behaviour. Among the strategies the government has emphasized on, thus, is the designing and implementation of behaviour change communication. A range of behaviour change communication strategies have been put into effect (Ministry of Health, 2010). One that has been relied much on has been the use of mass media to create awareness about ways of curbing the expansion of the threat and to promote behaviour change communication.

Of the forms of mass media, radio appeared to be widely used to such end. Radio, as a medium to behaviour change communication, tended to be favoured over others taking into account its ease of accessibility and reachability to a large number of audiences in the nation (Population Media Centre, 2010). Currently, there are a number of radio stations that produce programs relating to HIV/AIDS in the nation (Ward, 2011). Among the programs these stations produce, productions with a radio phone-in format tended to get currency in nearly every radio stations in the country. Despite the growing interest in the production of such kind of programs, to the researcher's observation, there has been no specific study that sought to explore how radio phone-in (talk) programs about

HIV/AIDS are accomplished with chief preoccupation in the analysis of the discourse (or actual talk data) in the interaction site.

The studies undertaken so far, as can be inferred from the review in 2.3.1, tend to focus on the evaluation of the communication practices against pre-defined theoretical constructs and/or the elicitation of the audience's perception of the practice. They leave completely out of account the underlying questions of the actual, situated speaking practices by which callers' opinions on issues, and their interactions with hosts, are managed in the public arena represented by the radio phone-in program. In these studies, less attention is paid to the question of how that talk is actually produced, to the interactional and sequential contexts in which different participants speak, and to the relationship between the talk and the local organizational constraints of the setting itself. In short, the studies conducted relating to the communication practice in the context of radio phone-in talks about HIV/AIDS thus far could be described as fundamentally concerned with the environment around the phenomenon (i.e., aspects surrounding the talk) rather than the phenomenon (i.e., the talk) itself.

In contrast, this study aims to offer an early report on how talk about HIV/AIDS and related issues is managed in the context of radio phone-in program, which is being used as one of the routes to accomplish behaviour change communication in the country. This is because of the cognition that studying the communication practice with a primal consideration of the talk as data, as will be elaborated in detail in 2.3.2, has much to offer. It particularly is of indispensable role when the aim is to gain better insights into the nature of the media output (Fairclough, 1995; Hutchby, 2006; Tolson, 2006; Tracy, 2001) and is of an applied end (Fairclough, 1989, 1992; Sarangi, 2005; Silverman, 1997; Tracy and Mirivel, 2009). It is these interests that represent the present researcher's principal concerns in this study.

1.3. Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study is to uncover features of communication in radio phone-in program about HIV/AIDS and related concerns on FM Addis 97.1. As its specific objectives, the study aims to:

- a. identify the organization of interaction in the radio phone-in program;
- b. investigate the ways discourse roles and identities of the interactants are built to give the program the feature it has; and
- c. examine aspects to do with the participants' power relationships.

The study purports to achieve these objectives by seeking answers to the following research questions:

1. How is communication in the target radio phone-in program organized?
2. How are the participants' discourse roles and identities constructed in the program? and
3. How is the participants' power relationship constructed?

1.4. Significance of the Study

Seen broadly, this study is hoped to have dual contribution: theoretical and practical. It is likely to add to the existing literature on radio phone-in discourse studies by providing data and information from a different environment, culture and context. Besides, it is hoped to be of value in demonstrating the methodological application of participants-oriented, action-based discourse analytic approach to data in languages other than English for data in the English language has received great deal of attention from researchers across a range of contexts.

Specifically, given the ever increasing attempt in producing phone-in programs by nearly every broadcasting station in the Ethiopian context, the observations attained through this

study are hoped to benefit several stakeholders. Firstly, it might be of great significance to radio phone-in hosts of health matters in general and radio phone-in hosts of HIV/AIDS in particular to evaluate and rethink their ways or strategies of 'lived' interaction management and thereby contribute to the development of their professional experience. In addition, it is hoped to serve higher education teachers who train journalists (particularly hosts of HIV/AIDS phone-ins) as a useful classroom resource to demonstrate the intended and unintended consequences of participants' turn constructions. Furthermore, the study's observations might provide organizations that work in promoting public health communication collaboratively with the media with insights into, among others, how mass mediated interactions about HIV/AIDS is working and how participatory and inclusive they are. Findings relating to such points might enable these organizations assess whether the interactions are going in line with their communication goals. Most important, as this is an academic work that is conducted based upon a scientifically principled method of inquiry, it is likely to serve those who are interested to undertake further investigation in the target area as spring board. It might also help others who undertake discourse analytic studies on some other related forms of broadcast interactions, e.g. audience participating talk shows, to compare and contrast their analytical observations with.

Chapter Two

Review of Related Literature

This chapter will, first, provide a theoretical account of the role mass media play in the area of health communication in general and in the communication of issues relating to HIV/AIDS. It proceeds in providing a brief account of radio broadcasting in Ethiopia. Next, it presents review of the practice of studying mass mediated communication with a focus on the communication practice about HIV/AIDS in the context of radio phone-in programs. It highlights two approaches that have been put to use in studying the communication practice in the area. It, then, introduces the theoretical foundations the study subscribes to, and, ends by discussing the analytical approach to be drawn on.

2.1. The Role of Mass Media in Health Communication

2.1.1. Introduction

Mass media is a means of communication designed to reach and influence very large numbers of people (Fairclough, 1995; Thornborrow, 1999). Due to this reason Mass media's role in the society is immense. The mass media is the most potent instrument of a society for economic and social transformation (Talbot, 2007). For instance, the mass media keeps the people informed on political and governmental matters to enable them make rational decisions. Mass media has basically been used for information dissemination, education and entertainment in the society at large (Thornborrow, 1999).

One of the areas where mass media's role is profound is in health communication. As the watchdog of society, the mass media subtly dictate the pace of the health sector (and other sectors) and the development of any society (Crisell, 1994). This attribute of the mass media springs mainly from its mass reach, communicative verve and the persuasiveness of its reports. Essentially, these features, which draw principally from the communicativeness and expressiveness of its language use, largely mark and define the

acclaimed power of the mass media (Fairclough, 1995). The mass media play a very significant role in disseminating, among others, HIV/AIDS messages across to the entire public. It can be used to promote more open discussion about the many issues surrounding HIV/AIDS. For this reason, mass media can be considered as a very powerful tool in health communication.

The mass media can be grouped into print and electronic media (Thornborrow, 1999). According to Thornborrow, the print media are books, newspapers and magazine, whose basis is the printed word, electronic media, on the other hand, comprise all the mass media which rely on electronic power to get their message to their audience, and these mainly include radio and television. Among the forms of mass media, radio tends to be widely utilized in health communication endeavours. In the section to follow, we will see why and how radio appears to be used predominantly.

2.1.2. Using Radio in Health Communication

Radio is one of the most prominent broadcast media that has its own sets of characteristics and procedures. It is considered to be a ‘permeable medium’ for the distance between the broadcaster and the audience can never be more than the distance between the microphone and the broadcaster or the radio set and the listener (Crisell, 1994). As Scannell (1991) observes, radio and television mediate the public into the private and the private into the public in the manner and style of their performances in a wide range of settings and for correspondingly diverse purposes. According to Scannell, this is achieved to a great extent through on-air talk, which constitutes the institutional spaces of radio and television and which is daily seen and heard in the private, domestic and work spaces of listening and viewing. This implies that the listeners of radio may be people who are engaged in a very wide and varied range of circumstances and contexts.

Radio is acclaimed as the voice of the grassroots. Supporting this, Crisell (1994) observes that radio is the primary communication medium for reaching the largest segment of the population. He contends that radio is a constant presence on the streets, in homes, market

places and workplaces. Geller (2007) adds that as a tool for social change and participatory communication, radio has several comparative advantages over the other media. First, it is cost-efficient in terms of investment – both for those that run the station and for the audience. Second, it is pertinent in terms of language and content – ideal for the huge illiterate population that still remains marginalized especially in rural areas of the Third World. Third, it is relevant to local practices, traditions and culture. Fourth, once the initial investment in equipment is made, sustainability is feasible, though dependent on the level of community participation. Fifth, in terms of outreach and geographic coverage, radio has a strong advantage over other media. It can, thus, be seen that radio plays crucial role in fostering health communication.

2.1.3. Using Radio Phone-ins in Communications about HIV/AIDS and Related

Issues

As has been pointed out, radio can play a crucial role among other issues in the fight against HIV/AIDS by promoting debate, dialogue and breaking the silence over the epidemic (Geller, 2007). Radio can be an effective tool in providing information; stimulating and leading open and frank discussions enabling people living with HIV/AIDS to air their views; challenging stigma with information and positive images; and encouraging leaders to take action.

A broad range of radio formats are used to address an equally broad range of health issues. It is widely held that effective health communications are those that raise community dialogue. Among the radio programs that are produced to reinforce public dialogue radio-phones are one. They are programs that allow the public to involve in different forms of interaction with the talk host and sometimes with studio guest(s). They can accomplish this by creating an environment that promotes the involvement of every stakeholder. Characterizing radio phone-ins, Thornborrow (2001a, 2002) states, the production takes place in a small office in the station; members of the public call the

office and suggest their topic for the program; editors or producers receive these calls and screen them before the live studio broadcast.

People call in to phone-in programs for various reasons: to give opinions, to get advice, and often to ask questions (Thornborrow, 2001a) among other issues on health matters. Crisell (1994: 192) identifies three types of phone-ins: *the expressive*, *the exhibitionist* and *the confessional*. He describes that the callers' purpose in the case of *the expressive phone-in* is to air their views on some topic or issue. Higgins and Moss (1982: 1) characterise this form of phone-in as 'a counter-hegemonic discourse phenomenon – as it is one of the few ways people can find to give public expression to private and perhaps dissonant viewpoints in a culture otherwise saturated with approve meanings'. The callers' purpose in *the exhibitionist phone-in* is not so much to express their opinions on particular topic as to project their personality, to become a performer (Crisell. 1994). In this form of phone-in, the programme host encourages the callers to tell jokes, sing songs, or simply talk about themselves and their interests. In the third type – *the confessional phone-in* – the callers' aim to express their individual needs or problems and get advice (Crisell. 1994). To this end, thus, the callers 'confide', and the host and/or the studio guest(s) enact in the role of therapist, confessor, confidante or counsellor (ibid: 194).

2.2. Overview of Radio Broadcasting in Ethiopia

Ethiopia is one of the countries where there are various kinds of mass media. As media history of the country indicates the print media is claimed to be the earliest form of mass media production. It precedes the broadcasting media and dates back to the early 1900s (Mekuria, 2005). As Mekuria (2005) points out, radio, the earliest broadcast media to appear in the country, came into being in 1941.

The broadcasting sector in Ethiopia has broadly three different kinds of broadcasters: 1) publicly funded television and radio services owned by national and regional mass media agencies 2) private sector radio stations; and 3) community broadcasters. There are more than thirty broadcasters registered in the country. Of these stations, six are operated by

five private radio broadcasters and the remaining are a combination of state owned and community broadcasters (Ward, 2011).

Of the total radio stations, only the state owned Ethiopian Radio and Television Agency's, which is presently renamed as Ethiopian Broadcasting Corporation (EBC), Ethiopian Radio and FM Addis 97.1, and the private owned Fana Broadcasting Corporate's (FBC) Fana Radio and Fana FM have near national coverage and are claimed to be received across the country through a network of transmitters (Ward, 2011). These stations provide multilingual news and programming across Ethiopia. As Ward (2011) puts, the community radio stations cover a radius ranging from 16 to 75kms.

FM broadcasting was launched for the first time in the country by FM Addis 97.1, the state-owned broadcaster, in 2000 (Tadesse, 2010). As Tadesse (2010) observes, following FM Addis 97.1, the Addis Ababa city administration launched its FM radio broadcasting, viz. FM 96.3, in the beginning of 2006 targeting audiences at Addis Ababa. Radio Fana's FM 98.1 is another radio station that started broadcasting in March 2007 putting different news and programs to the audience of Addis Ababa and surrounding areas. In the subsequent years, Sheger FM (FM 102.1) and Zami Public Connections (FM 90.1) among others have joined the list of FM radio stations in Addis Ababa. Currently there are also a number of FM radio stations in different regional states in Ethiopia. All of these stations mainly focus on producing programs on social, business and trade, health, political, sports, traffic etc. issues in addition to news production (Ward, 2011). The launch of the FM radio programs opened the airwaves in that they started interactive radios by establishing live phone-in productions. These productions are believed to engage the audience in discussions over significant issues and problems of the public. However, how talk-in-interaction on radio phone-in encounters is accomplished in the Ethiopian context has not yet been studied with a perspective in discourse analysis.

2.3. Studying Mass Mediated Communication Practice

In this section attempt will be made to review briefly the trends in studying mass mediated communication practices and thereby indicate where the present study is situated.

2.3.1. Less-discourse Centred Approaches

Communication practices in the media context have experienced observations by different researchers who have shown varied concerns. In the early days of media practice, looking at audiences as passive and media as powerful was a dominant view in explaining the relationship between audiences and media (Scannell, 1991). This view was reflected by the traditional *effect* theories which are also known as the magic bullet theories (William, 2003). This effect paradigm emphasized the power of media in determining how audiences think and behave. However, studies that reflect that media were not powerful and had no direct effect on people's attitude or opinion, as people also could be influenced more by other factors, also emerged by the mid of 1970's (Davis and Baran, 2006). This emerged as a reaction to the effects studies. Central to this group of researchers' practice was a theory known as the *uses* and *gratifications* theory. This theory was characterized by its basic assumption that audiences "actively involved in selecting messages to gratify individual needs" (Pitout, 2001:244). As being an opposite of the early effect theories, this theory assumes media "with no effect on their audience...with power resting with individuals who determine what part the media play in their lives" (William, 2003:166).

One of the problems that can be observed in effects research is the implicit model of the audience that it depends upon. It regards the audience as cultural dopes that are acted upon by the media outside of their own active awareness (Hutchby, 2006). The uses and gratifications approach sought to develop an alternative view of audiences as active consumers of media output. Far from it being the case that the mass media produced unconscious effects that changed audience behaviour, it was argued, audience members

actively and critically selected those aspects of media output which most suited their various everyday needs; be it a desire for entertainment, for escapism, for information about events in the world, or whatever. Thus, people *use* the media, and they experience or derive certain *gratifications* from the media (ibid).

Uses and gratifications research was not also devoid of criticisms. It has been criticized for its particular implied model of the audience member. Like effects research, although in a slightly different way, this approach tends to adopt a behaviouristic standpoint. But while effects research often takes a basic stimulus-response position, uses and gratifications research favours a more complex model. It views people as having innate ‘needs’ which are then ‘gratified’ by certain forms of media output (Hutchby, 2006). Put differently, its general aim is to get at the psychological mechanisms by which media output is related to the aims that people formulate. To this end, it asks what audiences ‘want’, what they ‘get out of’ certain programs, and it has a particular interest in how programs satisfy individual ‘needs’. Researchers in this tradition rely on such methods as interviews, focus group discussions, the use of ‘viewer diaries’, and questionnaires in order to accomplish their study goals (Hutchby, 2006).

Out of a critique of the assumptions underpinning both the effects as well as the uses and gratifications theories, there developed another approach to the understanding of audiences. This theory is termed as *Screen Theory*. Drawing on the study of literature, screen theory argued that media products could be seen as ‘texts’ the meanings of which the audience ‘read’ or interpret, much the same as we do with books or other literary artefacts (MacCabe, 1985). For these theorists, the meanings of a text are written in the process of production in such a way as to make only certain subject-positions available to the viewer, or reader.

Utilizing the textual idea developed by Screen theorists, there developed a model that seeks to explain the workings of mass communication. This model is referred to as the *encoding-decoding* model (Hall, 1980). Those working with this model argued that the mass media – primarily radio and television – should be understood in terms of a *circuit*

of communication. At one part of the circuit are the producers, who encode, or 'write', the meanings of their programs in particular ways and with particular kinds of audiences' understandings into consideration. At another part of the circuit are the audiences, or consumers, who decode, 'read' or interpret that program in particular ways. These two parts of the circuit are linked by the processes of distribution (broadcasting, advertising, etc.), on the one hand, and feedback (viewing statistics, market research, etc.) on the other (Heath and Bryant, 2000).

According to Hall's (1980) encoding-decoding model, the process of making meaning or decoding is also open to a number of interpretations as the ability of individuals to give meaning for a media text is determined by the social context they are living in. This model, however, has also received criticisms. One of the criticisms emanate from its tendency of being overtly political. Hall was drawing not only from the work mentioned above, but also, and possibly more directly, from the Marxist theory of hegemony. Because of this, like the *Screen* theorists, he was explicitly concerned with the *ideological* functions of the media. Indeed it is only within this framework, in which the media are seen as a powerful ideological force closely bound up with the establishment and maintenance of hegemony for capitalist structures of social order, that the three types of potential audience readings can in fact make sense (Hutchby, 2006). The other source of criticism, according to Hutchby, concerns its consideration of class as the key sociological variable.

Despite such criticisms, much contemporary empirical research into audience sense making owes a great deal to the original models and methodological techniques developed by researchers in this tradition. There is an on-going program of research which has become referred to as '*reception research*'. At the heart of this program of research is finding ways of gaining closer access to the interpretive work of audience members (Moore, 1993; Nightingale, 1996; Ross and Nightingale, 2003). Reception researches mainly use the two main alternatives of in-depth interviews, focus group and individual interviews, to study how people make sense of a media product. Such a research approach is not free of limitations. One danger of this approach is that audience

understandings are subsequently reinterpreted within the framework of the researcher's own reading of the program. The opposite danger is that the endless variety of audience sense-making practices is uncritically celebrated, resulting in a rather empty, 'populist' festival of diversity (Cobley, 1994; Seaman, 1992).

Related studies undertaken in the Ethiopian context tended to subscribe in one way or another to the research traditions reviewed so far. Among the related studies conducted Tibebe Mergia's (2006) is one. He explored how high school youth in Addis Ababa interpret HIV/AIDS media messages focusing on 'yebekal' HIV/AIDS radio program. Tibebe Mergia based his analysis on the 'encoding-decoding' model. He emphasized on identifying the subjects' main sources of information about HIV/AIDS and examining whether messages disseminated by the media are understandable by the target audience. To these ends, he relied on data gathered using questionnaire and focus-group discussion. The study revealed that mass media are the subjects' main source of information. Yet it depicted that there were problems of understanding or decoding of the variety of messages incorporated under the umbrella of HIV/AIDS related production.

Another related study is Tsegaye Beyene's (2007) investigation of HIV/AIDS related Programs of Voice of the Revolution of Tigray. Drawing on the frameworks of participatory communication theory, agenda setting theory and the mobilization function of media, his study focused on assessing the extent to which the Voice of the Revolution of Tigray (VORT), which is transmitted in Tigrigna language, was effective in setting the issue of HIV/AIDS as an agenda and mobilizing the audience for participation in Mekelle town. In this study, Tsegaye used three methods to assess the extent of audience participation on the HIV/AIDS programs of VORT. These are survey, content analysis and in-depth interview. The result of this research showed that the radio station was able to persuade the audience to consider HIV/AIDS as a top priority issue of concern. However, the study revealed that the degree and level of audience participation on the HIV/AIDS radio program was generally not encouraging compared to the other programs of the radio station.

Among the other studies undertaken what could be considered as relevant are Tigist Mekonnen's (2010) and Zelalem Tesfaye's (2010) works. Tigist's (2010) concern was in examining the nature of communication strategies adopted in Amhara Radio's media communication campaigns about HIV/AIDS. Her findings revealed that the target radio program made use of participatory communication approach, an approach that empowers the students. Zelalem (2010) focused on finding out the role of the phone-in program of the Amhara Mass Media Agency in promoting free and open discussion on HIV/AIDS and related health matters. His findings revealed that the program did not play significant role in empowering the audience to involve in the discussion.

Kibrom's (2011) research is also among the studies that have attempted to examine the communication practice in FM radios. His study particularly aimed at assessing the prospects of public journalism practice in FM radios in creating public sphere. He paid attention to assessing the communication practice in radio phone-ins in Mekelle. In this study, attempt was made to see whether these FM radio stations pertain to the pursuits of public journalism based on the existing practices of citizen journalism. To answer the research questions, the study drew on data collected using in-depth interviews, focus group discussions and participant observation. To get concrete instances regarding the status of public journalism in the media and to elucidate features of the programs, the researcher relied on the utilization of content analysis. This study attempted to offer description and critical analysis of participatory program production with reference to the tenets of public journalism for the purpose of forecasting prospects to practice public journalism. One thing that makes this study different from the earlier ones is the consideration of participant observation. The study revealed that good practices were there though the journalists were not putting the principles of public journalism into effect in its real form.

As can be inferred from the review of these studies, there is something radically missing in all of the researchers attempts to study the communication practice in the target site. No where in these studies does one find a consideration of the actual talk that radio phone-in shows broadcast. They seem to present no example of words actually spoken, or

a speech exchange actually broadcast. When such a tendency is there, the preferred method appears to be transforming the words people spoke into coded units or categories and then quantify the results in order to represent those positions in statistical tables. The statistical approach does tell us something, albeit on a relatively gross level, about certain types of patterns in talk radio discourse, for instance, patterns of agreement and disagreement with various propositions. But, in the process, it leaves completely out of account the underlying questions of the actual, situated speaking practices by which callers' opinions on issues, and their debates with hosts, are managed in the public arena represented by the radio phone-in program. As can be inferred in the review, the investigators main concerns tend to be with how the content of the talk itself relates to wider social and cultural issues. Less attention has been paid to the question of how that talk is actually produced, to the interactional and sequential contexts in which different participants speak, and to the relationship between the talk and the local organizational constraints of the setting itself.

The researchers, in common, tend to rely much on data gathered using questionnaires, interviews and focus group discussions. Whilst these tools can be understood to produce valuable information they are unable to document and describe the precise characteristics of practice-in-action, or seeing a particular situation as that specific situation i.e. as a locally organised phenomenon. Here is a point of departure for the present study. It subscribes to a line of research which takes that any changes to practice that may emerge from analysis and reflection may be facilitated by a method that, as its central concern, documents and describes members' practices *in situ* (Housley and Fitzgerald, 2002). It is the analysis of practice, rather than questionnaire responses or interviews, which can provide far more insights into developing strategies that can ameliorate professional practice (Sarangi, 2005; Silverman, 1997; Tracy, 2009; Housley and Fitzgerald, 2002).

In the following section, attempt will be made to trace out the development of an empirical interest in media talk as a phenomenon of analysis in its own right. We shall begin by noting the centrality of talk to the vast majority of radio and television program genres. Then, by means of a focus on the relationship between broadcasters and their

audiences, effort will be made to address how research foregrounding talk emerged in part out of a critique of the dominant text-reader models adopted in analysis of mass communication processes. Text-reader models tend either to take broadcast talk for granted, or place it in the background in favour of theoretical interests in issues such as the ideological underpinnings of programs. By contrast, research on broadcast talk aims to unfold the structures of discourse and patterns of social interaction that serve as the actual make-up of programs (Hutchby, 2006).

2.3.2. Discourse Centred Approaches

Early research on broadcast talk within media studies developed in part out of a critique of the whole textual approach to the relationship between media output and audiences. For example, Scannell (1991) criticized the conventional procedures of media analysis for their focus on the mediation of ‘messages’ between the ‘encoding’ institutions of broadcasting and the ‘decoding’ or receiving audience at home. For Scannell, this text-reader model meant that the discourse practices of broadcasting themselves tended to vanish. His explorations of the development of early broadcasting (Scannell, 1991), hence, had come to focus on shifts in forms of talk utilized by broadcasters to address their (absent) audiences with progressively more sociability and communicative ease. It was this side of broadcasting that was radically missing from conventional media studies, and it was this that was to become the central object of attention for broadcast talk studies (Hutchby, 2006).

Drawing on a range of influences in linguistics, philosophy and sociology, researchers began to sketch out a novel approach to the question of the relationship between radio and television and their audiences. Through working with detailed transcriptions of the talk that occurred in radio and television broadcasts, based on recordings of shows as they were put out on air, these researchers began to reveal how talk itself could be treated as a legitimate object of study in relation to broadcasting – a factor that had been neglected in the earlier approaches to media studies (Hutchby, 2006; Tolson, 2006).

As we shall see, this perspective analyses speech not in terms of what it is *saying*, but what it is *doing*; or, more precisely, what it is doing when it says what it says (Cameron, 2001; Tolson, 2006). The focus in such perspective, thus, gears toward closely studying the *talk* that constitutes the target media production. This results from the vitality of talk in social relations construction. In the first instance, to talk is to form relations with others (co-participants, interlocutors, audiences) and only on that basis can we go on to make claims, propositions, or statements about the world (Tolson, 2006). Moreover, the primary social relations constituted through talk do not require analysts to make ‘interpretations’ (Hutchby, 2006). The participants themselves, in their behaviour, reveal the relevant patterns and structures. It is true that in some forms of ‘critical’ discourse analysis there is some recourse to theoretical speculation, but in principle the interactions made possible by talk can be empirically observed in recorded examples of data (Tolson, 2006). Thus, a focus on talk can provide insights into the very nature of ‘mass communication’ in the specific arena of radio and television broadcasting (Hutchby, 2006).

The starting point in this study is that whatever aspect of broadcasting we think about, at some level we are inevitably thinking about the use of language (Hutchby, 2006). Perhaps because of its ubiquity, talk as a broadcasting activity in its own right has largely been ignored, or more precisely, taken for granted in media studies using the approaches reviewed earlier (Hutchby, 2006; Tolson, 2006). This tended to be due to the consideration of the activity of talking as a trivial phenomenon, one which has nothing much to do with more pressing issues such as the nature of media bias, persuasion, or the portrayal of violence. For instance, any study of media bias, such as in the news reporting of strikes, politics or war is based on accounts of the relevant events that the media produce. Those accounts are necessarily linguistic: they use language to describe events in a particular way (Thornborrow, 2002). Similarly, any study of how the media persuade, such as through adverts, necessarily relies on a description of the persuasive language that is used, and the relationship between that and the persuasive images that adverts give us (Matheson, 2005). Even studies of media as entertainment rely to a great

extent on the fact that certain forms of language are used to signal audiences into the sense that what they are encountering is, in fact, entertainment (Hutchby, 2006; Tolson, 2006).

Scholars and communication workers are coming to appreciate the importance of using language analysis as a method for studying health communication. Language is a basic resource we require to negotiate social relationships with others, to construct our sense of our world by shaping values, meanings and understandings (Gee, 2005). Communication involves interlocutors interacting to create meanings and messages, construct and reconstruct meanings and values in order to arrive at a common understanding usually witnessed by a common social action. Inevitably, language is a key to social processes and interactions which form the basis of human survival (Sacks, 1992).

Since mass mediated health communication is perceived as human-centred, a study on the communication practice should involve a study of human relations in the practice. Language, which is basic to human communication and social understanding, is crucial here. A number of scholars (e.g. van Dijk, 2001; Fairclough, 1995; Matheson, 2005) have advanced the argument that language is socially situated and as such the texts that we encounter everyday are socially constructed, constituted and determined through language and by language. For this reason, if we want to understand social structures and social processes, then we must turn to language since it is language which constitutes such phenomenon (Thornborrow, 2002). In this study, thus, the researcher both draws upon and develops ideas and methods found in the growing body of research that emphasizes on the situated use of language.

So far, attempt has been made to offer a sketch of theoretical tradition in studying communication practice in the media and point out the difference in focus between the 'interpretive' cultural studies perspective and the perspective of discourse analysis. The following section introduces us with the concept of discourse with a special focus on the contribution of discourse analysis as a theoretical and methodological apparatus. Related discourse analytic studies will then be highlighted briefly.

2.3.2.1. Discourse Analysis in Mass Mediated Communication Studies

The definition of the term ‘discourse’ has remained a point of controversy among scholars. This can be learned from Johnstone’s (2002) summary of how the central concern of discourse analysis is viewed differently by different scholars.

The subject matter of discourse analysis is vast – “language in use,” as Brown and Yule (1983) put it, “utterances,” according to Schiffrin (1994), “ verbal communication” for Renkema (1993) – and most discourse analysts would be hard pressed to describe what, if anything, makes discourse analysis a discipline. (2002: xi)

Cameron (2001) conceptualizes discourse analysis as holistic approach – one that acknowledges that discourse analysis is several things at one.

It is a method for doing social research; it is a body of empirical knowledge about how talk and text are organized; it is the home of various theories about the nature and workings of human communication and also of theories about the construction and reproduction of social reality. It is both about language and about life (2001: 17).

From Cameron’s conception, it can be inferred that discourse analysis is fundamental to understanding human interaction and the ways in which meanings are negotiated through language, and in which social identities are constructed and expressed. Discourse analysis involves recording interaction; transcribing the recorded talk; repeated study of the transcript; formulating claims about the interactional moves, structures, and strategies displayed in the interaction; and then building an argument with transcript excerpts that are analyzed (Tracy and Mirivell, 2009).

The interest in language’s central role in social life is what sets discourse analysis apart from formal linguistics (Johnstone, 2002). According to Johnstone, once we have described the rules of phonology, grammar, syntax and the other systems that form the nuts and bolts of a language, we are still a long way from analysing it. Language use is surrounded by many more rules or conventions and does much more than simply denote objects and actions (Cameron, 2001). Once we extend language analysis beyond simple sentences, we are in a realm that linguistics is not well equipped to explain, and which

involves sociology, anthropology, psychology, philosophy and further disciplines besides (Johnstone, 2002). The term ‘discourse analysis’ is used by researchers in this tradition rather than terms such as ‘linguistic analysis’ or ‘textual analysis’ to signal that language is being situated within these wider frameworks on the nature of thought, experience and society (Cameron, 2001; Johnstone, 2002; Matheson, 2005).

The present study, then, shares, and attempts to advocate, the view held by discourse analysts, that if we take seriously the claim that language is part of a broader range of systems which underlie the organization of social life and human conduct, then the study of language should be situated in the social/interactional matrix, and should incorporate attention to how language figures in the processes of meaning making and meaning negotiations in the evolving actions in talk-in-interaction (Wooffitt, 2005). This view is clearly expressed in the following quote from Schegloff (1996:5), where he calls for a consideration of re-framing the object of attention in linguistic analysis, especially stating that in the analysis of discourse:

It is critical that the analysis of discourse incorporate attention not only to the propositional content and information distribution of discourse units, but also to the *actions* they are doing. Especially (but not exclusively) in conversation, talk is constructed and is attended by its recipients for the action or actions which it may be doing. Even if we consider only declarative-type utterances, because there is no limit to the utterables which can be informative and/or true, the informativeness or truth of an utterance is, by itself, no warrant or grounds for having uttered it - or for having uttered it at a particular juncture in an occasion. There is virtually always an issue (for the participants, and accordingly for professional analysts) of what is getting *done* by its production in some particular here-and-now.

Discourse analysis is getting wider application in answering a range of questions that are raised about people’s practices by researchers in different fields of study. Relating this, Johnstone (2002: 7) states:

Discourse analysis continues to be useful in answering questions that are posed in many fields that traditionally focus on human life and communication, such as anthropology, cultural studies, psychology,

communications, and sociology, as well as in fields in which the details of discourse have not always been thought relevant.... Anyone who wants to understand human beings has to understand discourse, so the potential uses of discourse analysis are almost innumerable.

Discourse analysis, as can be inferred from Johnstone's (2002) claim, has got a wider application in a range of communication contexts. Within Communication, discourse analysis is described as the study of talk (or text) in context, where research reports use excerpts and their analysis as the central means to make a scholarly argument (Tracy, 2001). Discourse analysis provides communication researchers with a compelling way to study how people present themselves, manage their relationships, assign responsibility and blame, create organizations, enact culture, persuade others, make sense of social members' ongoing interactional practices, and so on. Stated a bit differently, taking talk seriously has enabled communication researchers to reframe and address long-standing disciplinary concerns in powerful, novel ways (Tracy, 2001).

One among the contexts of communication where the applicability of discourse analysis is profound is in the mass media. Discourse analysis of the media allows us to describe and assess the sharing of meaning in close detail (Hutchby, 2006; Matheson, 2005; Tolson, 2006). According to these scholars, it analyses which representations of the social world predominate. It analyses what kinds of interactions media texts set up between people and the world and between the powerful and the rest. And it analyses how meaning is made differently in different media texts, and therefore what different ways of seeing and thinking tend to be found there. Discourse analysis can better be characterized for being more concerned with the structures of public discourse (Tolson, 2006).

Close, empirical attention to forms of media talk is able to illuminate a range of questions. It, according to Tolson (2006: 17), for instance, enables us learn: How is para-social interactivity encouraged by the strategic employment of particular forms of talk? What kinds of cultural identity are promoted, by being 'talked-up' as it were? To what extent is the discursive world of broadcasting committed to 'communicative entitlements'?

or alternatively to promoting a consumer culture consistent with its commercial imperatives? What kinds of talk circulate in the contemporary public sphere?

The major reason behind the selection of discourse analysis as a methodological apparatus in the present study lies primarily on the fact that in research using discourse analysis we do not have to rely on intuitions about language and communication because *we have actual data to look at* (Hutchby, 2006; Thornborrow, 2002; Tolson, 2006). We avoid the analysis of forced language use gathered using experiments (where conditions for speaking are tightly controlled to account for different characteristics of the speakers – gender, proficiency, and so on, for example), acceptability judgments (where respondents are asked to rate, perhaps, the grammaticality of sentences or naturalness of speech acts), and questionnaire responses (Hutchby, 2006). By looking at authentic language use in context, we do not have to worry about the reliability of what people *think* they would do or say in a given situation or context; we have access to what they *actually* do or say (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998; Wooffitt, 2005).

In the following sections, attempt will be made to provide a brief review of discourse analytic studies (that gear toward uncovering the structures of public discourse in spoken interactions) in the context of radio phone-in programs and thereby hint at its applicability towards achieving the intent of the present study.

2.3.2.2. Review of Radio Phone-in Discourse Analytic Studies

Much of the research on radio phone-ins emerged in the 1990s, exploring its potential democratic functions (Hutchby, 1996). Researchers placed great emphasis on the significance of the opportunity provided for audiences to participate in mass-mediated debate and discussion. They have focused on the role radio phone-in programs play in keeping listeners up-to-date with political issues, and how these programs provide a forum where these issues can be discussed by ordinary citizens.

Among the earliest studies that have emphasized the central role of talk on radio phone-in programmes is Moss and Higgins (1984). Their interest was in the ways in which

different roles or discourse identities are embodied at different moments in talk of hosts and callers to a radio phone-in programme. They conducted this study drawing on Halliday's (1978) linguistic model of register. Their study revealed the relationship between cultural knowledge and communicative intentions in actual radio phone-in discourse, and showed both the expressive dimensions of that discourse and the way in which the medium itself has a language whose features it is possible to delineate empirically. Their approach could be taken as one that contributed to a shift in attention in media studies toward the question of how radio phone-in interaction is managed.

Hutchby's (1991) analysis of the London- based radio phone-in program is another study that centred on analysing the organization of calls in radio phone-in programs. Guided by sequence organization, like Cameron and Hills (1990), he revealed that radio phone-in productions share features apparent both in 'ordinary' form of talk and 'institutional' form of talk. Hutchby (1991: 119) describes the structure of the talk in the program he analysed as:

The talk produced on talk radio exhibits a variety of features which formally liken it to everyday conversation or 'mundane' conversation, on the one hand, and more 'institutional' forms of verbal interaction (e.g. broadcast news interviews, courtroom or classroom exchanges), on the other.

An interest in radio phone-in talk is further evident in Hutchby's work (1996) where he applied a conversation analytic approach to analyse talk data taken from one show. Capitalizing the centrality of talk to radio phone-in programme, Hutchby (1996), set out to focus on how sequential patterns in talk reveal participants' construction of social realities and communicative activities, and their orientations to social contexts and identity relationships. Beginning with this perspective, he analysed the ways in which the communicative activity of arguing is practically accomplished through sequences of talk within the social setting of talk radio. Hutchby also explores the strategies available to participants in argument sequences, and shows that typically the caller 'goes first', by stating their position in relation to a particular topic, while the host 'goes second',

challenging the caller's opinion without necessarily having to produce one of their own (1996).

In his book that comprises a series of case studies on media talk, Hutchby (2006) not only described the communicative imperatives of talk on radio and television, but offered ongoing illustrations of how the analysis of media talk could be carried out in practical terms. Overall, in this work, he makes a compelling case for the study of broadcast talk as a significant contribution to media and cultural studies, demonstrating why media conversations need to be prioritized for examination. Indeed, as Hutchby shows, such conversations are 'both involved in – and, crucially, are partly constitutive of – an everyday awareness of the social realities around us' (2006: x). Hutchby's (2006) work on the asymmetrical relationship between studio hosts and callers in phone-in programs demonstrates how power works routinely on radio and television in institutionally defined settings. It is not though, as he meticulously shows, the monolithic exercise of control from the studio that is in play, for instance, in phone-ins. Rather, in argumentative or disputatious talk, the host is in a stronger and caller a weaker position by virtue of the defined sequential structure of the conversation in which callers initiate the topic and hosts respond. The way the caller introduces his or her 'opener' is vulnerable to criticism, disagreement or skepticism in the host's response. Of course hosts do not invariably respond in such ways, and callers may vigorously defend themselves in response to negative assessments of their turn; but the organization of turn-taking in broadcast phone-ins is skewed in favour of hosts over callers.

By focusing on one specific program as an illustration, through the analysis of the organization of the calls to a radio phone-in, Thornborrow (2001, 2002, 2010), another veteran researcher in the area, has attempted to show how the potentially powerful speaker role of questioner in other institutional contexts such as courtroom settings, police interviews and medical examinations is interactionally 'defused' through the participatory framework of the talk. Basing her analysis primarily on the methodological frameworks of Conversation Analysis and Participation Frameworks, she has demonstrated empirically that the radio phone-in program is a context for talk where the

relationships between participants are such that the interactional status of the people ‘doing the questions’ is not accompanied by a correspondingly powerful institutional status.

Another study worth citing is Housley and Fitzgerald’s (2002) analysis of radio phone-ins in the context of UK. Arguing that by concentrating purely upon the sequencing of talk, as it was a common practice in the studies that preceded them, researches tend to neglect the situational relevance of categorial ordering often present in media events. These researchers draw on the analytical tools of conversation analysis and membership categorization analysis to examine the lived work of a radio phone-in production in UK. The approach taken entails examining the data through a number of methodological developments within conversation analysis and membership category analysis. Firstly, by extending category analysis to include an appreciation of turn generated categories under the umbrella of categorisation, and secondly, to develop further upon category analysis by exploring the multi-operative work of categories-in-action. Housley and Fitzgerald (2002) examined the radio phone-in talks in more detail documenting a variety of categorial and sequential resources, both routine and specialised, used and relied upon by participants when offering their opinions and debating a topic.

Throughout the chapters in her book *‘Investigating Media Discourse’*, O’Keeffe (2006) pays analytical focus on radio phone-in exchanges. She considers radio phone-in programs as one genre that deserves attention in a study that seeks to describe the nature of spoken media discourse in a broader sense. In this book, drawing on Goffman’s (1981) *‘participation framework’* as the theoretical framework, she analysed such forms of spoken interactions in the media as chat shows, interviews with celebrities, radio phone-ins and political interviews. Arguing that reliance on the utilization of just one analytical method as insufficient to analysing media discourse, her analysis brings together methodologies of discourse analysis, conversation analysis and corpus linguistics. Using a corpus of radio and television extracts from around the English-speaking world, she emphasizes on illustrating how they are managed, how ‘pseudo-relationships’ are established and maintained, and how ‘others’ are created (O’Keeffe,

2006). Throughout her analyses, she attempted to place media interactions in the context of the genre of 'ordinary' form of talk which, she argues, have a certain lineage. She observes, "Our primary experience of talk is through everyday conversational interactions and despite the imposition of institutional conditions, we can still draw on our knowledge of its norms to mix and blend new genres such as media discourse" (O'Keeffe, 2006:1).

Another influential work in the area is Tolson's (2006) '*Media Talk*'. Tolson examined the talk we hear on radio and TV. He looked at styles of program presentation, commentary, dialogue, interview and debate. His study's primary concern was with the way forms of talk, in different program genres, are designed to appeal to overhearing audiences. It was concerned with the ways participants in radio and TV programs interact with each other in such a way that viewers and listeners interact with them. The study focused on exploring the communicative dynamic which is at the heart of broadcasting. It presented a discussion of selected key concepts derived from discourse analysis which could be applied to the study of media talk. These concepts were derived from three main approaches to the analysis of spoken discourse: Conversation Analysis, Pragmatics, and Interactional Sociolinguistics. Drawing on these methodological approaches, Tolson's (2006) work presents the analysis of a series of case studies of different forms of media talk that range from news and current affairs, through sports and DJ talk, to ubiquitous and mundane forms of 'ordinary talk'. The analytical chapters of the work focused to explore such various genres of programing with respect to the main forms of talk they employ. In one of his analytical chapters, Tolson paid attention to the analysis of radio phone-in programs on 'sports talk'. Through his analysis of this particular form of production, Tolson showed how features of radio phone-ins exhibit variation by comparing his observations with Hutchby's (1996) seminal work.

Two main observations can be made from the above-reviewed literature. First, all of them share the foundational assumption that talk is the defining medium of communication on radio as it is in daily life. To study talk on and of the radio is to engage with how communication in fact works in everyday social settings. Second, all of them attempted to

study the communication practice in the western settings, the practice in UK and USA receiving much scrutiny. One point of difference noticeable in these studies, however, is that while some strictly adhere to the methodological orientations of CA (e.g., Hutchby, 1991, 1996, 2006; Thornborrow, 2001) others tend to consider the application of some other analytical frameworks in addition to the employment of CA (e.g. Myer, 2004; O'Keeffe, 2006; Tolson, 2006; Housley and Fitzgerald, 2002).

The present study takes that while a lot more studies of radio phone-in interactions have come from Western contexts and elsewhere, the same cannot be said of Ethiopia. Although the findings of these studies offer insightful observations relating to the interactional accomplishment of radio phone-in programs, they could not be used to inform the applied end that the present study seeks to accomplish as one of its concerns. This makes the present study significant since all the studies have a central goal of informing the communication practice in specific contexts and situations. What makes it even more important is that none of the studies reviewed so far dealt with the nature of radio phone-in interaction about HIV/AIDS, a void that the current study seeks to fill. The interaction practice these analysts dealt with cannot be considered to be constitutive of all genres of radio phone-ins.

In spite of the ever increasing centrality of talk to broadcast media practices and the rise of productions that give prominence to live broadcast talk programs in the Ethiopian context, efforts made to study the accomplishment of such programs appears to be missing. Although the AIDS pandemic has won the attention of considerable researchers, as has been outlined, the focus has almost entirely been on evaluation of the messages and programs produced and on surveying the communication practice against pre-set frameworks developed in other contexts. In contrast, this study seeks to uncover how talk about HIV/AIDS and related issues is managed in the context of radio phone-in program. An analysis of transcripts of talk data in such an interaction site reveals how the participants organize their talk. To engage with such question, the study draws on the conceptual and analytical tools of the previous studies on institutional talk in general and

radio phone-in talk in particular. In what follows, effort will be made to introduce the theoretical and analytical foundations of the present study.

2.4. Theoretical and Analytical Frameworks

2.4.1. Radio Phone-in Interactions as Institutional Discourse

Thornborrow (2002: 4) characterizes institutional discourse as “talk which sets up positions for people to talk from and restricts some speakers’ access to certain kinds of discursive actions.” This implies that institutional discourse, or ‘institutional interaction’ as Drew and Heritage (1992) term, is constituted by specific linguistic resources and communicative procedures, and that participants display their orientation to the institutional character of the interaction by using these resources. The procedures are in turn formed by the character of the roles and activities relevant to the institution concerned. As Drew and Sorjonen (1997: 94) note:

The institutionality of dialogue is constituted by participants through their orientation to relevant institutional roles and identities, and the particular responsibilities and duties associated with those roles; and through their production and management of institutionally relevant tasks and activities.

Institutional interaction is described by Conversation Analysts as formal setting which is seen to differ interactionally from ordinary conversation. The settings examined are seen to differ organizationally from ‘ordinary conversation’ in the amount of pre-allocation of turn organization and speakers’ rights (Drew and Heritage, 1992).

The analysis of talk in institutional settings has developed into a wider range of interactional sites such as: classrooms; courtrooms; medical interviews; calls to emergency services; television and radio interviews, talk shows and phone-ins (Hutchby, 2006; Thornborrow, 2001 and Tolson, 2006; Heritage and Clayman, 2010). Talk shows and phone-in programs involve the production of unscripted, naturally occurring, fresh talk (Tolson, 2006). However, they are also very much occasioned events whose institutional nature is analysable through their distribution of communicative

entitlements, their participatory statuses and performative roles (Scannell, 1996), and the organization and control of talk (Millar and Rodgers, 1987; Scannell, 1996).

Radio phone-in programs have received extended discursive researches which demonstrate that their talks are institutional (Hutchby 1996; Thornborrow, 2001, 2002; Housely and Fitzgerald, 2002). Hutchby (1996) describes radio phone-in talk as form of interaction that takes place within an institution that has its own structure and stability. According to Hutchby, such structure and stability are phenomena that are produced and reproduced through talk and interaction. Drawing on observations by these researchers, this study considers radio phone-in interaction as institutional form of interaction whose feature is demonstrably observable in the participants' orientation which could be made evident in various ways.

2.4.2. Using Integrated Approaches to Analyse Radio Phone-in Interaction

There are different approaches to media discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1995; Hutchby, 2006; Mathenson, 2005; Tolson, 2006). To some extent, these approaches seem to be the product of divergent philosophical perspectives with different attitudes to the interpretation of data. But for the present study's purpose, it is assumed more productive to introduce approaches which are (more or less) complementary and applicable to the analysis of talk in the target site. In what follows, then, approaches to discourse that have bearing to the accomplishment of the present study's intent will be discussed.

2.4.2.1. Goffmanian Approaches

Aspects of Goffman's analytical frameworks have been widely used in studies of institutional talk (Fairclough, 1995; Hutchby, 1999; O'keeffe, 2006, Perakylla, 1995; Thornborrow, 2002; Tolson, 2006). In cognition of their contribution in a range of institutional discourse studies and relevance to the attainment of the present study's aim, Goffman's constructs will inform the analytical endeavor in this study too. These include: participation framework, footing, and facework.

2.4.2.1.1. Participation Framework

It has been a common phenomenon to conceive of and account for communication practices in terms of the 'sender – receiver' model, where the sender produces an utterance that is conveyed to the receiver in a one-to-one fashion. This model tends to simplify (reduce) the participants' roles just to speaker and hearer. The development of 'participation framework' by Goffman (1981), however, puts the validity of the 'sender – receiver' model into question. Goffman posits that the exchange of utterances cannot be fully accounted in terms of the dyadic speaker – hearer model of communication. He instead argues that the participation dynamics between mediated discourse and audience can be accounted for in terms of a model he termed as 'participation framework'. To Goffman, participation framework refers to the instantaneous view of any social gathering relative to the act of speaking at any one moment.

The point of departure for Goffman is that the traditional concepts of 'speaker' and 'hearer' are far too global and holistic. The interaction involved in talking cannot be satisfactorily understood unless the different variations of 'speaking' and 'hearing' are taken into account. He argues that '[w]hen a word is spoken, all those who happen to be in perceptual range of the event will have some sort of participation status relative to it' (1981: 3). People who hear an utterance may be in a very different relation to it: there is an array of possibilities ranging from a person being directly addressed in an intimate contact, to an eavesdropper, and to a receiver of a broadcast.

Goffman (1981) suggests that we must recognize that speaking is a multidimensional activity with the participants taking varied production and reception roles. Concerning the production roles, he made a distinction between the animator, the author, and the principal. The *animator* is the one who gives the voice to the words; the *author* is the one who selects the sentiments which are being expressed and the words in which they are encoded; and the *principal* is the one whose position is established through the words that are spoken (Goffman 1981: 145). In terms of reception roles, he made a distinction between ratified and unratified participants. According to Goffman, *ratified* participants

are the 'official' hearers, whereas the *unratified* participants are just overhearers, bystanders or eavesdroppers (1981: 131). Moreover, within the ratified participants a distinction can be made between *addressed* recipients and *unaddressed* recipients (ibid) For the purposes of media discourse there are two key insights to be gained from Goffman's argument:

The traditional speaker–hearer model takes no account of the unratified hearers, that is, anyone intentionally or unintentionally within earshot of the conversation. The traditional model does not accommodate the ambiguity of the listener. In multi- party talk a listener as a hearer and a listener as an addressee are not always synonymous. (1981: 132)

Goffman (1981: 137) stresses that the participants in any exchange guide, orient and modify their talk within their *participation framework* in pursuit of their goals. As participation framework offers an alternative for media discourse to the dyadic model of communication, which fails to accommodate the multidimensional feature in communication, this study will draw on it in the effort to characterize the organization of communication in the radio phone-in show in focus.

2.4.2.1.2. Footing

Goffman (1981) introduced this term to account for a form of code switching that does not actually involve a code switch, but where clearly there is some substantive change apparent in a conversation. Goffman notes that a persistent feature of natural talk is participants' shifting 'alignment of speaker to hearers' and he calls this phenomenon *footing* (Goffman 1981: 128). According to Goffman (1981:226-227), "The alignment of an individual to a particular utterance, whether involving a production format, as in the case of the speaker, or solely a participation status, as in the case of a hearer, can be referred to as his footing." Put differently, footing is a shift in the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production and reception of an utterance. A change in footing can also be seen as another way of talking about a change in our frame of events (Tolson, 2006).

As Bhatia (1993) points out, different genres create different frame spaces, “a set of potential footings available to an interactant but not currently realised”, and, for some speakers, the right to occupancy of certain frame spaces is restricted. Coupland and Coupland (2000) point out that there are both entitlements and responsibilities associated with relational frames, so that failure to align to a frame or failure to sustain the appropriate footing will be noticeable and negotiation will take place. Koester (2004: 197) claims that speakers use “frames or metastatements to signal their transactional as well as relational discourse goals: in other words goals in both getting things done and getting along”.

2.4.2.1.3. Facework

Facework is among Goffman’s analytical constructs that has been drawn on in most analysis of institutional talks. It has particularly been found to be of value in studying (power) relationships between participants in interaction. It is based on the notion of face – a term originally coined by Goffman (1955) – and the assumption that people interacting socially strive to save their own and the other’s face. It has long been believed that face is a basic element of social interactions and face concern is an important aspect of interactions in a society (Brown and Levinson, 1987; Leech, 1983). Face is defined in a twofold way: negative face wants, which refer to the right to unimpeded action and self-fulfilment; and positive face wants, which represent the desire for recognition and appreciation by one’s social environment.

A person’s performance of face-work, extended by one’s tacit agreement to help others perform theirs, represents one’s willingness to abide by the ground rules of social interaction (Goffman, 1955). It seems to be a characteristic obligation of many social relationships that each of the members guarantees to support a given face for the other members in given situations. To prevent disruption of these relationships, it is therefore necessary for each member to avoid destroying the others’ face. Furthermore, in many relationships, the members come to share a face, so that in the presence of third parties an improper act on the part of one member becomes a source acute embarrassment to the

other members. A social relationship, then, according to Goffman, can be seen as a way in which the person is more than ordinarily forced to trust her/his self-image and face to the tact and good conduct of others” (Goffman, 1955 in Jaworski & Coupland, 2006: 309-10). Through an exploration of the selection and deployment of linguistic resources by the participants in the interaction, it is possible to observe the construction of social relationship.

Only a contextualized analysis, that is, an analysis that compares what is said to how it is said, helps to more clearly determine what a speaker means with his or her utterances, what activities he or she performs while speaking, how these fit into the larger action scheme and communicative genre, and how the attitudinal framework is established between the participants. A focus on such aspects enhances our understanding of the nature of interaction practice within the setting of media talk. While Goffman’s theoretical constructs are of importance, it is when they are coupled with perspectives from ethnomethodology that their contribution be paramount.

2.4.2.2. Ethnomethodology-based Approaches

Ethnomethodology is a sociological approach to language and communication (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). Ethnomethodology focuses on studying the link between what social actors do in interaction and what they know about interaction. Social structure is a form of order, and that order is partly achieved through talk, which is itself structured and orderly. Ethnomethodologists view social actions as meaningful for those who produce them. They search for natural organisations that can be documented through close examination of the texts and talk that organise them. Their interest “is in finding the *machinery*, the *rules*, the *structures* that produce that orderliness” (Psathas, 1995: 2, emphasis in original). At the same time, ethnomethodologists try to avoid preformulated theoretical and conceptual categories when they approach data, but rather try to be led by the phenomena of study, namely, the data themselves.

For ethnomethodologists, the interactive quality of language and language use is a natural area for investigation into how practical reasoning and locally produced senses of order are achieved through observable strategies and methods by members (Tolson, 2006). They take that social life is very much realised through language. That is to say much of the local work involved in carrying out practical everyday accomplishments is realised through the situated, contextually sensitive natural use of language. Language is the intersubjective resource whereby social members meet and accomplish their social realities, including constituting their institutional identities and relationships, and negotiating their relative positions within their social worlds. Indeed, a fundamental tenet of ethnomethodology is that the primordial site of social order is found in members' use of orderly practices to produce, make sense and render accountable their local circumstances (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). The task of ethnomethodologists, thus, is to investigate the recurrent practices found within members' interactions that constitute their shared common-sense worlds, and make them orderly. To such end, they rely on the utilization of two closely related approaches: *conversation analysis* and *membership categorization analysis*.

2.4.2.2.1. Conversation Analysis

Conversation Analysis is one of the widely used ethnomethodology-based research approaches on language use (Fairclough, 1995; Hutchby, 1996, 2006; Matheson, 2005; Myer, 2004; Perakylä, 1995; Thornborrow, 2002; Tolson, 2006; Tracy, 2001; Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). It is a field of research that originated in the 1960s through collaboration between Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. A central tenet of Conversation Analysis, henceforth addressed as CA, is the view that conversation - as a primordial site, and the basic form, of social interaction - is structurally organized; it is "a describable domain of interactional activity exhibiting stable, orderly properties that are the specific and analysable achievements of speakers and hearers" (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). The primary goal of CA, then, has been to uncover and describe the organizational features of ordinary conversation and other talk-in-interaction which provide interactants the resources for building in a routine grounding for intersubjectivity.

Conversation analysis starts from the observation that language as a social process is sequentially organised into recognisable procedures and units (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). What CA is primarily concerned with are not singular acts carried out through singular utterance, but the patterns and structures of interaction built up in conversation or other verbal exchanges among two or more participants. As Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) observe all aspects of social action and interaction can be examined in terms of conventionalized or institutionalized structural organizations which analysably inform their production. These structural organizations have at least the following key features: a) they operate through sequences of talk; b) they are oriented to by the participants as normative standards; and c) such structures are pervasively present in all interaction (ibid). The structures of interaction concern primarily the relations of successive utterances and the actions of which these utterances are vehicles. What action a given utterance performs is, however, a matter to be defined interactionally. The syntactic form and semantic content of an utterance are only partial factors determining this. What an utterance does is to be defined during the course of the interaction between the speaker and the hearer(s).

CA aims to uncover the relevances that participants themselves orient to. It tries to do this by taking advantage of the fact that its materials are 'interactive', in the sense that what the participants do next implements and displays their understanding of the previous action. What participants say or do next depends crucially on their understanding of what another participant has said previously – and furthermore displays how those prior utterances have been taken (i.e., understood). The fact that participants themselves display their understanding to each other can be used by researchers as a 'proof procedure' (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998) for their professional analysis.

A central premise in CA research into the interaction within institutional contexts is the 'primacy of ordinary conversation' (Drew and Heritage, 1992: 19). Ordinary conversation is taken as the basic form of talk-in-interaction, and the institutional types of talk are seen as transformations of it (ibid). This argument has both ontological and methodological aspects. In ontological terms, it is assumed that the variety of different

conversational practices is 'full blown' in ordinary conversation, and the institutional interaction involves selective reduction and concentration on fewer practices (Clayman and Heritage, 2002). In methodological terms it is assumed that ordinary conversation is used as a 'bench-mark' (Clayman and Heritage, 2002; Drew and Heritage, 1992) against which the other forms of interaction are recognized. This methodical use of ordinary conversation is basically the same for conversationalists making sense of the interactive settings in which they are participating, and the professional analyst trying to pin down the specific characteristics of any recorded data (Clayman and Heritage, 2002).

Most importantly, the selective reduction and concentration of conversational practices involved in institutional interaction is not understood as a result of the context unilaterally 'affecting' the conduct of interaction (Clayman and Heritage, 2002). On the contrary, the institutional context is assumed to be an achievement, brought about by the participants through their very activities. In other words, by selectively reducing the scope of conversational practices, by concentrating on some practices, the participants can activate a certain institutional context. The interaction can be rightly analysed as 'institutional interaction' insofar as the participants, through the linguistic detail of their conduct, render their talk observably talk-within-a-particular-setting (Clayman and Heritage, 2002; Drew and Heritage, 1992; Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998).

CA, as has been discussed earlier, approaches discourse analysis with a focus on the activity of language use, investigating the to-and-from of interactions and looking for patterns in what language users (speakers) do (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). In this approach, the use of various turn shapes, such as question and answer sequences, is seen to be distributed to identities, such as interviewer and interviewee within the interaction. It is the particular distribution of the pre-allocated turn organization that it is argued reveals the event as media talk. According to Myer (2004), CA allows the analyst to focus on how normative frameworks underpin the sequential organization of interaction within a constrained and highly institutional setting and what kind of patterns of relationship emerge and how.

CA has also developed in the direction of what ten Have (1999) has called ‘applied conversation analysis’, using the findings of conversation analysis across a range of data to understand the special constraints within institutions, as in doctor–patient interactions, talk to therapists and advisors, courtrooms, or classrooms. According to ten Have, applied conversation analysis is capable of telling us not only about the talk but about the nature of the institutions involved.

Conversation Analysis has been applied to various studies of media talk. This approach, exemplified by, amongst others, Clayman (1988, 1991), Greatbatch (1988), and Heritage (1985), examines the organization of media interaction through its apparent sequential structure. From the 1990s onwards, Hutchby (1991, 1992, 1995, 1996, 2006), Thornborrow (2001a, 2001b, 2010) and Tolson (2006) have contributed to the studies of radio phone-in broadcast by applying the insights of situated sequential analysis to the formats of institutional talk.

CA has been criticized by proponents of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), another discourse analytic approach whose chief preoccupation is uncovering the ways power relations are enacted, for disregarding power relations in its analysis, ‘power’ viewed as control. Fairclough (1989: 46) points out, “Power in discourse is to do with powerful participants controlling and constraining the contributions of non-powerful participants”. van Dijk (2001) defines social power as control and holds that groups have power if they are able to control the acts and minds of other groups. Critics of CA argue that Conversation analysis is somewhat blind to that kind of externally managed context – or rather it says such contexts are merely analysts’ readings into the material (Matheson, 2005). The complaint of the critics is that conversation analysts will assume that conversational interaction is between social equals unless they find evidence in the transcript to suggest otherwise.

Although CA is criticized by Fairclough (1995: 23) for insisting on a strictly micro-level approach and being ‘resistant to linking properties of talk with higher level features’, Hutchby (2006), refutes this arguing that CA lends itself to the investigation of how

micro-level processes in conversation shape macro-level social order. He states how CA is different from CDA and is capable of analysing power relations without postulating it *a priori* as:

We do not need to start from the assumption that factors such as power and ideology operate outside the immediate awareness of participants. CA is not in favour of the view that power relations somehow pre-exist and determine the course of actual concrete encounters; but by focusing on the local management of talk-in-interaction this approach can in fact provide compelling accounts of how power comes to operate as a feature of, and is used as a resource in, institutional interaction. Indeed, even though the issue is usually left entirely implicit, a good deal of CA can be seen as dealing with a possible analysis of power, where power is viewed in terms of differential distributions of discursive resources. These resources enable certain participants to achieve interactional effects that are not available (or are differentially available) to others in the setting (Hutchby, 2006: 33).

In fact, from its inception, one of the most distinctive features of CA has been its greater reliance on the observable conduct of participants as its central resource for developing analyses. One upshot of this feature is that no order of detail in interaction can be dismissed, *a priori*, as irrelevant; and conversely, no analytic distinctions or social characterizations of participants (e.g., age, class, gender, etc.) - however relevant they are to particular disciplines - should assume first-order relevance in analysing actual talk-in-interaction (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). This is not to say that CA takes the position that such analytic distinctions or social characterizations have absolutely no bearing on participants' conduct on any given occasion, only that any claims made along those lines should be empirically grounded and warranted (Hutchby, 2006).

A number of discourse analysts argue that these claimed shifts in power can be studied best at the micro-level of individual interviews and talk (Mathenson, 2005). In order to do so, conversation analysis, a method which analyses the smallest details of verbal interaction, is being favoured in many institutional talk studies (Hutchby, 1996, 2006; Matheson, 2005; Myer, 2005; Thornborrow, 2002). This approach takes to its furthest defensible extent the claim of discourse theory that culture and social action happen

through the details of language use rather than in larger abstract structures which are then instantiated in language (Hutchby, 1996, 2006; Thornborrow, 2002). Conversation analysis of talk on air can, then, describe aspects of the distribution of power in society.

The theoretical and methodological views of CA, a widely used discourse analytic approach for institutional forms of talks, will inform the analysis in the current study. This is primarily due to the cognition of its relevance to the objective of the target study. CA's importance to analysing particularly 'opinion exchanging' talks in the media, which in some way is related to the concern of the present study, can be observed in Myer's (2004:33) claim:

Conversation analysis is central to the study of opinions in interaction because it provides a middle level between the kinds of details that we observe in the text – pauses, overlaps, continuers, laughter – and the kinds of issues we want to study – the statement of opinions, the evaluation of these opinions, the role of the moderator, the opening or closing or shifts in topic.

In addition, taking into account the extensive work on broadcast talk done by CA researchers, the basic understanding of institutionality and the emphasis on the ways roles and meanings are made relevant in interaction, the mechanisms of interpretation and the social values attached to discursive practices, CA's framework will be utilized. Most important, the relevance of CA's paradigms and concepts for the current study's analysis lie in its potential to reveal how interpersonal relationships are sequentially accomplished in talk-in-interaction through turn-by-turn negotiations of situated identities and relations (Hutchby, 2006; Thornborrow, 2001). Its framework illustrates how power relations can become evident through the analysis of turn taking, participants' positioning, forms of address, and argumentation construction within the interaction (Hutchby, 2006).

More specifically, the current study's analysis will closely follow Hutchby's (1996, 2006) CA framework. This is because, first, his framework is of direct bearing to the current investigator's objectives, and, secondly, it has been proved vital for the approach has been adopted and used widely by such scholars in the field as Myer (2004),

Thornborrow (2001a, 2001b, 2010), and Tolson (2006) to mention few, in their analysis of varied forms of media talk, phone-in talk being one. Nevertheless, as relying solely on the methodological tools of CA may not sufficiently allow the analyst to uncover the interactional features the researcher seeks to, another but closely tied ethnomethodology-based analytical tool will be employed to complement the observations.

2.4.2.2.2. Membership Categorization Analysis

Membership Categorization Analysis (henceforth MCA) is like CA an ethnomethodological approach developed by Harvey Sacks (Hester and Eglin, 1997). While CA focuses on the sequential aspects of talk-in-interaction, MCA investigates the categorisational aspects of social interaction. Participants in interaction position themselves and each other within certain social categories or classes within and through their talk by using certain interaction devices. Sacks (1992, Vol.1: 113-125) called these devices membership categorization devices (MCDs), likening them to “inference-making machines”. He suggested that members position themselves and each other within certain categories or classes based on their extra-local knowledges, and their knowledges gained from the use of particular prelocutionary strategies. Such understandings allow members to make inferences about what people are or should be like if they belong to certain categories or classes. That is, members come to associate certain attributes or activities as appropriate or ‘normal’ for certain groups of people.

MCA enables to analyse the practical methods of categorization work in relation to the local accomplishment of social and moral organization and order (Housley and Fitzgerald, 2002). It allows examining the way in which participants in a verbal interaction organize their interaction using categories, devices and predicates, mapped onto a category or collection of categories. As Housley and Fitzgerald (2002) put, MCA involves examining the practices that display ‘culture-in-action’ in relation to the accomplishment, negotiation and repair of social and moral organization. Moral categorisations and or versions or accounts are actively talked into being *in situ*. Categories are collected with others in the course of their being used. This means that the

collection to which a category belongs on a specific occasion is constituted through its use in this particular context. It is, thus, part and parcel of its use in that particular way. Its recognisability is part of the phenomenon itself. “What ‘collection’ the category belongs to, and what the collection *is*, are constituted in and how it is used *this time*” (Hester and Eglin, 1997: 21-22, emphasis in original). That is, membership category devices or collections can be regarded as locally produced achievements of members’ practical actions and practical reasoning.

The development of the methodology of MCA in recent years has also drawn attention to the relationship between sequential and categorical methods within talk-in-interaction (Housley and Fitzgerald, 2002). This methodology has developed a fine-grained analytic sensitivity to the locally organized display of categories and devices as situated events. As Housley and Fitzgerald (2002) state, the methods and configurations through which such events are interactionally accomplished include specific forms of category configuration that are recognizable resources for members in their attempts to constitute opinion, make evaluations, promote specific world views, and assess practices. The methodology of MCA has been applied in the studies of broadcast talk analysts (Housley and Fitzgerald, 2002; Myer, 2004).

Overall, membership categories provide individuals with a crucial resource for making sense of their social world. Hence, the investigation of how individuals use membership categories, devices, and predicates yields insights into the locally invoked and organized common sense knowledge of social structures which individuals are oriented to in their dealing with everyday affairs and therefore complements conversation analysis (Hester and Eglin, 1997). Membership categorization analysis, along with the analysis of turn sequencing and recipient design provided by CA, offers a powerful analytic toolkit with which roles of and relationships between interactants can be understood (Hester and Eglin 1997; Housley and Fitzgerald, 2002; Sacks 1992).

Drawing upon the success of past and on-going ethnomethodology-based researches, this study seeks to situate the analysis of talk in radio phone-in program about HIV/AIDS

within a holistic environment in which the tools of both CA and MCA may be combined in order to further see the way in which sequential and categorial organizations are mutually elaborate and inextricably connected. Such a combined analytic approach presents a real space for achieving the aims of both ethnomethodologically-rooted approaches. From an MCA angle, introducing sequential features as part of the category analysis highlights that categories are an integral, reflexive part of talk-in-interaction and that separating the analysis of category membership from such local deployment is liable to result in a severely impoverished account. Meanwhile, from a CA perspective, bringing in the analysis of category membership features as part of the sequential analysis highlights that the local organisation of the talk-in-interaction is steeped in membership work. The chapter that follows will introduce us with the methodological foundations of the present study.

Chapter Three

Methodological Considerations

In the preceding chapter, attempt has been made to review related literature as well as to situate the present study in light of the previous works. In this chapter, attempt will be made to introduce the methodological considerations to the collection and analysis of the data, and explain the theoretical and practical reasons behind these considerations.

3.1. Design of the Study

The ideas in this study are consistent with a social constructionist paradigm (Croker, 2009). From a social constructionist perspective, communication is regarded as an interactive practice. Utterances are viewed as practical activities that both create and maintain our social selves. The focus here is, thus, on how utterances are presented and embedded within an interactive and social tapestry. Such an end can be attained by applying a rigorous and systematic approach that enables to explore people's worlds – a qualitative research.

Qualitative research, unlike quantitative research, is not necessarily done to predict what may happen in the future or in another setting – what is learned about the phenomenon, participants, or events in the setting can be an end in itself (Silverman, 1997). The term 'qualitative research' is an umbrella term used to refer to a complex and evolving research methodology approach (Croker, 2009). Within qualitative research a number of research methods have been developed. Discourse analysis is one among these methods (Brown, 2004; Cameron, 2001; Johnstone, 2002; Thornborrow, 2002; Jaworski and Coupland, 2006).

Discourse analysis is situated within an interpretive social science metatheory that conceives of meanings as socially constructed, and needing to be studied in ways that take that belief seriously (Tracy, 2001). What distinguishes discourse analysis from

other sorts of study that bear on human language and communication lies not in the questions discourse analysts ask but in the ways they try to answer them: by analysing discourse – that is, by examining aspects of the structure and function of language in use (Johnstone, 2002: 4). One of the areas where the applicability of discourse analysis is widely considered is in the analysis of media talk (Fairclough, 1995; Hutchby, 2006; Tolson, 2006). Fairclough (1995), for instance, argues that analysis of media language as discourse can help in reaching a detailed understanding of the nature of media output. The present study, thus, can be seen as a discourse analytic work.

3.2. Source of Data

This study, as has been pointed out, aimed at analysing the communicative practice with a focus on the case of FM Addis 97.1's 'live' radio phone-in talk about HIV/AIDS. Underlying the researcher's preference to use the term 'case' is Hood's (2009: 68) conceptualization that "for a qualitative researcher a 'case' can be seen as a bounded system comprised of an individual, institution, or entity and the site and context in which social action takes place, the boundaries of which may not be clear and are determined by the scope of the researcher's interests". Such conception is also apparent in Yin's (2003: 13) observation that a case is a 'bounded system', or a defined individual or entity (like a student, program, school, institution) that the researcher wishes to explore. This study, thus, might be considered as a case study in the sense that it sought to focus on studying the interaction or communication practice of a specific program (*radio phone-in talk about HIV/AIDS*) in a particular institutional context (*FM Addis 97.1*) in Ethiopia.

3.2.1. Why This Research Context?

The determination to invest on this particular data site was not made unwittingly. The choice has been motivated in terms of both research discipline and research interest. As the research project is part of a PhD program in Applied Linguistics and Communication, choosing a work-related setting was somehow a predetermined option. This is because

Applied Linguistics focuses on language in use, connecting our knowledge about languages with an understanding of how they are used in the real world (Sarangi, 2005). Radio phone-in interaction proved a reasonable choice in that sense. This is because interaction of this sort is found to have the potential of providing the researcher with an excellent source of interaction that tends to be closer to ‘natural conversational data’ (Tolson, 2006).

In fact, while the program (the research discipline) was of role of determining the broader areas one could focus on, what accounted much to the selection or choice of the specific research context was the researcher’s interest to invest in the area. Two factors could be accounted for the researcher’s development of interest in the area. One has emerged from the researcher’s regular listenership of the program. This has made the researcher to sow the seeds of actual interest towards making a closer observation of the accomplishment of the program. The other factor that added to the development of interest in the area has been the absence of studies with a perspective in discourse study. This raised the present researcher’s curiosity of undertaking a study in the target communication/ interaction site.

3.2.2. Description of the Research Site

FM Addis 97.1 is a radio station in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Established in 2000 by the Ethiopian National Radio Service Agency, FM 97.1 is recognized as the first FM radio station in the nation. As Gebremedhin (2006) states, what laid the foundation to its establishment was the agency’s intent to provide the people of Addis Ababa, and its environs, with an alternative media outlet. FM Addis 97.1 was basically designed to be different from the format employed by the national service. However, as it was established by the national radio service agency, it remained under the agency’s supervision. This made it to share, instead of having its own, the editorial policies, administration and staffs of the national service for long.

Broadcasting its programs in Amharic, the station currently operates 24 hours a day among others with programs such as talk, music and news formats. The talk programs usually focus on providing education and information on issues such as health, sports, tourism, governance, economy and education. ‘Phone-in Talk about HIV/AIDS and Related Issues’ is one of the programs in the station. The program is designed by the station to disseminate ‘lived’ discussion concerning HIV/AIDS and related issues. The program is aired between 6:00 and 8:00 p.m. on Sundays during which callers are invited to air their views, opinions, and experiences regarding the topic set for talk.

3.2.3. The Corpus

The data for this study has primarily been collected by audio-recording ‘lived’ radio phone-in talk program about HIV/AIDS and related matters. The recordings consisted of a series of dyadic interactions between the talk (program) hosts and the callers to the program. The radio phone-in programs produced on the themes titled: ‘*Blood Testing Experience for HIV-antibody*’ and ‘*Challenges in (to) being Faithful*’ constituted the corpus for the present study’s analysis. These themes were selected randomly. While the on-air speech exchanges relating to the former theme were broadcast on 04. 09. 2011; 18. 09. 2011; 25. 09. 2011 and 02. 10. 2011, the talks on the latter theme were broadcast on 09. 10. 2011; 16. 10. 2011; 23. 1. 2011 and 30. 10. 2011. The data considered in the analysis together last about fifteen hours. This amount of interaction data was taken to be sufficient to the attainment of the study’s end.

One of the things that give discourse analysts a hard time is the decision regarding how much data is needed. This remained far from specification. The reason for the difficulty in giving a specific quantitative figure could be attributed to the very subjectivity of the area. Scholars in the area, however, seem to agree on the point that how much data one needs depends very much upon the nature of the research questions one is trying to answer (Arminen, 2005; Cameron, 2001; Johnstone, 2002). Relating to data size decision in discourse analytic studies, Cameron (2001:28) posits that ‘it depends’ seems to be a more sounding answer. She contends that our decision relating to data size should be governed

by our goals, resources and the kind of claims we are hoping to be able to make. She also argues that our determination needs to depend upon the time we have available for recording, transcribing and analysing. Cameron claims, “A factor that affects how many different encounters you may have to record is how frequently the variable you are interested in occurs in talk” (2001:28). According to Cameron (2001: 29), one guiding principle to take into account in an attempt to determine the adequacy of the data collected could be the analyst’s realization of the fact that ‘analysis is not turning up anything new, but only additional examples of patterns they have already identified’. The current researcher, hence, has relied on about fifteen hours of audiotaped host-caller interactions, for this amount of interaction data was felt to be sufficient to the attainment of the study’s aim. In the following section, attempt will be made to explain the analytical procedures the researcher underwent

3.3. Procedures Followed in the Study

Once the data collection is completed what is considered as the next task in the research process is to engage into analytical work. This holds true for research designs with a quantitative orientation. Such procedural demarcation, however, may not be strictly adhered to in a qualitative research tradition. This is so primarily owing to the emergent nature of the qualitative research process. Concerning this, Croker (2009: 9-10) observes the following:

... they (qualitative researchers) usually begin the study with only a research purpose and conceptual framework, and a sense of the initial focus of interest. They then prefer to enter the research setting and become familiar with the context and the participants, and ascertain what participants think the main issues and problems are, before determining their specific research questions. These questions are modified and refined, and the research design developed, as their understandings of the research setting, participants, and research focus mature.

The fact that qualitative research is described as emergent does not, however, necessarily imply that it is devoid of clear and orderly pattern. It is as Croker (2009: 10) succinctly puts, ‘systematic and rigorous’. It is so because researchers have to demonstrate that their

research practices are sound and that they have used clear logic, provide strong evidence to substantiate the arguments they make, and diligently document the process of collecting, analysing, interpreting their data (Silverman and Marvasti, 2008). In the sub sections to follow, effort will be made to elaborate the analytical procedures this study has followed.

3.3.1. Transcribing the Audiotaped Data

To undertake a discourse analysis of interaction via speech, as pointed out earlier, spoken data must be collected. Once the oral language data have been collected, they need to be transcribed, or represented visually. Such visual representation or transcription may take various forms, from simple orthography to finely detailed notations of pronunciation, breathing, loudness, pitch, and the like (Cameron, 2001).

Some researchers categorize the transcribing activity under the data collection process while others regard it as part of the data analytic process. This seems to develop among others from the way researchers have conceptualized and have been using transcribing in their research process. It could be understood in the former case, for instance, if one's primary goal or aim is just getting the spoken data visually represented for an analysis to be carried out some other time. It could also be considered in the latter's sense for it is while transcribing that researchers come to identify some features for (further) analytical foci or in-depth scrutiny. In this sense, transcribers could be seen as engaged in some form of preliminary or initial analysis. This can, for example, be inferred from Silverman's (1997: 27) statement, "It should not be assumed that the preparation of transcripts is simply a technical detail prior to the main business of the analysis." Putting it into one stage of the research process, say data collection or data analysis, tends to be demanding for a possibility is there to consider in either way. It, hence, calls for the researcher's justification of use. The present researcher considers it in the latter sense primarily for attention has been paid, while transcribing, to observe some recurring features of the organization of interaction in the target site.

In transcribing spoken data, researchers usually get confronted with ethical issues as well as issues of accuracy and consistency (Johnstone, 2002). It is important, thus, to realize that transcription itself is theoretical, in that what one chooses to represent and how it is done reflects a view of the world, the speakers, and their relationships (Cameron, 2001; Johnstone, 2002; Tolson, 2006). Whereas some suggest that words should be transcribed in standard orthography as writing cannot hope to capture the quality of speech, others have raised the question about how researchers can transcribe the ‘whole social person’ to convey the speaker’s identity (Arminen, 2005). Ochs (1979) maintains that strictly standard orthography should be avoided, arguing that a modified orthography, such as that adopted by Sacks et al. (1974) should be employed, as it captures the way in which a word is pronounced versus the way it is written. Bearing the objections against non-standard written representations of spoken discourse in mind, a ‘moderate’ system of non-standard orthography is suggested for use.

Arminen (2005: 65-66), capitalizing on the impossibility of producing a perfect transcription, describes /characterizes good transcripts as ones that:

illuminate the dynamics of turn-taking and the essential characteristics of speech delivery. Turn-taking involves details about the turn initiations (do they involve para-linguistic elements, such as inbreathe, pitches, hesitations, re-cyclings, etc), turn closings (are they marked with prosody? do they happen at the first possible point? are there excrements, rush-throughs, etc?), overlaps (do speakers speak simultaneously, from where to where), gaps and pauses (for how long in tenths of seconds). The characteristics of speech delivery involve noticeable features of stress, pitch, loudness, speed, and recognizable prosodic patterns.

Transcription of discourse data, hence, could be seen as a large and contentious topic as there are various techniques of transcription which could be associated to different approaches to discourse analysis (Cameron, 2001). According to Cameron (2001), as there is no transcribing technique to consider as perfect, which transcription convention one has to use tends to depend much upon one’s research purpose.

Taking the purpose of the study into account, the mode of transcription employed in this study combines English orthography with notational conventions that follow the CA

model developed by Gail Jefferson (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). The CA model was extended or modified in some symbols to suit the purpose of the present study's analysis. Attempt has been made to make the transcripts capture the verbal and prosodic details of speech, such as simultaneous speech, pauses, extra lengthening of a sound or syllables. As to the procedures of transcribing, in this study, Arminen's suggestion has been considered. He observes, "As no transcript is ever perfect, a reasonable strategy is to start from the elementary features, and add details to the degree that they become relevant for the analysis" (Arminen, 2005:65-6). To Arminen, elementary features include aspects to do with turn taking whereas advanced features include aspects relating to characteristics of speech delivery.

3.3.2. Approaching Data Analysis

As has already been mentioned, data for the current study were collected by audio recording 'live' radio phone-in talk program about HIV/AIDS, and the corpus was assembled by making detailed transcriptions of the recordings. In this subsection, attempt will be made to explain how the data analysis was approached.

The analytical endeavour made in this study has been informed by integrated discourse analytic approaches. The analytical tools of CA were employed to guide the present researcher to uncover how interaction in the target site is structured, what form of social relations is apparent, and whether the interactants have fair access to and control over the discursive resources in the encounter through such analytical lenses as issues of turn-taking, turn construction, control of the floor and sequence organization. MCA was also used in the effort to unravel how the participants' roles and identities are evidenced in the process of the speech exchange. The analysis started with a process of 'unmotivated looking', whereby general remarks were made on an arbitrarily chosen sequence of the transcribed data. The observations formulated were then extended to the entire corpus, and the provisional findings emerging from the single case analysis (i.e., the arbitrarily chosen case) hinted focusing the study on *turn-taking organisation* and *sequence organisation*. The observation of similar instances in other cases in the corpus was, then,

made. In so doing, the observations were validated through ‘proof procedure’ and ‘deviant case analysis’ (Arminen, 2005; Clayman and Heritage, 2002; Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). In other words, effort was made to look systematically for the participants’ initiatives and the co-participants’ responses, and examine cases where things go differently. The analysis was then extended to include other conversational features which are identified by conversation analysts as the basic places to probe the institutional feature of interaction, namely *overall structural organisation, turn design, lexical choice* (Arminen, 2005; Clayman and Heritage, 2002; Drew and Heritage, 1992; Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). Besides, participants’ moment-by-moment categorization activities were paid attention in the effort to unpack identity negotiation and manifests of power relationships from their own perspective.

In sum, the data collected for the current study have been analysed using the analytical toolkits mentioned in an integrated way. The rationale for the selection and determination to rely on these toolkits has been the cognition of their indispensability to the study’s aim. The approach taken was inductive and descriptive. It is inductive insofar as the conclusions finally reached are the result of a reasoning founded on factual evidence. The descriptive aspect of the method derives from the aim of providing a detailed analysis of the particulars of the target communication site. Attempt has, thus, been made to formulate some suggestions that could account for repetition and variation in the patterns identified.

3.3.3. Organizing and Presenting the Data

Central to discourse analytic work is the use of transcripts of actual interaction data. Every claim or argument made by the analyst needs to contain data fragments or examples taken from the transcripts in the corpus. These examples are primarily used to illustrate the analyst’s observation through real interactional data from the target interaction setting. In this sub section, how the interaction data were organized and presented in the present study will be outlined.

There are various ways data are organized and presented in academic works. The commonest ones are the three-line and two-line presentation methods. According to ten Have (1999: 93-94), the three-line presentation, which is considered to be the most rigorous method, involves: a line in the original language; a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss of the line in the target language; and an 'idiomatic/free' translation in the target language. The utilization of a three-line data translations is considered crucial if the analysis focuses on the syntactic features of talk-in- interaction that are shaped differently in the language of the data and the language of presentation (Arminen, 2005). According to Arminen, if the researcher discusses features that do not depend on the syntactic variation between languages, findings can just be presented in two-lines: with the first line presenting the transcript in the original language and the second line containing the translation of the transcript using the language of presentation.

The current study followed the two-line presentation approach owing to two reasons. For one thing, such a presentation was found to be sufficient to the attainment of the present study's aim. Secondly, it was felt that space constraint would have been there if the three-line presentation method had been adopted. The data analysis was based on the original materials in the original language (*Amharic*), and was assisted with the transcription of data. The findings, however, were presented in a language other than the original (*English*). Each transcribed Amharic utterance was followed by the corresponding translation in English. The transcripts present the Amharic in English letters (orthography). Effort has been exerted to translate the Amharic as close to the original as possible in form and meaning, while making the translation readable. Various aspects of interaction, such as overlapping talk, silence and other specifics, are noted in the lines of the original Amharic utterances and their English translations. However, because of the differences between English and Amharic, such as differences in word order, the specifics about the speaker's delivery of the turn in the English translations are not exact, and the original Amharic utterances should always be consulted when reading the transcriptions.

3.4. Ethical Considerations

Among the things to consider in discourse analytic studies is the confidentiality of the recorded material, and this is especially relevant if one intends to record speakers in institutional interactions (Cameron, 2001). There are, however, institutional interactions to which these concerns do not apply because they are produced for a mass audience: talk that is broadcast on radio or television (Cameron, 2001; Goffman, 1981, Hutchby, 1996). In spite of this fact, in the current study, all transcripts were made anonymous by removing sensitive references to people and replacing them with invented names containing the same number of syllables as the originals to add to confidentiality.

3.5. Concerns of Reliability and Validity

Issues of reliability and validity are taken among the decisive factors in the research process (Croker, 2009; Silverman and Marvasti, 2008). These concerns are considered to be central in the evaluation of research undertakings. Following Arminen (2005), *reliability* can be described as the potential repeatability of findings so that they are not accidental and idiosyncratic. *Validity* can be characterized as the accuracy of findings in terms of the avowed topic of research. According to Arminen (2005), in discourse studies, issues of reliability encompass two broad themes: external and internal reliability. External reliability can be maintained through the analysts' consideration of temporal and organizational inclusiveness; theoretical sampling of recordings; and complementary ethnography and document usage. Decisive to the attainment of internal reliability are the technical quality of recordings and the adequacy of transcripts.

The concern of discourse analysis for the most part is to focus on the analysis of interaction between and among speakers (Johnstone, 2002). Such an analytical focus calls for the analyst's attention to engage in the uncovering of the interaction feature with much reliance on the participants' own resources. An important concept in this regard is 'co-construction', which is defined as 'the joint creation of a form, interpretation, stance, action, activity, identity, institution, skill, ideology, emotion, or

other culturally meaningful reality' (Jacoby & Ochs, 1995). By looking at the interactants' authentic language use in context, the analyst, thus, does not have to worry about the reliability of what people *think* they would do or say in a given situation or context; s/he has access to what they *actually* do or say (ibid). In this study, in order to secure the reliability of the study, issues outlined by Arminen (2005) have been thoroughly considered.

As to the issues of validity, this study attended to three considerations to justify the validity of the analytical claims made. First, the researcher made use of the participants' own understandings as they displayed them in interaction. Speakers orient in any turn of talk to what came before and in anticipation of what comes next. This orientation typically displays the sense that the participant makes of each conversation turn. In other words, in the unfolding of the interactions the speakers display to one another their interpretations of what is going on, especially what was going on in the immediately preceding turn of talk (Hutchby, 2006; Tolson, 2006). CA researchers label this type of validity check the 'next turn proof procedure' (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). They attend to what an utterance does in relation to the preceding one(s) and the implications it poses for the succeeding one(s).

Second, the present researcher has provided rich and extended transcriptions of conversations to allow future readers to make their own judgements about the claims made. Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998) called this the 'transparency of analytic claims'. Once a reader goes through the exemplars given for every analytical claim, she or he has the opportunity to make a judgement if they were transparently true. The present researcher recognizes the results are always open to reinterpretation and that readers must continually negotiate the strength of the claims through continuous dialogue. This conversational way of understanding validity is reminiscent of the conversational process studied in this research.

Third, the researcher noticed when conversational routines or structures identified elsewhere broke down in other conversations; what CA researchers term a 'deviant case'

(Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). As pointed out earlier, the present researcher has worked to understand the ways in which participants, through their actions, oriented to such departures. Their actions provided additional support for the analytical claims as the interactants oriented to the interaction as one involving a departure from the routines. For instance, when the interactants deviated from a particular conversational pattern, the researcher noticed how this led to a difference in the conversational outcome.

In this unit, the virtues of the methodological approach subscribed to, i.e., discourse analysis, have been introduced as a particular insistence on close attention to detail, where talk is recorded and transcribed according to strict protocols. It has also been pointed out that such an approach is able to demonstrate that the strategies of talk it identifies are attended to by the participants themselves, and are not simply interpretations of the data made by the analyst. The following chapters will demonstrate the application of such methodological considerations through analytical works. While the first analytical chapter focuses on uncovering the organization of communication in the target interaction site, the second chapter pays attention to the analysis of the linguistic accomplishment of host-caller communication.

Chapter Four

Organization of Communication

It is argued that the fundamental difference between verbal interaction in non-institutional contexts and in institutionally framed contexts is to be found in the extent to which communicative actions are managed in concrete communicative encounters (Drew and Heritage, 1992) through certain form of participation organization (Goffman, 1981; Thornborrow, 2001b) and format of communication the participants routinely draw upon (Perakylla, 1995 and Silverman, 1997). These aspects are suggested as the generic properties of talk-in-interaction (Goffman, 1981; Perakylla, 1995; Silverman, 1997; Drew and Heritage, 1992). It follows that any data of spoken interaction can in principle be analyzed both from the point of view of the organization of participation and from the perspective of turn taking (organization). To get good insights into the accomplishment of communication in the target radio phone-in program, in the sections to follow, analytical attempts will be made respectively on these organizational aspects.

4.1. Participation Organization

As has been pointed out, one of the means to observe the workings of interaction in institutional contexts lies in the organization of participation. This can be understood by analysing the management of the participation framework (Goffman, 1981; O'keeffe, 2006; Tolson, 2006). This is because any talk-in-interaction involves specific measures taken by the producers and recipients to constitute themselves as having a specific relation to the words that are spoken. So the investigation of the management of participation framework in institutional settings may enhance our understanding of the specific character of the institutional talk (O'keeffe, 2006; Perakyla, 1995; Thornborrow, 2001b). Besides, focusing on such an aspect renders one with the opportunity to uncover the participants' discourse roles and the form of interpersonal relationship the interactants tend to constitute through their choice of linguistic resources (Goffman, 1981; Hutchby, 2006; O'keeffe, 2006; thornborrow, 2001b; Tolson, 2006).

Communication in the phone-in program under analysis can be understood as program produced, like any other radio programs, for the mass (listening audience). Unlike any radio programs produced for the mass, the interaction is noted, however, for being accomplished mainly by two parties who can be noticed as making speech exchanges. While this feature might be shared with other forms of broadcast talk, say news interview, a feature peculiar to the radio phone-in production in focus is there. This lies in that the radio phone-in program is found to be a form of broadcast production that grants space for the participation of a number of callers within a (single) production. The present study takes as caller member of the audiences who (hearably) take part in the on-air production with a person in the institutional space of the production studio.

In the productions analysed for the present study, the host, conceived in this study as the person who engages from the institutional space of the studio in the (hearable) on-air production with the callers, marks the beginning of the production through the use of general opening remarks. This general opening component usually constitutes the hosts' broader introduction set to identify the program, the issue, and the people who are entitled to have opinions (views/ participation) on it. It sets out features that typify talks held in institutional contexts for it is intended to achieve certain institutional goals. These goals presuppose generally that the dialogue itself and its result(s) concern not only the interactants involved: they are of general interest and are meant to have an effect on the audiences. The institutional goals of the program appear to accomplish an increased awareness about the target issue. The excerpt that follows shows the prototype of the general opening component in radio phone-in program about HIV/AIDS and related issues in FM Addis 97.1.

Excerpt (1) 0A1: 04/09/11, 1:1

*endemen ameshachehu yetewededachehu yezegejitachen teketatayoch(.)
yehzetenasebatneteband afamadis new yehud meshet yewuyeyet kefelegiziachen
jemerual melakubelaynehnegn balefew samenet laratsamenetat yakahiadnewun
wuyeyet atekalelen [...] lezare adis r'eseguday yezenmetenal eskemeshetuhuletsat*

deres aberenachehu eneweyayebetalen malet new(.) kepagumeand eskamest baratamet andekpagumeand eske sedest bagerakef dereja ye(.) befekadegnenet yeahaivads yemermeranayemeker agelegelot yekahedal (0.5) yehezemecha zenderomendezihu yekahedal(.) kehuletken gedema buhala maletnew yejemeral selezih egnam (xxx)tebeken yehen guday lenanesa ezih studio tegegntenal [...]

Good evening our dear audiences This is 97.1 FM Addis Our Sunday's discussion programme has started I am Melkamu Belayneh Last week we finished our discussion that lasted for four weeks [...] For today we have brought a new topic and will be together until 8 o'clock (.) From Pagume 1 to 5 once in four years from Pagume 1 to 6 at the national level there is a voluntary counselling and testing for HIV/AIDS (0.5) This campaign is going to take place this year too, (.) about two days later so [...] we are here in the studio to discuss about this issue [..]

As can be inferred, the main purpose of such general opening remarks seems to give a reason for choosing to talk about the particular topic relating to HIV/AIDS, and thereby appealing to the audience to recognise that the situation under reference is a major concern. It tells the audience what to expect as it provides a picture of the sequence of ideas to be presented. In other words, such a presentation preview gives a background to the programme, conceptualises the discussion, and serves as an attention-getter.

In the interaction data analysed, the host usually tends to open up the session, as is evident in the above extract, by introducing himself just by name, as somebody already known to listeners. This might stem from the 'dailiness' (Scannell, 1991) of the program. As the program is of a regularly produced one, the hosts tend to presuppose that they are familiar to the callers (audience). This can also be observed, though less frequently, in the callers' choice of address terms, as will be shown in the greetings exchange practice. The basic format for introducing the topic appears to be the statement of a difference between two possible responses that could lead listeners to call. This part of the introduction presents a guide to the listener as to what to expect from the discussion. It previews the

structure of the presentation, and serves as a kind of summary of the content of the presentation. This introductory remark is usually succeeded by the announcement of the phone number of the radio station. A text number is also announced for those who prefer to participate via sending (writing) short text messages.

Excerpt (2) 0A2: 04/09/11, 1:1

[...] zare gin yewuyeyetachen matentegna yemihonew esekahunders (1.0) yaltemeremeren sewoch alenwey eskahun deres befekadegnenet lay yetemeserete yeahaiv meremera alakahedenemwey yemil (xxx) kalakaheden lemen yemilewun teyakenanesalen (.) kakaheden senakahed yeneberewunneger eyanesaneweyayalen malet new (.) eskahun (.) deres yeahaiv meremeraaladeregnemwey.zeroandandamestamesamestamesahuletsemanyaratwey em semanyamest lay medewel yechalal sementzeroand lay tekest madregendezihu yechalal wuyeyetun eyemerahumelakubelaynehalehu teknikun bememerat beseratyetagesu selekochachehun bemekebel saramengestu eskemeshetu leminoren koyeta bakeberot eyegabezen kemeshegageria muzika buhala melesen enegenagnalen

[...] our today's discussion centre on Aren't we tested until now(1.0) Haven't we made voluntary test for HIV (xxx) if we haven't, why? (.) If we have made, what our experience looked like will be talked about (.) Haven't we made an HIV test yet? It is possible to give a call using 0115555284 or 85; it is also possible to send a text message using 801 Leading the discussion Melaku Belayneh, leading the technical matter Bisirat Yitegesu, and receiving your calls, Sara Mengistu will be with you We cordially invite you to stay tuned We will be back after the music

This excerpt demonstrates some of the structural and contextual norms enacted by the occupier of the institutional category of 'host'. It also exemplifies the hosts' theme-setting move for the phone-in, and the hosts' provision of routes for callers to access and engage in the programme. As can be seen in the excerpt, introducing himself along with

the technical crews by name, the host opens up the program by animating a number of possible responses to the topic without giving his own view (overtly), or voicing his own opinion explicitly. He also tends to model the kind of interaction the audiences expect. The host's reliance on the construction of his opening turns in such a way can be seen as consequential for it serves to give emphasis to the goal-oriented nature of the program. This can also be inferred, as we shall see in the later sections, from the host's goal enforcing moves made subsequently in the program.

In so doing the host invites any listening audience to take part in the production. In response to the hosts' remarks of invitation, members of the listening audiences get involved in the production work. This group of participants are positioned in the institutional relevant identity of 'callers'. They engage in the on-air speech exchange with a co-participant positioned in the institutional relevant identity of 'host'. These two participants with the institutional footing of 'caller' and 'host' then involve in the production work that seeks to achieve the institutional goal of the program – *which seems to be producing talk that aims to foster behaviour change among the listening audiences*. Such introductory description hints that the callers, the hosts, and the audience constitute the participation framework of the radio phone-in show in focus.

The organization of participation in the radio phone-in show in focus could be described as a form of production that is primarily conducted with the 'active' participation of the hosts and the callers. While the hosts are in the (institutional) space of the studio, the callers do not share the space of the studio for they get the participation status in such an institutional footing just by phoning in from a space outside. Positioned in the institutional role of program manager, the hosts appear to engage in doing, among others, such actions as introducing the (theme of the) program, bringing callers on air, managing interaction with the callers, organizing the transition from one caller to the next. The callers tend to be positioned as primarily having the role of sharing what they have on the theme-based discussion in the on-air talk, once they get ratified. Before getting ratified to take part in the production of the on-air talk, the callers have to meet the 'back stage' worker, one who shares the same space of studio with the host and is responsible for sort

of ‘screening’ work (Goffman, 1981). The caller has to pass through such a step before getting into the participation framework. This appears to characterize the routine organization of participation in the communication site. While the detailed observation concerning the constraining features of and the discursive actions available to these interactants in the participation framework shall be made in 4.2. of this chapter, for the sake of just giving an overview of the participatory framework in the target communication site, let us now see an excerpt that illustrates this generic feature.

Excerpt (3) 3: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: → *wuyeyetachen tejemerual ademach mesemer lay tegegnetau(.)*

helo

Our discussion has been started A caller is on air(.)

hello

2 C: *helo helo*

Hello hello

Excerpt (4) 7: 18/09/11, 2:1

1 H: → *lela ademach mesmer lay endalu eyetenegeregn new helo helo*

I am being told that another caller is on air hello hello

2 C: [*helo*]

[hello]

Excerpt (5) 4: 02/10/11, 4:2

1 H: → *sara mengistu and ademach mesmer layeyastenagedech*

new wede mesmer megebat yemichel yemeselegnal

ademachachenen esun astenageden wedebalemuyachen

enemelesalen helo

Sara Mengistu is with one caller I think he can join
the on air talk After hosting him we will be back to a
talk with the expert hello

2 C: *helo*

hello

Excerpt (6) 2: 09/10/11, 1:1

1 H: → *lela ademach mesmerachen lay ale*

Another caller is in our line

2 C: *(tut tut)*

(sign of getting off line)

3 H: → Ok *yeselek mesmerachen tekuarete yemeselegnal*

ahunem engedih ademachochachenke FM (.) *temeleso gebetual*

eyalugn new helo

Ok I think our line's got off also at the moment our

audiences from FM (.) They are informing that he has got

back on line

4 C: *(helo)*

(hello)

As can be understood from these exemplars, the host accomplishes one of the actions that s/he is in charge of in the institutional role of program manager in line 1 of each of the above four exemplars, bringing the other parties (i.e., both the respective callers and the audiences) into the participation framework. The turn designs by the hosts in this line demonstrate how a sense of co- presence is simulated, the role of footing in ratifying the audience members and making them feel part of the participation framework. The hosts' turn constructions in the latter three excerpts (excerpt 4, excerpt 5 and excerpt 6) seem to

suggest the presence of what Goffman (19981) refers to as ‘back stage’ work. Excerpt 6 appears also to hint the number of back stage production workers as (being) two or more for the host sticks to the use of plural marker ‘*eyalugn new*’, which literally means ‘they are informing me’. Besides, the inclusion of the guest (expert) in the participation framework can be noted in excerpt 5 (‘*wedebalemuyachen*’, which appears to mean ‘to the expert’). These exemplars can also be seen as displaying the discursive actions availed to the parties in the participation framework. One thing that can be inferred in the way participation is framed is the (manifest of the) simultaneity of both interpersonal and mass communication features in this communication site.

Features of Interpersonal Communication

As has been observed, central to the organization of communication in this interaction site appears to be the direct involvement of two parties. Participation is primarily organized in a way whereby the hosts and the callers engage in actual (the on-air) speech exchanges. This aspect makes it to have a feature in common with the interpersonal form of communication, a two-way form of communication which involves the reciprocity of speaker actions. This reciprocity implies a constant role shift of involved participants from speaker to hearer in the course of the communicative process.

Excerpt (7) 3: 04/09/11, 1:1

- 1 H: [...] *lela ademach halo*
 [...] another caller hello
- 2 C: *helo*
 hello
- 3 H: *selam ameshu*
 Good evening {h+}
- 4 C: *tena yestelegn*
 Good evening

5 H: *eziaber yemesgen e: (0.5) keehaivi meremera gar anseten
eyeteweyayen new [...]*

Praise is to God e: (0.5) We are talking about HIV test
[...]

6 C: *e: awo aletemeremerekum*

e: yes I have not been tested

While the speech exchange made between these two participants seems to recur as inherent feature in the phone-in program in focus, a room, however, is also there, as can be inferred in the excerpt below, for different parties to be in a form of interpersonal communication. This comes with the involvement of a guest (expert) invited to add to the realization of the production's goal.

Excerpt (8) 1: 02/10/11, 4:2

1 H: *eh esti balemuyachen ezih studio alu ahun bezewuditu
hospital (.) ye (.) hekemena (.) yemekerena meremera (.)
ma'ekel 'senior counselor' yehonut Sr. Abrehet Zewude
ezih studio nachew yalut bekedemiya sistern enkuan dehena
metu mallet enwedalen (.)* I

eh okay our (guest) is here in the studio now

Sr. Abrehet Zewude, a senior counsellor in medical,
counselling, and testing center at Zewuditu hospital
is here in the studio First of all we would like to say
welcome to Sr.

2 G: *amesegenalehu*

I thank you

In addition, deviation from the prototypic interpersonal mode of communication was observed. The participation seemed to be organized, though rarely, in a way that displays the host as mediating interaction between the guest and the caller. This tended to manifest in the organization of communication when the host interacts with the final caller in the call sequence before moving on to make a dialogical exchange with the guest. This can be evidenced in the host's turns in lines 1, 3, 5 and 7 in the excerpt that follows.

Excerpt (9) 1: 02/10/11, 4:2

1 H: → *lezich ademachachen emiyanesut teyake lezenash yenoral*

Do you have a question to pose to the caller Zinash

2 G: *awo mendenew leteyekat yasebekut (.)*

Yes what I would like to ask her is

3 H: → *ehe*

ehe

4 G: *degame lememermer yasferat men linor yechelal (.)*

HIV beteamer ayemetam [metelalefiya]

What will make her to feel afraid of testing again (.)

It is impossible to get infected with HIV miraculously

[transmission]

5 H: → *[eshi zenash]*

[Ok Zenash]

6 C: *abet*

Yes

7 H: → *yaluten metelalefiya mangedoch bemulu tawukiyachewalesh*

(.) benezia mangedoch endayemetabeshem tenekake setadergi

koyeteshal (.)

You know all the transmission routes (.) You were taking
care of yourself not to be infected in those ways (.)

8 C: *awo*

Yes

The host here can be seen enacting in one of his institutional roles of manager of the production (as can be seen in lines 1, 3, 5, and 7) by mediating the caller and the guest and thereby control the interaction flow. This might be seen as one way whereby the goal-orientedness of the program can be inferred. As has been observed, the radio phone-in program appeared to be primarily produced to the accomplishment of an institutional goal. The organization of interaction between the host and the guest, as in the organization of the host-caller interaction, is also observed to be part of the participation framework. This happens to be so just because the interaction of the host and the guest is of direct bearing to the attainment of that institutional goal, the latter being invited to make a professional contribution. The interactants adherence to the goal orientedness of the production can be inferred in their discursive moves. All the parties would seem to hint their engagement in the production of talk to benefit the audiences.

Features of Mass Communication

In the target radio phone-in show, we have just seen that interactions take place in a participation framework, which principally is constructed between the host, guest/caller and the audiences. This is a three- fold construct inclusive of the audiences as a participant in the interaction since the talk that unfolds from moment to moment in the phone-in production is aimed not just at the hosts who elicit talk from the callers/ guests or the callers/ guests who present their views/ opinions relating to the theme set for talk, it is primarily shaped for and by the audiences who listen to that program.

What seems to underpin the organization of participation in the radio phone-in in focus is its concern of involving members of the public and thereby hints the production's benefit to the audiences. Instances in the corpus of data analysed that clearly reveal the fact that

the program is *produced to benefit the audiences* are found. This seems to be made evident in the participants' overt utterances. The hosts make this feature displayed explicitly at different stages in the organization of the production. Awaiting the detailed observation of the structure of the communication in the target phone-in program for chapter five, let us simply take for the moment that different phases are there in the accomplishment of the target production. The hosts make this feature apparent, as has been demonstrated earlier, at the opening phase when the hosts produce the *general introduction* of the program and in their management of *transition* of talk exchange from one caller to the next. Apart from these segments in the production, the hosts tend to make the phenomenon evident in their organization of *follow-up talks* with the callers, as can be seen in the following exemplars.

Excerpt (10) 2: 18/09/11, 2:1

1 C: *ahun gin tenesh (.) yaw rot rot ({laughs}) selaleku (.)*

ferahu

But now for I (.) just run a little ({laughs}) I become
fearful

2 H: *bezu bezu new yerotekew weys tenesh*

Have you run too much or a little

3 C: *and amest shi (.) yehonal rejim adelem acher new*

It may be about five thousands it is not long, short

4 H: *malet seterot[*

It means when you run [

5 C: *[acher rucha new]*

[it is a short run]

6 H: →Ok Ok *yeteleyayu keteleyayu sewoch gar geberesega*

genegnunet setareg (.) [ehh (.)]

Ok Ok different **when you make sexual intercourse with**
different individuals (persons) (.) [ehh (.)]

7 C: *[and hulet]*

[about two]

In this exemplar, it may be understood that one of the ways whereby the host hints that the (host-caller) production is meant to benefit the audience lies in his attempt of formulating (see *line 6*) the caller's turns that seem to be designed using expressions of ironical sort (see *lines 1, 3, 5*). Despite his understanding of the caller's intents in those turns, the host's insistence in formulating the caller's production in a language that he thought as appropriate to the audience (in *line 6*) may hint the host's concern to the mass communication end (i.e., to benefit the audiences).

The *closings or concluding component* in the program could also be seen as one of the other segments in the production where the hosts disclose (*e.g.* via overt utterances; via inviting '*expert*') the concern to produce a program that aims to benefit the audiences. This can be seen in the hosts' turn constructions in the following two excerpts.

Excerpt (11) 13: 04/09/11, 1:1

H: → *betam amesegelehu yezareasramiest ken **altemeremernem***

yalachehu ademachochachen yezare asramest ken yakuam lewut

adergachehu badis mereja endemenegenagn tesfadergalehu

selam ameshulen

thank you very much in our next fortnight session I hope

those of you who said we have not been tested will change

your mind and come with new report in our next fortnight

session Have **a** good evening {h+}

Excerpt (12) 1: 18/09/11, 2:2

1 H: → *esti lewolajoch yehoneneger yebelunena koyetachenen*
enatenak

Let you pass on something to the parents and end
our talk

2 C: [...] *bene bekul emastelalefew* [...]

[...] personally what I want to pass on [...]

The phenomenon of hinting that the program is mainly produced to the benefit of the listening audiences is not confined solely to the hosts. In their turn, callers too tend to make this feature evident, among others, in the following way.

Excerpt (13) 13: 25/09/11, 3:2

1 C: → [...] *tenesh yehone mereja lemasgebat vayresu kand sew*
enten keteyaze sew wedalteyaze yemitelalefebet gize sent
new=

[...] just to add small piece of information concerning
how long does it take for the virus to transmit from the
infected to the non-infected

2 H: =*ehe ehe*

Ok Ok

3 C: → *lemilew tenesh eske huletshi sement almost eske*
huletshi zetegn yalew mereja the data up to two thousands
eight almost up to two thousands nine

4 H: *ehe*

ok

Excerpt (14) 3: 25/09/11, 3:1

- 1 C: → [...] *ena yanen yahel ewunet newey ene eskahun*
alsemahum yenanten temeretem eketatelalehu rejim gize (.)
[...] so is it that true I have not heard about up to now
I have also been **attending the lesson that you offer for**
long
- 2 H: *eh (.) algebaghemena (0.5)*
eh (.) as it is not clear for me (0.5)

Excerpt (15) 7: 04/09/11, 1:2

- 1 H: *teru neger endaderege sew demetseh wuset beras*
yemetemamenena des yemil semeit [new]
The tone of your presentation hints your good feeling and
confidence as if you have done something valuable
- 2 C: → [*eko lenegereh new*] *yaw yemiyastemer neger selale*
beye eko new
[yeah I am about to tell you] it is because that it **has**
(a sort of) educative end
- 3 H: *melkam eshi*
Ok go on
- 4 C: → *yaw kandu hiwot andu memar selalebet beye new*
It is simply because one has to learn from another's
experience
- 5 H: *ketel eshi*

Ok continue

In these excerpts, the callers tend to depict the radio phone-in show under analysis as a site where the audiences are provided with information of pedagogical end. They tended to make this evident in their turn constructions written in bold in lines 1 and 3 in excerpt 13, line 1 in excerpt 14, and lines 2 and 4 in excerpt 15.

The participants' cognition of the audiences as the recipients of their production would in addition seem to be tacitly shown in their locally accomplished speech exchanges. The host's turn design in line 3 and the caller's turn construction in line 4 in the exemplar that follows demonstrate this.

Excerpt (16) 9: 04/09/11, 1:2

1 H: *ehe ehe (0.5) bezih huneta wuset new yaleshew rejim gize*
honoshal ketemeremersh hulet wer

ehe ehe (0.5) you are in such a condition
it is too long since you got tested, two month

2 C: *eh awo ({laughs})*
eh yes ({laughs})

3 H:→ *min tekeledalech new emilush mechem sisemush [...]*

Why is she kidding the audiences might say upon listening

4 C: → *ay lene rejim gize new in fact lenesu minalbat enesu*
rejim argew emiyayut hulet amet soset amet emilewun neger
new [...]

It is long for me in fact to them probably

what they take as long may be two or three years [...]

Participants' preference in designing their turns in ways that hint *a modicum of attention is given to the interpersonal* end may seem also to tacitly indicate their cognition of the

primarily institutional nature of the production, i.e., one that aims just at realizing the institutional goal by producing talk to the audiences.

Excerpt (17) 1: 09/10/11, 1:1

1 H: → *ademach mesmer lay endale eyenegerugn yegegnalu helo*

They are informing me that a participant is on line hello

2 C: *tena yestelegn genetu beru ke Shashemene*

Good evening (I am) Genetu Beru from Shashemene

3 H: → *eshi genetu zare engedih [...] meketachenen wedenante*

aderesenal yemewesen fetenawoch mendenachew eyalen new

esti men getemeh

Ok Genetu today [...] we have aired our concern we are

saying what are the challenges in being faithful

ok what have you experienced?

Here we can observe the host rushing to the main business of the production – *producing talk that helps to hit the program's goal* - by constructing a turn that serves to signal such a concern as earlier in the third turn (i.e., in *line 3*) and thereby tacitly show a modicum of attention to the relational end.

Another production phenomenon that might hint the participants' orientation to the feature in focus is their tendency to engage in what CA researchers' label as 'repair works' (Hutchby and wooffitt, 1998) at instances where the interactants draw on the utilization of a *switched code* or a *mixed code*. A *switched or mixed code* here is used to refer to the participants' temporary reliance on the use of a word or phrase from another language in their turn designs.

Excerpt (18) 3: 18/09/11, 2:2

1 C: *gin eza dem besetenbet seat lay (0.5) yene bered selenebere*

→ *yene dem tenesh (.) coagulate honobegn neber*

but during the moment we delivered our blood for a test

(0.5) mine as it was cold then, my blood **got** a bit

coagulated

2 H: *eshi*

Ok

3 C: → *regetobegn neber malet new*

that means **it coagulated**

Excerpt (19) 2: 25/09/11, 3:1

1 C: *zare gin keza buhala rasem yaw endemetayew ahun*

counsellor *negn*

but now right after that as you can see I am a counsellor

2 H: *ehe ehe*

ehe ehe

3 C: *zare mekari negn (0.5)*

Now I am a counsellor

4 H: *ehe*

ehe

5 C: *yaw lezih dereja dereshalehu (.) memermer gin sewoch*

lifereu yechelalu ene gam simetu emiferu sewoch alu (.)

→ *gin yerasen yanen neger **share** eyaderegekuachew **teru** neger*

endehone memermer tekami endehone eyenegerkuachew malet

new (0.5)

I got to this level (.) but individuals may fear getting
their blood tested There are persons who display their
fear when coming to see me But I am **sharing them**
my experience that means I am **telling them that getting**
one's blood tested is a good thing and of benefit

In these exemplars, we can see the callers' attempt of explaining or restating words which they might think as worth restating so as to benefit the audiences and thereby display their orientation to the goal of the production they are participating in. While the caller in the first extract tends to make the phenomenon of switching a code by restating the English word '*coagulate*' through its Amharic equivalent in line 1, the caller in the latter extract engages in such an activity by explaining the English word '*share*' in her/his succeeding turn design in line 5.

The analytical observation made thus far is hoped to provide with the opportunity to understand the nature of the participation framework in the radio phone-in production in focus. It has demonstrated the involvement of different parties to the realization of the production's goal. While more than two parties are included in the participation framework, the effort to accomplish the institutional goal, however, seems to heavily rely on the speech exchange made between two participants. These participants tend to engage sometimes in conversational (less formal) form of exchange – feature of interpersonal communication - and at times in institutional (formal) type of exchange – one that reflects feature of mass communication. The prevalence of such a 'generic blend' (Thornborrow, 2002) seems to characterize the kind of radio phone-in production under observation. The participants appeared to make such feature evident in the actual speech exchange through the utilization of discursive resources that tacitly display their tension in role enactments. It is now to this communication phenomenon that we turn to.

Tension in Role Enactment

The way by which the accomplishment of the production to the audiences (feature that marks an aspect of *mass communication*) is realized primarily through the discursive enactments of the callers and the hosts and at times between the hosts and the guests (feature typical of *interpersonal communication*) shows the *duality feature* in the organization of communication in the target interaction site. In the communication data under analyses, this feature can be understood in the discursive moves the participants are making to the accomplishment of the production's goal. The hosts particularly tend to be in tension of whether to enact in their institutional role or in their social role. The following are some of the ways that allows us infer the hosts' role ambivalence emanating from the *duality feature* of the production.

One of the ways by which the hosts' role ambivalence tends to be disclosed is in their designs of *terms of address*. In their turn constructions, the hosts appear to draw on the deployment of terms of address that made their tension of whether to enact in their footing in the institutional role of host or in their footing in the social role of any participant taking part in a conversational exchange. While the discursive moves they need to make in the institutional role of host tends to require them to enact in the production role of what Goffman (1981) terms as '*animator*', the discursive moves they make in the social role of any participant may not necessarily require them to enact just in such a more narrowed production role.

Excerpt (20) 5: 09/10/11, 1:1

1 H: → *eh tenayestelegn demetseh tenesh kef tadergelegn*

eh good evening can you make **me** your voice a bit louder

2 C: *eh eshi eshi abero yestelen beyalehu*

eh ok ok (I said) good evening (too)

3 H: → *eshi eyeteweyayenebet yalew guday ale engedih selemewesen*

*fetenawoch eyaworan newuna ante engedih bemewesen wust
kaleh min fetena getemeh*

ok there is a theme on which **we** are discussing **we** are
talking about challenges of being faithful and if you are
in such a state, what challenge have you encountered?

As can be understood in this excerpt, the host would seem to make evident her tension in address term choice by enacting in her social role of any participant in a conversational form of interaction, as in line 1, and by enacting in her institutional role of program host, as in line 3. In line 1, she uses greetings opener ‘*tenayesetelegn*’, and request marker ‘*keftadergelegn*’, which are usually drawn on in one’s social role as an individual speaker and thereby hint that the participants are engaged primarily in a conversational form of exchange than in the institutional. In contrast, in her turn design in line 3, by mobilizing such inclusive resources as ‘*eyeteweyayenebet*’ and ‘*eyaworan*’ the host evidences that she is enacting in her institutional role and thereby display that the talk is being produced not just to her but to the audiences. It can, hence, be seen that while her turn design in line 1 appears to exclude the audience from the participation framework, her turn construction in line 3 tends to include the audiences in the participation framework.

Ambivalence in the hosts’ role might also be inferred in their lexical choice. While constructing their turns, the hosts’ lexical choice seem, as in the practice of term of address we have just observed, to depict their role ambivalence. They tend to orchestrate the interaction in this radio phone-in by focusing sometimes on the use of lexical resources that are of conversational end (i.e., ones that are mobilized to solely appeal to the co-participant’s state) and by drawing at times on the use of lexical devices that appear to hint that at the centre of their production is the audiences out there. Here we can revisit excerpt (10) on page 84 to see how the host tends to elicit talk from the caller by repeating the words, which seems to be used when one interacts with a person of closer relations, the caller uses to design her/his turn, and later by restating the lexical items the

caller and the host have been utilizing with ones that tend to be perceived to suit to the audiences.

The other discursive resource by means of which the hosts' role ambivalence seems to be understood is in their interactional tendency of revealing stance. Owing to the multiplicity of roles they talk from, it is not uncommon to observe them grappling with whether or not to disclose their stance.

Excerpt (21) 8: 18/09/11, 2:1

1 H: → *mejemeriya yetemeremere sew temeremero rasun yawoke*

Sew ketelo wedalew meremera sihed beteley bemehal

behuletu mermerawoch mehal emiyasegaw neger eskaltefetere

deres

One who had made a blood testing earlier when one,
who knew his (blood testing) result, is about to make
testing for the second time unless a threatening event
occurs especially between the two

2 C: *[eh]*

[eh]

3 H: → *[ferat] ayenorebetem yehe bezum ayegeremem*

one will not be [in fear] **this is not that surprising**

4 C: *eh*

eh

5 H: → *bemejemeriya dereja wedemeremera yemihed sew gin*

yetewesene ferehat liyastenaged endemichel balemuyawoch

yenageralu ersewo bemejemeriya gize wedemeremera sihedu

yeneberewun neger yastawusalu eza akababi yalewun

But **experts claim that** a person who is going to make
blood testing for the first time may feel frightened

Do you remember the state you were in when you went
for the first time your experience relating to that

This excerpt illustrates the tension that tends to manifest as a result of the host's subscription whether to enact in his social role or to enact in his institutional role. While he seems to depict his stance taking, which tends to be typical in one's engagement in conversational exchanges, through the mobilization of an evaluative discursive remark '*yehe bezum aygeremem*, which literally means 'this is not that surprising' 'in line 3, he appears to display a neutral stance in his turn construction in line 5 via the deployment of acknowledgment device, '*balemuyawoch yenageralu*', which is to mean 'experts claim'. It is widely held that participants in the institutional role of talk manager, for example, news interviewer, usually tend to take neutral stance (Tolson, 2006). In the phone-in data in analysis, it seems that whether or not hosts, being in the institutional role of talk manager, take neutral stance are determined by the relevance of the act there and then in the attempt to achieve the production's goal. This observation will further be developed in 4.2.2 of this chapter. For the moment suffice to observe stance taking simply as one interaction resource whereby the hosts' role ambivalence tends to be made apparent.

Summary

The analytical observation made thus far is hoped to provide with the opportunity to understand the nature of the participation framework in the radio phone-in production in focus. It has demonstrated the involvement of different parties to the realization of the production's goal. In this communication site, participation is framed in a way that depicts the manifest of simultaneity of both interpersonal and mass communication features. It is primarily organized in a way whereby the hosts and the callers engage in

actual (on-air) speech exchanges. Yet what appears to underpin the organization of participation in the communication site is its concern of involving members of the public and thereby hints the production's benefit to the audiences.

In this sub section of the analytic chapter, we have seen how participation is organized and how the participants display their orientation to the features inherent in the communication site. Having observed the participation framework in the target site, let us turn now to the analysis of the formats of communication in play.

4.2. Communication Formats

In this sub section, attempt will be made to reveal the formats of communication that are in play in talk-in-interaction on the target radio phone-in program. As has already been unpacked in the analytical presentation of the participatory framework section, communication in the radio phone-in production in focus has features of both mass communication and interpersonal communication. The speech exchange in the communication site, however, is primarily conducted in the form of a dialogue between two parties – the host and the caller. The verbal interaction between the host and the caller characterizes the kind of speech exchange that predominates in the communication practice. It is through the 'live' speech exchange between these participants that the accomplishment of the program's goal is realized primarily.

The flow of communication in the radio phone-in program under analysis can be viewed as a chain of shifts between a small number of simple sets of locally managed interactional roles of questioner, answerer, speaker and recipient. In the communication site, the host and the caller are respectively aligned either as the questioner and the answerer, or as the speaker and the recipient. These persistent sets of roles can be described as, following Perakylla and Silverman (1991) and Silverman (1997), as the '*interview format*' and the '*information delivery format*'. As can be seen in the excerpt below, in the *interview format* – the communication format predominantly in play, the host and the caller are respectively aligned as the questioner and the answerer.

Excerpt (22) 7: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *endemen ameshehu*

Good evening {h+}

2 C: *ziaber yemesgen*

Praise be to God

3 H: *eshi (.) temeremeren*

Ok (.) have we been tested?

4 C: *awo temermerialehu yeneberegennen yemermera agatami*

lenegereh new

yes I have been tested and I am about to tell you my
experience

5 H: *betam des yelegnal eshi.*

I'll be very much pleased go on

6 C: *mejemeriya yeserahut and sehetet new*

First I made one mistake

7 H: *ante.*

You?

8 C: *awo*

Yes

As this excerpt shows, the fundamental structure of the interview format involves chain of speech exchanges in the form of questions and answers. The interactants often produce sequences of speech exchanges where the hosts act as questioners and the callers correspondingly as answerers. It can also be observed that the long sequences of questions and answers are then locally and collaboratively produced by the interactants, who recurrently opt to confine themselves to the roles of a questioner and an answerer.

Enhancing the exploration and expression of callers' beliefs and presenting one's experience and/or observation relating to the selected topic for talk, as can be learned in the above excerpt, are just among the functions question and answer exchanges accomplish. As will be discussed at length in the (sub) section that addresses how communication between the participants is accomplished, via question-answer exchange, at each phase in the organization of interaction, questions and answers serve a variety of interactional purposes the ultimate aim being the realization of the program's goal.

In *information delivery format*, while the host has the role of the speaker, the caller has the role of the recipient. Through this format, apart from factual information, the host sometimes delivers advice to the callers. The excerpt to follow illustrates the workings of the information delivery format in the communication site in focus.

Excerpt (23) 8: 04/09/11, 1:2

1 H: *lemen endehone takiyalesh.*

You know why?

2 C: *ehh*

ehh

3 H: *beteley bergezena lay yalu enatoch (.) meremera*

maderegachew bemenem melku ledereder emikereb endalhone

balemuyawoch yaworalu enatem abatem (.) behone mekeneyat

behone sehetet virusu wede tsensu endayetelalef lemadreg

wesagnu gize ya new (.)

Professionals suggest that it should not be compromised

that pregnant woman must get her blood tested for HIV

They suggest mothers and fathers as well (to do so)

They suggest that this is the crucial time to prevent

the transmission of the virus to the fetus

4 C: *ehe*

ehe

5 H: *leju siweled kevayresu netsa endihon*

To get the baby delivered free of the virus

6 C: *ehe*

ehe

7 H: *weyem degemo leleju tenenet sibal lenateyew tenenet sibal*

batekalay beketay tedar wuset leminirew genegnunet

seketamamanet sibal (.) beteley regezena simeta menem

beka (.) yeged new

for the sake of the child's health for the sake of the

mother's health generally to leading a healthy marital

life (.) particularly during pregnancy no option

it is a must

8 C: *ehe*

ehe

These two formats appear to be the stable and persistent formats in the target interaction site. Both parties in the interaction tend to display their orientation to these formats through their collaborative achievements in several ways. The participants also, however, step outside these stable formats. In the corpus, such feature appears to mostly emerge when the callers initiate questions, as can be inferred in excerpt (24), and when they show the tendency to make further conversational contribution, as can be seen in excerpt (25) below.

Excerpt (24) 7: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *eshi*

ok

2 C: *keza behuala sasebew (.) beka kelal neger endehone
betedegagami memeremer jemerekugn [...] setasebew beratio
setaselaw ye eteyopia hezeb betam tenesh percentu new
beHIV teyezo yalew ena yesew amelekaket mendenew beka
beyazes belo tebab tebabun new yemiyasebew gebetohal*

Then after (.) I have come to consider (it) just as
minor thing

I started getting tested repeatedly [...] When you see
when you put it in a ratio it is very small percentage of
the Ethiopian population that is already infected with
HIV but what the people perceive is just narrowly what if
I get infected (do) you understand

3 H: *ehe*

ehe

4 C: → *gen yalteyazew hezeb new emibezaw aydel*

But it is the uninfected that outnumber, isn't it?

5 H: → *awo*

yes (it is)

Excerpt (25) 13: 25/09/11, 3:2

1 H: *betam amesegenalehu kehawasa [ademachachen]*

I thank you very much our [participant] from Hawassa

2 C: → *[enten malet] tenesh yehone mereja lemasgebat vayresu kand*

sew enten keteyaze sew wedalteyaze yemitelalefebet

gizesent new=

[...] just to add small piece of information about how long

it takes for the virus to transmit from the infected

to the non-infected

3 H: = *ehe ehe*

Ok Ok

The other format the participants draw upon to accomplish the interaction goal in the radio phone-in show is one that makes use of the *combination of the two* recurrent communication formats discussed thus far. The commonest way of organizing interaction is beginning with the interview format and then moving into the information delivery format. Here the information delivery format is relied on once the caller's answer to the question posed by the host in the interview format suggests the need to provide clarification or explanation concerning the subject or concept in discussion. So, drawing on the information format is considered here as useful for tailoring the talk to the caller's answer and also for explaining the rationale behind the caller's questions. Following the achievement of this purpose, the communication is run using the interview format to encourage the caller to talk about the subject in hand. Excerpt (26) illustrates the participants' interactional accomplishment in such a communication format

Excerpt (26) 12: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *lemendenew almeremerem yemetelew*

Why do you say I won' get my blood tested for HIV

2 C: *(.) eh bemeremerem balemeremerem menor echelalehu*

(.) eh I can live whether or not I got (my blood) tested

3 H: → *{laughs}* *betemeremerem batemeremerem tenoraleh*

esu gelets new

({laughs}) you can live whether or not you got tested

that is obvious

4 C: eh

eh

5 H: *betemeremerem batemeremerem yalew neger endale hono (.)*

Betemeremer gen endet endemetenor takaleh malet new=

Without denying that (fact) but if you got tested,

you will know how to live

6 C: *eh awo*

eh yes

7 H: *lemesale setemeremer HIV bedemeh bayenor (.) keza behuala*

endet aynet tenekake madereg endalebeh takaleh (0.5)

for example, if, up on testing, HIV is not found in your

blood, you come to know the kind of preventive move

you should make afterwards (0.5)

8 C: *eh*

eh

9 H: *enji betemeremer HIV bedemeh wuset binor degemo*

endet argeh tenahen eyetebekek menor endalebeh takaleh

(0.5) selezih bemeremer tetekemaleh enji bemeremerem yaw

new balemeremerem yaw new wedemil medemedemiya

→ *yemiyaderes aydelem aydel (.)*

if you got tested and HIV is found in your blood

you know how to live taking care of yourself
therefore you will benefit out of getting tested and
there is no need to conclude saying no difference
whether or not I got tested is there (.)

10 C: *awo*

Yes

11 H: *selezih nege mehed techelaleh*

So can you go (for testing) tomorrow

12 C: *eh (.) echelalehu*

eh (.) (yes) I can

As can be understood in this excerpt, following the caller's answer in *line 2*, the host switches out of the interview format into the information delivery format (*lines 3 to 8*) and then the participants display a return into the interview format towards the end of the excerpt, i.e., from *line 9* on. In the interaction data in focus, the possibility of ending the speech exchange that was taking place in the interview format with the information delivery format is evident. In such cases, as can be observed in the excerpt that follows, the information delivery format usually take the form of advice exchange – the host offering advice and the caller receiving advice.

Excerpt (27) 8: 04/09/11, 1:1, P. 19-20 M

1 H: *eneza negeroch yelum beleh emetaseb kehone*

sewoch selefereu new emeteferaw malet new belela amarigna

If you think that those worrisome things are not your
concern put differently does it mean that you feel afraid
because that others are afraid

2 C: *eko awo endeza aynet neger new*

yea it is something like that

3 H: →*lemanegnawum eh (.) zerzer yalu negerochen eh*

zetegn amsahulet lay magegnet techelaleh

yenetsa yeselek mesmer new

Any way eh (.) you can get detailed information eh

on 952 it is a telephone (help) line free of charge

4 C: *eshi*

ok

As can be inferred from the analytical observations we have just made, the interview format and the information delivery format tend to be the prototypic communication formats in the organization of verbal interaction in the radio phone-in program about HIV/AIDS and related matters. The excerpts analysed depict the collaborative character of establishing and maintaining these formats. Although instances revealing departure from these more stable formats are also evident in the data, they appeared to be short-lived for the interactants are observed to engage in a collaborative restoration of the prototypic communication format. While different observations could be made concerning why these formats get currency, one that might better hint at the condition is the participants' orientation to the institutional nature of the production.

As has been pointed out in earlier in 4.1, though speech exchange is predominantly made between the host and the caller, which renders it to have features of interpersonal kind of communication, the fact that it is primarily designed to be listened by a large number of audiences makes it to possess features of mass communication - program type that in its production takes the listening needs and interests of the audiences into account. Given this characteristic feature, the participants might have the impression that, unlike in the management of ordinary conversation, the professional is expected to be firmly in control of the communication accomplishment. In fact, this may not just be based on their intuition but because evidences in the production of the programs are there that suggest

the recipient-orientedness of the production (see 4.1). It can, thus, be observed that it is the participants' cognition of such a feature, among other reasons, that adds to their joint involvement in the maintenance of the recurrent communication formats.

A related and decisive factor for the choice and consistent reliance on these communication formats may be seen as stemming from their suitability to the realization of the central aim of the program, which seems to be awareness creation on issues likely to be little understood or misperceived by the society and thereby promote a model conduct or behaviour. While the interview format tended to offer far more advantage when the purpose of the speech exchange, for instance, was eliciting one's beliefs about and experience of blood test for HIV/AIDS as in excerpt (28) below, the information delivery format appeared to render better space when the purpose was providing information about the procedures involved in and the implications of blood test for HIV/AIDS as in excerpt (29).

Excerpt (28) 7: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *eshi. temeremerem*

Ok Have (you) been tested (*impersonalized*)

2 C: *awo temeremeriya lehu*

yeneberegna yemeremera agatami lenegereh new=

Yes I have been tested

I am going to tell you about my testing experience

3 H: *=betam des yelegnal eshi.*

I will be very much glad (please) go on

4 C: *mejemeriya yeserahut and sehetet new*

First the mistake I made is one

5 H: *ante.*

You?

6 C: *awo*

Yes

7 H: *menedenew seheteteh*

What is your mistake

8 C: *yaw* intercourse *nebereg*n normally *yetetekemekutem*
Becondom new gen sele HIV teru awareness *senebereg*n
malet new (0.5)yehe hula lene aletewatelegnem gebetohal
HIV leyaz echelalehu yemil entene wuset seladere
kemigebaw belay asechenekegn=

Just I had intercourse normally I made (the intercourse)
using condom although I had good awareness concerning
HIV (0.5)I found it hard to swallow you understand
for I felt I could be infected with HIV it made me be
very much worried

9 H: *=eshi*

Ok

Excerpt (29) 8: 04/09/11, 1:2

1 H: *bemnet(.)ene becha bemeremer beki new malet*
yawatal (0.5)

By integrity (.) Is it sounding to take that if I only
got tested it suffices

2 C: *esu ayawatam gen benehed yaw beka (.) yehone*
becha HIV yalebet sew gen yehone meleket atakebetemende

That is not sounding but if we go for it just (.) but
is it not possible to take some symptoms to identify
a person who blood contains HIV

3 H: *{{laughs}}* ehe (.) *HIV yalebet sew HIV kelelebet sew
yemileyebet bechegnaw meleket men endehone takiyalesh.*

{{laughs}} ehe (.) Do you know the only method
to identify a person infected with HIV from a person
who is not infected with HIV

4 C: *eh*
eh

5 H: *temeremero ante alebeh ante yelebehem mebalu becha new
(.) lela menem emileyew neger yelem menem (0.5)
wede HIV HIV wede AIDS dereja sishegager besheta
weyem wede besheta dereja simeta hemem yemesaselut
negeroch likesetu yechelalu [...]*

It is only blood test result that differentiates the
infected from the non-infected (.) there is nothing
other than this that helps to differentiate (0.5)
to HIV when HIV develops to AIDS the illness or when
it develops to illness there may come sickness
or related things [...]

In short, we have seen that the interview format and the information delivery format are
the two formats of communication that characterize the organization of communication in
the present data. The participants routinely draw on these formats to the attainment of the
program's goal. While the interview format of communication seemed to be used

predominantly, the information delivery format tended to be put to effect mostly following the interlocutors' speech exchange began in the interview format. These communication formats were also evidenced as locally accomplished feature. In the communication site under observation, the participants' preference to and reliance on the use of one communication format over the other, hence, seems to be dictated by the consideration of their importance to the attainment of the productions' goal. We shall return to these in detail in 5.2 while discussing the structure of interaction in the 'Doing the Talk' phase.

Summary

In this chapter, attempt has been made to unravel how participation is organized and what formats of communication are drawn (up)on in the interaction site. Relating to the former, it has been observed that in addition to the participants involved in the on-air production, the audiences are included in the participation framework. The parties involved in the interaction mark the inclusiveness of the production by designing their turns in ways that hint their orientation that the audiences are included in the participatory framework. Concerning the latter feature, it has been noted that the attainment of the target production's goal is sought to be realized by subscribing to such communication formats as the interview and the information delivery. While the interview format tends to predominate, it has also been a commonplace for the utilization of a combination of the interview and information delivery formats. The fact that the participants' choice of one format over the other or the determination to put into play a mixed format appears to be mainly dictated by the benefit the particularly chosen format offers to the achievement of the program's goal then and there.

As has been shown, as there is closer relation between the management of the participation framework and the system of turn-taking, the management of the participation framework and the workings of turn-taking are often tangled. Therefore, the analytic approaches that concentrate on participation organization or communication format are not mutually exclusive alternatives. However, while aspects of the participation framework can change on a momentary basis, particular institutional

modifications of the communication format may be more stably present in the speech exchange

Once we have observed the organization of communication in the target interaction site, it seems then a logical move if we now draw our attention towards the analyses of how communication about HIV/AIDS and related issues is organized by focusing on the interactional accomplishments across phases in the host-caller speech exchanges. In the following analytic chapter, the focus, therefore, will be on unpacking how the interactants construct their turns in ways that enable them to accomplish the production goal at each phase in the interaction in the target communication site and thereby show the participants' orientation to the institutional feature.

Chapter Five

Structure of Host-Caller Exchanges

In this chapter, attempt will be made to describe how host-caller interaction about HIV/AIDS in the target radio phone-in program is sequentially ordered or structured on the basis of the analysis of their speech exchanges from the corpus of recorded talk data. The description of the interactional organization has drawn on the units of the *turn*, the *adjacency pair* and the *sequence* used by conversation analysts (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998) as well as *categorical works* employed by membership categorization analysts (Fitzgerald and Housley, 2002). In fact, analytical constructs suggested by Goffman (1981), like footing, have also been subscribed to whenever they are found to be instrumental.

Analysed with these insightful tools, the communication practice in the target site was found to constitute three broader phases. These are the openings, the ‘talk’ elicitation, and the closings phases. Each phase is observed to have distinctive features which can be unravelled by focusing on the language use of the participants in the interaction. In what follows, effort will be made to describe the interaction features typical of the opening exchanges, the first phase in the organization of host-caller communication.

5.1. Accomplishing Openings

Studies conducted concerning the interaction organization of the opening stage in radio phone-in encounters tend to rely much on Schegloff’s (1986) observations as baseline (Cameron and Hills, 1990; Hutchby, 1991, 1999; Thornborrow, 2001). Using CA’s notion of sequence organization, Schegloff (1986) characterized the canonical structure for a phone call opening between unmarked forms of relationships as constituting: *summon-answer sequences*, *identification-recognition sequences*, *greetings sequences*, *how are you? sequences* followed by the *first topic*.

In the productions analysed for the present study, the opening sequence was observed as encompassing the general opening component and the specific ones. The general opening component, as has been pointed out in 4.1, is one that usually constitutes the hosts' broader introduction set to identify the program, the issue, and the people who are entitled to have opinions (views/ participation) on it. It sets out features that typify talks held in institutional contexts for it is intended to achieve certain institutional goals. These goals presuppose generally that the dialogue itself and its result(s) concern not only the interactants involved: they are of general interest and are meant to have an effect on the audiences. The institutional goals of the program appear to accomplish an increased awareness about the target issue.

Once the general opening has been produced by the host, the program proceeds to the specific opening routines. These routines constitute the interaction practices that initiate the host's encounter with the callers. The practices follow a fairly repetitive pattern. This pattern typically comprises three moves in which each participant takes turns. It includes: the *announcements*, the *pre-greetings* (on-line cuing), and the *greetings*.

5.1.1. Announcements

These moves are organized in ways that tend mainly to accomplish dual purposes. These are, firstly, the business of informing or announcing to the audiences that host-caller dialogue is due, and, secondly, bringing the callers into the participatory framework or orienting the callers that they are about to be positioned as 'ratified' participant (Goffman, 1981). Such feature can be observed in the following excerpts.

Excerpt (30) 1: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: → *wuyeyetachen tejemerual ademach mesemerlay tegegnetual* (.)

helo

Our discussion has started a participant is on air (.)

Hello

2 C: *helo helo*

Hello hello

Excerpt (31) 4: 18/09/11, 2:1

1 H: → *wuyeyetachin ketelual beafam adis 97.1 lay enegegnalen*
helo

Our discussion continues we are on FM Addis 97.1 hello

2 C: *helo*

Hello

As can be observed, the hosts use their first turn to mark their alignment with the audience and the caller. In excerpt (30), for example, we can see how the host manages shifting alignment by moving between addressing the audience and the caller. He uses ‘*wuyeyetachen tejemerual*’ in line 1 to make the audience feel ratified in the participation framework and then says ‘*helo*’ to mark the ratification of the caller. Goffman notes that a persistent feature of natural talk is participants’ shifting ‘alignment of speaker to hearers’ and he calls this phenomenon *footing* (Goffman 1981: 128). The host’s ‘*beafam adis 97.1 lay enegegnalen*’ in excerpt (31) illustrates the point that the host’s announcement move is sometimes constructed in a way that identifies the station from where the program is produced. Such an identification utterance by the host might be seen as serving a promotional role.

The announcements moves, in addition to such functions, appear at times to hint how one should frame her/his turn once s/he has secured the participation status. The host’s announcements turn design in excerpt (32) seems to depict such an end.

Excerpt (32) 8: 25/09/11, 3:1

1 H: → *esekahun aletemeremeremem*

laletemeremerem lemen yemil teyake enasketelalen helo

Haven't we been tested yet for those who haven't

been tested yet , we will **then ask why** hello

2 C: *helo*

Hello

In the radio phone-in program in focus, one of the things that the hosts' announcements turn constructions enabled us to infer was the fact that callers do not come on air and participate straight away. It appears to be the norm of the program that the process of selecting the callers and establishing the order of their calls take place off the air, as can be seen in the hosts' turn constructions in the following excerpts:

Excerpt (33) 7: 18/09/11, 2:1

1 H: →*lela ademach mesmer lay endalu eyetenegeregn new*

helo helo

I am being told that another participant is on air

Hello hello

2 C: [*helo*]

[Hello]

Excerpt (34) 3, 18/09/11, 2:2

1 H: →[...] *lela ademach mesmer lay endale tenegrognal helo*

[...] **I am told** that another participant is on air hello

2 C: *helo tenayestelign melaku*

Hello good evening Melaku

In fact, it is not also uncommon to find the hosts' announcements turns that do not make such remarks explicit in the data analysed. The host's turn construction in the excerpt that follows exemplifies this.

Excerpt (35) 7: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: → *ademach mesmer lay ale helo*

A caller is on air hello

2 C: *abet abet*

Yes yes

The absence of these remarks in the host's turn constructions, however, does not necessarily suggest that the callers' calls are directly received by the host. It is after their encounter with the other person in charge in the studio that callers get the space to be on air. This can be inferred in the general opening remarks of the hosts, where they explicitly announce the involvement of several parties to give the program the feature it has (see excerpts (1) and (2), on page 75 and 76).

As has been shown in the illustrative excerpts, through the announcements moves, the host would tend to reveal the discourse role of the participants: the host being in the role of program manager (announcer) and the caller in the role of awaiting person to involve in the 'on air' talk. In the role of a program manager, the host appears to be positioned as one who calls for the audience's attention toward the program and leads the discussion with the caller screened by, in Goffman's (1981) terms, the 'back stage workers'. Once the hosts' announcements moves are produced, what succeeds in the organization of the opening phase in the program is the accomplishment of pre-greetings exchanges by the participants.

5.1.2. Pre-greetings

This can be characterized as a move in the opening phase of the production where the hosts cue that 'on-air' speech exchange between the two participants (the host and the ratified caller) is on. In fact, the hosts initiate this most frequently along with the announcements moves (as in excerpt (35) above) and sometimes in a separate turn (as can be seen in excerpts (36) and (37) below). Here the hosts usually say '*helo*' to mark that

interaction with the ratified caller has started. The callers take the hosts' *'helo'* as a signal that the line is open to them and display their uptake of the floor by responding, in most cases, in a similar way as can be seen in excerpt (37). Although callers tended to heavily rely on the deployment of *'helo'* in many instances, there are also cases in the data where they appeared to respond using the device *'abet'* or its double form *'abet abet'* as in excerpt (36) and excerpt (38) below having more or less same function with that of *'helo'*.

Excerpt (36) 4: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *helo*
Hello
2 C: → *abet*
Yes

Excerpt (37) 5: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *helo*
Hello
2 C: → *helo*
Hello

Excerpt (38) 7: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *ademach mesmer lay ale helo*
A caller is on air hello
2 C: → *abet abet*
Yes yes

The deployment of such devices (*'abet'* or *'abet abet'*) is not, in fact, restricted to the callers alone; they are also used by the hosts as can be seen in line 3 of excerpt (39) below. The host here relies on the use of such linguistic resource to hint the caller that

s/he is ratified to advance the talk. This could be inferred in the caller's turn that was designed in the form of greetings initiator. The caller's '*tenayestelign*' in line 4 displays her/his orientation of the function of the host's '*abet*' in line 3 as a signal to move the interaction forward, which gets confirmation through the host's aligning turn construction in line 5.

Excerpt (39) 11: 04/09/11, 1:2

- 1 H: *lelaademach helo*
Another caller hello
- 2 C: *helo*
Hello
- 3 H: → *abet*
Yes
- 4 C: *tenayestelign*
Good evening
- 5 H: *aberoystelin* (0.5)
Good evening

Although the practices of host-initiated pre-greetings moves are found to be recurrent in the present data, there are also instances which demonstrate the presence of caller-initiated pre-greetings. These tended to occur in the present study's data just succeeding the hosts' announcements turn.

Excerpt (40) 4: 18/09/11, 2:1

- 1 H: *wuyeyetachin ketelual beafam adis 97.1 lay enegegnalen*
Our discussion proceeds (we are) on FM Addis 97.1
- 2 C: → *helo*

Hello

3 H: *tenayestelign manlibel*

Good evening who's calling

Excerpt (41) 1: 02/10/11, 4:2

1 H: *bewuyeyetachin lay tesatefo lemadreg admach mesmer lay
tegegnetewal (.)*

To take part in the discussion a caller is on air

2 C: → *helo*

Hello

3 H: *tenayestelign (.)*

Good evening

4 C: *tenayestelign*

Good evening

What can be inferred from the participants' practice in these excerpts is the callers' tendency of perceiving the hosts' announcements moves as cuing moves for which they need to give response which takes the form of turns designed to initiate pre-greetings.

As has been shown, the pre-greetings moves, in the corpus, tended to recur together with or succeeding the hosts' announcements moves. There, however, occurred an exception to these seemingly normative pre-greetings routines. This can be evidenced in the following excerpt where the host in his first turn simultaneously attempted to accomplish announcements and initiate greetings.

Excerpt (42) 1: 02/10/11, 4:1

1 H: → *bezihi meshet wuyeyetachin lay lemesatef yemejemeryaw
admach mesmer lay tegegnetewal tenayestelign*

The first caller to participate in our today's evening
discussion is on air good evening

2 C: *dehena egziabher yemesgen selam new melaku dehena neh*

Fine praise to God Is everything ok Melaku you fine

3 H: *dehena negn endemen ameshu*

I am fine good evening {h+}

In line 1 in this excerpt, unlike in the examples we have seen earlier, the host's announcements move was followed not with pre-greetings move but with greetings initiator – '*tenayestelign*'. This kind of turn design may be seen to have consequence in the caller's turn construction. As can be seen in line 2, the caller tended to take a longer greetings initiator than usual. The tendency to rely on such a longer construction seems to hint the caller's lack of orientation to a turn construction of the sort and thereby tacitly reveal the recurrent practice in the communication site.

In the present data, it seems to be a norm for the hosts' pre-greetings moves to be succeeded by the greetings moves. It can, thus, be inferred that the pre-greetings moves mainly serve as a preface to the greetings sequence. We will see how the greetings sequences are managed in the communication site in focus in the sub section that follows.

5.1.3. Greetings

The greetings moves in the target interaction data seemed to be within the range of two-turn to six-turn sequences. Such variation could be accounted for the participants' different tendencies in whether to include callers' identification or not. In the examples below, the greetings moves are accomplished in two- and three-turn sequences. These are typical features of greetings sequences in the data where identification moves are missing.

Excerpt (43) 5: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *helo*

Hello

2 C: *helo*

Hello

3 H: → *selam amesheh*

Good evening

4 C: → *egziaber yemesgen*

Praise to God

5 H: *eshi (.) temeremerende*

Ok (.) have you been tested?

Excerpt (44) 3: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: [...] *lela ademach helo*

[...]another participant hello

2 C: *helo*

Hello

3 H: → *selam ameshu*

Good evening {h+}

4 C: → *tena yestelegn*

Good evening

5 H: → *eziaber yemesgen eh (0.5) keechaivi mermera gar anseten*

eyeteweyayen new [...]

Praise to God eh (0.5) we are talking about HIV [...]

As can be seen in these excerpts, the greetings moves are accomplished in excerpt (43) in two-turn sequences and in excerpt (44) in three-turn sequences. In both cases no attempt

of seeking identifications was made. Though cases whereby the callers take a lead in the initiation of greetings were observed in the corpus, it seems to be a norm for the hosts to initiate greetings as such a practice predominated (in the corpus). The callers would also tend to make this feature evident by awaiting such a discursive action to the hosts through reliance on longer pre-greetings exchanges.

Excerpt (45) 7: 04/09/11, 1:2

1 H: *helo*

Hello

2 C: *helo*

Hello

3 H: *abet*

Yes

4 C: *helo melaku*

Hello Melaku

5 H: *abet*

Yes

6 C: *selam new*

(you) fine

This exemplar demonstrates how callers, by postponing the initiation of the greetings turn until it is managed by the hosts, display their orientation to the program's routine. The caller in excerpt (45) above seems to show such orientation for he tended to initiate greetings just in his sixth turn, following the absence of the host's greetings initiating move in line 3 and line 5, which appear to be the potential turns for the initiation of greetings by the host. The caller's turn design in line 4, addressing the host by name, seems to hint that the caller was confused following the host's move in line 3 that seemed to breach the recurrent practice in the target radio phone-in production and

wanted to make sure whether or not he was interacting with the host. It was only after he became sure of this issue that the caller tended to take a lead in the initiation of the greetings sequence, observing the host's '*abet*' in lines 3 and 5 as ratifying him to make a discursive move that keeps the interaction progressing. Even then the caller's preference to construct his seemingly greetings initiator in line 6 might imply the caller's observation of the host's moves as deviational.

In the data analysed, the greetings moves with longer turn sequences (usually four- or more-turn sequences), as has been stated, tended to be those that contain the participants' identification tokens.

Excerpt (46) 1: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *helo*

Hello

2 C: *halo halo*

Hello hello

3 H: → *selam amesheh*

How are you

4 C: → *egziaber yemesgen*

Praise to God

5 H: → *manlebel keyetnew*

Who's calling and from where

6 C: → *melkamu negn kebole*

I am Melkamu from Bole

Excerpt (47) 4: 18/09/11, 2:1

1 H: *wuyeyetachin ketelual beafam adis 97.1 lay enegegnalen*

The discussion continues we are on FM Addis 97.1

2 C: *helo*

Hello

3 H: → *tenayestelign manlebel*

Good evening who is calling

4 C: → *eh: amelework (.)*

eh: Amelework

5 H: → *endemen ameshesh amelework*

How are you Amelework

6 C: → *dehenamesheh melaku*

How are you Melaku

7 H: → *betam dehena mendenew yanchihasab*

Very fine what is your opinion

Excerpt (48) 6: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *wuyeyetachin ketelual beafam adis 97.1 lay*

ademach tegegnetual helo

The discussion continues on FM Addis 97.1

there is a participant hello

2 C: *(xxx)*

(xxx)

3 H: *halo*

Hello

4 C: *abet*

Yes

5 H: → *endemen amesheshu*

Good evening {h+}

6 C: → *egziaber yemesgen selam nachehu*

Praise to God are you fine {h+}

7 H: → *dehena nen*

We are fine

8 C: → *memeher (xxx) ebalalehu*

I am (called) teacher (xxx)

9 H: → *memeher endemen ameshu selam new*

How are you {h+} teacher how are things

10 C: → *egziaber yemesgen*

Praise to God

As can be observed, while the host and the caller accomplished their greetings exchanges in four turns (*see lines 3-6*) in excerpt (46), it took the participants of the exchange in excerpt (47) five turns (*see lines 3-7*) and the interactants in excerpt (48) six turns (*see lines 5-10*) to manage the greetings exchanges. From these illustrative excerpts, it can be observed that, unlike in the findings of previous studies in the contexts of UK (Hutchby, 1996; Thornborrow, 2001) which unpack the *host-led* nature of the introductions work as typical feature, the identifications (introductions) moves here are not always initiated by the host. Callers, as is evident in excerpt (48), may also use their turns to identify themselves even when no identification eliciting utterance is produced by the host. This might imply callers' orientation about the interaction site as a site that requires one to

identify her/himself. In fact, the callers' presupposition of such a practice as a feature that characterizes the site holds true for it is not uncommon for the hosts to include such a request in their turn constructions, as can be respectively seen in lines 5 ('*manlebel keyetnew*') and 3 ('*manlebel*') of excerpts (46) and (47) above.

The variation found in the practice of whether to include or exclude identification moves in the construction of the greetings turns might be attributed to at least two reasons. The first reason could relate to the institutional nature of the interaction (program). This might emanate from the time constraints the program imposes to accommodate voices of different callers as was sometimes made explicit in the closings sequence, as we shall see later in 5.3, by the hosts.

The other reason might be associated to the hosts' observation of the importance of focusing on identifications. As it is common for the hosts to engage in interaction with callers who appear to overtly state their dispreference to be identified by their name, as is evident in the caller's use of '*seme yekoyegn*' in line 6 of excerpt (49) below, the hosts might take seeking identifications as less important.

Excerpt (49) 9: 25/09/11, 3:1

1 H: *lela ademachhalo*

Another participant hello

2 C: *tenayestelegn*

Good evening

3 H: *abero yestelen*

Good evening

4 C: *eshi eh selemermera guday lemenegager new*

Ok eh it is to talk about (HIV) testing

5 H: *yechalal enetewawek man enebel*

Possible let's get introduced who is calling

6 C: → *eshi ene seme yekoyegn kezih kesebeta akababi*
new emedewulew

Ok **let my name remain unmentioned** I am calling
from (here around)Sebeta

7 H: *hasabewoten yeketelu*

Your opinion (please) {h+}

As can be understood, the caller in this exemplar tended to make an explicit avoidance to be identified in name. He instead displayed the preference to be identified merely with his location/ place name, '*kezih kesebeta akababi*' which literally mean 'from here around Sebeta', which is yet not located in the specific sense. Such a preference might also be seen as a kind of strategic choice by the caller to be in alignment with the host.

Such observation, however, may not hold true all the times for it is not uncommon to witness instances in the interaction practice where callers show the tendency to be identified. They usually made this evident in their self-initiated identification moves as can be seen in line 6 of excerpt (50) below, and in their turn constructions toward the closing sequences in the encounter as will be demonstrated later in 5.3.

Excerpt (50) 11: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *halo*

Hello

2 C: *helo abet (.) helo*

Hello yes (.) hello

3 H: *⁰selam new⁰*

(are you) fine (impersonalized)

4 C: *selam new egziaber yemesgen*

Fine thanks to God

5 H: *eshi*

Ok

6 C: → *amare ebalalehu kantsokiagemza (.) majete*

I am Amare from Antsokia Gemza (.) Majete

7 H: *⁰eshi⁰*

Ok

Another feature worth noting in the greetings sequences in the target interaction data is the hosts' choice and deployment of varied linguistic resources to construct their identification seeking requests and greetings initiating turns. As can be seen in the following excerpts, the hosts tend to use linguistic resources that index ambivalence relating to their role.

Excerpt (51) 5: 18/09/11, 2:1

1 H: → *tenayestelegn salam amesheh*

Good evening how are you {*personalized greetings*}

2 C: *egziaber yemesgen salam new melaku*

Praise to God how are things Melaku

3 H: → *alehu ma libel*

I am fine who is calling

4 C: *yisak kegojam bichena*

Yishak from Gojam Bichena

Excerpt (52) 9: 25/09/11, 3:1

1 C: *tenayestelegn*

Good evening

2 H: → *abero yestelen*

Good evening

3 C: *eshi e: selemermera guday lemenegager new*

Ok e: it is to talk about (HIV) testing

4 H: → *yechalal enetewawek man enebel*

Possible let's get introduced who is calling

5 C: *eshi ene seme yekoyegn kezih kesebeta akababi new
emedewulew*

Ok let my name remain unmentioned I am calling from
(here around)Sebeta

6 H: *hasabewoten yeketelu*

Your opinion (please) {h+}

Excerpt (53) 10: 18/09/11, 2:1

1 C: *helo tenayesteleagn*

Hello good evening

2 H: *endemin ameshu*

Good evening {h+}

3 C: *egziaber yemesgen selam nachehu*

Praise to God are you fine{h+}

4 H: → *selam nen man enebel*

We are fine who is calling

5 C: *alemu ebalalehu kesilte zon*

I am Alemu from Silte zone

6 H: → *man alkegn*

Who did you say (me)

While the host tended, through his turn designs in lines 1 and 3 of excerpt (51), to enact in his social role of a participant in the context of interpersonal communication, he appeared to enact in the role of ‘animator’ (Goffman, 1981) in lines 2 and 4 of excerpt (52) and thereby implicated that the talk was (being) produced with the audiences into account. The host’s tendency to shift from relying on one linguistic device to another, as made evident in line 5 and line 7 in excerpt (53), might also be seen as emanating from the tension to enact in his institutional role of a talk host who is supposed to frame the interaction in a way that is produced for the benefit of the audiences, and in his social role of a participant in a dyadic verbal interaction (interpersonal encounter) with the co-participant.

Summary

The opening sequences of the interaction practice in the target site would appear to serve mainly such functions as: announcing the audience that host-caller exchange is due, signalling the line is open for the caller, exchanging greetings. In terms of the interactional consequence, the opening phase of the encounter in the target program might be observed as a sequence that constrains the callers from what they are able to accomplish in practices of ordinary form of telephone conversation (Schegloff, 1986) thereby legitimizing what counts as normative in the context of interaction in the radio phone-in show. The opening sequences of the interaction on radio phone-in programs in focus, thus, would seem to be a hybrid of what we expect of speech exchange in interpersonal communication and what we expect of production for the mass communication. The organization of interaction in such a way may be seen as having bearing to the turn-taking practices in the subsequent sequences.

The organization of these opening phases may be seen to have two main consequences in terms of how callers are positioned in relation to the hosts. Firstly, the summoner-summoned relationship in ordinary telephone openings between caller and receiver is reversed in the phone-in, thereby shifting the obligation to listen away from the host and

on the caller. Secondly, if the announcements move is absent or delayed, the tendency of callers to wait until it has been produced before going ahead suggests that this move functions not just as a channel opener, but as the hosts' signal to the callers to move into taking their turn. As a result of these structural relationships, the potentially powerful role of callers as talk opener is partially mitigated through the institutional constraints which come into play during this opening phase of the production. Through their actions of announcements and channel opening, the hosts are setting up an interactional environment which places callers in a subordinate position from a discursive point of view, as will be made evident in the remainder of this analytic chapter, before they get to take up their talking turns. In the sub-section to follow, we shall see how talk exchanging is accomplished.

5.2. 'Doing' the Talk

This stage in the production of the target radio phone-in program appears to be the stage where the main goal of the program is primarily sought to be accomplished. As has been made clear, question-answer exchange appears to be the predominant format characterizing the speech exchange system in the communication site in analysis. While the role of the questioner tends to be that of the hosts, the role of the callers is confined mainly to that of answering (to) the question initiated by the host. The conversational rules entailed in the question-answer chains do not, however, determine the actions of the participants. What tends to be of value to such end instead is the design of the questions. Hosts design their questioning turns to make callers share their personal views and/or experiences on issues set for discussion at this stage. Given the hosts' more stable role of questioner (or talk initiator) in the interaction site, how they design their turns to serve the elicitation of range of actions from the callers, and how do the participants make evident the negotiation of their discourse roles and relations as the interaction unfolds through their collaborative discursive accomplishments animate the central concern in this sub-section.

The accomplishment of communication at this phase in the organization of verbal interaction between the host and the caller could better be described as involving two components: *initial moves* and *follow up moves*. While the former refers to turn designs used to commence the ‘talk’, the latter involves turn constructions used to make the ‘talk’ to extend. Hosts accomplish these respectively using *talk initiating devices* and *follow up turn constructing devices*. It is to these discursive accomplishments that we turn to now.

5.2.1. Talk Initiation

Talk initiation is not on the agenda for the callers, as has been discussed earlier, owing to the fact that the structural arrangement of the call exchanges has rendered such a role to the hosts. This can also be understood, as in the participants’ pre-greetings accomplishment, in the callers’ tendency either to extend the greetings exchanges until the hosts construct a turn that initiates the ‘talk’ proper, as in excerpt (54) below or when at times the callers manage to do so, to design their seemingly talk initiating turn in a way that seeks to accomplish permission, as in excerpt (55) below. The excerpts that follow are just examples of the callers’ orientation to such (institutional) routine.

Excerpt (54) 10: 04/09/11, 1:1

- 1 H: *admach mesmer lay seletegegne ahun lela ademach*

 yemenasetenaged yehonal eskahun altemeremeremenem helo

 As a caller is on line we will be hosting now another
 caller Haven’t we been tested (for HIV) yet hello
- 2 C: *helo*

 Hello
- 3 H: *selam new*

 Good evening *(impersonalized)*
- 4 C: *selam new melaku*

How are you Melaku

5 H: *alen*

(I am) fine

6 C: → *(.) endet new*

(.) How are (you) (*impersonalized*)

7 H: *betam alehu mendenew emibalew*

I am very fine what would (you) say

Excerpt (55) 9: 25/09/11, 3:1

1 H: *lela ademach halo*

Another participant hello

2 C: *tenayesteleagn*

Good evening

3 H: *abero yestelen*

Good evening

4 C: → *eshi eh selemermera guday lemenegager new*

Ok eh it is to talk about (HIV) testing

5 H: *yechalal enetewawek man enebel*

Possible let us introduce who is calling

6 C: *eshi ene seme yekoyegn kezih kesebeta akababi new
emedewulew*

Ok let my name remain unmentioned I am calling from here
around Sebeta

7 H: *hasabewoten yeketelu*

Your opinion (please) {h+}

In excerpt (54), above, although a chance for the caller was there to take the talk initiatory role in line 6, s/he prefers to await that role to the host by designing an extended greetings turn, which is responded to by the host along with a talk initiator. In line 7, the host made evident that they have been exchanging greetings in a more than sufficient manner by moving from the greetings token on to the initiation of the talk proper at a turn. Likewise, in excerpt (55) above, even though the caller manages to be in an initiatory role by responding to the host's pre-greetings turn via greetings initiator in line 2, which in turn is properly responded to by the host in line 3, s/he used the interactional space available to initiate the talk proper in line 4 by designing a turn that instead serves to position her/him as permission seeker. This, in addition to the caller's turn framing in line 4, can be understood in the host's confirmatory remark '*yechalal*', which means 'possible' in line 5. But the host, in his turn in line 5, manages to regain his institutionally imprinted role of talk initiator/ questioner by designing his turn in a way that simultaneously enables him to respond to the caller's permission seeking request as well as to raise identification seeking question. While demonstrating the presence of possibilities for the callers to be in a discursively more powerful position, these two callers' turn construction preferences respectively in line 6 and line 4 of the two excerpts seem to hint the participants' subscription to the institutionalized role construction when it comes to taking the talk initiatory position. The practice in this excerpt can be taken as exemplar of how the institutionally imprinted participants' role is accomplished collaboratively. The institutional affordances of the host category underpin the conventional norms of interactively positioning the caller in this way. They vest the host with a greater degree of structural control than any caller.

In this phone-in program, what callers have to do once the openings sequences are complete is to realign themselves as answerers to the hosts' talk initiatory turns. The hosts initiate the callers' 'talk' or opinion presentation using several discursive devices. The recurrent discursive resources deployed by the talk hosts to initiate callers' 'talk' or opinion may be categorized into three groups. One of the discursive resources the hosts rely on to accomplish the initiation of the callers' views or opinions on the topic set for

discussion is by way of *reminding the theme of the session's talk, usually in statement form*. In the corpus analysed, such form of talk initiator tends to be followed by the callers' confirmatory turn. The following excerpts exemplify this practice.

Excerpt (56) 6: 09/10/11, 1:1

1 C: *abero yestelen tena yestelen*

Good evening (too) good evening

2 H: → *selemewesen fetenawoch eyetenegagern new yalenew*

We are talking about 'challenges in being faithful'

3 C *awo (.) eyesemahu new*

Yes (.) I have been listening

4 H: *eski eresewo yegetemewot yemewesen fetena minden new*

Ok what challenge did you encounter in being faithful?

Excerpt (57) 3: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 C: *tена yestelegn*

Good evening

2 H: → *eziaber yemesgen e: (0.5) keHIV meremera gar anseten*

eyeteweyayen new eskahun altemeremerum yemil yemeweyaya

re'es alenena

Praise to God e: (0.5) we are talking about HIV test

as we are talking on a topic haven't we been tested yet

3 C *eh awo altemeremerkum*

eh yes I have not been tested

As can be seen in the turn designs in line 3 of excerpt (56) and line 3 of excerpt (57), the callers appear to depict confirmation via 'awo', which literally means 'yes'. This kind of

hosts' interaction device can be seen as being consequential in controlling the callers not to stray from what has been prefaced thereby implicating the talk's goal-oriented nature, which is, as has been pointed out, one of the characterizing features of institutional talk. In addition to framing the nature of opinions callers are supposed to air out in their upcoming turns, such kind of hosts' discursive resource seems to offer preview as to the nature and direction of the talk to the audience.

The second discursive device the hosts deploy to initiate callers' opinions is by *posing a question that (directly) relates to the theme of the talk*. While using this method, they design their (questioning) moves usually in two ways. The first group constitutes questions addressed to the callers using identifications. The second ones are questions directed to the callers without using identifications. The hosts' turn constructions in the following excerpts illustrate these features.

Excerpt (58) 1: 04/09/11, 1:1

- 1 H: *manlebel keyetnew*
 Who is calling and where are you calling from
- 2 C: *melkamu negn kebole*
 I am Melkamu from Bole
- 3 H: → *eskahun altemeremerkemende melkamu*
 Haven't you been tested **yet** Melkamu

Excerpt (59) 9: 04/09/11, 1:1

- 1 C: *helo melaku endemen walek*
 Hello Melaku good afternoon
- 2 H: *dehena dehena selam new*
 Fine fine (are you) fine
- 3 C: *dehena eziabher yemesgen*

Fine praise to God

4 H: → *eskahun altemeremernem=*

Haven't you been tested yet? (*indirect*)

5 C: =*temeremerenal* (.)

I have been tested (*indirect*)

While line 3 of excerpt (58) displays the host's construction of his question (turn) in a way that addresses the respective caller by name (*melkamu*), line 4 of excerpt (59) demonstrates the host's reliance on a question framed in an impersonal manner. The host's preference to use the former over the latter might suggest (us) two things. The first is the fact that this turn has been preceded by the greetings sequences that comprise identification moves. As has been observed, moves in the opening sequences tend to be consequential. One of the ways this observation could be made evident is in the hosts' preference to address the callers by their names as the interaction unfolds. The second thing that the practice of addressing by name suggests might be the hosts' valuation of the interpersonal concern in their attempt to initiate the callers' opinion. Put differently, it could be seen as manifest of the accomplishment of both the transactional and interpersonal ends of discourse at a time. The hosts' tendency to frame the question without addressing the callers by their names (with a preference to impersonalized address form), on the other hand, might be seen as indicative of the point that the hosts' chief preoccupation is to initiate the callers' opinion on the agenda set out for discussion.

The use of such talk initiatory device might be seen as offering good opportunity for the hosts to assess the callers' sense of belief and practice and so to tailor the later discussion to the callers' individual needs. The difficulty it might create for the hosts to design turns that allow them to hit the target of the production can, however, be seen as its shortcoming.

The third discursive resource the hosts rely on to initiate callers' opinions is by using '*eshi*' or '*eshi*' succeeded by a chunk(s) of utterance in the form of statement or

interrogative (or ‘*eshi*’- prefaced turn designs). Such talk initiation practices can be observed in the following excerpts.

Excerpt (60) 12: 18/09/11, 1:2

1 H: *abet abet*

Yes yes

2 C: *(xxx)ebalalehu*

My name is (xxx)

3 H: → *eshi*

Ok

4 C: *ene yezare soset amet akababi temermerialehu [...]*

I was tested three years or so before [...]

Excerpt (61) 5: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *selam amesheh*

Good evening

2 C: *egziaber yemesgen*

Praise to God

3 H: → *eshi (.) temeremerende*

Ok (.) have you been tested? (*indirect*)

4 C: *e: (0.5) temermere(.)nal awo*

e: (0.5) I(.) have been tested yes (*indirect*)

The host’s opinion initiating turn in line 3 of excerpt (60) is constructed using the former device (i.e., ‘*eshi*’) while the host’s opinion initiating turn in line 3 of excerpt (61) is designed using the latter device (i.e., ‘*eshi*’ followed by an interrogative). From the host’s opinion initiating turn design differences in these excerpts, it might be inferred that the

'eshi' followed by an *interrogative* would tend to be used whenever the hosts see the deployment of *'eshi'* as insufficient to elicit talk from the callers. In line 3 of excerpt (61), the pause that precedes the host's *interrogative* seems to indicate that the host ends his turn thereby positioning the caller to be in a role of a 'ratified' speaker (Goffman, 1981); the host's utterance succeeding the pause (i.e., the *interrogative*) might be seen as an enactment of 'repair' work (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998) as a result of the caller's 'failure' to understand the discursive function of the host's pause. The caller's lack of attention to the discursive function the pause is designed for by the host may, however, be seen as emerging from the hosts' inconsistent usage of the device as can be evidenced in the following excerpt:

Excerpt (62) 3: 18/09/11, 2:1

1 H: *dehena negn man lebel*

I am fine who is calling

2 C: *(xxx) belayhun negn*

(xxx) I am Belayhun

3 H: → *belayhun eshi mendenew yante hasab*

Belayhun ok what is your opinion

4 C: *malet yene asab (0.5) memermer betam teru new [...]*

My opinion is that testing is very important [...]

As can be seen in this excerpt, it tends to be a common practice for the hosts to design their talk initiating moves without employing a pause between the device *'eshi'* and the *discursive resource* that follows.

So far we have seen how the hosts initiate the callers' opinions on the subject (theme) identified and thereby construct their discursive footings in the organization of the radio phone-in discussion. In the data in focus, the callers' tendency to take an initiatory role, though less frequent, can also be witnessed. In such cases, the callers seemed to design

their initiatory turn in a way that serves to tacitly display their tendency of seeking permission as has been evidenced in excerpt (55). By so doing they tended to make their recurrent institutional footing evident.

From the examples we have seen above, the talk initiators used by the hosts might be observed as having both merits and demerits. The open-ended forms of the talk initiating moves (i.e., those which appear to commence with *representation of the theme* and '*eshi*') seem to give relatively better space for the callers to frame their talk production in a way they understand and like where as it adds to the complexity to frame the talk into the manner whereby the institutional goal is easily realized. It particularly makes it demanding for the hosts to tune into the direction that the production's goal be easily attained. In contrast, despite their constraining impact on the part of the callers to flexibly organize their talk, the close-ended forms of talk initiators (i.e., those that appear to draw on *interrogatives*) tend to assist the hosts to easily attain the target. These different ways of talk initiation, however, seem to serve to achieve one thing in common. This is a categorization activity. The participants in their respective institutional footings in the role of questioner and answerer, or more specifically talk initiator and one that responds to the talk initiating move, work towards unpacking the callers' membership of a certain category. The hosts' questions posed at this stage seem to serve mainly the elicitation of the callers' *theme-related category*, in consistency with Thornborrow's (2001b: 470) 'relevant participatory status' and Fitzgerald and Housley's (2002: 596) 'topic-relevant identity' into the talk.

As Fitzgerald and Housley (2002) observe, the host-managed talk initiations avail the host an uninterrupted opportunity to both construct a call-relevant identity for the caller, and to make germane particular topic-relevant identities. They propose that topic-relevant identity involves callers invoking topic-relevant aspects of their experience in connection with the opinion being expressed and laying claim to some form of personal relatedness to the topic set for discussion. This is clearly manifest in the present data, too. The excerpts below show how the hosts design their turns to such an interaction outcome.

Excerpt (63) 3: 18/09/11, 2:2

1 H: → *temeremerek yafet*

Have you been tested, Yafet?

2 C: *awo betedegagami temeremeriyahehu*

Yes I have been tested repeatedly

Excerpt (64) 7: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: → *eshi (.) temeremeren*

Ok (.) have you been tested? (*indirect*)

2 C: *awo temermerialehu yeneberegennen yemermera agatami
lenegereh new*

Yes I have been tested and I am about to tell you my
experience

Excerpt (65) 4: 16/10/11, 2:1,

1 H: → *eshi kibrom mendenew ante yegetemeh*

selemewesen fetena new eyetenegageren yalenew

Ok Kibrom what have you encountered

we are talking about challenges in being faithful

2 C: *awo ene yegetemegn men endehu takiyaresh*

Yes you know what I have encountered

As can be understood in these excerpts, the local assignment of theme relevant category membership, via the sequential conventions of host-led talk initiation, carefully manages how the callers can initially engage in the communication. It defines what the hosts treat as theme-relevant membership, narrowing the scope of actions available to the callers and more or less requiring them to address that subject of discussion from the entailed

membership categories, work to challenge the construction of the given categories, or refute membership of those categories before engaging in further theme-relevant category membership displays.

How do then the callers' tacitly express their orientation to the realization of such institutional feature is another important issue to treat if we are to demonstrate the fact that the production involves a joint achievement of the parties taking part in the speech exchange. In interaction practice in the target phone-in program, the majority of the callers seem to commence or open up their contribution to the production in the role of answerer to the hosts' talk initiatory turns by relying on the utilization of some framing devices, which are termed by Hutchby (1999) as '*buffer devices*', to preface the production of their talks. Hutchby describes these as aspect of a micro process whereby interactants work through a series of positionings from 'speaker-in-waiting' to a footing of 'full speakership' in the accomplishment of the main business of the program (1999:47).

Excerpt (66) 6: 18/09/11, 2:1

1 H: [...] *mendenew b beskahun eyeteweyayenebet*

balew re'es lay yersewo hasab

[...] what is your opinion in relation to
the theme we are talking about

2 C: → *eh eh yene hasab e: (.) yememermer ferehat*

eh eh my opinion e: (.) fear of testing

Excerpt (67) 5: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *eshi (.) temeremerende*

Ok (.) have you been tested? (*indirect*)

2 C: → *e: (0.5) temermere(.)nal awo*

e: (0.5) yes we(.) have been tested

As can be seen in these examples, the callers appear to commence their production with the utilization of buffer devices (see the bolded utterances in lines 2). The callers' use of these devices may hint the existence of the following (inter) related features (phenomena): firstly, the constraining nature of the callers' footings in the role of answerers, and, secondly, the constraining nature of the hosts' turns designs.

We have seen thus far how callers, in the phone-in program in focus, reveal on the one hand, an orientation to their situated role in the achievement of the institutional feature, and on the other hand, that their participation is relevant. The collaboration of both the hosts and the callers, as has been observed, allowed the program to get the feature it has. Their collaborative efforts tend to be realized in their turn constructions that further the interaction to unfold. In the corpus of the data in focus, no single case has been observed where the host's talk initiating moves are not followed by the callers' productions which in turn are succeeded by the host's follow-up talk elicitation moves. Callers' way of organizing their response to the hosts' talk initiating turns, as will be treated in the upcoming discussion of the accomplishment of follow up talks, is also observed to have bearing on the conduct of the ensuing talk. We shall see how either the presence or absence of information of the sort that callers have been displaying in the talk initiation phase is of decisive role in the accomplishment of the communication activity typical of the target site.

5.2.2. Follow up Turn Constructions

Underpinning the program's goal would appear to be the assumption of the hosts and the listeners that the callers' contribution is relevant to the current topic. The hosts may have to engage in framing the direction of the talk, which serve to make the program's goal realized. Central to the organization of the transaction at this stage, thus, would tend to be the hosts' talk eliciting moves. The discursive resources used by the hosts as follow-up talk elicitors appear to be of several types. Their forms seem to be dictated by the

discursive moves the callers rely on to design their turns in response to the hosts' talk initiators.

While a range of discursive resources are utilized to make the speech exchange to extend, the ones to be introduced here are only those that have direct bearing to and are consistently practised for the achievement of the target radio phone-in show's goal – i.e., promoting behaviour change concerning HIV/ AIDS and related matters. The following discussion will, hence, centre on two most important resources the hosts widely stick to in their attempts to elicit talk that seek to visibly attain the primary goal of the productions in the turns that follow the initiatory exchanges. One of these discursive resources appears to be driving the talk towards the elicitation of callers' first-hand experience, observation and/or knowledge.

5.2.2.1. Mobilizing the Talk around the Callers' First-hand Experience

We have observed earlier that the callers in the target phone-in program design their turns that follow the hosts' talk initiating move in a way that warranties them a relevant participatory status. Among the resources they draw on is the provision of personal details that serve to authenticate their contribution to the production, i.e., tacitly displaying them as having the knowledge and/or experience of direct bearing to the program in focus. One of the recurrent discursive resources the hosts' rely on to construct their follow up turn and thereby reinforce the realization of the target program's goal, hence, is by *narrowing the focus of the talk toward the callers' first-hand experience* relating to the theme of the talk.

To elicit the callers' first-hand knowledge and/ or experience, as part of their follow up turns, in connection with the theme set for discussion, the hosts' tend to mainly mobilize two broader discursive approaches: *designing a framing questions* and *allowing the callers frame their productions in their own preferred manners*.

Designing a framing questions

Hosts preferring to design their follow-up turns on such a discursive move draw on the utilization of two devices. One of the widely relied on method in moving the interaction going and thereby elicit data that is primarily related to the callers' theme relevant category is through the use of questions that begin with *wh-words*. The following excerpt makes such a practice visible.

Excerpt (68) 13: 04/09/11, 1:1

- 1 H: *eskahun altemeremerem eyalen new*
We are saying haven't you been tested yet (*indirect*)
- 2 C: *eh eh awo altemeremerekum*
eh eh yes I have not been tested
- 3 H: *kehualah radio yesemagnalena esun zegeteh*
I hear the sound of radio on the back so turn it off and
- 4 C: *Ok (1.0) ahun yesemal aydel*
Ok (1.0) it is audible now isn't it
- 5 H: *ahun yesemal*
It is audible now
- 6 C: *ena altemeremerkum(.) yaw eferalehugn mefrat new*
eh (1.5)lela (.) yesemal aydel
So I have not been tested (.) I am fearful of it
eh (1.5)(no)other (.) it is audible isn't it
- 7 H: *awo yesemal yesemagnal*
yes it is audible I can listen
- 8 C: *ena ya new godayu (.) mefrat new=*

So it is because of that (.) it is because of fear

9 H: → = *mendenew emiyasferah*

What frightens you

10 C: *(1.0) memermeru (.) betam new emiyaseferaw*

(1.0) the testing (.) it is highly frightening

11 H: → *eko memermeru menu new ahun kememermeru wust*

So **what** of the (blood) testing which aspect of
the (blood) testing

The other technique the hosts commonly use appear to be by designing their talk eliciting turn with the formulation of the callers' turn. They seemed to draw on this when they particularly observe it as having bearing to their on-going effort of generating first-hand knowledge/ experience from the callers.

Excerpt (69) 4: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *[...] men hasab mendenew yersowo hasab*

bewuyeyet re'esachen lay

[...] what opinion what is your opinion on the
theme of the discussion

2 C: *eh yene hasab ene yetemeremerekut behuletshiand new*

eh my opinion I was tested in 2008

3 H: → *behuletshiand yezare hulet amet gedema=*

In 2008 around two years ago

4 C: *=awo*

Yes

5 H: → *eshi yane yeneberewun semet enawuraw*

Ok Shall we talk about the condition then (*indirect*)

As can be seen in this example, the host in line 3 reformulated the caller's turn (in line 2) to move the interaction forward. His turn design in line 5 was also an extension of that.

Giving space for the callers to frame their production

The second approach the target radio phone-in program hosts draw on in the management of follow-up interaction with the callers is by giving space to the callers to organize their production in their own preferred way. The excerpts that follow depict how the hosts accomplish elicitation of the callers' follow up productions in such a way.

Excerpt (70) 11: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *hasabehen meketel techelaleh*

You can present your opinion

2 C: *eh e:shi bemeremera lay yaw (.)*

memeremer bezu emiyaseferaw neger yale ayemeselegnem (.)

malet yeraseh conditionoch yewesenewal (.) memeremer

emiyaseferabetena emayaseferabet hunetawoch alu

eh o:k concerning testing just (.) I don't think that

testing has that much frightening thing (.) I mean

your conditions determine (.) there are conditions that

make testing frightening and not frightening.

3 H: → *ehe*

ehe

4 C: *ena ahun ene temeremeryalehu semeremer yerase yehone*

enten yenoregnal (.) e: yehelina weyem yechenkelat

psychologically *zegejet malet new*

For example I have been tested to get tested I have
my own(preparation) internal or of mind that means
psychological readiness

5 H: → *eshi*

Ok

6 C: *wede meremmera guday kemehedachen befit*
rasachenen azegajeten new mehed yaleben (.)

Before going to the (blood) testing
we need to have the readinesss

7 H: → *eshi*

Ok

Excerpt (71) 1: 04/09/11, 1:2

1 H: *abey yetegnaw gora neh*

Abey which category do you belong to

2 C: *ene yaw temeremeriya lehu mejemeria yetemeremerekut (.)*
yaw le (.) gabeche (.) guadegnaye ga neber

I have been tested I firstly got tested (.)for (.)
the purpose of marriage (.) with my girl friend

3 H: → *eh*

eh

4 C: *kezia yaw (.) engedih wutetachen wede gabeche*
emiyaseked neber bagatami (.)

Then just (.) fortunately our result was one
that warrantied us to get married

5 H: → *eh*

eh

6 C: *engedih keza behuala enemeremeralen (.)*

betedar wuset senenor malet new

From that moment on then we have been testing (.)

that means in our married life

7 H: → *eh*

eh

These exemplars demonstrate how the hosts, unlike in the former approach where the direction is given by them, take advantage of the callers' willingness to reveal their first-hand observations just by designing their turns simply with continuers.

The hosts usually stick to the construction of turns that seek to elicit the callers' first-hand data as their follow up moves on conditions where the callers show the tendency to delay making an explicit address of the phenomenon that specifically relates to their first hand observation. The callers, through delaying the overt presentation of their first-hand experience until requested by the hosts, may find a solution to two interactional inconveniencies. First, they may avoid the potentially morally dubious activity of volunteering details on 'delicate' issues (e.g. telling or narrating about one's sexual practices). Second, having lacked the awareness or knowledge concerning what is appropriate in such a setting, they may give the hosts an option about whether specification is in order.

Excerpt (71) 4: 04/09/11, 1:2

1 H: [...] *eshi temeremerek*

[...] ok have you got tested

2 C: *awo*

yes

3 H: *eshi negerena ende*

ok why don't you tell us (tell us then)

4 C: *malet memeremer konjo new lemalet felege new*

ena ene temreemere rasen awukiyalehu (.)

I mean it is to testing is a good thing and getting

(my blood) tested, I have come to know my result

5 H: *ehe*

ehe

6 C: *ena be lemejmeriya gize betam yaseferal ena (.)*

yaw ketemeremerek behuala gen des yelal (0.5)

It is highly frightening to get tested for the first

time but once you did you become happy afterwards (0.5)

7 H: *mejmeriya lay yeneberewun neger esti enastawusew*

Let us talk about the condition in that first moment

8 C: *yaw mejmeriya lay [...]*

Just firstly [...]

As can be seen, the caller dispreferred to make the specifics overt until in line 7, where the host constructed his turn in a way that sought to accomplish the elicitation of the particulars about the caller's first hand experience. It was following the host's turn design in line 7 that the caller came to disclose the phenomenon. By doing so, the caller tended to postpone making the particulars overt until the request came from the host and thereby displayed an orientation to the collaborative accomplishment of the interaction order in such institutional production. The participants seemed to further display their orientation to this feature by maintaining their joint interactional achievement in their succeeding turn constructions. By producing a minimal amount of personal information (which may

be viewed as a potentially delicate item) at his turn following the host's turn in lines 4 and 6, the caller seemed to leave it up to the host to decide whether to treat it as a gloss which needs unpacking via a probe or a demand for further specification as was evidenced in his turn design in line 8, where the host showed the tendency to unpack the specifics that he had managed postponing until requested by the host in line 7.

In the accomplishment of such interaction phenomenon, as can be understood in the illustrative examples analysed thus far, the positioning of the hosts in the role of elicitor of ones specifics and the callers' footing in the role of narrator or producer of specifics about oneself seem to be recurrent. In such speech exchanges, in their footing as elicitor of specifics, the hosts engage in turn designs that constrain the callers from drawing on a number of possible answers in a far greater way than do any other form of elicitation turns serve. The callers are made to disclose specific issues which may include the presentation of their delicate matters. Here the hosts footing in their institutional role of talk manager might be seen as allowing them to make use of such interaction resource which is made available only for them. This is suggestive of how the asymmetrical power relations is produced and maintained in the target site of communication.

In the corpus of the data considered for analysis, the hosts' construction of turns in a way that seeks to elicit delicate topics from the callers hint the manifest of asymmetrical relations. The asymmetry might be evidenced in the callers' reliance on the utilization of disaligning moves to the hosts' turns. As can be observed in the excerpt that follows, the caller seems to display her/his disaffiliation to host's specification seeking turns via delaying the talk about her/his particulars relying on *hesitation* marker, *preface* use, and *silence*, all of which are widely acknowledged as canonical markers of dispreferred responses (Heritage and Sefi, 1992; Silverman, 1997).

Excerpt (73a) 13: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *eskahun altemeremerem eyalen new*

We are saying haven't you been tested yet (indirect)

- 2 C: *eh eh awo altemeremerekum*
eh eh yes I have not been tested
- 3 H: *kehualah radio yesemagnalena esun zegeteh*
I hear the sound of radio on the back so turn it off and
- 4 C: *Ok (1.0) ahun yesemal aydel*
Ok (1.0) it is audible now isn't it
- 5 H: *ahun yesemal*
It is audible now
- 6 C: *ena altemeremerkum (.) yaw eferalehugn mefrat new*
eh (1.5)lela (.) yesemal aydel
So I have not been tested (.) I am fearful of it
eh (1.5) (no) other (.) it is audible isn't it
- 7 H: *awo yesemal yesemagnal*
Yes it is audible I can listen
- 8 C: *ena ya new godayu (.) mefrat new=*
So it is because of that (.) it is bcause of fright
- 9 H: *= mendenew emiyasferah*
What terrifies you
- 10 C: *(1.0) memermeru (.) betam new emiyaseferaw (2.0)*
The testing (.) it is highly frightening
- 11 H: *eko memermeru menu new ahun kememermeru wust*
So what of the testing which aspect of the testing
- 12 C: *eh*
eh

13 H: *kememeremeru wuset demeh siwesed merfew (.)*
emifeterebeh semet new emiyaseferaw (.) balemuyawochu
endet new negeru belew siyawaruh new emeteferaw
wutetu linegerah sil yalew part new emiyaseferah
>yetu new<>mendenew< emiyaseferah

In the testing procedure, is it the feeling that results
 from the needle when your blood is taken that frightens
 you Is it when the counsellors talk to you that you
 become frightened Is it the part where the test result
 is told that makes you feel afraid >which one<
 >what frightens< you

In the continuing turns in the same exemplar, as can be seen below, the caller, by avoiding giving response to the host's question set to elicit the reason that added to his fearfulness, instead constructed a turn that enabled him to elicit whether or not the host had been tested for HIV-antibody. The way he constructs his follow up turn, however, is implicative of his orientation to their institutionally inscribed footings. He made this evident via his '*yikerta gin*', which is to mean 'excuse me, but' and '*and teyake leteyekeh?*', which literally means 'shall I ask you one question?'. Both of these discursive moves seem to imply either that it would be inappropriate (or it is not the norm) for the caller to question the host or it is not appropriate to address a question relating to the issue in focus to the host. The host's successive turns also seem to display tacitly his astonishment for being questioned. He, instead of rendering the caller a space for a follow up turn, insisted on providing response to the same issue in the turns that follow. In addition to the caller's preference to rely on such discursive devices, the host's tendency of responding to the caller's turn via successive turns may, thus, seem to affirm the participants' orientation to their institutional footings in the role of host and caller.

Excerpt (73b) 13: 04/09/11, 1:1

13 H: *kememeremeru wuset demeh siwesed merfew (.)*
emifeterebeh semet new emiyaseferaw (.) balemuyawochu
endet new negeru below siyawaruh new emeteferaw
wutetu linegereh sil yalew part new emiyaseferah
>yetu new<>mendenew< emiyaseferah

In the testing procedure, is it the feeling that results
from the needle when your blood is taken that frightens
you Is it when the counsellors talk to you that you
become frightened Is it the part where the test result
is told that makes you feel afraid >which one<
>what frightens< you

14 C: *ehh (xxx) gen and teyake leteyekeh echelalehu*
ehh (xxx) but can I ask you one question

15 H: *betekekel techelaleh*
Exactly you can

16 C: *yekereta gen ante temeremereh takaleh*
Excuse me, but have you ever been tested

17 H: *yekereta ayasefelegewum betam temermeriyalehu*
No need to ask for an apology
I have been tested (very much)

18 C: ({laughs})
({laughs})

19 H: *yemerem new*

I am serious (not kidding)

20 C: *eh*

eh

21 H: *yemere new yehe endewum yekereta ayasefelegewum*

ene endewum yerasen tenagere neber

mejemer yeneberegenn wuyeyeten

I am serious this does not require to ask for an apology

I should have instead opened up the discussion

by narrating about my experience

22 C: (xxx)

(xxx)

23 H: *betedegagami temeremeriyahehu*

I have been tested repeatedly

24 C: (xxx)

(xxx)

25 H: *betam amesegehehu yezare asrameset ken*

altemeremerenem yalachehu ademachochachen [...]

Thank you very much a fortnight after

those of you who said we haven't been tested yet[...]

In fact, instances are also there which tend to depict the hosts' mobilization of discursive resources that serve to elicit talk on delicate issues being perceived as supportive rather than as constraining. As can be understood in excerpt (74) below, this usually occurs when the callers display the readiness to disclose issues of the sort but seek guidance concerning the order in place.

Excerpt (74) 2: 25/09/11, 3:2

1 H: *eskahun altemeremerenem yemil teyake ansetenalena [*

As we have raised a question ‘haven’t we been tested?’

2 C: *[ay] ene temeremere rasen kawekaku sebat amete new (.)*

[no] it has now become seven years since I got tested
knew my (test) result

3 H: *eshi*

Ok

4 C: *eteta neber*

I used to drink

5 H: *ehe*

ehe

6 C: *aches neber*

I used to smoke

7 H: *ehe*

ehe

8 C: *ekem neber*

I used to chew (‘*khat*’)

9 H: *betekelala (.) sus goji emihon yetebaluten susoch*

In general (.) addiction addictives labelled as harmful

10 C: *[awo]*

[yes]

11 H: *[eza wuset neberu]*

[you were indulged in]

- 12 C: *eza wuset neberkugn*
I were indulged in
- 13 H: *eshi*
Ok
- 14 C: *ahun temeremere awekeku medehanitun eyewesedeku*
sebat amete new (.) hulun neger tekotebe (.)betena
eyenoreku new (.) dero gen rasen salawuk befit (.)
Having known my result now it is seven years since I
started the medication(.) protected (from the addiction)
(.)I am living healthier (.) but earlier
before knowing my result (.)
- 15 H: *ehe*
ehe
- 16 C: *(xxx) rasen egoda neber*
(xxx) I used to hurt myself

Unlike in excerpt (73) above, it can be seen here that the caller manifests affiliation to host's turns via his undelayed aligning turn designs. It can, thus, be inferred that even though the hosts, owing to their institutionally imprinted managerial position in the communication conduct, tend to be in a very powerful role, maintaining such an asymmetrical power relations seem to be a joint achievement by both of the participants.

The fact that the interactants in the communication site work collaboratively to the construction of asymmetrical relations also seem to be displayed in their accomplishment of the communication phenomenon whereby the hosts' disaffiliative move to the callers' turn is taken as no more than just of a framing function. In the corpus of the data, it is evident that when the callers' turn designs are perceived by the hosts as a bit irrelevant, the hosts construct their follow up turns in a way that overtly disclose their evaluative

stance. In such cases, the hosts tend to explicitly reveal the lack of relevance of the callers' turn designs to the theme in focus and thereby affirm the goal-orientedness of the program. The excerpts that follow exemplify such a discursive phenomenon in the target phone-in program.

Excerpt (75) 4: 02/10/11, 4:1

1 H: *mendenew yanchi hasab*

What is your opinion?

2 C: *e: (.) yene hasab memeremer teru new new emelew*

e: (.) my opinion I say getting tested is good

3 H: → *yememeremer teru (.) mehon alemehon aydelem ahun*

yezih yewuyeyetachen matentegna (.) teyake new yanesanew

esekahun aletemeremeremem yemil teyake

It is not about whether testing is good (.)or not

that the discussion focuses on (.) we rather

raised a question that says Haven't we been tested yet

4 C: *ok esekahun awo ene temeremeriyahehu*

Ok up to now yes I have been tested

5 H: *[ehe]*

[ehe]

6 C: *[sew] gen endimeremer new beka yalegn mele'eket ene*

All I want to pass on is just for [people] to get tested

7 H: *sewoch endimeremeru kanchi emiyagegnut yehone neger*

yenoral belen enasebalen (.) kanchi yemeremera hidet=

We think that in order to get tested, people would gain

something out of the process you went through (.)

from the process in your (blood) testing

8 C: =*awo*

Yes

9 H: *anchi setemeremeri yeneberesh lemed sewoch*

yehone neger yagegnaluna [

As people would gain something out of your (blood)

testing experience [

10 C: [*awo*]

[yes]

11 H: *selesu enawura me men men anesasashena hedesh*

Let us talk about it wh what what inspired you

to go for the (blood) testing

Despite the host's turn design (*see line 3*) in a way that clearly marked his disalignment with the caller's production (*see line 2*) by taking an evaluative stance, the caller in her follow up turn in line 4 constructed her response in the manner the host sought to elicit rather than in the way she preferred to disclose in her earlier turn in line 2. The amount of face-protective turns produced by a majority of callers when making interaction with the hosts seems to indicate respect for the authority of hosts, an interpretation which is reinforced by the many signs of hesitation and tentativeness in the discourse of callers. The patterns observable in the provision of remedy for minor infringements provide further insights into participants' interpretations of their situational rights and duties. Callers almost always tend to atone for minor procedural errors with remedial relational talk, suggesting that they consider themselves under an obligation to perform in an institutionally competent manner. This would seem to depict the participants' cooperation in the discursive attainment of the program's goal via an orientation to their institutional role in the target communication site.

As can be observed in the examples we have treated thus far, the accomplishment of the speech exchange that focus on the elicitation of callers' first-hand experience and knowledge that particularly leads them to talk about delicate matters seem to be demanding. What adds to this difficulty is the demand on the participants to engage in the joint achievement of preserving self-esteem and social solidarity. The participants in the interaction are expected to subscribe to the cooperative protection of the positive moral standing of the self and of others, which Goffman (1955) terms as 'face'. As has been shown, for example, in excerpt (75) above, the caller's indirect resistance to disclose her particulars through *delaying* depicts the pressure on the participants to create an environment in which they can seek to reaffirm social solidarity without directly acknowledging the occurrence of a disagreement. Likewise, the host's insistence on designing his turns in a preferred manner (*see lines 7, 9, and 11*) is implicative of the demand to accomplish the communication practice with such orientation. In short, it seems that the interactants organize and revise their utterances so as to manage dispreferred actions in a way that preserves one another's public self-esteem.

So far we have treated how follow up talks in the organization of the target radio phone-in program is accomplished by focusing on the elicitation of callers' first-hand experience and knowledge. Hosts' valuation of a recourse to the elicitation of callers' first-hand experience as central device to the attainment of the program's goal also at times appear to be noticeable in its absence via their tendency to mobilize callers' knowledge of/ about the issue as an alternative interaction resource and thereby move to the initiation of the closings sequence. The excerpt that follows evidences such practice.

Excerpt (76) 2: 16/10/11, 2:1

1 H: *[...] chegeroch wuset honek metamenen*
 letaferesebet yederese agatami neber
 [...] has there been incident that made your
 effort in staying faithful in trouble

- 2 C: *(.) eh yelem ene enkuan esekahun alafekerekum*
 endezih ayenet negerem enten alalekum
 (.) eh no For I have not yet been in love
 I have not also encountered such kind of thing
- 3 H: → *guadegnocheh sileyayu temeleketaleh adel weyem degemo* [
 You witness your friends dumping, don't you or [
 [*betam*]
 [(yes I do) very much]
- 5 H: → *endezih aynet hunetawoch wuset honew tayalehena endew*
 endezih lalemetemamenachew mekeneyat lihon yemichelew
 For you witness such things what do you think could be
 their reason for being unfaithful to one another
- 6 C: *eh bezat yaw bewere derjam emileyayu alu balemtemamen*
 malet new
 eh there are individuals who dump one another mostly
 because of gossips
- 7 H: *eh (.) betam teru eshi ademachachen betam argen new*
 emenamesegenew lesetehen aseteyayet
 eh (.) very good Ok we thank you very much our caller
 for the opinion you have provided us

The fact that the hosts pursue the discursive accomplishment of authenticating the callers' talk via a range of knowledge eliciting devices seems to imply that such warranties are expectable on these occasions. In each of the above examples, either when the discursive work of grounding the callers' talk was not produced in the earlier phase, or conversely

when it went on digression, then the hosts work either to establish those grounds, or frame them.

As has been discussed, the elicitation of callers' first-hand experience and/or knowledge relating to the issue under discussion by the hosts, in most cases, are observed to lead to the production of delicate issues. The construction of turns to do with the management of delicate issues tends, in turn, to lead usually to the design of turns that take some form of advice exchanges. Let us now see how advice giving and receiving, the second widely practised communication resource, is managed in the interaction site to the attainment of the target productions' goals.

5.2.2.2. Focusing on Advice

Drawing upon the definition proposed by Heritage and Sefi (1992), this study takes as advice those sequences in which the professional 'describes, recommends, or forwards a preferred course of action' to the client, or in which 'she approves or supports a past course of action or present state of affairs' (1992: 368). This section shall address the *forms* of advice sequences that recur in the communication practice under analysis. It also treats *when* and *how* participants draw up on the deployment of this device, i.e., *advice giving* and *advice seeking*, to organize the follow up turns in the effort to realize the behaviour change communication end which the program seem to be primarily produced for. The conversational environment in which advice is constituted and delivered by the parties involved in the communication practice will be highlighted with the help of illustrative excerpts from the corpus.

In the corpus analysed, advice manifests taking different forms. The variations evident in the forms could be seen as emanating from *who initiates it* and *who it is primarily addressed to* (or who are the target recipients). Seen from the first perspective, the form of advice apparent in the data may be classified as ones *initiated by the hosts* and ones *initiated by the callers*. The following excerpts respectively illustrate these observations.

Excerpt (77) 2: 04/09/11, 1:1

- 1 H: *mendenew gen emiyaseferah*
But what makes you become frightened
- 2 C: *beka ene akim betuga dereshe new ememelesew*
beka ene endet endehone alakem
I just come back getting at the clinic
but I do not know why
- 3 H: *(.)emiyasegah neger alende.*
(.) is there any thing that worries you
- 4 C: *eh.*
eh.
- 5 H: *emiyasegah neger ale.*
is there any thing that worries you
- 6 C: *menem emiyasegagn neger yelem*
There is nothing that worries me
- 7 H: *ena tadia menedenew emiyaseferah*
So what terrifies you
- 8 C: → *ahun rasu (xxx) men madereg endalebegn enaneten*
lemeteyek new
It is seeking your suggestion that I now also (xxx)
- 9 H: *(0.5) engedih hakim ga satehed weyem degemo mekerena*
meremera agelegelot ga sewochu ga satederes endezih
[keferah]
(0.5) so if you are that [frightened] without seeing
the physicians or without getting into the counselling

and testing centre and seeing the persons in charge

10 C: [awo]

[yes]

11 H: *e:zetegnamsahulet yemibal yenetsa yeselek mesemer ale=*

e: there is 952 a telephone talk line free of charge

12 C: *=eshi*

Ok

Excerpt (78) 2: 25/09/11, 3:2

1 H: *yane (.) endew sele (.) wede virusu lehed echel yehon*

belo yemaseb neger aleneberem

Wasn't there room to think about (.) the virus and that

I might be exposed to by then (.)

2 C: *ere menem neger yelem beka (.) menem neger alasebem*

There was no room at all (.) I was not concerned about

3 H: *ehe*

ehe

4 C: *ahun new emetenekekew ahun new*

It is just now that I am caring Only now

5 H: → *menalebat ahun bezih huneta wuset ersewo beneberubet*

huneta wuset yeneberu sewoch yenoraluna ahunem

yaletemeremereu rasachewun yalaweku ezihem sus wuset

yalu sewoch yenoraluna mendenew lenezih sewoch tadiya

ersewo emiyasetelalefut

Probably as there will be individuals who are in

a condition similar to yours, who have not yet been tested, and who are indulged in addiction, what would you pass to these individuals?

6 C: *beka enen eyaye hulum yeketa (xxx) temekeru new ene emelew*

Just let others take care of themselves taking my experience as learning point (xxx)

let everybody be responsible to her/his own life

These excerpts respectively are exemplars of caller-initiated and host-initiated advice sequences. The construction of the advice sequence that commences in line 9 in the former excerpt appeared to occur following the caller's turn design in line 8 which markedly made evident the desire. In the latter excerpt too, the caller's design of advice sequence began right after the host's turn construction, in line 5, which disclosed the desire.

On the basis of their direct addressees, while some advice sequences appear to be of *caller-centred*, others tend to be of *audience-centred*. *Caller-centred* advices are those forms of advice usually designed by the hosts either in response to callers' explicitly stated advice seeking turns as in line 9 in excerpt (77) above, where the caller overtly displayed advice seeking, or following some sort of confusions evidenced in caller's turn constructions as in line 5 in excerpt (79) below.

Excerpt (79) 8: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *yehone neger virusun wede sewuneteh yemiyasegeba neger linor ged new*

There must be something that lets the virus get into your body

2 C: *new ay[del]*

Yes is[n't]it

3 H: *[eneza] negeroch yelum beleh emetaseb kehona*

sewoch seleferu new emeteferaw malet new belela amarigna

If you think that those worrisome things are not your

concern put differently does it mean that you feel

frightened because that others are afraid

4 C: *eko awo endeza aynet neger new*

Yes it is something like that

5 H: → *lemanegnawum eh (.) zerzer yalu negerochen eh*

zetegn amsahulet lay magegnet techelaleh

yenetsa yeselek mesmer new

Any way eh (.) you can get detailed information eh

on 952 it is a telephone (help) line free of charge

6 C: *eshi*

ok

Although these forms of advice are addressed overtly to the callers, they might also be used to serve the behaviour change communication end, which appears to be the central aim of the production, by tacitly addressing the audiences. The other form of advice might better be described as *audience-centred*. It is characterised as audience-centred for it tends to depict the audiences as its primary recipient. Unlike the caller-centred form of advice sequences, such kind of advice can be initiated either by the callers or by the hosts as can be respectively seen in the following excerpts.

Excerpt (80) 4: 02/10/11, 4:1

1 C: ok *esekahun awo ene temeremeriyahehu*

Ok up to now yes I have been tested

2 H: [ehe]

[ehe]

3 C: → [sew] *gen endimeremer new beka yalegn mele'eket ene*

All I want to pass on is just for [people] to get tested

4 H: *sewoch endimeremeru kanchi emiyagegnut yehone neger*

yenoral belen enasebalen (.) kanchi yemeremera hidet=

We think that in order to get tested, **people would gain**

something out of the process you went through (.)

from the process in your (blood) testing

5 C: =awo

Yes

6 H: *anchi setemeremeri yeneberesh lemed sewoch*

yehone neger yagegnaluna [

As **people would gain something** out of your (blood)

testing experience [

7 C: [awo]

[yes]

8 H: *selesu enawura me men men anesasashena hedesh*

Let us talk about it wh what what inspired you

to go for the (blood) testing

Excerpt (81) 2: 25/09/11, 3:2

1 H: → *menalebat ahun bezih huneta wuset ersewo beneberubet*

huneta wuset yeneberu sewoch yenoraluna ahunem

yaletemeremeru rasachewun yalaweku ezihem sus wuset yalu
sewoch yenoraluna mendenew lenezih sewoch tadiya ersewo
emiyasetelalefut

Probably as there might be individuals who are in
a condition similar to yours, who have not yet been
tested, and who are indulged in addiction, what would
you pass on to these individuals?

2 C: *beka enen eyaye hulum yeketa (xxx) temekeru new*
ene emelew

Just **let others take care of themselves taking mine**
as learning point (xxx) let everybody **be responsible**
to her/his own life

Having seen the *forms* of advice sequences in play in the interaction site in focus, a concern worth observing then is about *when* does in the organization of the communication advice sequences are initiated by the participants. In the corpus analysed, advice sequences tend to emerge mainly in two ways. The first is when the advice sequence appears to be initiated by the participants as part of their attempt to develop the the speech exchange (see excerpt (80) above) whereas the second seems to be initiated when the interactants are about to bring the unfolding talk to the close (see excerpt (81) above). Despite the difference observed in their form and occurrence, one thing tends to be invariably evident in the construction of the advice sequences. This is the participants' orientation to the utilization of the advice sequences as useful resource to the achievement of the target radio phone-in program's goal. This appears to be observed in the resources they draw upon to depict the collaborative nature of their turn constructions.

In the construction of the advice sequences observed, it appears to be the norm that when the hosts take the (discourse) role of advice givers, the callers are positioned as advice recipients. In spite of this, at times instances whereby the callers are positioned as advice giver tend to be evident. One thing to note here, however, is that although a possibility is there for the callers to be positioned in the discourse role of advice givers, it does not necessarily suggest that such positioning in return assigns the role of advice recipient to the hosts. In such instances, the hosts, instead, enact in the role of talk facilitator to benefit the audiences. This can be unpacked in addition to the host's advice sequences initiating turn construction in line 2 of the excerpt below, which explicitly positions the audiences as primary recipient of the advice, in his turn design in line 4, where he preferred to rely on the utilization of a continuer that hints his footing in the role of just talk facilitator. In this role, the host seems to simply simulate the role of advice recipient.

Excerpt (82) 13: 25/09/11, 3:2

1 C: *[...] tenesh yehone mereja lemasgebat vayresu kand sew
enten keteyaze sew wedalteyaze yemitelalefebet gize
sent new=*

*[...] just to add small piece of information about the time
it takes the virus to transmit from the infected
to the non-infected*

2 H: *= ehe ehe*
Ok Ok

3 C: *lemilew tenesh eske huletshi sement almost eske
huletshi zetegn yalew mereja*

*The data up to two thousands eight almost up to
two thousands nine*

4 H: *ehe*

Ok

In the construction of the advice sequences discussed thus far, the relational works the participants tend to make evident in their turn designs could be characterized as involving both symmetrical and asymmetrical power relations. While the reciprocity observed in the interactants' footing in the roles of advice initiators and advice givers seem to position them in a symmetrical relation, i.e., both as capable of initiating the advice sequence and offering advice, the absence of reciprocity in the participants' footing in the discourse role of 'advice recipient', which tends to be confined merely to the callers, is suggestive of the manifest of power asymmetry in the achievement of the interaction feature.

In the analysis of the corpus, what contributes to the co-construction of asymmetrical relations evidenced seems to be the communication format that the participants draw on in the organization of the advice sequences. In nearly all of the advice sequences considered for analyses, the hosts' moves of offering '*caller-centred advice*' – one that positions the callers as primary recipient of the advice – tend to emerge in the interview format of communication. As has been pointed out, the hosts seem to take a lead in advising the callers either following the callers' overt advice seeking turn designs or having noticed some sort of confusion made available by them while responding to the hosts' turns in the interview format of communication. Put differently, the callers' answers as follow up to the hosts' turns tend to serve to the co-construction of the asymmetrical relations which specifically is referred to as 'epistemic asymmetry' by conversation analysts (Clayman and Heritage, 2010). In such a footing, the callers remain recipients of the hosts' pieces of advices via reliance on response tokens that seem to disclose their acknowledgement of the hosts' higher epistemic stance.

In the interview format based advice sequences construction, in contrast to the observation made above, a possibility for the callers to be in an interactionally more powerful footing tends also to be there. This usually happens when the callers, in their response to the hosts' turns, reveal their good knowledge of the subject in discussion via

their utilization of authenticating resources. As has been pointed out earlier, there are different ways through which callers attempt to establish a claim to speak based on a sense of entitlement, and this is made evident as being relevant here. In the data of this study, it is apparent that callers, who draw on their first-hand experience, knowledge, observation, membership as ‘*witnessing device*’ (Hutchby, 2006), tend to be ratified to offer advice to the audiences. *Witnessing* is a term that refers to ‘a range of actions associated with making claims to personal knowledge, personal experience, direct perceptual access, or categorical membership in respect of an event or topic under discussion’ (Hutchby, 2006: 84). It can, thus, be understood that it is the callers’ strategic reliance on the mobilization of witnessing devices that win them candidacy to be positioned in an internationally powerful role. Such a discursive powerful footing in turn bestows them with an interactional role of advice giver.

In instances where the callers’ theme relevant category (membership) is visibly marked using witnessing devices in their initial productions, as in excerpt (83), the hosts tend to work jointly in positioning the callers to an internationally powerful role. This can be inferred in the forms of follow up turns the hosts draw on. In excerpt (83), for instance, the host seem to display such phenomenon by designing his follow up turns through the deployment of *continuers* (see lines 9, 11, 13, and 15) and in one turn (see line 17) by giving a *confirmatory response*.

Excerpt (83) 7: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *eshi. temeremeren*

Ok have (you) been tested (impersonalized)

2 C: *awo temeremeriyahehu*

yeneberegna yemeremera agatami lenegereh new=

Yes I have been tested

I am going to tell you about my testing experience

3 H: *=betam des yelegnal eshi.*

I will very much be glad (to listen to) ok (please go on)

4 C: *mejemberiya yeserahut and sehetet new*

First the mistake I made is one

5 H: *ante.*

You?

6 C: *awo*

Yes

7 H: *menedenew seheteteh*

What is your mistake

8 C: *yaw intercourse neberegn normally yetetekemekutem
becondom new gen sele HIV teru awareness seleneberegn
malet new (0.5)yehe hula lene aletewatelegnem gebetohal
HIV leyaz echelalehu yemil entene wuset seladere
kemigebaw belay asechenekegn=*

Just I had intercourse normally I made (the intercourse)
using condom Although I had good awareness concerning HIV
(0.5)I found it hard to swallow (do) you understand for
I felt I could be infected with HIV, it made me become
very much worried

9 H: *=eshi*

Ok

10 C: *ena lememeremer sefeleg mejemberiya tebekekugnena
asetawusalehu hamelearat hameleameset yametu abo new*

So when I wanted to get tested first I waited and

I remember July 12 July 13 is (of religious holiday with
marked festivity per annum)

11 H: *eshi*

Ok

12 C: *ena abo betekereṣṭian adere techeneke beka*

heje yetemeremerekut

So it is after passing the night at Abo church that

I went and got tested

13 H: *eshi*

Ok

14 C: *keza behuala sasebew (.) beka kelal neger endehone*

betedegagami memeremer jemerekugn [...] setasebew beratio

setaselaw ye eteyopia hezeb betam tenesh percentu new

beHIV teyezo yalew ena yesew amelekaket mendenew beka

beyazes belo tebab tebabun new yemiyasebew gebetohal

Then after (.) I have come to consider (it) just as minor
thing I started getting tested repeatedly [...]

When you see when you put it in a ratio it is very small
percentage of the Ethiopian population that is already
infected with HIV but what the people perceive is just
narrowly what if I get infected (do) you understand

15 H: *ehe*

ehe

16 C: *gen yalteyazew hezeb new emibezaw aydel*

But it is the uninfected that outnumber, isn't it?

17 H: *awo*

yes (it is)

18 C: *betam anederaresem endawum selezih yalemeyaz*

*chanceachen betam sefi newuna tekaken negerochen eyagolan
ferachachenen eyechemeren kalememeremrena beheywetachen
tedegagami sehetetochen kemenesera betam tenkakoch
enehonalen [...] selezih yememeremer bahelachen bezih
manged benasadegew teru yemeselegnal*

We have even a big difference thus our chance of
not being infected is very high so instead of avoiding it
by magnifying minor things that add to raising the level
of our fear and making frequent mistakes in our life,
we become very careful(if we get tested) [...]

I therefore think that it will be nice if we develop
our (blood) testing culture in such way

19 H: *melkam amesegenalehu hasabehen tekebeyalehu*

*balemakef dereja kehuletshi keasrazetegnzenazetegn eske
huletshizetegn balew gize wuset yeHIV yeserechet meten
eyekenese endemeta new tenatoch yemiyasayut [...]*

Good I thank you I take your opinion At an international
level studies are hinting that the expansion of HIV
from two thousand from nineteen ninety nine up to
two thousand nine is showing a decrement [...]

In this exemplar, the caller tended to manage being in an internationally powerful position using different discursive resources. Firstly, the caller preferred to make his theme relevant identity evident right at his initial turn in the organization of the speech exchange. Secondly, he, in that same turn (*see line 2*), instead of waiting for the host's turn that commonly serves in this interaction site to frame the callers upcoming productions, overtly mentioned what he was going to do in a way that hinted its significance to the production's goal attainment. By so doing the caller managed to win to be in an internationally powerful footing as the host in his follow up markedly revealed this through immediacy of his utterance (=) and saying '*betam des yelegnal*', indicating stance taking and then using '*eshi.*' implying his eagerness to listen to. Thirdly, the caller tended to draw on anecdotal narrative (*see line 10 and 12*). Fourthly, he mobilized his production using a mentioning of statistical data (*see line 14*). The caller's insistence on the mention of sort of statistical data as a resource in organizing his production seemed to appeal to the host for the host, while managing the closings, tended in turn to mobilize statistical information.

Like the practice we have seen in the analysis of the accomplishment of the hosts' elicitation of the callers' particulars which potentially involve delicate matters, it tends also to be apparent that callers at times display their resistance to accept the hosts' personalized advice giving turns. This seemed to be revealed mostly through such dispreference markers as: silences, hesitations, prefaces. In such instances, the hosts seem to equally engage in the modification of their turn designs (for example, via *reformulation, providing an account of it*) by closely monitoring the callers' tendency of unreceptiveness. The excerpt below demonstrates such a tendency by the hosts.

Excerpt (84) 12: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *hulet amet honohal aletemeremerekem keziya behuala*
yeteleyayu negeroch ligetemuh yechelalu (.) ena (.)
meche new yemetemeremerew (.) nege lemesale tuwat

wede meremera tabiya mehed techelalehwey beleh
meneden new meleseh

Two years since you got tested as different things might
happen in your life then after (.) when are you going to
test (.) If I for example want to know whether you can
go to testing center tomorrow, what will be your response

2 C: → *ə: (.) mehed echelalehu gen ə: mendenew ezia akababi*
bemederebet gize alemeremerem lemalet neger new e: (.)

I can go but e: it is to mean simply that up on reaching
around I would not get tested

3 H: *lemendenew almeremerem yemetelew*

Why do you say I would not get tested

4 C: → *(.) eh bemeremerem balemeremerem menor echelalehu*

(.) eh because I can live whether or not I get tested

5 H: *({laughs}) betemeremerem batemeremerem tenoraleh*
esu gelets new

({laughs}) you can live whether or not you get tested
that is obvious

6 C: *eh*

eh

7 H: *betemeremerem batemeremerem yalew neger endale hono (.)*
betemeremer gen endet endemetenor takaleh malet new=

Without denying that (fact) but if you get tested,
you will be able to know how to live

8 C: *eh awo*

eh yes

9 H: *lemesale setemeremer HIV bedemeh bayenor (.) keza behuala
endet aynet tenekake madereg endalebeh takaleh (0.5)*

For example, if, up on testing, HIV is not found in your
blood, you (will)come to know the kind of preventive move
you should make afterwards (0.5)

10 C: *eh*

eh

11 H: *enji betemeremer HIV bedemeh wuset binor degemo
endet argeh tenahen eyetebekek menor endalebeh takaleh
(0.5) selezih bemeremer tetekemaleh enji bemeremerem yaw
new balemeremerem yaw new wedemil medemedemiya
yemiyaderes aydelem aydel (.)*

if you got tested and HIV is found in your blood you know
how to live taking care of yourself Therefore you will
benefit out of testing It is not as such reasonable to
conclude that there is no difference whether or not
I get tested isn't it(.)

12 C: *awo*

Yes

13 H: *selezih nege mehed techelaleh*

So can you go tomorrow

14 C: *eh (.) echelalehu*

eh (.) (yes) I can

In the communication conduct concerning HIV/AIDS in the phone-in program in focus, while the potential for a form of dispute is evident, neither hosts nor callers seems to take up the challenges posed, and the subtle way in which challenges are made indicates the orientation to agreement rather than confrontation. Unlike Hutchby's (1996) characterization of talk radio interaction as site where confrontation talk predominates, in the present data confrontational talk tend to be rarely evidenced. The exemplar that follows hints that despite apparent counter-positions taken on the issue for discussion between hosts and the callers, the participants work to come to ultimate agreement and cooperation, which is, as Tolson (2006) observes, the feature of sociable argument.

Excerpt (85) 7: 04/09/11, 1:2

1 C: *eh (.) ena yaw yalegnen hasab enten lemalet new*

eh (.) so it is to (air) my opinion

2 H: *ketel eshi.*

Ok go on (please)

3 C: *e: (.) yeageremehal e: (.) yehe yedem meremera ene betam
nebere emeferaw (.) ena (.) temari eyalehugn*

e: (.) to your surprise e: (.) I used to be much fearful
of blood testing (.) when I was a student

4 H: *eshi*

Ok

5 C: *betam (.) ateki negn*

I am a striker

6 H: *eshi*

ok

7 C: *kefel wuset endawum Christiano yelugn neber guadegnoche*

My class mates used to name me Christiano

8 H: *eshi*

ok

9 C: *ena betam betam ateka neber yegeremehal (.)*

ena ayalefegnem nebere endezih kemis neger

So I used to strike very highly to your surprise (.)

I would not miss (having sex with) anyone wearing a dress

10 H: *eshi*

Ok

11 C: [*keza*]

[then]

12 H: [*betam des beloh*] *melkam neger endaderege sew betam*

belebemulunet new emetaworaw eyesemahegn new

you are talking [very happily] very confidently as

one who has done something valuable are you listening me

13 C: e: e:

e: e:

14 H: *teru neger endaderege sew demetseh wuset beras*

yemetemamenena des yemil semeit [new]

The tone of your presentation hints your good feeling and

confidence as if you have done something valuable

15 C: [*eko lenegereh new*] *yaw yemiyastemer neger selale*

beye eko new

[yeah I am about to tell you] it is because that it has
(a sort of) educative end

16 H: *melkam eshi*

Ok go on

17 C: *yaw kandu hiwot andu memar selalebet beye new*

It is simply for the other has to learn from one's
experience

18 H: *ketel eshi*

Ok continue

19 C: *ena yaw (.) e: befekadegnenet yedem meremera temeretebe
metana ene yehe neger tenegerogn bedeg sel
endale temariw sake*

So just (.) e: voluntarily based blood testing team came
to our school and having informed about when I stood up
all of the students out burst into laugh

20 H: *ehe*

ehe

21 C: *keza yehone neger anesasetogn temeremere netsa honekugn
bagatami egzer siredah yaw andand gize netsa tehonalehena
keza behuala (.) yegeremeha rasen akebe (.) ahun demo
men yelugn Vidic new emilugn yegeremeha betam
tekelakay hognalehu [...]*

Then motivated by something I got tested and the virus

was not found in my blood fortunately as there
is sometimes such chance in God's help Then after (.)
abstaining myself (.) they call me now Vidic I become
a good defender [...]

22 H: *ehe*

ehe

23 C: *ena bezan seat bememeremere new ahun lalehubet derja
netsanet norogn beconfidence endenor yaderegegn yan leleh
yefelegekut kene heyewot lelaw limar yechelal kemil
antsar new*

So it was my testing then that has made me live with
freedom and confidence The reason for saying that is
taking that others might learn from my experience

24 H: *guadegna aleche ahun*

Do you have a girlfriend now

25 C: *awo ahun guadegna alechegn yeageremehal awo*

I have now a girlfriend to your surprise yes

26 H: *setemeremer bechahen new emetehedew kesua ga new
emetehrdew*

when you go for (blood) testing do you go alone or
with her

27 C: *yan gize (.) semeremer yaw temeretbet new beyehalehu keza
wedih kesua gar aberen huletachenem aberen check
tederegenal*

When I got tested earlier I told you that it was in
school After that with her both of us have together been
checked

28 H: *ehe ehe melkam betam [amesegenalehu]*

ehe ehe good [I thank you] very much

29 C: *[ena keza behuala] temari eyalen emenaderegewun neger
balemawek bezuwochu wetatoch yan neger tetewut rasachewun
awukew tewesenew endinoru kememeker antsar [new]*

[so then after] when we were students (we were engaged in
wrong deeds) not knowing what we do It [is] just to
advise many youngsters to quit that and live faithfully
getting tested

30 H: *[melkam]*

[good]

31 C: *yerasen heyewet endezih lakafel yechalekut*

that I wanted to share my life in such a way

32 H: *[betam des yela]*

[that is very nice]

33 C: *[ena yaw] teru sera serechalehu beye beconfidence*

lemawurat selalefeleku new

[so just] it is not to talk confidently that I did
good thing

34 H: *betam amesegenalehu seledewelekelen betam endalekew*

lelochum kante temeret emiwesedu yemeselenal [leloch]

I thank you very much for calling like you said
emphatically we think that the others might take lesson
[others]

35 C: [awo]

[Yes]

36 H: *emiluten demo aberen enesemalen [...]*

We will together listen to what (others) will air out [...]

As can be seen in this exemplar, the caller's turn designs in lines 5, 7, and 9 appeared to depict a dispreferred action. The host's turn in response to such move revealed the feature. The emergence of the *argumentative (form of) talk* here might be seen as arising from the participants' utilization of disaffiliative interactional resources which depict that they seem not to attend at all to the 'rules' of, what CA researchers term as, 'preference organization' (Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998). This is illustrative of how the absence of the participants' utilization of redressive devices, which also is a joint accomplishment, to preserve their self-esteem and social solidarity led to *argumentative* speech exchange and thereby tacitly display the order of communication in the target interaction site.

From the analyses of the organization of communication in the target radio phone-in program we have made thus far, the accomplishment of interactional power asymmetry can be observed as related primarily to the (recurrent) discursive role the participants during the speech exchange hold, say as questioner or answerer, which correspondingly provides them with some form of more or less powerful interactional resource. It is *merely* when a shift in their discursive footing is locally accomplished and thereby position the participants in an interactionally more or less powerful position (i.e., a reversed footing from the recurrent one) that the effect of one's institutional status seem to be of bearing to the construction of asymmetrical power relations. For instance, if the host in her/his discursive position of answerer following the shift in footing refrains from giving answer (e.g. via *downgrading device, changing topic, etc.*) to the caller's question

and thereby design a turn that achieves a strategic shift to her/his original discursive position, it might only be then that the asymmetrical relations made evident be described as arising from her/his institutional status. It seems ideal here to quote what Thornborrow (2002: 58) succinctly states: “institutionally inscribed relations of power and status do not determine the actions that are possible for speakers to take, but do affect the outcomes of those actions in the ensuing talk.”

Summary

The interactional workings involved in all of the exemplars we have thus far attempted to analyse could be seen as having one feature in common. In spite of the prevalence of shifts in their footings or positionings, interactants are involved in the collaborative achievement of the institutional goal. They, to the attainment of this end, engage in the negotiation of discourse roles through their locally constructed turns. The shifts in their footings might, thus, better be observed as emanating from the participants’ orientation to the achievement of the production’s goal. From the observations made thus far two features appear to hint at the more stable local identities of the participants in the communication site. First, the host is in an *initiator role* and the caller in a *responsive* one. The hosts initiate the actions which project an adequate next action by the callers. This also entails control of the topical focusing and the opening and closing of the speech exchange. Second, the host is allocated a *knowledgeable identity*. This is evidenced through the production of specialist knowledge (pieces of advice), which appeared to serve as a warrant to ask questions and sometimes to evaluate the answers (views/opinions). These are made evident in our analyses of the accomplishment of eliciting callers’ first-hand experience and/or knowledge, and the achievement of advice sequences. Concluding the detailed analysis of the nature of host-caller exchange and the various linguistic resources the participants deploy in the management of this ‘business’ here, let us turn now to make observations on one basic matter that the discussion in the present chapter has left hanging: how the closings sequences in the target radio phone-in program is accomplished.

5.3. Accomplishing Closings

The final phase in the host-caller interaction is the call closure. The accomplishment of closings in the radio phone-in program in focus appears to reveal a complex feature. One of the major sources of complexity in the description of the closings sequences tends to relate to the structural organization. Despite the complexity of interactional work, the closings of interaction in the target site may, however, be seen as comprising two moves: a *pre-closing move* and a *terminating move*. The pre-closing section is the part where the complexity appears to be more pronounced. Owing to the complexity, the boundary indicator does not normally appear as the sole pre-closing device. In the data considered for analysis, this feature would tend to manifest in the format of either a '*closing preface*' or a '*closing projection*' (Clayman, 1989). The closing preface consists of the use of such boundary indicating devices as '*melkam*' and '*selezih*' whereas the closing projection comprises linguistic resources that either tacitly or explicitly suggest that the participants' exchange is due to end.

Excerpt (86) 2: 25/09/11, 3:1

1 C: *gudatu betam yamezenal (0.5)*

The disadvantage outweighs (0.5)

2 H: → *melkam betam new emamesegenew seletesatefoh [...]*

Good I thank you very much for your participation [...]

Excerpt (87) 1: 18/09/11, 2:2

1 H: → *esti lewolajoch yehoneneger yebelunena*

koyetachenen enatenak

Let you pass on something to the parents and

end our talk

2 C: *[...] bene bekul emastelalefew [...]*

[...] what I personally want to pass on is [...]

As can be seen, in excerpt (86), the host uses the boundary marker ‘*melkam*’ in line 2 as preface to signal the interaction is due to terminate whereas he relies on the explicit announcement of lastness in the design of his turn ‘*koyetachenen enatenak*’ in line 1 of excerpt (87). The linguistic resources that overtly mark initiation of closings, as in excerpt (87) above, seem to take the initiation of advice sequences. They, in most cases in the data analysed, tend to serve as closing projection: hinting that the main section of the talk – doing the ‘talk’ – is about to end and thereby give clue both to the ratified callers and the overhearing audiences that call termination is due.

Summarizing formulation appears to be another device used to project closings by the interactants. The summarized formulation, in most cases, seems to be of direct bearing to the production’s purpose. This might be learned from their tendency to select just points of relevance (to the issue in discussion and to the audiences). The hosts tend to rely on the use of such device to reinforce audience’s uptake as can be inferred in line 2 in the following excerpt.

Excerpt (88) 6: 04/09/11, 1:2

1 C: (*xxx*)*yaderegekuachew negeroch betam new*(*xxx*)

(*xxx*)things **that I was doing** very much

(frightens me) (*xxx*)

2 H: → *enesu betam new emiyasegut yehe hasab manem sew*

chenkelat wuset yemimeta new bante chenkelat wuset yalew

Those things are worrisome this concern is shared

by anybody the one that worries you

3 C: *eshi*

Ok

4 H: *selezih yebelete balemuyawoch bezih guday lay maberariya*

endisetuh beakal hedo manegager yemesaselewun bezu sewoch

liferu yechelalu selezih bekedemiya (.)e:

zetegnamesahulet yemibal yenetsa yeselek mesemer ale(0.5)

Therefore relating to this matter seeing experts

many individuals might find making face-to-face talk

with experts fearful, so firstly (.) e: there is a talk

line nine fifty two (it is) free of charge (0.5)

5 C: *ehe*

ehe

In the communication site, despite the difficulty in pinpointing the boundary of the closings structurally, one thing seems to be of direct bearing to the hosts' tendency of moving onto the initiation of closings. It is their sensing of whether the callers' first-hand experience relating to the theme in hand got elicited to the level that hit the target (of the production). As we have already mentioned, one of the ways by which the attainment of the program's goal is sought to be secured is via reliance on the elicitation of the callers' first-hand knowledge and/or experience pertaining the theme set for discussion. We can note such interactional workings by comparing the following two excerpts.

Excerpt (89) 5: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 C: *ena betam arif new gen bezih agatami betam enja*

bimere temeremero maweku betam betam betam enja

kemeleh belay new

So it is very nice (thing) but by the way it is very

I don't know (how to) if tes getting tested and knowing

result is very very very (good thing) I don't know

(how to express)it is beyond what I am saying

2 H: [menalebat]

[probably]

3 C: [deferet] yesetehal malet new

that means It gives you [courage]

4 H: → ahun balehebet huneta lay guadegna alecheh yefeker

In your current condition do you have a friend love mate

5 C: yefeker guadegna enkua yelegnem

I do not have a love mate

6 H: melkam and teyake lasketel neber (0.5) yanten hasb

tekebeyalehu beketay bekebebachahu yemetadergut

enkesekasem endisaka emegnalehu melkam meshet yehuneleh

Good I was about to raise one follow up question (0.5)

I take your opinion I wish success in the next move that

your club is making Have a good evening

7 C: eshi egzier yesetelegn

Ok blessing

Excerpt (90) 7: 04/09/11, 1:2

1 C: ena bezan seat bememeremere new ahun lalehubet derja

netsanet norogn beconfidence endenor yaderegegn yan leleh

yefelegekut kene heyewot lelaw limar yechelal kemil

antsar new

So it is my testing then that makes me live with freedom

and confidence The reason for saying that is taking that

others might gain something out of my experience

2 H: → *guadegna alecheh ahun*

Do you have a girlfriend now

3 C: *awo ahun guadegna alehegn yeageremehal awo*

I have now a girlfriend to your surprise yes

4 H: *setemeremer bechahen new emetehedew kesua ga new
emetehrdew*

when you go for testing do you go alone or with her

5 C: *yan gize (.) semeremer yaw temeretbet new beyehalehu
keza wedih kesua gar aberen huletachenem aberen
check tederegenal*

When I got tested earlier I told you that it was

in school but after that with her

both of us have been checked together

In excerpt (89), the initiation of closings in the host's turn in line 6 appeared to emerge following the caller's utterance in her/his turn in line 5, which seemed to constrain the host not to design a follow up turn. In contrast, in excerpt (90), the caller's responding turn to the same form of host's question to that of the caller in excerpt (89) tended to warranty the initiation of further elicitation turn by the host.

The other sources of the complexity seem to relate to the question of who initiates the closings sequences. This is because it is not uncommon, though the degree varies, for both the hosts and the callers to initiate closings. While we can see the closings initiated by the host, which are typical in the majority cases, in line 6 of excerpt (89) above, closings initiated by the callers can be observed in the following excerpt.

Excerpt (91) 4: 02/10/11, 4:1

1 C: → *ena memermer teru new beye lememaker yahel new **betam***

amesegenalehu

So it is to offer my advice that testing is a good thing

Thank you very much

2 H: *enamesegenalen*

(we) thank you

What appears to be a routine in the organization of closings in the target data is that the hosts advance to the terminating sequence immediately after the enactment of the pre-closing turns. This is usually accomplished through the deployment of a thanksgiving act addressed at the caller. Such a practice takes two forms. While the first practice is characterized as one that allows the callers to respond to the hosts' acknowledgement tokens, the second can be described as one that does not allow the callers to respond to the hosts' thanking remark. The first terminating method renders the callers with the space to take part in the construction of their response token to the adjacency pair initiated by the host and thereby imply the valuation of the (interpersonal) relational element in the encounter. The excerpts that follow exemplify such a practice.

Excerpt (92) 3: 25/09/11, 3:1

1 C: *[...] yehenen ante kebalemuya ga seteweyay mesemat
selefeleku new*

[...] I want you talk about this with an expert

2 H: *melkam hasabun tekebelenal seledeweleshelen
enamesegenalen*

Good we have taken your point (we) thank you for calling

3 C: → *eshi amesegenalehu*

Ok thank you

Excerpt (93) 5: 04/09/11, 1:1

1 H: *melkam and teyake lasketel neber (0.5) yanten hasab
tekebeyalehu [...]*

Good I was about to raise another question (0.5)

I have taken your opinion [...]

2 C: → *eshi egzier yestelegn*

Ok **blessings**

As can be seen in line 3 of excerpt (92) and line 2 of excerpt (93), the callers used their turns to design a response token to the hosts' thanking remark through the devices 'ameseginalehu' and 'egzier yestelegn' which are typical of the commonest response tokens in that turn.

In the practice involving the second method, one that denies callers from constructing a response tokens, the hosts design their turns in a way that usually mark their tendency of proceeding to other programming business. This can be inferred in their turn constructions in excerpts (94) and (95) below.

Excerpt (94) 9: 04/09/11, 1:1

H: *melkam amesegenalehu hasabeshen tekebeyalehu
leloch sewoch yemiluten abren enesemalen
ademachochachen zetenasebatneteband efemadis lay [...]*

Good I have taken your opinion we will hear

what others would say (we are) on FM Addis 97.1 [...]

Excerpt (95) 13: 04/09/11, 1:1

H: *betam amesegenalehu yezareasramiest ken altemeremernem
yalachehu ademachochachen yezare asramest ken yakuam lewut*

adergachehu badis mereja endemenegenagn tesfadergalehu

selam ameshulen

Thank you very much In our next fortnight session

I hope those of you who said we have not been tested

will change your mind and come with new report

in our next fortnight session Have a good evening

As can be seen in these extracts, the hosts deploying such method of terminating may design their final turns in a way that expresses their well wishes; invites the callers to stay tuned to listen to others' views; highlights the theme of the program; reminds the name of the station that broadcasts the program; and sometimes announces the in-coming of another (the next) caller, which might be seen as aspects of the programming business. The hosts' preference to move directly on to other programming business may seem to serve, among others, denying some callers the space for re-opening talk.

The practice of re-openings appears to be one of the interaction phenomena that add to the complexity in the characterization of the closing sequences in the present data. It is not uncommon to witness the practice of moving the speech exchange back, or retaining the conversation from getting terminated. In the target data, this usually appears to be evident immediately after the hosts' thanksgiving acts. It is also observed that both parties take the initiatory role of the re-openings. The host, following his terminating move, in excerpt (96) below constructs a turn that re-opens the exchange by way of raising a question that serves to further the interaction. Likewise, excerpt (97) shows the caller's resistance to orient to the host's terminating move by engaging in the construction of re-opening turn that serves to identify her/him and thereby hinting the preference to be acknowledged using her/his identification.

Excerpt (96) 3: 04/09/11, 1:2

H: *melkam betam amesegeenalehu melkam meshet*

→ *ahun (.) besera new yaleshiw yane lesera setey
betemeremershebet sera lay nesh yaleshiw weyes
ezihi hagerwust nesh*

Good I thank you and wish you good evening

Are you in the same job now in the occupation you were in
while getting tested or are you here in Ethiopia

Excerpt (97) 13: 04/09/11, 1:2

1 H: *betam amesegeenalehugn melkam yemeremera gize yehunelewo*

I thank you very much (wish you) a nice testing time

2 C: → *eshi (xxx) ebalalehu*

Ok my name is (xxx)

3 H: *eshi kadama*

Ok from Adama

4 C: *(xxx)*

(xxx)

In the corpus of the data analysed, unlike the hosts, it is only few callers who tend to manage the achievement of re-openings, however. While the practice of initiating re-openings of talk by the hosts seem to be one that might be observed as stemming from their footings in the institutional role of initiator of every action, as has been pointed out, the practice of re-opening the talk by the callers might be attributed to their strategic managements of their turns in the organization of the speech exchanges in the phases that precede. Callers who appear to be successful in this respect are those who, in the interactional management of the main body of the ‘talk’ – doing the talk – were capable

of displaying their resourcefulness either in the subject in discussion or in their conversational skills through their strategic utilization of powerful discursive devices. The management of re-openings by the caller in excerpt (98) below seems to be implicative of this phenomenon.

Excerpt (98) 13: 25/09/11, 3:2

1 H: *betam amesegeñalehu kehawasa [ademachachen]*

I thank you very much our [caller] from Hawassa

2 C: → *[enten malet] tenesh yehone mereja lemasgebat vayresu*

kand sew enten keteyaze sew wedalteyaze yemitelalefebet

gizesent new=

[...] just to add some pieces of information about the time

it takes for the virus to transmit from the infected to

the non-infected

3 H: *=ehe ehe*

Ok Ok

4 C: *lemilew tenesh eske huletshi sement almost eske*

huletshi zetegn yalew mereja

the data up to two thousands eight almost up to

two thousands nine

5 H: *ehe*

Ok

As can be seen in this excerpt, the host designed his turn in line1 in a way that overtly marks termination. The caller in line 2, however, disaligned to the host's turn by constructing an overlapping turn and thereby hinted his tendency to make the interaction to proceed.

Summary

The complex interaction work that characterizes everyday conversation would seem to be reduced in the case of interaction practice in the target radio phone-in program. One thing that seem to visibly contribute to such end (a reduction) relates to the difference observed in the structure of the call exchanges between the interactants in (ordinary form of) telephone conversation and in the target phone-in program. Drawing on the description of the sequential organization of closings in the target interaction site, the following features of the communication practice and of the participants' behaviour are observed at this phase of the host-caller interaction: (1) the closings phase tends to be initiated predominantly by the hosts. This feature appears to derive from the turn-taking system that is routine in the practice. (2) The closings phase seems to be invariably preceded by pre-closing work, even if minimal. This feature might be due to the time limit to which the events are restricted and on the goal of the event. (3) The closings phase appears to be constructed in a way that marks the consideration of the relational ends of discourse, despite some inconsistency.

In this chapter, effort has been made to demonstrate how communication in the target context is visibly structured. Such a structural observation has primarily been concerned with the turn-taking system that organises the distribution of turns at talk into sequences of adjacency pairs. The analysis of the turn-taking organisation has allowed inquiring into the actions done in each of the turns at talk. It has also been demonstrated that a wide range of discursive strategies are generally used by the interactants to mark the different stages in the organization of the program. As the participants in the described institutional setting have been observed as recurrently and pervasively organizing their turn-taking in a way that is somewhat distinctive from ordinary conversation, it can be proposed that they are organizing their communication conduct so as to display and realize its "institutional" character over its course. The chapter to follow will summarize the major findings of the analytical endeavour and the implications of the analytical moves and observations made in this chapter.

Chapter Six

Summary and Implications of the Findings

This study has had the principal aim of describing characteristic features of communication in radio phone-in production about HIV/AIDS by narrowing its focus onto the context of the practice in FM Addis 97.1, a (radio) broadcasting station in Ethiopia. In this chapter, attempt will be made to present the results of these efforts and explain how the participants' communication conduct in this interaction site seems to be governed by the goal-oriented nature of the program. Furthermore, effort will be made to discuss the implications of the findings.

6.1. Summary of the Findings

In the attempt to provide a description of the communication conduct in the target interaction site, the analytical move made focused on two organizing points. Undertaking analysis concerning the organization of communication was taken as the first organizing point. Examining the stages in the participants' speech exchanges was considered as the second organizing point. The analytical attempt made with foci both on the organization of communication and the structure of interaction between the interlocutors has enabled the researcher to reach the findings that follow.

Findings relating to the organization of communication

Communication in the production analyzed can be described as program produced, like any other radio programs, for the mass (listening audiences). Unlike any radio programs produced for the mass, the interaction is noted, however, for being accomplished mainly by two parties who are hearable as making speech exchanges. While this feature can still be shared with other forms of broadcast talks, say news interview, a feature peculiar to the radio phone-in program analysed is there. This lies in that the radio phone-in program is found to be a form of broadcast talk that grants space for the participation of a number of callers within a (single) program.

In the target radio phone-in program, interactions take place in a participation framework, which is constructed between the host, guest/caller and the audiences. This is a three- fold construct inclusive of the audiences as a participant in the interaction since the talk that unfolds from moment to moment in the phone-in production is aimed not just at the host who has asked the question or the caller/ guest who is being asked the question, it is primarily shaped for and by the audience who listen to that program. Though interaction between the host and the guest constitutes part of the program, the organization of participation in the program could be characterized as primarily involving the ‘active’ participation of the hosts and the callers. While the hosts are in the (institutional) space of the studio, the callers do not share the space of the studio for they get the participation status just by calling in from a space outside.

The communication practice (between the host and caller) in this site was found to constitute three broader phases. These are the openings, the ‘talk’ elicitation, and the closings phases. Each phase was observed to have distinctive features. The openings sequence encompasses the general opening component and the specific ones. The general opening component constitutes the hosts’ broader introduction set to identify the program, the issue, and the people who are entitled to have opinions on it whereas the specific opening comprises the interaction practices that publicize the commencement of the hosts’ encounter with the callers. The practices appear to follow a fairly repetitive pattern. This pattern typically comprises three moves in which each participant takes turns. It includes: the announcements moves, the pre-greetings (on-line cuing) moves, and the greetings moves.

The *announcements moves* are organized in ways that tend mainly to accomplish dual purposes. These are, firstly, the business of informing or announcing to the audiences that host-caller dialogue is due, and, secondly, bringing the callers into the participatory framework or orienting the callers that they are about to be positioned as ratified participant. The *pre-greetings moves* can be characterized as moves in the openings stage

where the commencement of ‘on-air’ speech exchange between the host and the ratified caller is cued. In fact, this tends to be initiated most frequently along with the announcements moves and sometimes in a separate turns. The hosts’ pre-greetings move is then succeeded by the greetings moves. The pre-greetings moves tend to mainly function as preface to the greetings sequence. The *greetings* sequence is put to use by the participants mostly to make exchanges of greetings and sometimes to accomplish identifications. In short, the openings sequence would seem to mainly serve such functions as: announcing the audience that host-caller exchange is due, signaling the line is open for the caller, and exchanging greetings.

The ‘talk elicitation’ or ‘doing talk’ phase in the production of the radio phone-in program appears to be the stage where the main goal of the program is primarily sought to be accomplished. This stage features longer sequences, formulations, and possible shifts in footing and topic as hosts and callers attempt to make sense of talk. The accomplishment of the communication conduct at this phase may better be described as involving two components: *initial moves* and *follow up moves*. While the former can be characterized as turn designs used to commence the ‘talk’, the latter can be identified as turn constructions used to make the ‘talk’ to extend. The hosts tend to accomplish these respectively using *talk initiating devices* and *follow up turn constructing devices*. Central discursive resources drawn upon by the hosts to make the talk to unfold involves: the elicitation of the callers’ first-hand experience and/or knowledge, and the initiation of advice sequences.

The final phase in the organization of host-caller interaction involves the closings. The accomplishment of closings in the radio phone-in program in focus appears to reveal a complex feature. One of the major sources of complexity in the description of the closings sequences seems to relate to the structural organization. This phase in the encounter could better be described as a stage where much interaction complexity is witnessed. Despite the complexity of interactional work, the closings of interaction in the target site might be described as consisting of two moves: a *pre-closing move* and a

terminating move. The former tends to be attained in the format of either a *closing preface* or a *closing projection* whereas the latter appears to be accomplished usually through the deployment of a thanksgiving act addressed at the caller.

Findings concerning the construction of the participants' discourse role & identity

Within the radio phone-in program analyzed, the participants' discourse roles appear to be made relevant in many ways, with explicit role definitions by the host and with implicit negotiations by the participants. The participants' identities emerge in the former way as the hosts attempt to accomplish the general openings and (call) transitions whereas in the second means they tend to emerge over the course of unfolding interaction. They appear to evolve from category work proceeding on several layers of categorization. Within the organization of the radio phone-in, the *host* and *caller* are the two categories that are at the center of the production. Within the program, these categories were observed to have actions attributable to them. As has been shown analytically, the *hosts*, for instance, perform, among others, such category-bound actions as introducing the program, setting the theme for the program, inviting callers to speak, discussing issues on the theme set with the callers, and managing caller transition. Similarly, there are category-bound activities for the *callers* which they orient to in the program. These include: calling to the program, waiting for the hosts' invitation to take part in the on-air talk, offering opinions/ views on the topic set for discussion. These two categories could be seen as operating within a relational pair to give the radio phone-in program the feature it has.

The hosts' announcements turn moves a person from the general category 'audience' of the program to the category a 'waiting caller'; the hosts' pre-greetings initiator makes the 'waiting caller' to progress to another layer of category a 'ratified caller'. Following greetings exchanges, the caller will be provided space to offer an opinion relating to the theme, placing her/him in a *theme-opinion category*. The opinion advanced within that turn (construction) will display implicitly, or more often explicitly, the position of the caller on the theme at hand. Such positioning can be observed to categorize callers in

relation to the theme. In the data analyzed, for example, the theme- opinion category was one of ‘blood testing for HIV is dreadful’, or ‘blood testing for HIV is not dreadful’. The opinion given by the callers is an opinion that is heard as a predicate of their personal identity. By offering such a position the caller can be seen to move into and personally occupy a theme-opinion category in which their opinion situates them on either one side or the other. After this opinion has been offered, the hosts construct turns that either challenge the callers’ opinion by offering an alternative opinion or elicit responses that add to the development of the speech exchange. The hosts here can be seen as not enacting from a constant position. They tend to shift their positions according to the callers’ positions to make the talk unfolding and thereby add to the transactional end of the program. The point that the realization of the program’s goal is reinforced through engagement in categorization activities can be inferred in the hosts’ preoccupation in seeking such categorical information through their follow-up turn designs.

The importance of categorization activity to work towards the achievement of the program’s goal can also be understood in the participants’ engagement in the co-construction of a further layer of categorization. This layer of categorization involves unveiling a particular categorical identity through the co-construction of turns that authenticate the claim to theme-related knowledge or experience. It is through a reliance on the co-construction of such a further level of categorization work that a relationship between the caller and the theme on a personal level is grounded. In the data analysed, this layer of categorization was found to receive prominence as the hosts tended to draw much on the elicitation of the callers’ firsthand experience and knowledge.

It seems viable, hence, to conceive of the flow of interaction within the target radio phone-in program as one involving a reflexive combination of categorial and sequential methods through which the participants’ identities are built. In the analytic chapter, the participants’ identities have been shown to be of direct bearing to the realization of the program’s goal. It may, thus, be inferred that the cognition of the contextual relevance of categorization activities to the achievement of the program’s goal is what underlies the

participants' engagement in the co-construction of multi-layered categories (roles). The constructions of roles in such ways can also be seen to contribute in various degrees of explicitness to reciprocal positioning of the interlocutors. Our observations of the construction of the participants' identities in the earlier paragraphs could also suggest the form of relationships apparent in the interaction site, the concern of the third research objective, to which we now are turning.

Findings relating to the construction of power relationships

It is widely held that power asymmetry prevails in and is of an inherent feature of institutional forms of interaction. Interaction on radio phone-in programs, being a form of institutional production, is thought to be a site where power asymmetry can be evidenced. Consequently, research into host-caller interaction has tended to focus on how hosts, being the institutional figure in charge of the management of the program, maintain control over the interaction. The analysis of the data in this study, however, reveals that asymmetrical power relationship is not a feature that characterizes all that is happening in the target site, and that asymmetrical power relationship manifest in this setting tends to be not an outcome of just social structural difference between the participants but (mainly) of an interactional accomplishment which is made evident in and through the joint interaction moves by the parties involved.

To begin with the first observation, in contrast to the case in a range of other forms of institutional interactions, it may not be that simple to take that asymmetrical power relation is inherent in the radio phone-in analyzed. One feature of the present corpus is that it exhibits manifestations of partial symmetries alongside asymmetries which are established in various subtle ways. By partial symmetry it is meant that all the participants in the program, be they hosts or callers, have access to the same set of discourse patterns: both hosts and callers use conversational languages, both parties offer advice to the audience, and both parties sometimes make evaluative statements (e.g. they tend to blame and/or criticize (some) members of the audience for 'wrong deeds' or 'poor practice on health matters'). Despite the manifestation of partial symmetries, if we look

carefully into the discursive procedures in the data, fine threads of asymmetry could be observed. For example, it is true that both hosts and callers tend to make evaluative statements on (some) members of the audience, usually on the callers who aired their opinions earlier, for not complying with a form of health behavior advocated in and by the media through criticism, but they tend to differ from each other in terms of the target and locus of criticism. The data tacitly show that while the hosts can pick aspects in the callers' speech and have the discursive space to inquire the callers to account for what they have produced in their turns, the callers cannot do so and have no the discursive room to ask the hosts to give account for their productions. The hosts can also simply ask questions instead of offering their own viewpoints.

In this communication site, asymmetry tends to arise and manifest mainly in two ways: in the way host-caller interaction is structured, i.e., in the sequential organization of their speech exchanges, and in the participants' categorization activities while making speech exchanges, i.e., in the sequential unfolding of membership categorizations. As has been pointed out, interaction between the hosts and the callers is organized predominantly in such a way that the hosts assume an initiatory role while the callers take that of a response giver (responder) role. Such a more stable interaction role in the program situates the interlocutors in a structurally asymmetrical relationship. It takes the interactional role of talk initiator - typical of (everyday) telephone conversation - which involves, among others, setting agenda for a talk in one's preferred manner and choosing what to talk and how to talk, out of the hands of the callers. In this program, the openings phase brings callers into the talk as call receivers rather than initiators. Unless they manage to make a strategic discursive move, which is rarely made evident, to reverse such a more stable role, the callers, thus, participate in the program with a less powerful discursive role. Asymmetry would also appear to be observed in the way closings are managed. In some host-caller encounters in the present data, the closings tended to be designed to prevent callers bringing up other things to say, and therefore precluding the talk from developing. The way host-caller interaction is structured, thus, hints that

asymmetry with respect to the occupation of the host versus caller roles manifests in the radio phone-in in focus.

Whereas power asymmetry that stems from and operates in the recurrent organizational pattern in interaction in the target communication site situates one group of the participants (i.e., the callers) in a discursively less powerful position and the other (i.e., the hosts) in a discursively more powerful position, power asymmetry that evidences in the second manner tends to be one that promotes a differential discursive resource distribution to the callers. The target radio phone-in program could be described as communication site where callers' voices are heard and an atmosphere of open discussions predominates, yet, despite this veneer, certain moral messages seem to be differentially advocated. The local sequential enactment of talk within this interaction context appears to afford differential discursive power to callers. Such asymmetric discursive resource distribution, in fact, tends to emanate from and is manifest in the participants' joint interaction accomplishment in the program. As has been observed earlier, participants engage in the sequential co-construction of different layers of categorization. In the present data, the membership categories of the callers could be understood to function as an asymmetric category set, whereby an asymmetry operates between category incumbents with respect to rights and duties and/or skills and knowledge.

Upon examining the local opportunities available for the callers to contribute to the program, it might be observed that a greater emphasis is given to those actors whose social roles, made interactionally evident through membership categorization devices, are perceived to be of relevance to the achievement of the target production's goal whilst, conversely, actors whose category sets are perceived to be of little relevance appear to be constrained from getting access to the discursive resources available. In the data analyzed, for instance, a greater emphasis was given to those callers whose arguments promote the importance of 'getting tested for HIV-antibody' and 'being faithful to one's sexual partner' whilst, conversely, discourses from callers who argue in opposition with

these were downplayed. It can, thus, be inferred that power asymmetry in this communication site hinges on the interplay between structural features and membership categorizations made evident in the interactions. Having summarized the findings, let us now turn to see their implications.

6.2. Implications of the Findings

Implications to Theory

This study has implications for the various areas it has touched upon. It has demonstrated that the investigation of communication practice in a radio phone-in program is a rewarding project, enriching the field of mass communication studies. It has shown that existing models developed for studying mass communication practices, with chief preoccupation on the mediation of ‘messages’ between the ‘encoding’ institutions of broadcasting and the ‘decoding’ or receiving audience at home, cannot account for the complexities of interactions in radio phone-in programs. The model adopted in this study, however, attempts to make up for this limit and is able to describe the features inherent in the communication site.

Operationally, the findings illustrated in the analytic chapters support the micro-analysis of (broadcast) talk as a reliable instrument to make sense of participants’ initiatives. Focusing on a communication site from a distinct context, one that uses Amharic as language of interaction, this study has demonstrated how the participants accomplished communication in a way that marks its institutionality. The study has also highlighted that the communication practice reveals variations in some features with that of the practices in the western settings as described in seminal works on radio phone-in programs by Hutchby (1996) and Thornborrow (2002). This study has added further insights to the study of identities within radio phone-in programs and the way these may be presented, sought after and used by participants by demonstrating how the two versions of ethnomethodological approaches (CA and MCA) may be usefully combined in such a way that an appreciation of the categorial relevances together with the sequential

organization of talk may be developed. The study could also be seen as having implications to the study of power relations in media talk. It has demonstrated how the consideration of a combined use of these methods enables to make a valid inference as to the workings of power as made evident by the participants themselves in their local interaction accomplishments without subscribing to the consideration of issues of (social) structure a priori.

Implications to Praxis

In this section some of the practical implications of doing (an ethnomethodologically based) discourse analyses will be reprised. This is due to the cognition that the contents and methodology presented in the study may have some implications for practitioners in terms of both future (professional) practice and communication skills training. These could benefit in many ways from such a linguistic examination of the participants' real exchanges. A very important point to ponder here is that a possibility is there to develop the practical pay-off of the analysis of the communication conduct. By focusing on the analysis of talk data, effort will be made to demonstrate that the interactional solutions to be sought after in communication practices which may reveal difficulties are not that reached intuitively by the researcher but are ones inferred primarily from the participants' own practices. The observations to be made, hence, are one of demonstrating the role of analysis of talk data and it by no means aim at evaluating the hosts' performance. Let us see some of the discursive practices as illustration on how the detailed analysis of the talks could be of value to inform future practices and trainings.

One of the discursive practices worth reprising is *identification* practice. In the talk data analyzed, varying practices could be noted relating to identifications. One relates to whether (or not) identifications turn designs are part and parcel of the communication practice. As we have seen in the analytic chapter, some openings of host-caller speech exchanges involve identifications works while others do not. Identifications works tend to be missing in host-caller interactions with shorter greetings turns whereas greetings

accomplished in four or more turns appear to encompass identification moves. The other source of variation pertains to who takes the initiative in cases where identifications are part of the practice. In the corpus analyzed, the hosts tended to construct identifications seeking turns as part of their speech exchanges with some callers in the openings sequence. Some callers also seemed to use their turns to identify themselves even when no identifications eliciting utterance was produced by the host. This might imply these callers' orientation to the observation that the interaction site requires one to identify her/himself. In fact, the callers' presupposition of such practice as a feature that characterizes the site holds true for it is not uncommon for the hosts to include identifications request in their turn constructions.

The variation found in the practice of whether to include or exclude identification moves in the construction of the greetings turns might be attributed to at least two reasons. The first reason could relate to the institutional nature of the interaction (program). This might emanate from the time constraints the program imposes to accommodate voices of different callers as it is sometimes made explicit in the closings sequence by the hosts. The other reason might be associated to the hosts' observation of the importance of identifications moves. As it is common for the hosts to engage in interaction with callers who appear to overtly state their dispreference to be identified by their name, the hosts might take seeking identifications as less important.

Such observation, however, may not hold true all the times for it was not that uncommon to witness instances in the interaction practice where callers made the tendency to be identified hearable. They usually made this evident in their self-initiated identifications moves and in their turn constructions toward the closings sequences in the encounter. Hosts' inclination to disregard the inclusion of identifications seeking move in the greetings turns construction might be observed as having implications about the nature and form of interpersonal relationships the interactants sought to construct in the opening phase of the encounter. Reliance on the greetings exchanges with the exclusion of identification moves is to be traced to the marked transactional nature of the encounter,

which is done exclusively for the audiences' sake. While the greetings moves with relatively shorter number of turn sequences may imply that less value has been given to the relational aspect of the interaction, those moves with turn sequences extended to include identifications tokens might suggest that due weight has been given to the relational end.

Although reliance on achieving identifications might be seen as potentially taking the disclosure of callers' membership categories out of their hands, it may also be taken as having merits to the hosts in that they could draw on such categorization to tailor the interaction to move forward (i.e., achieving the transactional end) as well as to interact with the caller in a way that display their valuation of the relational cline (i.e., accomplishing the interpersonal end). While the best solution to the interaction difficulty concerning whether to consider identifications as useful component in the openings sequence is to be found contextually, it seems that the merits of drawing on identifications practice oughtweigh. This is because such a practice renders the hosts as well as some callers who would prefer to be identified with an advantage, placing only those callers who disprefer to be identified in a disadvantage. In fact, callers who disprefer to be identified may not necessarily be seen as loser for, as has been evidenced in the data, it is possible for them to show resistance to the hosts' identifications request by designing a disaligning turn (see excerpt (49)).

Another interaction phenomenon that could be considered to illustrate the practical pay-off of drawing on the details of talk relates to the hosts' *turn design form* to elicit talk from the callers. As observed in the analytic chapter, among the recurring talk initiating devices by the hosts is '*eshi*' or '*eshi-prefaced*' turn. In the analytic chapter, it has been depicted that some callers design their turn following the hosts' use of the device '*eshi*' in a way that aligns with the hosts' intent whereas other callers appear to be somewhat confused about what and how to respond.

Although the device ‘*eshi*’, when compared with the other talk eliciting devices we have analyzed, might be seen to offer the callers with better space to design their turns in their own preferred manner, the callers’ tendency to disalign with the hosts’ turn was observed to be greater. This would seem to be evident particularly when the device was used towards the beginnings (mostly in the first three or four host-caller encounters) of the program. In such instances, the hosts had to engage in some sort of repair works so as to elicit the kind of talk they want the callers to focus on. As has been demonstrated with exemplars in the analytic chapters, hosts who drew on the device (‘*eshi*’) in speech exchanges with callers who appeared to participate in the production following several callers in the call sequence, however, tend to succeed in eliciting talk that aligns with the hosts’ turns. This might be attributed to the point that callers in the latter sequences, in contrast to those who participate towards the beginnings, have better chance of understanding the subject for discussion and the (nature of) response expected of them. It may sound, hence, reasonable to suggest the hosts to stick to the use of this device as a preface to their talk initiating turn design in the call sequences that occur earlier in the production. While suggesting the utilization of the device ‘*eshi*’ in such a stage in the organization of the program seems to be logical, we should be cautious in generalizing as the best solution can only be discerned locally.

Our third exemplar to demonstrate the practical bearing of fine-grained analysis of talk relates to the use of *continuers*. The analysis made concerning this interaction device indicates the presence of two categories of callers. The first group comprises callers who showed the tendency that every chunk of their utterances needs to be succeeded by the hosts’ continuers whereas the second group consists of callers who inclined to display excessive reliance on the use of pause just as a strategy to organize their utterances. While the first group markedly made their expectation of the hosts’ continuers evident mostly through the construction of turns that seek confirmation of the hosts’ attentiveness (e.g. via ‘*eyesemahegn new*’, which literally means ‘*are you following me*’), the latter group tended to keep on producing their (pause-based) utterances without displaying their need of the hosts’ continuers even when the absences of the hosts’ continuers appeared to

be hearable. The manifest of such a contrastive feature seemed to give (the hosts) a difficulty relating whether or not and when to make use of continuers. Though giving a binding answer is not both that simple and the concern of this research, making observations concerning what would be the thing(s) that the hosts gain and lose by placing this discursive device into use may seem to be a sounding place to start off.

Seen from this perspective, what the communication practice data seem to hint was that the gains outweigh when the hosts stick to the deployment of continuers following every chunk of utterance by the callers. What the practice suggests, hence, seems that when hosts are grappled with such kind of interaction management difficulty, it may be of advantage for them to consider relying on the deployment of continuers immediately following the callers' pauses for, at least, the risk of implying inattentiveness to the callers' interaction moves could be avoided, as in the case for callers that visibly implied their expectations of the hosts' continuers, without impeding those callers who tend to produce (much) pause-based utterances from continuing to deliver their speech.

While the interaction phenomena discussed thus far could be taken as examples of aspects where interaction difficulties seem to be evidenced in the host-caller exchanges (at the interpersonal level), they could also be tacitly observed to have bearing to the mass communication end. A distinctive feature of communication in radio phone-ins of the form analyzed here is that the actual interaction takes place between the hosts and the callers and their productions are primarily designed for audiences with diverse background, or as Hutchby (2006) proffers as a better term, for 'distributed recipients'. One of the techniques whereby the participants disclose their orientation to the production of talks to the benefit of the audiences is through their (discursive) engagement in repair works. Participants imply their engagement in repair works mostly through rephrasing and/ or reformulation of their turns. They usually tend to do so whenever they feel that their turn design, while fitting to the needs and cognition of their co-interactant, would place at least some of the audiences out of the participation framework. Although repair works are accomplished by and concern both parties in the

interaction, our observation here will be confined to the hosts' practice solely for it is of direct bearing to the purpose in hand.

Concerning repair work, although evidences are there that reveal the hosts' valuation of the need for doing repair works to benefit the audiences, as has been displayed in 4.1, instances illustrating the absence of such an interactional work are also found in the corpus. One of the interaction features that the hosts would seem to take as not requiring repair works appears to be *code switching* phenomenon. This involves the interactants' reliance on use of code from another language while constructing their turns. While such a practice might be taken as indicating the valuation of the interpersonal feature of communication, it, however, might also be viewed as breaching one of the maxims of mass communication. It implies that the speaker uses this interaction resource to affiliate with her/his co-participant but by disaffiliating with (at least some) members of the listening audiences. Given that the production is meant to benefit the audiences, participants' code switching phenomenon in their turn designs could, hence, be seen as having the potential of excluding (distancing) members of the audiences with little or no understanding of the code or word from the other language – English in the case of the data under analysis. What may be seen here as a learning point is the need to beware of the fact that the talk is produced with an overhearing audience in to account. The tendency to treat the communication exchange merely as form of interpersonal communication might be seen as having a distancing effect on the part of the mass (audience) and thereby serves an end the production is not set to attain.

The interactional solutions proposed above should not be taken as generalizable, however. This is because of the cognition that no two interaction contexts will always have identical features. So while the interactional solutions pointed out could be seen as emergent in practices that went well, they might not necessarily be taken as the right solutions to the pinpointed interaction difficulties or problems. It is to simply demonstrate that adhering to a discursive method assists hosts in attending to the taken-for-granted in communications. What instead may be suggested as a right solution lies in the closer

(re)reading of the interlocutors' turns there and then (i.e., context sensitivity). The hosts need to be aware of the relativity of cultural practices and preferences of the callers, and hence work painstakingly to discern them locally. The attempt made in reprising some of the features noted in the analytic chapter of this study aimed at laying a corner stone to make a call for the practitioners to turn their attention to practicing discursively. This involves sensitivity to the meaning-making possibilities and activities inherent as hosts and callers exchange turns in the course of their interaction. Making a closer observation of the meaning making process allows the hosts to recognize the multi-functionality of a (certain) discursive resource (i.e., both the merits and demerits associated with the utilization of the discursive resource) and hence make a contextually relevant choice. Hosts can cultivate this sensitivity by using the same methods used in this discursive research.

The other aspect where hosts should develop sensitivity includes acknowledging (to) the doubly articulated feature of the production and raising their efforts towards maintaining a fairly reasonable balance between the interpersonal and the transactional ends of talk. As pointed out earlier, the production of talk in the data appears to be achieved mainly with the speech exchanges of the host and caller, yet their talks need to place the audiences in the participation framework. In the data of the present study, the participants were found to display this feature by drawing on the use of discursive resources that put the audiences as the primary recipient of their production. Despite the (existence of) practices that depict such orientation, it also seems to be commonplace to witness the participants mobilizing discursive resources with a distancing effect. They sometimes seem to engage in form of production that hints as if their speech is personal, directed at an individual listener. Such phenomenon could be inferred, among others, in the interlocutors' practices of *audience exclusive address terms* constructions and *code switching*. The hosts were also noted to (sometimes) show the tendency to impose routine procedures without attending to the caller. By remaining within a transactional frame, which excludes interpersonal attention and focuses on ensuring that procedures are being followed correctly, the hosts tended to fulfill their task remit as they aim to achieve the

production's goal, but, in so doing, they seemed to ignore the face needs of some callers. Arundale (2010), following Brown and Yule's (1983) observation on the two sides of discourse, asserts that the relational side of discourse is of equal relevance to the achievement of goals as the transactional end. Our observations of these interaction phenomena could be seen as having bearing to future praxis implying the hosts the need to raise their efforts towards both maintaining the face wants of their co-participants and enhancing audience uptake simultaneously.

Limitations

As is the case with any research undertaking, this study is not devoid of its own limitations. The first shortcoming of the research relates to the absence of the ethnographic information. The lack of ethnographic data may be seen as a significant absence, given the concern of the study with the accomplishment and outcomes of communication on a radio phone-in show. However, the data at hand – recordings and transcripts of the actual broadcast talk – can in fact provide their own kind of evidence that enables us to see how interaction is accomplished in the target communication site. An understanding of the institutional contexts of radio phone-in talks about HIV/AIDS allows us to move from our necessary initial focus on how the participants organize their talk. In order to study the functions of communication patterns in this site, so gathering ethnographic data would have been of value. It would have allowed getting better insights into the workings of communication and, thereby, made possible constructive input into policy debates.

The other limitation of the present study concerns the focal point of analyses. This study has given special attention to the detailed analysis of host and callers' interactions. The interaction made between the hosts and callers is one that constitutes the central feature of the program. It might alternatively be described as omni-relevant (feature) in the production of the program (as these participants are instrumental in the making up of each session or edition of the program). Cognizant of this, the present study has paid special attention to the analysis of the interaction made by these parties. While interaction

(made) between the host and the guest is a component of the program, one that is usually conducted for the sake of giving concluding or final remarks relating to the issues posed and covered in host-caller encounters, this study has not given it as such detailed analytical coverage. It has addressed this component just in the attempt made to uncover the overall organization of communication in the radio phone-in show. Had this component been treated in detail, it would have added something valuable to our understanding of the communication conduct in the target interaction site.

The analyses of the present study purported to delineate communication conduct in a radio phone-in program about HIV/AIDS in Ethiopia. Like many other qualitative researches in general and media discourse analytic works in particular, it has not paid attention to and didn't aim at covering all features that could be covered under this rubric.

Directions for Future Studies

Owing to, among others, time and space constraints, the present study has mainly focused on unraveling some aspects or features of communication in the target interaction site that are of direct bearing to the attainment of the research objectives set out. While the study might be seen as bringing to light some aspects of the complexities in the accomplishment of communication in a radio phone-in program about HIV/AIDS (in Ethiopia), (related) areas for sure are there that are worth paying attention to in future studies. To mention some:

- Complementing analyses of actual interaction (talk) data with corresponding ethnographic data;
- Focusing on such aspects that either have not been treated in greater depth or given much prominence in the present study as: discursive strategies used by the participants to affiliate and disaffiliate with their co-participant, interaction features (organization) of host-guest encounter, detailed examination of problematic encounters in H-C speech exchanges as well as contextualized analyses of remedial action.

- Treating radio phone-ins involving productions on subjects other than HIV/AIDS (e.g., asking questions on other theme-based health talks, counselling (relational) talks, question-answer game shows, etc.) to see the similarities and differences in the description of communication conduct in phone-ins in Ethiopia;
- Making a comparative analysis on the communication features of dyadic form of interaction (the one focused in this study) with that of a triadic form, i.e., a form of radio phone-in production where a caller interacts with two hosts;
- Making a comparative analysis of interaction accomplishment in radio phone-in programs produced in private and state owned radio stations (in Ethiopia); and
- Making a comparative analysis of communication conduct in radio phone-in show with such other types of (broadcast) talk shows as news interviews and audience participating (TV) talk shows in Ethiopia.

Concluding Remarks

By following a discursive approach, this study has attempted to develop description of communication conduct on FM Addis 97.1's HIV/AIDS phone-in show empirically derived from how participants in the interactions make sense of, and respond to, each other. It has also brought to light that the participants conduct their communication with an orientation to the institutional requirement. This is made evident in the overall organization of their interaction and co-construction of their roles and relationships. In sum, it has been observed that the target radio phone-in participants organize their communication in a fairly repetitive pattern, enact from multiplicity of roles, align and disalign with some form of actions, and position each other symmetrically and asymmetrically to the attainment of the program's goal: *modelling of a desirable health behaviour and stance*.

References

- Agha, A. (2007). *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arminen, I. (2005). *Institutional Interaction: Studies of Talk at Work*. Aldersho, England: Ashgate Publishing.
- Bala, A.B. (2004). Radio phone-in programme as a powerful tool to generate awareness on HIV/AIDS. *International Conference on AIDS*. Bangkok, Thailand. Available in <http://gateway.nlm.nih.gov/MeetingAbstracts/ma?f=102281401.html>
- Barbour, R. and Kitzinger, J. (eds) (1999) *Developing Focus Group Research*. London: Sage.
- Bell, A. (1995). Language and the Media, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press, 15, 23-41
- Bhatia, V. (1993). *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. Harlow: Longman.
- Bhatia, V. (2004). *Worlds of Written Discourse: A Genre-Based View*. London: Continuum.
- Bloomaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: a Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boden, D and Zimmerman, D. (eds.) 1991. *Talk and Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Social Structure*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.

Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, J.D. (2004). Research Methods in Applied Linguistics. In A. Davies and C. Elder. (Eds). *Handbbok of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Button, G. (1987) ‘Moving out of closings’, in G. Button and J. Lee (eds). *Talk and SocialOrganisation*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 101–51.

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

Cameron, D. and Hills, D. (1990) “‘Listening in”: negotiating relationships between listeners and presenters on radio phone- in programmes’, in G. McGregor and R. White (eds) *Reception and Response: Hearer Creativity and the Analysis of Spoken and Written Texts*, London: Routledge , pp. 53–68.

Carter, R. and McCarthy, M. (1997). *Exploring Spoken English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carter, R. and McCarthy, M. (2000). *Exploring Grammar in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Channell, J. (2000). Working on the telephone – how telephone receptionists workwith language. In Coulthard, M., Cotterill, C. and F. Rock (eds.) 2000: 221-230.

Clayman, S. E. (1988). Displaying neutrality in television news interviews. *Social Problems* 35(4): 474–92.

- Clayman, S. E. (1989). 'The Production of Punctuality: Social Interaction, Temporal organization and social structure'. *American Journal of Sociology* 95 (3): 659– 91.
- Clayman, S. E. (1991). News interview openings: aspects of sequential organization. In P. Scannell (ed.), *Broadcast Talk: A Reader*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp. 48–75.
- Clayman, S. E. and Heritage, J. (2002). *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cobley, P. (1994) Throwing out the baby: Populism and active audience theory. *Media, Culture and Society*, 16: 677–87.
- Coulthard, M., Cotterill, C. and Rock, F.(2000). Dialogue Analysis VII: Working with Dialogue. (Selected papers from the 7th IADA conference, Birmingham 1999). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Coupland, N. and Coupland, J. (2000). 'Relational frames and pronominal address/reference: The discourse of geriatric medical triads'. In Sarangi, S. and M. Coulthard (eds.) : 207-229
- Crisell, A. (1994) *Understanding Radio*. London: Routledge.
- Crocker, A.R. (2009). An Introduction to Qualitative Research. In Heigham, J. and Crocker, A.R. (eds). *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan
- Cotter, C. (2001). Discourse and Media. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen and H. E. Hamilton (eds) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, pp. 416-436.

Oxford: Blackwell.

Davies, A. and Elder, C. (2004). *Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Davis, D.k. and Baran, S.J. (2006). *Mass Communication Theory: Foundations, Ferments and Future*. 4th ed. USA: Thomson Wadsworth.

van Dijk, T. (1997). *Discourse Analysis: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. London: Sage.

van Dijk, T. (1999). 'Critical Discourse Analysis and Conversation Analysis'.

Discourse & Society, 10 (4), 459-460. Available at

<http://d&s.sagepub.com/content/3/1/119>

van Dijk, T. (2001). 'Critical Discourse Analysis'. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen and H. E.

Hamilton (eds) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, pp. 352–71.

Oxford: Blackwell.

van Dijk, T. (2007). 'Discourse & Communication: a new journal to bridge two fields'.

Discourse and Communication, 1(1): 5-7. London: Sage Publications.

available at <http://d&c.sagepub.com/content/3/1/119>

Drew, P. and J. Heritage. (1992). *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*.

(eds). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P. and Sorjonen, M. (1997). 'Institutional Discourse'. In T. van Dijk (ed.),

Discourse Analysis: A Multidisciplinary Introduction. London: Sage, pp.

92–118.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: polity.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media Discourse*. London: Arnold.

- Firth, A. (ed.) (1995). *The Discourse of Negotiation: Studies of Language in the Workplace*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Fitch, K.L. and R. E. Sanders. (2005). *Handbook of Language and Social Interactions*.(eds). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Fitzgerald, R. and W. Housley. (2002). 'Identity, categorization and sequential organization: the sequential and categorical flow of identity in a radio phone-in'. *Discourse and Society*. Vol. 13:579 available at <http://das.sagepub.com/content/13/5/579>
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.
- Freed, A.F. and Ehrlich, S. (2010). "*Why Do You Ask?*" *The Function of Questions in Institutional Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Freire, P. (1997). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed (Revised Edition)*. New York: Continuum.
- Gallois, C. and Giles, H. (1998). Accommodating Mutual Influence in Intergroup Encounters. In M.T. Palmer. *Mutual Influence in Interpersonal Communication: Theory and Research Cognition, Affect and Behavior*. New York: Albex.
- Gebremedhin Simon (2006). 'African Media Development Initiative: Ethiopia Case Study'. London: BBC World Service Trust. Available at www.bbcworldservicetrust.org/amdi
- Gee, J.P. (2005). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. London: Routledge.
- Geller, V. (2007). *Creating Powerful Radio: Getting, Keeping, and Growing Audiences*. \

Oxford: Elsevier Inc.

- Goffman, E. (1955). 'On Face Work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction' In Jaworski, A. and N. Coupland. (2006). (eds). *The Discourse Reader*. London: Routledge. PP 299-310.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gramsci, A. (1971) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Greatbatch, D. L. (1988). 'A turn-taking system for British news interviews'. *Language in Society* 17(3):401–30.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumucio-Dagron, A. and Tufte, T. (2006). *Communication for Social Change Anthology: Historical and Contemporary Readings*. New Jersey: Communication for Social Change Consortium.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *Theory of Communicative Action*. Vol. 1. London: Heinemann.
- Hall, S. (1980). 'Encoding/decoding' In S. Hall, D. Hobson, A. Lowe and P. Willis (eds), *Culture, Media, Language*. London: Hutchison.
- Hall, S., Hobson, D., Lowe, A. and Willis, P. (eds) (1980) *Culture, Media, Language*. London: Hutchison.
- Halliday, M. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis: a practical guide*. London: Sage.
- Heath, R. and Bryant, J. (2000). *Human Communication Theory and Research: Concepts, Contexts, and Challenges*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Hester, S. and Eglin, P. (1997) *Culture in Action: Studies in Membership Categorisation Analysis*. Washington, DC: University Press of America.
- Heritage, J. (1985). 'Analysing News Interviews: aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience' In Teun A. Dijk (ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, vol. 3. New York: Academic Press: 95–119.
- Heritage, J. and Sefi, S. (1992). 'Dilemmas of Advice: Aspects of Delivery and Reception of Advice in Interactions between Health Visitors and First Time Mothers', In Drew and Heritage (1992).
- Heritage, J. and Raymond, G. (2005). 'The Terms of Agreement: indexing epistemic authority and subordination in assessment sequences'. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68(1): 15–38.
- Heritage, J. and S. Clayman. (2010). *Talk in Action: Interactions, Identities, and Institutions*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
- Hood, M. (2009). 'Case Study' In Heigham, J. and Croker, A.R. (eds). *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Housley, W. and Fitzgerald, R. (2000). 'Conversation Analysis, practitioner based research, reflexivity and reflective practice: some exploratory remarks' In *Ethnographic Studies Issues*. No.5
- Housley, W. and Fitzgerald, R. (2002) 'The Reconsidered Model of Membership Categorisation', *Qualitative Research* 2: 59–74.
- Hutchby, I. (1991) 'The organisation of talk on talk radio' In P. Scannell (ed.), *Broadcast*

Talk. London: Sage.

Hutchby, I. (1992) 'Confrontation talk: aspects of 'interruption' in argument sequences on talk radio'. *Text*, 12: 343–71.

Hutchby, I. (1995) 'Aspects of recipient design in expert advice-giving on call-in radio'. *Discourse Processes*, 19: 219–38.

Hutchby, I. (1996). *Confrontation Talk: Arguments, Asymmetries, and Power on Talk Radio*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hutchby, I. (1999). 'Frame attunement and footing in the organization of talk radio openings'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 3: 41–64.

Hutchby, I. (2001) 'Oh', irony and sequential ambiguity in arguments. *Discourse and Society*, 12: 123–41.

Hutchby, I. (2005). Conversation analysis and the Study of Broadcast Talk. In Fitch, K.L. and Robert E. Sanders. (2005). *Handbook of Language and Social Interactions*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Hutchby, I. and R. Wooffitt. (1998). *Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity.

Jacoby, S., & Ochs, E. (1995). Co-construction: An introduction. *Research on language and social interaction*, 28, 171–183.

Jaworski, A. and N. Coupland. Eds. (2006). *The Discourse Reader*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Jefferson, G. (1973) 'A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: overlapping

- tag- positioned address terms in closing sequences', *Semiotica*, 9: 47–96.
- Jensen, K. B.(2002). *A Handbook of Media and Communication Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Methodologies*. (Ed.), London: Routledge.
- Johnstone, B. (2002). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kaspar, G. 2000. 'Data collection in pragmatics research' In Spencer-Oatey H. (ed.): 316-341.
- Kibrom Berehane. (2011). 'Participatory Program Production, Public Deliberation and Prospects for Practising Public Journalism in Mekelle FM Radio Stations'. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa.
- Koester, A. (2004). *The Language of Work*. London: Routledge Taylor and Francis.
- Lawrence R. Frey Kenneth N. Cissna. (2009). *Routledge Handbook of Applied Communication Research*. London: Routledge.
- Lazaraton, A. (2009). 'Discourse Analysis' In Heigham,J. and Croker, A.R. (eds). *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Lemke, J. (1998). 'Analysing verbal data: Principles, methods and problems' In Tobin, K. and Fraser, B. (eds.) *International Handbook of Science Education*. Dordrecht and Boston: Kluwer Academic. 1175-1189. Available online at <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~jaylemke/papers/handbook.htm>.
- Levinson, S.C. (1992). 'Activity Types' In Drew and Heritage (1992).

- Livingstone, S. and Lunt, P. (1994). *Talk on Television: Audience Participation and Public Debate*. London: Routledge.
- MacCabe, C. (1985) *Theoretical Essays: Film, Linguistics, Literature*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Matheson, D. (2005). *Media Discourses: Analyzing Media Texts*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Mekuria Mekasha. (2005). 'Ethiopian media landscape'. EMMTI, Addis Ababa. Unpublished material.
- Millar, F.E. and L.E. Rodgers. (1987). 'Relational Dimensions of Interpersonal Dynamics' In Roloff, M.E. and Miller, G.R. (eds). *Interpersonal Processes: New Directions in Communication Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ministry of Health. (2010). 'HIV Behaviour Change Communication Framework (Ethiopia)'. Federal HIV/AIDS Prevention and Control Office.
- Moerman, M. (1988). *Talking Culture: Ethnography and Conversation Analysis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Moore, S. (1993) *Interpreting Audiences*. London: Sage.
- Moore, S. (2000). *Media and Everyday Life in Modern Societies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Moss, P. and Higgins, C. (1984). Radio Voices, Culture and Society, 6, 353-375.
- Myer, G. (2004). *Matters of Opinion: Talking about Public Issues*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Myer, G. (2005). Applied Linguistics and Institutions of Opinion. *Applied Linguistics* 26 (4), 527-544.
- Myer, G. (2007). 'Enabling Talk'. *Text and Talk*, 27(1), 79-105.
- Nightingale, V. (1996) *Studying Audiences*. London: Routledge.
- Ochs, E. (1979). Transcription as theory. In E. Ochs & B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Developmental pragmatics* (pp. 43–72). New York: Academic Press.
- O'Keeffe, A. (2006). *Investigating Media Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Palmer, M. T. (1998). *Mutual Influence in Interpersonal Communication: Theory and Research in Cognition, Affect and Behaviour*. New York: Albex.
- Perakyla, A. (1995) *AIDS Counselling: Institutional Interaction and Clinical Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Perakyla, A. and Silverman, D. (1991). 'Reinterpreting Speech –exchange Systems: Communication Formats in AIDS Counselling', *Sociology*, 25(4): 627: 51
- Pitout, M. (2001) 'Reception Theory' IN: P.J. Fourie ed. *Media Studies: content, Audience and Production* Vol. 2 South Africa: Juta Education, 243-263.
- Population Media Centre - Ethiopia. (2010). 'Media Communication for Social and Behaviour Change'. 10th Anniversary Special Issue.
- Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation Analysis: The Study of Talk-in-Interaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA and London: Sage.
- Raymond, G. and Heritage, J. (2006). 'The epistemics of social relations: Owning Grandchildren'. *Language in Society*. 35, 677–705. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Renkema, J. (1993). *Introduction to Discourse Studies*. John Benjamins

Ross, K. and Nightingale, V. (2003) *Media Audiences: New Perspectives*. Maidenhead:

Open University Press.

Sacks, H. (1992) *Lectures on Conversation* (2 Vols. ed. G. Jefferson). Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. and Jefferson, G. (1974) 'A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking for conversation'. *Language*, 50: 696–735.

Sarangi, S. (2005). 'The conditions and consequences of professional discourse studies'.

Journal of Applied Linguistics, vol 2.3, 371–394.

Sarangi, S. and Coulthard, M. (eds.) (2000). *Discourse and Social Life*. London:

Longman.

Scannell, P. (1991). *Broadcast Talk*. London: Sage.

Scannell, P. (1996) *Radio, Television and Modern Life*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schegloff, E.A. (1986) 'The routine as achievement', *Human Studies*, 9: 111–52.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). 'On talk and its institutional occasions' In Drew, P. and J.

Heritage: 101-134.

Schegloff, E. A. (1996). 'Issues of relevance for discourse analysis: Contingency in

action, interaction and co-participant context' In *Computational and*

Conversational Discourse: Burning Issues C An Interdisciplinary

Account, E. H. Hovy and D. R. Scott (eds), 3–35. Berlin and New York:

Springer-Verlag.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D. and Hamilton, H.E. (2001). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. (eds). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Seaman, W.R. (1992) 'Active audience theory: Pointless populism'. *Media, Culture and Society*, 14(2): 301–11.
- Silverman, D. (1997). *Discourses of Counselling: HIV Counselling as Social Interaction*. London: Sage.
- Silverman, D. and Marvasti, A. (2008). *Doing Qualitative Research: a Comprehensive Guide*. London: Sage.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (ed.) (2000). *Culturally Speaking: Managing Rapport through Talk across Cultures*. London: Continuum.
- Tadesse Zinaye. (2010). 'Media in Ethiopia: The beginnings, developments, and Challenges'. Available at www.ecss.org.et/.../BROADCASTING%20IN%20ETHIOPIA%20II.ppt
- Talbot, M. (2007). *Media Discourse: Representation and Interaction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Taylor, S. (2001). 'Locating and Conducting Discourse Analytic Research' In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. J. Yates. *Discourse as Data*. (Eds.). London: Open University.
- Thornborrow, J. (1999). 'Language and the Media' In Linda Thomas & Shan Wareing (eds). *Language, Society and Power: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Thornborrow, J. (2001a). 'Questions, Control and the Organization of Talk in Calls to a Radio Phone'. *Discourse Studies*, 3(1): 119- 143. London: Sage.

Available at <http://dis.sagepub.com/content/3/1/119>

Thornborrow, J. (2001b). 'Authenticating talk: building public identities in audience participation broadcasting'. *Discourse Studies* 3(4): 459–79. London:

Sage. Available at <http://dis.sagepub.com/content/3/1/119>

Thornborrow, J. (2002) *Power Talk*. London: Pearson.

Thornborrow, J.(2010). 'Questions and institutionality in public broadcasting' In Alice F. Freed and Susan Ehrlich. (Eds). "*Why Do You Ask?*" *The Function of Questions in Institutional Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tibebe Mergia (2006). 'Decoding Messages: A Reception Analysis of How Youth Make Sense of HIV/AIDS Messages of Yebekal Radio Program'. Unpublished Thesis, Addis Ababa University: Addis Ababa.

Tigist Mekonnen. (2010). 'Interactive Use of Radio: The Case of Yichalal Radio Program'. Unpublished Thesis, Addis Ababa University: Addis Ababa.

Tolson, A. (2006). *Media Talk: Spoken Discourse on TV and Radio*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Tracy, K. (2001). Discourse analysis in communication. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. Hamilton (eds.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 725–749). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Tracy, K. and Mirivel, C.J. (2009). 'Discourse Analysis: The Practice and Practical Value of Taping, Transcribing, and Analyzing Talk' In Lawrence R. Frey Kenneth N. Cissna.

- Tsegaye Beyene. (2007). 'The Role of the Voice of the Revolution of Tigray Radio in Setting HIV/AIDS as an Agenda and Initiating Audience Participation: The Case of Mekelle Town'. Unpublished Thesis, Addis Ababa University: Addis Ababa.
- Ward, D. (2011). 'Ethiopia Media Mapping'. Electoral Reform International Services.
- William k, (2003) *Understanding Media Theory*. London: Arnold.
- Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research: design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Zelalem Tesfaye. (2010). 'Media Communication Campaign in Promoting Free Public Discussion Dialogue and Debate about HIV/AIDS and Sexuality Related Issues'. Unpublished Thesis, Addis Ababa University: Addis Ababa.
- Zimmerman, D. (1998). 'Identity, context and interaction' In Antaki, C. and S. Widdicombe (eds.) *Identities in Talk*. London: Sage. 87-106.

Key to Transcription Notations

Excerpt (5) 3: 04/09/11, 1:2 shows that this is the **fifth** exemplar in the data analytic

chapter, it was the **third** host-caller speech exchange broadcast on

04, 09, 11 (*date, month, year* respectively), part **one**, in the **second** session

of the talk in part one

{h+} use of honorific marker

[...] previous or subsequent omitted talk at the beginning or end of a turn

(.) short pause of less than (.5) of a second

(1.0) timed pause in seconds

[] overlapping talk [marks onset of overlap,] marks end of overlap

hello=

=hello latching (no hearable gap) between the end of one turn to the beginning of

the next

(xxx) indecipherable talk

→ marks the lines of transcript relevant to a point made in the text

? rising tone

. falling tone

(Adapted from *Hutchby and Wooffitt, 1998*)