

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University
Microfilms
International**

300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Bronstein, Eva Mindy

**LOCAL CALL-IN RADIO: A STUDY OF THE SEARCH FOR ADVICE AND
SOCIAL NETWORKS**

City University of New York

Ph.D. 1984

**University
Microfilms
International**

300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1983

by

Bronstein, Eva Mindy

All Rights Reserved

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark ✓.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy ✓
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ✓
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages ✓
15. Other _____

University
Microfilms
International

LOCAL CALL-IN RADIO: A STUDY OF THE SEARCH FOR
ADVICE AND SOCIAL NETWORKS

by

EVA M. BRONSTEIN

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate
Faculty in Sociology in partial fulfill-
ment of the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy, The City Univer-
sity of New York.

1983

COPYRIGHT BY
EVA M. BRONSTEIN
1983

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty In Sociology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dec. 16, 1983
date

Charles Winick
Chairman of Examining Committee

Dec 16 1983
date

Boyle Denick
Executive Officer

Charles Winick
Charles Winick

William Kornblum
William Kornblum

Michael Brown
Michael Brown

Philip Leonhard-Spark
Philip Leonhard-Spark

The City University of New York

Abstract

LOCAL CALL-IN RADIO:
A STUDY OF THE SEARCH
FOR ADVICE AND SOCIAL NETWORKS

by

Eva M. Bronstein

Adviser: Charles Winick

The present study used content analysis, survey research and in-depth personal interviews to test whether resourceful people turn to advice formats on radio in times of increased change and impermanence. An examination of the social network possibilities was also conducted. Radio history and the unique characteristics of intimacy, immediacy and anonymity make radio a suitable source of information and advice, as well as the creation of a social network of "unfamiliar others". The findings of this study goes counter to previous studies that were critical of those who turned to call-in radio.

It was found that listeners selectively expose themselves to call-in hosts; hosts presented an identifiable and consistent view of the world. Audience perceptions of that presentation matches that of the content analysis. Call-in radio both reflected and promoted shared social reality. Many listeners consider call-in radio to be a "Window on the World," calling it an honest slice-of-life, a vehicle for catharsis and vicarious experience.

Hosts were considered credible and proficient. Older,

male hosts enjoyed the greatest listener agreement, and were found less likely to interrupt or abruptly terminate calls made by women.

Topics such as health, personal finance, family advice and the economy were considered by the listeners to be most interesting and most likely to lead to discussion and personal use.

The call-in hosts were found to "frame" calls by using cues to both encourage and discourage calls as well as assert authority. Hosts encouraged callers by allying themselves with callers; they discouraged them by being impatient with callers. The audience perception of hosts as believable and expert was confirmed by content analysis and radio staff evaluation.

Social learning and parasocial interaction were two consequences of call-in radio. Listeners admitted to vicarious reinforcement and considered the hosts to be friends and coworkers.

Radio anonymity was necessary to open the discussion of private issues and protect callers from sanctions. Listeners stereotyped those who call finance shows as being "Interested" and those who call psychotherapy shows as "Lonely". The difference in subject matter and appeal explain this difference. Listeners and radio staff identify three motivations for calling: Free advice, holding a legitimate question, and ventilation of frustration.

Fishman's work on conversation analysis and gender

difference was applied to host and caller interaction. Male hosts were found less likely to interrupt or abruptly terminate a female caller. However, one call-in producer noted that male callers made more statements, female callers asked for questions.

Call-in radio staff were found to be "hegemonic" (see Gramsci, Williams, Gitlin, Sallach) as a result their self-defined roles, responsibilities, the "community" they attend to, and the screening process which defines and limits discussion. Hosts were found, in general, to present a conservative view of the world that protects the status quo. However, call-in radio was found a more open forum of ideas than other commercial radio formats.

Another use and gratification of call-in radio was that of "connecting" with others in the creation of a social network.

"Thus Democratic theory, starting from it's fine vision of ultimate human dignity, was forced by lack of the instruments of knowledge for reporting its environment, to fall back upon the wisdom and experience which happened to have accumulated in the voter. These chosen people in their self-contained environment had all the facts before them. The environment was so familiar that one could take it for granted that men were talking about substantially the same things... In the self-contained community one could assume, or at least did assume, a homogenous code of morals".

-- "The Self-Contained Community"

"Our knowledge of human institutions is still extraordinarily meager and impressionistic. The gathering of social knowledge is, on the whole, still haphazard... And yet, the collection of information will not be made, one may be sure, for the sake of its ultimate use. It will be made, because modern decision requires it to be made. But as it is being made, there will accumulate a body of data which political science can turn into generalization, and build up for the schools into a conceptual picture of the world. When that picture takes form, civic education can become a preparation for dealing with an unseen environment".

-- "The Appeal to the Public"

From Walter Lippman, "The World Outside and the Pictures in Our Head," Public Opinion (1965).

PREFACE

In quiet moments, one is sometimes likely to flip through high school yearbooks and revel in youthful aspirations. Reflections of future dreams and good wishes are inscribed by friends, fellow students and teachers. One childhood friend, Dana, promises she'll look for my best-seller to hit the stands. Poetry "Guru" Mr. Glynn called me the "Girl with the golden vocabulary". Class wit and orchestra leader, Larry, admonishes me to "Speak up -- stay intellectual and don't be afraid to display knowledge. Too many people are, and they 'forget' to sign names". I left for college with the energy to write, write, write. Alas, one Freshman English Composition class killed off that dream.

I had always hoped to write a play, a novella or some poetry. Instead of poetry I wrote print and radio news copy. My dream of becoming a playwright was realized in producing cultural specials for a local, independent television station in New York. And I discover that, eleven years after my High School Yearbook, the bestseller my friends await is not a bestseller at all. It's not a play, a novel or even a book of poetry. It is, in fact, an in-depth look at the local, call-in radio show in New York. What? You're doing a serious study on something we listen to in the car, something only 'wackos' are interested in? Along with the shrugs, laughs and grimaces, I received much support.

Many thanks to my Dissertation committee: Chairman Charles Winick spearheaded the study and shared his breadth of knowledge, experience and insight with me. Philip Leonhard-Spark provided careful evaluation and re-evaluation of my work and his emphasis on organization. William Kornblum offered leadership and guidance. Michael Brown shared perceptive and creative ideas shared in his cigar-smoke-filled office.

My gratitude to my professors at the CUNY Graduate Center who shared their interests and expertise with me. To Pat Kendall, for her important and precedent-setting research on radio. Her evaluation of the survey instrument and discussion of in-depth interviewing was indispensable; Charles Kadushin, for his aid in setting up the computer program and for sharing his WBAI data; Gaye Tuchman, on her provocative talks on the "Production of Culture"; Jack Hammond, for his open forum on Social Movements and Emile Oestereicher, on his compelling introduction to the theories of Marx, Durkheim and Weber.

Fellow students were confidantes, supporters and springboards for ideas. Special appreciation to Lloyd Klein, who carefully reviewed my notes and offered constructive and sociological advice; and to Steve Gorelick who gave freely of himself as he supplied financial and moral support. Thanks to my study groups, Linda Siebert, Frances Kasbob and Seth Wellin, who taught me so much on those hot Tuesday afternoons. Thanks for the friendship, guidance and good

times to: Elizabeth Boian, Vernon Boggs, Ann Weinrib, Victor Ayala, Aviva Cohen, Lloyd Wishoff, Trudy Gruber and Will Petrie. And to the two women who keep the Sociology Department in step and offer their friendship and sympathy, much thanks to Marian Smith and Madeline Cover.

I am grateful to the Eastern Sociological Society for its positive and encouraging reception of the initial call-in radio study presented in March, 1983. Thanks to the hard-working people down at the Computer Center of the Graduate Center for directing me through the SPSS labrynth. Special thanks to Jeanne Strauss of WMCA, Bob Bruno, Jeff Byers, Jim McAleer, Mimi Lopez and Robert Alden at WOR and Mark Mason and Walter Mysolowski of WABC for their valuable time and insight. Thanks to Christine Nastri for her careful typing of the manuscript and to my brother, Herb, for his speedy reproduction of the radio transcripts.

I am grateful to my colleagues at Brooklyn College, Don MacLennan, Dale Franszwa and Bill Sheppard. Their guidance, support and professionalism was greatly welcomed by this "kid" in the Radio and Television Department. Many thanks for the encouragement afforded by the Department of Communication at the University of New Haven, chaired by Dr. Steven Rauscher. And I am grateful for all the challenges posed by my students, they keep me on my toes, both as a academician and a broadcaster. Special thanks to Sue Leibowitz who assisted in the phone survey.

This study represents the culmination of many months of research and many years of dreams. I am deeply grateful to my immediate family and personal friends who shared the dream with me by their support and understanding. Also, special thanks to the radio call-in fans, Gloria Lipton and Frank Magdevido, for their personal interest and commitment to call-in radio.

It has always been my desire that radio and television promote the exchange of ideas and improve lives. I hope this study may further that cause.

Eva M. Bronstein
August, 1983
Brooklyn, New York

Table of Contents

Preface

Chapter 1	Radio Call-In Programs: A Socio- logical Concern.	1
Chapter 2	The History of Radio Call-In Pro- gramming	18
Chapter 3	Study Methodology.	28
Chapter 4	Reflecting and Promoting Shared Social Reality	41
Chapter 5	Impression Management by Call-In Hosts	106
Chapter 6	Host Appeal and the Assertion of Authority.	182
Chapter 7	Social Learning and Parasocial Interaction.	199
Chapter 8	The Caller: Anonymity, Caller Stereotypes and Gender Differences	228
Chapter 9	The Production of Culture.	252
Chapter 10	Conclusion.	287
References		317
Appendices		326

CHAPTER ONE

RADIO CALL-IN PROGRAMS: A SOCIOLOGICAL CONCERN

Driving north on the New Jersey Turnpike, one Saturday afternoon, a passenger takes note of what radio program is broadcast from each toll booth along the way: Bernard Meltzer's "What's Your Problem" show on WOR. At ten o'clock in the morning a housewife in Brooklyn awakens, then sets her three house radios to talk radio stations. She insists on keeping all three radios playing all day and night so that she may travel about the house and not miss any "talk". She also carries a portable radio, tuned to call-in radio, to the supermarket and bank. She sets her social schedule around these programs and retires to bed at about 2 a.m. In Manhattan, repeat caller and local radio call-in show "celebrity", Frank, receives an envelope from WMCA. In it are letters from people who listen to him call, cajole and argue with talk show hosts. Along with the letters is an audio cassette. It seems that a member of Frank's spontaneous "fan club" has taped Frank's conversations with talk hosts and edited them to create a "Best of Frank" tape. How does this fan know when Frank will be on the air? Often Frank is summoned by the host over the air or is requested by other callers on-air.

New Yorkers are filled with stories of the dependence and consequence of radio call-in programming. What accounts for it's recent popularity? What is actually going on?

Is this a normal or healthy response to the changes in society?

The Complexity of Life

Social futurist Toffler (1970:33-34) analyzed the impact of industry, technology and science on social institutions in his precedent-setting Future Shock. He emphasizes the acceleration of change in society, resulting in greater "transcience" or impermanency in relationships. He warns,

"...The acceleration of change in society increases the difficulty of coping with life. This stems from the fantastic intrusion of novelty, newness into our existence. Each situation is unique. But situations often resemble one another. This, in fact, is what makes it possible to learn from experience. If each situation were wholly novel, without some resemblance to previously experienced situations, our ability to cope would be hopelessly crippled.

The acceleration of change, however, radically alters the balance between novel and familiar situations. Rising rates of change thus compel us not merely to cope with a faster flow, but with more and more situations to which previous personal experience does not apply. And the psychological implications of this simple fact, which we shall explore later, are nothing short of explosive.

'When things start changing outside, you are going to have a parallel change taking place inside,' says Christopher Wright of the Institute for the Study of Science and Human Affairs. The nature of these inner changes is so profound, however, that, as the accelerative thrust picks up speed, it will test our ability to live within the parameters that have until now defined man and society. In the words of psychoanalyst Erik Erikson, 'In our society of change at present, the (natural course of events) is precisely that the rate of change should continue to accelerate up to the

as-yet-unreached limits of human and institutional adaptability'.

To survive, to avert what we have termed future shock, the individual must become infinitely more adaptable and capable than ever before. He must search out totally new ways to anchor himself, for all the old roots -- religion, nation, community, family or profession -- are now shaking under the hurricane impact of the accelerative thrust. Before he can do so, however, he must understand in greater detail how the effects of acceleration penetrate his personal life, creep into his behavior and alter the quality of existence."

Gemeinschaft

The concept of the ever more complex society was first advanced by Tonnies (1887). His "Gemeinschaft" describes a close-knit community where social interaction among people is intimate and familiar. In contrast, Gesellschaft describes urban life, where there is little sense of commonality between people and social interaction is distant and limited. Durkheim adds to this study of social structure with his examination of mechanical and organic solidarity. Early, preindustrial society was labelled "mechanical solidarity" because society was dominated by the existence of a strongly formed set of shared sentiments and beliefs, that he called the "conscience collective". In this form of society there exists little differentiation between individuals. In The Elementary Forms of Religious Life (1947, 1912) he demonstrates that religious rituals and ceremonies served to both reaffirm faith and unite the tribe. However, he draws from Darwin's "survival of the

fittest" in that he explains the division of labor as a struggle for existence. Weber characterizes Tonnies' "Gemeinschaft" as a social relationship based on tradition, emotional and familial ties.

Gesellschaft

In "Capitalism and Rural Society in Germany (Gerth and Mills, 1958), Weber identifies the following causes of Capitalism: The density of the population, the high value of land, increasing rationalism and predestination in ascetic Protestantism and the diversity of occupations. In Division of Labor (1933, 1893), Durkheim states that the world had become increasingly rationalized, penetrated with a "moral individualism". Some of the causes for the division of labor that characterizes "organic solidarity" are: The concentration of populations, the formation of cities, advances in communications and transportation, resulting in social segments losing their individuality. Intelligence becomes keener with an increased competition in the struggle and individuals diversity as they exert greater freedom from the conscience collective. People become interdependent on each other to have their needs satisfied. A "cult of the individual" predominates as social life secularizes and focuses on individual worth and dignity. Weber sees Gesellschaft as social integration based on self-interest, regulated by contracts.

his theories on the transition from Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft. The speed at which we as individuals diversify greatly alters the permanence with which we relate to others. The "others" include family, friends, coworkers and the like. Futurist Toffler (1970:342) cites the increasing importance of "crisis counseling". This counseling is in response to major life changes or transitions. Are all that seek counseling to be considered sick? Toffler thinks not,

"Not only are there many kinds of present-day life transitions for which no counseling help is provided, but the invasion of novelty will slam individuals up against wholly new kinds of personal crises in the future. And as the society races toward heterogeneity, the variety of problems will increase. In slowly changing societies the types of crises faced by individuals are more uniform and the sources of specialized advice more easily identifiable....The answer is a counterpart to the situational grouping system -- a counseling set-up that not only draws on full-time professional advice givers, but on multitudes of lay experts as well.... Once again, there is nothing new about people seeking advice from one another. What is new is our ability, through the use of computerized systems, to assemble situational groups swiftly...and to do so with considerable respect for privacy and anonymity.... Under that system, the giving and getting of advice becomes a highly personalized process that not only helps individuals crest the currents of change in their own lives, but helps cement the entire society together in a kind of 'love network' -- an integrative system based on the principle of 'I need you as much as you need me'".

Radio is the most personal and intimate of all forms of mass media. It is often listened to alone, as opposed

Anomie and Disenchantment With Life

The negative by-product of division of labor and the "cult of the individual" is anomie. In Suicide, anomie accounts for the different suicide rates in France. For Durkheim (1951, 1897), when the conscience collective has become so weakened that it holds little control over the individual, moral disintegration results. Bendix (1971) in Scholarship and Partisanship: Essays notes that Weber stresses that as specialization increases, man is less the master of his own work and more subject to alienation. Weber calls this "disenchantment with the world". Also industrialization and democratization destroy human relations by loosening personal obligations to community. In Weber's The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (1958, 1904), "utter loneliness" results when the individual relates one-on-one to God without the intervention of a religious hierarchy. All of life becomes more rationalized and bureaucratized. Responsibilities and privileges are prescribed by bureaucratic, fixed rules backed by authority. In contrast to Durkheim, these regulations become oppressive to individualism. Bureaucratic rules stress specialized training, thereby creating a new elite. The rewards of financial success benefit the individual, not the collective.

Radio Advice

It is now almost 100 years since Tonnies first advanced

to group listening. Transistor and car radios can be as mobile as the listener. A rapport is established between the radio host or announcer based on respect, trust and credibility. Those who participate on radio shows are guaranteed their privacy and anonymity because radio presents no picture. The listener is more closely drawn to radio than to visual media because the imagination is called into play to make sense out of sound broadcasting. In technological terms, radio is also the most "immediate" medium. News and information can be disseminated most quickly, from studio or on-location microphone, through telephone lines, to station transmitter and picked up on the radio receiver. Print media stories must be written, typed, typeset, printed, distributed. Television, before the advent of the on-location live minicam, had to tape or film a story, edit it, then place it on the air, once the time was cleared from other programming. Radio's intimacy, immediacy, privacy, mobility, as well as the importance of imagination and trust, make radio a perfect source of information and advice. Intimacy and privacy permit the honest sharing of embarrassing and difficult problems. Imagination and trust make what is presented on radio believable and personally adaptable. The immediacy of radio keeps the subject of discussion current. Radio's mobility makes it available to all.

Why are people turning to call-in radio in New York?

In a personal interview, WOR's Executive Producer, Jeff Byers, states,

"In a city environment like New York, you look for connections to bridge the sense of anonymity. Radio is a very intimate medium, it allows something to the imagination and people come in on the phone while radio call-in finds people 'at home' in their environment. There's not a lot of baggage (in radio production), no lights, cameras, etc. In rural areas, people also want to make connections, but over distance. They need an immediate source of comment on the news".

WABC's Program Director, Mark Mason, in a personal interview, stresses interpersonal strain,

"There's a perception that we live in a complex world. It seems so different from the 50s and 60s. Particularly in New York, so many pressures from people, jobs, family, friends, etc. Relationships need time and time is hard to find these days".

Alternative survival techniques are suggested in a personal interview by WMCA's Vice President and Program Director, Jeanne Strauss, as an explanation for its continued popularity,

"The shows are an opportunity for people to talk and work through their problems and the host shows them different possibilities. Advice has always been important. Communication is more wide open now that it used to be and will become increasingly wider... The society we live in will be increasingly complex and people will be more interested in themselves and their place in the world".

WABC's Director of Research, Walter Mysolowski, in a personal interview, emphasizes people's universal insecurities as a reason for its' popularity,

"Call-in shows are popular everywhere. There are a lot of people with a lot of insecurities, 'Am I normal?', 'Do I experience what everyone else experiences?'... These shows (especially at night) fulfill a need that help people get through another day".

The breakdown of familial connections is endemic in the "Gesellschaft". So is the stress on relationships caused by time and work pressures. The diversity of opinions and increased specialization are results of the division of labor. Questions like "Am I normal?" point to anomie and disenchantment with the world. Is call-in radio a response to the complex, interdependent, stress-filled, insecure present? Definitely.

Community and Other Key Terms

Marshall McLuhan (1965) identified three stages of communication development: The tribal stage, where tribe leaders or clan chiefs controlled a communication environment of familiar others resulting in fluid, rich, non-regimented interaction; the "Gutenberg stage" where, in the 1450's as a result of the invention of movable type, a linear, organized communication system was established to reach out to a mass audience of heterogeneous, unfamiliar others.

The final and current stage of communication development is called the "Global Village". As a result of the increased sophistication of media technologies and improvements in education and information dissemination, the world,

as diverse as it is, shrinks to no more than a village. The mass media connects us to our neighbors both across the street and across the ocean. In this stage we go full circle and return to the tribe of familiar, homogenous others. The communality and shared values, beliefs and attitudes of the tribe in pre-Gutenberg days is restored by new media technologies and media program formats.

Call-in radio and cable television herald the "Global Village". They are two-way, interactive media forms. The receiver is not a passive recipient; he or she acts and reacts to messages narrowcast on these more select and targeted media forms. With participatory media, the mass media are reduced to the simple stimulus-response communication model advanced by Lasswell. In his model, feedback is crucial but often delayed or non-existent in traditional forms of the mass media. Interactive media such as call-in radio and two-way cable television depend on feedback. "Strangerness" is reduced when many share in creating a social reality complete with values, beliefs and attitudes. These are no longer isolated radio or television viewers. They join the ranks of a continuously-emerging homogeneous audience. A diverse but committed and active community or social network is formed.

What reality does this new community share? The interactive systems of mass communications, it must be noted, are not free forms. Just as in the phone call, there is

someone who initiates a dialog, the respondent replies and feedback ensues. Listeners and callers selectively expose themselves to particular radio programs, primarily based on the appeal of the host and the subject matter to be discussed. The calls that do get on the air on commercial call-in radio have met the approval of the host's station producer. The hosts relies on his or her set style in responding to questions and participating in dialog. Certain types of calls and callers are elicited by each host in order to make the program unique, appealing and hopefully popular in the ratings.

Goffman's (1959) "Impression Management" study is instructive here. This dramaturgical approach concludes that the host controls the interaction or dialog. His or her role is to share and promote social values, legitimize the interaction, maintain "team" solidarity and assure anonymity. This can only be achieved if the host has earned the audience's trust and allegiance. The host turns the audience into a "team", another term for a social network. He or she achieves control solely by influencing the definition of the situation. This "definition of the situation" parallels the shared social reality and includes all values, beliefs and attitudes endorsed by the host.

Goffman also states that the host/performer creates an impression of "Legitimacy" when s/he engenders in his audience the belief that he has related to them in a more

ideal way than is always the case, even to the point of exaggerating the uniqueness of the transaction. The audience, in turn, expects a consistent, perfectly homogenous performance. The anonymity of the interchange between audience members and the host allow for increased intimacy, altruism, a privatizing of dialogue. This enables "Parasocial Interaction" to occur. Horton and Wohl (1956) found that parasocial interaction explained audience perception of media performers that goes beyond their immediate and apparent role. Often radio listeners regard talk show hosts as more than their present role; they might become friends, relatives, co-workers, acquaintances or mates in the lives and imaginations of listeners. Goffman alludes to this phenomenon when he writes of the "privilege of familiarity" created in the "team". The anonymity protected in call-in radio allows and encourages voyeurism as listeners freely and unabashedly eavesdrop into intimate and personal discussion. Bandura's "Social Learning Theory" (1971) is important here; his theory asserts that symbols provide the observer (or listener) with information on which to base subsequent behavior. Those who turn to call-in radio, as members of a team, are more susceptible to incorporating what they hear into their own lives. The "Global Village" theory of open communications among an expanded audience of familiar others allows for a greater diversity of values and behavior under exploration and possible adoption.

But what is the perception of the neighbors in this call-in radio community? Each commercial radio station screens calls to determine those most suitable for broadcast. Once a call passes successfully through the screening process it is met by the host. Using Fishman's (1978) analysis of gender differences in marital conversation it is interesting to note differences in power and control between host and caller by gender. Does the tone and topic of questions asked differ dramatically by gender? Fishman's work on conversation analysis is instructive here. Less than one percent of all listeners actually call-in to the program. What stereotypes of callers are harbored by the call-in listeners? CB radio studies are helpful here.

Kerbo et. al. (1978) study "Searching for 'Community' Lost" in a study of the popularity of Citizen Band radio. Wolfe (1976) underscores the alienation experienced, "My idea is that people today are feeling increasingly alienated...and this is an attempt to compensate for that by communicating with other people". Kerbo reasons that the CB subculture is motivated by expanding friendship networks of dependable others in a tightly knit, in-group structure. Yet Kerbo discovers a dissatisfaction with the "loss of community" theme (Gans, 1972, Sennett, 1976, Hunter, 1975, Kasarda and Janowitz, 1974). On the other hand, Lofland (1973), focuses instead on Simmel's (1950) "sociability" which is not a community but promotes a

feeling of community. Lofland states that sociability requires some order and can be pursued once the "strangerness" of the individual is reduced (1973:29). He suggests that "privatizing public space" will reduce "strangerness" (1973:118). This can be accomplished by creating dispersed villages where individuals travel to "familiar" areas so that strangerness is reduced (1973:137).

Kerbo's discussion of the CB subculture bears upon the examination of call-in radio. For one, out of alienation people turn to others. The CB subculture provides an expanding friendship network. Do the audiences (callers and listeners) of call-in radio programs present an intimate close-knit group of "dependable others"? And does call-in radio, like CB, promote sociability by "privatizing public space" and reducing "strangerness"?

Often the host is viewed as credible and sincere. Perception of the caller often reflects the hosts' treatment. Baiting is a term used to describe the host's abuse of the interaction process and s/he exploits the sensational in a callers' conversation. In the case of baiting the host goes beyond simply legitimizing his or her role to actually abusing the caller. The host plays a large role in shaping the shared social reality of his or her program, by both guiding callers and appealing to listeners.

A Marxian analysis of the control over social reality is called "The Production of Culture". It draws upon

Marx's notion that the dominant ideas in a society are promoted to subordinates in order to protect the interests of the dominant or capitalist class. Bourdieu grants that those elites have "culture capital" when they control any aspect of the media. Gitlin (1979:261) agrees that,

Commercial culture does not manufacture ideology, it relays and reproduces and processes and packages and focuses ideology that is arising both from social elites and from active social groups and movements throughout the society as well as within media organizations and practices".

Hence a community or social network is formed between social elites, social movements and mass media organizations. But do the "production of culture" theorists believe that alternative ideologies are capable of arising from this system? Sallach believes that the media sets limits or parameters on the scope and depth of discussion, thereby hampering the discussion of alternative or anti-establishment views.

Hypothesis

This study will examine two hypotheses. The first, whether, as life becomes more complex with change accelerated and relationships more transient, individuals will turn to advice-givers on radio. This examination will test the hypothesis that resourceful people will seek information and survival techniques by turning to call-in radio. The second hypothesis examines whether call-in radio, in an intimate way, creates a social network of "strangers" as it dis-

penses advice? Necessary elements of study include a review of the history of talk radio; the social reality shared by the call-in audience, host/caller/listener interaction, needs that are met for the caller, the consequences of radio advice, a study of the advice-givers and the ideology they create.

Organization of Study

Chapter Two, "The History of Radio Call-In Programming", presents a history of radio call-in programming, its audiences, popularity, business justification and initial social examination. Chapter Three, "Study Methodology", includes the methodology of study, which explains the content analysis of programming, random phone sample of listeners and personal interviews with station personnel. Chapter Four, "Reflecting and Promoting Shared Social Reality", offers the reader a descriptive look at what takes place on call-in radio by examining the shared social reality presented. Chapter Five, "Impression Management by Call-In Hosts", takes an interactionist approach to how communication is controlled by the host, using Goffman's "Impression Management" approach. Chapter Six, "Host Appeal and the Assertion of Authority", evaluates how the host asserts his or her authority and establishes audience trust. Chapter Seven, "Social Learning and Parasocial Interaction", examines two different ways people act on what is presented on call-in radio: Social learning and para-

social interaction. Chapter Eight, "The Caller: Anonymity Caller Stereotypes and Gender Differences", studies three aspects of the caller: The role of anonymity, gender differences and caller stereotypes. Chapter Nine, "The Production of Culture", applies the theories of "Production of Culture" to those people behind-the-scenes in call-in radio and an examination of the ideology created.

In all areas of mass communications, people seek an escape from the complex world by increasingly demanding information, and decreasing their dependence on fantasy or entertainment. Note the expansion of television network news in all dayparts, early morning, early and late evening, latenight and overnight as well as all-news radio and cable TV. This is coupled with the popularity of in-depth news and issue-oriented programming for both radio and television. WOR's Jeff Byers claims that call-in radio is symptomatic of a "reality hungry society" who are not escaping life with the fantasy movies of the 1940s but want to get a grasp on what is real.

CHAPTER 2 HISTORY OF CALL-IN RADIO PROGRAMMING

In order to examine why people turn to call-in radio, it is necessary to study the relatively short history of the call-in format. The "wireless" was invented by Marconi in 1895. The wireless radio was first used by amateur radio hobbyists and for maritime communication. The sinking of the Titanic made the public evermore aware of the potential benefits of radio. Radio blossomed in times of crisis. During World War II the public listened intently and with active participation to Edward R. Murrow as he broadcast atop the rooftops of wartorn London. Radio was established as a source of immediate, credible and involving source of information. However radio's prosperity suffered it's first major setback with the invent and popularity of television. It was television that went after radio's general audience with similar type programming: News, documentaries, drama, situation comedy and soap operas. And television could create greater excitement for the audience with the addition of pictures. So radio transformed into "formats" making an appeal to a specific, targeted segment of the audience, rather than compete with television for the general audience. The call-in format is one of the newest and presently most prolific formats in radio's still early life.

This chapter will examine the history and popularity

of the call-in radio format, initial social implications of the format and the significance of this study.

History And Popularity

In 1960, radio formats became more specialized and broadcasters turned to call-in talk programs with controversial personalities (Media Book, 1982). Telephone talk received attention with the acerbic Joe Pyne on Los Angeles' KABC in 1963. When WMCA in New York switched to the radio call-in format, it soared from nineteenth place to sixth place in the New York market (Newsweek, 1972). In 1976 it held a seven percent share of the market and claimed \$5 million in revenues (Forbes, 1976). Another call-in radio program pioneer was Bill Ballance with his "Feminine Forum" program in Los Angeles in 1970. On this controversial program, called "Topless Radio", female callers would expose their sex lives and fantasies. But by the end of the 1960s most call-in radio shows died as a result of manpower expenses, technical problems and undesirable audiences (Time, 1972). Yet in the 1980s, as FM radio predominates music with stereo sound, AM radio again considered the call-in format. Vice President of Gilmore Advertising, Inc., James H. Duncan, explains, "For many AM stations, the change to talk is a defensive move against severe profit erosion" (Business Week, 1981). Add to this rationale the decrease in production costs

and the greater desirability of the older audience (as our population ages) and we can begin to appreciate the proliferation of the AM radio call-in format.

Its popularity has been proven in all-sized markets, with varied programming themes. In San Francisco, Russ "The Moose" Syracuse attracts 50,000 listeners with "This is Love Line" on KSFO (Business Week, 1981). In Chicago, Wally Phillips attracts 1.5 million listeners with "The Answer Man" program on WGN (Newsweek, 1972). In Los Angeles, KABC's number one rated show, "The Toni Grant Show", offering psychological counseling, attracts 135,000 listeners (Rice, 1981). In New York, Bernard Meltzer attracts 200,000 listeners with his "What's Your Problem" show on WOR (Rice, 1981). WOR's General Manager, Rick Devlin, . boasts, "Our advertising revenues were \$15-16 million last year (1980). That's more than anyone else in the New York area and 25% higher than two years ago (Business Week, 1981). Nationally, the Larry King show "Open Line" is distributed to 253 radio stations (in 49 states) and attracts 4.3 million listeners nightly. The ABC AM Radio Network recently went with the call-in format. ABC Radio Programming Vice President, Rick Sklar, states, "Music on AM is doomed...Now AM has to evaluate itself again and see how it can survive without music. Talk and information is the obvious solution" (Goldman, 1982).

Market research demonstrates that the radio call-in program's audience profile is 45+, predominantly in the Northeast and Pacific regions, come from professional/managerial, clerical and sales occupations, 15% of them are college graduates and have a median income of \$19,500 (Media Book, 1982)(See: Appendix one).

According to TV/Radio Age (August 28, 1979), of all listening to AM stations in the top 10 market, 35 percent is to news/talk stations, number one among all broadcast formats in that market group. From the April/May 1979 Arbitron sweep, 10.4 percent of the leading stations in the top 50 markets programmed news and/or talk. In 1978 it was 4.8% of the total (See Appendix A). Among all leading AM stations in the top 50 metropolitan areas, 22.7 percent were news and/or talk. However there is a noted difference in market size. The news/talk accounts for 12.1% of listening in the top 50 markets, but only accounts for 5.0% in the 51st-100th market; This represents a drop of almost 60%.

Talk radio's popularity on AM radio is well-substantiated and makes sense to broadcasters. But why does it appeal to listeners and callers? General Manager of CBS O&O KMOX-AM in St. Louis, Robert Highland, states, "We started the all-talk format because we found that listeners and callers wanted a forum (Tuthill, 1969). The American

Jewish Committee concurs with this desire for civic participation,

"In recent years, call-in programs have responded to their growing audiences by touching on many controversial and provocative subjects. Ideally, such programs and their exchange of ideas could promote heightened awareness of social and political issues and motivate personal involvement in the democratic process"(Lowry, 1981:ii).

Initial Social Implications

Radio call-in programs can serve to connect or "network" strangers with common interests. Senior editor of Psychology Today, Berkeley Rice, likens the radio call-in show to the network of friends and relatives in his small town in Massachusetts. He states,

"Few people have family doctors or ministers--at least not the kind you turn to for help in times of emotional trouble. And fewer people live close enough to their relatives or stay in one place long enough to establish the kind of social networks that might provide help" (Rice, 1981).

Radio call-in programs have created a community-of-the-air, bringing strangers together to serve as a support network.

The interactive, two-way communication premise of talk radio serves another societal function: An outlet for criticism. An American Jewish Committee paper notes that "Talk shows provide a safety valve for disgruntled elements in our society which make it less likely that they will cause greater mischief" (Lowry, 1981:i).

Social researchers have studied a variety of gratifications obtained from the radio call-in show: The need for interpersonal contact (Turow, 1974), the ability to make opinions public (Avery, Ellis and Glover, 1978), the desire for political discussion and education (Crittenden, 1971) and as a response to loneliness (Bierrig and Dimmick, 1979).

Singer's (1973) analysis of three radio call-in stations in London, Ontario reveals the interrelationships between host, caller, subject matter and audience. The appeal of the host, called the talk jockey, is an important element in the gratification for callers and listeners. Professor Avery of the University of Utah, claims, "People don't want to engage in controversy. Instead they know the one who'll stroke them. The caller knows the host has the power--control of the on-off switch. They don't want to lose a confrontation" (Cohen, 1977).

The host gains his reputation by the calls that go on the air and how they're answered. What causes someone to call? Dr. Singer's content analysis reveals that the largest category of calls are independent of previous calls or hosts remarks (49%). The second strongest stimulus is the response to a previous call (41%)(Singer, 1973). The favorite topic of discussion (24% of calls studied by Singer) were about politics, government and social issues.

Significance Of The Study

Early research and commentary on mass media advice was discussed in Steiner's Where Do People Take Their Troubles? (1945). She was critical of those who offered psychological counseling in newspapers and over radio, "Those pseudo-consultants are answerable to no-one" (1945:4). She stressed the limitation of the media to solve problems, "Insofar as the problems presented were real ones, they were certainly too involved to be handled on a radio program" (1945:67). Not only was she suspicious of the sincerity of the callers and hosts, but she doubted the value of the advice, "The personal opinions of the psychologist have no value in the solution of the patient's problems. He needs advice that suits his life, not the consultants" (1945:30). She also had a negative view of those who sought the advice,

"From my experience as a column therapist I concluded that the writers of the letters are for the most part desperate, ready to take any tangible advice just by 'doing something about it'" (1945:55).

A host informed her of the trust that was afforded to radio by the audience,

"He stated frankly, 'People will write to a voice which enters the privacy of their homes, things which only God knows, once that voice has established their confidence. It becomes part of their daily routine. At first they only listen. Then they take the voice into their solemn confidence'" (1945:57).

More recent social research in mass communications has not kept pace with the increased use and impact of talk

radio. Only Benjamin Singer's book, Feedback and Society: A Study of the Uses of Mass Channels For Coping (1973) and a handful of articles (Crittenden, 1971, Turow, 1974, Avery et. al, 1978, and Bierig et. al., 1979) have approached limited aspects of the radio call-in format. Few have drawn implications from the appeal of this radio format to other interactive media that encourage expressive feedback. Also, there has been little discussion of how the increased popularity of talk radio reflects the health and stability of the social system.

No research has looked positively at those who avail themselves of call-in radio. This study will go counter to previous research. It will analyze the relationship between the program host, the caller, the listener and the topics under discussion. It will focus on the uses and gratifications perceived by host, callers and listeners and the social implications of this particular use of the medium and the content of messages transmitted. Is the radio call-in show a modern day answer to the Greek Forum and the New England Town meeting? Is the popularity of radio call-in programs functional to society or an indication of societal dysfunction? This study will approach these questions.

Summary

In summary, radio has had to adapt to changes in technology, its competition and popular taste. Radio had to target to specific audiences when faced with the competition of

television. Yet the qualities that make radio unique haven't changed: Intimacy, immediacy, credibility, imagination and as a source of news and information. AM had to adapt to the challenge of FM stereo music capability by adopting non-music formats, specifically all-news and talk call-in programming. Broadcasters found this move quite profitable as production costs decreased, audiences increased and the diversity of subjects appeared limitless. High advertising revenues encouraged other beleaguered AM radio stations to "talk up".

But why are people tuning in to call-in radio? Steiner's early writing on the value of media therapy is severely critical of the hosts, callers and the utility of the advice offered. Yet more recent researchers have commented on call-in radio's potential to further participatory democracy, serve to network and connect people and provide an outlet or "safety valve" for criticism. The only extensive work on call-in radio was completed by Singer, ten years ago, using three radio stations in Ontario, Canada. It should be noted that his locale of study is considered a "college town". The demographics particular to this area affect his study results. Ten years later call-in radio in the United States has mushroomed beyond broadcast market predictions and current practitioners have even higher expectations for the future of the format. In the next chapter "Study Methodology", we will examine an appropriate method of

studying the present questions: Do people turn to call-in radio in reaction to their perception of a complex and difficult world? And does the call-in program create a social network of "faceless" friends as it dispenses advice? In Chapter 4 "Reflecting and Promoting Shared Social Reality", we will study closely what transpires on some call-in radio programs by analyzing the shared social reality that is both reflected and promoted.

CHAPTER THREE

STUDY METHODOLOGY

Since the study primarily focuses on call-in radio and secondarily on changes in society, it must concern itself with an in-depth examination of various elements in the call-in process. Therefore, the call-in program and all its participants, both active and passive, must be considered. This includes the host and his or her staff, the caller, the listener and the program as areas of exploration. By examining these roles we can begin to test the two hypotheses at hand: Do resourceful people seek out information and survival techniques by turning to call-in radio? Does call-in radio, in an intimate way, create a social network of "strangers" as it dispenses advice?

The methodology included the selection of radio call-in shows, taping representative radio programs, transcribing the programs, developing an instrument for scrutiny of content, coding the content analysis; developing a list of random phone numbers in the five boroughs of New York City, developing an instrument to measure listener attitudes, coding the instrument, statistical tabulation and cross-tabulation, a content analysis for open-ended questions; setting up interviews with radio call-in host, producers, screeners, station management personnel, developing an instrument to explore station personnel roles and attitudes; a review of the literature, both scholarly and popular, on

the radio call-in format.

The first step was to select the programs that would be studied. Because this was a study of radio call-in as "community", only local, New York, commercial radio programs, were selected. Hosts were chosen who varied in daypart of their programs, radio station, host sex, age, popularity, longevity and subject matter. Two radio psychologists were chosen: Dr. Elyse Goldstein and Dr. Judith Kuriansky. Dr. Elyse Goldstein airs on WMCA, from 10 am to 12 noon and is younger than Dr. Judith Kuriansky who broadcasts on WABC from 9 pm to 12 midnight. Both women have been on the air for approximately two years. Two personal finance/business advice practitioners were selected: John Scheur and Dr. Bernard Meltzer. John Scheur is on WMCA from 2 to 4 pm and Dr. Bernard Meltzer broadcasts on WOR from 8 to 10 pm. Both are older men and have been on radio for many years. Dr. Carlton Fredericks delivers health and nutrition advice on WOR from 3:10 to 4 pm. He is an older man who has a long history on radio. He has no health/nutrition counterpart on a regular basis on commercial radio in New York. Health colleague Gary Null airs on non-commercial WBAI in New York. To round out the study of radio subject matter, popular local talk show host, Barry Gray, on WMCA from 12 noon to 2 pm, was chosen for study. He is an older, popular, talk jockey who deals with politics, current events and personalities.

These six hosts were chosen because they are prominent in the field of local, New York talk radio and easily identifiable to members of the listening audience and to the researcher.

Dr. Judith Kuriansky

Dr. Judith Kuriansky, at 35, is certified as a sex therapist by the American Association of Sex Educators. She went to Bayside High School in New York, received her BA from Smith College, an MA in psychology from Boston University coupled with study at the University of Geneva. She holds a Ph.D. in clinical psychology (specializing in schizophrenia) from Boston University. She interned at New York's St. Luke's Hospital and a senior researcher at the New York State Psychiatric Institute.

Her various media experience include: Specialist reporter for WABC-TV's (New York) "Eyewitness News", ABC's "Good Morning, America", WBZ-TV's (Boston) "Feeling Good", and television consultant to WNBC-TV's (New York) "Newscenter 4".

Her program on WABC-AM began in October 1981 and is reported to reach 30 states. She told The Bridgeport Telegram (August 5, 1982) that she has received fan mail from as far away as Bermuda, Fort Lauderdale and Nova Scotia. Recently the New York Daily News featured Dr. Kuriansky dissuading a possible suicide victim.

Bernard Meltzer

Bernard Meltzer is a licensed civil engineer, with a BS in Civil Engineering and a MA in Land Engineering, graduated from the City College of New York in 1938. He overcame poverty, born on the lower Eastside to Polish-Jewish immigrants who highly valued their American citizenship. He overcame dyslexia by studying Shakespeare and entered the elite Stuyvesant High School. He saw his father broken as a result of the Depression and dropped out of high school. Despite a scholarship to Columbia, his finances demanded he attend New York's public C.C.N.Y. While attending college he joined the ROTC because he states, "I feel I owed it to my country" (Stevenson, 1978).

He moved to Philadelphia where he served with the Army Corps of Engineers in World War II. He succeeded in teaching real estate on a part-time basis at the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School. He rose to Chairman of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission. His duties at WOR forced him to resign from this post in 1977. He began at Philadelphia's WCAU-AM in 1965 as a "fluke" when he quickly replaced a departing host. He credits his three-hour commute between New York and Philadelphia for his ability to devour various popular and special newspapers and journals. He told a New Yorker reporter, "By the time I was twenty-six, I had done a hundred million dollars of construction. I have achieved expertise since then in

twelve different professions -- real estate, city planning, finance and economics...so it took me twenty years to become a human being" (Stevenson, 1978:43). For over ten years the Field Newspaper syndicate in Chicago has distributed Mr. Meltzer's column, "What's Your Problem?" to various papers nationwide. He also writes a column in the Philadelphia Bulletin entitled, "A Real Estate Expert's view" as well as a weekly advice column for the New York Daily News.

Dr. Elyse Goldstein

Dr. Elyse Goldstein is an APA affiliated psychologist, graduating Phi Beta Kappa and magna cum laude with a Ph.D. in psychology from City University. She was an editorial consultant for The American Psychologist and The Merrill Palmer Quarterly. She is associated with The New York Academy of Sciences and has done periodical research at Montefiore Hospital and Medical Center. She has also published paper in national psychological journals.

Dr. Carlton Fredericks

Dr. Carlton Fredericks holds a doctorate in Public Health from New York University. For over 30 years, Dr. Fredericks has been an educational broadcaster on nutrition and health. He is the former President of the International Academy of Preventive Medicine, a founding fellow of the International College of Applied Nutrition and a member of the Academy of Orthomolecular Psychiatry. He has authored numerous books including Psychonutrition and Breast Cancer:

A Nutritional Approach. He is listed in the "Who's Who in American Education", and the "Who's Who in Chemistry".

John Scheur

John Scheur's interest in money management began when, at 12, his father and grandfather lost their fortunes. He is a graduate of Yale. He served as a broadcasting executive from 1942 until 1969 when he left to devote time to financial management. In 1973 he founded CycleSciences, Inc., a research organization that monitored profitable investments. He originated the Wallstreet Moneyletter, a monthly newsletter that serves both corporate and personal interests and served as a private corporate financial consultant. He served as President of the Variety Club of Philadelphia. He is noted as stating that he reads 18 newspapers per day. In 1976 he began radio money management in Philadelphia. In 1978 he joined WMCA to become "Your Money Man".

Barry Gray

Barry Gray began broadcasting 42 years ago, 33 years with WOR-AM. He is credited with the longest running radio program in New York, totaling over 10,000 broadcasts. It is estimated that he has interviewed approximately 40,000 people. He is noted by New York magazine for starting the talk show on his late night "Moonlight Savings Time" by having friends stop by and chat with him through the night.

At 66 he continues to broadcast two programs on WOR, one from 12 to 2, the second called "Post Time", weekdays from 6 to 7 pm.

He was born Bernard Yaroslau in New Jersey and at age seven moved to a lower-class neighborhood in Los Angeles. He apprenticed at a Kosher butcher but then returned to New York to try his hand at announcing. He joined WMCA in 1950. How does he feel after 42 years in radio? He states, "It was always for me, anyway, like going to a party" (Hochman, 1980:38).

Since Dr. Fredericks and Barry Gray entertain calls on only a sporadic basis, it was decided to do a content analysis of the four advice-givers whose programs are exclusively composed of calls.

Three full-length broadcasts with each program host were taped, at random, during the weeks of October 17, 1982 and March 20, 1983. These two weeks represent two different seasons, and are unaffected by special occasions, such as holidays, that might affect program content. These programs were completely transcribed, minus the commercials, station promos, P.S.A.s and news. To the extent possible, all utterances were included in the transcription, including 'uh, uhuh, yea, huh, etc....'.

The researcher initially listened to the programs to determine the dimensions for content analysis. After a

review of the literature and the early listener questionnaire pre-test, an instrument was developed that would study the interaction of host-caller-topic by focusing on the impression management by the host, the treatment of topics, the dissemination of social values, and the following gender differences: Caller motivation, rational/emotional presentation of call, values, host treatment. Included in this instrument were references to the potentials and limitations of call-in radio, host expertise, appeals to community, a sense of social prestige or status from the caller and the role that anonymity plays for the caller. A variety of tables were created in coding this data for each program. Results from all three shows per host were then tabulated and analysis followed.

The Statistical Tables for Biological, Agricultural and Medical Research (1953) list of random numbers was used to glean phone numbers from New York's telephone directories. The phone number was composed in the following way: The first two digits sent me to the page in the phone directory. If this number did not contain a page of phone numbers, another digit was attached to the end of the two digit number. For instance, if the number was 23 and page 23 in the Queens phone directory had no phone listings, it then became page 230. Subsequent page numbers then received 1,2,3,...9.0... The second pair of digits directed the researcher to the column on the page. Since there are

only five columns on the page, the first digit, one through five, would be used. The next pair of digits directed the researcher to the line in the appointed column. To assure that some numbers in this random sample would be unlisted, the last two digits of the phone number found would be replaced by another two-digits from the list of random numbers. The following is a list of all calls made by borough:

<u>Borough</u>	<u># of Yes Responses</u>	<u># of No Responses</u>	<u># of No Answers</u>	<u># Disc.</u>	<u># Busy</u>
Manhattan	46	135	74	28	3
Brooklyn	55	110	133	48	13
Queens	60	142	117	67	13
Bronx	84	85	62	63	12
Staten Island	<u>65</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>102</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>28</u>
	NN = 310	NN = 552	NN = 488	NN = 238	NN=69

The phone calls were made on Saturday and Sunday afternoons between February 1st and April 10th, 1983. A total of 1657 calls were made in order to reach 300+ Yes responses. The refusal rate was 33.3%. This total includes those who refused to take the survey as well as those who were not familiar with the six call-in shows under study. An upper-level student at Brooklyn College assisted with some of the phone interviews. She was under the researcher's careful direction and observation.

The instrument consists of 38 closed-ended questions, many with multiple response values (See Appendix 2). Respondents were asked about their attitudes toward program hosts, callers, other listeners and their own listening

patterns, preferences and concerns, as well as personal demographic data. From a list of 17 topics, respondents were asked to rate those that interested them most, least, those which led to further discussion and advice personally used. Two open-ended questions, which were coded later, examined views on the popularity and "health to society" of the call-in format. These responses were coded into appropriate categories.

The instrument was initially coded at the time of the phone interview and then transferred to computer punch cards. The data was placed in an SPSS package program. The program ran all frequencies and cross-tabulations.

Producers and screeners, as well as station management from WABC, WMCA and WOR radio, were contacted in person. The average interview length was 60 minutes, the shortest 30 minutes, the longest 90 minutes. The interview schedule was developed following a synthesis of all previous study materials (See Appendix 3).

A thorough review of the literature was conducted beginning November 1982. Books, scholarly journals, trade publications and mass circulation magazines and newspapers were considered.

On the basis of the review of the literature, radio program content analysis, listener interviews by phone and personal interviews with radio program hosts and their staffs, a detailed, in-depth study of radio call-in pro-

gramming will emerge.

The classifications used in the content analysis of select radio call-in programming were created in the following manner. The programs were taped on audio cassette, then transcribed in radio script format, noting the identity of the speaker and the dialogue. The transcripts for the three programs representative of each host were read over repeatedly, looking for common strains of subject matter. A list of those topics or subjects was created.

Then the researcher proceeded to code each call into an appropriate subject category. Calls that fell outside of these large classifications were coded as miscellaneous and treated separately. These transcripts were then coded for host encouragement and discouragement. Hosts verbal cues were used to determine these classifications. Codes of encouragement and discouragement were then cross-referenced with caller gender and topic/subject classification. The transcripts were then examined for the rationality and emotionality of calls. Verbal cues of the callers were used to determine this variable. These codes were then cross-referenced with host encouragement/discouragement and caller gender.

Patterns of verbal behavior were examined in the formulation of codes for encourage/discourage and rational/emotional. Ambiguity or the absence of obvious verbal cues were coded as "Neutral". This tri-level content

analysis, of subject matter, topic encouragement/discouragement and caller rationality/emotionality was determined solely by examining and classifying verbal cues and necessary to the study of the host-caller-topic triad under study.

Summary

In summation, the focus of this study is firstly, on the appeal of call-in radio, specifically in regard to a search for advice and survival techniques. Secondly this study examines the consequences of call-in radio in social networking or connecting unfamiliar "others". The content analysis provides an approach to both subject matter and the interaction process in two-way radio. A random phone survey of listeners can identify audience input and reaction. The interview guide included both closed and open-ended questions to measure perceptions and attitudes. Personal, in-depth interviews with the staffs at the three New York radio stations under study, WABC, WMCA and WOR, utilized identical interview schedules. The schedule, however, was flexible enough to encourage probing on particular issues and discussions on divergent or specific matters. It is valuable to compare and contrast the opinions and perceptions of those behind-the-scenes with both the attitudes of the audience and the observations made by the researcher.

The results of the research follow a logical pattern

of first getting a close look at what happens on call-in radio in the next chapter, then analyzing host control via impression management in Chapter 5, "Impression Management By Call-In Hosts", and authority assertion in Chapter 6, "Host Appeal and the Assertion of Authority". Audience reaction is considered in Chapter 7, "Social Learning and Parasocial Interaction", with a focus on two consequences: Social learning and parasocial interaction. The caller is studied in Chapter 8, "The Caller: Anonymity, Caller Stereotypes and Gender Differences", with a focus on anonymity, caller stereotypes and gender differences. Radio station staff are considered in Chapter 9, "The Production of Culture", as the theories of Williams, Gitlin and Sallach are applied to those behind-the-scenes of call-in radio.

CHAPTER FOUR
RADIO CALL-IN PROGRAMS AS REFLECTING AND
PROMOTING A SHARED SOCIAL REALITY

In order to study what kinds of people turn to call-in radio under what circumstances, it is necessary to begin with an examination of what is the phenomenon of call-in radio. Because of the two-way nature of call-in radio, listeners passively listen to what is presented and can actively call up to add or transform the message heard on air. American mass media are diversified with many communications channels and much variety in subject matter. The listener's process of self-exposure to radio call-in, in general, and to specific subject matter on call-in shows, in particular, is important to this study. Following the study of self-exposure to radio call-in shows, a second question must be asked, What audience needs are met by call-in radio? To what extent do members of the listening audience consider what they hear to be a true picture of reality? The question of radio as a "window on the world" must be asked. If what transpires on call-in radio is considered very realistic and credible, what part does audience perception of the host and topics of discussion play in this.

In this chapter we introduce Klapper's theories of selective exposure and how it relates to call-in radio listening. A study of needs gratified by the listener are

explored with special emphasis on the response that call-in radio is a "window on the world". To test the validity of the real and credible perceptions of call-in radio, host reliability and proficiency as well as topic interest is examined. What follows is a content analysis that codes those topics encouraged and discouraged by each of the four advice-giving hosts. The subject matter and verbal cues employed are discussed in this interactionist study.

Selective Exposure

Each radio call-in program, unique in its hosts' appeal, subject matter, caller and field of loyal listeners, presents an identifiable social reality. Listeners selectively expose themselves to programs with consistently expressed values on favorite and popular topics.

Klapper (1960) first introduced the notion of selective exposure in explaining how the media simply reinforces what the public already believes via three layers of selection. The listener initially selectively attends to messages they already agree with. In the second stage, the listener selectively perceives the messages and distorts messages to fit pre-existing beliefs. In the third and final phase, the listener selectively retains only those portions of the message they agree with.

Several researchers have followed Klapper's determination that the audience is not passive. Stephenson's "Play Theory" (1967) explains how the audience exerts its freedom

to select from a wide variety of products. The choices we make are mediated by their intended use. Stephenson states, "Through our use of mass communications we learn how to express ourselves in meaningful ways through the choices we make" (1967:). Davidson in Propaganda and the American Revolution (1941:) underscores the active, selective audience. He states,

"The audience is not a passive recipient, not a lump of clay to be molded by the master propagandist. Rather, the audience is made up of individuals who demand something from their communications that are likely to be useful to them".

What effect does selective exposure have on media content and our view of society? Bauer (1971:342) goes as far as to liken media selection to the democratic process. He states, "Our individual media choices can shape media content surely as our individual votes are critical to our democratic system". Certainly the participatory element of call-in radio makes this statement more striking. Stephenson says that the freedom of media selection "assures a social stable order" and that "play (theory) enhances everyday life by facilitating self-expression and may actually improve people's capacity to work efficiently" (1967:

This discussion of selective exposure, self-expression, shaping media content are particularly significant to the study of radio call-in programming. Because any member of the listening audience chooses to listen and may decide to

shape the content of the show by calling in, considerations of increased self-expression, maintenance of social order and the democratic process are especially relevant. This is demonstrated in a study of call-in radio in Philadelphia sponsored by the American Jewish Committee (Lowry, 1981:8). It found,

"In recent years, call-in radio programs have responded to their growing audiences by touching on many controversial and provocative subjects. Ideally, such programs and their exchange of ideas could promote heightened awareness of social and political issues and motivate personal involvement in the democratic process."

Window on the World

Drawing from Klapper's theories of self-exposure, since listeners selectively expose themselves to certain call-in radio programs, I propose that they are in agreement with the social reality presented on these programs. To examine this, we must ask, "Do listeners regard the exchange between host and caller as a 'window on the world'?" In a random phone sampling of listeners to the six radio programs under study, when asked, "Why do you listen?", the response "window on the world" was the third most frequent of six responses, behind educational and entertaining (except of listeners to Dr. Fredericks, where it was the second most popular response, following educational). Table 4.1, "Percentage of the Top Three Responses to Reveal Why Listeners Listen Per Host", presents the response to listeners reasons for tuning into call-in radio. For all call-in programs,

Table 4.1

Percentage of the Top Three Responses to Reveal
Why Listeners Listen Per Host.

<u>Host: Dr. Goldstein</u>	
<u>Response</u>	<u>% of Total Responses</u>
1. Educational	30
2. Entertaining	26
3. Window on World	15
	(N=46)

<u>Host: Dr. Kuriansky</u>	
<u>Response</u>	<u>% of Total Responses</u>
1. Entertaining	32
2. Educational	28
3. Window on World	17
	(N=60)

<u>Host: Bernard Meltzer</u>	
<u>Response</u>	<u>% of Total Responses</u>
1. Educational	31
2. Entertaining	24
3. Window on World	16
	(N=53)

<u>Host: John Scheur</u>	
<u>Response</u>	<u>% of Total Responses</u>
1. Educational	30
2. Entertaining	24
3. Window on World	13
	(N=46)

<u>Host: Dr. Frederick</u>	
<u>Response</u>	<u>% of Total Responses</u>
1. Educational	34
2. Window on World	20
3. Entertaining	18
	(N=71)

<u>Host: Barry Gray</u>	
<u>Response</u>	<u>% of Total Responses</u>
1. Entertaining	31
2. Educational	30
3. Window on World	16
	(N=85)

regardless of subject matter, the two most frequent responses are that these shows are educational and entertaining. The third most frequent response is that it is a "window on the world". Just under 20% of respondents per program selected this response. One can state that from this survey, radio call-in as a "window on the world" is not the primary motivation of listening. Educative and entertaining aspects are primary to the listener. However the view that radio call-in programs present the audience with a broad, realistic canvas or picture of the world outside is a secondary, or latent, function noted. This may be because education and entertainment are adjectives to describe a particular form of communications, while statements such as "window on the world" speak both to the function and consequences of the format, not just a description of preference.

When we put the concept of "window on the world" under greater examination, in Table 4.2, "Percentage of All Responses to Why Radio Call-In Is So Popular", the results of an open-ended question about radio call-in's popularity, demonstrate that a sizeable percentage of respondents felt that radio call-in programs are a "window on the world".

Table 4.2
 Percentage of All Responses to Why Radio
 Call-In Is So Popular.

<u>Response</u>	<u>% of Total Responses*</u>
1. Solves problems	13
2. Free good advice	13
3. "Real" programming	12
4. Outlet for discussion	12
5. Window on the world	11
6. Better than other media	11
7. Like the topics	10
8. Host's appeal	9
9. Social prestige/status	<u>8</u>

(N=203)

*Sum of percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

Responses coded as "real" programming, outlet for discussion and window on the world are all related to the program's presentation of reality. Combined, they comprise the largest portion (34%) of all responses.

Table 4.3, "Percentage of Respondents by Demographics Who Responded 'Window on the World'", demographically breaks down those who reflected on the "window of the world" aspect of call-in radio. The largest portion of respondents with this response had some college (27% of total respondents with some college), are clerical, sales and homemakers (16-16% of total respondents in these job categories) and listened four or less times per week. The reason respondents with some college may have responded in this way is that these are people who wish to further their education, both in and out of a classroom and call-in radio serves that purpose. Clerical, salespeople and homemakers usually travel and associate in smaller circles than do professionals, managers and students. Because of their more limited environments, they may use call-in radio to expand and broaden their more limited circle of friends and contacts. Occasional but not heavy listeners represented those respondents who called call-in radio a "window on the world". Infrequent listeners are purposively so, and heavy listeners, five to seven times a week, gave other reasons for listening.

Table 4.3

Percentage of Respondents by Demographics Who
Responded "Window on the World".

<u>Demographic</u>	<u>% of Respondents</u>	<u>N of Category</u>
Education:		
1. Some high school	11	27
2. High school graduate	6	46
3. Some college	27	45
4. College graduate	7	42
5. Post Grad	14	62
		N=264
Job:		
1. Professional	6	49
2. Managerial	13	38
3. Sales	15	39
4. Military	7	28
5. Clerical	16	32
6. Homemaker	15	39
7. Student	0	5
8. Retired	16	58
9. Other	0	2
		N=264
Times Listen Per Week:		
1. One time	11	54
2. Two times	15	56
3. Three times	7	29
4. Four times	22	10
5. Five times	5	61
6. Six times	20	11
7. Everyday	0	5
8. Infrequently	16	37
9. Unsure/no answer	0	1
		N=264

The responses coded "window on the world" were generated by a cross-section of respondents by sex, age, education, occupation, program choice, listening history and frequency.

A number of respondents claim that radio call-in shows make them more aware, better-informed, and better able to cope with problems. A male civil service worker, 41-50 years old, who has been listening to Dr. Kuriansky for the past year and a half states, "People want to be aware. They should be aware". In agreement is a self-employed male, 31-40, with a high school education, who has been listening to Barry Gray infrequently over the past five years. He states,

"People become more aware and more alert. They can sympathize or react against some of the callers. These shows are very enlightening. There's a helluva a lot more they can learn from the radio than out of a book."

A college-educated homemaker, 41-50 years old, who has been listening to Dr. Fredericks, Dr. Bernard Meltzer and Dr. Kuriansky "from the beginning" says that radio call-in is a good source of information. She states, "People need this. None of us are that well-informed. Radio (call-in) shows are better than a secondary source".

Awareness is coupled with catharsis in the view of a clerical worker, aged between 50-60, who has been listening to Dr. Bernard Meltzer, four times a week, over the past year. She states, "People like to hear what goes on. I don't think it hurts. It clears their minds and thoughts".

A college-grad male, 25-30, who has frequently listened to Barry Gray and Bernard Meltzer over the past ten years, says that the programs' openness underscores the public's desire to be aware. He claims,

"It brings things to people's attention. On the air it's more open and honest. You get a varied number of responses. It brings a different light on a subject. (It) might answer a question you haven't even asked."

Listeners also cite that this format helps them relate to their problems. A homemaker, 31-40 years old, with a high school education who listens to Dr. Goldstein, Dr. Fredericks and Barry Gray, states,

"It's helpful. It brings light to problems. It's a window on the world. You can relate to the problems, now they're out in the open".

Another function of radio call-in shows is to compare one's problems against others. This is seen as useful by a saleswoman, 41-50 years old, with a college degree, who has been listening to all six shows for the past five years. She states,

"It's a window on the world. Our problems are not as bad as others. There are problems we might not have been aware of. Meltzer covers a wide base. (These shows) expose people to the realities of life. Especially for someone who's naive (like myself). We are now aware of these problems."

Veteran listeners and newcomers agree. A young male student, 18-24, who has been listening to Bernard Meltzer infrequently

with others, an honest "slice of life" presentation of reality and encouraging of an altruistic attitude.

Host Competence

Listeners selectively expose themselves to a particular program with a well-conceived notion of what values the host will express in response to the calls. A study by Professor Robert Avery of the University of Utah found that callers are drawn to hosts they consider allies. He states,

"People don't want to engage in controversy. Instead they'll call the one who'll stroke them. The caller knows the host has the power-control of the on-off switch. They don't want to lose a confrontation."

I offer the hypothesis that the listener also seeks an ally in the host. To test this hypothesis, two questions must be asked. First, how well does the host deal with the topics presented and does the listener agree with the host's advice. Listeners were asked whether the host deals well with the topics presented by the callers. Table 4.4, "Percentage of Responses to How Well Hosts Deal With Topics", shows that responses for all six hosts were 85%+ affirmative. Clearly over 90% of the listeners to Dr. Kuriansky, Beranrd Meltzer, John Scheur and Dr. Fredericks, consider the hosts proficient in dealing with the topics presented. The slightly smaller vote of confidence for Barry Gray may be due to the rather broad issues he tackles on his show. It's a potpourri of current events, politics and personalities.

for the past month, states, "Informative -- helps people to understand things better".

Listeners feel that the radio call-in show, as a window on reality, is representative of what is really happening. A professional woman, 31-40, who listens every day to Barry Gray, Dr. Fredericks and Dr. Bernard Meltzer, for the past 15 years, reflects this position: "It's a slice of life. It gives a voice to the population". A clerical worker, 25-30 years old, who has been listening to Bernard Meltzer frequently over the past seven months agrees, "(Radio call-in) is modern day. It's what's going on today. For those who don't know, it gives them knowledge".

Radio call-in programs allow listeners to vicariously experience and take an outward view of life. This is best expressed by a retired man, who, for the past four years, has been frequently listening to Dr. Fredericks, Bernard Meltzer and Dr. Kuriansky. He claims,

"The majority of people would put this on to know what else is going on besides themselves, instead of the 'stupid box'. If somebody else was in my shoes and had the opportunity to listen to these shows, they'd be a better individual. I've travelled a lot because of my work and military service. These (radio call-in) shows enlighten people".

Within the category of responses termed, "window on the world", we find that radio call-in shows are believed to make listeners more aware, well-informed, a vehicle for catharsis and vicarious experience, a way to compare problems

Another important test for the listener's search for an ally is agreement with the host's advice. Table 4.5, "Percentage of Respondents Who Agree With the Host's Advice" shows that 60%+ of listeners to all six shows agree with the host's advice.

Table 4.4

Responses to How Well Hosts Deal With Topics
(In Percent).

	<u>Dr. Goldstein</u> (N=29)	<u>Dr. Kuriansky</u> (N=43)	<u>B. Meltzer</u> (N=102)	<u>J. Scheur</u> (N=29)
<u>Response</u>				
1. Yes	86%*	93%	94%	97%
2. No	10	7	4	3
3. Sometimes	3	-	2	-
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

	<u>Dr. Fredericks</u> (N=47)	<u>Barry Gray</u> (N=59)
<u>Response</u>		
1. Yes	96%	85%
2. No	4	10
3. Sometimes	-	5
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

*Sum of percentage may not equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 4.5
Percentage of Respondents Who Agree With The
Host's Advice

<u>Host</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>N of Total Responses</u>
Fredericks	75%	47
Meltzer	73	103
Scheur	62	29
Gray	61	59
Kuriansky	60	43
Goldstein	59	29

It is clear that the older, established, male hosts with easily identifiable expertise, Fredericks (health and nutrition) and Meltzer (personal and business finance) find the greatest listener agreement. There is considerably less audience agreement with the two controversial, younger, female radio psychotherapists. Subjects such as health and finance are more tangible and less provocative than family, marital and sexual counseling.

Topic Interest

What topics interest listeners most? Respondents were asked to state whether a particular topic on radio call-in shows interested them most, least, led to further discussion or offered advice that was personally used. Tables 4.6 and 4.7, "Percentage of Respondents and Topic Interest/Disinterest", "Percentage of Respondents Who Have Furthered Discussion or Use Radio Call-In Advice", contain the results.

Table 4.6

Percentage of Respondents and Topic Interest/Disinterest.

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Interest Most %</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Interest Least %</u>
1. Health	10*	1. Politics	15*
2. Real Estate	9	2. Sex	15
3. Current Evts.	8	3. Drugs	13
4. Personal Fin.	8	4. Alcohol	11
5. Economy	8	5. Marital	9
6. Family Advice	8	6. Neighbors	7
7. Bus. Advice	7	7. Crime	4
8. Politics	7	8. Economy	4
9. Sex	6	9. Business Advice	4
10. Consumerism	6	10. Family	4
11. Marital Advice	5	11. Health	2
12. Drugs	5	12. Personal Fin.	2
13. Crime	4	13. Real Estate	2
14. Neighbors	4	14. Current Evts.	2
15. Alcohol	4	15. Religion	2
16. Religion	3		N=46
	N=267		

*Sum of percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 4.7

Percentage of Respondents Who Have Furthered Discussion or Use Radio Call-In Advice.

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Lead to Discussion %</u>	<u>Variable</u>	<u>Use the Advice %</u>
1. Health	13	1. Health	15
2. Politics	11	2. Family	15
3. Bus. Adv.	10	3. Personal Fin.	13
4. Personal Fin.	8	4. Economy	10
5. Economy	8	5. Sex	8
6. Current Evts.	7	6. Bus. Adv.	8
7. Sex	6	7. Marital Adv.	6
8. Family Adv.	6	8. Real Estate	6
9. Real Estate	6	9. Crime	6
10. Crime	5	10. Politics	4
11. Consumerism	5	11. Consumerism	4
12. Drugs	4	12. Drugs	2
13. Marital Adv.	3	13. Current Evts.	2
14. Religion	3		N=48
15. Religion	3		
16. Alcohol	2		
	N=149		

*Sum of percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

Topics such as health (10%), personal finance (8%), family advice (8%), and the economy (8%), were considered most interesting and most likely to lead to discussion and personal use. Twenty-six respondents found health most interesting, 19 said it led to discussion with family and friends and 7 respondents said they personally used the advice. Likewise, personal finance was found interesting by 21 respondents, 12 said that it led to further discussion and 6 respondents said they personally used the advice. In a similar vein, family advice was favored by 20 respondents, 9 of whom said it led to further discussion and 7 who claim they personally used the advice.

The majority of those who favored discussion of health on radio are professionals. This may be explained by the new emphasis of health and nutrition on job productivity and life expectancy. It is interesting to note that heavy call-in listeners (those who listen five times a week) find health most interesting, however the occasional listener (one time per week) says it led to further discussion. Under-scoring the popularity of health on call-in radio, WMCA talk jockey, Barry Farber is quoted, "The off-beat doctors get the most attention. Still medicine as a whole is the number one topic of discussion."

On the topic of personal finance, retirees dominate the response that it is of most interest, led to further discussion and is personally used. A retiree's life-long savings

might explain the preoccupation with personal finance.

Clerical and salespeople predominate in favor of the dissemination of family advice on talk radio. Perhaps because they are between 20 and 50 years old, with children still at home. This group is also more likely to say that it leads to further discussion. The less frequent listener says it leads to further discussion (1-2 times per week) while the more frequent listener (3-5 times per week) is more apt to personally use the advice. Family advice is also one of the most provocative and emotion-laden topics of discussion. In an interview with WMCA Program Manager, Jeanne Strauss, says that you can drive up the audience with emotionally-loaded topics. The proliferation of sexual and psychological conversation has been called "community mental health" (Rice, 1981), "electronic voyeurism" (Time, 1972) as well as educational and entertaining.

Clerical workers and retired people find discussion of the economy most interesting, that it will lead to further discussion and use the advice. This may be because those on fixed or low-incomes are more closely monitoring inflation, recession and unemployment fluctuations than other sectors of the population. Also, heavier listeners (five times per week) favor the discussion of the economy on talk radio. When economist and author, Adam Smith, was on a radio call-in tour to promote his book, he found that people were most concerned with the national economy. He states,

"A lot of listeners (and callers) were fearful of Reagan's budget cuts. Almost no listeners perceived that the budget was not being cut, only the increase in the budget."

Real estate is the second most favored topic for discussion, with 9% of the total responses. This is especially the case for professionals, managers and salespeople. This could be because these people are in a position to own or invest in real estate. What is surprising is how the topic of real estate infrequently leads to further discussion (except for managers) and rarely represents advice that is personally used.

The finding that politics is found least interesting is curious because it is second, only to health, in topics that lead to further discussion (11%) with friends and family. In an interview WOR producer Jim McAleer, emphasized that local issues were the key to radio call-in shows. Talk jockey Sherrye Henry concurs,

"On a local show, it's important to have someone who understands the area...the community will let you know what it cares about...anyone with good fingertips can go out there and feel the pulse of the people" (Turdyn, 1982).

It may be that the discussion of politics, and all phases of government, frustrates the listener who feels they've lost faith in the political system. Continued discussion makes the listener more aware that they "can't fight City Hall". The feelings of frustration and hopelessness are ventilated as they discuss politics with friends and family. Therefore

politics is a topic least favored in a call-in radio exchange but very likely to lead to further discussion.

Sex ties with politics (15%) as the least favored topic of discussion on call-in radio. The majority of those who opposed this discussion cited that hosts and callers should be mindful of impressionable youth in the listening audience. Despite the opposition to this topic, sex was likely to lead to discussion by 6% of the respondents, following health, politics, business advice, personal finance, the economy and current events. With the prevalence of sexual titillation in American mass media, the preoccupation with discussion about sex is not surprising.

What values are presented on these radio call-in shows? And how does this affect the listener's concept of the world of politics, the economy, health, family, personal business matters and sexual concerns? Listeners and callers alike identify with the host's expression of social values. Bernard Meltzer opens his program with "This is your friend, Bernard Meltzer". The program is entitled "What's Your Problem?". James Stevenson, in his article in the New Yorker, identifies the values expressed by Meltzer which hold great appeal to his listeners.

"Meltzer's listeners love him because he understands how puzzled, frightened, angry, lonely and threatened they feel. Meltzer shares their belief in God, patriotism, family, neighborhoods, good kids, respect for old people, tax-free municipals and dry basements. His credo is practical: Treat

your fellow man in a spirit of love and brotherhood, but if he really gives you trouble, don't forget -- you can probably get a lien on his house? (1978:40).

A host's popularity is also dependent on being responsive to the needs of the listeners and the ability to identify and disseminate shared values. WMCA radio founder, R. Peter Strauss, underscores this point when he states, "I have to develop a special identity with my listeners. To do that, I must be more responsive to their needs" (Forbes, 1976:48). There have been listeners, however, who disagreed demonstrably with a host's stated values. For instance, WMCA's Barry Gray told a New York magazine reporter that he'd been "slugged on the air and beaten up twice after his program" (Hochman, 1980).

What topics does each host encourage? This examination will reconstruct the social reality, the picture through the "window on the world" that each call-in radio program presents. A thorough content analysis of three randomly selected programs featuring each host, reveals the following list of topics, encouraged and discouraged. Categories were established to encompass like topics and were created after a thorough analysis of the radio program transcripts.

As was noted earlier, the content analysis of the radio programs was performed after careful evaluation of the verbal cues as present in the program transcripts. Three levels of analysis were performed: One of the subject or

topic of the call; a second examination of the hosts' apparent encouragement or discouragement; and third, a study of the caller's rationality or emotionality as embodied in their question and interchange with program host. Classifications for subject/topic drew upon strains of similarity between calls. Classifications were broadened to encompass as many calls of like subject matter as possible. Calls that did not fall into any of these categories were coded as "Miscellaneous" and were treated individually. Apparent and obvious verbal cues and patterns of interaction were used to code host treatment as either encouraging or discouraging. Compliments and praise were coded as encouraging, for instance. Likewise, impatience and mockery were coded as discouragement. The verbal cues engaged by the caller, both in the initial question and the exchange with the host were used to determine rationality/emotionality classifications. Sentiments of helplessness, pain and fear were coded as emotionality while expressions of interest, reinforcement or fact-finding were coded as rationality. The codes for all three levels of classifications were cross-referenced later. This enabled the researcher to closely examine the social reality presented, the host's use of impression management and gender differences between callers.

Bernard Meltzer

Bernard Meltzer entertained 35 calls during the course of three two-hour broadcasts. The following is a table of

topics encouraged (N=19) and topics discouraged (N=16).

<u>Topics Encouraged</u>	<u>N</u>
1. illegal business practices	5
2. real estate investments	4
3. concern over children	4
4. employment tips	2
5. retiree concerns	2
6. fears of urban life	1
7. friendships	1

The category "Illegal business practices" includes the following calls: The abuses of collection agencies and insurance companies, building contractors who don't complete their work and a leaking, illegal apartment. Here, callers vent their frustrations and seek legal advice. For example,

Call topic: Illegal Apartment*
 Caller : Can the girls break their lease?
 Meltzer : If it's an illegal apartment, of course they can break the lease...If the building inspection works right they'll hold him (the landlord) in court.

"Real Estate investments" includes calls regarding real estate come-ons, as well as mortgaging a relative's house, real estate sales and using a second home as an investment. Most of these calls are made by middle-aged and upper-income callers who have the resources to delve into the real estate market. For example:

*Short, illustrative pieces of the dialog and conversations between the host and caller are included here. Due to space limitations the entire text could not be included. The essence and context of the dialog was kept intact to the best of the researcher's ability. The occasional non-fluid appearance of the transcribed material reflects the actual verbal interactions.

Call topic: Second Home
 Caller : My husband and I are in our early 30's. We have a five year old and are expecting another child soon. Would it be a sound investment to buy another home?
 Meltzer : An investment like this can work out if you or your husband watch it, rent it, manage it and take care of it.

Calls categorized as "Concern for children" spanned from law school selection, Bar Mitzvahs and home computers to college scholarships and unfair hiring practices. The calls made were split between the teens themselves (scholarship and hiring practices) and parents and other concerned relatives (other calls). Some examples:

Call topic: Law School Selection
 Caller : My brother's been accepted to Virginia and NYU law schools. Which should he choose?...
 Meltzer : ...So why not take momma's wishes into effect for once

Call topic: Unfair Hiring Practices
 Caller : I was hired for later this month and I got a phone call yesterday saying that I didn't have a job because I had an undesirable reference.
 Meltzer : For some reason they don't want to hire you now. So instead of telling you they goofed, they're telling you it's a bad reference. You should call their bluff.

Employment tips categorize calls that ask for information about Civil Service jobs, attorney relocation and unfair hiring and promotion practices. For example,

Call topic: Attorney Relocation
 Caller : My son...is an attorney for a large oil company in the Southwest. He really wishes to return...
 Meltzer : If you get yourself as a specialist in energy law, mineral law, so on,

then you can come back to N.Y. at a real high level.

Senior citizen's investments and concerns with a retiree's leisure time were placed in the "Retiree Concerns" category. To round out the calls that appeared encouraged by Bernard Meltzer was a confession of fear of subway crime, nicely complimented by a caller's poem about friendship.

One can note that real estate, personal finance and family advice are encouraged by Bernard Meltzer. These are also among the topics the phone sample claims was of most interest, led to further discussion and was advice that was personally used.

<u>Topics Discouraged</u>	<u>N</u>
1. Bad business deals	6
2. Mortgage finance	3
3. Attacks on the "system"	3
4. Young professionals	3
5. Drugs	2

The category "Bad Business Deals" includes: Ruining a credit rating, dealing with a bankrupt company, brokerage house, individual retirement accounts and the elderly in the stock market. Meltzer questions the common sense and reasoning of the callers, sometimes mocking them or matter-of-factly disagreeing with the caller. For example:

Call topic:	<u>Brokerage House IRAs</u>
Caller :	I have a question about a brokerage house IRA account.
Meltzer :	...So I say that the brokers are pushing the IRAs in their situation. In my opinion are doing the wrong thing. An IRA has got to be safe and sound and secure. It belongs in a bank or it belongs in a govern-

ment security, or securities guaranteed by Uncle Sam. It belongs no other place... So, what's this business about special benefits?

Mortgage financing questions include calls about the balloon mortgage, a high mortgage to finance the children's education and financing a mobile home. For example:

Call topic: Balloon Mortgage
 Caller : They (the prospective house-buyers) currently have property.
 Meltzer : There's no reason why, except perhaps that they cannot get a mortgage at a bank. There's a reason for it which they are not telling you.

Bernard Meltzer is adamant about caller's attacks on the political/legal/social system. Calls here includes the charge of police brutality, social security overpayment and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in a discriminatory hiring situation. Some examples:

Call topic: Police Brutality
 Caller : The police proceeded to beat up the boys.
 Meltzer : Police don't act this way. This is not 1920 in a Southern state. This is 1983 in the state of New Jersey.

Call topic: ROTC Scholarship
 Caller : I was awarded an ROTC scholarship... Today in the mail from the college I plan to attend I just got an award for \$6,200...
 Meltzer : Many young people think that (ROTC) is old-fashioned. But you must remember the liberties and benefits that you now enjoy. Somebody died and bled for it...

Meltzer is surprisingly impatient with the concerns of young professionals. These include: The relocation of a young lawyer, the plans of newlyweds to live with their relatives and life insurance for young marrieds. For example:

Call topic: Newlyweds live with relatives
 Caller : Should we move in with them?
 Meltzer : Did it ever occur to you that they want
 you there?

Call topic: Life insurance for young marrieds
 Meltzer : In that case, why are you calling me? In
 other words, if everything I tell you, you
 have an answer for.

Meltzer discourages the discussion of drugs when two
 mothers call to say that their sons are arrested on narcotics
 dealer charges. For instance,

Call topic: Son on drugs charges
 Caller : What should I do?
 Meltzer : Mothers who love their sons that they
 cripple them for life. That happens many
 a time.

In summary, beside being a spokesperson for common sense
 business and investment practices, Meltzer is a staunch de-
 fender of the "system" and a strong attacker on deviant be-
 havior, such as drug dealing. The only explanation for his
 impatience with young professionals is that although they may
 pose very interesting and relevant questions, they do not
 share the same concerns as his "older" audience.

John Scheur

In three two-hour programs on WMCA, John Scheur enter-
 tained 40 calls. The following is a table of topics en-
 couraged (N=25) and topics discouraged (N=15).

<u>Topics Encouraged</u>	<u>N</u>
1. Mortgage financing	6
2. Retirement planning	5
3. Purchases (boat, car, furniture)	3
4. Real Estate	2
5. IRAs	2
6. Starting own business	2
7. Marital separation	2
8. The economy	1
9. Trust funds	1
10. Foreign monies	1

The categories "Mortgage financing" includes calls regarding the balloon mortgage, loan rates, shopping for a mortgage, remortgaging a house, fixed and pre-payment mortgages.

Some examples:

Call topic: Mortgage a Second Home
 Caller : This is the second home we planned to build in North Carolina. Should we take out a new mortgage on our present home or go with builder's financing.
 Scheur : You want, when you are buying money to get the best deal you can, to get the lowest price for the same kind of money... So I would shop around.

Call topic: Fixed Rate Mortgage
 Caller : Should I take it (a mortgage) at a variable or fixed rate?
 Scheur : I would implore you with every fiber in my being to take a fixed rate mortgage. Every study that I've respected strongly says that we're going to have over the next foreseeable 10 years and more on balance, inflation, inflation, inflation.

Under the heading "Retirement Planning" fall the following calls: Retirement planning and investments. For example:

Call topic: Retirement Investments
 Caller : I've been retired one year on a pension and social security...but I do not find

after I pay taxes that I have any money left to throw around.

Scheur : It's asking too much to thrust this burden upon you, without training and experience. I would certainly not sit still for any losses.

Calls were made about boat, car and furniture purchases.

For example,

Call topic: Car Financing

Caller : We want to buy an \$11,000 car. I want to pay it outright and my husband says we should take out a passbook savings loan.

Scheur : It's tough for everyone to save nowadays. It really is very difficult. Particularly in these times. Saving the \$11,000 is priceless. I suggest you go with dealer financing -- it's just under 9% now.

Calls about real estate dealt with real estate as an investment and starting a real estate consulting firm. For example:

Call topic: Real Estate Investment

Caller : I have an opportunity to give my uncle \$300 a week for a property and house in a very nice residential area in Rockland County.

Scheur : I think people very rarely get an opportunity to buy decent real estate for that amount of money on the basis of no money down...I would go the real estate route beyond any question of a doubt.

Calls coded "IRAs" were about self-directed and mutual IRAs. For example,

Call topic: Mutual Fund IRAs

Caller : I'm 59 and I'm interested in this particular mutual fund which is an aggressive growth fund.

Scheur : When someone puts their money in a mutual fund of common stocks, one is really buying the management...Somehow there has crept into the culture of this country the concept that once one makes an investment

move it is forever, and nothing could be more damaging or costly.

Calls coded "Starting Own Business" include a singer who wants to give speaking voice training and an economics college professor who wants to become a financial analyst. For example:

Call topic: Singer Gives Voice Lessons
 Caller : I'm starting a new business. I'm an opera tenor and a concert violinist. I like to teach and there are some stock brokers, lawyers and commodity men on the floor who have problems with their voice because they speak all day.
 Scheur : Don't deprecate your service to the extent (giving it away for free) just to introduce them. People truly do not appreciate something given to them for nothing.

"Marital Separation" includes calls that deal with questions of child support and dividing the house following a separation. For example:

Call topic: Dividing the House
 Caller : I have a 17 year old son who lives with my ex-husband. We're separated for four years. If I need money and want half of the money from the house, how can I get it. I don't want to go to the courts because my husband is a decent man.
 Scheur : I admire your whole attitude. I'm assuming that you don't want to go back and live there. You are going to have to force a sale of the house.

There was one call that questioned economic theory.

Caller : From listening to you, if interest rates drop, then the consumer confidence goes up and they start to buy. Would you say that this is true?
 Scheur : You are correct in textbook theory; the trouble is that we are living in a time where the textbook theories in most things

are not working. That's a statement of fact...People are not confident because they're scared. And there's too many people walking around with too little money.

Two miscellaneous calls were made that asked about setting up a trust fund for a granddaughter and another call when a woman found an old foreign bill. Scheur emphasizes with the grandparents, "I have several grandchildren and you know, they're something". He suggests keeping the investment liquid, "Not to tie that money up for a long period of time". In the second call, a woman claimed she found a \$100,000 Deutsche Mark with George Washington's picture. After settling that Washington's picture would not appear on a foreign bill, Scheur suggests she contact collectors "to get an idea of what it's worth".

Throughout all of these calls, Scheur recommends shopping around for the best deal, only dealing with large, reputable individuals and companies and a new concept for considering money and investments. He offers a practical, educated approach that promises to "Cut your losses when the market is bad and make out like a robber when the market is good" with his "Trailing Price Floor". He is not optimistic about the future of our economy as he expects both inflation and interest rates to increase and further cut into savings.

<u>Topics Discouraged</u>	<u>N</u>
1. Managing own investments	7
2. Money market funds	3
3. Alternate mortgage financing	2
4. Budgeting	1
5. Tax free investments	1
6. Wills	1

Under the category "Managing Own Investments" fall the following calls: Managing stock investments, the metals market, unit trust and tax-free investments and the use of a financial consultant. Some examples:

Call topic: Stock Investments

Caller : I'm in the 50% tax bracket. I'm a conservative, I don't like shelters. I'm just trying to set up a plan looking ahead and I find it very difficult.

Scheur : We as a nation have not taught ourselves the basics of this, is a grave injustice. I know big wage earners who are as ignorant in this field as a ten-year old. It's a darn shame. I can't answer to all your concerns in this brief period.

Call topic: Tax-Free Investments

Caller : Regarding tax-free investments. I saw someone who gives you a formula...the result is the equivalent of the tax return. How does it sound to you?

Scheur : Lousy. Most people believe they understand the taxing system in this country and they don't. That about sums it up. You can't run your life by a formula. This is ludicrous. Let's use a little common sense...Government created a very complicated system and saying to the people 'you're dopes because you don't under this'.

Call topic: Managing Stock Investments

Caller : I have \$100,000, almost all liquid and that's because I've been scared of what I've done in the past...I've lost on previous stocks.

Scheur : Nobody can tell anyone else which of the thousands of ways would be best for you, which makes it so tricky...How much do you have to lose before you're going to do what I'm suggesting. Get out first. Get out totally and learn. Investing in the stock market is an even more precise a skill than acting.

Calls regarding money market funds questioned money-market declines. For example,

Caller : I just sold a house and I have \$30,000 in cash. Then I put that money in a money market fund account, but this thing is going down.

Scheur : No, it isn't going down. I differ with you. (He sets up hypothetical case of gourmet and simple meals)...You're not going to starve. It's going to go right back to the gourmet.

Calls regarding mortgages were concerned with buying second homes or more expensive homes. For instance,

Call topic: More Expensive Home

Caller : We have recently married. Should we sell his house, which we could get about \$90,000 for and we have found one we like for about \$145,000 and turn it into a 2-family house?

Scheur : Oh no. As little as you possibly can. If it's in an area where property values are going up, yes, if the arithmetic is profitable, if you're not going to live far away, if you can have someone you could trust professionally manage it for you and if you like to fix stopped up drains at three in the morning.

John Scheur opens his program with a philosophy on budgeting:

"All of us have been brought up looking at it as some chore or problem. Budgeting is not bad or painful...What you have in any budget situation is a certain amount of money coming in and demands on that money

for expenses to keep the person or the household or both going. It's the 'cookie jar' concept".

He is, however, brief, with a caller who has a budgeting dilemma:

Caller: I've been getting monthly checks. I seem to fritter them all away.

Scheur: All I can say is that the moment that a check comes, before you can do anything with it, put it in a passbook savings account and forget that it's there and then it won't be frittered away.

John Scheur discourages a young man from withdrawing from his tax-free pension plan. He states,

"It's something very difficult for people to get into. It's a bad idea (to withdraw) unless you absolutely have to have it, if you absolutely must, then take out only what you absolutely need".

On the question of residence for the will executor, Scheur tersely states, "Yes (someone living in Florida can be executor of a New York resident's will). Even somebody living in Timbuktu".

It is obvious that Scheur discourages "do-it-yourself" money management. However, he blames our education system and the unnecessary bureaucratic complications that divorce people from sound financial and economic information. He campaigns for a continuous monitoring of the economy and chastises those who don't understand stocks, money markets, mortgages, tax-free investments, wills and budgets. Again he blames our culture of conservative economic thought for much of the misinformation.

In summary, while Scheur is critical of our present financial situation, he encourages all to study, monitor, and carefully invest, with the aid of an expert. He allies himself with callers who fear approaching higher authorities. He gives support to those beginning new careers as well as taking the burden off the individual for economic ignorance. Also, he attempts to infuse some fun in investing. He opens his show with "I am your friend, your personal confidante, your advisor, your uncle in the business of life..." There appears to be a change over time in Scheur's attitudes and approach to callers and listeners. In the earlier survey period Scheur was more the advisor. More recently, however, he has appealed to the audience as a confidante, an uncle.

Dr. Elyse Goldstein

Dr. Goldstein entertained 44 calls during the course of three two-hour broadcasts on WMCA. The following is a table of topics encouraged (N=28) and topics discouraged (N=16).

<u>Topics Encouraged</u>	<u>N</u>
1. Vulnerability about love	6
2. Personal independence	6
3. Substance abuse (smoking/drinking)	4
4. Husband-wife problems	4
5. Agression/violence	2
6. Career questions	2
7. Parenting questions	3
8. Sibling hostility	1
9. Friendship rivalry	1

The category "Vulnerability about love" includes the following calls: Where demanding too much love has ruined a relationship, a man fearful of making a commitment and a possessive girlfriend. Some examples:

Call topic: Vulnerability About Love

Caller : I have a problem with my girlfriend. We've been going together for about 18 months and I'm trying to get her to say that she loves me, in her own words, without having to pry it out of her...

Goldstein : Well, it sounds like you want her to say it solely to make you feel good. Now that's neither good nor bad. What's unfortunate is if you can't feel loved unless she says 'I love you'.

Call topic: Demanding Too Much Love

Caller : I have this terrible need to be loved, to be wanted, I need constant affection...When I get the feeling that I'm not loved, I put a demand on them... and sooner or later the relationship breaks.

Goldstein : Ask yourself, am I feeling that I'm not good enough?...you'll be taking control of your own feelings and really allowing yourself to get some of that love that you really want.

Call topic: Possessive Girlfriend

Caller : It's a big fight. She doesn't want me going out with my friends. I have to stay with her.

Goldstein : Sounds like she's a little frightened, a little possessive, a little insecure and she's using which party you go to as a test of your love for her.

The "Personal Independence" category includes the following: A widower's fear of independence, the need to separate from adult children, the difference between assertive and aggressive, a desire for personal independence, and the psychology of slobbery. Some examples:

Call topic: Personal Independence

Caller : Dependence, in my case, was just awful. I completely sold myself out for a family and husband and put all my...I, I, I have this fear of being overcome.

Goldstein : Now, it is possible Nancy to need to be with people, to like people. We all need people but yet we don't always have to insure that they will stay with us by trying to please them.

Call topic: Widower's Fear of Independence

Caller : My wife passed away in her early 40's. I thought it was a type of mourning that I never experienced in my life so I panicked and needed a woman in my life and it didn't matter who.

Goldstein : Charlie, the key to helping yourself is for you to learn and discover your own resources. Because when you feel that you won't feel that you're at the mercy of anyone else, you won't have to fear the closeness so much.

Call topic: Need to Separate from Adult Children

Caller : I have this terrible habit...I told one son what my other son's wife is doing, borrowing his car.

Goldstein : I suggest a book called Cutting Loose by Howard Halpern. It talks about the act of separating from one's children... sometimes backing off is wonderful because what it does is it puts you back in touch with your needs, rather than just attending to their needs.

Calls categorized as "Substance Abuse" include the following: A call to stop smoking, a teen's drinking problem and what to do with an alcoholic wife. Some examples:

Call topic: Stop Smoking

Caller : I smoke about three packs of cigarettes a day and I can't seem to stop.

Goldstein : I used to smoke about three packs a day also and it is terribly tough. Make a list of what you can tune yourself into those moments of terrible temptation.

Call topic: Wife Who Drinks

Caller : Every two or three years my wife starts to drink and it gets worse and worse and she splits...I love the woman, but at the same time that I love her I don't like her. All her personality traits are off the wall.

Goldstein : What you're doing is you're hanging on to this woman. She's not giving you very much. Sometimes...it's because they don't find anyone else, or they're afraid that another woman will reject them (that men like you stay).

Call topic: Teen's Drinking Problem

Caller : I'm 16 and I have a drinking problem... I really don't like the taste of alcohol, it's just that I'm now addicted to it.

Goldstein : You're probably not liking yourself. One of the ways to get more confidence is to actually put yourself in those (anxiety-producing) situations just a little bit.

The category "Husband-Wife Problems" consists of the following: A wife who fears her husband's illegal business activities, playing out a wife's sexual fantasies, and the perfectionist husband. Some examples:

Call topic: The Perfectionist Husband

Caller : I've been having this problem with my husband for many years, he's a perfectionist. Little by little he starts finding out that I'm not as neat as he is.

Goldstein : This is a very important issue. If I can't get my way than the other person doesn't love me. That's pretty unrealistic, isn't it? Often partners try to mold each other and if they win they get the other person to do it their way.

Call topic: Husband's Crooked Business Deal

Caller : My husband just embarked on a business deal which I feel is a bit underhanded. I feel very uncomfortable about him doing it.

Goldstein : You might talk about the impact it has on you, the feelings you just told me, and ask him what feelings he has about it.

Calls coded "Aggression/Violence" include: A martial artist who fears violence and how inadequacy leads to aggression. For example:

Call topic: Martial Artist Fears Violence

Caller : I seem to have a fear of violence around me. What confuses me is that I'm a student of the martial arts and I can really handle myself.

Goldstein : If you find yourself too anxious, keep reminding yourself that you are an adult now and that you can take care of yourself.

"Career Questions" include: A woman stuck in mid-life career crisis and "making it in New York". For example:

Call topic: Making It In New York

Caller : I've been here in the city working and struggling for the past five years. I'm thinking about going back to the country... I've worked so hard and I don't know if I'm just copping out on my life by going home.

Goldstein : You're like a young flower that's starting to form its buds. Your expectations are too great at this time.

"Parenting Questions" include: The impact of divorce on children, sex education for youngsters and a mother who always puts her daughter down. Some examples:

Call topic: Impact of Divorce on Children

Caller : I have a 12 year old who has an inordinate hate for his sister...and leaving them alone in the house. I'm recently divorced.

Goldstein : People who get divorced feel almost guilty about the impact that it will have on the children. They put too much pressure on themselves, that pressure is then conveyed to the children and they don't want the children to have any problems.

Call topic: Mother Always Puts Daughter Down

Caller : My mother was playing games...she'll constantly put me down. The family used me as a scapegoat.

Goldstein : You can say 'My poor mother, she must feel so anxious, threatened, so afraid when she's in my presence that the only way she can deal with me is to constantly put me down'.

A call about an adult brother's animosity was labeled "Sibling Rivalry". For example,

Caller: I'm 48 and I have a brother who's 2½ years older than me. In my life-long relationships I was annoyed because there was never anything I could do with him.

Goldstein: Is it possible that you were presented as the special one because of your illness (polio)? It's also possible that he was frightened or petrified at the idea that someone close to him, his brother, could be sick as well.

"Friendship Rivalry" consists of a call about two girlfriends who fight over the same boy.

Caller: We fight over a boy in our class all the time, but we're best friends.

Goldstein: I think what you're doing is using this boy to measure which one of you is better, to yourself and to each other.

It is interesting to note that interpersonal, marital and parent-child relationships are stressed, with a definite emphasis on independence and the development of self-worth and confidence. Family, marital and sexual advice was found a favorite with listeners.

<u>Topics Discouraged</u>	<u>N</u>
1. Sexual frustration	4
2. Children's rebellion	3
3. Female competition for a man's attention	3
4. Fear of developing a good relationship	3
5. Lack of independence	2
6. How appearance affects attitudes	1

The category "Children's rebellion" includes the following calls: Son/daughter competition, adult children who rebel and a nine year-old with behavior problems. Some

Examples:

Call topic: Son/daughter Competition
 Caller : When I first started leaving I read them the riot act.

Goldstein : So, your son starts to beat up on your daughter when he feels inadequate..I wouldn't try to eliminate any fighting or bickering. I really wouldn't.

Call topic: Adult Children who Rebel
 Caller : I had no idea that my daughter told my son-in-law things that were untrue about my drinking...that I gave her a terrible childhood.

Goldstein : There's also something going on between you and your daughter. Sounds like she pulled away and told her husband all those terrible stories about you...I think you need to set your self-esteem and to keep your self-respect out of this.

Calls called "Female Competition for a Man's Attention" include the following: Jealousy of the "other" woman, and competition, with a female friend. For example:

Call topic: Jealousy of the "Other" Woman
 Caller : He's very jealous of me and I think I'm very jealous of him. (She's having an affair with a married man.)

Goldstein : It's like a competition set up with you saying that you have to be the winner. Miss Desirability, Yeah,,You're looking for your sense of self, good feelings about you from how he evaluates you.

Questions coded as "Sexual Frustration" include calls that deal with sexual guilt during menstruation, the inability to get pregnant, sexual perversion and pregnancy as a sign of love, as well as discussion of impotency. Some examples:

Call topic: Impotency

Caller : There's a partial erection, from there it proceeds to collapse.

Goldstein : So you're used to it (masturbation), you've got control; you know what to expect, you don't put yourself on the line dealing with the intricacies of dealing with another person in the exchange.

Call topic: Pregnancy as a Sign of Love

Caller : I had a separation with my husband for two years. We have four children. Now that we are back he seems to want another one and I don't think we need another one at all.

Goldstein : Just remember that it's your body. You don't have to do anything with it that you don't want to do.

"Fear of Developing a Good Relationship" includes the following: A woman who loves an alcoholic, a very long-distance boyfriend and the social stigma of a handicapped woman. Some examples:

Call topic: In Love with an Alcoholic

Caller : I'm in love with an alcoholic. I want to know how to keep on his good side so if he decides to give up drinking and discovers that I was the right one for him, all along.

Goldstein : People are attracted to alcoholic others, for instance, to protect themselves. You know they think he'll be so polluted that he won't notice my faults.

Call topic: Social Stigma of a Handicapped Woman

Caller : I just feel guilty. I don't know where to hide. This man I think wants to see me again.

Goldstein : I could ask you how seriously do you want a relationship, because you keep building up all the reasons why you shouldn't have one.

A caller's inability to say "no" and another's inability to break from an unsupportive family were coded as

"Lack of Independence". For example:

Call topic: Inability to Say "No"
 Caller : I realized that it was too close and no good because they (her boyfriend's daughter and son-in-law) were trying to run our lives completely.
 Goldstein : But nobody can lay a guilt trip on you if you're not willing to accept it. That's the bottom line.

A call about dressing for court concerned with giving the appropriate impression was labeled, "How Appearance Affects Attitudes".

Caller: Regarding a fractured hip...I'm going to to appear before a group of lawyers... By dressing richly would I antagonize the people who are going to question me?
 Goldstein: I think the important thing is what you feel comfortable in...since I don't know the details of your situation, I hesitate to say here.

In summary, situations where the caller surrenders independence or control are discouraged by Dr. Goldstein. Circumstances where the caller is at the mercy of children, romantic partners and even the court system are frowned upon, given abrupt, impatient answers or are dealt with indirectly, sometimes way off the mark (especially in the case of the answer to dressing for court).

Dr. Judith Kuriansky

Dr. Kuriansky entertained 46 calls during the course of three 3-hour broadcasts on WABC. The following is a table of topics encouraged (N=21) and topics discouraged (N=25).

<u>Topics Encouraged</u>	<u>N</u>
1. Not reaching potential	5
2. Self-esteem/self-control	4
3. Value of therapy	4
4. Negative stereotypes	3
5. Breaking sex roles	2
6. Romance	2

The category "Not Reaching Potential" included the following calls: Creativity and writing blocks, a workaholic and a caller too serious to be successful. Some examples:

Call topic: Writing Block
 Caller : Whenever I begin to write, it's good for a while and then I get a block.
 Kuriansky : ...have everything you want in your life. Can you say to yourself, I'm going to go for it. Well, if you can't, then you might be in some pain about that. There are ways, however, to let yourself go for it. Certainly having someone encourage you do that by saying you directly go for it, let yourself do it.

Call topic: Too Serious to be Successful
 Caller : I'm afraid of too much success...I still find I block myself from really doing things I loved. I know it comes from some really horrendous times.
 Kuriansky : (Responding to the caller's laugh) You know what. There was a burst, when you laughed, did you feel differently? A tremendous weight was lifted off you.

Calls coded "Self-Esteem/Self-Control" include the following: Taking control, using wife's illness or kids as an excuse not to take charge of life and the importance of learning one's roots. Some examples:

Call topic: Taking Control
 Caller : I want to reflect on what you mentioned earlier about the mirror technique. A few years ago I was stuck at a going nowhere job and at the time I couldn't look at myself in the mirror. I used to

comb my hair through the corner of my eye. Then I read a book called Pulling Your Own Strings. That was the point of my transformation and I started gathering my positive points and my creative points...When I look at myself in the mirror I can give myself a good smile because I feel that I have achieved.

Kuriansky : Wonderful, good for you.

Call topic: Wife's Illness Inhibit Creativity

Caller : Long ago and far away I was very creative. The past two years my wife is practically bedridden with severe pain and pain transmits into myself.

Kuriansky : Well, I hear very much the love you have for your wife. But you need to start taking creative time...you're using your guilt (complex) to kill you in some way.

Call topic: Learn Roots

Caller : I am a halfway educated Black who is attempting to go back to school. I realize that I am black. I am proud of being Black. I lack Black history and I truly hope you can understand where I'm coming from in this.

Kuriansky : I think Dr. Moss (guest) would agree that a knowledge of your roots is very important for one's self-esteem.

Dr. Moss : My sense of what happens to people for whom there is no sense of continuity in feeling a sense of who they are and a sense of self-worth...this lack of consistency leaves the individual with a feeling of frustration and personal impairment.

Calls coded "Value of Therapy" include the following:

The pace and duration of therapy, child-and group-therapy and a cry out for therapy. Some examples:

Call topic: Pace and Duration of Therapy

Caller : I find long-term therapy most conducive to changes. We are most secure with the insecurities. I had more outlets (From the insecurities) three years ago then I had two years ago and now I try to use my energies constructively.

Kuriansky : Well, I think that if it's (long-term therapy) is working for you, for whatever reason, then that's terrific.

Call topic: Cry Out for Therapy

Caller : I have a pretty distressing problem... I'm watching over my friend's son. She died six years ago. He uses drugs. He idolizes Hitler. When his mother was dying of cancer in the hospital, he tried to commit suicide by setting fire to the garage.

Kuriansky : What is the boy really saying? As his mother was dying he set fire to the garage because of the coldness within. It is imperative that you have an outside professional involved.

"Negative stereotypes" include the following calls:

The reputation of show business people, prejudice against the elderly and attacks on "Mom" in therapy. For example:

Call topic: Blame Mother in Therapy

Caller : My husband and I are in therapy with different therapists and totally different problems. Both therapists blame our mothers. It doesn't make sense to me.

Kuriansky : Well, certainly there are different styles of therapists...Those first relationships with Mother determine how we relate to other people. So some therapists will use that relationship as a pattern. Well, putting the blame (on your mothers) I don't really think it's really helpful. It's time for you now to get on something else, for what gets between you and your husband.

Calls categorized as "Breaking Sex Roles" includes the following: The "Un-Macho" image for men and a male's desire to express his feminine side. For example:

Call topic: Male's Expression of Feminine Side

Caller : I want to explore my second self. My feminine side is quite dominant, while my male side is a flop. I've had

several divorces. Repressing the feminine side of myself caused a lot of evil in my life. I feel it's out of control.

Kuriansky : You're making one extreme or the other, labelling them and then you make a split inside yourself. The goal of any human being is to integrate those selves. You may feel abandoned or left by a woman, rejected by a woman. To deny the hurt, you assume the role of the one who hurt you.

Questions of "Romance" include the following calls: A husband's one-night stand and a kiss-and-tell girlfriend. For example:

Call topic: One-Night Stand

Caller : My husband confessed to me that he had a one-night stand with an old girlfriend. I'm so upset about this...I don't trust him anymore. It upsets me so...Confess to him my suspicions? I don't want to know.

Kuriansky : What do you suppose is the message, when someone is told about an affair... I'm suggesting that it may be constructive to you to talk to him. It's not constructive to remind him, accuse him. It makes the other person defensive.

It is important to mention that Dr. Kuriansky may open the first hour or so of each program with a guest. Often calls that follow reflect the discussion with the guests. The three randomly selected programs included guests that spoke about how to enhance creativity, racial and religious discrimination and the value of psychotherapy. Calls coded reaching potential, self-esteem and the value of therapy are a direct result of Dr. Kuriansky's discussion with her featured guests. Dr. Kuriansky patiently questions

caller's motivations, intentions, feelings and statements and encourages independent and creative thinking, such as in the calls that break sex roles and attack stereotypes. She advocates self-control yet cautions callers about exerting undue pressure on others. She often reflects on the early bonding between mother and child in setting patterns for relationships with others. Callers actively question the veracity of this theory.

<u>Topics Discouraged</u>	<u>N</u>
1. Sabatoging self	7
2. Discrimination	5
3. When to admit it's over	4
4. Interrelationships	3
5. Time wasted/things stolen	3
6. Therapy	3

"Sabotaging Self" includes the following: Belief that creative people are neurotic, using peers as critics, relying on smoking or drugs for relaxation, the perfectionist athlete, the inability to complete things and fear of applause. Some examples:

Call topic: Fear of Applause
 Caller : I have a little problem. I don't like to be looked at and I don't like being applauded at.

Kuriansky : Little limitation? Not wanting to be applauded at is really critical Julio. A lot of that is the fear of being acknowledged and being noticed.

Call topic: Drug-Induced Creativity
 Caller : About eight years ago I did LSD about five or six times just as part of my growing up and every few months I get flashbacks. During those periods I have an enhanced state of creativity.

Kuriansky : First of all I don't call that an enhanced state of creativity. You may think you're more conscious. It would be helpful to you in unleashing your creativity to be in touch with your thinking process very much while you're here at this very moment.

Calls coded "Discrimination" include the following:

Calls about affirmative action, reverse discrimination, discrimination of the adopted child and the increasing discrimination in New York. Some examples:

Call topic: Discrimination in New York

Caller : I'm originally from Nashville. I can honestly say that I've encountered more discrimination of all forms here in New York than I ever did in Nashville. In New York it's as if many of the minorities are warring against each other.

Kuriansky : There have been periods in the history of New York where that was even more the case.

Call topic: Discrimination Against Adoptees

Caller : I am adopted and I feel that I was discriminated against when I was growing up. On one hand they felt sorry for me, and the other hand they looked at me as though I was different.

Kuriansky : The point you bring is that one reason people form prejudices is out of lack of knowledge and real understanding, so anyone that is different may be looked upon more negatively.

The category "When to admit it's over", includes the following: Separation from children and when to leave therapy. Some examples:

Call topic: When to Quit Therapy

Caller : I tried to quit (therapy) three times, but I wasn't ready.

Kuriansky : Well, then it's not time for you to leave. What do you want from me?... So what are you really asking?

Call topic: Separation from Children

Caller : I have a writing block. I can't seem to write in my diary my feeling for my child.

Kuriansky : One of the things parents do to themselves is they refuse to allow themselves to feel angry and to feel like they don't want to have the child around.

Calls coded "Interrelationships" include the following:
The inability to deal with life, trouble relating to women, female therapists and the long-distance relationships.

Some examples:

Call topic: Trouble Dealing with Women

Caller : I have trouble relating to women... I haven't figured it out. My (female) therapist is trying to push me to go more.

Kuriansky : What blocks do you have communicating with her? It's possible that you're not having a good therapeutic interaction anyway, so...

Call topic: Trouble Dealing with Life

Caller : I have a hard time dealing with life.

Kuriansky : Therapy can often work on people who have a hard time dealing with life. It can frighten people as well. But, it's up to you.

Calls coded "Time Wasted/Things Stolen" include the following calls: Time with a nonsupportive husband seen as wasteful, stolen ideas and missing medical records. Some examples:

Call topic: Ideas Stolen

Caller : I'm poor but I should be rich. I lost face in sending out material and I started writing articles.

Kuriansky : It sounds like, Sylvia, you're proud of yourself but you're rushing a lot. You can't really put your idea out there without it potentially being stolen.

Call topic: Medical Records

Caller : My mother had three severe nervous breakdowns. Now we want to change hospitals and they won't release her records.

Kuriansky : A medical organization is obligated to share the information requested by the patient...Really, the family truly needs to make a lot of noise and stay on top of it (the medical administrators) and keep calling.

Calls regarding "Therapy" include the following:

Confrontational therapy, the psychological motivation for nudism and what to expect out of therapy. Some examples:

Call topic: What to Expect out of Therapy

Caller : What should I be expecting in terms of time frames (in therapy) to gain the tools to deal with my spouse?

Kuriansky : I've asked you the question and you haven't been able to verbalize it. It's hard for you to see this.

Call topic: Confrontational Analysis

Caller : I was very upset by the way he (therapist) treated me. He tried to push me into things. He was a terror to (my wife). She disappeared...that was a violent reaction for my wife.

Kuriansky : You seem to want to blame the therapy on this.

Call topic: Motivation for Nudism

Caller : What is the psychological motivation for nudism in an organized fashion?

Kuriansky : What does it mean for you? Usually the most comfortable answer for people is in the desire to really expose oneself. Is this something you're thinking of doing?

Dr. Kuriansky mainly discourages callers with questions that belie her skepticism or with impatient, abrupt answers. She discourages against all bad habits, including drugs and cigarettes and the individual's refusal to accept

responsibility. Any crutch, be it external (children, friends, parents) or internal (guilt complex, fear, prejudice, therapy) are discounted.

Radio Call-In Programs as Shared Social Reality:

Comparisons

Two popular subjects of radio call-in are one, personal finance/business advice and family, marital and sexual counseling. Various market research studies have shown that people spent more time listening to talk radio than they do to music radio (Arbitron, 1981). Ed Bush, co-host of RKO's network show, "America Overnight" states, "The important thing is that the listener takes the information he hears to the people he needs to consult about it" (Tudryn, 1982). Joan Hamburg, host of "How to Cope" on WOR, said that everyone wants free advice, "Everyone wants the same thing -- survival techniques" (Carter et. al., 1979).

Surely both financial and interpersonal counseling are important tools for surviving and coping. Bernard Meltzer emphasizes the dangers of illegal business practice, real estate investments, employment tips and retiree's concerns. John Scheur shares similar concerns with retirement planning and real estate, supplemented by discussion of mortgage financing, purchases, IRAs, and starting new businesses. Both hosts offer practical, common sense, minimal financial suggestions. However,

Meltzer imbues his advice with personal and emotional ramifications, while Scheur sticks more directly with the more tangible, financial consequences.

Scheur vs. Meltzer

While both hosts are advocates of America's political and economic system, Bernard Meltzer is truly unwavering in his support for the present and projects for the future. In contrast, Scheur is critical of the country's political activities of late, and pessimistic of our present and projected economy. While Meltzer speaks as a patriotic supportive of the status quo, Scheur often speaks of flexibility and a "revolution" in the public's thinking about money and the economy. It is Scheur who attacks the "conservative" stockholder. This is a major difference between the two purveyors of radio financial advice. Meltzer's

"A land so bountiful and a land so beautiful... We reflect that we are indeed fortunate to live in this wonderful land, the best land of all".

is countered by Scheur's,

"The United States everyday is taking on additional financial responsibilities, underwriting the financial stability of more and more things and countries around the world and it is a very frightening prospect".

Truly these are two divergent voices.

However, despite Scheur's more liberal pronouncements, he suggests callers to be patient and flexible in all personal and business dealings. Here, he and Bernard Meltzer

are in agreement. Scheur says, "One needs to have a continuous management procedure, which changes with each major change in the market conditions". In a similar vein, Meltzer advises, "An IRA has got to be safe and sound and secure. It belongs in a bank or in a government security, or securities guaranteed by Uncle Sam. It belongs no other place".

Both hosts ally themselves with callers and offer their support. Scheur tells a loan seeker, "You have to sell yourself. You should not deal with the lower level of the bank's bureaucracy. You should try to see the head of the department...go at it in a positive way". Meanwhile Bernard Meltzer also offers support and inspires confidence. He tells a teen suddenly turned down for a job, "For some reason they don't want to hire you now. So instead of telling you they goofed, they're telling you it's a bad reference. You should call their bluff".

The two hosts differ on topics that they discourage. Meltzer's major emphasis is against bad business deals and attacks on "the system" while Scheur's emphasis is on discouraging financial self-management. For example, Meltzer is skeptical of someone desiring a balloon mortgage, staging, "There's no reason why, except perhaps, that they cannot get a mortgage at a bank. There's a reason for it which they are telling you". He is likewise skeptical over

a caller charging police brutality in New Jersey, claiming, "Police don't act this way. This is not 1920 in a Southern state. This is 1983 in the state of New Jersey". Meanwhile, Scheur is skeptical of those who wish to manage their own investments. He condescendingly proclaims, "I know big wage earners who are ignorant in the field as a ten year old. It's a darn shame". To underscore this point, he loses his temper with a caller, "How much do you have to lose before you're going to do what I'm suggesting. Get out first. Get out totally and learn".

Both hosts discourage topics by being impatient. Scheur's previous statement was evidence of this. To another caller he offers the following, "You can't run your life by a formula. This is ludicrous. Let's use a little common sense...Government created a very complicated system and is saying to the people 'You're doped because you don't understand this'". With similar impatience, Meltzer answers young marrieds, who questions life insurance, "In that case, why are you calling me? In other words, if everything I tell you, you have an answer for".

In summary, the major difference between hosts Scheur and Meltzer is a liberal versus conservative stance, respectively. Meltzer advocates the status quo while Scheur, pessimistic about the government and the economy, advocates "revolutionary" thinking. Both are similar in offering practical, common sense, low-risk advice. Both

ally themselves with callers who feel they are at the mercy of more powerful "others": Banks, landlords, government officials, the IRS, etc. Both hosts discourage certain topics via skepticism and impatience. Scheur is most skeptical over the public's false knowledge of financial management while Meltzer is most skeptical over bad business deals and attack on institutions. Likewise, each exhibits his impatience in areas he discourages. Scheur is impatient with callers who profess to understand investments; Meltzer's impatience emanates when a caller refuses to admit to Meltzer's prognosis of a bad business deal. Is the information and advice disseminated seen by the audience as "tools for survival"?

Goldstein Versus Kuriansky

A Daily News article likened talk radio to a "Sort of verbal version of Ann Lander's columns; each program hosts its own therapist who gives instant on-the-air advice to troubled callers" (Carter et. al., 1979). Radio psychotherapist, Toni Grant, agrees, "It's a soap opera that educates". It's often been said that soap opera's appeal stems from a belief that, one, we are not alone in our problems, and two, that there are problems much worse than our own.

A study by Lazarus and Beinlein (1967) concludes that soap opera techniques allow the patient to become involved in an emotionally-charged situation without the ego-threat

of direct participation and provides a takeoff for education on emotional conflict. Sharing of the TV experience also legitimizes it as a subject of discussion. Psychiatric patients who viewed soap operas and subsequently engaged in discussion sessions about them were found to have improved clinically. They verbalized their problems more directly and increased their capacity to ventilate both dependent and aggressive feelings (Time, 1980).

It is reported that a widow in her seventies called WOR's Dr. Blaker and said, "When I hear about others, I feel I'm not the only one in the world with problems" (Rubenstein, 1981).

It has already been stated in this discussion that from a survey of listeners, the audience believes it is "educated" by these calls. But what do these radio therapists educate their audience about? What problems are brought to light, that can alleviate the audience's present worries? And, to reflect upon the earlier discussion of Scheur and Meltzer, is the audience offered tools for coping and techniques for survival? Both therapy hosts offer pertinent advice in interpersonal, family, marital and sexual matters. But each does so with a different emphasis.

Dr. Goldstein's emphasis is on personal independence. She's supportive of a woman who felt overcome by husband

and family when she states, "We all need people yet we don't always have to insure that they will stay with us by trying to please them". She tells a widower to be resourceful,

"Charlie, the key to helping yourself is for you to learn and discover your own resources...you won't feel that you're at the mercy of anyone else, (so) you won't have to fear the closeness so much".

And she advises a mother to make the break from her children, stating,

"...act of separating from one's children... sometimes backing off is wonderful because what it does is it puts you back in touch with your needs, rather than just attending to their needs".

Coupled with this heralding for independence is the admission of the vulnerability that surrounds love and romance. It is in this discussion that Dr. Goldstein emphasizes the "independent" element. In response to a caller who fears that she demands too much love, Dr. Goldstein advises, "Ask yourself, am I feeling that I'm not good enough?..." "you'll be taking control of your own feelings...". Self-esteem, a by-product of personal independence, is recommended in her suggestion to a man vulnerable about love, when she queries, "Well, it sounds like you want her to make you feel good...What's unfortunate is if you can't feel loved unless she says 'I love you'".

Another element of personal independence is the fear of rejection and the inability to say "No". She encourages a handicapped woman to "take control of her life" and

tells another that no one can lay a guilt trip on her. She seizes each available opportunity to speak on women's liberation issues, without identifying them as such. She explains the invasion of independence as the other person's insecurity, fear, anxiety. In this way, she allied herself with the caller who is beset by a possessive spouse, lover or children.

In contrast, Dr. Kuriansky offers a slightly different slant on radio psychotherapy. She encourages attempts toward achieving greater human potential, as she emphasizes self-esteem, self-control and reaching potential; she discourages discussion of the ways people sabotage this pursuit. She offers two concepts in her instruction: "The Mirror Test" and "Critical Mommy". In the "Mirror Test" she offers a therapy where if we refuse to see ourselves as we are reflected in the mirror, we hide ourselves behind barriers that inhibit growth and development. To this, a caller responds,

"...I used to comb my hair through the corner of my eye...at the point of my transformation I started to gather my positive points and my creative points...When I look at myself in the mirror I can give myself a good smile because I feel that I have achieved".

What are the barriers in achieving potential? She offers the "Critical Mommy" as our most prohibitive internal inhibitor. It is that part of us that replaces the Mommy, when we were young, who told us when and what was wrong or not satisfactory. She offers the husband chained

to his dying wife this rather stark advice, "You're using your guilt (complex) to kill you in some way". The "Mommy" concept is presented in another form: Dr. Kuriansky adheres to the popular theory that our interpersonal relationships, gender identifications, etc. are patterned after our early mother-child relationships. In response to a question about therapy, she states, "Those first relationships with mother determine how we relate to other people...so some therapists will use that relationship as a pattern".

In comparison, Drs. Goldstein and Kuriansky offer psychotherapeutic advice which adheres to the theories of modern psychology that are espoused in current self-help books and manuals. In fact, Dr. Goldstein, to a greater degree, and Dr. Kuriansky, more infrequently, will refer to these self-help guides. Book referrals have both functional and dysfunctional consequences. Encouraging the caller or listener to give further study to a problem or set of questions is valid and educational. However, the illusion that these pop-psychology books are an instant "cure-all" for all psychological maladies is quite harmful. Winick (1982) points to the hazards of what he labels "psychobabble".

"That some persons who have serious emotional problems will attempt to engage in self-treatment... another hazard is that each season brings a new such book to the best-seller lists, and the regular purchaser of such materials could be trying a new technique every few months".

While both radio therapists stress self-esteem, Dr. Goldstein's

stand is on control and independence (power) while Dr. Kuriansky's emphasis is achieving potential (individual capability). These are two markedly different foci on the general question of self-esteem. Questions of control and power describe relationships with "others". Questions of capability and potential describe the "inner self". Herein lies the major difference between the two radio personal counselors: Dr. Goldstein's advice is more interpersonal, while Dr. Kuriansky's is more intrapersonal.

Both hosts exhibit impatience and abruptness with callers on topics they discourage. Dr. Goldstein chastises callers who surrender control to children and romantic partners. Similarly, Dr. Kuriansky is skeptical and impatient with those who permit barriers or crutches to inhibit personal development. However, when these hosts are encouraging, it is generally with supportive, common sense, direct-action advice to the caller. In the methods of support, Dr. Goldstein draws support from her tough stand, while Dr. Kuriansky tends to display a supportive role by probing feeling, intentions and consequences.

In summary, Dr. Goldstein takes a more forceful stand with callers as she espouses the importance of personal independence in all relationships. By contrast, Dr. Kuriansky is more probing in her attempt to advocate breaking barriers to achieve greater personal development. Because Dr. Goldstein's emphasis is on social psychology, how the indi-

vidual relates to others in society, she is more "community-oriented" in a sociological sense. This is in contrast to Dr. Kuriansky's approach which is more geared to the individual in therapy, not out in society.

Summary and Theory

In summation, listeners selectively expose themselves to particular radio call-in shows. This validates Klapper's (1960) theories about selective exposure. Listeners consider the programs both entertaining and educational, with a surprisingly large proportion calling the format a "window on the world". Among the characteristics of those who felt this way are some college education, occupations including clerical, sales or homemakers. They tended to listen to the programs occasionally but not daily. They claimed that call-in radio make them more aware and better able to cope with problems. They felt that the programs presented a reflection of reality, allowing listeners to vicariously experience as well as serve as a cathartic outlet.

Over 90% of the respondents found the hosts proficient in handling the topics presented. This supports Avery's (1978) theory that people seek out an ally in the talk show host. Also, over 60% of the respondents agreed with the advice given by the hosts. The older, male hosts enjoyed the greatest listener agreement.

Topics such as health, personal finance, family advice and the economy were considered the most interesting and

most likely to lead to further discussion and personal use. The special interests and worries of audience members makes these topics so popular or useful.

Goffman's "Impression Management" study examines closely the host's control over the definition of the situation and legitimation of interaction. In this study each host uses verbal cues to either encourage or discourage a topic of discussion. Bernard Meltzer was found to be a spokesman for common sense business and investment practices, as well as a staunch defender of the "system". On the other hand, John Scheur is critical of our present financial situation; however, he encourages all to study, monitor and carefully invest, with the aid of an expert. He blames our culture and education for national ignorance on economic matters as he calls for change.

Dr. Goldstein stresses interpersonal, marital and parent-child relationships, with an emphasis on independence and the development of self-worth and confidence. She discourages those callers who surrender their independence to children, romantic partners and even higher authorities, like the courts. On the other hand, Dr. Kuriansky often features a guest in the first hour or so of her program. Calls taken in that time period and shortly thereafter usually reflect the topic and expertise of the guest. Dr. Kuriansky encourages independent and creative thinking, such as promoting calls that question sex roles and stereo-

types. She advocates self-control and pushes for reaching human potential. She discourages all internal and external inhibitors to reaching potential.

Goffman speaks of the host's role in sharing and promoting social values and the maintenance of "team" solidarity. In this study, the hosts are compared by the subject matter of their programs. In the economic and financial realm, Meltzer endorses the status quo while Scheur attacks the conservative stance in economics and heralds a "revolution" in financial thinking. Despite this difference in perspective both are patient and flexible with most callers. However the two differ on topics which they discourage. While Meltzer discourages attacks on the social institutions, Scheur chastizes those who are prone toward financial self-management.

Young, female radio therapists are the norm in radio psychotherapy. Both offer pertinent advice in interpersonal, family, marital and sexual matters. But while Goldstein's emphasis is on personal independence, Kuriansky encourages self-esteem, self-control and reaching potential. Dr. Goldstein offers on-air referrals, while Dr. Kuriansky's are all off-air. The major difference in perspective is that Dr. Goldstein's advice is more interpersonal while Dr. Kuriansky's is more intrapersonal.

In the next chapter, "Impression Management by Call-In Hosts", we will use Goffman's impression management concept

as a tool to measure the control exerted by the host in controlling the interaction. In Chapter Six, "Host Appeal and the Assertion of Authority", we will draw from this examination to get a better understanding of the host's appeal and how authority is asserted.

CHAPTER 5

IMPRESSION MANAGEMENT BY CALL-IN HOSTS

How does call-in radio differ from the CB subculture described by Kerbo et. al. in Chapter One, "Radio Call-In Programs: A Sociological Concern"? One major difference is that there exists a host in call-in radio who controls and regulates the flow of two-way communication. While CB is an unregulated "partyline" of anyone who happens to "break" into the channel, call-in radio usually restricts the interaction to two people, the host and the caller. In the previous chapter the theory of selective exposure to call-in radio hosts was discussed. Listeners and callers purposively tune in and decide to call a particular host, one they generally believe will ally with them. Verbal cues that encourage or discourage callers prompt a prospective caller to predict the reception of his or her call. The analysis of topics in the prior chapter is instructive to the future caller as well. From the host's previous handling and treatment of past subjects and calls, the audience is prepared for and supportive of the host's particular perspective.

But, how does the host control the interaction? The dramaturgical approach advanced by Goffman is an appropriate tool to measure this. There are numerous similarities between the theatrical performers Goffman discusses and the radio call-in show with both host and callers as

"performers". The host's role of sharing social values and legitimizing interaction as well as team solidarity and anonymity bear directly on our analysis of call-in radio. His analysis of the Forms of Talk and Frame Analysis are also instructive. We will then apply Goffman's concepts of "Manners" and Appearance" to each of the four hosts.

Goffman applies sociological analysis of dramaturgical practice to his field work in the Shetland Islands in The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. In this study he introduces the important paradigm of "Impression Management" to social situations. He draws upon theories offered by Cooley, Mead, Merton, Durkheim, Radcliffe-Brown and others when he states, "When an individual is in the immediate presence of others, his activity will have a promisory character... it will be in his interests to control the conduct of others, especially their responsive treatment of him. This control is achieved largely by influencing the definition of the situation which the others come to formulate" (1959:2-3). He adds,

"We must also see that the others (the audience), however passive their role may seem to be, will themselves effectively project a definition of the situation by virtue of their response to the individual and by virtue of any lines of action they initiate to him" (1959:9).

Impression Management

Goffman believes that the speaker and audience wish to avoid conflict over the "definition of the situation".

He calls this a "working consensus". Several more definitions are in order before we may implement impression management to reveal host-caller-listeners interaction in call-in radio programs. A "part" or "routine" is the pre-established pattern of action that unfolds during a performance. Goffman explores the term "role" when he states,

"It is no mere historical accident that the word person, in it's first meaning, is a mask... fact that everyone is always... playing a role... It is in these roles that we know each other; it is in these roles that we know ourselves" (1959:19).

A "front" is that part of the individual's performance which regularly functions in a fixed fashion. "Appearances" are those stimuli which tell us of the performer's social statuses, whereas "Manners" are those stimuli that warn the audience of the interaction the performer expects of the audience. A "region" is defined as any place that is bounded, to some degree, by a barrier to perception. Regions are divided into front and back; seen by the audience and those hidden, respectively. The exchange from back to front region, via the utilization of "inside secrets" "helps the group feel separate and different from those individuals who are not 'in the know'".

What does Goffman say about "Impression Management" that has direct bearing on the study of call-in radio? With regard to social values expressed in the performance, Goffman admits that,

"When an individual presents himself before others, his performance will tend to incorporate and exemplify the officially accredited values of the society, more so, in fact, than does his behavior on the whole" (1959:35).

Legitimacy

In the previous examination of the shared social reality and social values expressed in four radio call-in shows, it was concluded that despite different perspectives, Meltzer's conservatism, Scheur's liberalism, Goldstein's social personality and Kuriansky's individual-centered therapy and advice, the values disseminated both incorporated and exemplified established values of society.

Likewise, the performer is accorded greater status, as Goffman admits,

"We tend to assume that the expressive stresses in a performance, necessarily claim for the performer a higher class status than might otherwise be accorded him" (1959:37).

Goffman states that the performer creates an impression of "legitimacy" when "he engenders in his audience the belief that he has related to them in a more ideal way than is always the case" (1959:48) and even "exaggerates the uniqueness of the transaction between performer and audience". Their interrelationship is expected to be a consistent one, "A certain bureaucratization of the spirit is expected so that we can be relied upon to give a perfectly homogeneous performance at every appointed time".

However he also identifies four types of "Communication Out of Character", because they are in opposition to the impression officially maintained to define the situation. They are: Treatment of the absent, staging talk, team collusion and realigning actions. A pointed example of the "treatment of the absent" is the way team member derogate the audience when backstage. This serves to solidify the team. "Stage talk" involves the "shop talk" necessary between all "service specialists" in the radio call-in show team. "Team collusion" includes all secret cues and signals between them, that is kept out of the range of the audience. In "Realigning Actions" a "subordinate (the caller) can initiate action without jeopardizing the status of the superordinate (the host)" (1959:195). Goffman admits that,

"Interestingly enough, there are occasions when it serves the wider goals of the higher team (the host and staff) to lower barriers and admit the lower team (callers) to greater intimacy and equality with it" (1959:199).

However, if this happens too often, the performer/host may jeopardize his standing with the audience. Goffman emphasizes,

"When a performer refuses to keep his place, whether it be of a higher or lower rank than his audience, we may expect... the audience may well become ill-disposed toward him" (1959:200).

How is the performers/host's authority established with the audience? Goffman suggests that by maintaining of social distance a cooperative audience will be in awe

of the performer/host. Goffman labels "inopportune intrusions" times when an outsider accidentally enters a performance region. However, when the performer/host inadvertently destroys his image, Goffman calls that a "Gaff" or "boner". To prevent these "incidents" the performer/host can maintain audience loyalty in several ways: By developing high in-group solidarity within the team, to change audiences, using self-control to suppress private, emotional responses, limiting the size of the team (by screening them out) and insuring the anonymity of the caller.

Team Solidarity And Anonymity

Goffman emphasizes that "Anonymity insures that a person maintain a front that is rather false" (1959:221). But the performer must be sensitive to the needs of the audience,

"Sensitive to the hints and ready to take them--it is through the hints that the audience can warn the performer that his show is unacceptable and that he had better modify, it quickly, if the situation is to be saved" (1959:234).

The term "team" refers to any set of individuals who cooperate in the staging of a single routine and whose "intimate cooperation is required if a given definition of the situation is to be maintained". The call-in radio audience, both callers and listeners, comprise a "team" in Goffmanesque terms. What prompts an individual to join the team? Goffman suggests that a reciprocal dependence will form between teammates, "the privilege of familiarity--constituting a kind of intimacy without warmth..." (1959:83).

Call-In Radio Staff

Goffman identifies four discrepant roles: The "service specialist", the "training specialist", colleagues and confidantes. The "service specialist" is an anonymous backstage member of the team and must use discretion in not giving away show secrets. The show producer, researchers and screeners serve in this function. The "training specialist" has the dual task of building a desirable impression for the performer while also taking the part of the audience. Repeat callers, familiar to host and listeners, alike, fit this role. "Confidantes" are identified as the persons, offstage, to whom the performer can confess his sins. Confidantes for call-in radio hosts may be non-radio specialists in the particular areas of expertise. Goffman defines "colleague" as a "person who presents the same routine to the same kind of audience but who do not participate together". Clearly, colleagues would be other call-in radio hosts. All four roles feed information to the host and will be examined in Chapter 9, entitled "Production of Culture".

Forms Of Radio Talk

In discussing dramaturgical practice, Goffman also offers us an early response to the question of the popularity of radio call-in programming. He states,

"Whatever it is that generates the human want for social contact and for companionship, the effect seems to take two forms: A need for an audience before which to try out one's vaunted selves, and a need for

teammates with whom to enter into collusive intimacies and backstage relaxation... In-group solidarity tends to result, in this 'social support', as it is called, presumably has therapeutic value... It may be that these shifts from apartness to intimacy occur at times of chronic strains or perhaps we can view them as part of an anti-dramaturgical social movement, a cult of confession" (1959:204-205).

Do new audiences view the performer/host differently than longtime listeners? Goffman suggests that,

"The more information the audience has about the performer, the less likely it is that anything they learn during the interaction will influence them. On the other hand, where no prior information is possessed, it may be expected that the information gleaned during the interaction will be relatively crucial. Hence, we may expect individuals to relax the strict maintenance of front when they are with those they have known for a long time and to tighten their front when among persons who are new to them. With those whom one does not know, careful performances are required" (1959:222).

What kind of interaction takes place? Goffman calls this a "social establishment". He defines it as,

"A place surrounded by fixed barriers to perception, where we find a team of performers who cooperate to present to an audience a given definition of the situation...where familiarity prevails, solidarity is likely to develop and secrets... are shared and kept. Typically, but not always, agreement is stressed and opposition is underplayed..." (1959:238).

Goffman's Presentation of Self in Everyday Life was published in 1959. He pursues his theories of impression management and its application to talk and call-in radio

in a later book, Forms of Talk (1981). In general, about radio speech, he states,

"A radio announcer must inevitably talk as if responsive others were before his ears and eyes... the announcers must conjure up in their minds' eye the notion of listeners..." (1981:241).

More specifically, about radio talk, he adds,

"The 'three way' mode of announcing in talk shows and guest interview formats, the M.C. sustains a conversation--obviously fresh talk...whilst the remote audience is treated as if it were a ratified participant...in these ways the audience can appear to be brought into the conversation as it unfolds; knowing enough to follow the talk...Another variant is found in phone-in shows, where the remote audience is made privy to one or both sides of colloquies that the announcer intermittently has with callers, these two-party talks conducted in the encompassing encounter the announcer is maintaining with his wider audience" (1981:234-235).

The following discussion I will examine, by utilizing Goffman's impression management and frame analysis to examine the host's control over the conversation as well as "gaffs" and "boners".

Bernard Meltzer

Topics Encouraged

Bernard Meltzer employs a variety of cues in his "routine" as life advisor to his audience. Among the "manners" he uses with his "team" to encourage certain topics of discussion are references of spirituality, an emotional appeal, the use of endearments, complimenting the callers, empathy and an alliance with callers, an

offer of comfort, laughter and asking for additional information. Cues that add to his "Appearance" include the following: Talk from personal experience, self-promotion, rewarding callers with T-shirts, references to his certainty and the wisdom of his advice.

Manners

Meltzer incorporates spirituality in the form of religion, patriotism and friendship to the callers. To a caller who questions mortgaging an uncle's home in Rockland County, Meltzer includes, "May you, almighty God,...". In response to a woman's complaint about the World's Fair in Knoxville, Tennessee, he adds, "Then you say, God bless Tennessee". He allays the fears of a man who overslept and missed his sons' Bar Mitzvah with, I'm sure by the way, the good Lord is going to forgive you because you are humble". He begins one program supplicating aid from the Almighty so that he may continue to "better the world", stating,

"I call this a prayer of gratitude.
 Father, I thank thee for the peace of this
 night and for the waking of the world which
 comes with the pleasant morning light. I
 thank thee Father, for thy loving care and
 for all that makes the world so fair. Help
 me to do the things I should and to others
 may I be kind and good... that I become a
 better person, a more kind person that I
 may truly say that with each passing day I
 helped to make this world a little better
 place in repayment for my blessings many".

He appeals to patriotism, when responding to a student contemplating an ROTC scholarship, he offers, "If you feel as

an American citizen that you owe your country an obligation in return for these benefits...". He closes one program with the following Mother's Prayer:

"After some of the conversations we had tonight, the thought occurred to me. Brotherhood is so important... I close with a mother's prayer for a child... Sleep my love, and peace attend thee, all through the night. Guardian Angels, the good Lord will send thee, all through the night... Love itself, thy watch is keeping... And to each and everyone of my radio family, a toast as I close... May each and every one of you awake with the morning light, early tomorrow, blessed by almighty God himself. Good night, God bless you and God keep you".

How does the infusion of spirituality "frame" or define the situation on this New York radio call-in program? We, victims of a most materialistic, harried and often anomic lifestyle in New York City, are offered a respite for two hours on WOR. Meltzer offers his audience a spiritual retreat, blessing his audience in the manner of a preacher, summoning his flock of listeners and calling them "family". He comforts and soothes callers with references to friendship, brotherhood, peace, love, patriotism, gratitude but, what other function does spirituality serve the host? He solidifies his "team" when he calls them family, imbues them with the shared experience of communal blessing and elevates his station and authority by placing himself in the role of a preacher. Of course, this is accomplished with the support of his team of listeners. His audience

has come to expect his spiritual offerings and would be dissatisfied if this were not to continue.

Meltzer appeals to the callers' emotions, as well as good common sense. He opens one program with the following introduction, "I'm very proud that we solve problems with both head and heart". He is sympathetic to the feelings of a nephew who wants to mortgage an Uncle's house: "When you owe money to relatives... sometimes, it gets very embarrassing". In a friendly manner he chides a caller fearful of a real estate sale, "Stop being bashful". By using an approach that considers the callers' emotions, as well as the use of endearments, he can lower the caller's resistance to his advice, as well as increase the likelihood of greater cooperation in getting needed information from the caller. For instance, in response to a call about using a second home as an investment, Meltzer asks, "Can hubby handle it"? To the student with questions about an ROTC scholarship he asks, "How does mom and dad feel about this"? The use of endearments to a particular call, specifically "Honey" or "Sweetheart" to his female callers, puts the caller at ease and greatly unites the individual to the "team" of other callers.

He also succeeds in inducting loyal listeners by complimenting those who call. To the first caller of the evening on one program he says, "You're number one tonight". To another, a wife of a newly retired man, he proclaims,

"Where'd he (your husband) get a woman like you?". He rewards certain callers, especially those that open the call with praise for Bernard Meltzer, with an award of two T-shirts.

How does Bernard Meltzer comfort his callers? He soothes one caller who asks about Federal Civil Service jobs, with "But also, I will tell you, If you'll just take it easy..." He facilitates matters for the mother of a daughter in a leaky illegal apartment by stating, "All you have to do is send him a certified letter...". He empathizes with callers; To an 81-year-old man interested in investments, he offers, "If I were 81 years of age, John, I'd get out of the market. It won't even buy you a newspaper everyday. You know that". To the ROTC scholarship candidate, he advises, "If I were you, I would take the ROTC". He empathizes with a caller who's fearful of crime in the subways when he exclaims, "Where are the police?... Where are they?... Why do they let people like that roam loose?". When Meltzer empathizes and mirrors the feelings of the callers he both aligns and allies himself with the caller as he maintains his authority as advisor.

How else does Bernard Meltzer encourage and ally himself with callers and their concerns? He offers upbeat encouragement to a man who wants to buy his uncle's house. He tells him, "Take it gladly". To the woman interested in a real estate purchase he adds, "You owe it to yourself,

yes, you owe it to yourself". He allies himself with a teen who's been refused employment. He tells her, "You should call their bluff. Don't be afraid of them. Fight them". He even scolds callers in an encouraging manner. To the caller who complained that the house contractor had not completed the job, he offers: "You paid him, right? (Not completely) Oh, why didn't you tell me. You're in the drivers seat". He gives strength to a weary landlady, "Listen, you don't have to put with him (non-payment of the rent)" and he pleads with her, "Please do it". He comforts the victim of an abusive insurance company, "You don't have to take it". Bernard Meltzer alligns himself with the caller, offering encouragement, support and strength as well as advice. By taking this supportive view, Meltzer unites his team behind him as well as encouraging agreement over confrontation. He also uses laughter when in agreement or in amusement over a call. The laughter not only makes him more human and personable, but both lowers the guard of the caller and acknowledges that a supportive ear awaits.

Bernard Meltzer also demonstrates his interest and encouragement of the topic presented by asking for additional, specific information. To the caller inquiring about purchasing a second home as an investment, he asks for the specifics and explores various options. "If... on the other hand... Can you get something less expensive?... What kind of rents?" After probing her situation, he makes

his advice specific to her case, "In your case..." He probes the teen denied employment, "Well, who gave you an undesirable reference?" He queries the weary landlady, "How long is he behind in the rent? So what did your attorney do?" and to the victim of an abusive insurance company, "Where was the ice, on the floor? You didn't answer my question. How much money is involved?" These essential and specific facts about each case are necessary to define the situation of the call and begin to develop a working consensus. As in the case with the slip-and-fall insurance case, Meltzer becomes impatient with the caller who does not share all the necessary information. Necessary, that is, to the advice Bernard Meltzer will make specific and individual to each case.

To sum up, Meltzer uses the following cues or techniques when he encourages discussion: Spirituality, emotional appeal, the use of endearments and compliments, empathy, an alliance with callers, support, comfort and encouragement, laughter and probing for additional specific information.

Appearances

Bernard Meltzer asserts his authority and elevates his social stature, as well as makes a personal appeal by speaking from his personal experience. He gains sympathy and credibility from a caller who inquires about Civil Service employment when he recalls, "As a young fellow a

long time ago... We were in the Depression... Watch all the letters now Jim, (the producer), from all the people telling me I don't know what I'm talking about". He establishes his credibility, assures the caller that he survived through more trying times and reinforces his stand with his producer against potential adversaries. He encourages discussion about personal, home computers by admitting, "In fact, I play around with computers every so often".

Self-promotion is important to Bernard Meltzer. He awards T-shirts to callers who praise him or express particular gratitude for his service. He is most emphatic about self-promotion when he advises the complaintant about the World's Fair, "... Tell the Governor (of Tennessee) you spoke to Bernard Meltzer on the air on WOR. No don't laugh, sweetheart, it means alot". By acknowledging the desire for positive word-of-mouth that extends both beyond the boundaries of the listening area and, also, beyond the peer group, Meltzer both attempts to broaden the circle of his "team", as well as further upgrade his social status.

Meltzer further asserts his credibility and status by presenting himself as a wise old man who works very hard. He cautions a caller who is considering purchasing an uncle's house, "Watch out honey. This old fellow here is teaching you what happens in life". He rejects an offer made by this caller to join her friends on a cruise, by stating, "I'd love to go but time keeps my nose to the grindstone here".

He speaks with certainty. To the person dissatisfied by the World's Fair he retorts, "Of course I would (write them a letter). This is the best way to get at something like this". He assures the victim of insurance abuses of the completeness of his advice, stating, "That's all you have to do". He persuades callers that he is in the forefront of information about scams and come-ons. In response to a call about a real estate come-on, he states, "You might remember about the company that was advertising like crazy about gold. Now all of a sudden, which I knew all about, and thank God, Attorney General Abrams has come along and stopped them. But these ads were coming up everywhere". Meltzer also refers to official documents or news sources to back up his advice: "Here's something from yesterday's Wall Street Journal that says that the Federal Trade Commission is accusing this company of misrepresenting and agreed to pay back \$125,000". He is sure of his instincts and emphatic in the advice he offers the mother of a daughter who lives in a leaky illegal apartment. He states:

"I suspect that the whole apartment is illegal... You cannot live in an apartment where every time it rains you get flooded out for two reasons (enumerates them)... If it's an illegal apartment, of course they can break their lease".

To sum up, Bernard Meltzer furthers his social status with the audience and asserts his authority by using the following techniques: He speaks from personal experience,

promotes himself and rewards those who praise him, and presents himself as a wisened and hard-working man. He is secure in the advice that he offers, satisfied with his instincts and secure in the completeness and appropriateness of his directives.

Topics Discouraged

Bernard Meltzer utilizes several cues as part of his "routine" to discourage discussion of certain topics. Borrowing Goffman's terms, the following are "manners" of discouraging conversation: Cautions, warnings and alarms; treating the caller condescendingly like a child; suspicion, skepticism and mockery; the expression of hopelessness; exposure of the harsh realities of the case; and abrupt interrogation of the details or discussion of consequences; and impatience with a caller who might misunderstand.

Manners

Meltzer asserts his authority in discouraging discussion by cautioning, and warning the caller. In response to a mother whose son had been picked up on drug charges in Israel, he shows alarming concern with "What's wrong?" He cautions her, unsympathetically, "Well, sweetheart, let me tell you one little thing... you're reasoning like an American. Do you think he can go to a country like Egypt, or Iran? Are you kidding?" He goes further in blaming her, indirectly, for what has happened: "...Mothers who love their sons that they cripple them for life. That

happens many a time". He alarms the caller to the consequences for her son, mocks her reasoning (like an American) and implicated her in the guilt of her son. This call, oddly enough, is followed by another call from a mother who's son is implicated in selling narcotics. Meltzer treats her in a similarly alarming and harsh manner, "Sweetheart, if your son is in the kind of environment, he's in trouble... Isn't he on narcotics now? It's inconceivable that he went through this and wasn't exposed... Honey, in that kind of life you always get beat up". He also cautions callers on financial, less emotional matters. To a caller who is interested in Brokerage house IRAs he advises, "Keep in mind that an IRA is a security umbrella... So I say that the brokers that are pushing IRAs in their situation in my opinion are doing the wrong thing. ...It belongs in a bank or it belongs in a government security, or securities guaranteed by Uncle Sam. It belongs no other place." Phrases such as "Are you kidding?", "cripple for life", "he's in trouble", "inconceivable", "It belongs no other place" are emphatic warnings and alarms. These definitely serve to caution the caller and inhibit further discussion. Meltzer is also condescending to the woman who called, asking for assistance for her son in Israel. He treats her like a child when he asks, "Here's the thing sweetheart. What's daddy say in all this?" He appears to be empathetic, but isn't, when he claims,

"I'm just putting myself in the position if this were my son... I know being a mother is a very hard bond to break".

His most popular and oft-used method of discouraging discussion is by inadvertantly mocking the caller. He lashes out at a young couple interested in a mobile home purchase, with, "In that case, why are you calling me? In other words, if everything I tell you, you have an answer for?!" To newlyweds who want to live with their relatives, he offers: "Did it ever occur to you whether they want you there?... Go ahead and start your dream". He refuses to hide his suspicions from callers. To the woman who charges some New jersey policemen with police brutality, Meltzer is openly skeptical:

"Unless these policemen are crazy, and they're not, why would seven policemen come into a restaurant and start beating up two boys unless something else had happened?... But again, police don't act this way. Has any policemen walking down the street just taken out his club and start beating someone up? If what you told me is true, then get yourself attorney... But I have a feeling that this story is not quite true. This is not quite true. This is not 1920 in a Southern state. This is 1983 in the State of New Jersey and policemen don't act that way".

He exaggerates it to make his point about skepticism: "If what you say is true, then this is a major civil rights case!".

In another case, he is not suspicious of the caller, but of the caller's situation and supply of information.

To the caller who inquires about a balloon mortgage he offers:

"There's a reason for it which they are not telling you... Why can't they get a \$30,000 mortgage... Suppose they don't pay, then what are they going to do?... (in response) That's what you think!... Right now I suspect something is wrong in what they've done... This is not a question of law. This is a question of life experience... (in response) That's right!".

Meltzer reveals a number of cues in the manner in which he discourages this caller. His instincts tell him to be suspicious. He sets up a hypothetical situation, where the money does not come through, and asks the caller to consider the consequences. He mocks the caller by exclaiming, "thats what you think!" He shoulders greater authority and social status when he puts his advice above that of a lawyer's. He does not, however, state that he can replace an attorney's counsel, but that his advice, and not an attorney's, is appropriate and correct in this circumstance. And he is not satisfied until the caller agrees with him, in his own words. To that, Meltzer exclaims, "That's right!".

Meltzer further discourages callers with expressions of hopelessness. To the mother whose son is charged with selling narcotics, he offers little: "Nothing, honey. Remember the laws today are designed to protect the guilty... No, no, right now do nothing. You'd only do something if your boy disappeared". Likewise, to the caller whose dis-

abled sister is being required to return a Social Security overpayment, Meltzer states,

"The government overpaid her. By law, she owes them the money, even if she didn't know anything about it... This is one case where she's got to give in... You'll find that the wheels of justice as far as Social Security does grind very slowly... They will crush her and she'll end up getting nothing."

This is also an example of how Meltzer discourages discussion by exposing the caller to the harsh realities of the situation. Another example involves a response to a call about dealing with a bankrupt company. He states,

"Right now, one of the companies in America is going bankrupt every 32 seconds. So count 32 and another company has gone bankrupt... Didn't they tell you that?"

Here, Bernard Meltzer makes a compelling plea using graphic verbal technique. Does he discourage discussion on bad business deals involving bankrupt companies by presenting the harsh reality? Yes.

The abrupt interrogation of the details of the case or his abrupt discussion of the consequences are cues that are meant to discourage the topic. When a caller complains that an imposter has ruined his credit rating, Meltzer shoots back with "Tell me about it". He then proceeds to reinforce the callers findings in a less than sympathetic way, "Now, more important Sir, it was not you". He is short with the caller in offering advice, "You ask the bank to write to the credit card company and notify them to

remove the item". Abrupt interrogation is coupled with strong disagreement of fact, in his conversation with a caller who wants to remortgage their home to finance her children's education:

"Where did you get the \$96,000 from?... In your situation to buy and sell will cost you a minimum of \$15,000. Why do you want a high mortgage? Because if you go to sell you'll have a high mortgage?... That advice is just not right... I don't know where you got the idea to sell it and buy another one for the same price. That isn't a very good advice."

Then as an interesting cap to the call, he tells the audience "It's one of the strange laws of nature that a person's head only begins to swell after the mind stops growing". In an evaluation of three of his broadcasts, this is by far, the harshest axiom that he shares with his family of listeners.

Meltzer gets impatient with callers who, he feels, do not comprehend the advice he had given them. His suspicion and impatience over a caller's lack of comprehension succeed in discouraging conversation. For instance, to the caller who desires a mobile home he asks, "Do you understand what I just said?: and then proceeds to mock him, "In other words, if everything I tell you, you have an answer for (why are you calling me?)". He is also impatient with a young man who inquiries about life insurance. Meltzer's answer to him: "All I'm trying to tell you...

understand what I just told you" and he abruptly ends the dialogue with a "Thank you".

To sum up, Bernard Meltzer uses the following cues to discourage topical conversation: Cautions, warning and alarms, treating the caller like a child, suspicion, skepticism and mockery, and expression of hopelessness, revealing the harsh realities of a situation, the abrupt interrogation of details or consequences and impatience with a caller who doesn't quite understand.

John Scheur

Topics Encouraged

John Scheur uses a variety of cues in his "routine" as confidante and personal advisor to his audience. Among the "manners" he utilizes are: Complimenting callers as he offers support, encouragement and alliance, and appeal to emotions, strong statements of belief and endorsement, both the ability to make a concern universal and advice specific to the individual, reference to other research materials, the creation of analogies and hypothetical cases and a call for feedback from the callers. Cues that enhance his "Appearance" with his "team" include: Direct appeals to his "family" of listeners, speaking with authority and confidence and an invitation for callers to correct him on the air.

Manners

He compliments callers at the beginning of the call, thanking them for calling the show. He states to a woman

who wants one-half of the value of her house, "Thank you for calling us". "Us" refers to the team of listeners. He further compliments her on her desire not to hurt her estranged husband, "I admire your whole attitude". He is then sympathetic to her situation, "It's not easy--it truly isn't". He then alligns himself with her and offers her direct action: "You've got to keep it stopped. Tell him (your son) what I'm telling you". He is equally supportive of the caller who questions financing a car, when he states, "It's tough for everyone to save. It really is very difficult. Particularly in these times. Saving the \$11,000 is priceless". He offers encouragement to the Economics Professor who wants to get into the Real Estate business, "I would certainly encourage you to try". He allies himself with a caller interested in a boat as he calls for immediate action, "Go do it". He is also supportive of a singer who wants to market his voice lessons when he offers, "They say that every no brings you closer to a yes... Don't deprecate your service (by giving it for free)." He allies himself with a caller looking for a low mortgage when he advises, "You have to sell yourself... Go at it in a positive way". The encouragement and alliance bonds him closer to his team and serves to exaggerate his interrelationship with the audience as well as underscore his role as "friend, confidante, advisor, uncle in the business of life".

John Scheur captures the public sentiment and extends himself to the caller with an appeal to emotions. This cue also serves to show endorsement for a topic of discussion. In response to a question on economic theory he offers this pessimistic view, "People are not confident, they're scared..." He is emphatic in his emotions regarding Mutual Fund IRAs, "I don't know why and I don't care why". He allays the fears of a caller about budgeting: "Budgeting is not bad or painful". He wants to spare his caller embarrassment, when in answer to a question about car financing, he advises, "I hope I don't turn you off, when I think that honest to goodness, that neither one of you (caller or her husband) is right". He offers warm emotionally-shared sentiment with a caller who wants to set up a trust fund for her granddaughter, when he offers, "I have several grandchildren and you know, they're something".

John Scheur makes very clear those areas he encourages by strongly advocating a stand or by showing the urgency of the action he endorses. On the topic of pre-payment mortgages he offers, "One needs to have an amortization schedule. You need that". He is emphatic in his advice regarding the search for a financial advisor, "I do beseech you to give it the most serious consideration and I further beseech you to call me in a few days, after you've given it some thought". To the grandmother who wants a trust fund,

he advocates, "I encourage you not to tie that money up for along period of time". To the caller inquiring about retirement planning he states his policy on stocks: "I've always contended that dividend income from stocks is the icing on the cake, not ever the reason for investing in the stock of a company in my opinion." He does, indeed, repeat this contention to five different callers in the course of one broadcast. Later in the broadcast he says, "Dividends, I say for the fifth time today, are the icing on the cake". To the caller griping about politicians and their "underground money" he states, "I think a great many people feel that way. I quite agree".

In the last case, he not only offered a statement of his belief but makes this a universally-held belief. He continues to encourage other topics by making them universal. He blames our educational system for our financial and economic ignorance, when he states, "(this ignorance) has crept into our culture... nothing could be more damaging or costly". To the caller who inquires about remortgaging a two-family house he states, "It's a problem with so many of us who are scared with our taxes". To the man who inquires about retirement planning, Scheur takes the weight off the individual and lays the burden on government: "We as a nation have not taught ourselves the basics of this... I know big wage earners who are as ignorant in this field as a ten-year-old". By both making the question or opinion

one that is universal he can appeal to the broad concerns of his audience as well as emphasize the shared concerns that bind his team.

John Scheur also makes his advice tailored to the individual caller. To the professor who wishes to become a consultant he advises, "Any of these things (her proposals) are fine provided you have the skill, the time, the temperament and contacts". And to the caller who is looking for a low mortgage, he offers, "...more and more bankers have told you this... That doesn't mean it is so with all bankers". He suits his advice on retirement planning to the caller by stating, "A person in your position is in an ideal position to pick up a little additional income and have fun at the same time, where there is no strain or pain. (Should I get out of this Ginny May which drives me up a wall?) Yes. For you, you should. Yes".

He further strengthens his advice by often referring to other sources. For instance, in answer to a question about insurance company premiums, he states, "The research on this, thanks to Money Magazine..." He reflects on past economists in answer to a question about Mutual Fund/IRAs when he states, "Bernard Baruch, rest his soul, used to say 'Buy low, sell high'". By reflecting on past, great financial wizards or on the expertise of financial publications, he furthers his own expertise as well as gives added weight to the advice he offers.

To help illustrate a point he uses hypothetical cases and creates analogies. To emphasize the importance of car dealer financing he states, "I would like to have one dollar for every person who doesn't have \$11,000 in the bank. How many dollars do you think I'd have? (Millions) That's right!" In answer to the Professor who wants to become a consultant, John Scheur stresses the importance of talent, with an analogy to actress Meryl Streep, "In this crazy world, what is difficult for one person may not be difficult for another... actress Meryl Streep, considered one of the three best actresses in the world... went farther, faster..." To emphasize investment in a mutual fund he creates the following analogy about baseball:

"As an analogy to baseball hitters, as you know each league has very good hitters with high averages and through the years some of these top hitters stay up year after year, some drop back and have mediocre years, some drop back and have bad years and then some drop back later and have good years, and so on. It is the same thing with mutual funds of common stock. If money making is dependent on the batting average, which it is, it's as if you can invest in a Peter Rose and you can get in and out of those batters when they get weak, then that's what one should do. The idea of being with any particular hitter year in and year out, regardless of his batting average, is to me the height of bad money management".

John Scheur cues his audience to topics he encourages by encouraging the callers to "feedback", call him with updated information or additional questions. To the woman who wants half of the value of her house he offers, "I

wish you all kinds of luck, Bridget, and, I hope that you will come back to us". To the caller who questioned car financing he states, "Please call me back, you're a sweetheart". And to the professor considering consulting work he states, "I entreat you to phone me back here--I look forward to hearing from you". He asks the caller who questions withdrawing a deposit on a purchase to "Please stay with us". And to the caller who wants to remortgage a two-family house in Queens, "Mary, please come back and let me know how it went, even if its bad". And to the caller who found an old German Mark and questioned it's value, Scheur offers, "Good luck to you. I wish you'd let us know.. please call back". One thing these callers have in common is that they are all woman. Apart from it being natural that a male host will curry the favor of female "team" members is my suspicion that John Scheur is making a strong effort to encourage woman to call with financial and other problems, to break the stereotype of finance as a "man's affair". By encouraging feedback from female callers he also puts at ease possible first-time callers or those who contemplate calling.

In summation, John Scheur encourages topic discussion by using the following cues: Complimenting callers, the offer of support, encouragement, and alliance, an appeal to emotions, strong statements of endorsement, the ability to make a problem universal to the population, tailoring

advice to suit the individual who calls, utilizing other research materials or famous quotations, using analogies and hypothetical cases to strengthen a point, and a call for feedback from the callers.

Appearance

John Scheur opens each show with a direct appeal to his "family" of listeners. He states,

"This is the program where we, my friend, put our heads together and see what it is we can do with each other to help each other's thinking. I'm stimulated with a call about a problem you might have on your mind, that you wish to discuss and comment on. But out of this dialogue comes help for us both. You get a different slant on what's been bugging you or who's been hassling you or how to handle a problem in your life... And I get a tremendous input from you in understanding, even better, from you, all the things that go on. Please correct me when I stray off the reservation, so to speak, stray off-base. ...We exchange these thoughts. You put your head together with mine and I with yours only can we do this if you avail yourself of the telephone. All alone by the telephone. Where the WMCA family listens and calls... I'm deeply appreciative of the listener pointing out... This is John Scheur, your friend, your confidante, here, your advisor, your uncle in the business of life, putting his head together with yours to hash over whatever is disturbing you".

Here, John Scheur offers many cues that enhance his social status with his "team". He legitimizes his role as host by stressing the "Shared" experience necessary to his work when he states, "We put our heads together and see what it

is we can do with each other to help each other's thinking". He also mentions how both parties benefit from the exchange. The caller (and listener) gets "a different slant on what's been bugging (them) or... how to handle a problem". Scheur gets "tremendous input from you (the team) in understanding". That understanding translates into support and high social status. He also serves to realign actions" when he asks that callers correct him. By stating, "Please correct me when I stray off-base" he encourages the subordinate, the caller, to initiate action without threatening or jeopardizing the status of the host. He exaggerates his relationship with the audience when he states, "I'm deeply appreciative of the listener who pointed out..." and further increases his sense of social status among the team of listeners. There are many appeals to the team in the guise of the "WMCA family". This family is maintained by the shared information from exchanges with Mr. Scheur as well as what Goffman terms "the privilege of familiarity". Also by naming himself the "uncle" in the business he has set himself as a titular but non-threatening head of the family. Also, in his discussion with callers he urges them to continue to listen. He suggests to the caller inquiring about pre-payment on mortgages, "It's a little tricky. If you keep listening, Dominic, we discuss it from time to time". He ends a call about remortgaging a two-family house with

"That's another wonderful call from the wonderful WMCA family of callers". He further supplicates the support of his team when he states,

"Sometimes, as listeners and callers are kind enough to confirm, two heads are better than one. Let it stimulate your thinking and mine. I know you're as helpful as heck to me in understanding things better. Quite a bit better. And many of you are gracious enough to say that I'm helpful to you... You get in on this by picking up your phone and calling directly".

Again he "realigns actions" when he encourages callers to correct or make additions to his advice. He tells a caller who refers to previous call about remortgaging a two-family house,

"Thank you for your thoughtfulness. I don't mean to imply that I cannot often be quite off-base and I welcome anybody who calls in and everybody contribute to the pot... And if any of you have any other thinking on this I'd like to know what it is. It is not a universal truth, in the sense that there are plenty of people who disagree".

Goffman warns, however, despite the advantages of "admitting the lower team (callers) to greater intimacy and equality" the host must guard his standing with the audience. Therefore, if John Scheur is corrected too often, his role as host may be jeopardized. Goffman asserts,

"When a performer refuses to keep his place, we may expect the audience may well be ill-disposed toward him".

How does John Scheur assert and maintain his authority? He speaks with authority, confidence and concern for the

caller. How does this authority manifest itself? In answer to the person in search of a financial analyst he offers, "I have developed what I consider to be a pretty foolproof way to manage money successfully provided you emotionally can handle the concept". He then adds, "I do obviously say to you that I've covered a lot of important ground with you here, very quickly". Terms such as "I consider" "Pretty foolproof", "manage successfully", "obviously", and "important ground" serve to assert the host's authority. He is assured of himself when he informs a caller on car financing,

"Oh yes, you must know. You're going to get sore at me and I don't want you to. You don't go around telling people things you don't know... I do know."

First he encouragingly scolds her for her misinformation and places himself as the source of information. He ends the call with a self-congratulatory pat on the back, "You could say, 'I talked to that great guy on the radio' and he agreed with me". He claims to be wise as a result of life experience, "Let me tell you something Bernie (who refers to past call on remortgaging house) that life has taught me". He asserts his authority even if it means outright disagreement with the caller, when he tells the caller with a remortgage idea, "You're not going to like this, but I can only tell you what the reality of the marketplace is". In response to a question about loan

rates Scheur states, "I sure would shop around... it's my best judgement... That's my best answer". And he completes a call about real estate investment by saying, "... beyond any question of doubt". He also elevates his social status with the audience by displaying concern for their welfare. To the caller who asks about Mutual Fund IRAs he asserts, "All I care about is you and your money". By asserting his authority via absolute statements, being the source of information, life experience, scolding a caller's misinformation and concern for callers, he shields himself from jeopardizing his status.

To sum up, John Scheur strengthens his status with callers by making direct appeals to his "family" of listeners, inviting callers to comment upon or correct his advice and speaking to callers and listeners with authority, concern and confidence.

Topics Discouraged

Manners

John Scheur discourages certain calls by being impatient, emphatic, condescending, sarcastic and scolding. He also restates a question or his position; he will paint a negative picture of what the caller suggests. Occasionally he stays the outsider, vague in his questioning or his advice. Other times he gives a command to the caller, then abruptly interrupts or cuts the caller off.

His impatience with callers is demonstrated in several ways. He cuts off a caller inquiring about buying a more expensive new home with "Oh no". This is repeated with someone inquiring about money market funds, when he adds, "I don't know how to get across to you what the reality is here". He gives a pat answer to a caller asking about tax-free investments, "That about sums it up". He loses his patience with someone who has trouble managing his stock investments when he states, "I cannot tell you anything else".

Sometimes impatience manifests itself in condescension, sarcasm and chastizement. He scolds the person unable to manage own stocks with, "... literally thousands of successful ways of managing money... Nobody can tell anyone else... How much more do you have to lose before you're going to do what I'm suggesting... We're talking on two different subjects. I cannot tell you anything else". He scolds a caller who calls himself "conservative" in financial management with "Well, that's not being very conservative (letting the money just lay there), particularly in the light of what I've just said..." He scolds a caller who questions tax-free investments:

"You can't run your life by a formula... This is ludicrous. Lets use a little common sense... The Government is saying to people... 'You're dopes because you don't understand this.

Occasionally he is condescending or sarcastic to the callers. To the caller who asks about the residence of a will executor he sarcastically remarks, "Even somebody living in Timbuktu (can be your will executor)". He condescends to one caller on fixed rate mortgages by emphasizing the simplicity of his advice, "It's a complex matter and I've reduced it to very simple terms. Do you understand?"

By restating the question or his position he quells further discussion on the topic. To the caller who wants to buy a more expensive new home he states three times, "As little (mortgage) as possible". To the person who called about using stock as an investment he restates his policy, "I've always contended that dividend income from stocks is the icing on the cake, not ever the reason for investing in the stock of a company in my opinion". To the caller who inquires about a Balloon Mortgage he restates the problem in layman's terms:

"Or I give you a balloon. The balloon is that you pay me every month like you were getting a 30 year 13% mortgage but at the end of five years you must pay me all the money that you owe... or you lose the property... It's very rarely the right way for anybody to go."

He also restates the situation to get affirmation from the caller. For instance, with the person who wants to do her own financial planning he states, "I get the feeling you realize I'm telling you that this is not a simple matter".

However, he never gets confirmation from her and assumes this is the case.

By painting a negative picture for the caller he also discourages conversation. He discourages a caller who desires a Balloon Mortgage when he states, "... you must pay me all the money that you owe... or lose your property". He ends the call with "It's very rarely the right way for anybody to go" after he received affirmation from the caller. Throughout these broadcasts John Scheur speaks negatively of our national economy, "The day will come when they (interest rate) will go up again..."

Occasionally he deters conversation by remaining vague in his questioning or his advice. He discourages conversation by remaining the outsider, no longer the concerned, supportive and encouraging host. He exemplifies this with a call from a divorcee about investments, when he states, "... coming into your situation as an outsider for the first time" and then does not pursue the topic of discussion. On the other hand he sometimes gives the caller a command, an order, and then abruptly terminates the call. He loses patience with someone who questions financial self-management, when he orders, "Get out first. Get out first. Get out totally and learn. Investing in the stock market is an even more precise a skill than acting..." His impatience also demonstrates itself in his being emphatic about certain points. He discourages a caller

who wants to handle real estate investments through a financial consultant by shouting, "No one yells 'Rotten Fish' but I'll yell it" and then he proceeds to do just that.

To sum up, John Scheur discourages conversation using a variety of cues: Impatience, manifested in condescension, sarcasm and chastisement, painting a negative picture of the situation, restatement of the question or his policy, being an uninterested participant or giving a command followed by an abrupt termination of the call.

Appearance

Despite deterring and discouraging information, he maintains his social status by both referring to his personal expertise as well as the collective responsibility of the team.

He asserts his authority by emphasizing his expertise in advice-giving. To the caller who wants to manage her own stocks, he states, "This is what my experience teaches me". To the caller who questions unit trust investments, he offers, "(This advice) is the best of both worlds..." He supports his statements with references to other research. In answer to a question about a fixed rate mortgage he offers, "Every study that I've respected agrees that..." And to the caller who wants a financial consultant to invest in real estate he states, "Experience has taught me, Helen".

He then sets his advice above, but not replacing, that of an attorney's, when he offers, "Your lawyer cannot tell you what I have just told you".

He appeals to the expertise of "shared information" among the team with the use of the pronoun "We". He asserts the collective responsibility of advice-giving and -taking when, in answer to a question of a Balloon Mortgage he asserts, "We have reason to believe that they will be starting greater than less in any reasonable time in the future. If we are wrong and interest rates do nothing but go down, it is very possible to refinance every mortgage downward helpfully and profitably". Here, the team both possesses some inside knowledge as well as shared responsibility if that information is incorrect.

To restate, despite discouraging discussion on certain topics, John Scheur keeps up his "appearance" by asserting his expertise and authority and by emphasizing shared information and team responsibility.

Dr. Elyse Goldstein

Topics Encouraged

Dr. Goldstein utilizes a series of cues in her "routine" as personal advisor and counselor to her audience. Among the "manners" she uses with her "team" of early morning listeners and callers, to encourage specific topics of discussion are: An invitation to speak on any topic, referring to callers by first name and complimenting them,

a probe for additional, specific information, delving into the caller's past or childhood, exploration of feelings and motivations, assurances to the caller that their question is universal or shared by many, serving as a sympathetic, encouraging ally, the offer of direct, immediate remedial action, as well as on-air counseling and self-help book referrals. Her major "Appearance" strategy is that of restating the caller's problem or testing a hypothesis and waiting for caller affirmation.

Manners

Dr. Goldstein opens her program welcoming and soliciting calls on any topic. She begins her program one Friday morning with, "Whatever mood you're in, I'd like to hear from you. Let's talk over any concern you have". She continues to invite calls throughout the program, "Now if you need any help along or if you'd like to talk over a question that's been on your mind. I'd like to hear from you". She acknowledges that some people call with a problem they've harbored for a long time, while others might have just thought of a question or problem during the course of the program or as a result of previous calls: "Is it something you've been thinking of or something that you just thought about. I'd like to hear from you. Something that came up earlier is the impact of divorce on a child... We can also look at any problems from a lifestage point of view. What crises are coming up due to where you are in

life? I'd like to hear about this or any thing else that's on your mind... If you have a question about a new experience you've had, call in, I'd like to hear from you". Here, Dr. Goldstein widens her "team" to include those who have never called before; they might be first-time listeners or might not be considered having a problem or question as motivation for listening. The use of the word "We" emphasizes the team aspect as well as the shared experience in call-in radio.

With each caller, Dr. Goldstein asks for the first name and repeats the name as a preface to any question or advice. By using the caller's first name, the caller and his/her problem become more real, more human. The advice that is offered appears more personal and individual. Also, using someone's first name gives Dr. Goldstein the leverage she needs, both in probing feelings, motivations, specific personal information as well as getting the caller to agree or concede to her suggestions. The ability to call someone by name is an oft-underestimated method of control or power over the other person. Ask anyone who teaches children about the power afforded by first name calling.

Dr. Goldstein also draws from her callers by complimenting them. She puts one caller at ease over her husband's crooked business by saying, "I like your name, Lily". She soothes a girl who's frustrated about not "making it" in New York when she says, "You're like a young flower that's

starting to form its buds". She allies herself with a caller who fears that needing too much love ruins her relationships, when she offers, "You're a bright woman and fairly perceptive".

She probes for specific information and examples from each caller. When a woman says that she fears independence and a widower similarly admits that he is resentful of his dependence on women, Dr. Goldstein asks for some examples. She asks, "For instance?" "Some examples?" "What kinds of things did she do for you?" To the woman married to the perfectionist husband, Goldstein asks, "What was he like when he first married you? To a man who remains married to a wife who deserts him when she's drunk, Goldstein asks, "Married for how long?... Where does she go?... Are there any children?..." To the woman who complained that her mother always put her down, Goldstein asks, "How did they use you as a scapegoat?: By her questioning she also clarifies, not only the situation, but the use of the word "scapegoat". She asks a teen with a drinking problem several pertinent questions, "Where do you live?... What do you drink?... How do you feel about it?... How much?" To a woman asking about the difference between being assertive and aggressive, Dr. Goldstein asks "What was assertive that made them (the boyfriends) take off", before she proceeds with the following definitions and comparisons:

"Let me explain to you the difference between assertiveness and aggressiveness. I think assertiveness is when you tell someone what you need, not tell them how to be... What you end up doing is hitting the other person over the head, being 'aggressive' because you want what you want, but you can ask for what you want in a non-offensive low-key way, and I don't think it would turn the men off quite so much".

It is only through her call for additional examples and definitions that Dr. Goldstein can appear to "tailor" the advice, rather than offer a pat, generalized answer. This is also her main source of interaction with the caller. She will probe the caller for specifics, about feelings, motivations and childhood, then develop a hypothesis and wait for the caller to accept her theory.

Explorations into the caller's childhood are frequent but often non-productive. She likens the desire for constant love with "... (You) probably grew up feeling unloved", explaining the caller's obsession, "The wish behind it is... the total admiration of one's parents". To the woman who complains of a "Cinderella Complex" fear of independence, Dr. Goldstein offers: "Aha, so what you're saying is, when you were a child, you were very what, dependent? And then you were hurt, and with your husband as well". The caller's response negates Dr. Goldstein's hypothesis:

Well, I, I, as a young girl I, when I first left home, I had a very successful career. And was quite definitely my own person... And, then, later on I

married. In my thirties I married and became very dependent. And to a frightening extent."

Delving into the caller's childhood also fails to uproot a martial artist's fear of violence:

Caller: I feel that I'm going to get attacked or hurt or something.
 G: Did your parents fight alot?
 Caller: Not really
 G: Were you ever hit as a child?
 Caller: Not that I remember, no.
 G: Yeah. I have a feeling that even though you can't recall anything, you, ah, I have a feeling that you must have grown up with a feeling of fear.

Dr. Goldstein proceeds to explore the caller's motivations. To the mother who creates a wedge between her children through gossip, Dr. Goldstein asks, "Why did you do that?" To the man who can't leave his drunk wife, she querries, "Do you want to leave her?" To the man with a possessive girlfriend, she inquires, "What's behind her feelings?" She is curious when a woman complains about a mid-life career crisis, and asks, "What will more money bring you?" To the woman who fears she's too aggressive she asks, "What are you afraid of?" To the man vulnerable about love and desiring his girlfriend say "I love you" Goldstein asks "Why do you want her to say it?" It is clear that Dr. Goldstein employs the Socratic method of questioning. She questions motivations, feelings and intentions that will fuel her hypothesis. She questions

the intentions of a caller who wants to stop smoking: "Do you really want to stop?" And, to the man who is unsure if he should succumb to his wife's sexual fantasies about being bound or punched"... I think the road to go down is to say, 'What arouses me when I spank her?'". She also appeals to the caller emotionally by identifying with their fears, frustration, anger and confusion. She tells the woman married to the perfectionist, "You're scared of being on your own" and shares the caller's anger, "Yeah, where are you there? You've got the pillow (not your husband's affection)". Her prognosis for the woman calling about her husband's illegal business practices, "So, it make you feel guilty... Feel dishonest before?" By identifying with the caller's feelings, Dr. Goldstein allies herself and her audience behind the caller.

A very interesting method Dr. Goldstein employs to allay the caller's fears is to make the specific problem general to a universal public. Many people call in, suspecting that they alone have this particular problem and agonize over it's uniqueness. Dr. Goldstein refuses to label any question or problem "abnormal" despite the caller's cries for such. By showing how one is not alone, how widespread and even universal a particular problem or question is, Dr. Goldstein soothes and comforts both the caller and each listener who might share the same problem.

She assures a man who is not ready for a commitment, "Yes, there are many people who have that pattern". The caller then feels that he is not alone. To a polio-stricken brother who tries to reach out to a unreceptive brother, Dr. Goldstein adds, "There's always some resentment". To the woman who's vulnerable about love, Dr. Goldstein offers, "If you are feeling vulnerable, that's a human feeling. To the woman who's experiencing a mid-life crisis, she advises, "Often people feel that more money will give us more good feelings about ourself... Alot of people have trouble in picking people for relationships... within each one of us the seeds for being complete (are present)".

She offers encouragement and sympathy as she allies herself with callers whose topics she encourages. She empathizes with the smoker, "I used to smoke three packs a day also and it is terribly tough". She encourages the woman who isn't "making it" in New York, "Well, you are successful in your own way". She sympathizes with a woman who needs to separate from her adult children, stating, "I know it's very difficult". She instructs the man not ready for commitments, "Give yourself some time". To the man with an unfriendly brother, Dr. Goldstein first agrees with his assessment of the problem, "It's got alot of validity" and then encourages him to act, "You're headed in the right direction". She encourages a teen alcoholic to accept her feelings of anxiety while sober, "(anxious feelings) don't

make you a bad person... You can view yourself as an okay person". She even resorts to scolding a caller in a supportive manner when she encourages a man to leave his alcoholic wife. She advises, "You're hanging on to this woman. She's not giving you very much... You need to put yourself out on the line a little bit and consider other women".

After she probes for additional information, tests a hypothesis and receives caller affirmation, she often offers direct, immediate action. To the man with an unreceptive brother she advises, "Go to him and tell him what you think". To the boy with a possessive girlfriend, who uses a party as a test of love, Dr. Goldstein suggests, "Offer to pick her up tonight at the end (of the party)." She tells the teenage alcoholic, "For now, water down the drinks and begin to drink less".

She asks that certain callers keep in contact and give her progress reports. Certainly this serves to encourage discussion of certain topics as well as extend a caring, supportive role of the host. She asks the woman suffering from the "Cinderella Complex", "Good luck, let me know how you're doing". She also asks the divorced mother of two children who constantly fight, "Try this and give me a call back. We have a seven-day policy and let me know how it works."

She concludes many calls with on-air referrals for therapy, or in lieu of therapy, a self-help guide book. Unlike her counterpart, Dr. Judith Kuriansky, Dr. Goldstein gives the names and phone numbers of her therapy referrals on-air. She recommends many books and rarely is the same title repeated in one broadcast. These on-air referrals serve a number of functions: One, they answer direct pleas for therapy, two, they give callers and listeners valuable source information, three, the announcements are a public service and four, they add to Dr. Goldstein's credibility as a resourceful expert in the subject who's current and on top of her field.

To sum up, Dr. Goldstein employs the following cues in interaction with callers on topics she encourages: An invitation to speak on any topic, referring to callers by their first names and complimenting them, probing for specific information, the caller's childhood, motivations and feelings, assurances that no situation is abnormal; in fact, that situations are shared by many, if not universal. She also presents herself as an encouraging, sympathetic ally as she offers direct remedial action as well as on-air referrals for therapy and self-help books.

Appearances

It's already been stated that one of the consequences of Dr. Goldstein's on-air referrals is a boost to her status as a professional counselor who is current in her field.

However, her main technique in increasing her status among her "team" of callers is that of a detective. She interrogates, probes, cajoles, testing out certain hypotheses with her questions. When the symptoms of her prognosis are revealed by the caller, she reveals her hypothesis. She then waits for the caller to agree that this is, in fact, the case. This is achieved in various ways. One way Dr. Goldstein gets a better handle on the call is to restate the question. To the mother with fighting children, she restates the problem, "So, your son starts to beat up on your daughter when he feels inadequate, O.K." The O.K. is a method Dr. Goldstein uses to assure herself that she is clear on the topic and capable of remedying it. Okay, appears again, to the man who fears impotency, when she states, "Okay, so you lose your erection". She restates the problem of a woman who feels that demanding too much love has ruined many relationships: "Do you feel that because you had this insatiable need for love that ended up pushing the other person away from you?" She helps clarify the problem for a man who fears commitment, when she offers, "And you oh, oh, if I marry her what about these other women I'm attracted to? (Right)"

She often sets up hypothetical cases by which to test out her theories. She probes the feelings of a man resentful of his dependence on woman with the following,

"Alright, lets see what happens. Let's say you're with a woman right now. She says, 'Charlie, I love you, I want to be with you forever'. Right, and you really care for this woman. What feelings come up?"

To the woman who fears for her husband's crooked business deals, Dr. Goldstein suggests,

"It might be useful to get at his conception, really, if he feels that the world is a terrible place and everyone swindles everyone else you may as well take advantage and sow the seeds and reap the benefits".

She offers her hypothesis to the caller, followed by "Right?". For instance, to the martial artist who fears violence, Dr. Goldstein offers,

"Maybe Mike, you're afraid of your own impulses when you watch these other people fight. It's not so much that they're going to hurt you but it reminds you of your own feelings of anger and if you were to get so furious. People feel guilty about the desire to strike out. But there's a difference between our desire, our wanting to do it and actually doing it. Right?"

This begins to take on a pedagogical tone, one of an instructor who checks on how well the student has mastered a lesson. She offers the following advice to a woman who fears her divorce has had a negative affect on the children,

"But, Cathy, one reminder about that. While you might have conveyed that (the divorce was not due to the children) to them, that doesn't mean in their fantasy life they wouldn't feel that way. For people, reality doesn't always match what's going on inside. Right?"

She seeks affirmation numerous times from a woman unhappily married to a perfectionist.

G: Yeah, you know you said jump and he said how high, which means that he presented himself initially as having a tremendous desire to please you. And maybe that fulfilled both your need and his need, Right?

Caller: Uhuh.

G: But you wouldn't want a dog for a husband. Right?

Caller: That's right.

G: ...And, then he, I think, after being so submissive, right, started to be more himself. Right? And also his perfection came out. Right?... But there's no reason why you have to put up with criticisms about you. Right?... Tell him of course that you don't like it but get at what bothers him, Right?... If I can't get my way than the other person doesn't love me. That's a pretty unrealistic stance, isn't it.

Caller: Uhuh

G: Right?... Okay, I think you're asking for some character change on his part.

Caller: Uhuh

G: Right?

Caller: Right.

Here, Dr. Goldstein coaxes the caller from "Uhuh" to the final "Right". Dr. Goldstein even affirms her own hypotheses with a "Yeah". For instance, in response to the martial artist, she states,

"You did learn how to protect yourself and I think your interest in the martial arts really reflects that. I think you're saying that you feel very vulnerable to attack. Yeah. I have a feeling that even though you can't recall anything, you, ah, I have a feeling that you must have grown up with a feeling of fear, moreso than you imagine right now."

What is accomplished when Dr. Goldstein waits for confirmation of her hypotheses and advice? Agreement between her "team" and herself is achieved. Her status as a capable expert in personal counseling is maintained with each "Right" and "Yeah". A reluctance or refusal to confirm her advice would weaken both her social status with the audience as well as loosen the bonds of the team of callers and listeners.

To sum up, team solidarity and social status is maintained by the audience's confirmation of Dr. Goldstein's hypotheses and advice. She achieves this by restating the question, probing the caller with a particular hypothesis in mind, offering and selling a prognosis and awaiting purchase.

Topics Discouraged

Appearance

Dr. Elyse Goldstein employs several cues as part of her "routine" to discourage conversation. Most are manifestations of impatience. They are: Attacks that are critical, suspicious or scolding of the caller, an unsympathetic questioning of motives, advice that doesn't reflect a search for the specific facts of the case or an abrupt "thank you" to get the caller off the line.

Verbal cues such as "So", "Yes", "Right" and "Wait" belie Dr. Goldstein's impatience with a caller who fears the physical competition between her son and daughter.

G: How old is his sister:
 Caller: She's 11, they're 14 months apart.
 G: So, How does the hate come out?
 Caller: Um, for instance, I just started
 working last year and I have to
 leave the house about 45 minutes
 before they do...
 G: Yes
 Caller: And leaving them alone in the
 house. I'm recently divorced...
 G: Right
 Caller: ... I read them the riot act...
 but anyway...
 G: Wait, before the anyway.

She impatiently tries to pin down the caller who reveals his blindness at the end of his call on sexual perversion: "Who is 'her' you're talking about?" and continues "We're not talking about her, we're talking about you". She is also understandably suspicious of the motives of the caller who is blind. She states, "Well, if you're blind then how do you watch her walk around the room? The intentions of the caller are suspect here. She is equally impatient with a handicapped woman who experiences a social stigma. She abruptly says, "so... Right? That's the honest truth, you can't hide that (your disability) from them". She abruptly lectures the woman married to a perfectionist: "Alright, then, why not be honest in a counseling session... Well, Marie, What do you want? Do you want to stay married to him or not?"

She gets angry and scolds callers upon occasion. To the woman having an affair with a married man and jealous of his "other" women she questions, "What happens to his

wife? She doesn't count in this?" She scolds a woman who feels manipulated by her boyfriend's children: "But nobody can lay a guilt-trip on you if you're not willing to accept it. That's the bottom line". She chastizes a couple who have waited for years to have a child and are now unable to, by stating, "You're trying to adhere to this perfect schedule". On the same subject of pregnancy with a different caller, she presses, "How are you going to know unless you ask? (why he wants to have another child)" She is also condescending to a mother who worries about her nine-year-old sons behavior problems. Dr. Goldstein allies with the nine-year-old and throws the weight of responsibility on the caller when she offers, "Also, use your head and see how he relates to your husband, how you relate to your husband in front of him and see if you think there is anything wrong there".

Her method of unsympathetic questioning of motives serves to deter further discussion. To the woman who's in love with an alcoholic she asks, "Why the need for him? It makes me have doubts whether you feel you're right enough... Okay, aren't you Okay?" In a similar fashion she asks the caller unhappily married to a perfectionist, "You stay in a relationship where you feel hurt. Why would you do that then?" And to the "other" woman who's jealous she is first impatient, with "But that's not really answering my question" and then she asks, "Why must you be Ms.

Desirability? To a depressed woman who's distant from her family she unsympathetically offers, "That's not a good way to spend a birthday (alone), definitely not". She is abrupt with one caller when she states, "You don't have to justify it (a guilt trip) to me". And she does not ally herself with a couple who after many years of planning now cannot conceive. She states, "That doesn't make sense... So, this is the planned time that you were supposed to have the baby". She also does not offer much encouragement to a handicapped woman when she states, "Speaking for myself I don't dislike you... just because you have a handicap".

Dr. Goldstein also discourages discussion by being distant, either in her questioning or in her advice. For instance, to the woman who loves an alcoholic, she offers, "These are the kinds of things you might think over". She also avoids offering advice when she suggests, "Also, remember that you can always use the services of a school psychologist" to the mother with a son who has behavior problems.

She is also vague and uninterested in pursuing specific facts of the motivations of persons who wishes to discourage. To the handicapped woman she states, "I could ask you how seriously do you want a relationship, because if...". But, she doesn't ask. To the woman who wonders why her recently reunited husband wants another baby, she states, "I guess you're saying... I don't know what the

meaning is" and she doesn't proceed to find out. She cuts off the man who fears that he will antagonize the court if he dresses too richly, when she states, "I don't know the details of your situation..." but then proscribes the book Dress for Success which is way off-target. Again, she tries to guess, and doesn't probe, with a caller who feels guilty about not having sex during menstruation, "It's hard for me to guess whether..."

She will abruptly cut off a caller with a "Thank you" followed by a commercial or another call. She gives up on the woman who loves an alcoholic with "Thank's for calling". After she asks the woman who's jealous of her married boyfriend to question her identity, she says, "OK, thank you for calling". And she ends the call with the woman guilty during menstruation by surrendering, "I'm not sure why you feel that you're supposed to have sex..."

Manners

Dr. Goldstein maintains her social status with the audience and proceeds to discourage calls by emphasizing the frankness of her advice. She tells the woman who loves an alcoholic, "You know I'm being frank with you". Here she softens the blow to the caller, who she previously insinuated was selfish and a liar. By underscoring the "frankness" of the discussion, Dr. Goldstein also strengthens the notion that her interrelationship with her "team"

is special, genuine and sincere. It also helps to solidify the bonds between this community of callers and listeners.

To sum up, Dr. Goldstein discourages discussion in several ways: By attacks that are critical, suspicious or scolding of the caller, an unsympathetic questioning of the caller's motives, vague or disinterested probing or advice, an abrupt thank you and an assertion of "frank" advice to both soften the blow of an attack and exaggerate the relationship the host has with the audience.

Dr. Judith Kuriansky

Topics Encouraged

Dr. Kuriansky employs several cues that encourage discussion. They are: Complimenting or praising the caller, restating the question or her position on the issue, exploring the specific facts or motivations in the question, serving as a supportive, sympathetic ally, making a problem universal to the public, assigning the caller a phrase to repeat or commanding an immediate action as well as offering an off-air referral. She asserts and maintains her social stature with the "team" by presenting herself in the role of a catalyst, as a trusted authority, confident in her advice, which is from personal experience. She awaits affirmation of her advice, which she sometimes considers the "only" solution.

Manners

By complimenting and praising callers she both puts them at ease as well as encouraging the subjects of their discussion. To the man who realizes he uses his children as an excuse not to get on with creative work she says, "Wonderful". She rewards a caller who says that you can overcome prejudice against the elderly with, "It's a good point". Similarly she rewards a caller who best identifies his problem, when she asserts, "No, I'm glad you said that. That's called an assertion of identity". And she praises and congratulates a woman who is overcoming her stigma about being in show business, when she states, "Critical Mommy.. Uh huh. That's it... Fabulous Lucy..."

By restating a question or her advice she emphasizes her priority in terms of what is to be encouraged. To the woman unhappily married to workaholic she affirms, "Well, you have certainly described the pain that comes to the family from a workaholic..." as she proceeds to restate the caller's problems, "You're miserable... he's knocked out cold from working so much... he likes to stay away from home... you should be in a sharing intimate relationship..." She also uses repetition to confront the caller. For instance, to the man who uses his children as an excuse, she states, "Okay, so taking time for yourself and being creative means you're a bad person". And to the caller who questions the pace and duration of therapy, Dr.

Kuriansky states, "Your concern, Carol, seems to be that you are spending too much time in therapy... So you're saying that (the guest) is saying that long-term therapy is of little value..."

By exploring the facts and motivations of the caller Dr. Kuriansky can both tailor her advice as well as strengthen the bonds of the team using this "shared secret" information. She questions the definitions and feelings of a caller who shares his inability to express his feminine side. She asks, "What do you think is your 'second' self, Lee?... What does it mean to you? What's dissatisfying about your male side? Please distinguish for me the difference between your masculine and feminine side?... Why am I asking you to do this?" Dr. Kuriansky forces the caller to reveal more of himself as well as assist her in approaching a hypothesis. In a similar fashion she queries a woman who doesn't want to face her husband's one-night affair. She asks, "What have you been doing about it? What does it mean to you, Ronnie, that you're holding on to this?... So what did he do with his ex-girlfriend?... When you cry, what brings on the tears?... What do you suppose is the message, when someone is told about an affair?... Have you discussed this?" Beside just asking for the specifics to the case, Dr. Kuriansky probes the feelings of the caller, as well as turning it into a universal question, "What do you suppose the message is, when someone is told

about an affair?" Dr. Kuriansky hopes that by detaching the caller personally, the caller might begin to better understand her husband's motivations and come to grips with her fear of discussing it. She applies her detective work in solving the problem of a woman who has assumed care of the son of her deceased friend. She asks, "What does this (the son's problems) have to do with you?... What does 'watching over them' mean?... Why do you feel that you failed in your responsibility?... How much of a commitment have you made?... What is the boy really saying (when he tried to commit suicide)?" And to a man who calls inquiring about an "unmacho" image she asks, "A constant dream (he begins the call with this) of what?... Have you thought about becoming a woman?... Did you grow up feeling you were born in the wrong body?... Are men allowed to cry?..."

She encourages certain callers by serving as a supportive, sympathetic ally. To the caller who said that her self-esteem increased when she began to take control of her life, Dr. Kuriansky approves, "Wonderful, good for you". To the caller who has writing blocks, Dr. Kuriansky agrees, "The critical self... you got it (the concept)... uhuh, that's true (that it can be overcome)." She is supportive of another caller who is fighting writer's block with, "Uhuh, okay, that's terrific". She is sympathetic of the caller who questions an "unmacho" image when she states, "...it's something that's a little threatening for you to

discuss" and then offers support, "A man can feel (like crying) that way too..." She is supportive of a caller who admits to the negative stereo type of show business people, "Of course we all know it's more complex (a stigma). By saying it, it's a little embarrassing". She allies herself with a man overcome by his wife's illness, when she states, "I very much hear the love you have for your wife". On the topic of prejudice, Dr. Kuriansky encourages callers by agreeing with their opinions. To the elderly caller she agrees that "there are definite prejudices against the elderly in this culture" as well as encouraging a man to improve self-esteem by studying his roots.

By making a particular problem universal, the specific case is broadened to be shared by the entire team. In answer to the question about the stereotype of people in show business, Dr. Kuriansky offers, "Uhuh. There are lots of people who can relate to that, Lucy... Intelligent men don't do that (stereotype)..." To the man who is incapacitated by his wife's illness, she reasons that this represents the larger problem of separation from mother, "...this could be a result of the early connection to your mother, perhaps". To the mother who wants to intervene between her child and the child's therapist, Dr. Kuriansky asserts,

"It would be normal for children not to repeat a situation that makes them feel uncomfortable... Mostly children get

upset by not being one the crowd. Generally it's not a good idea to intervene with (a child's) therapist".

To the transvestite who feels a dominant feminine "self", she offers, "The goal of any human being is to integrate those selves... Gender issues do entirely come from an early age". To the caller who complains that "Mother" is always blamed in therapy, Dr. Kuriansky retorts, "Those first relationships often determine how we relate to other people. So some therapists will use that relationship as a pattern". She also allays fears by making universal the fear of hearing the truth to a woman worried about her husband's affair, when she states, "This is often what happens. You and many other men and women don't want to know". She sets the record straight for a woman married to a workaholic, "It's been recognized lately that workaholism is like any other disease".

Dr. Kuriansky uses behavior modification when she assigns callers to repeat prescriptive phrases to remedy their problems. To the caller who's inhibited by the stereotype of show business people, Dr. Kuriansky instructs, "I would suggest that you, right now and here, say, 'Bye bye (critical) Mommy'" and follows up with an exorcism, "Say this, I give you up. I send you away. I expell you. I exile you from my life..." And to the man unable to cope with his wife's illness she offers the following, "Say this, 'My wife may die, but I live'". She also

commands that callers take direct, immediate action. On the topic of creativity she instructs all listeners to do the following, "Go to a mirror or bring a mirror to you and just watch what happens when you look in it". To overcome writer's block, she instructs the caller "Do it (start writing) now!". She instructs the transvestite who feels more feminine than masculine to "Feel those parts". She offers the woman who argues that "mother" is often blamed in therapy, "It's time for you now to get on something else, for what gets between you and your husband". She advises a woman, fearful of her husband's affair, to confront him with her worries, "I'm suggesting that it may be constructive to you to talk to him". And to the caller who gripes about group therapy, she offers, "I do think you should talk to the group about it, by standing up for what you want, rather than fighting it instead."

She offers therapy referrals to many callers, asking callers to wait on the phone until a producer can get on the phone and make the referral. It's interesting that she does not share this information with the team. In Goffman's analysis, this is one way she maintains social distance from the audience. Also, by withholding this information from the audience she exaggerates her personal, confidential relationship with the callers. Both maintaining social distance and exaggerating the interrelationship serve to strengthen her social standing with the audience.

In summation, Dr. Kuriansky encourages discussion by using the following cues: Compliments and praise for the caller, restating the question, exploring specific facts or motivations while she make conclusions that are universal, serving as a supportive, sympathetic, concerned ally, the offer of a remedial phrase or direct, immediate action and off-air, secret therapy referrals.

Appearance

Dr. Kuriansky assigns herself the role of "catalyst". She begins one program on creativity with the following,

"Tonight we're going to be confronting that (writing, painting, thinking) creativity and I'm also unleashing it... Now, there are many people who write to me or even we've talked about who have an anxiety about speaking in front of people..."

She also hopes that the discussion with guests will arouse some questions new in the minds of the audience. She opens another program on therapy with the following: "As you've been listening to these myths about therapy, you might have some questions about it, or gripes about it". These direct appeals to the audience also serve to exaggerate the host team interaction and bind more closely the team.

Dr. Kuriansky emphasizes the trust the audience has in her as a means of maintaining social status. In response to the call about stereotypes in show business she replies, "Because you absolutely trust Judy to do that and you did it (try to overcome the "Critical Mommy")". She claims

that she draws the information from her own experience. In response to a caller whose seriousness impedes success, she states, "I always say to myself... this is how it is for me..." She presents her prescriptions with confidence, stating that it is the only solution; she awaits the caller's confirmation. She suggests the source of discomfort to a transvestite, who feels "too" feminine.

"You may be feeling abandoned or left by a woman, rejected by a woman. To deny the hurt you adopt the feminine qualities of oppressor. I say it because I've seen it operating".

She is confident in her advice to the caller upset with the emphasis on "Momism" in therapy, when she advises, "Well, certainly there are different styles of therapists and there are different forms of therapy". She expresses urgency to the caller who cares for the suicidal son of a deceased friend, "It is imperative that you have an outside professional involved". After presenting her hypothesis or remedy to the caller she asks for affirmation. To the woman married to a workaholic, she states, "Well, this may be an important issue". What, then do you think he's avoiding at home?" And to the woman unable to talk to her husband after his one-night stand she offers, "I'm suggesting that it may be constructive to you to talk to him. What do you think?" She advises that the man disabled by his wife's illness break away from his imagined guilt complex. She asserts, "It's the only way". After she gives him a phrase

to repeat she waits for confirmation, "Do you know what the point is?"

To sum up, cues that enhance Dr. Kuriansky's "Appearance" are: Presentation of self as a catalyst, a direct and exaggerated interrelationship with the audience, drawing status as a trusted authority, confident of advice drawn from personal experience. The advice or remedy presented is often presented as the "only" solution and the call is completed when the caller acknowledges this advice.

Topics Discouraged

Manners

Dr. Kuriansky utilizes the following cues to discourage calls: Impatience with a caller as she interrupts or abruptly cuts off a call, deterring interaction with the caller, unsympathetic treatment of callers as she mocks or scolds them, suspicions about motivations or feelings, an appeal for urgency, disagreement with the caller, and vague or non-involved advice.

She is impatient and abrupt with several callers. To the caller who wonders what to expect out of therapy, she asserts, "I've asked you the question and you haven't been able to verbalize it". She then commands him to write a list of goals and abruptly terminates the call. She is equally short with a caller who asks when to quit therapy, she snaps, "Well, then it's not time for you to leave

(therapy). What do you want from me?" She also displays impatience by interrupting a caller. To the young poet who is stifled by her critical peers, Kuriansky interrupts, "Anyway, anyway, it is (the poetry). Whatever the mushy is". She interrupts a caller who agrees with affirmative action by stating, "As you pointed out this is not a problem that can be solved by one solution in one area. There are alot of problems". By interrupting the caller she discourages conversation.

Also, on several calls there was no interaction between host and caller apart from the question and a short, brief answer from Dr. Kuriansky. Two examples are calls from an adopted child who felt prejudice growing up and charges that New York City is not a "Melting Pot". She also achieves this by simply restating the caller's question and refraining from discussion. To the caller who charges there's more discrimination in New York than down South, she states, "You point out that down South you didn't feel the effects (of prejudice) as much". That terminates the call.

She also discourages callers by mocking or scolding them for their calls. She mocks the caller who fears applause by exaggerating the severity of his problem, "Little limitation? Not wanting to be applauded, it is really critical, Julio". She scolds a caller who endorses drug-induced creativity by stating, "You may think you're

more conscious (on LSD)... So for David to creative... so it would be a drug flashback..." She scolds a girl who fears that her peers will criticize her poetry, "Girls your age... you made girls your own age (17) your critics... They're going to read it and say, Lynn doesn't know what she's talking about". Kuriansky mocks the caller who needs to smoke in order to be creative, stating, "You're being very good at being defeated". And to the caller who feels that ten years of marriage to a non-supportive husband was wasteful, she offers, "If you want to trick your mind that it was time wasted..." She mocks a caller who feels she would be rich if only her ideas had not been stolen, by stating, "...but you're rushing alot".

Being suspicious of the caller's feeling and motivation serves to deter discussion. She is suspicious of the man who has a female therapist yet has trouble relating to woman. She asks, "What blocks do you have communicating with her" and continues, "It's possible that you're not having a good therapeutic interaction anyway..." She supposes this as a possibility after he repeated this sentiment throughout the call. She queries the man who blames confrontational therapy for driving away his wife, "You seem to want to blame the therapy on this. What do you think went on there?... What didn't you like?" She is also skeptical of the caller who wants to identify with a

motivation for nudism. She asks, "What does it mean for you? Is it important for you?... Is this something you're thinking about doing?"

An appeal for the urgency of her advice also results in deterring discussion. To the caller who is unable to obtain her mother's hospital records, Kuriansky advises with urgency,

"Medical organizations are obligated to share the information requested by the patient... This is a time for you to reconsider what's going on for you and your mother. It's a deeper question you might consider along the way... Certainly, it's time for you if you are going to assume the responsibilities of your mother... Really, the family truly needs to make alot of noise and stay on top of it and keep calling."

And to the woman suffering from anorexia she advises, "All I can say to you, it's crucial for you to examine that (control as the root of problem)."

Out-and-out disagreement certainly discourages topics for discussion. For instance, she disagrees with the caller who feels more creative with LSD, "No, first of all, I wouldn't call that (LSD flashbacks) an enchanced state of creativity". And to the caller who questions her long-distance relationship, Kuriansky retorts, "Realistic is not the question. You're really asking about being satisfied".

Dr. Kuriansky chooses not to get involved as a psychological counselor with topics she discourages. Here her advice will be vague and non-involved. She throws the

weight of the problem onto the caller who questions how long to be in therapy, by stating, "I think you're the best judge of that. The results are on you and expectations are on you, too, Lee. What do you want to do?" To another caller who asks about the pace of therapy, her only advice is "It could be a part of your growing. It's hard to say, Goodbye". On a third call about therapy, from a caller who states she can't deal with life, Dr. Kuriansky advises, "Therapy can often work on people who have a hard time dealing with life". She never probes into the problems of this obviously troubled caller. She is simplistic and patronizing to a caller who complains that he can't complete anything. She parallels the act of his completing the call with his problem of not completing anything by stating, "It's (the call) was something that you started and you finished, Right?" However, she never gets beyond this to the root of his problem.

In summation, Dr. Kuriansky discourages discussion in the following ways: Impatience, interruption or abrupt termination of the call; lack of interaction with the caller; mocking and scolding callers; suspicion regarding the caller's feelings and motivations; making an urgent appeal and terminating the call; not getting involved in the call and offering vague advice.

Appearance

However, despite discouraging calls Dr. Kuriansky asserts her authority by stressing both the importance of her advice as well as the audience's trust for her. She stresses the importance of her advice with the caller who fears recognition, when she states, "This is a very important part of the mastery course (that she has explained). Julio, if I were working with you in therapy..." She also emphasizes the audience's trust for her in response to the caller who can't complete things. She asserts, "Paul, did you get that (the parallel between calling and completing something) because I know you're going to tell me all". By stressing the importance of her advice she exaggerates her relationship with the audience. By emphasizing the trust the audience has in her she both increases the amount of shared secrets for the team as well as exaggerates that interrelationship.

Frame Analysis

In both Forms of Talk, and Presentation of Self in Everyday Life, Goffman raises points that are particularly relevant to the analysis of how the host and his staff "frame" the situation presented on the radio call-in shows. In his work Frame Analysis, Goffman defines "frames" as "Sets of cues that people use to organize experiences or situations".(1974:10) This is achieved by frame "cues". "Frame cues are a socially accepted means of inducing

others to act as we want them to act".(1974:41) Two forms of communication play are identified: Participatory and Elite-dominated. In Participatory Communication Play, framing rules disappear and people collectively offer framing cues. On the other hand, as its name implies, in the Elite-Dominated form of Communication Play, the audience is passive and framing cues are dictated by a small elite group. It appears that radio call-in programs represent a cross between the two forms of communication play. As has been noted earlier in this discussion of "Impression Management" and the "Forms of Talk" the audience will both be submissive to the superordinate authority of the host and respond with cues, hints and signals that will alter the host's approach. To restate, the host implements a pre-established and consistent pattern of interaction, where idealized social values are expressed and a high social status conferred. The host impresses the audience both with the uniqueness and sincerity of his conversation with the audience. He established his authority with the audience, by maintaining a social distance. He will be ostracized by his audience if he steps too far from his station with the audience. To prevent "intrusions" the host can do numerous things: To develop high in-group solidarity, change the audience, suppress private emotional responses, screen out calls and insure the anonymity of the caller. Typically, cooperation between host and audience is

stressed and maintained. He is aided by his staff, confidantes in the field, repeat callers and radio call-in colleagues. In this sense, radio call-in may be deemed to be "Elite-dominated Communication Play".

However, the audience makes this participatory communication play. While they are joined together by "inside secrets" for the "privilege of familiarity without intimacy" and wish to continue a "working consensus" with the host, they will initiate action via questions, letters and calls to the host. Goffman warns the host to acknowledge the reaction of the audience and quickly rectify and remedy the situation. He also suggests that it is advisable to "Realign actions to lower barriers and allow the (caller) greater intimacy and equality with it". This can be achieved when a caller supplicates advice or corrections from callers. When a caller offers advice to the host or another caller, he is granted parity to the host's authority. When callers can take stands rather than just ask questions, when they can register opinions and probe prior callers, greater participation results.

Summary and Theory

In summation, Goffman's work in "Impression Management" is useful in examining both the "appearance" and "manner" of the host. The host was found to share "inside secrets" with the audience and unify the team. The host also legitimizes accredited social values and is afforded a high social

status. A homogenous performance is expected of the host, however, he or she may "realign actions" as they invite callers to add or correct their performance, within reason. The host maintains authority by purposely keeping social distance from the callers.

The "Appearance" and "Manners" of each host as he or she encourages and discourages topical discussion is examined. Dr. Meltzer appeals to the heart with endearments, compliments, alliance empathy and comfort. However he utilizes warnings, suspicion, hopelessness, harshness and impatience with calls he rejects or discourages. Likewise, John Scheur offers support, encouragement, alliance, strong endorsements, universal concern and an appeal for feedback when encouraging calls. Yet when discouraging or quelling a call he is impatient, emphatic, condescending, sarcastic, negative, uninvolved and abrupt. These verbal cues, both positive and negative, are accurately perceived by the audience and will be discussed in the next chapter, "Host Appeal and the Assertion of Authority".

Dr. Goldstein encourages discussion by probing for information, feelings and motivation as she offers herself as a sympathetic, encouraging ally. Like all the hosts, she discourages calls with her impatience by criticizing, suspecting and scolding callers. In similar fashion, Dr. Kuriansky positively "frames" discussion by probing callers and serving as a supportive, sympathetic ally.

These findings support Avery's report that the caller to call-in radio (and the listener, as well) search for an ally, not an antagonistic host. However each host demonstrates impatience in a variety of forms, that all serve to discourage present and future discussion. These findings also support the hypothesis that resourceful people turn to radio call-in for advice and that a social network of dependable others, what Goffman calls a "team" is created. The host's appeal and authority will be evaluated in the next chapter. Authority can be achieved by insuring high in-group solidarity, using self-control of repress emotions and by changing or limiting the size of the audience (in this case, the number and composition of callers). The caller screening process and radio call-in staff will be discussed in Chapter 9, "Production of Culture".

Caller anonymity is stressed by Goffman, although pejoratively. The effect of caller anonymity will be discussed in Chapter 8, "The Caller: Anonymity, Caller Stereotype, Gender and Differences". Goffman explains team membership as a reciprocal dependency and familiarity. It will also include a discussion of the audience's perception of fellow callers and listeners.

In the next chapter we will examine more closely audience perception of each host's appeal and measure that against the present analysis of the host's impression management and verbal framing of the situation.

CHAPTER SIX

THE HOST'S APPEAL AND ASSERTION OF AUTHORITY

In Chapter 5, "Impression Management by Call-In Hosts", we discussed how the host as "team leader" serves to unite a team of familiar others by sharing inside secrets, exaggerating the sincerity of interaction and occasionally inviting audience correction. This finding supports the hypothesis stated in Chapter 1, "Radio Call-In Programs: A Sociological Concern", that a social network of dependable others may result when a group of unfamiliar people turn to call-in radio for advice.

Also in the previous chapter, the host's control over call-in talk interaction was examined using Goffman's concepts of "Appearance" and "Manner". This raises the question about those qualities considered important for the host. We can then compare these qualities with the audience perception of the host's appeal. Staff evaluation of host appeal are an important third element to compare, contrast and possibly justify audience perception.

The appeal of the host, known as the talk jockey, is an important consideration in the gratification of call-in radio for callers and listeners. In a study of call-in radio by Professor Avery of the University of Utah, he finds,

"People don't want to engage in controversy.
Instead they'll call the one who'll stroke them."

The caller knows the host has the power -- control of the on-off switch. They don't want to lose a confrontation" (Cohen, 1977: 27).

WOR's talk jockey, Sherrye Henry, concurs,

"I think broadcasters get the audience they ask for. If you want to put on a kind of wild and wacky and crazy show, you'll get a wild and wacky and crazy audience. I happen to want to put on a shown for concerned, aware people who are intelligent" (Tudryn, 1982: 8).

Qualities Considered Important

What qualities are desired in a call-in host? In a personal interview, WOR producer, Jim McAleer, identifies the following: Honesty, sincerity, credibility, and local appeal. WMCA Program Manager, Jeanne Strauss, adds that the host should be considered a member of the family.

"Father" Bernard Meltzer opens his program with "This is your friend, Bernard Meltzer. The program is 'What's Your Problem?'" New Yorker writer, James Stevenson, describes Meltzer's appeal,

"Meltzer's listeners love him because he understands how puzzled, frightened, angry, lonely and threatened they feel. Meltzer shares their belief in God, patriotism, family, neighborhoods, good kids, respect for old people, tax-free municipals and dry basements. His credo is practical: Treat your fellow man in a spirit of love and brotherhood, but if he really gives you trouble, don't forget -- you can probably get a lien on his house" (Stevenson, 1978:40).

R. Peter Strauss, at the helm of WMCA, asserts, "I have to develop a special identity with my listeners. To do that,

I must be more responsive to their needs" (Forbes, 1976:48).

As has been noted, the host's honesty is a strong appeal for the audience. Sherrye Henry states,

"You better be honest with your audience. They are tuning in because they trust you -- if you violate that trust...then you're going to pay a price for credibility -- and I'm not willing to pay that price" (Tudryn, 1982:8).

The host's credibility is another factor to consider. Credibility often depends on being well-informed. Jim Dunbar of KGA, San Francisco, told Newsweek that he reads 25 magazines a week and can digest a medium-sized book in 45 minutes (Newsweek, 1972). Along with credibility, many hosts have become the objects of attention. Bill Ballance gained notoriety with his "Feminine Forum" program, dubbed "Topless Radio", although he is over 50 years old (Time, 1972).

Audience Perception of Hosts

Three-hundred phone respondents were asked to best describe the call-in hosts. They were asked about eight qualities: Believable, Nasty, Concerned, Impatient, Good Debater, Humorous, Sympathetic, Expert and Other. Table 6.1 "Percentage of Responses in Describing Host's Qualities", include the findings. It is interesting to note that all six hosts share similar qualities in the opinion of the audience: Believable, Expert, Sympathetic and Concerned. The host's "appearance" and "manners" will be evaluated to explain this.

Table 6.1

Ascription of Qualities to Host (in percent).

<u>Quality</u>	<u>Dr. Goldstein</u> <u>(N=50)</u>	<u>Dr. Kuriansky</u> <u>(N=68)</u>	<u>J. Scheur</u> <u>(N=38)</u>
1. Believable	26%	22%	26%
2. Expert	22	22	29
3. Sympathetic	18	15	16
4. Concerned	14	19	8
5. Nasty	6	4	3
6. Impatient	6	6	8
7. Other	4	4	8
8. Humorous	2	5	5
9. Good debater	2	2	8
	100%*	100%	100%

<u>Quality</u>	<u>B. Meltzer</u> <u>(N=181)</u>	<u>Dr. C. Fredericks</u> <u>(N=78)</u>	<u>B. Gray</u> <u>(N=104)</u>
1. Believable	23%	23%	24%
2. Expert	20	27	13
3. Sympathetic	17	9	11
4. Concerned	18	17	13
5. Nasty	3	1	10
6. Impatient	4	4	7
7. Other	3	8	4
8. Humorous	5	4	11
9. Good debater	5	8	10
	100%	100%	100%

*Sum of percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

For the two radio psychotherapists, Believability is the most important quality identified, followed by Expert. In analyzing the content of the programming, each host uses several cues to transmit these qualities. Both radio psychologists offer verbal cues to their "teams" that emphasize their authority and social status.

Dr. Goldstein offers on-air referrals and suggests self-help books that present her as knowledgeable in the field. Her methods of questioning is Socratic as she pursues a line of investigation based on a hypothesis she later reveals. Her "expertness" is underscored when the caller affirms her prognosis. She continues with each caller whom she encourages until "Yes" follows her question, "Right?" Her believability is also stressed in her admissions of offering "frank" counseling. With an offer of sincerity and honesty she diminishes the chance of losing callers and listeners to her sometimes harsh and brutal advice.

Dr. Kuriansky earns her reputation as expert and believable in a different manner. She opens each program with an address to the audience hoping she will catapult them to consider new issues and call with advice. She presents experts in various field of psychology in the first hour of her three-hour broadcast. She speaks knowledgeably and sometimes informally with these guests, giving the audience the impression that she is "in-league"

with these experts. Their reputation reflects positively on her. The respondent's vote of "believability" stems from Dr. Kuriansky's references to her audience's trust in her and her confidence in advice-giving. She quells all disagreement with her advice when she offers what she terms, "the only solution". Also, by stressing the importance of her advice, she furthers the "expertness" of her work. Both radio psychotherapists achieve social statuses of believability and expertness via different means.

While Dr. Goldstein offers on-air referrals, Dr. Kuriansky premieres various experts in the field. While Dr. Goldstein tests a hypothesis until it is confirmed, Dr. Kuriansky offers her advice as the "only solution". Both hosts share the technique of stressing frankness and confidence in their advice as well as the trust beholden to them by the audience.

A little over ten percent of the respondents indicate that they find Drs. Goldstein and Kuriansky either nasty or impatient (12% for Dr. Goldstein, 10% for Dr. Kuriansky). In the content analysis the researcher found example of the host's impatience or abruptness with callers.

Both radio therapists display impatience with callers whom they discourage. Dr. Goldstein is sometimes critical, suspicious or scolding of callers. Cues such as "So," "Yes," "Right," "Wait", demonstrate impatience. She lashes out in anger at various callers: A jealous "other woman",

a professional couple unable to conceive, a mother with a troubled son. She is also considered nasty as a result of unsympathetic probes to callers with such problems as loving an alcoholic, marriage to a perfectionist and alienation from family. Her impatience and nastiness may also be a result of those times when she is distant in her probes, vague in her advice. She will also abruptly cut off a caller with a "Thank you".

Dr. Kuriansky shares many of these cues. She is impatient with some callers and abruptly cuts off others. She is also unsympathetic in her treatment of calls she discourages by mocking or scolding callers. She is also vague and non-involved with certain callers. However she differs from Dr. Goldstein in several ways. With calls she discourages there is the absence of interaction; a question asked, her brief answer or simply a restatement of the question. She will also come out and clearly disagree with a caller, such as had happened with the man on LSD and the girl with a long-distance boyfriend. She terminates the call shortly after she lodges her disapproval.

In contrast to the differences between Drs. Goldstein and Kuriansky that earn each one the reputation of "believability" and "expertness" are the similarities which also drew 10% of the responses to claims they are "impatient and nasty". Cues that lend themselves to this audience response include: Impatience via scolding, mocking, con-

descension, criticism and suspicion, unsympathetic probes or vague and non-involved examination, and the abrupt termination of calls.

The audiences for the financial and business advisors, John Scheur and Dr. Bernard Meltzer, consider the hosts expert, believable and concerned. However there are differences in the perceptions of each host. John Scheur is considered "expert" by 29% of the responses to Bernard Meltzer by 20% of the responses. In contrast, 23% of responses to Bernard Meltzer consider him "believable", compared to 16% for John Scheur. How do the verbal cues of each host account for the difference?

John Scheur offers his audience cues that earn him the rating of "expert". He speaks with confidence, authority and concern for the caller. He mentions several times his "foolproof way to manage money". By claiming authorship for an investment tool places him as "expert". He speaks assuredly, using phrases such as "I consider", "pretty foolproof", "manage successfully", "obviously", and "important ground". His expertise is given added weight by his reliance of official "other" sources, although we are never certain the authorship of such. He mocks callers for their ignorance as he sets himself as the source of information. He offers himself a self-congratulatory pat on the back with "You could say, 'I talked to that great guy on the radio and he agreed with me'". He stands behind his advice,

claiming it is drawn from life-long experience. He makes absolute statements like "beyond any question of doubt" that lend him added credibility and expertise. His believability comes into play with his display of concern for the caller. An excellent example is when he tells one caller questioning Mutual Fund IRAs, "All I care about is you and your money".

Bernard Meltzer earns his reputation of "believability" in many ways. He speaks from personal experience, offering himself in the role of a "wise old man". He acknowledges the desire for positive word-of-mouth to the point of asking a caller to mention his advice to the Governor of Tennessee. He speaks with certainty, using phrases such as "all you have to do". He offers cues that belie "expertness" as well. He demonstrates to a caller that he was "in-the-know" about real estate come-ons before the Attorney General. He also refers to other sources to back up his advice.

What accounts for the difference in percentage of responses to John Scheur and Bernard Meltzer? While Meltzer makes a personal appeal to the audience, Scheur claims to have authorized a foolproof investment tool. The personal, intimate appeal makes Meltzer "believable" while the confidence and absolute security in the "Trailing Price Floor", John Scheur is considered the "expert".

By audience response, Bernard Meltzer is considered

less impatient or nasty (7% total) than John Scheur (11% total). An evaluation of the content of their programs reveals this difference.

Eleven percent of the responses claim that John Scheur is either impatient or nasty. Cues that he employs to discourage calls account for this view. They are: Impatience by being emphatic, condescending, sarcastic and scolding. He cuts off some callers in mid-question, or offers pat answers to others. He scolds callers who want to manage their own investments. He might also be considered nasty when he paints a negative picture of the consequences for a caller. Like Drs. Goldstein and Kuriansky he can be vague and non-involved in the problem and in his offer of help. On occasion he is emphatic with his advice, commanding a caller and then abruptly terminating the call.

Bernard Meltzer shares some of these negative cues. He is suspicious of callers whom he discourages. He also exposes callers to the harsh consequences of their situations by revealing the hopelessness of the situation. However he also discourages discussion by cautioning callers. He couches his alarming advice with endearments and an emotional appeal. His nastiness emanates from mocking callers, such as his attack on the couple interested in the mobile home, or the other couple who wish to live with their relatives. He reveals impatience when he abruptly questions callers whom he wishes to discourage. He is most unsettled by callers

who he feels do not comprehend his advice.

Although both John Scheur and Bernard Meltzer discourage callers by being what some in the audience would consider "impatient and nasty", Meltzer's emotional appeal may make him less susceptible to this criticism.

Health and nutrition advisor, Carlton Fredericks, is considered expert by 27% of the responses, followed by 23% who consider him believable.

Barry Gray, current affairs and politics talk jockey, is predominantly considered believable (24% of response) with other positive traits drawing 10+% of responses.

Staff Evaluation

Dr. Goldstein

Audiences perceived Dr. Goldstein as primarily "Believable", followed closely with "Expert" as a popular response. How does Program Director, Jeanne Strauss, evaluate Dr. Goldstein's appeal? She states,

"One of the most interesting things is that she had people look anew at their problems with a slightly new and different perspective. By talking to a disinterested-interested third party, it's pretty amazing to listen to...With Goldstein, there's a cross-section of callers and problems. She presents new topics, puts them in perspective. Not that many sex calls or calls about gays. They're in proportion to what you would encounter if you went out all the time".

From Ms. Strauss' estimation of Dr. Goldstein, we can speculate that believability and expertness emanate from topical, current discussion with an interested "third party" who can

offer alternatives to the caller. This compares with the researcher's observation, that based on her verbal cues, she pursues a Socratic method of questioning, makes on-air referrals and emphasizes the "frankness" of her advice. All of these factors, combined, explain the audience perception.

Dr. Kuriansky

Dr. Kuriansky was also perceived by the audience to be similarly "believable" and "expert". Research Director of WABC Radio, Walter Mysolowski, explains her appeal,

"Once Judy develops a certain trust that any talk personality has to have with the listener, they feel this is a person who can give a logical and honest answer and not be embarrassed to make the call. For instance, just recently, maybe a few weeks ago, Judy came across a man on the street who was threatening to jump from a building. She spent two hours talking him out of it. The story was in the papers. The audience knows she cares."

This evaluation compares with that of the researcher who found that she stressed the importance of her advice and emphasizes the audience trust and confidence. Obviously this trust, revealed in Dr. Kuriansky's verbal cues, is reflected in the views of the station's Research Director.

The perception of "nastiness" and "impatience" held by some 10% of the audience is explained by Program Director, Mark Mason. He freely offered,

"Toughness is part of her (Dr. Kuriansky's) appeal...I think you're asking about levels of sympathy. Elyse (Goldstein) oozes with sympathy. It just goes too far. A lot call her up for sympathy. In reality, we're not here to provide sympathy. Judy is shorter

on sympathy and a more direct style that I prefer...But Judy is not mean for meanness sake...Judy has done some interesting things with couples, it's dramatic. Sort of live therapy. You know it's different when she gets the other side of the story. Her voice and opinion are a lot more informed."

Here the station's Program Director justified Dr. Kuriansky's toughness as he sets her apart from psychotherapy counterpart, Dr. Goldstein. He also emphasizes his view of advice-radio. That is, to give advice or therapy and not sympathy. He also stresses the drama inherent in live radio therapy (in this case, between couples) and underscores Dr. Kuriansky's believability and expertness when he mentioned her voice and opinion.

Dr. Bernard Meltzer

Bernard Meltzer is primarily considered "believable" by the audience, secondarily "expert". An analysis of verbal cues found that Meltzer enhanced his believability by speaking from personal experience, with certainty and acknowledging positive word-of-mouth. Executive Producer, Jeff Byers, explains Bernard Meltzer's appeal,

"Bernard tells the audience he is 'father' or 'uncle'. He gives advice and listens with a sympathetic ear. He's not a harsh judge and has the personal conviction of spirituality...He would give more emotional, interpersonal, advice, rather than what to do in a litigation, it's not his role to be an attorney and he's not a lawyer. He broadcasts not to the individual but to the audience".

Mr. Byers accounts for the emotional, spiritual and fatherly appeal of Bernard Meltzer. This explains the audience's

perception of him as believable. The question of why the quality of "expert" came second is explained by salesman and Director of Special Projects, Robert Alden,

"Basically all the hosts have show biz and pizzazz. Bernard's information is not always well put together, he appeals to the heart, emotions. Meltzer is slower (than Scheur or Bill Bresnan) and repeats himself... One case will demonstrate the difference in appeal between Meltzer and Scheur. I remember a lady called John Scheur about real estate and she starts crying on the phone. John told her sternly that he couldn't help her until she stopped crying. Now here's the difference. If that was Bernard Meltzer, he'd say, 'Mama, let's have a good cry together'".

Mr. Alden justifies the audience's apprehension about Meltzer's "expertness" and demonstrates a clear difference between the two radio financial advisors.

Meltzer's warmth is highlighted by Program Director, Bob Bruno,

"(Meltzer) has a cult following. His 'radio family business' is relatively new (1½ years). It's a phenomenon. He is not the stereotype of a good, solid broadcaster. He violates all rules of announcing, he 'phumphes' (Yiddish for garbles), interrupts guests, carries on dual conversations, it's all forgiven because people find him a 'broad comfort zone', non-threatening. He understands their problems, they relate well to him. There are other, more specialized, financial guys, but they're cold and analytical and won't have that connection with the listeners. He (Meltzer) may not be 100% correct always, not quite hitting the mark..."

John Scheur

John Scheur is firstly considered "expert" by the audience, then considered "believable". He spoke assuredly

and with confidence about a foolproof method of financial management that accentuates the perception of his expertise. How does Jeanne Strauss, Program Director, explain this perception? She states,

"John Scheur's audience appeal is from his knowledge, wisdom, the security of knowing as disinterested third party he stands nothing to gain...Scheur addresses family and financial concerns -- money and life... Even if you never leave your apartment, a sense of how much money people are making, it's important that he not just do CD's and money market. He's broadened his focus".

This staff member's findings concur with audience perception and researcher observation.

Dr. Fredericks

The audience perceived Dr. Fredericks to be "expert" firstly, and secondly "believable". Program Director, Bob Bruno, calls Fredericks a "Guru nutritionist". Executive Producer, Jeff Byers, adds,

"His appeal is expertise. For many years he knows what he talks about. He has a thorough grasp of his area. Secondly, the listeners trust in him. He cares about listeners, and it shows through on the air. He offers help, people won't be put down or dismissed without an answer".

Fredericks' longevity on the air and his reputation as nutrition guru and questioner of the medical establishment account for the audience perception of his expertise. His offer of help explains why audiences consider him to be believable as well.

Barry Gray

The audience identifies Barry Gray as primarily "believable". Program Director, Jeanne Strauss, explains,

"Barry Gray is the creator of talk radio in the United States. He's known as Mr. New York. He's so well-known and is identified with the city... His appeal? Glamour, knowledge of New York, an understanding of the community, he talks for the little guy, the person on the street, excitement, immediacy, he is now, he is up on what's going on. His stature, he's been on the air for a long time. He's got a breadth of perspective of thirty years".

Qualities such as longevity, glamour, knowledge, excitement, immediacy and stature account for the audience perception of Barry Gray as believable. His appeal to the "little guy", his understanding of the city, his identification with the community and his history of attacking the political establishment justify his positive image and loyalty of audience.

Summary and Theory

In summation, radio call-in hosts and their producers identify the following qualities that appeal to the audience: Honesty, sincerity, credibility, concern, sympathy and expertness. These qualities are revealed in the calls the host attends to as well as the interaction between host and caller. Audience response to the six hosts under study confirms that positive qualities predominate. Content analysis of the four programs, which are comprised almost solely of callers, demonstrates that the hosts give the impression of believability,

concern, sympathy and expertness, via verbal cues, when they encourage discussion. It must also be noted that the content analysis justifies those responses from the audience (about 10% overall) who find the hosts nasty or impatient.

These qualities attest to Goffman's analysis that the host's control is achieved by "legitimizing" the interaction, establishing trust and allegiance and control achieved by influencing the definition of the situation.

Call-in show staffs evaluate and justify the audience perceptions and researcher observations. The verbal cues used to assert authority do not elude the audience.

In this Chapter, there has been a combination of audience perception, researcher's observation and staff evaluation of host appeal. The tools of impression management introduced earlier support the theory that, resourceful people will turn to a believable and expert host for advice and that a social network of listeners and callers is created in the process. In the next Chapter, "Social Learning and Parasocial Interaction", two listener consequences are analyzed: Social learning and parasocial interaction. What the listener does with the advice disseminated naturally follows the examination of subject matter and host control and appeal.

CHAPTER SEVEN

SOCIAL LEARNING AND PARASOCIAL INTERACTION

In previous chapters we discussed the unique characteristics of the radio medium, how radio call-in both reflects and promotes shared social reality and the host's control via impression management and the assertion of authority. These qualities of the host were then contrasted with audience perception and production staff evaluations. These findings support the hypothesis that resourceful people turn to radio call-in for advice. This raises another question: How do listeners use the information that they hear? Two consequences of radio call-in advice are social learning and parasocial interaction. Bandura's theories of social learning and the theories of parasocial interaction advanced by Horton and Wohl and Gregg will be applied to audience perception of the consequences of radio call-in advice. Staff evaluation of the consequences of call-in advice for the listener will then be compared with audience perception.

It has been found that a large portion of the audience considers call-in hosts to be credible, concerned and expert. Researchers Davis and Baran in Mass Communication and Everyday Life justify this finding, "People who use the social learning style, are likely to be passive, uncritical media users. The media professionals who create the content are assumed to be experts who know what they're doing" (David and Baron, 1981:144). In the 1920's Lippman broke new ground

with chapter, "The World Outside and the Picture in Our Heads" in Public Opinion. He warned that our dependence on media information will replace direct knowledge of the world. He states,

"We shall assume that what each man does is based not on direct and certain knowledge, but on pictures made by himself or given to him" (1965:16).

He adds that these pictures often mislead,

"The pictures inside the heads of these human beings, the pictures of themselves, of others, of their needs, purposes, and relationships, are their public opinions. We shall inquire first into some of the reasons why the picture inside so often misleads men in their dealing with the world outside" (1965:18).

Social Learning

How does this picture of the world form? How does the learning take place? Bandura developed the Social Learning theory which agrees that observers can acquire symbolic representations of behavior; these "pictures" provide the observer (the listener) with information on which to base subsequent behavior (1971). Bandura discusses several ways this is accomplished, but two methods are pertinent to the discussion of social learning from call-in radio. One, he calls, "Observational Learning", where new patterns of behavior are acquired through observation. In the case of call-in radio, new opinions or strategies can be formed by listening to caller's questions and the host's advice. A second manner of social learning is through "Vicarious Re-

inforcement", where an idea or action is reinforced although the observer (the listener) is not actually reinforced. Listening to call-in radio is a vicarious experience. Members of the "team" eavesdrop on secrets revealed by the caller. Often the particular concern is broadened to make it more universal and applicable to the many listeners. Do observational learning and vicarious reinforcement take place? Several respondents, in answer to the open-ended question, "Why do you think call-in radio is popular?" revealed that it does.

Eavesdropping on "regular" people is appealing to some of the respondents. One listener, a man, 25-30 years old, college graduate, professional who listens to Drs. Fredericks, Kuriansky and Meltzer states, "It's entertaining to listen to regular people. Yes, radio call-in shows give people a chance to listen to others".

The honesty of people is also mentioned by another listener, female, 51-65 years old and a clerical worker who listens to all six shows infrequently, as she states, "People are well-read, honest and it clarifies a lot of questions for me without having to pay for advice".

Another listener, male, 25-30, college graduate who listens to Barry Gray and Bernard Meltzer frequently, emphasizes the "honesty" on call-in radio. He states,

"Yes, it brings things to people's attention. On the air it's more open and honest than television or the print medium. Your voice is in it (call-in radio)".

Listeners emphasize the diversity of opinions offered on the program. One listener, female, 51-65 years old, a H.S. graduate, now homemaker, who listens to all six shows daily, states,

"It gives people a different outlook on life and they can gain from the experience".

Various listeners state that different points of view are presented, forcing the audience to "think". A male, 25-30 years old, manager with some college training, who listens to Dr. Goldstein, Barry Gray and John Scheur daily states,

"Most radio call-in shows are healthy for our society. They bring on different topics that most people don't bother doing research on. They don't have the money or the time to help their problem. People often don't bother to help themselves".

Another listener, male, 31-40 years old, college-grad manager who infrequently listens to Barry Gray, underscores that relevancy results from the screening in call-in radio. He asserts,

"People are biased but a few can be helped by new information or changing others' opinions and it is somewhat controlled -- there's a screening process, so the calls are usually relevant to what's going on".

Another listener, female, 18-24 years old, who is in sales and listens to Dr. Goldstein twice a week states, "It shows different answers to problem (we have) and opens your mind". A second listener, female 31-40 years old, professional with

post-graduate education, who listens to Barry Gray, Bernard Meltzer and Dr. Kuriansky about three times weekly, agrees, "Yes, you are exposed to different points of view. They make you think".

Several respondents mentioned that they identify with the problems presented on call-in radio shows. Another listener, female, 41-50 years old, college graduate in sales, who listens to all six programs daily, notes, "Our problems are not as bad as others". Another respondent, male, 18-24 years old, college student who listens to Dr. Goldstein, Barry Gray and Bernard Meltzer twice a week, states, "Problems are universal for a lot of people. The answers help many". One listener, male, 41-50 years old, a professional with post-graduate education, who listens to Barry Gray and Dr. Fredericks about twice a week, asserts, "People realize that many of them have the same problem. That way, people do not feel alone. They get comfort from someone (the host) who cares about them". The supportive function of the host is extremely important to note here. The support afforded callers by the host is stressed by another caller, female, 25-30 years old, college grad and managerial, who occasionally listens to Bernard Meltzer and Dr. Kuriansky, "People get a chance to get advice. There are people (the hosts) who they can deal with on an everyday basis". Another listener states that these experts substitute for family. She offers,

"You get an instant answer. People don't like to ask their family. They call in

instead of writing because it's more instantaneous".

A third listener, female, 41-50 years old, professional who listens occasionally to Bernard Meltzer, endorses him, "What he's saying makes a lot of sense. He knows what he's talking about". Another respondent, male, 31-40 years old, salesman with college education, calls Dr. Fredericks the "Ralph Nader of Vitamins". Why does he think people listen?

"For consumerism. People like to listen to experts on how to get the best out of life. You can't fool people anymore. People want to be turned on to what's best for them. How they can help themselves."

Another respondent underscores self-improvement as a reason for listening. This listener, female, 31-40 years old, homemaker who infrequently listens to all the programs, states, "People want to improve their well-being in every direction. People want to be better than they presently are. That's why they seek out information".

What is it about "talk" on radio that makes this format appealing? One listener, male, 41-50 years old, businessman who listens to WMCA daily, says, "People are audio-voyeurs. Controversial topics make for interesting talk". Another respondent, female, 31-40 years old and into sales, who infrequently listens to Barry Gray, states, "It's educational. What the hosts and callers give the public; it arouses their curiosity". A number of listeners reasoned that the public likes to hear others talk, argue and discuss problems. One woman, 51-65 years old, managerial with some

college, who occasionally listens to all six shows, asserts, "People like to listen to others' problems and 'Tzuras' (Yiddish expression denoting aggravation)". One respondent indicates that this may be a local phenomenon, when he states, "New Yorkers love to talk to like to hear others talk". Another listener who proclaims himself a fan of call-in is unusually cynical of why people listen, "People would rather look outside themselves for answers than looking inside".

In summation, respondents claim that they rather enjoy eavesdropping on the talk of fellow New Yorkers. They appreciate the honest, frank discussion that the anonymity of radio affords. They stress both the diversity of opinions and similarity to their own problems as an appeal of call-in radio. They claim that the variety of opinions forces the listener to think; the similarity of problems makes them feel more comfortable with their problems. This leads the audience to "vicariously reinforce" values presented on the programs. In a similar vein, the support of the host as expert, substitute family member or consumer watchdog encourages the observational learning. Why do people turn to radio call-in for social learning? Listeners offer various reasons: Radio talk piques curiosity, people are voyeurs, we like to listen to other's problems and aggravation and it's a way to try to find personal solutions by looking outward, rather than inward exploration and self-examination.

What social structure, or the absence of such, accounts

for social learning through call-in radio? Hall in Beyond Culture distinguishes between high-context and low-context cultures. He states,

"In societies of high-context culture (a lot of restrictions), there is high constraint and high efficiency of communication. In societies like ours there is low-context, we sacrifice efficiency but gain a greater diversity of communication".

The diversity of communications is also stressed by McLuhan in The Medium is the Message (1965). He states that, "People born after 1950 do not need 'retribalization' -- they grew up with TV and hence they have always been members of the tribe". Williams (1970) alludes to "tribe" and "community" thusly, "The framing consciousness (of mass communications) constitutes a meaning of community".

But various social scientists warn of the hazards of social learning through the mass media. Sennett in The Fall of Public Man cautions that,

"As mass communication has become pre-dominant, people have become increasingly unwilling to express themselves to others -- particularly to unfamiliar others or others in public situations -- through conversation" (1977:261).

Porter (1977) draws larger implications for the danger of society,

"Social institutions that are responsible for transmitting useful forms of culture (i.e. religious, political, educational) find that people are less willing to understand or even pay attention to complex messages...We are in danger of becoming a nation of children mesmerized by hucksters

who fill out heads with pretty stories"
(1977:787).

Is it true that those who listen to call-in radio are "mesmerized" by talk show hucksters?

Isn't the popularity of call-in radio a response to this? The format demands that callers express themselves to others -- a familiar host and an unfamiliar audience. In Goffman's discussion of "Impression Management", this audience is not so unfamiliar. They are bound by an exaggerated relationship with the host, a consistency of performance they have come to expect and shared secrets and information that solidifies these otherwise "unfamiliar others". Respondents offer several opinions on the effects of conversation.

The opportunity for discussion and the desire for such was stressed by numerous listeners. One respondent, female, 51-65 years old, who is a nurses' aide and listens to Dr. Fredericks and John Scheur, states, "I feel that many people don't have the opportunity for discussion". Another respondent, male, 25-30 years old with some college, who listens to Bernard Meltzer infrequently, states, "Instead of people letting things to by, they can ask a question and get answers". People are limited in their interactions with others by both work and family obligations and the fear of urban living. One female listener, 51-65 years old who listens to Barry Gray occasionally, offers, "In the daytime, women don't have much else to do or people to see and they're

lonely. People also can't get out as much because of the crime. Now men are getting into it too (radio call-in listening)." The inclusion of all elements of society was stressed by one respondent. She states, "It reaches all levels of people".

Others expressed a dissatisfaction with the political leadership. One respondent, female, 41-50 years old and a clerical worker who listens to Dr. Fredericks and Dr. Meltzer frequently, states, "You normally can't fight City Hall. But callers can inject their ideas and opinions and be heard." Another listener, male 31-40 years old, self-employed, who infrequently listens to Barry Gray, emphasizes the "celebrity status" of some callers: "It helps people become more alert and more aware. They (the callers) put their own views across and they become somebody. You (the listener) can sympathize or react against some of the callers".

Ventilation is another explanation for the appeal of radio call-in as well as explaining the alternative questions and ideas posed by callers. Numerous listeners responded that callers like to "let off steam", "speak their minds", "like to hear themselves think", "clear minds and thoughts", "talk out their feelings", and "air out views". This ventilation of aggression, hostility and frustration, on one hand, serves as a safety valve. This has been previously noted by Singer (1973) and Lowry's (1981) report to

the American Jewish Committee. However, it also serves to expose the audience of listeners to controversial, provocative and alternative ideas. It can be stated that Sennett's fears of the lack of communication between people is unfounded in call-in radio. People tune in for the opportunity of expanded social interaction, that which work, family and urban life diminishes. Call-in radio is a way for members of the society to lodge complaints, to "stand on a soapbox" before a large and generally sympathetic audience. As a result the audience is served up both questions and problems they can personally relate to as well as provocative, alternative opinions. The "ventilating" aspect of call-in radio for callers (and listeners, although not as pronounced) encourages public discourse.

In summation, Sennett and Porter's warnings are probably unfounded with regard to radio call-in programming. People look toward this radio format to supplement sometime limited social interactions. The range of interactions are unlimited as the program appeal and reach all levels of society. Callers seize the opportunity to speak out and "grandstand" against injustices they see. They ventilate their frustrations for listeners to either share, compare or reject. But the variety and scope of differences of opinion is evident.

Arbitron measurements of "Time Spent Listening" indicates that both talk radio stations, WMCA and WOR, have

relatively long listener times. For persons, 12+, Monday through Friday, WMCA's average listener time was 1 hour and 12 minutes; for WOR it's 1 hour and 35 minutes (See Appendix 3) (Arbitron, 1982).

WMCA Program Manager, Jeanne Strauss, asserts that talk radio is "foreground listening," not musical background. KABC Program Executive, Wally Sherwin, agrees, "If you listen, you get involved" (Rice, 1981:87). Show host, Toni Grant, concurs, "You're talking intensely with one person about some intimate, important thing and others suddenly stop vacuuming and listen in (Carter et. al., 1979).

Jeanne Strauss also calls listeners "information junkies". WMCA Market Surveys have shown that the listeners are big readers, between three to five books in the five-month period. President of ABC Owned-and-Operated Radio Stations, Charles A. DeBare, states, "News talk focuses on issues and lets people talk to someone in authority" (Daily News, 1983).

Why do call-in radio audiences seek out information? Talk radio consultant to WMCA, Carey Davis, states that people in small towns are less mobile and want to know what is happening in their town. They want to confirm rumors. He also notes that many small town call-in radio stations, like his native WSDR, in Sterling, Illinois, are active in the community and are called upon in times of crisis, i.e. delivering babies and distributing medicine. Ed Busch, co-host of RKO's national "America Overnight" states, "The

important thing is that the listener takes the information he hears to the people he needs to consult about it" (Tudryn, 1982). Host of WOR's "How to Cope" program, Joan Hamburg, concurs that "Everyone wants the same thing -- survival techniques" (Carter et. al., 1979).

Parasocial Interaction

Why do they seek out this information by using call-in radio? Goffman's "privilege of familiarity" is eluded to by WKAT's (Miami) call-in host, Judge Ellen Morphonious Rome. She states, "They (the audience) really feel you belong to them" (Time, 1972). Psychologist Julian S. Frank says that radio talk shows fill a need for human contact. He asserts,

"Most people go through life with very little human contact. We talk to computers in banks and telephone answering machines but that's not very satisfying" (Tuthill, 1979).

Rice, Senior Editor of Psychology Today, likens the radio call-in show to a network of friends and relatives in his small town in Massachusetts. He states,

"Few people have family doctors or ministers -- at least not the kind you turn to for help in times of emotional trouble. And fewer people live close enough to their relatives or stay in one place long enough to establish the kind of social networks that might provide help" (1981:91).

WOR's Sherrye Henry further illustrates this need for human contact and networking via call-in radio,

"I believe there's a need for talk in all of us...there seems to be in the midst of our many numbers so much loneliness in people's lives. There are families breaking up, singles living alone, elderly people shut off from their families, mobile families moving across the nation leaving behind their relatives. Talk radio allows us to connect to each other with a feeling of community" (Tudryn, 1982).

Is "Para-Social Interaction" operative in call-in radio? WMCA Program Manager claims that New York is a lonely city, where 50% of households are single-person households. She says that people call and listen to WMCA to "embrace themselves". KABC's Toni Grant says of Los Angeles, "Southern Californians need a lot of help. There is a profound sense of alienation and loneliness here and few traditional guidelines for behavior" (Time, 1980). A caller in his 30's reflects Grant's assessment, "The program is an oasis in an emotional desert" (Rice, 1981). Los Angeles psychotherapist, Dr. Norton, is quoted in Time as describing call-in radio as "Interpersonal glue that people need so much greater with the fragmentation of the family" (Time, 1972).

Former WOR Research Director, Mimi Lopez, told the researcher that based on her research, people grew up with the WOR "family" and regard the hosts as family members. The family analogy is extended to the proliferation of female radio psychotherapists:

"Industry experts speculate that listeners -- males as well as females -- simply feel more

comfortable revealing their problems to someone who they can visualize as a warm, sympathetic mother figure" (Rice, 1981).

Does "parasocial interaction" exist under isolation? WOR's Audience Listener Service told the researcher that many senior citizens call because they feel that "nobody listens". WMCA's consultant, Carey Davis, agrees that many callers come from an "empty nest". However, psychologist Carin Rubenstein, writing for Psychology Today, states that the audience is not full of loners. Instead, she found them "relatively stable and resourceful people" (Rubenstein, 1981).

Horton and Wohl (1956) offer an earlier definition for "Parasocial interaction":

The media user employs cues provided by a media character to create a personification for the character. The 'fan' comes to believe he 'knows' the persona more intimately and profound than others do; that he 'understands' his characters and appreciates his values and motives" (1956:218).

In response to open-ended question, "Why do you think radio call-in shows are popular?", the appeal and persona of the host was stressed. One listener likened the attachment to the host as a search for leadership. This male, 31-40 years old, managerial who listens to Barry Gray and Bernard Meltzer, states,

"People are becoming dependent in terms of leadership and they're groping for answers. These hosts are seen as leaders. We want someone who's strong and can take a stand".

Why do listeners consider hosts to be "leaders"? One respondent, female, 31-40 years old, a professional who listens to Barry Gray infrequently, states, "They discuss many topics. The host listens". Another likes the immediacy of response, "I like the free advice. I have faith in the host and the quick response on a one-to-one basis". Another respondent stresses common sense, "The hosts are knowledgeable and have more common sense than the callers". Another mentions the host's thoughtfulness, "The hosts are careful in what they say. They're intelligent". Another listener believes the host is "expert". One respondent, a clerical worker, 41-50 years old, is particularly laudatory of host Bernard Meltzer,

"The hosts give good advice, especially Meltzer. Millions of letters thank him, he says. A lot of the stuff goes in one ear and out the other, though. He sounds damn believable...The majority of his callers are pretty honest. I've heard some pretty terrible stories but I knew that I couldn't help".

So, listeners understand the hosts to be leaders, with intelligence, common sense, care, honesty and immediacy of response. In Chapter 5, an examination of the host's "Impression Management" supports these findings.

How does the audience "understand" the persona of the host? Table 7.1, "Percentage of Responses to Question on View of Host," presents audience views on social interaction with each host. Respondents were offered six choices:

Table 7.1

Proportion of Responses to View of Host
(in percent).

	<u>Dr. Goldstein</u> (N=29)	<u>Dr. Kuriansky</u> (N=42)	<u>J. Scheur</u> (N=27)
<u>Response</u>			
1. Friend	41%	36%	26%
2. Coworker	21	29	52
3. Stranger	21	7	7
4. Parent	10	14	4
5. Mate	4	5	-
6. Other	4	10	11
	100%*	100%	100%

	<u>B. Meltzer</u> (N=105)	<u>Dr. Fredericks</u> (N=48)	<u>Barry Gray</u> (N=61)
<u>Response</u>			
1. Friend	40%	35%	15%
2. Coworker	24	21	15
3. Stranger	12	6	39
4. Parent	17	13	-
5. Mate	1	-	26
6. Other	6	15	-
	100%	100%	100%

*Sum of percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

Parent, Mate, Friend, Stranger, Coworker and Other.

All hosts seen as advice-givers: Drs. Goldstein, Kuriansky, Fredericks, Scheur and Meltzer, were seen as both friends and coworkers. It is interesting to note that Barry Gray, who rarely gives advice but holds an open forum on current events and politics, was regarded by 39% of the respondents as a stranger, while 26% said they view him closest to a mate. This finding gives an added twist to the song and movie, popular a few years back, "Lovers and Other Strangers".

Of the advice-givers, however, the role of friend was the most frequent response for all hosts except John Scheur. Fifty-two percent of the responses called him a "coworker" with only 26% stating he resembles a friend to them. What verbal cues does John Scheur give the audience to make them view him as a coworker more often than a friend?

As was noted in Chapter 5, "Impression Management by Call-In Hosts", verbal cues such as confidence, direct appeals to the family of listeners, speaking with authority, and references to personal expertise serve to both assert his social status and make him more remote from the emotional and personal concerns of listeners. This explains why listeners regard him more as a "coworker", speaking of the marketplace, rather than a friend who is more intimately involved.

It is also interesting to recognize that only a mini-

scale percentage of responses found either Drs. Goldstein or Kuriansky to be a "mate". A higher percentage of responses found them closer to "parents". They are both young enough to be any male listener's mate, yet too young to be any listener's parent. Yet this interaction with a hypothetical "parent" in psychotherapy concurs with Singer's analogy between radio psychotherapists and a warm, sympathetic mother figure (1973).

To further examine the interaction between host and audience, two questions were asked, "Does the host address the audience?" and "Do you feel the host is talking to you?". Table 7.2, "Percentage of Responses to 'Does Host Address the Audience?'" gives results of "Does the host address the audience?". Ninety-plus percent of respondents felt the hosts address the audience. However, 12% of respondents felt that Barry Gray does not address the audience. Cross-tabulation with demographics, gender, age and education, reveal that those who feel he does not address the audience are predominantly men, aged 18-30, with some college + education (see Table 7.3, "Percentage of Responses to "Does Barry Gray Address the Audience?").

A more important consideration in the examination of "parasocial interaction" is whether the listeners believe that the host is speaking directly to them. These data appear on Table 7.4, "Percentage of Responses to 'Does the Host Talk to You?'". The majority of respondents felt that

Table 7.2

Proportion of Responses to "Does Host Address the Audience?" (in percent).

	<u>Dr. Goldstein</u> (N=29)	<u>Dr. Kuriansky</u> (N=43)	<u>J. Scheur</u> (N=29)
<u>Response</u>			
1. Yes	90%	93%	97%
2. No	10	7	3
3. Other	-	-	-
	<u>100%*</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

	<u>B. Meltzer</u> (N=103)	<u>Dr. Fredericks</u> (N=47)	<u>Barry Gray</u> (N=59)
<u>Response</u>			
1. Yes	95%	96%	88%
2. No	4	2	12
3. Other	1	2	-
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

*The sum of the percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 7.3

Percentage of Responses to "Does Barry Gray Address
the Audience (in percent).

Percentage of Host Address Audience Responses
by Gender (in percent).

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Address Audience</u>	
	<u>Yes (%)</u> *	<u>No (%)</u>
Male	83	17
Female	93	7
	<u>88</u>	<u>12</u>
	N=52	N=7

Percentage of Host Address Audience
Responses by Age (in percent).

<u>Age</u>	<u>Address Audience</u>	
	<u>Yes (%)</u>	<u>No (%)</u>
Under 18	100	-
18-24	67	33
25-30	60	40
31-40	86	14
41-50	86	14
51-65	100	-
65+	100	-
	<u>88</u>	<u>12</u>
	N=52	N=7

Percentage of Host Address Audience
Responses by Education Level
(in percent).

<u>Level of Education</u>	<u>Address Audience</u>	
	<u>Yes (%)</u>	<u>No (%)</u>
Some high school	100	-
High school graduates	94	6
Some college	79	21
College graduates	89	11
Postgraduates	80	20
	<u>88</u>	<u>12</u>
	N=52	N=7

*Sum of total percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

Table 7.4

Proportion of Responses to "Does the Host
Talk to You?" (in percent).

	<u>Dr. Goldstein</u> (N=29)	<u>Dr. Kuriansky</u> (N=43)	<u>J. Scheur</u> (N=29)
<u>Response</u>			
1. Yes	66%	56%	76%
2. No	31	40	21
3. Other	3	5	3
	<u>100%*</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

	<u>B. Meltzer</u> (N=103)	<u>Dr. Fredericks</u> (N=47)	<u>Barry Gray</u> (N=59)
<u>Response</u>			
1. Yes	66%	68%	59%
2. No	31	32	37
3. Other	2	-	3
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

*Sum of percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

the host spoke directly to them, but the percentages vary from a high of 76% for John Scheur to a low of 56% for Dr. Judith Kuriansky. What could account for this?

John Scheur's verbal cues were examined in Chapter 5, "Impression Management by Call-In Hosts", and restated earlier. Dr. Kuriansky's impatience accounts for the percentage of respondents stating that she does not talk to them. She was found to interrupt or abruptly cut off callers, deter interaction, mock, scold or otherwise treat callers unsympathetically and be non-involved in probing and offering advice. This could certainly account for a larger percentage of her listeners stating that she does not address them directly.

In summation, both social learning and parasocial interaction are operative in the audience's interaction with call-in radio. Social learning is accomplished by both the observational learning and vicarious reinforcement of new opinions and strategies for coping. The radio call-in audience constitutes a "tribe" per McLuhan or a "community" per Williams. Sennett and Porter warn of the consequences of social learning via the media but audience and psychological research finds the audience resourceful, using call-in radio as one of many sources of information. Various researchers as well as call-in hosts and their staffs assert the absence of human contact. They find that call-in radio affords the listener the social network that

has disappeared in Urban America. Horton and Wohl offer another definition of parasocial interaction: Where the "fan" or listeners develops a sense of understanding the "persona" of the media character. It was found that most of the hosts were considered either as friends or co-workers. The lone exception, Barry Gray, was viewed as either a stranger or a mate. It was also suggested that female radio psychotherapists appeal to callers and listeners as parents despite their actual age. Over ninety percent of the respondents felt that all the hosts address the audience. The majority of respondents felt that the host spoke directly to them. The effects of social learning and parasocial interaction are important to the study of the consequences of call-in radio programming.

Staff Evaluation

Staff members for the different radio stations and call-in programs have varied analyses of what learning takes place as a result of the call-in shows. Veteran radio salesman, Robert Alden, of WOR, claims he used to look negatively at call-in radio but "Bernard Meltzer's appeal and popularity turned all of that around". Borrowing from a scatological phrase, he states that call-in radio "'Shoulds" all over the audience...Where you should, what you should, how you should...".

He also stresses the agenda-setting function of call-in radio that was first introduced by Lazarsfeld and Merton

(1948, 1971). They claimed that mass media could confer status on the events and people that were depicted and that norms could be enforced through wider exposure in the mass media. McCombs and Shaw (1972) studied agenda-setting and its effect on political campaigns. They concluded,

"Media influences audiences not so much by telling them what to think but by telling them what to think about" (1972: 36).

Mr. Alden reflects, "There are a lot of people who learn better through the ear than the eye. They don't read. It (call-in radio) tells the audience what it should think about".

WABC Program Director, Mark Mason, stresses that people appreciate the presentation of alternatives. He states,

"Smarter people will take it (the advice) as 'informed but brief judgement'. Some will do what she says, however. Normally by the time the call is over she'll help them 'see through the jungle'. It's not that black and white. The caller comes away with a better idea, confirmation or change his or her mind, after informed counsel".

He acknowledges the brevity of the encounter but stresses its value as "informed counsel". He stresses the presentation of alternatives that either confirm or change the mind of the caller. He discourages, by his answer, a simple acting out of her advice out of blind faith or identification with the caller.

WMCA Program Director, Jeanne Strauss, agrees that

what is important is the presentation of options and alternatives. She states,

"The shows are an opportunity for people to talk and work through their problems as the host shows them different possibilities... What do listeners do with the information? They incorporate it into their lives... (Our market) research shows that listeners to talk radio travel at a much higher ratio than do other format's listeners. You can't tell. The numbers aren't there to make the correlation. It's dangerous to make that judgment".

Her statement raises a number of points. One, that the host will offer numerous opportunities and possibilities. Two, that the information is believed to be incorporated by the listener. Three, that listeners are mobile and social people, reflected in their increased travel. Four, it is impossible to measure what is learned by examining the callers because they are not representative of the total audience.

WOR's Executive Producer, Jeff Byers, notes that people write in or call the station's Audience Listener service with feedback or calls for additional information. In answer to what people do with what they hear, he offers,

"A spectrum of things. I know some follow through on it (they call or write the station or contact the Audience Listener Service for information that they missed). It benefited them in some way...A single life is made up of one million pieces and you can't have an advice-giver in each area, so the general advisors broaden out."

He acknowledges that social learning takes place as listeners contact the station with praise or calls for additional information. He also notes the many-faceted needs

of the audience.

Social learning via vicarious reinforcement is mentioned by WABC Director of Research, Walter Mysolowski. He states,

"People gain general knowledge from listening. They learning from other's problems. There are an incredible amount of things to learn. It's nice to know that others experience the same problems in life. Others have similar or worse problems. You can feel better than before. It solves your problem for the night (with Dr. Kuriansky's show) and helps you get through another day".

Summary and Theory

Bandura's "Social Learning Theory" (1971) helps to explain the phenomenon of call-in radio listeners. According to his theory, via simple observation of new behavior, "observational learning" may occur. Such learning happens when a person is exposed to the new behavior, is able to acquire and reproduce the behavior and subsequently accepts and adopts the behavior as a guide to his or her own actions.

McCombs and Shaw (1972) apply Lazarsfeld and Merton's (1971) theory of agenda-setting. McCombs and Shaw found that the media do not tell us what to think but tells us what to think about; they set priorities in the minds of the audience in terms of what is important and newsworthy. "Agenda" is set by the hosts and callers, brief, informed counsel assists listeners in exploring options and alternatives, information is incorporated in the lives of listeners, the audience "feedsback" to the station with praise and calls for additional information and vicarious reinforce-

ment takes place when similar problems are confronted.

These findings support the theory that people do seek, find and use advice offered on call-in radio. Social learning takes place with the incidence of both "observational learning" of alternative actions and options as well as "vicarious reinforcement" of similar or shared problems. Callers seize the opportunity to "grandstand" against injustices and ventilate their frustrations.

The theory of "Parasocial Interaction" relates to Goffman's concept of "privilege of familiarity". Here, the host as team leader gains the trust and allegiance of the team members as he continues to unify spirit under a shared set of social values, beliefs and attitudes. Therefore, members of the team (the radio audience) consider hosts as important people in their lives, often regarding them as friends, coworkers or mates.

Parasocial interaction takes place as talk radio fills a need for human contact and audience's perceive hosts as if they were personal friends or coworkers. The majority of audience respondents felt that the host both addressed the audience and personally spoke to them.

In Chapter 5, "Impression Management by Call-In Hosts", and 6, "Host Appeal and the Assertion of Authority", we discussed the host, his or her control, appeal and authority. In the present chapter we evaluated the reaction of listeners. In the next chapter, "The Caller: Anonymity, Caller

Stereotypes and Gender Differences", we will study the caller and the role anonymity, caller stereotypes and gender differences play.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE CALLER: ANONYMITY, CALLER STEREOTYPES AND GENDER DIFFERENCES

After discussing various elements of the call-in radio experience such as history of call-in radio, shared social reality, "impression management", host appeal and the assertion of authority and listener "social learning" and "Parasocial interaction", we must consider the question of what stimulates people to call in to this format. Each program official has his or her own theory about what stimulates calls. Another area for exploration is the role of anonymity with the caller and its contribution to the quality of the interaction. Audience perception and stereotypes of callers will be contrasted with radio staff statements on why people call. Also, using Fishman's (1978) interactive approach to conversation analysis, we will examine gender differences between callers and hosts. By studying what motivates the caller and the audience perception of callers we can further examine the extent to which resourceful people turn to call-in radio, in an active way, by calling in.

Staff Perception Of Callers

Singer's analysis of three radio call-in stations in Ontario, Canada provides some interesting insight into who calls radio talk shows. He found that over 20% of his sample indicated that they called the radio call-in pro-

grams (1973:46) and 36% of them claimed to have called "a few times" (See Appendix 4)(1973:47). Sixty-three percent of the callers were female, 37% were male. This may exist because many of the programs were broadcast in the morning when few men are available. The median age for callers was 40-years-old, with those under-35 underrepresented and those between 35-59 overpresented. The median education of the caller was 12 years of school (1973:47). The radio call-in show was dominated by the lower-middle and middle-educated groups. Singer found that the median income of the callers was \$8,800, as compared to \$8,200 for the overall sample. There was an overrepresentation among callers in the \$7,000+ bracket (See Appendix 5)(1973:47). One must remember, however, that Singer's area of study is considered a "college town". It appears from Singer's study that the average caller is female, with middle-education, middle-income and one-third are repeat callers.

There have been several reasons cited for why people call in. One reason identified is that people call to get help with their lives. WMCA's Jeanne Strauss offered the following,

"People basically feel their voice can be heard. In 1983 there are a limited number of places where you feel you can speak up and be heard and where someone would listen. They also call to get help. Ask questions and become better... If you can help people work out relationships, you can improve the quality of life for them".

A caller to the Larry King network show on Mutual Broadcasting, Marshall Kavesh, offered another stimulus: To give or get additional information about a topic. He stated,

"I was upset by something that was said by a guest on the show and felt I had to call. Where values are concerned-- a matter of principle-- money (for the long-distance call) isn't that important" (Tuthill, 1979: 44).

Another reason to call is for instant, expert and free advice. WOR's Director of Programming, Bob Bruno, suggests,

"It's free, the price of a phone call, people will take advantage of it, free advice. Dispense information and advice free of charge. It's a complex world and its comforting for people to know they have instant access to experts and advice."

The search for advice is repeated as a motivation by WABC's Program Director, Mark Mason. He offers,

"The majority sincerely look for advice, help, counsel. Some just like to call in. In Judy's show, they look for help... It's compelling, involving, very personal, one-to-one relationship".

Here the search for advice is coupled with the intimate relationship established on radio with the call-in host.

WOR's Executive Producer, Jeff Byers, distinguishes reasons for calling by the subject matter of the program. He states,

"Everyone wants to have an opportunity to speak what's on their mind. To Sherrye Henry, they're concerned about their community, they're mad and want to exercise control over the outside

environment, influence what society is thinking. They only get to vote one time a year. On the other hand, the callers to Bernard Meltzer are 'selfish' but not in the pejorative sense. They call for help. The band is pretty small for those who call Carlton Fredericks."

The most often heard response from radio call-in staff is that people call in to get advice to help themselves. The second most frequent response is that people want to speak out, grandstand or ventillate their feelings before a large audience. Researcher Rubenstein, in an article in Psychology Today, disagreed with the stereotype of the caller as lonely. She found them "relatively stable and resourceful people".(Rubenstein 1981) These findings support the theory advanced in Chapter One, "Radio Call-In Programs: A Sociological Concern" that resourceful people will turn to call-in radio for advice.

Anonymity

What effect does anonymity play in stimulating the caller and possibly freeing or transforming the call? Each member of the staff stressed the importance of caller anonymity for host-caller interchanges on call-in radio. Especially those who call in for advice. Jeff Byers, WOR Executive Producer, states that he did a show on "Mistresses" that necessitated the assurity of confidentiality. He states, "They talk about very private things on the air". WMCA's Jeanne Strauss concurs,

"People call self-help programs. There are a limited number of environments where there are no repercussions. It's not like at work or family. They can be more honest. It's very scary to go to a psychologist and go face-to-face".

The absence of repercussions is highlighted by WABC's

Mark Mason,

"It's awfully important (anonymity). Very few people would get on without anonymity. It would create harassment or embarrassment. For example, a call about sexual dysfunction. She (Dr. Kuriansky) gives referrals off-air; They are specifically for that person and not necessarily for others who 'think' they have the same problems."

So not only does anonymity preserve the individual caller's confidentiality, but it "privatizes" counseling and referrals. So the radio station staffs see anonymity as necessary to encourage frank, honest, private discussion without embarrassment or repercussion as to individualize or make private the consultation or referral. What are some other effects of anonymity?

Various sociological researchers have studied the diverse effects of anonymity upon behavior. These effects include the relationship between assurances of anonymity and socioeconomic status, the increase of intimacy, altruism, antinormative behavior and sex-stereotyping.

Jones (1979) found that the assurance of anonymity had a more positive effect on mail questionnaire response rates in higher income, more highly educated populations. A concern with confidentiality is more important to those

in the higher echelons of society. Jones also found a relationship between sponsor prestige, status and response rates. In the case of call-in radio, the sponsor is the host of the program. Therefore, we can speculate that both the assurance of anonymity and the prestige of the host encourage the participation of callers from higher socioeconomic levels. This counters the charge made by some radio call-in critics that only poor, elderly, shut-ins call in.

Dannefer and Kasen (1981), in their study of the anonymous exchangers between CB'ers, found that anonymity encourages a sense of intimacy. They state that the sense of comraderie, even intimacy, stems from several sources. Most importantly, messages of intimacy between CB'ers involved little personal psychological cost for the anonymous CB'er. They also note that this intimate, anonymous exchange results sometimes in "fantasy-like communication" fostered among strangers. (1981:277) In Chapter 5, "Impression Management by Call-In Hosts", the comraderie between "team" members was discussed. Callers can reveal their innermost thoughts and show the most embarrassing problems without the penalty of recognition and recrimination. The "fantasy-like communication" is another interesting aspect of anonymous exchanges that bears on call-in radio shows. A number of listeners expressed some doubts that some callers actually had all

the money and assets that they profess to the call-in hosts. Some listeners expressed suspicion because they felt that people with those assets would either have professional money-managers or have more expertise than their basic questions demonstrated. Others expresses envy of callers with solid financial standings that either had petty problems (by their standards) or had severe problems caused by such wealth. These observations may have some justifiable basis. The anonymous caller loses nothing by lying or padding the truth, to his advantage. It may be an outlet for some people to live a romanticized life. Either that of a caller with money he or she does not know what to do with or suffering a tragic and tortured life of financial setbacks. The same holds true for those who call in to the psychology shows although listeners rarely questioned the veracity of those calls. One that the researcher highly suspects is the call to Dr. Goldstein from a blind man who gets a kick out of "seeing" his girlfriend parade around in her underwear. As the call progressed Dr. Goldstein also became suspicious and abruptly terminated the call. Such as in any other anonymous exchange, phone calls, CB and talk radio, there will always be the few pranksters who will violate the public trust for their own temporary fun.

Zimbardo (1969) hypothesized that anonymity leads to antinormative behavior because "If others cannot identify

you, social evaluation no longer provides an impetus to behave 'correctly'. (1969) Studies by Diener et. al. (1976) tested this hypothesis and found that there was a positive relationship between anonymity and shock duration, swearing, criticizing one's parents and pilferage. These studies add further weight to the notion that anonymous callers are free of reprisal and normative sanctions. The negative consequence is that of violating the public trust and invalidating the prestige of the host. The positive consequence is that of freeing callers from normative boundaries, enabling the expression of otherwise prohibited, censured, or taboo material.

Bihm et. al. (1979) studied the effect of altruism by gender on anonymity. Their results support Deaux's (1974) finding that altruistic response differs when one moves from an identifiable situation to an anonymous one. The study found that in anonymous situations, females were given greater help by other females. This bears on the radio call-in show with regard to both host-caller interaction and gender differences. It also bears upon a consideration of which callers will call in to a radio program to append or alter the advice given a previous caller. When one caller is stirred to call in, in response to a prior call, it may be considered altruistic. There may be other factors underlying the motivation for

a caller to refer to past calls and offer personal advice. Identity assertion is just one of the possible motivations.

Both WMCA's Jeanne Strauss and WOR's Mimi Lopez agree that the anonymity of call-in radio draws callers. An American Jewish Committee report describes the conversation as "Obvious, oversimplified and egocentric; it has much the same hypnotic appeal to listeners as yesterdays' party line".(Bookbinder, 1981:2) Yet anonymity is essential in call-in therapy. Lloyd Moglen, psychologist and former San Francisco radio call-in host, claims, "You can do alot in five minutes. Because the relationship with the caller is anonymous you don't have the usual game-playing between doctor and patient; so you can get to the real problem quickly"(Cohen, 1977:27). Toni Grant concurs, "There is still a stigma attached to saying, "Help me". But on my show, people can be anonymous, it's free, and they trust me"(Cohen,1977:27). However the American Jewish Committee is alarmed by the dangers of anonymity. AJC representative, Herman Bookbinder, (1981:3) stated before the NAB radio Code,

"Myths, mistakes and lies-- are spoken by anonymous callers with an air of authority that can easily mislead the listeners not tutored in the particular subject".

Caller Stereotypes

Dannefer and Kasen (1981) introduce the notion of sex-stereotyping and CB anonymous exchanges. They cite

Schutz (1962) who maintained that greater knowledge of others (i.e. face-to-face interaction as opposed to anonymous interaction) would reduce the need for typifying them as "flat characters". The researchers go further to state that Cbers take these stereotypes (of woman) beyond the bounds of everyday normative restraints (1981:285). Tables 8.1 include responses to the question. "What is your view of the person who calls in to the particular show?" It is interesting to note that the largest response for those who call the radio psychotherapists was "Lonely" (30% of total responses to Dr. Kuriansky's callers, 28% for total of Dr. Goldstein's) as compared to "Interested" as the largest response for the other hosts (32% of total for Bernard Meltzer and Carlton Fredericks, 30% for Barry Gray and 26% for John Scheur). Why are callers to the female radio personal counselors considered "Lonely" in comparison to the "Interested" callers to the other hosts? Most likely it is because the two radio psychotherapists deal with problems in interpersonal relationships and deal with those private, often embarrassing, situations. The caller's loneliness or inability to cope will be revealed more readily in this circumstance, than in calls to advisors on personal and business finance, health and politics. However the stereotype of the lonely shut-in who sits by the phone persists. Over 20% of respondents to all hosts identifies

Table 8.1

View of Call-In Show Callers Per Host (In Percent)

<u>Responses</u>	<u>Dr. Goldstein</u> <u>(N=47)</u>	<u>Dr. Kuriansky</u> <u>(N=61)</u>	<u>J. Scheur</u> <u>(N=39)</u>
1. Lonely	28%	30%	21%
2. Interested	21	30	26
3. Educated	13	12	23
4. Just Hear Themselves	13	10	13
5. Bored	11	10	3
6. Other	9	5	8
7. Just Like Me	6	8	8
	100%*	100%	100%

<u>Responses</u>	<u>B. Meltzer</u> <u>(N=170)</u>	<u>Dr. C. Fredericks</u> <u>(N=73)</u>	<u>B. Gray</u> <u>(N=89)</u>
1. Lonely	25%	22%	20%
2. Interested	32	32	30
3. Educated	11	14	11
4. Just Hear Themselves	14	11	14
5. Bored	7	7	10
6. Other	6	8	6
7. Just Like Me	6	7	9
	100%	100%	100%

*Sum of percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

the caller as lonely. In the same vein, but from a different measure, less than 10% of responses to each host state that the caller is "Just like me". This shows the inability for most in the audience to identify with the caller. Even WMCA Vice President, Jeanne Strauss, warned the researcher not to speculate on who comprises the audience based on observing who calls. She claims they are of two different groups of people.

One must ask, why do people call in to call-in radio programs? The overwhelming response in Table 8.2, "Percentage of Response to Why People Call by Host," to all programs was the desire for free advice. Forty percent of the responses to all advice-giving hosts (all in the study minus Barry Gray) stated they believed that the major motivation for callers was the pursuit of free advice. The second most frequent reason given was the posing of a legitimate question. This was offered by over 20% of respondents. The third most likely response was "Just to talk", which would naturally accompany the observation that callers were lonely or bored. In Dr. Kuriansky's case, a slightly larger percentage of the total respondents found her callers "just wanted to talk" over wanting to "ask a legitimate question". One explanation of this observation might be the subject matter discussed on Dr. Kuriansky's show. Another might be that her psycho-

Table 8.2

Proportion of Response to Why People Call by Host (in percent)

<u>Category</u>	<u>Dr. Goldstein</u> <u>(N=50)</u>	<u>Dr. Kuriansky</u> <u>(N=57)</u>	<u>J. Scheur</u> <u>(N=46)</u>
1. Free Advice	38%	40%	39%
2. Legitimate Questions	24	21	23
3. Just to Talk	14	23	14
4. Last Resort	10	7	5
5. Reaffirm Belief	8	5	9
6. To Be Funny	4	4	5
7. Other	2	--	7
	<u>100%*</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

<u>Category</u>	<u>B. Meltzer</u> <u>(N=159)</u>	<u>Dr. C. Fredericks</u> <u>(N=65)</u>	<u>B. Gray</u> <u>(N=100)</u>
1. Free Advice	40%	42%	27%
2. Legitimate Questions	30	29	25
3. Just to Talk	12	9	16
4. Last Resort	8	6	7
5. Reaffirm Belief	6	8	16
6. To Be Funny	3	2	5
7. Other	2	5	4
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

* Sum of percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

logical show is on from 9 p.m. to midnight, a time when we are not occupied with work or family duties and might be more apt to dwell on loneliness, or frustration.

Therein lies the major difference between the perceptions of callers to Dr. Goldstein over Dr. Kuriansky. Twenty-three percent of the respondents felt that callers to Dr. Kuriansky did so "just to talk" compared to only 14% for Dr. Goldstein. A third explanation might be revealed by the content analysis. By studying the calls she accepts and how they are treated, we might see how the audience came to its observation.

What must be noted is that although over 20% of respondents to each host find the caller might call out of loneliness, they identify the major motivations to be positive ones: Free advice and a legitimate question. Negative or suspicious responses such as "to be funny" or "as a last resort" fell below 10% of total responses for each host. That also demonstrates that even though few members of the audience admit to identifying with the caller, they trust the intentions of the caller and a mutual trust between caller and audience is not severed or under question.

Gender Difference In Callers

A number of different interactions occur within the context of call-in radio programs. The most obvious interaction is that between host and caller. In Chapter 5

"Impression Managers By Call-In Hosts," we studied the host's use of verbal cues in encouraging or discouraging discussion as well as asserting authority and social status. In Chapter 4, "Reflecting and Promoting Shared Social Reality", we examined the host's presentation of social reality by investigating which topics and values are endorsed. So far, the examination of call-in radio has centered upon the host and audience perceptions. What work does the caller do in the interaction? Walters and Stone (1971) studied the effect of mass-mediated conversation on married couples and found that many couples used the conversations they witnessed on television as a basis for their own everyday conversation.

Fishman (1978) studied the gender differences in everyday interaction. She found that woman did more conversational work than men; they asked more questions, used more "attention beginnings", tried more often and succeeded less often. She found men more active in making statements (twice as many as the women) and unsupportive of their wives by using "minimal responses".

What questions does this raise for host-caller interaction in call-in radio? Both female and male hosts entertain callers of both sexes. Certainly daypart will affect the composition of the audience. In the morning and early afternoon, when Dr. Goldstein and John Scheur air, the audiences are predominantly housewives, students, unemployed

and retired men. In the late evening, when Dr. Kuriansky and Bernard Meltzer broadcast, working men and women join the ranks. Are there gender differences in the questions advanced to hosts? And how do the hosts treat same-sex and opposite-sex callers? Table 8.3, "Percentage of Calls the Host Encourages and Discourages by Caller Gender" includes percentages of calls hosts encourage and discourage by gender. From this table we can see that John Scheur encourages 80% of calls made by females, Bernard Meltzer encourages 63%. The two female radio psychologists encourage just less than half of calls made by females. The conclusion that male hosts encourage female callers more readily than do female hosts must be weighed against the total number of calls, regardless of sex that are encouraged and discouraged. Both male hosts, John Scheur and Bernard Meltzer, encourage more calls than they discourage, regardless of the sex of the caller. John Scheur discourages the smallest number of callers (20% of all female calls and 25% of all male calls).

This contrasts quite markedly with Dr. Kuriansky, who discourages 54% of all female callers and 56% of all male calls. The only striking opposite-sex encouragement by a host was Dr. Goldstein and her encouragement of 86% of all male callers. Although demographically the audience is at its low in terms of men when Dr. Goldstein broadcasts,

Table 8.3

Degree of Host Encouragement and Discouragement
by Gender (in percent).

<u>Caller Gender</u>	<u>Dr. Goldstein</u>			<u>Dr. Kuriansky</u>		
	<u>Enc.</u>	<u>Disc.</u>		<u>Enc.</u>	<u>Disc.</u>	
Female	46%	54	100% (N=26)	46%	54	100% (N=26)
Male	86	14	100% (N=14)	44	56	100% (N=18)

<u>Caller Gender</u>	<u>J. Scheur</u>			<u>B. Meltzer</u>		
	<u>Enc.</u>	<u>Disc.</u>		<u>Enc.</u>	<u>Disc.</u>	
Female	80%	20	100% (N=15)	63%	37	100% (N=19)
Male	75	25	100% (N=20)	60	40	100% (N=10)

between 10 a.m. and 12 noon, this may be a planned effort to stimulate male calling and better integrate different topics of discussion.

It is interesting to note that despite Bernard Meltzer's courting of middle-aged female callers, complete with endearments and the offer of two T-shirts, he discourages more female callers than his financial counterpart, John Scheur (37% to 20%).

Questions were then rated by their rational or emotional appeal. Table 8.4, "Percentage of Rational and Emotional Questions by Caller Gender" includes the percentages by gender for each host. For each host, emotional calls from women exceed those made by men. What sets John Scheur apart from the others is that fewer of his calls from women were emotional (57% compared to 79% for the other hosts). Naturally calls to the radio personal counselors would tend to more emotionally based, such as marriage, romance, family, etc. Bernard Meltzer differs from John Scheur in that he also courts those types of calls; therefore more of his calls especially from women, tend to be emotional. In an interesting twist, John Scheur leads the other hosts in men with emotional questions (43% to 21% for the other hosts). This may be a result of the many retirees, on fixed incomes or without adequate financial expertise, who call him.

Table 8.4

Proportion of Rational and Emotional Questions
by Callers by Gender
(in percent).

<u>Call Type</u>	<u>Dr. Goldstein</u>			<u>Dr. Kuriansky</u>		
	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	
Rational	53%	47	100% (N=15)	50%	50	100% (N=10)
Emotional	79	21	100% (N=14)	79	21	100% (N=28)

<u>Call Type</u>	<u>J. Scheur</u>			<u>B. Meltzer</u>		
	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	
Rational	39%	61	100% (N=28)	53%	47	100% (N=15)
Emotional	57	43	100% (N=7)	79	21	100% (N=14)

All hosts were discovered to be impatient with certain callers, interrupting them or abruptly terminating a call. How does that vary per host by gender? Fishman's (1978) research found that women were more likely to be interrupted by men. From the findings on Table 8.5, "Percentage of Hosts Abrupt Ends or Interruptions by Caller's Gender", the opposite occurs on call-in radio. Male hosts, John Scheur and Bernard Meltzer, are less likely to interrupt female callers than their two female counterparts (11% and 14% for Scheur and Meltzer, respectively, to 28% and 26% for Goldstein and Kuriansky, respectively). A closer look at the percentage per gender further underscores this point. The two female hosts interrupt or abruptly end more calls than do their male counterparts. But what is startling is that Dr. Kuriansky interrupts or abruptly ends close to 40% of all calls made by women. In contrast, Bernard Meltzer interrupts or abruptly ends female calls by only one-half of that percentage.

What can be concluded from this survey? That male hosts both encourage female callers and are less likely to interrupt or abruptly terminate calls made by women. Meanwhile, female hosts are more apt to discourage calls of both sexes and interrupt or terminate calls made by women. But there is a major problem with this conclusion. The expertise of the hosts and the subject matter to which the

Table 8.5

Degree of Host Abrupt Ends and Interrupts by Caller Gender

Total Number of Calls by Gender

(in percent)

	<u>Dr. Goldstein</u>	<u>Dr. Kuriansky</u>	<u>J. Scheur</u>	<u>B. Meltzer</u>
<u>Gender</u>				
Male	36% (N=14)	33% (N=18)	20% (N=20)	30% (N=10)
Female	31 (N=26)	39 (N=26)	27 (N=17)	21 (N=19)

Percentage of Host Abrupt Ends and Interruptions

by Caller Gender of Total Number of Calls

(in percent)

	<u>Dr. Goldstein</u> <u>(N=29)</u>	<u>Dr. Kuriansky</u> <u>(N=38)</u>	<u>J. Scheur</u> <u>(N=35)</u>	<u>B. Meltzer</u> <u>(N=29)</u>
<u>Gender</u>				
Male	17%	16%	11%	10%
Female	28	26	11	14
	45%	42%	22%	24%

calls they entertain lie, to a great extent, determine the levels of topic encouragement and the amount of interruptions and abrupt endings. Radio psychologists, be they male or female, are more likely to get emotion-laden calls dealing with such things as a widower's fear of independence, birthday depression and a man whose wife leaves him for a younger man. Personal and business finance counselors are more apt to get rational calls such as remortgaging a house, loan rates and real estate investments. However, there are greater percentages of callers with emotional calls to the financial advisors than there are rational calls to the personal counselors, made by either sex.

The staff was able to offer little in the way of exploring gender differences in the callers. WOR's Executive Producer, Jeff Byers, would agree with Fishman's conclusion that women work harder than men at initiating and maintaining conversations. He states, "The men who tend to call, tend to make statements more often than women. They tend to ask more questions. Otherwise there's not much difference". Robert Alden, Director of Special Projects for WOR reasoned that women call more often than men because "They are more concerned about wanting to keep their husbands alive (when calling Dr. Fredericks) and being well taken care of (when calling Bernard Meltzer)".

Summary and Theory

In summation, Singer's study found that the average caller is female, middle-educated, middle-incomed and about one-third are repeat callers. The two main stimuli to call were: Seeking personal advice and being able to address the audience with new information or ventillating frustrations. It was concluded that these are two positive, resourceful ways to use the medium.

Caller anonymity was found necessary to maintain a private, frank and hassle-free discussion as well as confidential and individualized therapy. Other social research has shown that anonymity has a positive correlation with socioeconomic status, intimacy, altruism, anti-normative behavior and sex-stereotyping. Anonymity served to privatize the dialog.

The notion of sex-stereotyping of callers is introduced by work on CB callers by Dennefer and Kasen (1981). Respondents felt that the major motivation for callers to a psychotherapy show was "loneliness" and stereotyped callers to personal finance shows as "interested". When asked why they felt people called, the two most frequent responses were "for free advice" and a "legitimate questions". This also supports the hypothesis that resourceful people turn to call-in radio for advice.

Fishman's (1978) work on conversation analysis between the sexes was the basis for a study of gender differences

among callers to these four shows. From content analysis of rational/emotional calls and calls interrupted or abruptly terminated, it was found that male hosts, John Scheur and Bernard Meltzer, were less likely to interrupt their female callers than their two female counterparts. However, regardless of host, women made more emotional calls than did men. Jeff Byers of WOR agrees with Fishman's early findings that men make more statements and women ask more questions of hosts.

The perceptions of members of the radio call-in staff have been included throughout this study. But what is their role in this process and product known as "the radio call-in show"? The "Production of Culture" theories of Gramsci, Williams, Gitlin and Sallach will be applied to study how they control the subject matter and host-caller interaction on call-in radio. Also, what ideology of values is created on these programs?

CHAPTER 9

PRODUCTION OF CULTURE

Many of the chapters in this study focused on effects: The broadcast marketplace and its effect on the development of call-in radio, the effects of social learning and parasocial interaction on audience members and the effects of anonymity, gender differences and audience perceptions on the caller. In Chapters 4, "Reflecting and Promoting Shared Social Reality", 5, "Impression Management by Call-In Hosts", and 6, "Host Appeal and the Assertion of Authority", host control was discussed using Goffman's dramaturgical, interactionist approach. In Goffman's Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (1959) he mentions some from discrepant roles: The service specialist, the training specialist, colleagues and confidantes. These different behind-the-scenes performers exert various controls on the subject matter and quality of host-caller interaction.

In this chapter we will use the theories of Gramsci, Williams, Gitlin and Sallach to examine whether those behind-the-microphone are "Producers of Culture". Each staff member perceives their role in a way that reflects power, decisions and action. Foremost in the discussion is the each staff member's criteria for "screening out calls". Self-defined social values and abuses of host-caller interaction will be examined. A second focus in this chapter

will be on the ideology of values that each host creates.

Producers of Culture: Theory

The Marxist view of social order assumes that the existence of a ruling class permeates and dominates the cultural and ideational institutions of the society.

In German Ideology, Marx writes,

"The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships, the dominant material relationships grasped as ideas". (1977:39)

The mass media is considered to be a tool of the upper class.

Domhoff (1967) suggests that the upper classes exert a predominant influence on the mass media, directly through ownership and indirectly through corporate advertising. Janowitz (1960) found that the mass media sets limits on public discussion. He states,

"The influence of the mass media, supported by networks of interpersonal contacts among opinion leaders, is not a dramatic conversion of public opinion, but rather in setting the limits within which public debate on controversial issues takes place". (1960:402)

Gramsci called this concept "Hegemony". He offers the following definition (Cammett, 1967:204).

"A certain way of life and thought is dominant, in which one concept of reality is diffused throughout society in all its institutional and private manifestations... The dominant class uses its privileged access to ideological institutions to propagate values which reinforce its structural position. Such propagation involves not only the inculcation of its values and

the censorship of heterodox views, but also and especially the ability to define the parameters of legitimate discussion and debate over alternative beliefs, values and world views".

Producers of culture create a social reality for subordinates to accept. Williams states,

"Hegemony is...a lived system of meanings and values -- which as they are experienced as practices, appear as reciprocally confirming. It thus constitutes a sense of reality for most people in the society, a sense of absolute because experienced reality beyond which it is very difficult for most members of the society to move, in most areas of their lives. It is, that is to say, in the strongest sense, a 'culture', but a culture which has also to be seen as the lived dominance and subordination of particular classes." (1977:110)

What social values constitute mass media hegemony?

Gitlin offers the following explanation for class interests and value dissemination:

"By direct corporate and class interest -- the owners and managers of the major media are committed to the maintenance of the going system in its main outlines: Committed, that is to say, to private property relations which honor the prerogatives of capital; committed to national security State; committed to reform of selected violations of the moral code through selective action by State agencies; and committed to approving individual success within corporate and bureaucratic structure". (1980:258)

Gitlin draws from Marx's concepts of ruling class ideas, Gramsci's "Hegemony" as defining the parameters of discussion and debate and Williams' "culture" that subordinates particular classes with a system of meanings and values.

He states that it is in the interest of the mass media to protect and preserve the status quo because it serves the interests of the ruling class. Some of those values include: Property relations, nationalism and defense, State agencies and corporate and bureaucratic organization.

How do people in the media learn this role? Johnstone et. al. (1976), in their portrait of the American journalist, reveal the irony that media professionals consider themselves autonomous yet accept, reproduce and defend the dominant frames that they deny are hegemonic. Is there ever an opportunity for beliefs or opinions that go counter to the "hegemonic" set of cultural values? Sallach offers this hope,

"When a sugar coated world-view conflicts with the subsequent experience and insight, the power of that original world-view may be reduced accordingly". (1973:172)

What questions do the theories of Marx, Domhoff, Janowitz, Gramsci, Williams, Gitlin and Sallach raise for those in call-in radio? Firstly, in response to Johnstone's portrait of the journalist, does the staff member consider himself or herself autonomous. How does the media professional justify his or her role? What frames do they accept, defend and reproduce? How are those subjects determined?

Secondly, what social values are disseminated on call-in radio? Do they represent the interests of the dominant

ruling class or is there opportunity for the discussion of alternate views and beliefs.

Self-Defined Roles

Each radio call-in show staff member was asked to describe what he or she does. Naturally there is hesitation when anyone is asked to describe their work. However in their descriptions they state both task-oriented and goal-oriented activity as well as autonomous and institutional controls.

Note the comparison of the three Program Directors.

WMCA's Jeanne Strauss:

"I am responsible for the programming on the radio, decisions about air hosts, air sound and how to improve sound, to get the station 'community involved' primarily by having the programs talk to and address the issues on people's minds".

WOR's Bob Bruno:

"As Director of Programming, I am responsible for everything. Hiring and firing, the objective is to maintain and improve the ratings of the radio station. Program Directors are charged with the responsibility to make sure that station attracts an audience that attracts advertisers".

And WABC's Mark Mason:

"Overall, I am responsible for the sound of the station, the talent, guests, presentation, format, flavor and texture of the station".

Each respondent begins his or her role definition with "I am responsible for" which denotes supervision and power. Program Directors Strauss and Mason speak of their respon-

sibility as emanating from within as opposed to Bob Bruno who speaks of external organization pressure when he states, "Program Directors are charged with the responsibility of...". All three claim responsibility for the talent, in this case, the hosts of the call-in shows. Program Directors Strauss and Mason state that they concern themselves with the station "image"; Strauss calls it "air sound" and Mason labels it "flavor and texture". Station image depends on credibility and appeal. In contrast, Bruno concerns himself with only one appeal, that of ratings that will generate greater advertising sales for the station. His is a purely business stance, which contrasts sharply with Strauss' appeal to be "community involved".

Who does each Program Director claim responsibility or deference to? Jeanne Strauss says she keeps an ear on community issues and people's needs. Hers is an audience-or public-centered responsibility. Bob Bruno keeps an eye on the ratings and sales activity for WOR. His is an advertiser-centered responsibility. Mark Mason keeps both eye and ear out for the perception of the station. His is an image-centered responsibility. This is not to say that all three Program Directors do not do all of these things, however, what someone states as his or her job instructs us as to how a media professional sees his or her role in the larger scheme of radio call-in programming.

Who assists the Program Directors in making decisions?

WOR's Executive Producer, Jeff Byers, describes his job:

"As Executive Producer I supervise the producers of daily talk shows and assist the program director. By supervising the producing I get guests and work on special broadcasts, read, talk to people".

This is another supervisory role where the Executive Producer also supplements the work of producers by securing additional talent, doing research and basically communicating (read and talk to people). The role as described here is a supplemental one, without much direct decision-making power. It is the opinion of the researcher, who has a thorough knowledge of broadcast practices, that the job of the Executive Producer carries much more weight in decision-making and responsibility than is revealed by Mr. Byers.

Another member of the support staff is the Director of Research for WABC, Walter Mysolowski. He states,

"I do sales research. I rip apart the Arbitron book (of ratings) and put together sales presentations that salesmen can carry around. It's also used for Programming. They can use what shows the negative, it gives them (the programmers) the right direction on what to keep and what they don't want to keep. I do a lot more programming research for WABC than for WPLJ (rock music station). On WABC each show can be eliminated and others retained."

What the Research Director does is search through quantitative audience measures for his station, excerpting the positive and highlighting them in sales presentations. The

negative findings are instructive to the Programming Department, who can then examine station or programming weakness. He claims that a lot more programming research is conducted for talk radio than music radio, because each host and subject matter appeals to a different audience. With rock music, the "playlist" or selection of songs doesn't vary greatly throughout the day and the disc jockeys, that do vary, are not responsible, to a great extent, for the station's appeal. Neither support area admits to the responsibility and consequences for programming that exist. Theirs are task-oriented activities generated from external sources, usually, from the Program Director or Sales Manager.

Self-Defined Social Values

How do the Program Directors account for the subjects tackled on their call-in radio stations? And, what are those subjects? When asked what topics are encouraged on WMCA, Jeanne Strauss replied,

"Crime is Number One. We were the first and only station to have a 'Crime Stoppers' program last year. Where the Police Department for one month answered questions off the air. It was the first time ever. Second, is how to get through life in this complex community. 'News they can use'. Also interpersonal relationships and the polarization of different groups, ethnic, religious, aged, in the city. How do I learn what concerns the community? From studies, different conferences, Community Board meetings. We cover events like fairs and festivals. We listen to callers".

Ms. Strauss identifies the following "hot" topics for WMCA and the New York Community: Crime, Getting through the complexities of life, Interpersonal Relationships, and the Polarization of Special Interest Groups. She does not assume responsibility for gathering up this information alone, but says, "We cover events... we listen to callers". And how is information garnered about what concerns New Yorkers? Ms. Strauss says that the station attends public, organized functions that feature the community as well as noting feedback and questions to the station. It is possible, however, that by only attending organized and select functions and by screening out particular calls that the parameters of community concern become short-sighted and limited?

When asked what topics are encouraged on WOR, Program Director Bob Bruno responded,

"We don't do 'hot' topics, akin to music's 'hot hits'. Older demographics are concerned with everyday issues -- Crime, transportation, jobs. How do we learn this? We learn this through our Ascertainment process. We've developed a balance of subject matter, a mix of social concern with celebrity-type stuff. We also do Perceptual research, through research tracking studies. We see what the community sees is our image".

Executive Producer, Jeff Byers, continues the discussion on Perceptual Testing:

"We call back callers, do focus groups, look at the mail, the response to par-

ticular shows, offers for transcripts, listener service answer questions of callers who didn't get all the information. They serve as a barometer for the station. Meltzer's barometer is high, you hear a broad spectrum of topics".

An explanation of the Ascertainment process is in order. All broadcast outlets are regulated and licensed by the Federal Communications Commission. Each station must satisfy certain requirements in order to apply for periodic reissuance of their broadcast license. The F.C.C. implements the phrase, "broadcast in the public interest, convenience and necessity" by applying the following check: The station is asked to periodically have various members of its station management go out to both community, civic and religious leaders as well as the general public it is licensed to serve, and ask the following question: What are the ten most pressing problems in this community? A tally of these problems is kept. Then the station must demonstrate to the Federal Communications Commission that in its programming of news, public affairs, instructional, religious and entertainment programming, as well as public service announcements, it had adequately addressed the "Community's Ten Most Pressing Needs". This report is just one of many that each broadcast station must submit for approval of the F.C.C. Currently it forces the station to approach members of its viewing and listening publics and met their concerns via programming. For the past few

years there has been considerable talk of "deregulating" broadcasting, with the eventual dissolution of F.C.C. requirements such as the Ascertainment Study. But even as Ascertainment Studies are conducted by radio stations across the country, a problem regarding hegemony exists. Who is being addressed for the ten most pressing problems?

Usually it is the leader of an established civic, community or religious group. It is not very likely that alternative beliefs or opinions will be expressed. Another problem with the Ascertainment process is the interviewer. That person represents station management and per the previously discussed theories, also represents a conservative and status quo vision. The values and perspective of the interviewer can not help but potentially sway or limit the interchange of alternative ideas and opinions. So while the Ascertainment Study is commissioned by the F.C.C., it is handicapped in its ability to survey diverse and alternative sentiment in the community.

Returning to WOR and its determination of subject material, Bob Bruno identified his audience as being older and claimed that their concerns are: Crime, transportation and jobs. Perceptual research, complete with focus groups, callbacks and mail tracking, trace and monitor the image of the station. The Audience Listener Service exists to both answer audience questions and measure subject and host popularity.

When WABC's Mark Mason was asked what topics were encouraged and how they were determined, his answer was "No particular topics are encouraged". Alone, this answer would appear to state that controls were lifted or that the media professionals had rejected media "hegemony". But this is not so. Mr. Mason animatedly described WABC's new campaign for the Fall. The station will appeal to suburban families at the expense of the inner city. His rationale,

"The inner city is 60-70% minorities. The suburban family is desirable to advertisers, 'winable', other stations have established loyal audiences, a lot of people listen on a program-by-program basis and there are people out there who are 'information freaks'".

WABC is the newest talk radio station in the New York market. It is also the most lucrative radio station owned and operated by the ABC network. Mr. Mason feels that it is still getting it's feet wet in the AM talk arena, which may account for the current absence of established topic guidelines. However the plans for the Fall of 1983 set very strong and limited guidelines. Appeals to suburbanites will include call-in shows on automobile repair, house repair and gardening, as well as expanded advice on suburban leisure activity. As the station's desire to attract inner city listeners continues to decline, so will their appeal to New York's inner city concerns. In general, as the competition in talk radio grows fiercer, the attraction to lure "desirable", meaning monied, listeners will

greatly alter programming and potentially push urban dwellers out of call-in radio. Another method, in operation, of controlling and deterring callers is the screening process.

Screening

The host gains his or her reputation by the calls that go on the air and how they are answered. The host and producer control the contents of the talk by screening out undesirables or reaching for the "panic button", the off-switch. The local New York stations have toll-free numbers from New Jersey, Long Island, Westchester and Connecticut. This serves to encourage a balance of callers from the Tri-State area, not simply from New York City. However, Larry King's national show on Mutual Radio does not offer toll-free numbers. It is his belief that the high cost of phoning will deter the "wackos" from calling (Daily News, 1983).

How are calls screened by producers? Wally Sherwin, producer for the "Toni Grant Show" on KABC, now a national, network program, describes the process, "We try to get the most entertaining -- Wait, I don't really mean that. I mean the most unusual calls" (Rice, 1981:87). After all, radio is in the business of attracting desirable audience demographics and lucrative advertisers. Sherwin adds that psychotics and suicidals are screened out. Richard Parker, Program Director for WXYZ, Detroit, adds, "We try to get

as many 25-54 year-olds as we can because that's what most advertisers want" (1981:88). Toni Grant concurs, "We really do keep the elderly off the air. They're very hard to listen to. It's sad but it's a reality on radio programming". There is no question that the screening process that eliminates calls that are usual, from undesirable demographics or the elderly, constitutes a limit to the parameters of discussion. This inhibits a true forum for ideas.

Host interaction with the caller is crucial. Larry King states,

"It's as you hear it -- it's happening right off the top. If the caller is off the subject I'm going to say goodnight quickly...you train your audience. They know they better be on the mark" (Tudryn, 1982).

Newsweek noted that Bob Grant on WMCA, a political conservative, "Likes to shout at callers who ramble, 'Get to the point or get off the phone!'" (1972). Toni Grant retorts, "I think to myself, this rabble -- they don't deserve me".

What are the criteria the three New York talk radio stations use in screening callers? Jeanne Strauss at WMCA offers the following:

1. Line quality, that the phone connection be good.
2. If we have already taken a question, we do not want that same question repeated. A lot of people don't understand this.
3. We try to vary the sex order of callers."

Jeff Byers of WOR states the following criteria for call screening:

- "1. The caller must speak audibly and clearly.
2. He or she must ask the question fairly succinctly.
3. The question must have some grain of social interest.
4. It must not violate any rules, like asking for a prescription (in the case of Dr. Fredericks). There is no substitute for personal consultation with a professional consultant. They (the hosts) don't pretend to be those things".

Mark Mason of WABC contributes his station's screening criteria:

- "1. Not old sounding voices. Our largest demos (demographics) are 25-54, with a core of 35-44. Our format does best at 35+. Advertisers don't want 65+. They have a fixed income with little discretionary income.
2. The person has to be articulate, focus in on what the problem is and express it.
3. They have to be on our target demographics. Not younger than 15.
4. We want a balance of calls.
5. There are no taboos on the program. It ranges a broad spectrum.
6. We don't want callers with heavy accents.
7. Also voice quality is important.
8. We also want to vary male and female for an interesting blend."

As we progress from WMCA to WOR to WABC, the criteria for screening out calls become more elaborate, decided and complex. As has been previously stated the host and station are judged by the calls accepted and how they are handled. So naturally, only calls with good sound quality, general appeal and a balance of age, gender and subject

matter is desired. But this does obviously obstruct true two-way participation via telephone talk as many callers compete for limited time and phone lines to get through to the call-in host and his or her audience. This further narrows the parameters of discussion and impairs the opportunity for debate of alternative views. Both the self-defined roles of the media professionals in call-in radio and the screening process that filters out calls are tools that promote the concept of hegemony. Talk show hosts, but not the ones included in this survey, have been found to abuse their power and manipulate interaction.

Abuse of Host-Caller Interaction

An abuse of host/caller interaction is the desire to lure controversy, called "baiting". It has been criticized by Lowry of Temple University in a report to the American Jewish Committee. He defines baiting as "Intentionally trying to pull hateful statements out of some callers who do indeed have hateful tendencies" (Lowry, 1981:40). In his study of Philadelphia call-in radio, talk jockeys were found guilty of inviting negative, often bigoted, remarks. The American Jewish Committee felt that call-in radio serves as a safety-valve for those unhappy with society (1981:ii). However these cathartic sessions sometimes manifest themselves into bigoted tirades. Lowry found that the ratio of negative (often bigoted) statements to positive ones were the following:

WDAS	4.9 to 1	
WHAT	2.2 to 1	
WWDB-FM	34.0 to 1	(1981:8).

He noted the concentration of negative assertions, per hour, for these stations,

WDAS	10.3 per hour	
WHAT	0.7 per hour	
WWDB-FM	5.2 per hour	(1981:9).

Out of the twelve target groups under study, the two receiving the most negative attacks were Fundamentalist Protestants and Blacks (1981:10). Lowry analyzed the source of negative statements on WWDB-FM. He found the 69% of the negative assertions aimed at Protestants were made by the hosts, the remaining 31% made by callers. In contrast, 11 of the 14 negative assertions directed at Christians were made by callers, six of the seven negative assertions pertaining to Catholics were made by callers and 68% of negative assertions pertaining to Jews were made by callers (1981:19). Lowry concludes his report,

"Criticism is sometimes socially constructive, one can nevertheless question whether the airing of eight times (the overall average for the three Philadelphia radio stations) more negative assertions than positive assertions is socially constructive and in the public interest (1981:20).

Radio Call-In Values as Ideology

Gitlin remarked that the mass media protects and preserves the status quo because they serve the interests of the ruling class. Some of those interests he identified

are property relations, nationalism and defense, State agencies and corporate and bureaucratic organization. In the next pages we will examine the values espoused by each host as revealed by the content analysis discussed in Chapters 4, "Reflecting and Promoting Shared Social Reality", and 5, "Impression Management By Call-In Hosts". The aspect of protecting the status quo or the possibility of liberal, alternative views being featured, will be examined.

What social values does Bernard Meltzer espouse in the course of these programs?

He is an older voice, a protector of the status quo. He defends the institutional order of the United States and believes that it justly serves the public. He is patriotic and spiritual, often evoking gratitude for wars fought to preserve American democracy. He opens one show with the following prayer of gratitude:

"It's grand to live and work and wake in a land so wonderful. In a land where we have freedom, freedom of choice, freedom of worship of God, freedom to pick your job, freedom to choose where you want to live, want to work, and who to govern. A land so bountiful and a land so beautiful, with its rolling forrested hills and its mountains, and its skies so blue and this evening we reflect that we are indeed fortunate to live in this wonderful land, the best land of all."

He appeals to all as friends and relishes a return of friendship. He states,

"I call this a greeting. Some day I'm going to put this sign over my studio door here at WOR and it will read, 'Hail friend, enter,

you are welcome. If you come as friend I greet you with open heart and with open hand. If you'd be a stranger when you enter, you will not be one for long, but warmth of our welcome will melt thee. But if you should come as foe, you will go forth as friend, for our welcome will be doubly enthusiastic and it will overcome thee with love and with affection'. Beautiful thought, isn't it?"

Shortly thereafter, a caller reciprocates with a poem:

"I have a little poem. Friendship is a charm of gold, shaped in God's own perfect mold. Each link a smile, a word, a tear, a hand, a word of cheer. As steadfast as the ages roll, binding closer soul to soul. No matter how far our head is a load, but oh how sweet is that journey of friendship's road".

But not all is harmonious. Questions regarding investments are controversial. Meltzer endorses bank investments, is wary of real estate investments and discourages brokerage house securities and alternative methods of financing mortgages.

He encourages his audience to believe that, despite his suspicion that "the wheels of justice turn slowly", the police, courts, social security, banks, the military and employment commissions work on behalf of the people.

He also inspires confidence in the caller who feels spurned by a landlord, a boss, a contractor, and insurance companies. He offers positive, no-nonsense, direct action remedies to their situations. He assures them with his wisdom from experience, his sense of duty, spirituality and brotherhood. He offers the listener a loving father, uncle

or grandfather's picture of the world.

Along with topics encouraged and discouraged, what social values does John Scheur espouse?

He encourages callers and listeners to be flexible, to be patient when making an investment or starting a new business and to diversify investments and holdings. He suggests diversification and flexibility to a retiree:

"Depending on how much money one has, one should have some experience in every legitimate field of investment; stocks, bonds, real estate, etc. But in order to do that one needs to have a continuous management procedure, which changes with each major change in market conditions".

He advises patience to someone embarking on a new business,

"They say that every 'no' brings you closer to a 'yes'...You might be interested to know that the period of growth of the average small business until it really gets off its feet is a little over three years."

He encourages callers to assert their individual authority, seek out business contacts and contact government representatives. To the caller who gripes about the "underground money" had by government officials, he states,

"...the sample of the nation shows that people are very confused and concerned and frightened now about the course of the federal government's directions. But in the system that we live under, the system has a way of correcting this if the people have a will to do so. The people have to take the action. The people have to let their representatives know that they want changes for the better. They're not letting

them know. There's where I think the biggest problem is."

Regarding a mortgage payment, Scheur advises a caller to speak directly to a bank officer. He suggests,

"You very often wind up having to fight this all the way to the top of the executive group. Many people, if they don't have the experience, don't have the authority, even if they understand it. If it needs to go all the way to the President, I don't know anyone, any president, who once confronted eyeball to eyeball, who has not quickly seen..."

He tells another caller, seeking a mortgage,

"You have to sell yourself. You should not deal at the lower level of a bank's bureaucracy. You should try to see the head of the department. Go at it in a positive way."

He is pessimistic about the current and future state of our economy. He believes that inflation and interest rates will rise and that people will continue not to invest out of fear. In answer to questions about the metals market, he admits the inability to project political futures internationally, thereby inhibiting economic speculation.

In answer to a question about fixed-rate mortgages, Scheur insists,

"We're going to have over the next foreseeable ten years or more on balance, inflation, inflation, inflation. The United States every day is taking on additional financial responsibilities, underwriting the financial stability of more and more things and countries around the world and it is a very frightening prospect...you don't want to be around with a variable (rate) when the prime (rate) goes flirting with 20% again".

He stresses the proposed change in the labor force and fear of spending, in answer to a question about economic theory.

He states,

"We have increasingly developed technologies which, when carried to the ultimate, will remove the need for 99% of human labor to produce goods and services...We've had interest rates come down some 60% over the last handful of months and people are not confident. They're not buying, the way they always have before, because they're scared. And there are too many people walking around with too little money to feel like buying".

He encourages his audience to be creative and enjoy financial investments. He informs one man, who calls about IRA interest, "Human beings aren't machines. We cannot live our lives by a formula". He tells a retiree,

"A person in your position is in an ideal position to pick up a little additional income and have some fun at the same time. Nobody could have gotten to a position of early retirement with these resources and not have the ability by doing one of the things that you enjoy most to do. That has nothing to do with producing income. What do you enjoy most? (Answer: Travel) Then you could be the travelling companion for someone who needs to go with someone, and you could get paid and travel at the same time. How does that grab you?

What social values does Dr. Goldstein advocate on her program? Often a response to a call will continue after the caller is off the air. It is those times when Dr. Goldstein strongly endorses values of self-esteem, independence and fighting the fear of rejection.

Dr. Goldstein offers various explanations for slobbery. They are all manifestations of the lack of self-esteem:

"Sometimes people have a very low self-image of themselves so they don't keep their possessions, their body, room, clothes, neat. It's often a sign of depression as well. It might be that the person doesn't feel any pride or might feel quite helpless. The person might feel that he/she is being treated like they are helpless, so they'll show you just how helpless they are. Sometimes it has to do with rebellion. Sometimes it's a message to other people saying that you cannot control me, that he/she won't let you control me."

She emphasizes self-love and confidence with the majority of callers. For those feeling vulnerable about love, for those with unsupportive families, for parents who are overprotective and undermine their children's self-confidence, for those who remain in destructive or unhappy relationships.

To the man who wants his girlfriend to say "I love you" she advises, "So in a sense you're asking her to say it solely to make you feel good. What's unfortunate is if you can't feel loved unless she says 'I love you'". To the woman who feels she rushes men into a commitment she retorts,

"The goal I think is to make oneself feel better by knowing that someone will love them. There is someone who has the possibility of always loving you. Do you know who that person is? That person is you."

Dr. Goldstein also focuses on the fear of rejection

and inability to say "No" that inhibits full independence.

In another seque, between calls, she states,

"What makes people not speak their mind? Sometimes they are afraid of the repercussions when they do speak out. Often people are afraid of rejection or punishment for what they say. Sometimes they are afraid of hurting the other person. Sometimes they are selfish for just coming out and saying what's on their mind. Often people are afraid that if they say just one thing that is on their mind, often forgetting that they have a license to pick out and edit what they can say".

Statements of control, power and independence are quite prevalent throughout the calls. She tells a caller, fearful of being too aggressive, to be direct in a relationship without clobbering the other person. She tells a recently divorcee that she is in control of her body with regards to having another child. She tells a woman that the daughter of her boyfriend cannot lay a "guilt trip" on her. A martial artists' fears are assuaged that he should control his fears of striking out. She tells a recently handicapped woman to take control of her life and not set up barriers to developing relationships.

However, while Dr. Goldstein emphasizes independence, self-confidence and control in our interpersonal relationships, she frowns against those who choose to refrain from intimate relationships. She tells one caller,

"It's a tremendous amount of fear and desperateness, to prove to yourself that you are acceptable as a woman. I must prove that this man will stay with me and love me, I'm not going to put myself

on the line and make myself vulnerable to a man. I'm not saying this to ridicule you. I'm saying that this is the chance that you're taking".

However it is this same vulnerability which she claims keeps a man in an unhappy marriage with an alcoholic wife. She advises,

"What you're doing is hanging onto this woman. She's not giving you very much. Sometimes when people hang on to one person it is because they're afraid they won't find anybody else or they are afraid that all other woman will reject them".

Dr. Goldstein often explains that people attempt to exert power over us because they are frightened, anxious, threatened and insecure. She tells a caller that both the bully and the victim in sibling rivalry have unresolved problems. She tells a mother who gossips that being over-protective makes the mother feel important yet destroys her children's self-esteem and confidence. She tells a victim of a scolding mother that the criticisms were due to the mother's fears, anxieties and insecurities. She informs a young man that those who test our love are frightened, insecure and possessive.

A number of callers are very concerned with whether their problem or situation is "abnormal". Dr. Goldstein refuses to label, stating "I don't know how useful it is labeling things normal is, or not, it's part of your unique makeup. We all have something like this". Instead, Dr. Goldstein delves into the caller's stated feelings and in-

tentions, often searching for a clue in the caller's childhood.

She is a strong supporter of women's liberation issues, such as equality of the sexes and a woman's control of her body. Yet she admits that both sexes fear rejection, fear both independence and dependence on others, exert control over others out of fear, anxiety and insecurity. With her emphasis on self-esteem, identity control conquering the fear of rejection, Dr. Goldstein is very much in vogue with the recent glut of psychological self-help books, such as I'm OK, You're OK, The Errogenous Zones, Looking Out for Number One, etc. She incorporates many book referrals into the program. The picture of reality she shares with her audience is similar to one by a no-nonsense "get tough" independent and very in-control older sister.

What values does Dr. Kuriansky espouse? Her selection of guests, that control the topic of discussion for much of the program, is telling. All three topics: Unleashing creativity, overcoming discrimination and the values of therapy, deal with the individual's attempt to reach closer to their potential and a struggle against all that inhibits or blocks this goal.

In response to a guest's experiment testing discrimination on children, she states:

"That's a double-edged sword. One is that the children, believing they were special, behaved more special and therefore lived up

to their potential. On the other hand, to be special required a group that was not special, and it was only in comparison to a non-special group that they were able to live up to their potential. My conclusion is that wouldn't it be wonderful if we could find a way to make everyone feel special so they could live up to their potential without putting any other groups down".

In terms of prejudice, Dr. Kuriansky admits that affirmative action is a complex problem and that minorities have had to work harder to get ahead. She agrees with a caller who states,

"If you were a minority you would push yourself just to show that you could keep up. Through my father, we just pushed ourselves because we viewed ourselves as equal to anybody".

She discourages against members of a minority group banding together in the "allusion of power" and the clash of various minority groups. Rather, she encourages the exploration of roots and a call for greater communication through shared job and life experience.

In discussing the value and limitations of psychotherapy she offers practical, common sense advice to the caller. She emphasizes setting goals and expectations by which to measure results. Whether the goal is to improve relationships with women, to explore feelings about nudity, to reconcile femininity in the male personality or how to control bulimia/anorexia. When she detects that the caller has not set goals she asks them to write a list or verbally

set goals. However, she is impatient with callers who express hesitation.

Often, callers consider controversial her theory that the early mother-child bonding is basic and intrinsic to interrelationships. To the man who feels his feminine side is dominant, she suggests that gender issues are established at an early age. In response to the husband who feels confrontational therapy drove his wife away, Dr. Kuriansky emphasizes that people pattern interrelationships after their early relationships. A number of the callers are unwilling to accept this.

She allies herself with callers who feel external pressure. She tells a young female poet not to succumb to the pressure of peer group criticisms. She tells a man to separate from his imagined guilt complex over a dying wife. She tells a few callers to separate from their children and not feel guilty about angry feelings toward their children. She's a bit tougher on callers who are victims of internal pressures. She tells an elderly caller he can transcend prejudice against seniors, she tells a man with strong feminine traits to integrate both selves instead of creating two harmful extremes. She pressures a woman to overcome her fear and confront her husband about his affair.

To sum up, Dr. Kuriansky advocates attempts to achieve potential and feeds the struggle to fight internal and ex-

ternal barriers. One important suggestion is the identification of tangible goals and expectations. She encourages all to explore feelings and motivations in pursuit of self-improvement. The social reality she shares with caller and listener is that of an informed, probing, but firm, teacher.

Does the radio call-in show preserve the status quo or does it invite public debate on alternative beliefs and attitudes? Gramsci, Williams, Gitlin and Sallach charge the mass media with "ideological hegemony" as it subordinates other classes to the ideas of the dominant ruling class and limits the spectrum of viewpoints and perspectives.

The four call-in advice shows under examination, are representative of call-in shows on commercial radio in the United States. The two personal finance counselors are older men and would be more prone toward conservatism. This is particularly the case with Dr. Bernard Meltzer. He makes strong patriotic and spiritual appeals. He shields social institutions from criticism. His "persona" is that of a loving father or uncle who's wisened from years of life experience. His "cult" following is that of older women. Even WABC's Mark Mason concedes this. He states, "His (Meltzer's) 'schtick' is important. We'll never get the old ladies away from Meltzer and we'll never attempt to".

On the other hand the observer found John Scheur

seems to be more flexible and liberal in his views on finance and the economy. He stressed a "revolutionary" way of thinking about money and investments and was openly and repeatedly critical of our national economy and foreign spending. WMCA's Jeanne Strauss agrees with this finding,

"John does not promote the status quo. Critics say he's too conservative, but he's concerned about the amount of energy lost in the marketplace due to ignorance and naivete. He educates people on how to educate themselves".

Certainly the discussion on Scheur's show would not allow for beliefs that endorse an alternative to the capitalist system. Callers are permitted to question and gripe about the present system and suggest and discuss remedies but not call for a complete transformation of the economic system. At least not on commercial radio in New York. However members of the New York community are invited, even encouraged by the radio hosts to take alternative stands on noncommercial, public supported WBAI, a Pacifica radio station. Call-in hosts and guests are selected for their oppositional views and calls are broadcast "sans" a screener. The absence of a screener enables all who get access to the limited number of phone lines to get on the air. However, repeat callers, who are sometimes a nuisance, abusive or pranksters, cannot be filtered out. Programs critical of our economy, politics, social institutions, culture and lifestyles abound on WBAI.

Because of subject matter and their relative youth, the two female radio psychotherapists can be more liberal in their advice of personal, marital, family and sexual matters. Dr. Goldstein is a strong endorser of women's liberation-type issues: equality of the sexes and a woman's control of her body. She emphasizes self-esteem, identity control and ways to conquer the fear of rejection, that both sexes succumb to. With a different focus or perspective on therapy, Dr. Kuriansky endorses the achievement of human potential. She emphasizes ways of combatting internal and external barriers toward this goal. With regard to lifestyle, do they support the status quo or hold forum for alternative ideas? Neither radio therapist discourages any caller who professed an alternate lifestyle, i.e. gay, sado-masochistic, transvestite, celibate. Neither will label any activity or lifestyle as "normal", despite the caller's requests for such. They will have the caller explore feelings, motivations, consequences without interjection of right or wrong, normal or abnormal. When asked for comment, WABC's Mark Mason stated,

"(Dr. Kuriansky) is slightly left of the middle of the road. Not overly permissive, not sensational. Not that different from Elyse Goldstein. They are out of the same generation, but not of the same school".

By the definition of ideology and hegemony advocated by Gramsci and Williams, commercial radio call-in pro-

gramming, as represented by these four call-in programs, does tend to promote the status quo. What is it about the radio call-in format that would make it tend to be more conservative and orthodox in its appeal? One major consideration is the audience attracted to this format. Young people are consumed by popular and rock music. Older people are tuning in greater numbers to all-news and talk formats. Mark Mason, now Program Director at WABC, has a breadth of experience in call-in radio. He was previously the Program Director of WMCA and NBC's network TalkNet. He offers the following explanation for the shift in political perspective on call-in radio,

"The potential talk audience is more conservative than liberal because the audience is older and older people tend to be more conservative. We also found that on WMCA the 'flaming liberalism' of someone like Alex Bennett, alienated too many people. So we brought on Barry Farber and Bob Grant...WMCA went through a series of evolutions. For instance, Barry Gray changed. He was a great liberal bastion. WMCA is now far to the Right. To give you an example, we had trouble with the Carter-Reagan campaign (on WMCA) because no one at the station was for Carter. Because we couldn't provide a balance in political opinions at the station, we had to stop discussing it".

As the competition for the call-in radio audience becomes more fierce, two things are likely to happen. One, stronger conservative overtures will be made to draw the older, more conservative audience; and second, talk radio stations will go after untapped audiences, i.e. WABC and it's pro-

posed courting of the suburban audience. All those interviewed are optimistic about the future of call-in radio, especially advice programming. They claim that problems will not disappear, only increase as people struggle to cope with an evermore complex life. And they turn to instant, accessible, trusted radio experts for new ideas, confirmation of opinions or comfort in knowing that not only are they alone, but that their problems are mild in comparison.

In summation, recent mass communications theory and criticism draws on the Marxist concept of the cultural ideas of the ruling class. Domhoff suggests that the mass media represents those ideas via broadcast ownership and corporate advertising. Gramsci defines "Hegemony" as a means of censoring heterodox views. Williams translates this into the sense of reality inculcated into our culture. Gitlin maintains that only certain pro-Bourgeois values are constituted in this ideological hegemony. Johnstone et. al., in an examination of American journalism, found that media professionals consider themselves autonomous yet succumb to the ideology of the ruling class. Sallach suggests that the escape from hegemony may come when people compare the "sugar-coated world view" with their immediate, complex and conflict-ridden environment.

Media professionals in the radio call-in program format define their roles as drawing from internal and external

responsibility. Program Directors tend to be goal-oriented, concerned with the audience, image or advertising support of the station. Other members of the support staff tend to be task-oriented and accept responsibility from external sources. These media professionals claim they research topics of discussion by market studies, organized community events, the F.C.C. required Ascertainment Study, perceptual testing, feedback via letters and follow-up calls.

Each of the programs screen callers. Screening criteria includes audibility, and voice quality. Less subtle is the desire of the screeners to vary calls by age, gender, and topic. The radio call-in staff make it very clear that certain people with certain problems are purposely kept off the air. This practice, necessary as it is to maintain a level of credibility and pacing for the show, keeps some people with certain alternative ideas and opinions off the airwaves.

A study for the American Jewish Committee cited three Philadelphia call-in stations with "baiting", the abuse of host-caller interaction where a caller is provoked to make hateful or bigoted statements. This was not discovered in this study of talk hosts in New York.

A content analysis and personal interviews with the production staff confirms, to some extent, Gitlin's charge that the mass media protect the status quo. Dr. Bernard Meltzer was found to be a very conservative and tradi-

tional voice on call-in radio. John Scheur was more critical of social institutions but did not abdicate the overthrow or adoption of an alternate system. Drs. Goldstein and Kuriansky were unwilling to state what is "normal" or "abnormal" but opted for personal happiness, independence and achieving potential. This perspective is modern but apolitical. A shift from liberalism to conservatism was noted by a call-in radio Program Director. He reasoned that since the format skewed older demographics, the appeal and perspectives most amenable to older audiences was a conservative one. Another shift in focus will be one station's attempt to go after the suburban audience. Advice programming appealing to the suburban lifestyle will be emphasized, to the detriment of urban dwellers, who are not considered as desirable to advertisers.

This chapter rounds out a study that examined how, when life became more complex, time more precious and relationships more transient, people increasingly turned to call-in radio. It was also found that a support group of unfamiliar others, people who shared a trust and a parasocial interaction with a talk host, was created through the intimate medium of radio. In the next chapter, "Conclusions", we will summarize the findings of this study and search for implications and further analysis.

CHAPTER 10

CONCLUSIONS

The proliferation of call-in radio in the United States parallels acceleration of change and impermanence in our environment. Was this coincidental or is there a reason people are tuning in to call-in radio shows? Two hypotheses were tested in this study. One, that as life becomes more stressful and complex, resourceful, stable and normal people turn to advice-givers on radio; Two, that call-in radio creates a social network of unfamiliar strangers. Both hypotheses were supported by this study that combined qualitative content analysis of the programming, quantitative survey of listeners with in-depth personal interviews of radio station personnel.

Normal People Turn To Radio Call-In For Advice

Anomie or "disenchantment with the world" is the sociologist's response to "Gesellschaft", the urban lifestyle characterized by interdependence, individualism and personal diversity. Radio, despite the social climate and state of current events, is immediate, intimate, mobile, pervasive, highly believed and anonymous. In the Gesellschaft, familiar relations are broken, stress and time limitations make interrelationships strained or prohibitive. A study of the CB subculture examines the alienated individual's search for what Simmel called "sociability", a sense of community achieved by "privatizing" public space".

Call-in radio overcame it's early stereotype as being "sexy" and "obscene" (with "Topless Radio") to become the most popular radio format on AM radio today. Market research shows that its audience is older, with above-average education and income. Early studies on call-in radio were critical of the advice offered (Steiner, 1945), stressed the loneliness of the listener (Turow, 1974); Bierig and Dimmick, 1979), studied the format (Singer, 1973) or found it a forum for political discussions and public opinion (Crittenden, 1971; Avery et. al., 1978). However, not since 1945 has anyone empirically studied the advice offered on radio and its consequences. And nowhere in the literature has there been a discussion of both the positive, constructive stimuli for tuning in and calling, as well as the community of friends that may result.

It was found that Klapper's notion of self-exposure holds true for the call-in format. Talk show hosts are generally consistent in their advice and the perspectives they take; the audience correctly perceives this and agrees with what they hear. Many listeners felt that the radio call-in show was a broad, complete presentation of the reality, calling it a "Window on the World". This response was predominantly offered by those with some college, occasional listeners and clerical, salespeople and homemakers. These listeners felt that radio call-in made them

better informed, provided a cathartic release, and were "honest slice-of-life" and a vehicle for vicarious experience.

The hosts are perceived to be credible and proficient advice-givers. Over 90% of respondents felt that the hosts were proficient in dealing with topics presented on-air. Over 60% of the respondents admitted that they agreed with the host's advice. Of that number, the older, male hosts enjoyed greater listener agreement, than their younger, female counterparts. Gender differences were explored in Chapter 8, "The Call: Anonymity, Caller Stereotypes and Gender Differences" and it was determined that these male hosts were less likely to interrupt or abruptly terminate a female caller.

Topics such as health, personal finance, family advice and the economy were considered most interesting and most likely to lead to discussion and personal use. Again, areas such as personal health, finance, family relationships, money and work are symptoms of anomie and the acceleration of change and growing impermanence.

Each host uses verbal cues to encourage or discourage calls. Off-air screeners evaluate each call based on a variety of tangible and intangible criteria. The result of on and off-air efforts to control the subject matter of calls is the shared social reality reflected (the call is generated by a private individual) and promoted (encouraged by passing through the screening process and verbally

encouraged by the host). It was found that Dr. Bernard Meltzer spoke for common sense business and investment practice and served as a protector and defender of present social institutions. John Scheur on the other hand, is for economic education. Like Bernard Meltzer, he offers rational business advice and discourages do-it-yourself money management. Dr. Goldstein encourages interpersonal, marital and parent-child relationships, with an emphasis on independence, self-worth and confidence. Dr. Kuriansky, on the other hand, campaigns for achieving individual potential and frowns on all internal and external crutches.

Goffman's dramaturgical approach and discussion of "Impression Management" was useful in examining the means and motives of host control of host-caller interactions. All hosts ally themselves in a supportive, complimentary, encouraging manner with callers whom they encourage. But, at times, each host has been impatient, critical or mocking of callers they discourage. Each host uses cues to elevate his or her status with the audience. This is achieved by exaggerating the trust and honest relationship between host and audience and by emphasizing the authenticity and expertness of the advice.

Listeners considered all of the hosts to be believable and expert. A small percentage, however greater for the two female psychotherapists, found the hosts nasty and impatient. These audience perceptions are justified by the

host's impression management and radio station staff personnel evaluations.

Bandura's theories of social learning were applied to the audience of call-in radio shows. Listeners admitted that both observational learning and vicarious reinforcement took place as a result of listening to call-in radio. They claim that they were forced to think, exposed to different points of view, able to identify with the problems presented and aided in self-improvement. The theories of Horton and Wohl on "Parasocial Interaction" were tested on the listeners. All advice-giving hosts were seen as either friends or coworkers. Over 90% of the respondents felt the host addressed the audience; between 50 and 70% of the respondents felt the host was speaking directly to them. Media professionals agreed that audiences both relate to the host in "special" and "trusted" ways and that much social learning takes place.

Media professionals emphasize two reasons why people call into talk radio: For self-improvement and to give or get additional information. Calls for self-improvement are rewarded with advice; callers who want to give additional information get the opportunity to ventilate their feelings. Both are normal and resourceful uses and gratifications provided by call-in radio. This point is stressed by psychologist Rubenstein, writing for Psychology Today (1981).

The assurance of anonymity is a vital stimulus for the caller. He or she is able to have a private, honest discussion on embarrassing or taboo subjects without society's sanctions or repercussions. The anonymity of call-in radio also privatizes counseling and referrals. Other social researchers found a positive correlation between anonymity and socioeconomic status, intimacy, altruism, antinormative behavior and sex-stereotyping.

The stereotype of callers to each program was examined. Callers to personal and business finance shows were considered "interested" and callers to psychotherapy shows were stereotyped as "lonely". Clearly, the intimacy of relationships, family, marital and sexual is more provocative and controversial than calls about real estate, money markets and CDs. Despite the negative stereotype for the person who calls radio psychotherapy shows, when asked what the listener believed motivated the caller, the two most popular responses were: Free advice and a legitimate question.

Fishman's (1978) work on conversation analysis between married couples was used as a model to study gender differences in callers and the interaction between same and opposite-sex hosts. It was found that the male hosts encouraged more calls than their female counterparts, regardless of the sex of the caller. Dr. Goldstein was found to encourage a higher percentage of male callers, in comparison to her psychotherapy counterpart. John Scheur

encouraged a higher percentage of his female callers, despite Bernard Meltzer's "cult following" of middle-aged women. Many more calls, in general, were made by women and a higher percentage of calls women made were emotional, in comparison to men. The results go counter to Fishman's theory that men are more apt to interrupt woman in a conversation. In this study, the male hosts were found less likely to interrupt or abruptly terminate a female caller. One Program Director, however, did concur with Fishman's conclusion that in conversation, men make more statements and women ask more questions. The results of the study of gender differences must be weighed against the areas of expertise of the hosts. The two female hosts are personal counselors, many of their calls would be emotional in nature. The two male hosts are finance counselors, many of their calls would be more rational in nature. Also, the composition of the audience at the time of broadcast is important. Dr. Goldstein and John Scheur broadcast mid-morning to afternoon, when the audience is predominantly women, students, unemployed and retirees. In contrast, Bernard Meltzer and Dr. Kuriansky broadcast all evening, until midnight, and therefore attract a broader and younger audience.

The theories of Gramsci, Williams, Gitlin and Sallach with regard to the "Production of Culture" were used to examine whether radio call-in was truly a participatory

democracy or limited by the "ideological hegemony" of media professionals. The radio call-in staff interviewed expressed responsibility that was both internal (self-defined) and external (to most institutional expectations). Program Directors tend to be more goal-oriented: Community involved, advertiser concerned and image building. Other support staff were more task-oriented, doing research for sales and programming decisions and researching and contacting prospective guests. They believe they serve the public and know what the public wants to hear and discuss. This is achieved through the Ascertainment studies done to satisfy the Federal Communications Commission, market studies, perceptual testing, attending organized community functions, and monitoring audience and caller feedback. Each station member described criteria for "screening out" undesirable calls. Larry King on the Mutual Network believes the high cost of making long-distance phone calls screens out the undesirables. A producer for Toni Grant's network shows says he goes after the "unusual" calls. Toni Grant, herself, admits that the elderly are kept off the air. The New York call-in stations admit to discouraging poor articulation, calls without general social interest (however that is defined by the station's producer), and varies calls by age and sex. One radio station admits to discriminating against calls either older or younger than it's market demographics, 25-54. This

same station, the newest in a fierce three-way race for the call-in audience in New York, revealed a new campaign to attract the suburban audience, at the expense of the "Heavily minority" inner city.

The ideology created on commercial call-in radio is considered by most to be a conservative one. One Program Director recalls the days when "flaming liberalism" was vogue for call-in radio in New York. But he and the other stations found that it had alienated the older listeners who were the mainstay of the call-in format. When examining the values exposed and reinforced on the shows, Meltzer's perspective is definitively conservative and preserving of the status quo; Drs. Goldstein and Kuriansky refuse to label behavior "normal" or "abnormal" (so they remain about half-way between left or right on perspective). John Scheur is liberal in his attacks on national economy but does not provide an alternative to the present capitalist system. So by the definition of "Ideological Hegemony" offered by Gramsci, Williams, Gitlin and Sallach, the call-in radio is not unlike its mass media counterparts. The discussion is more open than most on radio but is not without limitations.

Search For Community

Studies on the appeal of CB radio (Dannefer and Kasen, 1981, Kerbo et. al. 1978) link the popularity of anonymous exchanges between unfamiliar others as endemic to a society characterized by alienation. They cite Simmel's (1950) con-

cept of "sociability" as a desire to regain "Gemeinschaft". Despite obvious differences between CB and call-in radio (the host, control of interaction, only two parties speaking at one time, time limits, etc.) the desire to return to a society where people can better "connect" or "network" with others is oft stated in popular literature about call-in radio (Cohen, 1977; McEachern, 1970; Rice, 1981; Rubenstein, 1981; Avery, 1978). These writers stress the caller's search for alliance with a host. Talk shows hosts speak of networks of supportive listeners who feedback to callers in response to questions and problems.

A content analysis of the call-in programs using Goffman's theories of "Impression Management" found many appeals to a "family" or "community" of listeners. Listeners joined the team, behind the host, and were made privy to inside secrets on self-improvement. Occasionally the caller was encouraged or praised for correcting the host and assumed the role of "performer" or "team leader". Goffman explained that the team unified behind a sense of familiarity with dependable others. Hosts appealed to the audience along this line as well. Such as when John Scheur says, "We discussed this many times. It's complicated but if you continue to listen you'll see that..." Another example is Meltzer's use of endearments and compliments to callers. The (the callers) are made to feel special, unique and part of a loving team. When Drs. Goldstein and

Kuriansky ask for feedback or accept calls from "happy customers" of their advice, they both elevate their social status with the audience and solidify their team.

The audience's perception of the host is that of "believability" and "expertness". Likewise, the host stresses and builds on the audience's trust. Often that special rapport between host and audience is highlighted to either elicit praise from the caller or to encourage the caller to be more honest.

The listener's comments with regard to "Social Learning" show a dependence on the "team of others" who call. Listeners claim that they are both apprized of alternative possibilities and the ability to "share" similar problems with those on the air and be comforted by this "community" confession. When callers are given to opportunity to "Fight City Hall" by ventillating their frustrations on call-in radio, their anger is shared and supported by many listeners who feel the same injustices. Listeners support the caller's vocalized frustrations in the same way that a supportive, fist-waving crowd would surround the "angry" man (or woman) atop a soapbox in Hyde Park.

One way this community of listeners is achieved is through the "persona" of the host. Rice (1981) compares call-in radio to a network of friends and relatives. In fact, the audience perceives the hosts as being friends

and coworkers. The majority of the listeners felt that the host both addressed the audience and spoke to them personally.

Caller stereotypes are an important consideration in the study of this desire for "sociability". Lofland (1973) claimed that "strangerness" had to reduce in order for "sociability to be achieved. What conception does the audience have of callers? Callers to finance shows were thought of as being "interested," and those who called psychotherapy shows were considered "lonely". Despite this negative stereotype, the audience considered the caller's motivations to be quite honorable and positive: To get free advice and to ask a legitimate question. However, under 10% of the respondents said that the caller was "Just like me". This demonstrates that, despite a mutual trust for the host and the vicarious reinforcement of similar problems and questions, listeners are not yet at the point of identifying with callers.

Simmel also stated that sociability can only be achieved when public space is "privatized". In call-in radio, this is achieved through anonymity. Once confidentiality is assured, callers can freely discuss what is on their minds without embarrassment. Here, the private becomes public without the negative sanctions placed on the individual by society.

Media professionals in call-in radio profess that their appeal to "family" is derived in two ways: WOR has

a family of talk show hosts, e.g., Pat McCann is a third generation talk show host on the station WMCA claims to be one of the few family-owned radio stations left with Peter Strauss at the helm. The second appeal to "family" is that of supplementing human contact, connections, and support. WMCA's Jeanne Strauss, states,

"In the environment we live in, we need a context in which to place ourselves. Companionship, education, support, entertainment, distraction. Aren't these things family provides? People are increasingly troubled and are looking to better understand their world".

Impact on Television Programming

Is the increased popularity and dependence on call-in radio symptomatic of other changes in the mass media? We have seen an increased demand for "reality programming" on television, such as That's Incredible!, Real People and The People's Court. Television programmers are feeding the public desire to be "voyagers" as they vicariously experience the lives of adventurous, exciting, wacky, but otherwise normal, average people. The popularity and profitability of People Magazine attests to this. Not only does this format provide escape into fantasy but it also serves to elevate the "Commonman", to give him an importance and status once reserved only for celebrities and public officials. A Newsweek article quotes a big city newspaper editor as stating, "The talk show is a fabulous forum for people who feel somewhat important" (1979). Gibian in

Tabloid, a review of mass culture, questions,

"But does the striking garrulity of 1980s America, this sudden proliferation of talk and of opinions, correlate with any simultaneous increase in popular political power?... The newstalk explosion, then, may be a gauge not of popular power but of powerlessness and isolation" (1983:16).

Gibian questions the power of a lone call-in voice against the "Loud host with an itchy finger on the cut-off button" (1983:25). In the discussion of the call-in radio show and the production of culture it was found that the tangible and intangible criteria for screening as well as the host's use of impression management make Gibian's question a valid one. Pratt in Tabloid responds to this question and confirms the researcher's conclusion,

"Talk is the domain where social relations are set up and worked out, where people are knowingly negotiating their positions with respect to each other... In many instances of the call-in format, univocal authority is retained... There is no way for callers to talk to each other". (1983:28)

The researcher finds that a supportive network results from the call-in radio format. Gibian and Pratt acknowledge this,

"More and more, we seem to turn to the airwaves for our communal experience with large groups of people. Sports talk shows, then, build strong bonds of intimacy as they being trivia nuts and barroom debates together in a new forum for which there has apparently been a great need". (Gibian, 1983:19)

Has television programming set out to tap this need? Dialogic programs such as ABC's Nightline and the popular, syndicated Donahue show mix personality interviews with audience participation and call-ins. ABC's Nightline derived from the extensive and popular nightly coverage of the reporting on the American hostages in Iran. Nightline mixes entertainment with news. Each evening's program presents a news issue debate between "responsible" spokespeople. These spokespeople range from heads-of-state and public officials to the private, concerned citizen.

"There's a compelling electricity in the news-issue debate. It's a sort of television diplomacy where the issues are not solved, the speakers are not in agreement and the speeches are not pre-planned... The sense is that history is not only being reported but is being made; that our agenda for the future is being set".
(Gibian, 1983:17)

The immediacy of live television and the spontaneity of discussion couples that of call-in radio. But what makes Nightline both electric and involving is the input of the show's participants; the sense that a new social reality, created by these participants, is being formed. The concepts of "gatekeepers" and "agenda-setting" alter tremendously. The gatekeepers are no longer a small, elite group of "Country club journalists" but are democratic in orientation. The "agenda" is not set by this elite group; the public uses the media to negotiate an agenda, a set of priorities. The result is a fluid and ever-changing referendum on

public opinion. Both in call-in radio and with programs like Nightline and Donahue we more greatly depend on ourselves as spokespeople and authorities. This may be a result, in part, of the public's growing dissatisfaction with public officials and noted experts.

Donahue acts as a public crusader when tackling issues, guests and the live and call-in audience. The format often transforms for simple question and answer to audience "Town meeting" where both live and call-in audience members debate among themselves, ignoring both the guest and host Donahue. One social commentator stated, "...a passion that could transform current events chatter into a sort of group psychodrama" (Gibian, 1983:18).

Not all participatory television shows are as successful. ABC's Last Word included Phil Donahue and his abbreviated show along with a call-in segment hosted by Greg Jackson. The format was hampered by interruptions, rudeness and audience participation that was perfunctory at best. The weakness of the format was best demonstrated when media-savvy Jane Fonda and husband Tom Hayden served as guests.

"Each time Jackson asked one of his crass questions about money and movie stars, Fonda would interrupt him with laughter and ask why the media were so stuck on such yellow journalism topics... Hayden and Fonda stressed the other side of media dialogue: The ways that the questioner's role can also be oppressive. He alone can choose the issues, set the tone, imply the perspective". (Gibian, 1983:24)

Another example of a failed attempt to bring call-in radio to television was the syndicated program, So You Think You've Got Troubles. In a game show setting people present their problems before the show host who happens to be a ventriloquist complete with dummy. A panel of three "experts" is called upon to offer advice. Then the studio audience votes on the advice they most agree with. The advice of questionable "experts" and the appeal to our desire to feel sorrow and pity for someone else failed. Even an updated version of Queen for a Day, replete with tearjerker stories of destitute women cannot find a television audience today. Obviously the audience refuses to accept the trivialization of participatory democracy and self-help. "Reality programming" only works on television and call-in radio when the veracity and sincerity of the format and host are beyond question. The audience's trust is not to be toyed with, even for entertainment sake. Trust in both the format, the host and other listeners was key to the radio call-in format. For instance, on radio station KGO in San Francisco, radio call-in show Now Is That True? permits callers to question the veracity of previous caller's stories.

The call-in radio format can be most easily converted into television via two-way interactive cable. This has already been accomplished on a small scale in places as diverse as Reading, Pennsylvania and New Zealand. Two-way

interactive cable links each receiving television set to a main computer located at the production center. Subscribers to Warner Amex's QUBE in Columbus, Ohio and several other cities, can take public opinion polls, order recipes, shop and participate in live television programming. Two-way cable such as QUBE is the video equivalent of the telephone partyline. The Berks County Cable System in Reading, Pennsylvania, under the supervision of New York University's Global Village, experimented with the participation of the elderly in interactive television. They set up a series of auditoriums complete with television monitors and cameras so audience members could both listen and participate. New Zealand tested an experimental "Televote" program which enables home viewers to vote on public issues via cable television.

Both the medium and message of call-in radio has entered the video realm with varying degrees of success. The live, spontaneous communality of live television audience participation is appealing. It consistently draws a large audience for shows like Donahue and Nightline. Innovations in cable and computer technology make home audience participation just a push-button away. The radio talk format will continue to thrive as larger and more desirable audiences tune in. In the past, television drew from radio's successful programming forms: Sitcoms, soap opera, mystery, westerns and crime drama, etc. There is

no doubt that television and cable will continue to learn from radio and adapt the radio call-in format.

Ethical Implications of Radio Psychotherapy

Rockefeller University's George A. Miller, in his address to the American Psychological Association in 1969, is noted for exhorting the association's members to "Discover how best to give psychology away (to the people)" (Horn, 1979:98). Ten years later the A.P.A. created a series of radio shows called Spotlight: Psychology. The A.P.A. acknowledges that these types of shows build goodwill using a combination of expert-plus commonfolk approach.

Psychology Today reports,

"The APA's motives in spreading the psychological word are not completely altruistic. Its members in colleges and universities rely on federal and state funds to support their academic research; their colleagues who are therapists are intimately concerned with whether private and public insurance plans such as Blue Cross and Medicare will pay for their services, and how far the coverage the plans provide will go." (Horn, 1979:98)

The previously mentioned series of programs was created to serve as publicity and promotion for the A.P.A. and its members. How does the public view the "psychology business" with the proliferation of personal and sexual counseling programs on radio talk stations? Sexuality Today magazine found that 71% of the psychologists surveyed approved of the sex counseling shows on radio yet a fair number objecting to the shows on ethical grounds, stating the shows

were superficial and ill-advised (McCabe, 1983:157). A.P.A. guidelines on ethics were changed in 1981 to accomodate the radio call-in shows. They permit dispensing advice on the air with the following reservations:

"Psychologists use the latest research available, that they exercise the highest level of professional judgement and that they do not 'diagnose' or 'treat' over the air".

To counter criticism against the call-in show the Association for Media Pscyhology was formed in 1982. It's president, Dr. Jacqueline Bouhoutsous, admits,

"Certainly the amount of time that a psychologist can talk to a caller is not extensive enough to allow adequate exploration. Because of this there is a constant need for caution on the part of people who do these shows to realize that what they are doing may be therapeutic, but it's not psychotherapy". (McCabe, 1983:201)

Popular radio sex counselor on WYNY, New York, Dr. Ruth Westheimer has a doctorate in education and is a member of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, not the A.P.A. Her fans might call her "Grandma Freud" but she proclaims, "I'm not a therapist, I'm an educator". (McCabe, 1983:201) Dr. Kuriansky justifies her role as radio personal counselor,

"Part of it is armchair psychologizing. It is a bit like a game show. Listeners want to play along and guess the answer... Do you realize what this has done for poor people? For people who can't afford even the minimum fee for a therapist? On

the air I can't just nod and ask, 'What do you think of that? People want direction. They want answers". (McCabe, 1983:203-4)

Psychotherapist Dr. Susan Dickes Hubbard questions the value of these personal counselors in print and on radio.

She calls them "Happiness pushers" and states,

"One gets the impression that taking charge of one's total life experience and attaining happiness is the only sensible option for anyone with reasonably good reading comprehension skills. We could create a new aphorism based on a familiar old one: 'If you're smart, why aren't you happy?'" (Hubbard, 1979:39)

She is critical of the "Feel good" books that imply,

"If only you will pursue this rational, sensible approach to your feelings, your past and your intimate associates, dear reader (or listener), your troubles will be over... People are mislead into expecting magical changes, even though the authors say such changes require work." (Hubbard, 1979:40)

She is suspect of Wayne Dyer's immensely popular Your Erroneous Zones. She states, "Dyer goes to some lengths to let people know that they need not, indeed, should not, compare themselves with anyone else. Yet he sets people up to do exactly this." (Hubbard, 1979:41) Instead, she endorses a psychotherapeutic approach where the therapist should be a patient, "helpful ally, but not an authority who steps in to tell the client what he or she should see and feel as a healthy individual". (Hubbard, 1979:42)

Radio psychiatrist, Dr. Harvey Ruben, on NBC network's TalkNet, identifies himself as a community mental health educator. He is one of seven appointed by the American Psychiatric Association to the Joint Committee of Public Affairs, which is responsible for disseminating psychiatry to the media. As a psychiatrist he sets himself apart from the radio psychologists. In a personal interview he stated,

"The others (psychologists) don't have the sophistication to do what I do. Most are not sure what they're doing. They're giving treatment. It's invalid to make an interpretation after fifteen seconds or two minutes. I will always qualify with a statement, 'I've never seen you'. You don't hear that with other radio therapists. My role is the 'triage': To gather information, educate and make referrals. People call, they don't know how to get help. They see Dr. Ruben as someone who can tell them where to go."

Dr. Ruben counters Dr. Hubbard in his defense of self-help books. He states,

"I wrote the ultimate self-help book, Crisis Intervention in 1975 with Dr. Harvey Resnick. Self-help is the first level of help. Who reads self-help books? Troubled people, they're better educated, middle class who are hurting with neurotic personalities. And they're the best judge if something works. Everyone diagnoses themselves all the time. It's consistent with the human condition to do this. The community mental health message (I deliver) is I can help you diagnose yourself and tell you where to get treated."

Dr. Ruben spoke about how the radio call-in show has affected his practice. He still maintains offices at

Yale-New Haven Hospital and a private practice in Hamden, a suburb of New Haven. He cites his radio psychotherapy colleagues, such as Dr. Kuriansky, who have abandoned private practice. He asserts, "If you stop your private practice, you're nothing". He claims to be able to pick and choose patients and has taken on some patients as a result of his call-in show. But he reveals that they were not very good patients,

"Radio is pervasive and passive. There are some people who are not psychologically sophisticated enough to work on their problems. They expected magic. They didn't know they had to work on it. That hadn't suffered and weren't motivated to change."

Dr. Ruben stated that the American Psychiatric Association strongly endorses his work as a Community Mental Health Psychiatrist. This A.P.A. has different ethical guidelines in regard to call-in radio programs.

In "Guidelines for Psychiatrists Working with the Communications Media", the American Psychiatric Association encourages

"The frank sharing of its business and concerns with bona fide representatives of the news media. Members are encouraged to cooperate with reporters on all matters within the expertise and interests of the psychiatric profession" (American Journal of Psychiatry, 1977:609).

The following items are included in these guidelines:

1. Sound judgement and common sense should dictate the psychiatrist's relations with the communications media.

2. The promise of radical cures or boasting of extraordinary skill or success is considered unethical.
3. Claiming expertise in broad social matters without proof or positive contributions to solutions can destroy public trust.
4. The (psychiatrist) is obligated to protect the patient's privacy and maintain the confidentiality of his communication.
5. No individual can speak for the profession as a whole.
6. Comment should be made thoughtfully... understatement is usually more effective than excessive approval or denunciation.
7. In no case should a comment be made that might reflect adversely on the competence or characters of individuals directly involved in a particular situation, not because physicians should be mutually protective but because all the facts cannot be known in such circumstances. (American Journal of Psychiatry, 1977:609-611)

The guidelines also warn psychiatrists about confrontations with reporters and the importance of maintaining credibility both with the media and with the public.

In an addendum to the guidelines adopted in March, 1982 specific suggestions are offered regarding the call-in or

talk shows host. The following items are included in these guidelines:

1. The (psychiatrist) is often selected because of general attractiveness, personality and articulateness as well as for expertise in a given area.
2. Show concern for the caller and his or her problems.
3. Have readily available a list of referral sources in the community.
4. Do not belabor topics and points.
5. Screening incoming calls eliminates obviously distorted persons, those using offensive language and ensures a variety of questions from persons likely to be interesting to the audience.
6. Whenever possible, emphasize that psychiatrists are physicians with special training in the different diagnosis and treatment of mental disorders.
7. At all times try to avoid the trivialization of the profession and mental illness.
8. Psychiatrists should not attempt to state a diagnosis, or, in any conclusive way, describe the problem that might be troubling the person. i.e. "You must understand that I could not diagnose your problem without a very thorough evaluation. The symptoms you describe, however, are similar to those common for depression" (1982:1-3).

Judging from these guidelines, the American Psychiatric Association encourages positive and continued relations with the media. The 1977 guidelines state,

"Continuing positive relationships with the media are the best assurance of good media coverage... it is essential in media relations to establish trust and confidence between the psychiatrist and the working journalist. Even if the media representatives are strangers, it should be remembered that they are our community partners and that for most of the community the media are the principal, perhaps the only, source of information on psychiatry, on new and old therapies and on major health care issues" (American Journal of Psychiatry, 1977:610).

These guidelines exist to protect and promote good public relations for psychiatrists. They understand the public dependence upon the media as well as the growing popularity of program formats which incorporate the work of psychiatrists. While they encourage members of their profession to work with the news media they caution them to steer clear of confrontation and adverse criticism of the profession. They also suggest psychiatrists remain brief, factual and direct with the media while maintaining patient confidentiality and the ethics of diagnosis and medical practice. In the 1982 addendum the psychiatrist is coached to do the following:

"If you decide to be interviewed, tell the reporter, 'Let me check a few facts and call you right back.' Using the time to make notes on your intended responses and to determine what single

point about the subject you want to be known and remembered by the public. Then return the call and answer the questions, making your key point in no more than 30 or 45 seconds. Don't read your comment and don't use complicated words. Use your natural speaking voice" (1982:1)

This prompting of the psychiatrists obviously takes into account the exigencies of the mass media: Time limitations, extensive editing, an appeal to a broad, mass audience, a focus on one main point, and an emphasis on the sensational. For the public relations-conscious American Psychiatric Association these guidelines serve as a "How-To" guide rather than a list of ethical considerations and stipulations.

Call-in show opponents within the American Psychological Association liken radio psychotherapy to prescribing medicine without examining the patient, implying malpractice. Dr. Bouhoutsos admitted that one malpractice lawsuit had been filed, but it was thrown out of court (McCabe, 1983:204). She hopes that the findings of her study of Media Psychology might lead to a governing board for radio psychology shows to be comprised of professional psychologists and participating radio stations (McCabe, 1983:204).

The varying educational backgrounds, psychological/psychiatric practices and (raison de'etre) of the radio psychotherapist raises ethical questions that the American Psychological Association, the American Psychiatric Association, radio stations and the public must consider.

It deserves an open forum for discussion between all interested and involved parties and should not serve the public relations of one group or the profit-desires of broadcasters. How the listeners use this information and entertainment medium is crucial in determining ethical guidelines. Despite a radio host's determination to repeat "This is not therapy" or "I am an educator", if the public misinterpretes what is taking place psychological harm can result and malpractice suits deemed feasible and appropriate. This study on the listener's perception of host, format, advice and other callers should provide some beginning answers to these ethical concerns.

The World Outside And The Pictures In Our Head

This study is prefaced by two quotations from Lippman's Public Opinion (1965). The first quotation, "The Self-Contained Community" identifies all of those involved in the process known as call-in radio. On call-in radio, the host wins over the audience by establishing trust and a consistent view of the world. Listeners and callers selectively expose themselves to hosts they perceive as agreeing with their ideas, values and perspectives. The audience shares secrets on self-improvement. Callers feel free enough to bear their souls, bank accounts and marital problems. This homogenous code of morals comes closest to "Gemeinschaft" in our present society.

The second quotation, "The Appeal to the Public" discusses both the shared social reality present on call-in radio and the search for advice on ways of coping with an "unseen environment". Lippman's statement is pessimistic about the information we garner about social institutions. The audience's claim that call-in radio is a "window on the world" offers some hope. Preparation for dealing with an "unseen environment" is one of the reasons why people turn to call-in radio, for advice. And as our fear that we know less and less about social institutions grows, our demand to know more and our reliance on call-in radio for information and advice will increase.

Implications For Further Study

Six local radio call-in programs were examined in this study. Four were exclusively call-in shows; five were advice shows, the sixth was a potpourri of current events, issues and celebrity gossip by one of the most highly-recognized talk show hosts in the United States. Also, only commercial radio was considered for this study. Some research was conducted at non-commercial WBAI but could not be included in this study. This study began as an examination of how call-in radio appealed to the New York community. But media professionals dismissed the existence of one New York community. They described New York as an amalgam of competing interests groups and many different communities. A study on call-in radio and community appeal would best be conducted in one

definable small community, out and away from a metropolitan area. Despite failed attempts at surveying callers to commercial call-in radio shows, it is recommended that this important group not be ignored. Again, noncommercial radio or small radio stations might provide access to callers. Call-in radio is branching out in many different topical areas. Hosts with different appeals and expertise could be considered. An ethnographic study of work at the call-in radio station would be enlightening. Also, a controlled study that compared the perception and use of radio call-in advice, in contrast to other kinds or sources of advice, would be very exciting. Media professionals say that the future of radio call-in programming is very bright. The future of social research on radio call-in programming is equally illuminating.

REFERENCES

- Adams, V.
1982 "Night of Talk, Talk, Talk," Daily News (February 27):38.
- American Journal of Psychiatry
1977 "Guidelines for Psychiatrists Working with the Communications Media", (May):609-611.
- American Psychiatric Association
1982 "Addendum to Public Affairs Guidelines", (March 13):1-3.
- Arbitron Radio Analysis
1981 Fall, New York Market.
- Avery, R.K., D.G. Ellis and T.W. Glover
1978 "Patterns of Communication on Talk Radio," Journal of Broadcasting 22 (Winter):5-17.
- Bandura, A.
1971 "The Obstinate Audience: The Influence Process from the Point of View of Social Communication," in W. Schramm and D.F. Roberts (ed.), The Process and Effects of Mass Communications. Urbana, Ill: University of Illinois Press:336-346.
- Bendix, R.
1971 Scholarship and Partnership: Essays on Max Weber. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bierig, J. and J. Dimmick
1979 "The Late Night Talk Show as Interpersonal Communication," Journalism Quarterly (Spring):92-93.
- Bihm, E., I. Saudet and O. Sale
1979 "Altruistic Responses Under Conditions of Anonymity," The Journal of Social Psychology, 109 (October):25-30.
- Blumler, J. and E. Katz
1975 The Uses of Mass Communication. Beverly Hills: Sage,
- Bookbinder, H.
1981 Statement before the Radio Code of the National Association of Broadcasters, for the American Jewish Committee.
- Broadcasting
1981 "Talk Network the Next for ABC Radio" (July 27: 107.

- 1978 "What's All This Talk About?" (September 27):55.
- Business Week
- 1981 "What AM Radio Stations are Talking up," (June 15):99-100.
- Cammett, J.
- 1967 Antonio Gramsci and the Origins of Italian Communism. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Carlin, J.C.
- 1976 "The Rise and Fall of Topless Radio," Journal of Communication (Winter):31-37.
- Carter, B., L. Howard, J. Young, and E. Gelman
- 1979 "Radio's Gabfest," Newsweek (October 29):87.
- Cohen, D.
- 1977 "Talk Radio -- The Callers Want Approval, Not an Argument," Psychology Today (September):27-28.
- Columbia Journalism Review
- 1982 "Wrong Number" (May/June):77.
- Crittenden, J.
- 1971 "Democratic Functions of the Open Mike Radio Forum," Public Opinion Quarterly 35 (Summer):200-210.
- Daily News
- 1982 Untitled (April 4):3.
- Dannefer, D. and J.H. Kasen
- 1981 "Anonymous Exchanges: CB and the Emergence of Sex Typing," Urban Life 10 (October):265-287.
- Danzig, F.
- 1978 "WOR Loves Bernard Meltzer," Advertising Age (October 30):126.
- Davidson, P.
- 1981 Propaganda and the American Revolution. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Davis, D.K. and S.J. Baran
- 1981 Mass Communication and Everyday Life. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Deaux, K.
- 1974 "Anonymous Altruisms: Extending the Lost Letter Technique," Journal of Social Psychology 92:61-66.

- Diener, E., S.C. Fraser, A.L. Beaman and R.T. Kelem
 1976 "Effects of Deindividuation Variables on Stealing Among Halloween Trick-or-Treaters," Journal of Personal and Social Psychology. 33:178-183.
- Dimmicks, J., T.A. McCain and W.T. Bolton
 1979 "Media Use and the Life Span," American Behavioral Scientist, 23(Sept/Oct):7-32.
- Domhoff, G.
 1967 Who Rules America? Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Durkheim, E.
 1933 Division of Labor in Society. New York: Free Press.
 1947 The Elementary Forms of Religious Life. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.
 1951 Suicide. New York: Free Press.
- Fischer, C.S.
 1973 "On Urban Alienations and Anomie: Powerlessness and Social Isolation", American Sociological Review, Vol. 38.
- Fisher, R.A. and F. Yates.
 1953 Statistical Tables for Biological Agricultural and Medical Research. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, Ltd.
- Fisher, R.
 1970 "Decision Emergence Phases in Group Decision-Making," Speech Monographs 37 (March):53-66.
- Fishman, M.
 1978 "Interaction: The Work Women Do," Social Problems 25 (April):397-406.
- Foah, U.G.
 1971 "Interpersonal and Economic Reward," Science (January 29):335-351.
- Forbes
 1976 "When Controversy Pays," (November 1), 48-49.
- Gans, H.
 1972 "Vance Packard Misperceives the Way Most American Movers Live," Psychology Today, Vol. 6.

- Gerth, H.H.D. and C.W. Mills
 1958 From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Galaxy.
- Gibian, P.
 1983 "Newspeak Meets Newstalk: The Boom in Airwaves Dialogue" Tabloid; A Review of Mass Culture and Everyday Life. Vol. 7 (Winter) pp. 14-26.
- Gitlin, T.
 1979 "Prime Time Ideology: The Hegemonic Process in TV Entertainment," Social Problems 26 (February): 251-266.
 1980 The Whole World is Watching; Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Goffman, E.
 1959 The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.
 1974 Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
 1981 Forms of Talk. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goldman, K.
 1982 "Radio's Latest Boom: Late-Night Talk Shows", New York Times (May 2):3.
- Gregg, P.W.
 1971 Television Viewing as Parasocial Interaction for Persons Aged 60 Years or Older, Master's Thesis, University of Oregon.
- Hall, T.
 1976 Beyond Culture. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press.
- Hochman, S.
 1980 "The Talk, Talk, Talk of the Town," New York (May 19):34-38.
- Horn, Jack C.
 1979 "Airing Psychology With a Beat," Psychology Today (March):98.
- Horton, D. and R.R. Wohl
 1956 "Mass Communications and Para-Social Interaction: Observation on Intimacy at a Distance," Psychiatry 19(215-219).

- Hubbard, S.D.
1979 "The Happiness Pushers", *The Humanist* (January/February):39-43.
- Hunter, A.
1975 "The Loss of Community: An Empirical Test Through Replication," *American Sociological Review* 40: 537-552.
- Janowitz, M.
1960 *The Professional Soldier*, New York: Free Press.
- Johnstone, J.W.C., E.J. Slawki and W.W. Bowman
1976 *The News People: A Sociological Portrait of American Journalism and their Work.* Urbana, Ill: University of Illinois Press.
- Jones, W.H.
1979 "Generating Mail Survey Inducement Methods: Population Interactions with Anonymity and Sponsorship," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 43 (Spring): 102-111.
- Kasarda, J.D. and M. Janowitz
1974 "Community Attachment in Mass Society," *American Sociological Review* 39 (June):23:328-339.
- Kerbo, H.R., K. Marshall and P. Halley
1978 "Reestablishing 'Gemeinschaft'?" *Urban Life* (October):338-358.
- Klapper, J.T.
1960 "Mass Communications, Popular Taste and Organized Social Action," in Wilbur Schramm and D.F. Roberts, (ed.) *The Process and Effects of Mass Communications.* Urbana, Ill:Univ. of Illinois Press:554-578.
- Lazarus, H.R. and D.K. Bienlein
1967 "Soap Opera Therapy", *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy* 17:252-256.
- Lippman, W.
1965 *Public Opinion.* New York: Free Press.
- Lofland, L.H.
1973 *A World of Strangers.* New York: Basic Books.
- Lowry, D.T.
1981 *Racial and Religious Bias on Radio Call-In Programs: A Philadelphia Study; for the American Jewish Committee.*

- McCabe, P.
1965 Understanding Media: "Sex Talk Shows on Radio", Glamour, (January):156-157 and 201-204.
- McCombs, M. and D.K. Shaw
1972 "The Agenda-Setting Functions of Mass Media," Public Opinion Quarterly 36:176-187.
- McEachern, M.
1970 "The Town Meeting Is Not Dead--It's Alive and Well on Radio," Today's Health (July):32-33+.
- McLeod, J., S. Ward and K. Tancill
1965 "Alienation and the Uses of the Mass Media," Public Opinion Quarterly (Winter):583-594.
- McLuhan, H.M.
1965 Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Marx, K.
1960 German Ideology. New York: International Publishers.
- The Media Book
1981 Untitled.
- Milgrim, S.
1970 "The Experience of Living in Cities," Science 167 (March):1461-1468.
- Newsweek
1972 "Radio Gas Bags," (January 24):44.
- Porter, D.
1977 "Soap Time: Thoughts on a Commodity Art Form," College English 38:(April):782-788.
- Pratt, M.
1983 "No, She Really Loves Eggs: Fighting it Out on Call-In Radio", Tabloid; A Review of Mass Culture and Everyday Life, Vol. 7 (Winter):27-37.
- Rice, B.
1981 "Call-In Therapy: Reach Out and Shrink Someone." Psychology Today (December):39-44 and 87-91.
- Rubenstein, C.
1981 "Who Calls IN? It's not the Lonely Crowd," Psychology Today (December):89-90.
- Sallach, D.L.
1974 "Class Domination and Ideological Hegemony," in Gaye Tuchman (ed.) The TV Establishment, Programming for Power and Profit. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

- McCabe, Peter
1983 "Sex Talk Shows on Radio", Glamour, (January): 156-157 and 201-204.
- McCombs, M. and D.K. Shaw
1972 "The Agenda-setting Functions of Mass Media," Public Opinion Quarterly 36:176-187.
- McEachern, M.
1970 "The Town Meeting Is Not Dead--It's Alive and Well on Radio," Today's Health (July):32-33+.
- McLeod, J., S. Ward and K. Tancill
1965 "Alienation and the Uses of the Mass Media," Public Opinion Quarterly (Winter):583-594.
- McLuhan, H.M.
1965 Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Marx, K.
1960 German Ideology. New York: International Publishers.
- The Media Book
1981 Untitled.
- Milgrim, S.
1970 "The Experience of Living in Cities," Science 167 (March):1461-1468.
- Newsweek
1972 "Radio Gas Bags," (January 24):44.
- Porter, D.
1977 "Soap Time: Thoughts on a Commodity Art Form," College English 38:(April):782-788.
- Pratt, M.
1983 "No, She Really Loves Eggs: Fighting It Out on Call-In Radio, Tabloid; A Review of Mass Culture and Everyday Life, Vol. 7 (Winter):27-37.
- Rice, B.
1981 "Call-In Therapy: Reach Out and Shrink Someone." Psychology Today (December):39-44 and 87-91.
- Rubenstein, C.
1981 "Who Calls In? It's not the Lonely Crowd," Psychology Today (December):89-90.
- Sallach, D.L.
1974 "Class Domination and Ideological Hegemony," in Gaye Tuchman (ed.) The TV Establishment, Programming for Power and Profit. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

- Schutz, A.
1962 Collected Papers, Volume I. The Problem of Social Reality. The Hague:M. Nuihoff.
- Sennett, R.
1977 The Fall of Public Man. New York: Knopf.
- Shibutani, T.
1966 Improvised News. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc.
- Simmel, G.
1950 Sociology of Georg Simmel. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.
- Singer, B.
1973 Feedback and Society: A Study of the Uses of Mass Channels for Coping. New York: Lexington Books.
- Sloane, L.
1974 "Doctors Are Becoming Familiar Faces on Television's Talk Shows," New York Times (July 14):15.
- Smith, A.
1981 "What Are They Saying Out There," Esquire (June): 30-33.
- Steiner, L.R.
1945 Where Do People Take Their Troubles? Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Stephenson, W.
1967 The Play Theory of Mass Communication. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stevenson, J.
1978 "Profiles: Paying Sam Back," The New Yorker, (August 14):39-47.
- Tannen, E.
1974 "Liberals and the Media," The Progressive (April): 11.
- Time
1972 "New Talk Jockeys" (May 22):76-79.
1980 "Dial Dr. Toni for Therapy" (May 26):95.

- Toffler, A.
1970 Future Shock. New York: Random House.
- Tonnies, F.
1887 Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. Leipzig: Fues's Verlag.
- Tuchman, G.
1978 Making News; A Study in the Construction of Reality. New York: The Free Press.
- Tudryn, J.
1982 "Everybody's Talking -- A Profile of Talk Radio," Radioactive (April):6-9.
- Turow, J.
1974 "Talk Show Radio as Interpersonal Communication," Journal of Broadcasting 18 (Spring):171-179.
- Tuthill, M.
1979 "Hi There, You're on the Air!," Nation's Business (October):69-75.
- Weber, M.
1958 The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. New York: Scribner.
- Williams, R.
1977 Marxism and Literature. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Winick, C.
1982 "The Image of Mental Illness in the Mass Media," in Deviance and Mental Illness, ed. Walter R. Gove. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Wolfe, R.
1976 "What's Behind the CB Phenomenon," CB Magazine (April):13.
- Young, J.
1979 "Use of Media by Older Adults," American Behavioral Scientist 23(Sept/Oct):119-136.
- Zimbardo, P.
1969 "The Human Choice: Individuation, Reason and Order Versus Deindividuation, Impulse and Chaos," in W.D. Arnold and D. Levine (eds.) Nebraska Symposium on Motivation 17:Lincoln: University Nebraska Press.

Appendix 1

Listener

Page 1

Hello, my name is _____.

This questionnaire is being conducted as part of a doctoral research study in the appeal of radio talk shows. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

1. Which of the following radio shows do you listen to:

a. Dr. Elyse Goldstein	b. Barry Gray
c. Barry Farber	d. Carlton Fredericks
d. Dr. Bernard Meltzer	e. Dr. Judith Kuriansky

For those programs that you do listen to, please check off the responses closest to your own feelings.

	Goldstein	Gray	Farber	Fredericks	Meltzer	Kuriansky
2. How many times per week do you listen? (i.e. 1x, 2x, 5x)						
3. The show is:						
believable						
nasty						
concerned						
impatient						
a good debater						
humorous						
sympathetic						
an expert						
other:						

	Goldstein	Gray	Farber	Fredericks	Meltzer	Kuriansky
4. Your view of the host is closest to:						
a parent figure						
a mate						
a best friend						
a stranger in the park						
someone you work with						
other:						
5. Do you feel the host is able to deal with the topics presented?						
Yes						
No						
6. Does the hosts' response to calls:						
stimulate future calls						
retard future calls						
7. Does the host address the listening audience?						
Yes						
No						
8. Do you feel the host is talking to you?						
Yes						
No						
9. With regard to the host's advice, you generally:						
Agree						
Disagree						

		Goldstein	Gray	Farber	Fredericks	Meltzer	Kuriansky
10.	Have you ever called into one of these shows? Yes						
11.	If yes, was it to:						
	solve a problem						
	present an argument						
	get additional information						
	give additional information						
	desire to talk to host						
	desire to address the audience						
12.	If you did call, was it:						
	in response to past call						
	response to hosts' comments						
	something you thought of at the time						
	something that's been on your mind for a while						
	other						
13.	What is your view of the caller to the particular show?						
	interested						
	lonely						
	educated						
	just want to hear themselves						

	Goldstein	Gray	Farber	Fredericks	Meltzer	Kuriansky
13. (con't.)						
just like me						
bored						
other						
14. How does the host treat the caller?						
fairly						
impatient						
sympathetic						
sarcastic						
patient						
other						
15. Why do you think people call the particular show?						
reaffirm own beliefs						
have a legitimate question						
to get free advice						
just to talk to someone						
to be funny						
as a last resort						
other						
16. Why do you listen?						
entertaining						
educational						
use the advice						
listen to other's problems						
a window on the world						
other						

	Goldstein	Gray	Farber	Fredericks	Meltzer	Kuriansky
17. Where do you listen?						
home						
office						
car						
18. Would you like to listen:						
more						
less						
same amount of time						
19. Why do you think others listen?						
loneliness						
like conversation						
for advice						
listen to an argument						
for knowledge						
other						
20. How long ago did you start listening to the programs? (yrs/mos/weeks)						
21. Who or what introduced you to the program?						
family						
friend						
newspaper listing						
flip the dial						
22. Should there be a time limit for each call?						
Yes						
No						

	Goldstein	Gray	Farber	Fredericks	Meltzer	Kuriansky
23. On the advice given to callers, do you generally:						
Agree with the host						
Disagree with the host						
24. In your opinion, what calls get on?						
all calls						
only those that agree with host						
only disagree with host						
a mixture of calls						
only those that sound intelligent						
other						

	interest most	interest least	lead to further discussion	advice personally used	other
Politics					
Health					
Sex					
Personal finance					
The economy					
Business advice					
Family counseling					
Marital counseling					
Drugs					
Alcohol					
Neighbors					
Real Estate					
Current events					
Consumerism					
Crime					
Religion					
Arts and Leisure					
Other					

27. Why do you think the radio call-in show is so popular? _____

28. What do you think the growing popularity of the radio call-in show says about the health of our society? _____

29. Sex: a. Male b. Female

30. Age: a. under 18 b. 18-24 c. 25-30
 d. 31-40 e. 41-50 f. 51-65 g. 65+

31. Education: a. some H.S. b. H.S. graduate c. some college
 d. college grad e. post-graduate or professional school

32. Occupation: a. professional b. managerial c. sales d. military
 e. clerical f. homemaker g. student h. retired
 i. other

Appendix 1-a

**PROFILE OF AVERAGE QUARTER HOUR
ADULT RADIO LISTENERS FOR STATION FORMATS**
(Weekdays 6AM-Midnight)

	Median Age*	Median H.H. Income	% Attend/ Grad. College/ \$25,000+ H.H. Inc.
Adult Contemporary	32½ yrs.	\$16,500	13%
All News	44½ yrs.	\$19,000	19
AOR/Progressive	25½ yrs.	\$19,500	17
Beautiful Music	42 yrs.	\$20,500	17
Black	32½ yrs.	\$12,500	7
Classical/Semi-Classical	35 yrs.	\$21,500	28
Contemporary/Disco	32 yrs.	\$16,500	12
Country	40½ yrs.	\$14,500	7
Golden Oldies	31 yrs.	\$14,000	10
Middle of the Road	42 yrs.	\$17,500	13
Religious	38½ yrs.	\$14,500	8
Soft Rock	25 yrs.	\$19,000	26
Talk	48½ yrs.	\$19,500	15
All Radio Listening (U.S. Adult Pop.)	37 yrs. (40.7 yrs.)	\$17,000 (\$16,469)	13 (13)

*Editor's estimate based on SMRB data.

SOURCE: Simmons Market Research Bureau, 1979.

AREAS OF PEAK LISTENER APPEAL FOR SELECTED RADIO STATION FORMATS

	Age	Occupation	H.H. Income	Region
CONTEMPORARY	12-34	All categories	\$10,000-17,500	All Regions
ROCK	16-24	All categories	\$15,000-20,000	N. East, E. Cent., Pac.
BLACK	12-34	Clerical, Blue Collar	Under \$15,000	S. East S. West N. East
M.O.R.	30 & Over	All categories	\$10,000-20,000	N. East Central
COUNTRY	30-65	Blue Collar	Under \$15,000	Central S. East, S. West
GOOD MUSIC	35 & Over	Prof/Mgrs Clerical & Sales	\$17,500 & Over	N. East Pacific
CLASSICAL	25 & Over	Prof/Mgrs.	\$20,000 & Over	N. East Pacific
NEWS/TALK	45 & Over	Prof/Mgrs, Clerical & Sales	\$15,000 & Over	N. East Pacific
ALL NEWS	40 & Over	Prof/Mgrs Clerical & Sales	\$15,000 & Over	N. East Pacific

SOURCE: Editor's estimates.

Appendix 3

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR STAFF

1. How do you see your role?
2. How do you do your job?
3. Why do you think people call in?
4. What precipitates calls?
5. Who are the callers?
6. Are there any gender differences in the callers?
7. What effect does anonymity have for the caller?
8. Who do you believe the audience is?
9. What needs are met for the listener? For the caller?
10. What values does the host present?
11. Is it a true reflection of reality?
12. What topics does the host encourage and discourage?
What agenda is set?
13. What is the host's appeal? Who are his/her fans?
14. Please explain the appeal to "family" and "community"
in talk radio.
15. Is call-in radio a forum for all ideas? Which ones?
16. Why is advice popular now?
17. Does the program mirror society or is it an advocate
for change?
18. What do you think people do with what they hear on
talk radio?