A STUDY OF EXCHANGE STRUCTURES IN METRO TV'S 'AFTER HOURS' PROGRAM

Riskha Fidhiya Aulia*
Susie Chrismalia Garnida**

ABSTRAK. Artikel ini tentang analisis struktur alih peran dalam percakapan antara pemandu dan penelepon pada program berbahasa Inggris di Metro TV "After Hours". Tujuannya untuk mengetahui jenis tindakan memulai - menanggapi yang dihasilkan oleh pemandu dan penelepon. Mengadopsi teori Strenstrom (1994) sebagai kerangka teoretis, penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif untuk memeriksa sepuluh (10) percakapan dalam program "After Hours". Analisis menunjukkan bahwa ada pertukaran tindakan memulai - menanggapi tertentu yang sesuai dengan teori Strenstrom ini. Namun ada juga pertukaran yang tidak sesuai teori. Studi ini menemukan bahwa 18 poin dalam sepuluh percakapan tidak cocok dengan teori Strenstrom ini. Kemungkinan alasan untuk ketidakcocokan ini termasuk fakta bahwa pemandu dan penelepon berbagi pengetahuan umum, dan penerima ingin memberikan informasi kepada pembicara untuk memperbaiki asumsi pembicara. Meskipun respon tak selalu sepadan, percakapan berjalan dengan baik dan mereka yang terlibat bisa saling memahami dengan baik.

Kata kunci: *exchange structure*, *responding act*

INTRODUCTION

Interests in spoken discourse have flourished since the field of discourse analysis was first introduced to the study of language use. Topics of the analysis of spoken discourse have a very wide range, from an analysis of a simple exchange structure of greetings and farewell, analy-sis of casual conversations, to an analysis of a discourse in various professions. The main purposes of the studies range vary from identifying the typical lexical and grammatical features to identifying the ge-neral structure of the whole conversation.

Spoken language is different from written language in a number of features. These include the distinction between the speech of these whose language is highly influenced by long and constant immersion in written language forms and the speech of those whose language is relatively un-influenced by written forms of language. For the majority of the population, even of a 'literate' country, spoken language will have very much less in common with the written language. This, again, is a point appreciated by Goody: "some individuals spend more time with the written lan-guage than they do with the spoken". There are,

of course, advantages for the speaker. Under some circumstances a face-to-face interaction is preferred but, in others, for varieties of different reasons, the indivi-dual may prefer to conduct his transaction in writing. Whereas in a spoken interaction the speaker has the advantage of being able to monitor his listener's minute-by-minute reaction to what he says, he also suffers from the disadvantage of exposing his own feelings ('leaking'; Ekman & Friesen, 1969 in Brown And Yule, 1983 p: 14) and of having to speak clearly and concisely and make immediate response to whichever way his interlocutor reacts (Brown and Yule, 1983, p:14).

Spoken language has many forms, from casual conversations, lectures, speech, doctor-patient consultations, news interviews, interaction in the classroom, etc. Thus analysis of spoken language may take any of the above forms as the object of study. McCarthy (1991) points out that discourse analysis of spoken language may begin with examining the minimal exchange structure such as greetings and farewells. The analysis may focus on identifying the structural elements of the exchange. Each element is called an 'act.'

*   Riskha Fidhiya Aulia, S.S., alumni Prodi Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Sastra, Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya
** Dra. Susie Chrismalia Garnida, M.Pd., dosen Prodi Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Sastra, Universitas 17 AGustus 1945 Surabaya

The first element spoken by the addresser is called an 'initiating act' while the re- sponse from the addressee is called the 'responding act' (Stenstrom, 1994).

For the present study, an exchange as the minimal interactive unit, comprising at least an initiation (I) from one speaker and a response (R) from another. The simplest structure for an exchange is therefore IR. The most obvious example of such an exchange is probably a question-answer pair, with the structure QA (Stubbs, 1983).

The above principles of exchange analysis can be further explained with the nature of conversation in human communication. Stenstrom states that conversation as a social activity in which it involves two or more people participants who talk about something (Strenstom, 1994, p:189). Conversations are sometimes the ideal form of communication, depending on the participants' intended ends. Conversations may be ideal when, for example, each party desires a relatively equal exchange of information, or when one party desires to question the other. On the other hand, if permanency or the ability to review such information is important, written com-munication may be ideal. Or if time-efficiency is most important, a speech may be preferable *(Wikipedia.com)*. Firstly, the speaker says something by producing statement, question, request or whatever she or he wants to say then the addressee is expected to respond by answering the speaker's question, such as agreeing or dis-agreeing to the speaker's question, request, etc.

The focus of this study is identifying the structural elements of the exchange structure in conversation. It specifically aims at identifying the structure of minimal exchange between television hosts and their audience or caller in interactive TV programs. For the purpose of the study the data will be taken from short conver-sations between the hosts of Metro TV's "After Hours" program and the phone callers who respond to the program interactively. "After Hours" is an English-language program on Metro TV that presents interesting topics to be enjoyed. Broadcast every midnight and the callers are the people who want to give their opinion about the topic.

The purpose of the study is therefore to analyze the structure of conversation exchange between the hosts of Metro TV's 'After Hour' program and the phone callers who respond to the program. It specifically will examine the structural elements of the exchange structure and the language features of each element in the structure. This study is expected to contribute to the body of knowledge in the area of conversation analysis in particular and the area of spoken discourse in general.

The problem to be investigated in this research is: What are the exchanges of conversation between the hosts of Metro TV's "After Hours" program and its callers?

Exchange Structure in Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis looks at ordinary everyday spoken discourse aims to understand, from a fine-grained analysis of the conversation, how people manage their interaction. It also looks at how social relations are developed through the use spoken of discourse. Conversation analysis is an approach to the analysis of spoken discourse that looks at the way in which people manage their everyday con-versational interactions. Conversation analysis has examine aspects of spoken discourse such as sequences of related utterance (adjacency pairs), preferences for particular combinations of utterance (preference organization), turn taking, feed back, repair, conversational opening and closing, discourse markers and response tokens. Conversation analysis works with recording of spoken data and carries out careful and fine-grained analyses of this data (Brian, 2006: 107). One part of turn taking that the writer used in her theory is The Exchange Structure.

According to Sinclair and Coulthard (1994:99), an exchange is made up of three moves: an initiating move from the speaker, a responding move from the addressee, and a fol-low-up from the speaker. A move is the smallest free unit of discourse and is made up of one or more than one act. An act is a unit of discourse, and it is characterized according to its function in the discourse. Moreover, they propose that a

typical exchange has three elements of structure: an initiation, a response, and a follow-up. An initiation is the first obligatory move in the exchange, a response is the next obligatory move in the exchange after the initiation, and a follow-up ratifies the response. In the study, a special attention to the elements of exchange structure that are initiating and responding acts only.

Initiating Act

According to Stenstrom (1994:102), initiating act is the signal of what the speaker wishes to open the exchange. Initiation can be in the form of making a statement, asking a question, and putting forward a request. Furthermore, initiation is expected to be replied, to answered, and accepted, respectively. The basic initiating acts are *statement, question,* and *request* in which all of them are expected to be responded with reply and answer.

Question

Question is the act of asking information or confirmation and expected to be answered. It can be sub classified according to the kind of answer.

Identification question are typically realized by an interrogative sentence containing WH-word. Depending on which WH-word is used; the information required is either specifying or open-ended. Only very precise information will do the WH-word. If the question involves what, why, and how, on the other hand, there are no restrictions on what kind of information can be expected. Who, where, which, and when ask for specification. What, why, and how, there are no restrictions on what kind of information and how much information can be expected.

Polarity question are typically realized by an utterance asking for a yes/no answer. However, there will not be indication that the questioner expects for a yes answer rather than a no answer. Thus, such question requires yes/no answer so that the answer will not sound odd.

Confirmation question can be expressed in the tag question or a declarative utterance. It is expressing what the speaker assumes to be true and the speaker is inviting the addressee to

confirm that his/her assumption is true, and still requires yes or no answer.

Statement

Statement is the act of supplying information and expected to be acknowledged. To state means to put into words. Statement is a very wide concept; nevertheless, the description will be restricted to two main variants: *inform* and *opine*. *Inform* presents neutral information. They are typically realized by a declarative utterance. Usually, the speakers say the truth or the fact. *Opine* is the expression of the speaker's personal opinion, his/her feelings, and attitudes.

Request

Request is the act of asking the speaker to do something or to the addressee to do something and expect to be accepted. There are two categories of request, which are action request and permission request. *Action request* is the act of telling somebody to do something. Action request is realized by interrogative, declarative, and imperative utterance. *Permission request* is also realized by interrogative, declarative, and imperative utterance like the action request does. The fact that both categories of request can be answered by yes or no seems to indicate that they are basically polarity question. What decides the interpretation is only the actual situation. For example, *can I smoke here* can either ask whether it is possible to smoke or whether one is allowed to smoke. However, in the example *could you give me another recommendation* would probably be interpreted as asking for action in the first place, since *could you* is a conventional marker of request function.

Responding Act

Stenstrom states that responding act is the signal what the addressee wishes to continue or terminate the exchange. The way people respond is a result of what has been done in the initiating move. If the previous speaker made a statement, the addressee will have to respond to it by acknowledging, agreeing or objecting the statement; if she or he asked a question, the

addressee will have to respond to it by complying, implying, supplying, evading or disclaiming the question. If she or he made a request from the speaker (Stenstrom 1994:118).

Responding to Question

A question expects a proper answer. However, not all answers are 'proper' in the sense that they really answer the question. The following sub-categories can occur from most to least appropriate. *Comply* is the only answer that answer directly and adequately to a question. All the others are not exactly or not all straight to the point. Thus, it can be said that comply provides no more and no less than information asked for. *Imply* is the act of giving adequate information implicitly. *Supply* is part of answer, which gives inadequate information. It does not really answer the question or does not give a clear answer. Moreover, the addressee tries to give other additional information that is not related to the question. *Evade* is part of answer in which it is avoiding answering consciously. *Disclaim* declares that the answer remains unknown.

Responding to Statement

When a speaker makes a statement, she or he expects a reply signaling some kind of reaction. There are three subcategories of the reply, which are, acknowledge, agree, and object. *Acknowledge to inform and opine* is the signal that B accepts what A said as a valid contribution to the conversation. When A informs B something, B is expected to show that she or he has received the information. The most economical way of responding is using acknowledge, which is an extremely useful device, since it allows B to respond to without revealing whether she or he approves or disapproves of what she or he heard. Acknowledge depends on the initiating act, whether the speaker it means that the addressee is following the speaker's information. It also reflect B's attitude to what A said, more or less strongly. *Agreeing to inform and opine* is the indication that B approves what A means. If A just provides information, there is no need for B

to do more than approve let A go on. In order the conversation runs smoothly, sometimes some kinds of additional explanation are needed rather than only saying one-word of agree like good, absolutely, alright, or fine. Since conversation is a continuous give and take, be often acknowledged receipt of information and goes on. *Objecting to inform and opine* is the signal that B does not agree with A. it would be impossible to say that B agrees to everything A said. It would either give the impression that B did not have an opinion of her or his own, or that she or he either did not have anything to say or was simply not interested, with disastrous consequences for the conversation.

Responding to Request

Request can be responded to by a positive responding act and negative responding act. Accepting, being a positive action, it is not a big problem. On the other hand, rejecting being a negative action, often requires tact and diplomacy. *Accept* is an act that is fully satisfactory. *Evade* means unable to do what the speaker requests by giving the reason why but not answering in plain words. *Reject* is the act of disagreeing what the speaker's request. Usually, reject is often followed by a justification of giving the reason why.

RESEARCH METHOD

The research design of the study is descriptive qualitative because this research is studying in real-world situation (Bogdan,1928: 28), and the data being collected is in form of words or pictures rather than number (wikipedia.com). The data source were ten spontaneous conversations between participants in the Metro TV "After Hours" program. The program involve two hosts and some callers and the duration is thirty minutes. The data were collected from October 2012 – November 2012.

RESULTS

The data analysis shows that some of the exchanges support Stenstrom's theory and some others are different from Stenstrom's classification.

Exchange structures that comply with Stenstrom's classification

The various exchange structures of Initiating –Responding Acts are illustrated in the excerpts of data below.

a. Polarity Question-Comply (PQ-Co).

(1) 1.1 S: *Tama, are you a blackberry user,Tama?*

   1.2 T: *Yes, I'm a blackberry user*

Data (1) shows the exchange of "Polarity Question – Comply". It can be noticed that in (1.1) the host, Stanley (S) likes to ask a question to identify whether the caller is a blackberry user. Then, the caller, Tama (T) answers the question by giving an explicit direct answer.

b. Polarity Question-Supply (PQ-S)

Data (2) shows the exchange of "Polarity Question – Supply".

(2) 1.3 S: *Ok. Will you still wait for latest version next year, on March?*

   1.4 T: *I'm a blackberry user but I'm not too interested to blackberry*

This exchange shows that the speaker wants to ask a question and the responder gives an answer that does not really answer the question (1.4). Instead, the answer is not related to the question from the host.

c. Identification Question-Comply".

(3) 2.13 S : *oh why? You said you want it*

   2.14 Sa: *because there are a lot of gadgets that are better than a blackberry and for the specification also the connection*

In data (2.13), the exchange of Identification Question – Comply between Stanley (S) as the host and Salsa (Sa) as the caller occurs. Stanley (S) wants to know more to the caller about the topic that they are talking about. In this data, the host wants to know why Salsa (Sa) wants to stop using blackberry whereas she says that she wants

to wait a new version of blackberry before. "it" in the part of conversation above refers to "new version of blackberry". Therefore, Stanley (S) wants to know the answer by asking the caller, Salsa (Sa). It can be seen from the word "why". Here, "why" is part of the identification question since it is one of the WH-word that is characteristic of identification question. Then, the caller answers to him by giving an explicit answer that there are a lot of gadget that are better than blackberry, that is why she wants to stop using blackberry.This exchange shows that Stanley (S) as the host asks the caller a question which is typically a WH-word. Then, Putri (P) as the caller responds to the question by giving an explicit answer.

d. Confirmation Question – Comply (CQ-Co) Structure.

(4) 2.1 S: *Your name is Salsa?*
   2.2 Sa: *Yes*

(5) 3.3 S: *USA?*
   3.4 P: *Yeah, just like Evelyn*

Here, the host, Stanley (S) makes the confirmation to make sure that his assumption is true. If Stanley completing his question, it will be a question tag "aren't you?". Question tag is the part of confirmation question. Then, the Caller, Salsa (Sa) responds the question by giving an explicit answer or information to Stanley (S). The word "yes" here is a direct answer means that Salsa (Sa) confirms to Stanley (S) that Stanley's (S) assumption is true.

Another Confirmation Question – Comply structure is in data (3.3-4). As seen in the data above, the host, Stanley (S) confirms to the Putri (P) as the caller whether it is true or not if the most favourite destination abroad of the caller is USA because the caller had said that her most favourite destination abroad is USA. So, the host confirms again. Then, Putri (P) answers the question by giving an explicit answer. The word *yeah* means that Stanley's (S) assumed is right. She adds *just like Evelyn* for more explaining her

answer. Evelyn here is the caller before Putri (P) that said her favourite destination abroad is also USA.

e. Identification Question – Imply (IQ-Im)

(6) 4.1 S: *morning, man. I'm doing good, man. Flying solo tonight. Thanks for calling. What's your most favorite tourism destination abroad?*

4.2 B: *actually same with Evelyn. I'm gonna say: New York.*

Here in (4.1), the host, Stanley (S) asks a question to the caller (B). Beny (B) responds to the host's question by giving an implicit answer but still answered the question. From the conversation above, it can be seen that the host actually wants to know what the caller's most favorite destination abroad. It is an identification question with the keyword "what" here is one of the parts of identification question that asked for a specification. The caller, Beny (B) gives an implicit answer that the caller's favorite destination abroad is the same with Evelyn. Evelyn is the caller before. And, Beny adds by saying *I'm gonna say New York.*

f. Opine – Agree (Op-Ag).

In this exchange, the initiator or the speaker expresses his or her feeling, judgement or evaluation about certain events, people, or object. The response to this exchange is Agree which means the responder or the addressee agrees or has the same opinion with the speaker.

(7) 4.3 S: *NY. Concrete jungle, where dreams are made of*

4.4 B: *yeah, that's right*

In this data, the host, Stanley (S) express about his evaluation about a certain objects. It can be seen from the word *NY. Concrete jungle, where dreams are made of.* This word is the expression of the host's personal opinion to the caller. Because, the fact is New York is not the place where the dream are made of. But, the caller

responds the host's opinion by agreeing his statement. It can be seen from the word *that's right.* Which is the part of agreeing. It means the caller also has the same opinion with the host.

g. Question – Supply (IQ-S)

In this exchange, the host, Stanley (S) asks a question and the responder does not really answer the question. Instead, she or he gives another answer that is not related to the question.

(8) 5.1 S: *hi good morning. Who is on the line?*

5.2 J: *as usual, I've called these two days*

Here in (5.1), Stanley (S) asks a question to identify the caller, by using the word "who". The word "who" is typically a realization from the identification question. Then, the caller responds to the question but he does not really answer the host's question. Instead, he answers with another answer that indicated he had called these two days. However, he does not say who he is. It can be seen from the word *as usual, I've called these two days.* It means that he says another answer that saying that the caller had caller these two days, and now she is calling again. He expects the host will know him by producing that answer.

h. Opine – Acknowledge (Op-Ack)

The speaker expresses his or her feeling, judgement or evaluation about certain events, people, or object. Moreover, the response to this exchange is acknowledged. It means he or she receives the speaker opine.

(9) 5.7 J: *yeah, I just think want to Barrack Obama will be the president of USA for the second time. I just hear that a speech.. Aaa.. His speech when he visiting Indonesia. I mean Depok*

5.8 A: *Ok*

In this example, the caller, Jericho (J) expresses his feeling about a certain person that is Barrack Obama. The word *I just think* is the clue that

expresses the opinion. Then, the host, Aimee (A) responds to the caller's opine by giving an acknowledgement which means that she receives the caller's opinion as an input in the conversation. However, the host does not reveal whether she agree with the caller's opine or not.

Inform – Agree (In-Ag)

This exchange shows that the speaker tells the addressee about certain events, state, or affairs. The addressee responds to him or her by agreeing to the initiator's information.

(10) 5.9 J: *he has a good speech and he has to win twice in the selection and he just give the best impact for the world and reunite the moslem citizen in the world*
5.10 S: *Right, he has left a good memory to a lot of indonesian specially and one of the thing that we like to barrack obama is the way he puts all American and Islamic countries together*

Here, the caller is informing the host that Obama just give the best impact to the world because Obama can reunite the moslem citizen in the world. Then, the host (S) responds to his statement by agreeing what the caller's said. We can see from the word *right* which is the part of agreeing and the host adds the reason to support his agreement about Barrack Obama can reunite American and Islamic countries together.

Inform – Acknowledge (In-Ack)

(11) 5.11A: *and Barrrack Obama's approaching them together*
5.12 J: *Ok, he eh*

Here, the host, Aimee (A) gives an information about certain events. Furthermore, it is responded by giving an acknowledgement. It means that what the host had said is being accepted as a valid contribution to the conversation. In this part of conversation, the host, Aimee (A) informs the caller that Barrack Obama is approaching American and Islamic together. Then, the caller, Jericho (J) acknowledges what she said. It means

that the caller receives the host's information, and the caller is willing to follow the Aimee's (A) information.

Action Request – Evade (AR-Ev)

As shown in (6.7) below, the host Aimee (A) asks the caller to do something, as she wants. The response to this initiating act is evading to reply directly to the request.

(12) 6.7 A: *ok, thank you, Realrich. Hey, comment about "Realrich" too*
6.8 R: *I'm too shy to tell about it*

The conversation above shows that Aimee is asking the caller, Realrich (R) to comment about the caller's name, "Realrich". It is an action request because Aimee (A) is asking Realrich (R) to do something. Then, the caller does not want to reply the Aimee's (A) request. He is too shy to tell about his nickname. Furthermore, he tries not to answer it by evading and trying to platitude. It can be seen from the sentence *im too shy to tell about it*. Here, instead of answering the request, the caller tells that he is shy and it means that he does not want to comment about his nickname.

Polarity Question – Imply (PQ-Im)

(13) 7.5 S: *Do your girlfriend not stress you have a voice like Alvin and the Chipmunks? haha*
7.6 D: *Haha, sometimes*

In this exchange, the host, Stanley (S) asks a question and the caller, Dedy (D) responds the question by giving an implicit answer but it is still adequate information. Here, Stanley (S) as the host wants to know whether the caller's girlfriend is stress or not if Dedy as the caller has a voice like Alvin and the Chipmunks. Alvin and the chipmunks is a cartoon that has a small voice. Because Dedy's (D) voice is small when he calls After Hours programme. However, the caller provides an answer that implicitly says that his girlfriend would be a little bit stress. It can be seen through the word *sometimes*. This word is

an adequate answer because it answers the question. Nevertheless, it is implicitly because it is not stating whether the caller's girlfriend really stress or not.

i. Action Request – Accept (AR-Acc)

In the Action request - Accept below, the caller, Dedy (D), asks the host, Aimee (A) to do something. Furthermore, the host gives an acceptance to the caller's request as the respond.

(14) 7. 7 D: *yeah yeah thank you. Mmm actually, halo? Halo? Listen to me*
  7.8 A : *yes we're here. We're watching you and listening*

In this example, the caller is requesting the host to listen to him because the line of the telephone is noisy. The sentence *listen to me* can be categorized as the action request. It means that the caller, Dedy (D) is asking the host to do something, which is to listen to him. The word *yes, we're here. We're watching you and listening* shows that the host totally agrees to do the caller's request. The host will listen to him.

j.'Inform – Object (In-Ob)

In this exchange, the speaker informs the addressee about certain events, state, or affairs. The addressee responds it by giving an objection to the speaker.

(15) 9.9 A: *I know, I mean that's the only character when Bond can fell in love again, well, how could`Stanley not fall in love again with the girl like that*
  9.10 S: *No*

From the example above, it can be noticed that Aimee (A) as the speaker informs Stanley (S) about one of the character in the James Bond movie. Then, the addressee replied to her statement by objecting to what she had informed to him. It can be seen through the word *no* which means that the addressee object to the speaker's said that. The addressee provides a short answer

to answer to Aimee (A) that he does not like Eva Green.

Other Structures of Responding Acts

In this section, the writer would discuss the responding acts that do not match Strenstrom's theory.

a. Inform – Inform (In-In)

(16) 1.5 A: *So, youre not gonna wait at all even it has a very very great features, you know.. It also for the price*
  1.6 T: *I guess that I would like to have a smartphone those are blackberry just for BBM and internet connection because almost of all iPhone and iPaid served all the features that blackberry can't have*

This exchange shows that the host, Aimee (A) tells Tama (T) about a great feature and the price of the new blackberry. It means that Aimee (A) is giving Tama (T) a certain event such a information. Aimee as the hosts tell to Tama (T) about the price and the great feature of a new version of blackberry and Tama (T) responds to Aimee by giving an inform too. The caller, Tama (T) tells Aimee (A) that if he has a blackberry, it just for BBM and internet connection. This sentence proves that the caller gives an information too.

b.Inform – Confirmation Question (In-CQ)

In this exchange, the caller, Putri (P) gives information about personal experience in the past. Then, it is responded by asking for an explanation whether what she or he was talking about is true or not. It can be seen through the example below :

(17) 3.5 P: *I've been there before but I want to stay longer in the Big Apple*
  3.6 S: *wow, you've been there?*

From this conversation, the caller informs the host about her personal experience when she visited New York. The word *I've been there*

before shows that the caller, Putri (P) had been in the place where they are talking about. Then, the host, Stanley (S) is asking for an explanation whether the caller tells the truth or not. It seems when Stanley (S) asks the caller to confirm what Putri said. If Stanley's question is complete, it will be *you've been there, haven't you*? It is a confirmation question. Thus, Stanley (S) wants to know more about the detail.

c. Polarity Question – Inform (PQ-In)

In this exchange, the host asks a question and it is responded by an inform from the addressee.

(18) 4.9 S : *I can get some much watch you from here, man. Haha. Just kidding. Is there anything else you wanna say by your favorite tourism destination abroad?*

4.10B: *The first thing I've to say.. NY is my first destination if I could go there so Im gonna say NY is my first destination*

Here, the host wants to know whether the caller wants to say something about his favourite destination abroad or not. This question expects a yes or no answer only. In this case, the caller does not answer a yes or no answer instead he provides an answer that shows an information that if he can go to his favourite destination abroad, he wants to go to New York.

d. Polarity Question – Confirmation Question (PQ-CQ)

This structure can be noticed that the caller, Jericho (J) asks the addressee a question. Then, the addressee responds it by confirming to the caller (J) that Aimee's (A) assumption is true.

(19) 5.3 J : *Don't you remember bro?*

5.4 A : *Oh, Jericho from Jakarta?*

In this conversation, the caller asks whether the host still remember him or not. This question is a question that expected for a yes or no answer.

However, the host, Aimee (A) responds it by confirming the caller that it is true or not if he is Jericho from Jakarta.

e. Confirmation Question – Inform (CQ-In)

In this part of conversation, the confirmation question needed to be answered by complying, implying, supplying, evading, or disclaiming. However, in this part, the writer found that a confirmation question was responded with an information, as shown below:

(20) 5.5 A: *So, you've been follow this campaign, haven't you?*

5.6 J : *This campaigne is just.. it becomes a trending topic all over the world*

Here, the host (A) wants to confirm that her assumption is true. It can be seen from the sentence *so, you've been follow this campaign? Haven't you?*. The question tag is a part of a confirmation question. This question shows that the host, Aimee (A) assumes that the caller, Jericho (J) had been follow the news of Barrack Obama and Romney's champion. Then, the caller gives an information that the campaigne is becomes a trending topics all over the world. It means, he had follow the news of the campaign.

f. Opine – Reject (Op-Re)

In this exchange, the speaker expresses his or her feeling, judgement about certain events, people, or objects. Then, the addressee gives a reject to the speaker's opinion.

(21) 6.3 S: *I just think that debate before he just get for economic futures in USA, Obama did bring well with his charismatics that Romney deserves too. Romney is get the money, hahaha*

6.4 R: *haha, I just think it's not, it's just not about the work, it is the election of USA's favourite*

Here, the host, Stanley (S) express his feeling and his personal opinion about Romney that Romney is having a lot of money to win the

chance to be the next president of USA. It can be noticed from the word *Romney is get the money*. This word is the expression of the host's personal opinion about Romney. Then, Realrich as the caller rejects the host's opinion. It can be seen from the word *I just think it's not* and the caller gives the reason and explanation why he rejects the host's opine.

g. Identification Question – Identification Question (IQ-IQ)

Another exchange that is not included in the Stenstrom's theory is Identification Question – Identification Question (IQ-IQ). In this exchange, the speaker asks a question and the addressee also asks a question indicating that she or he does not get the point about what the initiator is saying. It can be seen from the example below:

(22) 6.9   S: *but wait. What do you really mean of "Realrich"? haha*
      6.10 R: *what?*

In this example, Stanley (S) as the host asks a question to Realrich (R) as the caller because he wants to know about the caller's nickname "Realrich". Stanley (S) wants to know what he means about its nickname. This question is included in the identification question because it is using the word "what" in *what do you mean of Realrich?*. The word "what" as in the theory said is a part of the identification question. Then, Realrich ® responds to it by giving another question indicating that he does not hear what the host had said. The respond which is giving by the caller is "what?". It is also a part of the identification question.

h. Identification Question – Acknowledge (IQ-Ack)

This exchange shows that the speaker asks addressee a question in which it is typically realized by WH-word. The addressee responds the question by an acknowledgement.

(23) 7.1   S: *yeah ok, you're connected Dedy. What do you wanna say?*
      7.2 D: *Ok good morning, Stanley*

Here, the host asks a question to the caller of what the caller's wants to say about the topic that they are talking about. The word "what" in what do you wants say here is included in the identification question. In return, the caller acknowledges what the host's said. It means the caller received the host's question and the caller is willing to follow the host's question by greeting him first.

i. Opine – Confirmation Question (Op-CQ)

Here, the speaker expresses his or her feeling, judgement, or evaluation about certain events, people, or objects. Moreover, the response to this exchange is Confirmation Question. It means that the addressee here wants to confirming about the speaker's opinion, as found in the example below:

(24) 7.11 D: *because I think the middle east would come to the country, the nation for their own prosperity. And I think Obama, he is a represent from a religion or ethnic in America and he has a good possibility to win this election, I would say like that. He is able to unite the citizen of America*
      7.12 S: *Especially, African-Ameri-can, right?*

In this example, Dedy as the caller expresses his personal evaluation about Barrack Obama. Here, the caller said that Obama is a represent from a religion or ethnic in America and Obama is able to unite the citizen of America. The word "I think" here is identified as opine. The host as the addressee, responds to the caller's opine by asking for an explanation to him if the host's assumption is true. In the example above shows that the host asks the caller if Obama is able to unite African and American. The word "African – American, right?" is the sign that the host asks a confirmation to the caller.

j. Permission Request – Confirmation Question (PR-CQ)

This exchange shows that the host, Aimee (A) asks the callers if the host could do some

thing. The response that occurs in this part is Confirmation Question. It means that the caller is asking for an explanation whether his assumption is true, like the conversation below:

(25) 8.7 A : *can I imagine if im being an American?*
8.8 An: *you'll imagine if you were an American? haha*

The part of conversation above shows that the host, Aimee (A) will imagine if she is an American, because the conversation they are talking about is about the next president of USA. It can be seen from the word "can I?" which is showed that the host asks a permission request whether she could imagine or not. The caller, as the responder, responds to the host by asking an explanation to her if his assumption is true. If the word *you'll imagine if you were an American here* complete, it will be "you'll imagine if you were an American, won't you? " which is the question tag here is the part of confirmation question.

k. Action Request – Acknowledge (AR-Ack)
This exchange shows that the host as the speaker asks the addressee to do something. Then, the addressee gives an acknowledgement as the response of the speaker's request.

(26) 9.7 A : *are you laughing or a spirit is prossessing you? Don't laugh like that, haha. How can you laugh without stopping it at all? Haha. Take a deep breathe. Easy, easy all right. Now exhale slowly, haha*
9.8 Sy: *oh yeah*

In this example, the host is asking the caller to stop laughing and continue the conversation. Then, the caller responds to the host's request by giving an acknowledgement which means that he received the host's request as an input the conversation. However, the caller does not reveal whether he approves to the host's question or not.

l.Identification Question – Opine (IQ-Op)
Here, the host asks a question to the caller. Then, the caller as the addressee expresses his or her feeling, judgement about certain event, people, or objects. As seen in the example below :

(27) 9.11 S: *What about the old one? The old 007, the classic one Maud Adams, Halle Berry, Rosamund Pike?*
9.12Sy: *I think, the newer james bond movie have a really good, you know with a good effect*

In the example above, the host is asking about the caller's opinion about the old James Bond movie. The sentence *what about the old one* here is the sign that the host is asking about the caller's personal opinion. Then, the caller answers the host's question by giving his personal opinion. The word *I think* here is the part of opinion.

m. Opine – Identification Question (Op-IQ)
In this exchange the speaker expresses his or her feeling, judgement or evaluation about certain events, people or objects. Moreover, the response to this exchange is identification question. It means that the addressee wants to know more about the speaker's opinion, as found in the example below
(28) 10.3 S   : *oh the cute one with the blonde hair, I think*
10.4 M : *how about her eyes? Haha*

In this example, the host expresses his feeling and judgement about Rosamund Pike, and the caller wants to ask the host's opine about Pike's eyes. It can be seen from the word *how about her eyes?* Here, "how" is part of the identification question since it is one of the WH-word that is characteristics of identification question

m. Action Request – Comply (AR-Co)
Here, the speaker asks to the addressee to do something. Furthermore, the addressee gives an explicit answer.

(29) 10.7 S: *well, well let's have some imagina-*
tion if Indonesian girl has to be one
of the bonds girls then..
10.8 M: *then Aimee would match the char-*
acter, haha

This example shows that the host is asking the caller to imagine if Indonesian girl has to be one of the bonds girl. The word *then* means that the host is requesting to the caller to continue the imagination. The caller responds to him by giving an explicit answer that Aimee would be match with the character of Bond's girl. Aimee here is one of the host.

DISCUSSION

The conversations between the hosts and the callers of *After Hours* programme are not limited only to the exchange as stated in the Stentrom's classification. Initiating acts can be used as responding acts, such as identification question, informs, confirmation question, etc. The response to a question does not always answer a question. A statement, can be responded with a comply, imply, etc which are parts of the response of question. A request, for example, can be responded by acknowledge, etc.

Stenstrom's classification of exchange of initiating – responding acts is not always applicable all the time. The other initiating – responding acts can happen in the informal conversation. There are several reasons that cause it happens. For example, it can happen because the host and the callers are sharing a common knowledge. It also can happen because the hosts or the callers are saying incomplete information so that one of the hosts or the callers adding other information to complete the information. Sometimes, the hosts want to confirm what the caller's said to make sure whether his or her assumption is true or not in order that the conversation can still run well although they do not always have to be responded with the proper responding acts according to the Strenstrom's classification. The speaker and addressee can use any kind of initiating – responding acts as long as they know what they are talking about, then the conversation still can

continue. It means that in the informal conversation, the exchange of initiating – responding acts can be varied and unpredictable. The writer can say that as long as both of the host and the caller understand each other, the conversation can keep going on.

CONCLUSION

Generally, the After Hours's conversation there are various exchanges of initiating-responding acts that occurs in the conversation. There are two kinds of exchange. The first is the exchange of initiating – responding acts that are stated by Stenstrom. The second finding is the exchange of initiating – responding acts that are not stated by Stenstrom.

In the conversation, a statement is not always responded by acknowledge, accept, or object. On the other hand, it can be responded by complying, implying, informing, etc. A question is not always responded by complying, implying, supplying, evading, or disclaiming the question. It can be responded by an answer that actually a part of the question too. For the action request, it is not always responded by accepting, evading, or rejecting the request. This happens for a several reasons: (1) The hosts or the callers are saying an incomplete information so that one of the hosts or the callers add another information to complete the information. (2) Sometimes, the hosts want to confirm what the caller's said to make sure that his or her assumption is true or not in order the conversation can still run well. (3) It also can happen because the addressee wants to give information to the speaker to correct the speaker's assumption. (4) Then, the addressee rejects the speaker's opine because he does not have the same opinion with the speaker. (5) It also happen because the addressee does not understand what the speaker' said so the addressee asks a question to responds a question.

Although there are exchanges that are not appropriate with Strenstrom's theory in the conversation, it does not affect the smoothness of the conversation itself. The conversation can still keep going on although they produce exchanges

that do not match according to Strenstrom's classification.

Finally the writer hopes that this research can give a better knowledge to the readers about how the conversation happens in the television programme. The writer hopes that this study can be used as reference to those who wants to do a research about initiating and responding acts.

REFERENCES

Brown, Gillian and George Yule. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

http://www.litnotes.co.uk/conversation.htm

Paltridge, Brian. 2006. *Discourse Analysis.* London: Continuum.

Strenstrom, Anna-Brita. 1994. *An Introduction to Spoken Interaction*. London and New York: Longman.

Stubbs, Michael. 1983. *The Sociolinguistics Analysis of Natural Language*. England: Cowle Road.

Wikipedia.com

www.metrotv/afterhours.com