CHAPTER NINE

JUST BE YOURSELF? TALK RADIO PERFORMANCE AND AUTHENTIC ON-AIR SELVES

HELEN WOLFENDEN

There is a standard piece of advice that talk radio presenters almost always get when they start working on-air: "Just be yourself". It sounds easy, especially when you hear people every day who are good at it. But more often than not, as soon as you are sitting in the studio by yourself, trying to talk into the microphone, the words that come out and the way they come out sound nothing like you expect – or the way the advice suggests. There are exceptions to this; people who can step up to the microphone and sound as if they have been there forever. But for many people it is a struggle – and with good reason. The advice belies the complexity of the task at hand.

This chapter is based on research with practitioners about how they do their work. Within studies of radio, *practice* is generally unexplored. Hesmondhalgh (quoted in Beck, 2003: i) calls it "the vitally important but shamefully neglected topic of cultural work". Enquiry tends to focus on broadcasting outputs. However, much can be gained from engaging practitioners in developing our understanding of the medium.

Which self? Which personality?

The modern style of radio presentation has been described as "personality radio" (Geller, 1996; Guilfoyle, 2002). This refers to broadcasters who build a relationship with their audience, based on embedding their authentic self – their personality – into their on-air presentation. These presenters are highly desirable to radio managers because, the theory goes, they attract and keep audiences. The reality is

likely to be much more complicated than that. Personality has always been a nebulous term and the "self" is also a tricky concept to unpack. But given that a radio presenter's livelihood will depend on it, it is worth delving into the complexities.

Some corners of academia have noted the dilemma. Tolson calls it:

> ... the 'professional ideology' of media presentation… But what do these people talk about when asked to describe the key attributes of the job? Overwhelmingly and routinely, these are reduced to the imperative of 'being yourself'. (2001, p. 446)

The essence of the problem is contained within the expression, "Be yourself". It assumes that human beings have a single identity, a single personality. "Be yourself", in the singular, does not leave any space for more sophisticated understandings of self, which have long gone beyond the unitary (Blumer, 1969; Cooley, 1922; Mead, 1934; Sullivan, 1953). So it would be reasonable for a presenter to ask: "Which self?" Added to the unitary self is the implied requirement for the "authentic" self. Montgomery illustrates the complexion of authenticity within a broadcasting context:

> Because broadcast talk by its nature takes place in the mediated public sphere, it is frequently - to a greater or lesser extent - staged for performance: and the performed character of the talk displays itself in various ways - for instance, in the pre-allocation of turns, in the reactions of a studio audience, or in a perceived sense of scriptedness. 'Authentic talk' in the public sphere might, by contrast, be seen as the reverse of this. It is a condition to which some kinds of broadcast talk aspire, in which traces of performance are effaced or supressed. (2001, pp. 397-8)

But while researchers like Montgomery and Tolson can help clarify the phenomenon, the view is that of an outsider. There has been a surprising lack of engagement with practitioners about how they experience and respond to these pressures. How does a radio presenter answer the question of how to "be yourself" on air? As part of the research on which this chapter is based, I conducted depth interviews with 14 radio presenters, eight producers, two leading radio trainers and close family or friends of the presenters. The presenters and producers all worked for Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) Local Radio stations or Radio National, presenting live daily (weekday) programmes.

My research process was informed by my own experience as a talk radio presenter. I began my broadcasting career as a "rookie" with the ABC regional Local Radio network, and as well as working on my own presentation skills, was in time responsible for recruiting and then training and managing several beginning on-air broadcasters, many of whom had no specific training in broadcasting. The apparent simplicity, but practical elusiveness of a normal, ordinary, engaging and authentic presence on air remained a challenge. Standard devices or training formulae seemed to have limited connection with practitioners' actual process, and limited effectiveness in improving it. Within this set of puzzles, an investigation into how radio broadcasters actually achieve the state of being a natural, funny, attractive, interesting, intelligent conversation partner, while sitting in a room by themselves, was long overdue.

Authenticity and performance

For the first decade of the 21st century, the ABC's approach to presentation was encapsulated by the highly naturalistic imperative of "personality radio". There had been a move away from the more remote, "objective" and authoritative presentation tradition inherited from the BBC. Now presenters were being encouraged to tell their own stories, to bring their lives and experiences into the programme content, and to allow listeners to build a connection with a "real" person – to have a "conversation" with the listener. Why the shift? The authentic self, as embodied by the conversational presentation style, is attractive to radio producers and station managers, "presumably because its verbal forms project in the public sphere in a cluster of values widely held to be desirable: egalitarianism, informality, intimacy, greater possibilities for participation, and so on" (Montgomery, 2001, p. 398).

Another reason is likely to be about creating a perception of presenters as "ordinary" – a mechanism that would also bolster authenticity. Tolson draws on Sacks' (1984) notion of "doing being ordinary", with the understanding that "Being an ordinary person is not something which is pre-given" and "…'being ordinary' is accomplished in the ways people tell stories about their experiences, in typically mundane ways" (2001, p. 449).

For some of the radio presenter interviewees then, my question of whether the on-air work is a performance represented a significant challenge to the dominant discourse. Performance is not considered to be

"ordinary" or "authentic". "Performance" is a loaded word, redolent of staginess or calculation.

In his seminal sociological study, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959), Erving Goffman dedicates his first chapter to "performance". Goffman's discussion is centred on ordinary and everyday contexts, and for most people a radio studio does not fit into that category – unless you are a radio presenter. But Goffman does take a particular interest in radio at various points in his work. And while a radio studio might be considered to be a foreign environment for most, listening to the radio, and the listening context for radio (in the car, kitchen or via a personal audio player) very much fits within Goffman's everyday, familiar setting for the evolution of a "self".

The radio studio is a very strange environment. As a presenter, your job is to sit in an often padded room, in front of a microphone and a complicated technological console, and speak to—as Paddy Scannell describes it—the "unknown, invisible absent listeners". This is a challenge which Scannell describes as the "fundamental communicative dilemma for broadcasters" (2000, p. 10). But even though the radio "product" is produced in this strange environment, for the listener who hears it in his or her everyday listening context, it must feel warm and familiar. If we understand the self as socially constructed, as Goffman and Symbolic Interactionists do (Goffman, 1959; Mead, 1934), that makes the task for presenters of working out an on-air self—or how to be yourself on radio—very tricky indeed.

Goffman defined performance as "all the activity of an individual which occurs during a period marked by his continuous presence before a particular set of observers and which has some influence on the observers" (1959, p. 22). There are, of course, other definitions. In this situation, performance can be taken to mean "inhabiting a character" or "being someone else". It may even be understood as a corollary of the pejorative description of someone being histrionic; of "putting on a performance". With this in mind, to question whether a presenter is performing when he or she is on-air may seem to contradict any effort to be "authentic".

Do practitioners think that it is a performance?

In the research, presenters' responses to questions around this issue proved complex and sometimes contradictory. To an initial question about

whether presenters consider themselves to be the same on-air as off-air, responses included:

> "I think I'm almost exactly the same"; "I don't think very different at all"; "The same person I am to my friends"; "In some ways yes and in other ways absolutely not"; "You always need to stop and think a little bit about what you say"; "I try to be similar"; "Much closer this year"; "In a lot of ways yes"; "Relatively close"; "It has to be you"; "Yes, but I think that there are different people, not that you not become, but that you sort of are"; "The very thing you need to be on the radio is yourself".

The comparison of the on-air to the off-air self is a challenge to the "just be yourself" rhetoric. It also explores a particular kind of authenticity – the level of congruence between how presenters recognise themselves in their "radio presenter" social context, and the way they see themselves in other social contexts. For many, there is an on-going struggle to approximate one to the other. For others, there is a resolution of that struggle in the awareness that multiple selves are employed, both on-air and off, depending on the way the social context shifts.

Social theory has long held this to be a complex matter. "Erving Goffman has shown the constructed nature of identity, the self as a presentation or performance designed to be appropriate to the circumstances and settings in which it is produced in the presence of others" (Brand & Scannell, 1991, p. 201). What is important to recognise here, however, is that off-air, the appropriate self deployed to match social circumstances is much more automatically drawn out or elicited by the social context. By comparison, the on-air context, at least initially, has much or all of that information missing. What a presenter is required to do is appropriate his or her understandings from off-air social contexts to apply on-air. This takes time, as we hear when one presenter describes herself as "much closer this year".

But it is not a straight translation from off-air to on. There are modifications needed to the off-air self in order for it to meet the needs of radio presentation and avoid transgressions. The most obvious of these is swearing – but there are other functions required of the presenting role that must also be accommodated. These include time calls, personal and station identifications, as well as simultaneously-performed technical functions, such as operating the radio desk and "timing out" so the content fits precisely within the allocated programme duration. Added to that is the difference between the social context in which the talk is produced (the

radio studio) and the variety of social contexts in which it is received (perhaps the car, kitchen or anywhere else you take your audio player). This changes again once you factor in variables such as programme content and purpose (for example current affairs programmes as compared to companionable general interest shows), time of day, duration of the programme, geographic location and the frequency with which that programme is presented. And then within each individual programme, the social context potentially changes from moment to moment. The act of taking talkback calls condenses social contexts such that a presenter may be required, within the space of seconds, to move from talking to an elderly lady to a truck driver.

So make no mistake, this is a difficult task. It is not a simple process to know which parts of your off-air selves you want to plagiarise for this particular social interaction and how they have to be modified and tweaked to meet the special requirements of the on-air context.

The presenters I interviewed provided a spectrum of responses to the question of whether on-air presentation was a performance. There were emphatic no's, equally unequivocal yes's, and those who sat somewhere in between or were still wrestling to find a definitive answer. We will start off with those in the "no" category.

Madonna King is the presenter of *Mornings* on 612 ABC Brisbane. This was our exchange on the topic:

> HW: Do you think of the on-air work as a performance?
>
> MK: No I don't and I know that's probably the wrong answer. I know other presenters think that is the case. If it is, it's not what I want it to be.
>
> HW: What is it if it's not a performance?
>
> MK: It's doing a job. It's doing a job that I love and that job is to tell people who are listening to me what is going on and how will it affect them. I don't know anything in that that smells of performance and to do it in a way that's yourself but to me that's not performance either. … The first year I thought I was in an eisteddfod and it was (dramatic voice) "Good morning, my name is Madonna King!" (laughing). I saw myself up on a stage just with no audience that I could see, probably none at home either! Whereas now I know it's more a conversation. (M. King, interview, February 1, 2008)

In terms of Goffman's definition, King is clearly concerned about her "continuous presence before a particular set of observers" and she worries herself that she is not answering the question correctly. What King has done is modify and adapt the presentational self as she has become more familiar with the environment. But for King, performance has too many negative connotations to be available to describe what it is she is trying to do. Instead, "performance" describes the incorrectly applied self we might call "eisteddfod Madonna".

Lindy Burns presents *Drive* on 702 ABC Melbourne. Burns is also adamant that this is not a performance:

> LB: No. Because I did drama at uni and so I know the difference. I know the difference of… how you feel. I've been a musician. […] I don't see what I do as a performance because I don't think it's actually all about me. It's about me giving the opportunity for people to hear from guests that we bring in who have an opinion about something that's going on at the time and for them to talk and for them to express. So it's more... I see myself more as a conduit - more so than a person who is sort of the star. I never see myself as the star.
>
> HW: But isn't it you that people have the relationship with and that they turn on...
>
> LB: Yeah that's the thing I don't quite get - apparently that is the case. And that's lovely but I find it a bit bizarre to think that they kind of love me for that because they don't actually know me…
>
> HW: But don't they, if they...
>
> LB: If I'm putting myself on the air? When I was talking about concealment before, if I'm really grumpy, you would tend not to go on air and go 'I'm SOOO grumpy today I can't begin to tell you'. So yes there would be things like the horrible aspects of Lindy I would tend to try and conceal. So… they don't get the full picture. They don't get to see what my husband gets to see, for example. (L. Burns, interview, January 24, 2008)

Burns had responded to the question of whether she was the same on-air as off by saying she thought she was "almost exactly the same". Yet Burns also says that she finds it strange that her audience loves her, because "they don't actually know" her.

I pursued this further because as the conversation developed (and this happened in many of the interviews) the inherent contradiction became apparent. Burns is clearly aware of the tension. However, not unpacking the contradictions too carefully is almost a defence mechanism. Burns, the girl from humble working-class and regional Newcastle origins who now holds a highly prized on-air position in urban and chic Melbourne, sees performance as "being the centre of attention". By avoiding confronting that issue she keeps herself unaffected—and perhaps even "authentic" — or at least "Newcastle Lindy" authentic.

Several of the presenters demonstrate this tension. Participants would often start out in one place, and end up in another – exploring the territory as their position emerged through the discussion. It is hardly surprising, because much of the training literature avoids confronting many of the uncomfortable inconsistencies that come from digging beyond the platitudes (Geller, 1996, 2000; Guilfoyle, 2002; Mills, 2004; Trewin, 2004; Simons, 2007).

Scripting, authenticity and "fresh talk"

There are other ways in which both practice and understanding of this issue fall short of the complexities of the actual experience of on-air talk. Scripting is one of them. Some in the ABC advocate working without scripts, but it has remained contested territory. For those who use them, several questions emerge. How can you claim to be authentic if you are not being spontaneous? What if a producer has written a script for you? Montgomery contrasts Goffman's notion of "fresh talk" with "naturally occurring talk" and quotes Goffman's complication of the term "speaker".

> One meaning, perhaps the dominant, is that of *animator*, that is, the sounding box from which utterances come. A second is *author*, the agent who puts together, composes, or scripts the lines that are uttered. A third is that of *principal*, the party whose position, stand and belief the words attest. (Goffman in Montgomery, 2001, pp. 399-400)

Goffman defines "fresh talk" as speaking that "is formulated by the animator from moment to moment, or at least from clause to clause. This conveys the impression that the formulation is responsive to the current situation in which the words are delivered" (1981, p. 171). But if you thought you could solve the problem by ad-libbing, Goffman also notes that "Fresh talk is something of an illusion of itself, never being as fresh as

it seems" (p. 172). Clearly in an endeavour to produce fresh talk a presenter may be any combination of animator, author or principal – but not necessarily all three at once.

Jon Faine produces fresh talk by working largely unscripted. Faine presents *Mornings* and *The Conversation Hour* on 702 ABC Melbourne. Faine is something of a stalwart in the ABC and several participants reference him in their interviews and consider him a role model.

> HW: Do you think of the on-air work as a performance?
>
> JF: Oh there's no doubt it is… Geoff Rush was on *The Conversation Hour* one day and at the end of it we sort of had a bit of a chat and you know I was star struck and terribly excited and he said "No no no. What I do," - this is Geoffrey Rush speaking, he said – "someone writes a play and I learn it. I rehearse it for several weeks and then I perform it for maybe an hour and a half in front of three or four hundred people, night after night after night, for a season. And I think that's hard." He said, "But what you do, no one writes anything for you, you don't have a rehearsal, you perform for three and a half hours live, in front of hundreds of thousands of people, and then you do a completely different show the next night, the next day." (J. Faine, interview, January 23, 2008)

Faine is able to contrast his own performance with that of an actor – even better, he is able to have the actor, who is one of Australia's finest, do the job for him. This exchange between Faine and Rush can be considered in the context of two people who are at the top of their respective crafts, contrasting the different elements of performance in each of their practices. Faine demonstrates the authenticity of his performance by highlighting the freshness of the content as well as the talk and the unrehearsed delivery. Faine would generally consider himself to be the "animator" and the "author" of his performance, but not always the "principal". He recognises that the nature of the role means that sometimes he "has to ask the mongrel question". Faine says, "I'm performing a role. I don't mean performing a role theatrically, I mean performing a role in society. It's… the ABC's obligation and role of keeping people accountable in decision making…" He says that he is "not a belligerent person but on-air [he] can be" (ibid).

The exchange between Faine and Rush does not acknowledge the "routine" and "episodic" nature of radio presentation. Brand and Scannell employ this framework, along with Goffman's notion of socially

constructed selves and performance, in their examination of the work of radio presenter Tony Blackburn (1991, p. 201). Within this framework, we can see that Faine, and every radio presenter, develops familiar or safe territory within the programme. The programme will follow a similar format each day. In Faine's case, this is something along the lines of hard news early, some regular or recurring spots and guests, and the more relaxed *Conversation Hour* as the end. The elements of unpredictability and risk are inversely proportionate to the familiarity of the space, and it is reasonable to claim that the more desirable kinds of "authenticity" become more available as a presenter becomes more relaxed and familiar with their programme.

Your "best" self? Other-directedness and performance

Richard Fidler is the presenter of *The Conversation Hour* for 612 ABC Brisbane and 702 ABC Sydney, and *Afternoons* for ABC Brisbane. Fidler recognises that "we're all like lots of different people in the one" and that the performance element is being "your best self".

> RF: The self that's kind of had its cup of coffee. The self that is in a good mood. The self that's interested and hearing properly and ready for some fun, ready to just hear what anyone has to tell you. Yeah… that's the kind of performance if you like. Prepping yourself so you're in that good frame of mind. Reaching a kind of sweet spot within yourself, where you're ready to be in that frame of mind. (Laughing) And I'm not always successful at that Helen, I freely admit. […]. Yeah. They're the worst days actually. Not really with the technical mishaps, where you just churn in a dull dull show and you haven't even been able to interest yourself in it you know. You feel this kind of low level of shame.
>
> HW: So how do you cope when you are having a bad day and is that something you would talk about to the audience?
>
> RF: Then you go into performance mode. It's much more of a performance then so you fake, you put on, you do fake at that point yeah, to some degree. […] If you were to go on-air and go "Oh look I'm feeling really kind of feeling bored and tired at the moment". What's in it for the listener there? Nothing. I mean you could admit it and it would be honest but the listener's thought then is well you know, "fuck off" or "crank it up". You know "I'm here I need something from radio right now. I need to know what's happening in town, I need to feel diverted or distracted or just entertained or informed" all those things. If you're not up to it, you know, go home. So you do need to fake it on some days, some days, not often, not

> often but yeah you do you fake it sometimes. (R. Fidler, interview, February 1, 2008)

Fidler gives us another example of the requirements of the role and subsequent limitations to authenticity. It is clear that there is definitely more to this than "just being yourself". As a radio presenter you have a job to do, an obligation to the people who have bothered to switch you on. If you are in the chair, no matter what your personal dramas are at that point in time, you still have to meet your responsibilities to the audience and of course, the organisation who is paying you. It is a more complicated "set of observers" that a presenter has to serve than just the "invisible absent listener". Fidler also recognises that the fact that "it could all go horribly wrong at any given time" is part of the authenticity of the performance (ibid).

James Valentine is the presenter of *Afternoons* on 702 ABC Sydney. Valentine offers a particularly articulate description of what is happening on-air:

> JV: You've always got to think about it from the point of view of the listener. Here's a person stuck in traffic with an AM radio in their dashboard. What does this sound like? And so unless you're thinking about it in that sort of perspective all the time then you're not going to be creating interesting things that come out of the dashboard and soon as you're thinking like that you're thinking as a performer thinks. That's what performers think like. (J. Valentine, interview, January 29, 2008)

According to Valentine, you effectively "perform as yourself" which is not the same as "being yourself". "Performing yourself" further complicates the notions of authenticity and naturalness inherent in the "be yourself" injunction. Valentine points out that it takes time to learn how to do it; to become familiar with this strange social context and to work out an appropriate self for it. He says "With all of these sort of things, what… increases is your base level. The more you do it the higher your base level gets." He also recognises that the presentational self must at some level, be other-directed, because it is only through reciprocity that the presenters needs are met.

> JV: I've got the biggest ego in the world, you know, but I also know that that ego's not going to get served unless I'm there for the audience and unless I understand what the audience is wanting. And unless…it's all

about them. If I make it all about them I get my jollies. (J. Valentine, interview, January 29, 2008)

Staying amateur… and being professional

Lucky Oceans is a two-time Grammy award winning pedal steel guitarist and presenter of ABC Radio National's world music programme *The Planet*. Oceans agree that the "base level" improves but he laments the price that is paid:

> LO: When I first became a musician I noticed that my perception of my good gigs, like they were absolutely fabulous. My bad gigs were just terrible, terrible, terrible, terrible. And a lot of that is self-perception you know. The audience will see this narrow range and you'll see a huge range in your performance […] and the same thing goes in broadcasting. But as you go on you learn the skills to deliver a decent performance in any situation you know. But you don't have that hanging on the edge feeling. And a few years ago I played with a guy named Liam Gurner and he was like 19 and I said "That's the feeling!" You never know when it's going to run totally off the rails and because of that, when it's good, it's fantastic […]. What was it that William Blake said about, you know, you have innocence, experience and innocence regained? So that somehow that ties in with the amateur thing is by not thinking of myself as a professional, yeah I'm going to make mistakes and maybe have highs and lows, you know good programmes and bad programmes, but I'd rather have that than a sort of a cookie cutter predictable everyday show. (L. Oceans, interview, February 18, 2008)

So we have a paradox: Valentine, whose practice of the craft over time creates a performance that becomes more professional and for him, is "not very different at all" to the person he is off the radio. And Oceans, who seeks to retain some amateurism in an effort to recall a "rawness" that is also considered to be authentic.

It is important to consider the implications of the relationship between time and performance. Talk radio presenters in the ABC are often on-air for shifts of two hours, some as long as six. Over this daily duration, five days a week, forty weeks a year, it is difficult to sustain a self that is highly alien to the selves used in other social contexts. Oceans' example of performing a gig is quite a different context to presenting a regular live radio programme. Nevertheless, his challenge to "professionalism" offers another perspective by which to understand both performance and authenticity.

At the time of the research interview, Geraldine Mellet was presenting 720 ABC Perth's afternoon programme. Mellet also agrees that this is a performance.

> GM: Yeah I do. I do think of it as a performance. I don't think that I'm inhabiting a character. And I'd really, really hope that other people don't think that because that would go directly contrary to what I try and do on air. But I think, one of the frustrations I have sometimes is with people assuming that the kind of work we do is simply just sitting there and chatting […] Thinking about what I'm going to say, preparing questions, thinking about a structure for the interview, yeah that's a performance for me. It's not just lobbing up and sitting in my lounge room and chatting with a friend. And I hope it doesn't have the negative connotations of performance that I am therefore extraordinarily different and it's a different beast. (G. Mellett, interview, February 18, 2008)

Mellet extends the boundaries of performance to include the preparatory work involved in being on air. Consequently, she comes much closer to Goffman's broad definition of performance. Mellet qualifies her understanding of performance by eschewing the definitions that are associated with negative characteristics like artifice and pretence.

Conclusions

Most people would not hesitate to label live talk radio presentation as a performance, but when the question is taken directly to practitioners, a more complicated picture emerges. The word itself is highly compromised, and therefore not available to some to describe talk radio presentation. Tolson recognises it as a "type of public performance, but a performance which, crucially, is not perceived as 'acting'" (2001, p. 445). I push that even further and argue that from a presenter perspective, it is critical that the presentation does not sound like performance – and in some cases cannot feel like a performance either.

So what is it? It is clear that for these presenters, there is an active projection of the self for the audience: a "best" self, a self at the top of their form. As in all such presentations of the self, the projection is a function of the relationship, and what the presenter would like the relationship to be, and what it will be allowed to be by their audience. The relationship is not of a friend or confidante or family member or new-person-you-met-at-a-party, though no doubt presenters cannibalise any or all of these for the purpose at hand. The relationship is of broadcaster to

audience. The audience is known through the presenters' own history in the community of listeners, through conversations with talkback callers, outside broadcasts, and the sheer imaginative cast of emotionally-intelligent minds. This audience is understood and related to in the same instant as individual and community, and in the constantly shifting play of gender, class, culture, geography, in-group and out-group nuances within a conversation which is sometimes actually two-way, but is more often a complex and reflexive interactive process in which the audience can only be imagined.

Presenting public service talk radio is not a straightforward process. It is not simply a matter of "being yourself". The requirement to be "authentic", the strange social context of a radio studio, and the discrepancy between that environment and the one in which the talk is revived, mean that radio presenters take on a significant challenge.

More generally the research interviews indicate that a range of tensions emerge about the way people operationalise an on-air self. There is also a deep instability in the way practitioners think about and talk about their practice, a significant underdevelopment of discourse about the practice and how it is accomplished. This indicates a real need for researchers in this field to be working with practitioners to elaborate and clarify what this fascinating interactive process is about.

References

Beck, A. (2003). Introduction: cultural work, cultural workplace - looking at the cultural industries. In A. Beck (Ed.), *Cultural work: understanding the cultural industries*. London: Routledge.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Brand, G., & Scannell, P. (1991). Talk, identity and performance: *The Tony Blackburn show*. In P. Scannell (Ed.), *Broadcast talk* (pp. 201-226). London: Sage.

Cooley, C. H. (1922). *Human nature and the social order (Revised edition)*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Geller, V. (1996). *Creating powerful radio: A communicator's handbook*. New York: M Street Publications.

—. (2000). *The powerful radio workbook*. Nashville: M Street Publications.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City:

Doubleday Anchor Books.
—. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Guilfoyle, D. P. (2002). *Certificate IV in broadcasting radio learning guide: Section seven.* Sydney: New South Wales Department of Education and Training.
Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Mills, J. (2004). *The broadcast voice*. Oxford: Focal Press.
Montgomery, M. (2001). Defining "authentic talk". *Discourse Studies, 3*(4), 397-405.
Scannell, P. (2000). For-anyone-as-someone structures. *Media, Culture & Society, 22*(1), 5-24.
Simons, M. (2007). *The content makers:Understanding the media in Australia*. Camberwell, Australia: Penguin Books.
Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
Tolson, A. (2001). "Being yourself": The pursuit of authentic celebrity. *Discourse Studies, 3*(4), 443-457.
Trewin, J. (2004). *Presenting on TV and radio*. Oxford: Focal Press.