Talking for the prize
Dialogue Macro Game Theory as the frame for the radio game show dialogues

Grażyna Stachyra

Dialogue Macro Game Theory originates from the work of Information Sciences Institute (ISI), a research team at USC, in the late 1970s. The team analysed natural dialogue, seeking to apply the results to human-computer interaction, and came up with the label Dialogue Games. These were defined as 'conventions of communication which can be used to account for the 'episodic' structure of natural dialogue as two-party goal pursuit in which the parties choose to interact by communicating'[1]. The term 'game' was first applied to the study of language by Ludwig Wittgenstein[2], while scholars continuing his line of research used notions, such as 'language game' or 'conversational game'[3]. Mann sees Dialogue Games as 'abstract elements of a theory of the discourse structure of human dialogue. They are bilateral, in the sense that each dialogue game refers to and accounts for aspects of the speech of both parties to a dialogue'[4]. A dialogue is understood as a sequence 'of two or more intervals of language use produced alternately by the partici-pants, without significant overlap in time. Each element of the sequence is called a *turn*, and the sequence is called a *dialogue*'[5]. Of particular importance to radio dialogue, which is analysed here, is Mann's reservation that his definition 'is meant to apply only to communication which takes place through media which do not impose significant delays between turns. Thus, face-to-face dialogue, radio conversations and linked typewriter dialogues are included, but exchanges of letters are not'[6].

DMT was proposed as a distinct theory to explore dialogue in more detail[7] and to broaden the research scope of Conversation Analysis or Rhetorical Structure Theory[8], a descriptive linguistic approach to the discourse, developed in the 1980s at the Information Sciences Institute of the University of Southern California by William Mann, Christian Matthiessen and Sandra Thompson, with cooperation of Cecilia Ford, Barbara Fox and Peter Fries. RST is a theory of text organisation, applied in particular in computational linguistics, where it is used to

---

[1] W.C. Mann, *Dialogue games: Conventions of human interaction*, "Argumentation" No 2 (1988), p. 528.

[2] L. Wittgenstein, *Philosophical investigations*, New York 1953.

[3] S.C. Levinson, *Pragmatics*, Cambridge 1983.

[4] W.C. Mann, *Dialogue games…*, op. cit., p. 511.

[5] Ibidem, p. 512.

[6] Ibidem.

[7] M Taboada, W.C. Mann, *Applications of rhetorical structure theory,* "Discourse Studies" Vol. 8 (2006), No. 4, p. 577.

[8] M Taboada, W.C. Mann, *Applications…*, op. cit*.*, p. 424.

'plan coherent text and to parse the structure of texts'[9]. DMT has also been combined with other theories, such as Vanderveken's illocutionary theory of discourse or Asher and Lascarides's SDRT theory, to analyse the logical structure of conversation[10].

The framework of DMT is still under development, and to date, DMT has not been applied to the study of radio discourse.

Dialogue Macro Game Theory (DMT) as a new approach to the study of radio dialogue

There are a number of approaches to mediated conversation analysis which consider radio, such as studies of radio phone-ins[11], research into the institutional dimension of mediated talk or studies of radio or television broadcasting[12]. Elements of Conversation Analysis have frequently been applied to the study of radio discourse[13], but, for game-show dialogue, in particular, it is the DMT framework which allows a very precise analysis of the levels of intentionality. Of particular interest is the impact of the overriding intention (metaintention) in radio game-show dialogue on individual intentions and on the discourse obligations of the participants of the conversation. In '*Szczęśliwa Trzynastka*' (*'Lucky Thirteen'*), a game show, the metaintention is the broadcaster's wish to demonstrate that the contest is attractive because "everyone wins". This is done by deploying prosodic and semantic means (exclamations, pauses, sighs, naming emotions, repeating the value of cash prizes), which stoke up the tension, but also evoke positive emotions. The attractiveness of the contest is, in the context of DMT, the outcome of a precisely calibrated strategy of establishing the intentions of the conversation participants, which can be gleaned behind making an offer to join the game, as well as opening and closing individual actions within the game. In this way, the metaintention creates a self-propelling mechanism which works to persuade the listeners that success is easily achieved. While providing entertainment, the dialogue 'advertises' the game show and encourages the listeners to participate in it by sending premium-rate text messages, a source of profit for the mobile operator as well as the radio station.

Object of research and methodology

The objects of research in this article are the radio dialogues obtained from the popular game show *'Lucky Thirteen'* by RMF FM, a major commercial radio station in Poland. Every day, one listener is selected at random out of all who applied to participate in the game by sending a text message. This listener-turned-player – the Responder – is telephoned by the DJ or the presenter – the Initiator – and asked to choose one of 13 safes which hold deposits of between 3,000 to 300,000 zlotys (€700-70,000). The Initiator then attempts to buy the chosen safe for a sum of money. The player may accept, reject, or negotiate the amount. The Responder even-

---

⁹ Ibidem, p. 423.

¹⁰ M. Paquette, *Rational interaction in dialogues: ingredients for success. Proceedings of the twenty-fourth International Florida Artificial Intelligence Research Society Conference*, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence 2011, p. 198, httDJ://www.academia.edu/3556441/Rational_Interaction_in_Dialogues_Ingredients_for_Success [accessed: 2017.02.01].

¹¹ I. Hutchby, *The Organization of talk on talk radio* [in:] *Broadcast talk*, ed. P. Scannell, London 1991, pp. 19–137.

¹² P. Scannell, D. Cardiff, *A social history of British broadcasting* , Vol. 1, Oxford 1991.

¹³ I. Hutchby, *Conversation* [in:] *Sociology: the key concepts*, ed. J. Scott, London 2006, pp. 41–45; E.A. Schegloff, *Beginnings in the telephone* [in:] *Perpetual contact: mobile communication, private talk, public performance*, ed. J.E. Katz and M. Aakhus, Cambridge 2002, pp. 284–300.

tually finds out if he or she 'lost' or 'won' by having accepted or rejected the DJ's bid. Game show in the station's programming has its objective: to publicise the dialogue which makes up the game, whose participants stand to obtain a substantial financial profit. The rules of the game are therefore fixed and clear, and joining it appears easy, with sending a text message the only condition. The low cost of the text message encourages listeners to participate; since hundreds of thousands do so, the profit for the radio station is substantial, especially since higher audience figures during the final stage of the competition translate to higher advertising profits.

This article analyses the game show as an on-air telephone conversation characteristic of radio, but primarily – within the framework of DMT – as a structure of specific intentions revealed in the subsequent stages of the dialogue. In the radio game show, the presence of metaintention exerts a decisive influence on this structure. The game show proceeds in accordance with a specific convention which governs the behaviour of the DJ – the Initiator of the game (I) and the listener – the Responder (R), since 'conventions of dialogue cause the participants to adopt and dismiss groups of intentions'[14].

The major construct in Dialogue Macrogame Theory is the dialogue macrogame (hereafter referred to as game). The game is defined as a set of three goals:
- the Goal of the Initiator (DJ or presenter in radio)
- the Goal of the Responder (listener – player in the game)
- the Joint Goal.

The scope of a game includes the initial bid of the game and all subsequent turns until the final acceptance of termination.

For the dialogue to come into existence on air, the listener must be provoked to join it by the DJ. The genre formula of '*Lucky Thirteen*' assumes that, in exchange for an opportunity to vie for the prize, the playing listener will take on the obligation to 'talk for the prize', in other words, to participate in on-air dialogue along the rules established by the broadcaster. The goal of the Responder is to win as high a prize as possible. In this, he or she is helped by the Initiator of the game (usually the DJ), who steers the dialogue so that it remains of interest to other listeners. On analysis, it appears that this strategy leads to (R) becoming aware of the necessity to adjust to 'guidelines' provided by (I), so that the game show reaches a conclusion satisfactory to the broadcaster. Entering the dialogue, (R) knows that, beside him- or herself and (I), all those listening to the conversation are passive participants in it. (I)'s utterances such as '…is here with us' make (R) aware that his or her presence on air is justified in that it fulfils the audience's expectation of an exciting moment in the programme. In turn, by making it possible for (R) to win a cash prize, (I) expects (R) to verbally communicate on air the subsequent stages of the game, and the Goal of the Initiator is to incite the Responder to play his or her part on air. Apart from (I) and (R) both striving to achieve as high a win as possible (Joint Goal), a specific metagoal emerges, whereby (I) requires that (R) become emotionally involved in the dialogue so that the dialogue is attractive and entertaining for other listeners. The 'everybody is having fun…' rule of the game show imposes the obligation of further conversation. Regardless of how high the cash prize is, the player must demonstrate on air that he or she is happy to play. Thus, radio dialogue creates (provisional) sender-receiver relations, mainly

---

[14] W.C. Mann, *Dialogue Macrogame Theory. Proceedings of the Third SIGdial Workshop on Discourse and Dialogue*, Philadelphia 2002, pp. 129–141.

by rhetorical strategies deployed by the sender to communicate familiarity and intimacy. The metagoal is achieved in the course of the competition exchange, but it also becomes the leitmotif of the entire programme. The competition is referenced in twenty-five separate on-air slots over six hours[15]. In addition, recordings of past winners encouraging listeners to participate in game shows are regularly played on air:

> Hi, it's Artur. I didn't quite believe in this whole winning thing until I saw my bank statement. I won 350,000 on RMF FM!! I'm telling you: join the game!! Doesn't matter if it's your private phone or your work phone. Just send the text message!!

Broadcasting statements like these give credence to the station's message that anyone can be chosen to participate in the final game.

To achieve the metagoal, the game show takes on the form of an informal conversation. The dialogue is attractive because it is not predictable to those who listen to it. The surprise effect is a substantial advantage. Thus, the relation between the presenter and the listener is of paramount importance. Framing the communication between them as a force which overwhelms people is a stock element of radio expression.

> L: I'm in front of the school, I've come to pick up my child and … I think I'm going to pass out!!
> DJ: Well your child can wait a moment, but, take it easy, it's going to be fine, take it easy!!
> L: O my!!

The traditional opening formula (Schegloff 2002) may, in fact, be lacking altogether. This opening is condensed to the DJ's "pre-dialogue" statement in which the listeners are informed what activities the DJ is undertaking (dialling a number and waiting for the phone to be answered). This is the moment when the game begins, a fact known by the DJ, the player, and the audience.

The impact of the metaintention on the attributes of individual intentions and the way these are shaped

In Mann's theory, 'individual participants' goals have the following attributes: *priorness*, *tacitness*, *immediacy*, *interaction-configuring*, *intended to be recognised*, *complementarity*, *structuredness*, *conventionality.* According to DMT, the joint goals have the additional attribute of jointness. For '*Lucky Thirteen*', this list should be supplemented with *expressiveness*, as the goals of the Initiator and the Responder must be communicated to the listeners in an intelligible and attractive way. This is why (I) imposes such a convention, steering (R) towards it. In a game show, emotions peak towards the end of the game, when (R)'s decision is confronted with (I)'s offer. 'Games often end by the apparent accomplishment of the joint goals of the game, which is the most common form of bidding termination' (Mann 2002: 133). It has to be borne in mind, however, that the joint goal in a game show is subordinate to the metaintention. Once the game starts, (I) and (R) share the intention of bringing about as high a win as possible. But they both have to remember the metaintention of the game: to provide positive emotions to the audience, to entertain it, and to encourage listeners to send the text message. Thus, irrespective of any disappointments, the Responder is obliged to elaborate on his or her happiness and satisfaction, to be shared by others:

> DJ: So, you've won ten thouuusand! Congratulations!
> L: Oh wow!!!!
> DJ: Do you want to find out how much there was in the safe-box? There was 50 thousand …

---

[15] RMF FM contents from 23.04.2016.

L: Oh dear… but ten thousand …. I'm happy too …

DJ: A fantastic attitude! Applause!

Occasionally, despite an inner imperative to show joy, the player is incapable of verbalising his or her positive emotions. This is met with an almost intrusive insistence to elaborate:

DJ: Come on, Stefan, show some joy, because I'm feeling remorseful…

The metagoal impacts the modelling of all the intentions in the dialogue. Actions performed with a certain goal in mind may not bring about the intended effects. This depends on the capabilities or communication competences of the interlocutors, in particular, the contestant. Even when the contestant focuses in his or her speech acts on achieving their goal (winning the cash prize), thus marginalising (I)'s intention to keep the dialogue entertaining, the structure of the game dialogue forces (R) to react by replying to (I)'s prompts. The rules of the game, whereby – regardless of the contestant's initial decision – the Initiator has to offer to 'buy back' the safe for varying amounts of money, enable (I) to fulfil the metaintention by providing evidence of the generosity of the radio station, which 'hands out money' to its listeners.

"You're playing for big money!" The game show as a macrogame

And now on RMF FM a story just like from a movie. An ordinary man had extraordinary dreams. He needed money to make them come true, a lot of money. Let's find out how the story ends! We're about to start the final of Szczęśliwa Trzynastka and we know it's going to be a story with a happy end, because everyone wins in the final!

The goal of (I) is to provide to (R) the information that he has made it to the final of *'Lucky Thirteen'*. In the radio game show, Information Offering resembles stage directions, intended for the audience rather than the contestant and aimed at updating the available information on

the contestant and the rules of the game. The goal of (R) is to identify and receive the particular Information Offered, which is a signal to mentally prepare for public speaking and to eliminate any factors impeding an on-air conversation by, for instance, stopping the car, turning the radio down so as to avoid interference, or leaving a noisy place. The Joint Goal, when the responder comes to possess the particular information, has specific consequences in radio: apart from absorbing the information concerning the participation in the final, the contestant also receives the information about the need to speak on air and express his or her emotions. Thus, the Joint Goal consists, on the one hand, in assuring the highest possible prize for the player, and on the other publicising the game, which is profitable for the radio station; while the former is verbalised on air, the latter is not.

In its initial stage, the radio game show can be described as Action Offering (AO). (R) knows what action (I) is offering to do for (R) because (I) has identified to (R) the action and (R) has decided and expressed to (I) whether he or she accepts (I)'s offer:

[1]: DJ: Hello, is that Mariusz?
[2]: L: Yes.
[3]: DJ: You're playing for big money… You're in the final of Szczęśliwa Trzynastka. There are 13 safes by my side. Between one to 13. There are big sums in the safes: three thousand, five thousand, ten, 20, 50, and the highest prize, the staggering amount of 300 thousand!!! So, which one do we choose? Between one and 13? (Action Offering)

The confirmation of the contestant's identity is automatically interpreted by (I) as accepting the offer to play the game. The offer to play for money is made to listeners in general at different points in the programme. The rules of the game are repeated by presenters and known to listeners. The condition of entering the game (tantamount to accepting an offer to play) is sending a text message to the radio station. The phone numbers which are 'rewarded' with a phone call

from the radio station and an opportunity to win in the final are drawn at random. Thus, the game does not open with the offer, but with the confirmation given on air that the offer was accepted at the moment of sending the text message to the radio station.

> [4]: DJ: It's time to win a prize
> [5]: L: Oh
> [6]: DJ: and win a nice sum of money on RMF FM (Repetition of Action Offering)
> [7]: L: All right!
> [8]: DJ: So which safe do we open? (Repetition of Action Offering)
> [9]: L: right ... err, number one
> [10a]: DJ: One, safe number one for Mariusz (Music building up tension....)
> [10b]: DJ: I did say I'd very much like you to smile before the weekend, didn't I? (Information Probe)
> [11]: L: Well... I'd like that too, haha
> [12]: DJ: Listen, I don't know what's in the safe – at least 3 thousand zlotys, at most 300 thousand. Right away, so as to put that smile on your face, I'd like to offer you 7 thousand zlotys in exchange for that safe. (Permission Seeking)

DJ's utterance in [4] not only functions as a statement but may also work as a bid in Action Seeking. It does not mention choosing the safe, but the Responder should readily recognise [4] as Action Offering. And this is what happens, as the sigh in [5] means that (R) realises he now has to make a decision.

Accepting the offer to play (AO) is here an extension of the decision on the number of the safe, stated by (R) twice – in [7] and [9] – and repeated by (I) in [10]. Instead of the conclusion of the game, what follows is music which builds up the tension before the anticipated closure, but instead of hearing what the prize is, the player hears another question [10b]. A subsequent game is thus opened [10b–11] by an Information Probe (IP): (I) does not know whether (R) knows the particular piece of information which he or she could conceivably know based on prior experience. The affirmative reply of

the contestant opens the way for the Initiator to build upon the game by Permission Seeking (PS) [12], motivated by the existence of the metaintention:

> [13]: L: I'm going to stick with number one.
> [14]: DJ: Isn't seven thousand enough for a smile?

(R)'s decision in [13] appears to close the game, but the game show goes on and now turns into Clarification Seeking (CL). The contestant, adopting a flexible approach to the rules of the game, has deduced a new strategy. He noticed that by using humour, he is able to negotiate an increasingly higher prize and so he defers making a final decision:

> [15]: L: It's enough to make me smile, but my wife, possibly not?
> [16]: DJ: Oh, I see, so if we throw in something extra, say 9 thousand zlotys, is it enough to make you both smile?

The Initiator takes up the humorous strategy of making increasing bids for the prize, as this is attractive to the audience, who might enjoy the idea of "bidding for the smiles" of loved ones.

> [17]: L: Well, I'd like my daughter to smile too
> [18]: DJ: And your daughter too? All right, say 12 thousand and we have three smiling people. I hope you don't have a big family, or do you?
> [19]: L: Oh, but I do, I do!
> [20]: DJ: Haha, because we are slowly running out of money… Look – 12 thousand, we don't know what there is in that safe number one.
> [21]: L: I know, but I also have three sons, so we have a problem.
> [22]: DJ: In that case, it's 15 thousand zlotys. You have me up against the wall, look, everybody's smiling. All your family is happy, you take them for a day out, take them shopping, redecorate your house, you have enough for everything.

In [22], the Initiator skilfully but firmly draws a line not to be crossed; further, extending this

exchange might be tedious for the audience, and the initial freshness of the joke might now be evaporating. Action Offering [22] closes Information Offering [17–21], because this fragment of the dialogue no longer makes for attractive radio.

> [23]: L: All right, I'll stick with number one.
> (R) changes tack: since the stake cannot be raised any more, he returns to his initial decision.
> [24]: DJ: You're sticking with number one, are you sure? Clarification Seeking (CL)
> [25]: L: Yes.
> [26]: DJ: Fine. Safe number 1 for Mariusz. You're passing on 15 thousand. Let's see what the safe holds..
> [27]: DJ: I told you I'd very much like you to smile before the weekend, right? I have five thousand zlotys for you.
> [28]: L: Thank you very much, I'm smiling!
> [29]: DJ: And that's the point, it's not bad either. Remember, it's the fastest-earned money in your life!
> [30]: L: Correct, haha, I always listen to RMF FM.
> [33]: DJ: And keep listening, congratulations!

Rejecting the bid in [12–13] does not terminate the game; this can only happen when (I) decides that the game can conclude. It can be said that the offer to play, or keep playing, the game is made independently of its negative assessment by (R). The conclusion of the game is only s e e m i n g l y n e g o t i a t e d; actual closure takes place when (R) shows little communicative flexibility, makes curt replies, does not take up conversational threads suggested by (I), and/or (I) is aware that the top range of the sum offered for the safe has been reached, and/or the time allocated for the game is running out [26–33].

The impact of the metaintention on the cooperation between dialogue participants and their 'obligations' in discourse

The application of DMT to a competition game highlights the functioning of 'discourse obligations' in dialogue, an issue first explored by David Traum and James Allen. They investigate a situation when the respondent replies despite his or her lack of acceptance for the intention of the speaker. 'An intention to respond in a particular way is the result of trading off the fact that there is an obligation to respond against one's private intentions, goals, preferences and capabilities. What kind of response will be given in the end clearly depends on this trade-off'[16]. The desire to be rewarded for the participation in the contest and the acceptance of an uneven balance of power in the mediated discourse engenders in the player-listener an inner compulsion to respond and to accept the presenter's intention. The player knows that his or her presence on air is about 'talking for the prize' and is, in fact, a promise of the prize. But this means taking up the obligation to engage in conversation on air, which to many contestants is a substantial emotional effort. (I), the presenter, has bid a game of a certain type, then (I) has partially specified the content of the game, while the listener (R) is obliged to take a position on (I)'s bidding game. Accepting the bid is tantamount to the emergence of the joint intention. Whether the participants of the game will be able to join in the fulfilment of the joint intention depends on whether they understand the essence of each participant's offer. The coordination of the individual rounds of the game, described in DMT as a negotiation metaphor, involves both participants of the

---

[16] D. Traum, J.F. Allen, *Discourse obligations in dialogue processing*, 32nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics 1994 (as quoted in J. Kreutel and W.C Mann, *Analysing bids in Dialogue Macrogame Theory using Discourse Obligations*, pp. 1–8, httDJ://www-bcf.usc.edu/~billmann/WMlinguistic/bids-final-submitted.pdf [accessed: 02.02.2017].

game, whose positions, however, are not equal in radio. The status of the Initiator is higher, as he or she can terminate the "cycle" of offers made to the listener in exchange for the selected safe, since a finite amount of time is available for the game show and needs to be filled, a task allocated to the broadcaster – the Initiator – the DJ. By accepting the offer to join the game, the Responder submits to the convention putting the Initiator at an advantage. But the Responder may show flexibility and adroitness in operating his or her status as a player and influence the Initiator to make a higher offer. This, however, depends on the Responder's skill in adopting the role of a party in the dialogue and in overcoming the stress related to the game and its public character.

The player (R) accepts as obvious the strategies made by (I) to offer increasing amounts of money in exchange for the safe, but (I) mentions this option only because the dialogue is heard by the general audience. This is why updating is, in radio, part of a cooperation strategy subordinated to the metaintention (providing entertainment for listeners and simultaneously promoting the image of the radio station as handing out money). The word "game" concerns the rules of the on-air dialogue, but it also refers to the rules binding both parties: the Initiator and the Responder, which are also played out on air. The reward the listener receives for playing his or her part is a sum of money, whether higher or lower. In other words, what takes place in radio is an obligatory participation in the individual acts of the game, enforced by the metaintention present in the broadcast.

The subsequent acts of the game are contingent on a certain communicative adroitness of the listener-contestant, who is able (or unable) to take up the hint thrown by the DJ. The higher the rhetorical potential of the listener, the more expanded the negotiation metaphor becomes. Cooperation requires that the DJ and the listener both strive for the same objective: to achieve the highest prize possible. Due to the metaintention, the cooperation adopts the formula of interaction. The DJ (I) discourages the player (R) from settling on a safe at the beginning of the game, in this way perhaps taking away (R)'s opportunity to win the main prize, as the latter, yielding to (I)'s suggestions, eventually makes a different choice:

> DJ: You have to choose a safe, choose anything between one and 13!
> L: Er… ten
> DJ: I can offer to buy back the contents of that safe for 10,000 zlotys.
> L: No.
> DJ: Definitely not? Do you know how many people in a family can be bought gifts for 10,000 zlotys?
> L: Well, I'd like the 10,000 …
> DJ: Wait, you have to state this clearly: you don't want safe number ten?
> L: No, I don't.
> DJ: So, it's the 10,000, sure?
> L: Er… yes, I want the 10,000.

The joint goal and the individual goals in the game definitions do not represent the fully specified intentions. Part of the show in a radio game show is precisely the gradual demonstration of the intention, or the delay of the moment when the stance is ultimately specified:

> [1]: DJ: Is there nothing I can tempt you with? (Bid game)
> [2]: L: Well, it's sink or swim (Bid termination of game)
> [3]: DJ: Well, how about a large sink... for ten thousand (Bid game)
> [4]: L: Then again, there could be the main prize (Bid termination of game)
> [5]: DJ: That's correct, the listener is well informed, as we can hear, what can I do, I'll put the ten thousand away and take out 15, what do you say to this? (Bid game)
> [6]: L: No, I'll stick with safe number two (Bid termination of game)
> [7]: DJ: Nothing I can persuade you with? Give me an amount, go crazy on a Monday (Bid game)

[8]: L: Well I am going crazy (Bid termination of game)

[9]: DJ: Haha, well all right then, fine… I'm putting 15 thousand away – and taking out 17 thousand! (Bid game)

[10]: L: I'm sticking with safe number two (Bid termination of game)

What is interesting in the context of DMT is the Initiator's making repeated efforts to bid a game in [3], [5], [7], [9], motivated by the metaintention, despite the Responder rejecting them (bidding termination of the game) and standing by the original choice, only seemingly accepting the bid [7-8].

Conclusions

> DJ: I can see the images going through your head, a motorcycle, a newer car… Or maybe 20 thousand zlotys! Oh! I like that! I'm feeling some tingling going down my spine. (…) I'm finding this game exciting too!

A game played for money involves the imagination and arouses emotions which are shared also by those observing it. Departing from this assumption, the radio uses the genre of the game show to fulfil the entertainment function of communication, which today dominates across the media. The aim of this article has been to show the application of DMT to an analysis of the radio dialogues of *'Lucky Thirteen'*, a radio game show. The analysis has shown the overlapping of two formulae: the radio game as a media show and the macrogame corresponding to DMT. This is not without communicative con-

sequences. Although the competition dialogue is generally reproducible, based as it is on a frame helping participants respect the specific rules of the game, it is also dynamic and spontaneous in the subsequent rounds of Game Actions, which are not entirely predictable for either Game Participant, whether (I) or (R). Participants striving to realise the Joint Goal and their individual intentions. What is important for radio is that the intentions of the parties are subordinated to the metaintention, which is the broadcasters' wish to demonstrate to the listening audience the attractiveness of the competition, in which large sums of money can be won by individuals who join the game with no entry qualifications. The metaintention and the convention of talking for the prize do, however, enforce a certain obligation on the participants. These obligations are the specific stances adopted towards the offers made and their specific verbalisations on air. Every game ends in success (winning a monetary prize), and although the expectations of the contestant are typically higher, he or she must express their pleasure and satisfaction on air. The status of the game also enforces a cooperation between participants to win the monetary prize. It is the element of gambling which becomes an imperative guiding the contestant to make subsequent steps in the game. Making repeated offers in the game show is a way to delay the final decision of the player-listener. Even when the contestant rejects the offers, the game does not end. Instead, the decision to make bid termination of the game is always made by the Initiator, and it depends on the metaintention.

Bibliography

Hutchby, Ian (1991) 'The Organization of Talk on Talk Radio', pp. 119–137 in P. Scannell (ed.) Broadcast Talk. London.

Hutchby, Ian (2006) 'Conversation', pp. 41–45 in J. Scott (ed.) Sociology: The Key Concepts, Routledge Key Guides. London.

Hutchby, Ian and Robin Wooffitt (2008) Conversation analysis. Cambridge.

Levinson, Stephen C. (1983) Pragmatics. Cambridge.

Mann, William C. (1988) 'Dialogue Games: Conventions of Human Interaction'. Argumentation 2 (1988): 511–532.

Mann, William C. (2002) Dialogue Macrogame Theory. Proceedings of the Third SIGdial Workshop on Discourse and Dialogue. Philadelphia, July 2002, pp. 129–141.

Mann, William C. (2003) 'Models of Intentions in Language', pp. 165–78 in P. Kühnlein, H. Rieser and H. Zeevat (eds.) Perspectives on Dialogue in the New Millennium. Amsterdam and Philadelphia.

Paquette, Michel A. (2011) 'Rational Interaction in Dialogues: Ingredients for Success'. Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Florida Artificial Intelligence Research Society Conference, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence: httDJ://www.academia.edu/3556441/Rational_Interaction_in_Dialogues_Ingredients_for_Success [accessed: 2016.02.01].

Rocci, Andrea (2004) Towards a Model for the Analysis and Annotation of Information Dialogues, httDJ://www.tec-lab.ch/d1_wed_fnrs_105211_1020611.pdf [accessed: 2016.05.14].

Scannell, Paddy (1991) Broadcast Talk. London.

Scannell, Paddy and David Cardiff (1991) A Social History of British Broadcasting (vol. 1). Oxford.

Schegloff, Emanuel Abraham (2002) 'Beginnings in the Telephone', pp. 284–300 in J.E. Katz and M. Aakhus (eds) Perpetual Contact: Mobile communication, private talk, public performance. Cambridge.

Sidnell, Jack (2010) Conversation Analysis: An Introduction. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Taboada, Maite and William C. Mann (2006) 'Applications of Rhetorical Structure Theory'. Discourse Studies 8 (4): 567–588.

Traum, David R. and James F. Allen (1994) 'Discourse obligations in dialogue processing', pp. 1–8 in 32nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (as quoted in J. Kreutel and W.C Mann, Analysing Bids in Dialogue Macrogame Theory using Discourse Obligations, httDJ://www-bcf.usc.edu/~billmann/WMlinguistic/bids-final-submitted.pdf [accessed: 02.02.2016].

Van Dijk, Teun (1997) Discourse as Social Interaction. London.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1953) Philosophical Investigations. New York.