

Discourse Structure of Persian Telephone Conversation: A Description of the Closing

AkramKhadem

(Corresponding author)

Department of English Language, Faculty of Foreign Languages,
University of Isfahan, Azadi square, Isfahan, Iran
ZIP code: 81746-73441
e-mail: Akramkhadem84@yahoo.com

Abbas EslamiRasekh

Department of English Language, Faculty of Foreign Languages,
University of Isfahan, Azadi square,
Isfahan-Iran
ZIP code: 81746-73441
e-mail: abbasseslamirasekh@yahoo.com

(Received: 26-10-11/ Accepted: 21-12-11)

Abstract

Mastery of the grammatical system of a language is not enough for the use of a language, we need to have “the knowledge of the rules of use and communicatively approach performance” (Richards & Schmidt, 1982, p.52) in conversation and particularly language in telephone conversation. Closing a telephone conversation is an activity which should be done collaboratively by both participants through employing a variety of procedures in order to bring the conversation to an end. In closing, speakers have to be concerned about the appropriate strategies to be used; otherwise, misunderstanding is likely to occur. A well-structured closing can strengthen mutual solidarity and serve maintaining the relationships.

This study aims to make a comparison between English and Persian speaker’s choice of strategies in telephone conversation closings. Natural data are tape recorded and transcribed for analysis to explore how closing is realized in Persian and how comparable it is to English. The English data analysis is according to Liddicoat’s findings (2007); he discovered the general conventions of conversation closing in English speech. Our comparison shows peculiar differences in the structure of the speech act of closing across English and Persian. The differences include mainly the strategies employed by the speakers to end a telephone conversation.

Keywords: pre-closing sequences, closing implicative environments, terminal sequences, in-conversation objects, moving out of closing.

1. Introduction

Ventola (1979) analyzed the structure of conversation in English and discovered the following structure: ‘greeting’, ‘address’, ‘identification’, ‘approach’, ‘centering’, ‘leave taking’, and finally ‘goodbye’. Schegloff (1972, 1979) introduced four parts in the opening section: 1) a summon-answer sequence, 2) an identification-recognition sequence, 3) a greeting sequence, and 4) the how are you

sequence. And in the analysis of the closing he explored the pre-closing sequences, then the closing sequences and finally the terminal sequences.

Taleghani-Nikazm (2002) contrasted ritual routines in telephone conversation openings in Iran and Germany. She discovered that telephone conversation opening in Persian ,the same as English, follows four sequences 1) a summon-answer, 2) an identification-recognition, 3) greeting, and 4) the how are you. She specifically focused on the *how are you* ritual in both cultures and found that Iranians after inquiring about one another's well-being, ask about the well-being of their respective families.

Following schegloff&sacks (1973), and Button (1987, 1991b), Liddicoat (2007) analyzed the structure of telephone conversation opening and closing and, in agreement with schegloff's findings (1986) he identified four sequences in openings. Regarding the closing, he believed that the closing of a telephone conversation is done collaboratively by both participants in action. Speakers first prepare a closing implicative environment, then the pre-closings such as *OK* and *alright*, and then the terminal component. According to Liddicoat (2007), closing a conversation is a two-part phenomenon: a) determining whether all the points have been mentioned and b) an agreement to end the conversation. In the context of Iran, to our knowledge, no study has been conducted with the aim of exploring how closing a telephone conversation is achieved. The present study is an attempt to explore the closing strategies used by Persian speakers and compare them with the politeness strategies used in English.

2. Materials and Methods

The data for analysis are mainly natural telephone conversations tape recorded from interlocutors with fairly similar social characteristics. A corpus of real life telephone conversations were recorded by seven volunteer candidates with an age range of 23 to 45 who agreed with keeping a record of their conversations. They were asked to record both calls they initiated and received. The conversations were mostly between relatives and friends. Closings of the collected data were transcribed according to the transcription notation developed by Jefferson (1984, pp.-xvi) for conversation analysis.

3. Results and Discussion

Iranian Persian speakers use a particular class of speech tokens in order to end their telephone conversations. Regarding that, the researchers in this study aim to analyze the natural recorded telephone conversations in Iran between the native speakers of Persian. The researchers attempt to compare and contrast them (if any) with the structure of telephone conversation in English and for fulfilling that purpose they have chosen Liddicoat's model (2007).

In his analysis of the last segment of closing English conversations ,Liddicoat (2007) found that "a conversation is usually ended by an exchange of goodbyes or similar tokens and that after such an exchange a conversation is considered closed and turn-taking system is suspended"(p.255).He calls these adjacency pairs " terminal components".

The researchers in this paper analyzed the last segments in closing telephone conversations in Iran and observed the same terminal sequences as in [1] (shown by >):

[1]→širin : **Hi:čidigeħem-in**

Nothi:ng else just-this

That's all

→MæhtAb : **Ke in-tor, (0) °bAšedæs-et dærdnæ-kon-e°.**

That this-way, (0) °be (subjunctive) hand-your ache no-do-3rd -sing°.

All right, OK thanks for your bother.

širin : **SælAmberes-oun. ↑xeili-æmeltemAs-e doA.**

Hello send-2nd sing. ↑a lot-also beg-of prayer.

Say hello to your family for me. And also say a prayer for me.

MæhtAb : **Mohtaj-Im be doA. =**

Needy-2nd plur to prayer.

I'm in need of prayer.

>MæhtAb : =**XodA-fez**
=God-protector

Goodbye

>širin : **XodA-fez.**
God-protector

Goodbye.

As it is clear and will be explained later, the participants bring the conversation to an end by applying a set of conventional rules. At the end of closing, they both wrap up their conversations by a series of goodbyes. These forms of goodbye are mostly *XodA-fez*(*God-protector*),*XodA-negæhdAr*(*God-Keeper*),*XodA-fez šomA*(*God-protector you*).

These exchanges of goodbyes as Liddicoat (2007) says “constitute an adjacency pair”. In this pair the first goodbye “makes the production of another a relevant next action for a conversation. In fact the first participant recommends ending the conversation and the second one by answering to the goodbye accepts it (p.256).

According to Liddicoat (ibid, p.256), “Terminal components may be expanded with other tokens, such as tag-positioned address terms and endearments”. These components amongst the Persian data include: *XodAhAfezæzizæm*(*Goodbye my dear*), *xodAfezširinjoun* (*Goodbye širin*) and so on.

As Liddicoat (2007, p.257) puts it “it is important when closing a conversation to determine if all potential mentionables have been mentioned” and of course if the other party doesn't have any other thing to talk about. As he says, terminal sequences (the pairs of goodbyes) cannot accomplish this work and “pre-closing sequences” are needed. In English “this talk usually takes the form of a short turn such as *Ok/alright/or right* with falling intonation, possibly with a tag-positioned address term of endearment.” In fact as Schegloff&Sacks (1973) argue, in pre-closing part, “each party declines at least one opportunity to continue talking “before they produce terminal components.

“**Emma**: Alright, **Sue** : Ok **Emma** : Bye=**Sue** : Bye :;” (Liddicoat 2007, p.257)

The researchers are eager to see whether such this pair is observed in Persian or not, look at [1] again, it is shown by →.

Equally, phrases such as *Hi:čidige hæm-in* (that's all), *keintor*(alright) , *besiyArxob* (ok, alright) with falling intonation were observed. In a closer look the researchers discovered that Iranian Persian speakers mostly have expressions such as *SælAmberesounid*(*Say hello to somebody for me*) with the answer *SælAmætbAshid/Bozorgitounomiresounæm*(*Be well, I will send your grace*) as pre-closings. In some cases according to some religious situations such as Ramadan they use *EltemAsedoA*(*say a prayer for me*) and the other party answers *MohtAjim be doA*(*we are in need of prayer*), or even may both *sælAmresoundan* and *eltemAsedoA* be used together.

Depending on the speakers this *SælAmresoundæn*(*Saying hello to somebody for somebody*) can be done as a whole as it was observed in [1] *SælAmberes-oun* or *SælAm be xAnevAdeberesoun* or individually as in [2] .

[2] Mom : **SælAm be bæčA-t beres-oun.**

Hello to children-your send-2nd-sing.

Say hello to your children for me.

Son : **Ghorboun-e-toun. (0) Bozorgi-toun-o miresoun-æm**
Love-of-you (obj) . (0) Greatness-your-obj marker send-1st -sing
Thanks. I will send your grace.

>Mom : **be širin, Leila joun, [Armin joun**
To širin , Leila dear, [Armin dear
To širin, Leila, Armin

>Son : **[Xeilimæmnoun.**
A lot thanks.

Thanks a lot.

These sequences are called pre-closings because as Liddicoat (ibid, p.258) says, they “provide a place to determine whether closing could be a next activity”. Liddicoat (ibid, p.258) notes that “pre-closings are adjacency pairs”. One party makes the first pre-closing, in return the other party may accept it and produce a pre-closing component too or maybe s/he doesn't accept it and talk about something new.

3.1. Closing Implicative Environments

Whether the speakers can easily close the conversation by *SælAmresoundæn* (*Saying hello to somebody for somebody*) and *saying goodbye* or do they use some conventional strategies in order to make some preparations for closing?

There are definitely some strategies. Liddicoat (ibid) in analysis has used the term “Closing implicative environment”. “The term Closing implicative environment refers to sets of actions after which closing may be a relevant next activity and after which closure is a common activity, but it does not imply that closure will necessarily happen after such an action” Liddicoat (ibid, p.259). He has referred to a series of subjects which have this characteristic and they are: **Announcing closure, arrangements, formulating summaries, appreciations, sequence-closing sequences, back references.**

Having in mind these closing implicative environments, the researchers analyzed the recorded conversations and observed all in the data. In the following a section is devoted to each and they will be explained in detail.

3.2. Announcing Closure

According to Liddicoat (ibid) announcing closure is by some external circumstances which force one of the parties to close the conversations, as in [3] (it is shown by the symbol >). [3]

>Pærdis : **Migæmširin-joun†šærmændemændændounpezeškinobætdAr-æm**
Say-1st-sing širin -dear †ashamed I dentistry appointment have-1st-sing

(0) **sAæt-e-10 bAyædounjAbAš-æm**
(0) O'clock-of-10 have to there be-1st-sing

So sorry Sirin .I have an appointment with the dentist & I have to be there at 10

širin : **bAšeeškAlinæ-dAr-e bor-o be sælAmæt**
be(subjunctive) problem no-have-3rd-sing go-2nd-sing to health
Ok no problem. Take care

→Pærdis: **Mamnounlotfkærd-i zængzæd-i. [sælAmberes-oun**
Thanks favor did-2nd-sing callhit-past-2nd-sing[hello send -2nd sing

Thanks for calling.Say hello to your family for me.

Because of her appointment with the doctor, Pærdis has to end the conversation and širin immediately accepts it and they both bring the conversation to an end. After širin accepts the excuse, Pærdis compensates for that sudden closing and thanks širin for having called.

Liddicoat (ibid) believes that in some cases this announcement of closure is due to the circumstances of the recipient of the announcement as in [4]. [4]

>NAzænin : **Mig-æmdigemozAhem-e-t ne-mišæm mix-ay bærAfærdAxodeto**
Say-1st sing else bother-of-you no-become-1st-sing want-2nd sing for
tomorrow yourself

AmAdeKon-i

ready Make-2nd-sing

I do not take your time anymore because you want to make yourself ready for

tomorrow

šamim : **Xaheshmikon-æm.BærA-m doAkonhAl-æmxoubbAš-e**
Beg do-1st sing. For-me prayer do-2nd-sing health-my well be(subjunctive)
(0)**mix-Am Ber-æmsær-eEmtehAn**

(0)want-1st sing Go-1st-sing head-of Exam
You're welcome. Say a prayer for me in order that I feel well at the time of my exam.

In the above conversation, NAzænin wants to end the conversation so she invokes from šamim's situation and makes some preparations for ending. šamim accepts it by saying *Xahešmikonam* (you're welcome) but any way they have an extended pre-closing. According to that excuse, šamim asks NAzænin to pray for her and their closing is a little bit extended because šamim has moved out of that closing.

Of course as Liddicoat (ibid,p.260) puts it, "The announcement of closure ,however, does not immediately lead to a terminal component, but rather leads to a pre-closing sequence where further opportunities to introduce new items of talk are passed up before the conversation is finally closed."

3.3. Arrangements

At the end of the telephone conversation, the participants may refer to some future interaction that they are supposed to do as in [5](it is shown by>). And after that arrangement, it is possible that the participants proceed very quickly to closing (Button, 1991b; Schegloff& Sacks, 1973).

[5] >Pærdis : **Xo:bpæshærmoghedusdAšt-id tæšrifbiyAr-id**
 Ok so each time like had-2nd-plur honor bring-2nd-plur

Ok so come over whenever you wish

YAsæmin : **čæšmmozAhem-e-tounmiš-æm=**
 eye bother-of-2nd-plur become-1st-sing=

Surely we will comeover burden you with our presence.

>Pærdis : **=MorAhem-id**

=blessing-be-2nd-plur

What burden, it would be a blessing.

These kinds of arrangements can be about visiting each other in person or talking again on the phone. As Button (1987) says, this kind of arrangement makes it possible for other potential topics to be dealt with in the future encounter and the closing will be likely.

3.4. Formulating Summaries

In order to make some preparations for closing, the participants may make a short summary of what they have been talking about in their conversation. "Such formulations present the talk as a thing which is potentially complete to the point where it can be now talked about as a bounded event and if the formulation is accepted as an accurate formulation by other participants, it can be treated as a proposal that the talk under way could be concluded (Button 1991a) where there is agreement about the formulation, conversation may move to a close" (cited in Liddicoat (2007, p.263)).

In the following extract a kind of summary of the whole conversation is presented by FærhAd. Daryooš immediately accepts it and with a set of thanking and some other conventional strategies they bring the conversation to an end.

[6] >FærhAd : **A: re in-æmæzghæziye-ye mA,**
 Ye: s this-also of matter-of our,
This was our story,

→ DARYOŠ : **Xob**
 OK
 OK

FærhAd : **bA-hAšhærfzæd-im**
 To-him letter hit-past-1st-plur
We spoke to him

→ DARYOŠ : [**Xob**

- [OK
OK
FærhAd : [belæxærerAzi-škærd-im
[finally satisfied-him did-1st-plur
And finally we persuaded him
DAryouš : >XobbAz-æmxodA-rošokr<
>OK again-also Go-obj-markergratitude<
Alright thank God
FærhAd : A:re:
Yea:h
Yeah
DAryouš : Xo::b
O::K
OK
FærhAd : Xo::b=
O::K
OK
FærhAd : =Mamnounvæght-e-to [ziyad ↑gereft-æm
=Thanks time-of-your [a lot ↑took-1st-sing
Sorry for taking your time

3.5. Appreciations

Liddicoat (ibid) believes that such an appreciation is for the call. When one of the participants does such an action, s/he makes it clear to the other party that s/he has no other thing to talk about and closing would be a relevant next activity to appear. In extract [7] such this appreciation can be observed.

- [7] šæmim : Mæmnounæz in-kezængzæd-i =
Thanks of this-that(relative) call hit-past-2nd-sing
Thanks for calling
šæmim : =°xe:ili: hosel-æmsær[ræfteboud °
=°A: lo:t patience-my herad[gone was °
I was bored alot
BæhAre : [xAhešmikon-æm.
[Beg do-1st-sing.
You're welcome.
BæhAre : SælAm[be mAmAn-et inAberes-oun
Hello [to mom-your these send-2nd-sing
Say hello to your mom and the rest for me.

3.6. Sequence-Closing Sequences

Liddicoat (ibid) has argued that “Sequence-closing sequences” are strongly topic-bounding and as such they serve as the final action in a conversation before the initiation of a closing” (p.264). These sequences may serve as a preparation for closing and after that some other closing strategies will be used or it is possible after that a new topic emerges. In extract [6] these sequences are shown by A: re: (Yeah) and Xo::b (OK).

3.7. Back References

According to Liddicoat (ibid), this part is referring to materials that have been talked about previously in the conversation. By this back references, the researchers indicate that the mentionables have been

mentioned and there is no new material to talk about. These back references can be arrangements that are reintroduced near the closing. They may also include reasons for the call and as he says they are strongly closing implicative. It is shown in [8] by the symbol >.

- [8]
 >Pærdis : **Xobpæs mA enšAlAdige[xedmæt-e-toun mires-im**
 Ok so we God-willing else [serve-of-you(obj) arrive-2nd plur
Ok so we will come over, God willing
 šæghAyegh : **[Ghædæm-e-toun be čæšm**
 [Step-of-you to eye
You're always welcome here.
 šæghAyegh : **Xedmætæz mA-st**
 Serve of we-be-3rd sing
The pleasure is ours.
 Pærdis : **XodAčesm-e-toun-o negæhdAr-e.**
 God eye-of-your-obj marker look have-3rd-sing.
May your heart be always well.
 >šæghAyegh: **sAæt -e 7 dige ?**
 O'clock-of 7 else?
At 7, yes?
 >Pærdis : **BælesAæt 7 =**
 Yes o'clock 7=
Yes at 7 o'clock
 Pærdis : **=mæmnoun .SælAm[xeiliberes-ounid**
 = thanks. .Hello [a lot send-2nd -plur
Thanks.Say hello to your family for me.
 šæghAyegh : **[SælAmætbaš-id**
 [Healthy be-2nd -plur
Be well!
 → Pærdis : **æmrinædAr-id?**
 Order no-have-2nd -plur
Do you have any further business?
 šæghAyegh: **ærzinist (0)mæmnoun ,pæs mA færdAsAæt 7 montæzer-e-toun-im**
 Remark no-is(0)thanks ,so we tomorrow o'clock 7 wait-of-
 you-1st -plur
No ,I covered everything, so we are waiting for you tomorrow at 7
 Pærdis : **čæšmhætænmozAhem-e-tounmiš-im**
 Ok certainly bother-of-you become-1st plur
Ok, surely we will come over & burden you with our presence.
 šæghAyegh : **XošhAlmiš-im**
 Happy become-1st -plur
We'll be happy to visit you
 Pærdis : **Ghorboun-e-toun. =**
 Love-of-you
Thanks.
 Pærdis : **=XodA-fez šomA**
 =God -protector
Goodbye

3.8. Moving Out of Closing

Sometimes it happens that one of the participants is willing to close the conversation and makes the preparations, but the other party moves out of it. For example by talking about something new, s/he can postpone the act of closing.

As Liddicoat (ibid,p.267) has mentioned, “What happens in moving out of closing,then,is that a turn is found in a slot which could normally be occupied by a closing-related component(that is, a pre-closing component or a terminal component) and the deployment of such a turn cancels the trajectory of the closing.” And he continues, as the participants move out of this closing segment “they cancel the relevance of the closing which had previously been proposed” and for closing the conversation again “a new closing sequence” is needed (p.267).

3.8.1. Locations for Moving Out

According to Liddicoat (ibid), moving out of closing segment can occur at any point in the closing part. It may occur “after the first pre-closing component” as in [9], after the second pre-closing component as in [8] and it is shown by→, and finally after the final terminal component as in extract [10].

[9]

PærvAne : =hævAs-e-t-æm be ounghæziyebAš-e (0)sælAmberes-oun

=sensesof-your -also to that matter be-3r-sing(0)hello send-2nd-sing

By the way be careful about what I mentioned.Say hello to your family for me>AnAhitA

:kodoumghæziyeromig-i?

Which matter-obj marker say-2nd sing?

Pardon me? What are you talking about?

PærvAne: hæmou:n>ghæziyenomregereftæn-o mig-æm<

Same >matter score getting-obj marker say-1st-sing<

The matter which is related to my score

[10]

Ariyæn : **XodA-fez**

God-protector

Bye

FærhAd : **XodA-fez**

God-protector

Bye

>Ariyæn: MIG-AM-A FARHAD

Say-1st sing-attention marker FARHAD

FARHAD I SAY

FærhAd : >æloælo? < Beg-ou

>Hello hello? <say-2nd-sing

Hello? Say it...

As Liddicoat (ibid) has argued, in case [10] “the talk is really relaunching a conversation which has been terminated rather than moving out of the closing sequence” (p.268).As it is clear in MIGAMA FARHAD (FARHAD I SAY), this part is said with a louder voice in order to both prevent the other party from hanging up and also get his/her attention.

3.8.2. Typical Sequences Found in Moving Out

Liddicoat (ibid) found that this moving out can happen by different sequences and they are **Arrangements, back references, topic initial elicitors ,in-conversation objects, solitudes, reasons for call** and the last but not the least **appreciations**.In the following each one will be illustrated with some examples.

3.9. Arrangements

Liddicoat (ibid, p.269) has noted that “arrangements are very common in conversations and they may overspill into the closing of a conversation.” He thinks when an arrangement happens in moving out,

“the participants may move to close the conversation immediately, as an arrangement in a closing implicative environment.”

3.10. Back References

As Liddicoat (2007) says, materials which have been mentioned in the conversation and has been the topic may occur again in moving out as in [8]. Liddicoat (2007, p.270) believes that “back references may not be closing implicative, so while they are found in moving out, they do not lead directly to reentering a closing.”

3.11. Topic Initial Elicitors

Topic initial elicitor is something which leads into a new topic (Button & Casey, 1984). In Persian, that's something like *čexabaradige?, xobdigečexabar?(what else is new?)*. According to Liddicoat (ibid, p.271), “topic initial elicitors explicitly provide a space for launching any mentionables which have not yet been included in the conversation and at the same time signal that the speaker is available for further talk in the conversation, although s/he may have no available mentionables to continue the talk.”

With the occurrence of topic initial elicitors, the conversation may last for some time again, as a new topic may be introduced, or it may quickly move toward closing if no new topic is mentioned. (it is shown by > in [11]).

[11] Omid : **FærdAmibin-æm-et**
 Tomorrow see-1st-sing-you
See you tomorrow

MilaAd: **bAše**

OK

OK

>Omid : **Xo:bdigeče: Xæbær?**
 O: k else what: news?

Ok, anything else happening?

MilAd : **hi:čisælAmæti.TokAr-i bAmænnædAr-i**

No: thing health. You work-any with I no-have-2nd-sing

Nothing else, good health. Do you have any request from me?

→Omid : **Næ: mæmnoun, mænfæghætzængzædæmbAbætjozvA [tæšækorkon-æm.**

No: thanks, I only call hit-1st-sing for study-notes [thanks do-1st-sing

No thanks, I just called to thank for the study notes...

3.12. In-Conversation Objects

Citing Button (1987), Liddicoat (ibid) says “in-conversation objects are objects which are used to mark the receipt of prior talk and to provide for the speaker to continue”. He believes that “they show that the speaker is available for talk and remains in the conversation although s/he is not offering any new material for talk in the conversation” (p.272). These objects in the English data of Liddicoat (ibid) were *Um, mm* and so on. In-conversation objects in Persian can be *xob (OK), uh huh* and so on. It is shown in [6] by →.

3.13. Solicitudes

Solicitudes are used as sequences for moving out of closing, and as Liddicoat (ibid) has mentioned they “constitute a minimal moving out of the closing”,but sometimes it is possible that they be elaborated .

[12]

šæmim : **Are doAkonfærdAhAl-æmxoub[bAš-e**
Yeah prayer do-2nd-sing tomorrow healthmy well [be-3rd-sing

Yeah say a prayer for me so that I feel well tomorrow

NAzænin : **[EnšAlAxæbær-A-ye xoš**
[God willing News-s-plur-of good

I hope to hear good news from you

šæmim : **Mæmnoun**

Thanks

Thanks

NAzænin : **↑SælAmberes-oun**

↑Hello send-2nd-sing

Say hello to your family for me.

šæmim : **SælAmæt bAš-i. =**
Healthy be-2nd -sing. =

May you be in good health

→ šæmim : **=MovAzeb-e xodet bAš.**
= careful-of yourself be-2nd-sing.

Take care

→ NAzænin : **čæšm**

eye

OK

→ šæmim : **DoAkon, bAše?**
Prayer do-2nd-sing,OK?
Say a prayer for me,OK?

→ NAzænin : **BAše,hatman=**

OK, definitely=

OK, defintely

šæmim : **=xodA-fez**
=God-protector

Good bye

NAzænin : **xodA-fez**
God-protector

Bye

3.14. Reasons for the Call

According to Liddicoat (ibid), reasons for the call are closing implicative and after them the conversation may quickly move toward closing as in [11] (shown by →).

3.15. Appreciations

As Liddicoat (2007) has pointed out, appreciations can be for the call or maybe about something relevant in the conversation. He says the appreciation for the call can occur within a closing sequence “without affecting the trajectory of closing” (p.276).look at extract [3], it is shown by the symbol →.

As it was observed above, the structure of telephone conversation closings like that of English follows a series of procedures. But as Iranians commonly use a set of tarofs, the closing part is more extended and some differences are observed too. For example according to the situation, not only do they appreciate the caller’s call but they also apologize a lot for having called the other party. They also

apologize for having interrupted him/her if the recipient has been busy doing something before the telephone's ringing. Moreover they have a necessary part in their conversations, which is about saying hello to the family of the other party and is called *SælAmresoundæn*.

Conclusion

The analysis of the data collected on the closing of telephone conversations in Iran suggests that Iranian Persian speakers like the English speakers follow a set of conventional rules. Closing should be done collaboratively with both participants in action. The Iranian Persian speakers first prepare a closing implicative environment and make some preparations for closing, then they go to the pre-closing sequences, and at last the terminal components, which are a set of goodbyes happen.

In spite of the preparations for closing, sometimes it is possible that one of the parties mentions something and postpones the closing. They can be different subjects, but the most common among Iranian speakers was appreciation for the call.

Although the number of similarities far outweighs, a number of differences was observed too. As it was said before, Iranians use tarofs (ostensible speech) a lot and consequently their conversations are extended in length. They may apologize several times for having called and interrupted the other party. And the last but not the least is that *sælAmresoundæn* (saying hello to somebody for somebody) is a necessary part in Iranian telephone conversations and can be called the pre-closing component in Iranian telephone conversation closings.

References

- [1] G. Button, Moving out of closings, In G. Button and J. R. E. Lee (eds), *Talk and Social Organization*, (1987), Clevedon and Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- [2] G. Button, Conversation-in-a-series, In D. Boden and D. Zimmerman (eds), *Talk and Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*, (1991), Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [3] G. Button, On varieties of closings, In G. Psathas (ed.), *Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*, (1991), Lanham, MA: University Press of America.
- [4] G. Button and N. Casey, Generating topic: The use of topic initial elicitors, In J. M. Atkinson and Heritage (eds), *Structure of Social Interaction*, (1984), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [5] G. Jefferson, Transcript on notation, In J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action*, (1984), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [6] A. J. Liddicoat, Closing conversation, *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*, (2007), London: Continuum.
- [7] J. C. Richards and R. W. Schmidt, Speech acts and second language learning, In *On Conversation (Seameo Regional Language Centre Occasional Papers no. 25)*, (1982), 52-78.
- [8] E. A. Schegloff, Sequencing in conversational openings, In J. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, (1972), New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- [9] E. A. Schegloff, Identification and recognition in telephone conversation openings, In G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*, (1979), New York: Irvington publisher.
- [10] E. A. Schegloff, The routine as achievement, *Human Studies*, 9(2-3) (1986), 111-151.
- [11] E. Schegloff and H. Sacks, Opening up closings, *Semiotica*, 7 (1973), 289-327.
- [12] C. Taleghani-Nikazm, A conversation analytical study of telephone conversation openings between native and non-native speakers, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(12) (2002), 1807-1833, Elsevier.
- [13] E. Ventola, The structure of casual conversation in English, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 3 (1979), 267-298, North-Holland Publishing Company.

