On Dynamics of Telephone Conversation Closedown in Farsi

Ali Kazemi[ab*]

[a]*Department of Applied Linguistics, College of Humanities, Yasouj University, Yasouj, Iran*

[b]*Department of Finnish, Finno-Ugrian & Scandinavian Studies, PL 5 (Vuorikatu 3), 00014 University of Helsinki, Finland*

Abstract

This study sought to unearth the dynamics of telephone closedown ritual in Farsi in terms of pre-closing and terminal exchanges in non-institutional settings and to compare them with similar sequences in American English. The participants were native Farsi speakers living in Iran. The analysis of the data from 39 mundane mobile phone calls, informed by Conversation Analysis, suggests that as in English, in the closing-implicative environment where the core business of the call is accomplished, occasioning the move toward closing, some pre-closing signals such as *bâshe* (*ok*)*, kheili khob* (*alright*)*,* and *kho(b) bâshe* (*ok then*), foreshadow initiation of closing, providing the possibility for parties to interactionally bring calls to closure, shade them or even topicalize something new. However, unlike American English in which tokens such as *ok* and *alright* could be used in closing- and non-closing-implicative environments alike, the frequently-used token of *bâshe bâshe* (*ok ok*) can be potentially closing-relevant and the interrogative form *kâri nadâri?* (*Anything else?*) and endearment terms, tied to closedown ritual, regularly warrant shutting calls down, *severely limiting* the possibility of shading the current topic-in-progress and *effectively precluding* the possibility of topicalizing something new, which makes a strong case for their language- or culture-specificity.

Key Words: Telephone Closing; Farsi Everyday Conversation; Mobile Telephone

1. Introduction

There is both intracultural and intercultural variation associated with the ways in which conversationalists achieve parting in telephone conversations which must end for one reason or another (Takami, 2002). However, terminating a call is not simply a matter of one party indicating a desire to bring the call to an end; rather it requires their close cooperation, using culture-bound rituals (Schegloff and Sacks 1973), which can, in turn, be revelatory of how delicacy of terminating conversations is handled in different languages

Email addresses: ali.kazemi@helsinki.fi; akazemi@yu.ac.ir

and cultures. Unlike telephone openings which have been the subject of numerous (comparative) studies (e.g., Button 1987; Coulmas 1981; Coupland et al. 1992; Davidson 1978; Gumperz 1982; Hopper, 1992; Laver 1981; Levinson 1983; Pavlidou 1994; Schegloff and Sacks 1973; Schegloff 1979, 1986; Taleghani-Nikazm 2002), telephone closings have not been as extensively researched. This has been partly due to the complicatedness of telephone closing, especially the fuzziness of the place where closedown initiation starts (Coronel-Molina 1998; Pavlidou 1997; Pavlidou 2002; Wong 2007). In the present study, the machinery of telephone conversation, as revealed in the closing of non-institutional Farsi[1] mobile telephone calls predominantly taking place between familiars, close friends and family members, is examined to explicate which devices they deploy to initiate pre-closing and actual closing of telephone conversations, to explicate the loci of closedown and to determine whether they conform to oftentimes criterial features worked out for American English.

2. Review of Literature

Research into telephone closings was set in motion by Schegloff and Sacks' (1973) seminal work. Since then, conversational closing has been a major line of research in ethnomethodological and conversation analytical studies (Broth and Mondada, 2013). According to Schegloff and Sacks (1973), the sequence organization of speaker 'talk-in-a-turn' applying to closing telephone conversations is different from that of other closing loci such as topic closure even if the technical formulation of closing could still be couched in terms of turns as 'fundamental order of organization'. Ordering sequential speaker turns is accomplished by an internal turn-taking 'machinery' tasked with selecting who speaks next and determining closing-implicative environment. Conversationalists orient to features of the turn-taking machinery, which accounts for the ongoing orderliness of the *talk-in-interaction*, a term which Schegloff (2007) prefers over *conversation* "to circumvent the connotation of triviality that has often to be attached to the latter term" (xiii). However, the normative distribution of turns is not applicable to closing the conversation "where one speaker's completion is not followed by a possible next speaker's talk" (Schegloff and Sacks 1973: 295). While the overall structural organization of conversation, in general, and sequenced adjacency pair, in particular, still remain the relevant frame of reference to address the 'problem' of closing, turn-taking and sequence organization fall short of accounting for the orderliness of conversation closings

---

[1] This term is usually used to refer to the language variety spoken in Iran.

because in that case a string of turns to talk can be generated which can be indefinitely extendable (Schegloff and Sacks 1973: 237). The problem consists in "how to organize the simultaneous arrival of conversationalists at a point where one speaker's completion will not occasion another speaker's talk, and that will not be heard as some speaker's silence" (Schegloff and Sacks 1973: 294-295). Conversationalists typically address the problem by taking methodic steps, allowing them to project possible closure in a closing-relevant environment, occasioned by the completion of the core business of the conversation. They jointly try to accomplish a negotiated termination of their talk. In the closing-relevant environment, by using a 'floor-yielding' (Hayashi 1991), possible pre-closing token, such as *ok* in English, one interactant checks to determine if there is any hitherto unspoken topic or 'mentionable' to be brought up, followed by a recipient's move to either ratify the closing, allowing the conversation to come to a close or to bring up a new mentionable, providing the possibility for the conversation to continue (Bolden 2017). In the former case, the first pair part proposes a warrant for closure, which strongly projects a contingent shift to the sequence of closing and obligates a second pair part from the recipient. The recipient's ratification, implicating that the ending is warranted, is typically followed by a terminal exchange of *Goodbyes*, which effectively brings the conversation to closure. This is the place where turn taking rules are no longer operative and closing the call is the most relevant next activity (Thonus 2016). Given the account above, the structure of closing sequences, as ritualistic events, is to be distinguished from that of other sections of talk (Raclaw 2008).

The description provided for telephone conversation closedown, transition relevance place, and sequence organization, encapsulated in the notion of 'adjacency pair', originally developed by Schegloff and Sacks, (1973), has been used as a yardstick for studies carried out so far into telephone closings to determine whether it is canonical of all closedown-relevant practices deployed by conversationalists. Of course, Schegloff and Sacks (1973), while trying to provide a typically normative description of interactional closedown and disengagement from a social action, do not preclude the possibility that on some occasions, the format of the archetype closing could be expanded in different ways by employing pre-, insert- and post-expansion (Schegloff 2002). Moreover, speakers commonly make use of additional pre-closing sequences prior to beginning a terminal exchange and may provide accounts of why they are leaving the conversation or may make arrangements for future plans with their interlocutors.

In the spirit of the critique of purely conversation analytical studies, some scholars subscribe to the view that CA studies need to go beyond a purely structural description characteristic of mainstream conversation analytical studies to include contextual factors which could have an impact on closedown-related practices (Moerman 1988). Sequences additional to pre-closing have been considered as fulfilling different interactional functions (Firth 1972; Goffman 1971, 1976; Lüger 1983), including the announcement of "continuing provisional consensus for future interactions" (Laver 1975: 233). Examining the function of different tokens in conversation, Davidson (1978) found that *okay* and *alright* appearing in the closing section have different functions, depending on the nature of the call and the relationship between participants. Likewise, drawing on insights gained from interactional sociolinguistics and pragmatics, Placencia (1997) showed that in Ecuadorian Spanish, closing utterances could perform different interactional functions and found that apart from some similarities, some features characteristic of Ecuadorian Spanish seem to be culture-specific, deviating from the normative description provided by Schegloff and Sacks (1973).

Given that Schegloff and Sacks' (1973) characterization was based on American English, the studies by Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig (1992) into closing in advising sessions, by Clark and French (1981) into closing telephone inquiries to university switchboard operators and by Kipers (1986) into closing service encounters revealed that closedown of telephone calls is subject to intralingual variation even in American English, depending on the situation where the interaction takes place, the relationship between conversants and even the degree of intimacy developed between callers and calleds.

In rather stark contrast with Schegloff and Sacks' (1973) characterization, Button (1987) came up with sequence types which might be deployed to bridge between the closing signal and the actual close, effectively lengthening the closedown or even aborting it as there is the possibility of one party topicalizing something which could attract interactional attention from conversationalists. Auer (1990: 387) expanded the sphere of the activity of turn-taking machinery originally proposed by Schegloff and Sacks (1973) by demonstrating "that the exit from the turn taking machinery is partly or completely accomplished *before* the terminating salutations: it is accomplished not co-terminously with the end of the section, but *during* it" (emphasis in original). Moreover, Bangerter et al. (2004), who sought to scrutinize both the hierarchical (i.e., vertical) and sequential (i.e. horizontal) transition of openings, middles and closings of telephone conversations, found

that the use of 'project markers' such as *alright* and *okay* are applicable to both entering and exiting joint projects, allowing interactants to navigate both vertically and horizontally different entry, body and exit phases of a telephone conversation.

Findings of comparative studies indicate that telephone conversation closedown is subject to interlingual and/or intercultural variation. Examining the way in which aborigines in Australian Southeastern state of Queensland exchange information, Eades (1985) found that adjacency pairs are not used on a regular basis in the variety spoken by the aborigines. While frequently volunteering information, they did not feel obligated to answer questions posed to them, suggesting that the notion of adjacency pair is culture-bound. Okamoto (1990), as quoted in Takami (2002), found that there are four major differences between closedown of Japanese and English telephone conversations. Unlike American English, the use of a punchline as an initial closing sequence was common in Japanese. In addition, Japanese speakers asked their interlocutors to convey greetings for them to their interlocutors' family members or familiars, frequently expressed their pleasure in holding a telephone conversation and did not use the terminal exchange of goodbye. Pavlidou (1997) compared closings in Greek and German telephone calls and concluded that closings in Greek do not completely conform to a dyadic turn-taking structure whereas in German, closings are far more orderly. In terms of content, in the former, emphasis was laid upon 'cooperative parting' whereas in the latter, closings were deployed to consolidate relationships. Coronel-Molina (1998), seeking to determine whether Hispanic patterns of telephone conversations conform to the sequences worked out by Schegloff and Sacks (1973) and the concomitant normative claims, found that there are sequential features which seem to be unique to Spanish, suggesting that the variations could be culture-specific.

Analyzing Chinese data, Sun (2005) found that in Chinese, telephone calls are brought to closure in ways differing considerably from American English. Specifically, he found that some categories are consistently used to initiate closing and that normative pattern of closing worked out by Button (1987) does not hold true of Chinese.

Finally, Bolden (2017) investigated the initiation of closing in Russian telephone conversations and found that closing is initiated either tacitly or explicitly. In the former case, prosodic marking has the pivotal role in that it both establishes a closing-relevant environment and accomplishes a move into closing. In the latter, an explicit request or

offer is made for ending the call at a stage where closing-implicative environment has not been established yet.

The capsule literature review above suggests there have been two major lines of enquiry into how telephone calls are brought to closure. The first is concerned with comparative studies across languages to determine their differences and similarities in terms of the way in which telephone calls are shut down. A second line of enquiry, in which normativity of closedown-related features figure centrally, takes its inspiration in the description of this particular speech exchange system, as worked out by Schegloff and Sacks (1973. In the latter, patterns or structures emerging from the studies are systematically related to those in American English, allowing the possibility of testing the generalizability of the description provided by Schegloff and Sacks (1973).

Given that there is already a growing body of research evidence about how conversationalists do closing in telephone calls in different languages, new research evidence coming from languages not investigated before could contribute to the data accumulated already about aspects of universalism or language- or culture-specificity in the closedown of telephone calls. Building upon the foundational work by Schegloff and Sacks (1973), the current study seeks to determine which telephone conversational mechanisms are employed by Farsi speakers to shut down telephone calls and the positions where they are deployed in terms of sequence organization, an area that has not previously received sufficient research attention.

3. Method

The materials used in the study were audiorecordings and the transcripts of 39 naturally-occurring non-institutional mobile telephone conversations between dyads speaking Farsi as their mother tongue, taking 70 minutes in total. The participants came from central and southern Iran and ranged in age from approximately 19 to 40. The only exceptions were two calls. The first was made by a boy to his mother and father aged 52 and 61, respectively, and the second was a call involving a taxi driver aged about 50. Apart from three cases in which the caller had called taxi drivers to give them directions, on other occasions, the dyads were friends, familiars, classmates and family members. Informed consent was obtained for recordings, which were made either by the callers or the calleds, who orally consented to participate in the study. Before the call, the party to the call was

informed that the call would be recorded and recording was made only when oral consent was obtained. For the three calls involving strangers, the recorded calls were follow-ups made to taxi-drivers and oral consent was obtained in the first calls made. In the transcription[2], an attempt is made to capture analytically relevant verbal and prosodic details deemed to be adequate for the analysis. The analysis of the data in terms of turns, adjacency pairs and sequences is grounded in the exemplary display of the ways in which closedown of a telephone conversation unfolds with reference to local (i.e. utterance by utterance) and topical organization.

4. Results & Discussion

In the following section, an account is provided of the analysis of the data and the relevant discussion, with some reference to research findings in American English by Schegloff and Sacks (1973) and Button (1987). The scrutiny of the present data set, grounded in the systematic observation of naturally occurring data, indicates that in some cases, the practices deployed by Farsi speakers to bring a telephone call to closure are not different from the ones already worked out by Schegloff and Sacks (1973) for American English and other languages (Bolden 2017; Coronel-Molina 1998; Eades 1985; Okamoto 1990; Pavlidou 1997; Placencia 1997; Sun 2005). However, on other occasions, there are certain practices which are unique to Farsi and occur exclusively for purposes of closing a topic or placing the call on a closing track.

In Farsi, as in English, closing-implicative environment where the central business of the call is accomplished occasions the move toward closing, tacitly or explicitly initiated either by the caller or the called. Moreover, the use of some devices as pre-closing signals betokens the initiation of closing, providing the possibility for parties to interactionally bring the call to closure, extend it or even bring up a new topic. Farsi conversants can choose from a repertoire of (possible) pre-closing tokens or their combinations such as *bâshe* (*ok*), *kheili khob* (*alright*), *kho(b) bâshe* (*ok then*), *ok*, *bâshe bâshe* (*ok ok*) and *kâri*

---

[2] The Jeffersonian Transcription System is used to transcribe the data (Atkinson and Heritage, 1984:ix-xvi). Four lines of transcript are provided: Farsi original, using Farsi alphabet, the transliteration in English, a gloss, and an idiomatic English translation. The Leipzig Glossing Rules have been adopted for person morphological inflections: "1SG" =first person singular, "2SG" = second person singular, "3SG" =third person singular, "1PL" = first person plural, "2PL" = second person plural, and "3PL" = third person plural (Comrie, Haspelmath & Bickel, 2015).

nadâri? (*Anything else?*) or endearment terms to bring a call to closure. The mere presence of some of these pre-closings such as *bâshe* (*ok*) does not betoken the closedown of the telephone call. Rather, their sequential placement in a closing-implicative environment (Schegloff 2007) and/or their prosodic marking (Bolden 2017) determine their closing function. In the following section, an account is provided of closedown mechanisms in Farsi which are similar to the ones already worked out for American English (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973).

4.1 Shared Closedown Mechanisms in Farsi

In expectably 'monotopical' telephone calls where the parties orient to the fact that not more than a single topic will be discussed, topic-bounding (i.e. gradually bringing the topic to closure) is the relevant conversational action in which a possible pre-closing follows a topic-closing exchange (Schegloff and Sacks 1973). In such cases, in a closing-implicative environment where the core activity of the call is accomplished, both interactants orient to the accomplishment of the call's single agenda, and its relevant closedown. Closings are typically launched by interactants, using possible pre-closing tokens and/or prosodic marking. For example, in the following excerpt, a student has called his roommate to ask him to make a list of students who would like to serve as proctors for a test to be administered later.

Exc. 1 Proctors' List (Call No. 2, 0:36/ 1:43)

```
01   CR:      خوبی کجائی؟
              khoobi kojâee?
              well+are+2ndSG where+are+2ndSG?
              are you well where are you?
02   CD:      سالن
              (  ) sâlon
              (  ) club
              …
11   CR:      آها مم میان برا مراقبی به نظرت؟
              ahâ mm miyân barâ morâghebi be nazaret?
              PART3 PART come+3rdPL for proctoring to view+your?
              PART PART do you think they like to be proctors?
12   CD:      ها اخداشونه
              hâ akhodâshooneh=
              yes by all means
13   CR: =>   (ها خو) رفتی اتاق یه لیست چا- چار پنج نفری
              (hâ kho) rafti otâgh ye liste châ- châr panj nafari
              (ok then) go+2ndSG room one list+of fou-four five persons
              (ok then) once you go to the room make a list of four or five persons
```

---

[3] Partîcle

```
14              هم بچه‌های خودمون بنویس
                ham bachehâye khodemoon benvis
                only guys+of ourselves write
                write down only our friends
                …
17      CD:     چنتا میخوای؟
                chantâ mikhây?
                how+many want+2ⁿᵈSG?
                how many do you need?
18      CR:     kolan shojâyee goft ye dah poonzdahtâ benvis har ki-
                totally shojayee said one ten fifteen write every one-
                totally shojayee said make a list of about ten to fifteen every one-
19      CR:     ای- هر کی نوشتی بنویس بقیشو خودم
                ay-harki neveshti benvis
                if-anyone to write write
                if-write down the name of anyone you wish
20              فردا اضافه میکنم اگر کسی بود.
                baghyasho khodam fardâ ezâfe mikonam agar kasi bood.
                remainder+3ʳᵈSG+of+OM⁴ myself tomorrow addition do+1ˢᵗSG if any is.
                I myself will add the remainder tomorrow if there is any.
21      CD:     نه آخه هرچقد بخوای من برات پیدا میکنم چنتا میخوای؟
                na âkhe harcheghad bekhây man barât peydâ mikonam chantâ mikhây?=
                no after all as many want+2ⁿᵈSG I for+you find make how many want+2ⁿᵈSG?
                no,after all,I can find as many as you need how many do you need?
22      CR:     آره اشکال نداره پونزده تاحداقل بنویس پس.
                âre eshkâl nadâre poonzdahtâ hadeaghal benvis pas.
                yes, problem not+have fifteen at least write then.
                ok, no problem then write down at least fifteen.
23      CD:     برا کی؟
                barâ key?
                for when?
24      CR:     برا فردا آزمونش جمعست آزمونش جمعست.
                barâ fardâ âzmoonesh jomast âzmoonesh jomast.↓
                for tomorrow test+its friday+is test+its friday+is.
                for tomorrow, the test is on friday the test is on friday.
25      CD:=>   اوکی
                ok
26      CR: =>  دیگه هرکی نوشت-خواست بنویسه بگو اسمو-
                dige harkeyo nevesht- khast benevise begoo esmo-
                then anyone write- wants to write tell name+and-
                then anyone who is written- wants to write,ask to write name and-
27              میگم شماره دانشجوئی شماره حسابشم بنویسه دیگه.↓
                migam shomâre dâneshjooee shomâre hesâbesham benvise dige.↓
                say+1ˢᵗSG number student number account+3ʳᵈSG+too write then.
                I mean, to write his student number and bank account number too.
28      CD: =>  باشه
                BÂshe=
                ok
29      CR: =>  اوکی مرسی میبینمت فردا.
                ok merci mibinamet fardâ.
                ok, thanks will+see+1ˢᵗSG+2ⁿᵈSG+OM tomorrow.
                ok, thanks, I will see you tomorrow.
30      CD:     با]شه
                BÂ[she
                 o[k
31      CR: =>  [قربونت خدافظ
                [ghorboonet⁵, khodâfez
```

---

⁴ Object Marker

⁵ This endearment term has no exact equivalent in English and has been rendered into English in different ways in the literature as 'thank you' by Taleghani Nikazm (2002) and as 'May I be sacrificed in your place!' by Saberi (2012). While

```
                    [sacrifice+myself+of+you thank you, bye
                    [may I be sacrificed in your place bye
32  CD:      خداﻓﻆ
             khodâfez
             bye
```

In the excerpt above, before initiating the-reason-for-the-call action, on Lines 1-11 (not included in its entirety in the transcript for space reasons), the caller makes a number of inquiries about where the called is, who he is with, and whether their roommates and mutual friends are available, followed by an inquiry about their willingness to act as proctors, all of which constitute pre-expansion sequences to the first pair part beginning on Line 13. Given the called's response on Line 12 about their willingness to be proctors, the caller proceeds to state the warrant prompting the call on Lines 13 and 14. It seems that at this stage of the call, the caller assumes the request has been granted. Following that, there are some details to be worked out (Lines 17-24), raised either by the called (Lines 17, 21) or the caller (Line 24).

As regards the closure of the call, pre-closing gambits have been attempted twice. On Line 24, in providing an answer to the query made by the called on Line 23, the caller clearly decreases his volume and pitch, which might be taken as evidence that he has nothing more to add. Given the sequence-closing third on Line 25, the call can be brought to an end. Notwithstanding this closedown-implicative position, by topic shading, the caller chooses to add something as an ostensible afterthought to the information he has provided already and extends the sequence (Line 26). Towards the end of his turn, he again decreases his pitch and volume, suggesting a proposal for closedown and implicating closing-resumptiveness. This time, taking the first pair part as initiating closing, the called ratifies the closing on Line 28 by using an acknowledgment token, passing the floor to the caller. Given that the called does not topicalize anything new in the response accorded the preceding turn, the caller continues to produce the first pair part of the pre-closing adjacency pair on Line 29, involving thanking the called and enacting an arrangement for a future action, followed by the second pair part by the called on Line 30 and finally the terminal exchange of goodbyes. Shutting down the telephone call is

---

the former is certainly correct, the latter has been adopted in the current study, which is more in line with the function which it performs.

launched tacitly on an occasion where there is a slot for its initiation and use is made of both a generic pre-closing token and prosodic marking.

In addition to deploying tacit practices to mark shutting down a telephone call, by initiating closing explicitly, interactants my offer or request to bring a telephone call to an end in Farsi. In the following episode, a boy has called his friend simply to catch up.

Exc. 2. Catching Up (Call No. 22, 2:19)

```
01  CR:     الـ[و
            a[lo
            hel[o
            hello
02  CD:            [جـان سلام
                   [jân salâm=
                   [dear hi
03  CR:     سلام چطوری؟
            salâm chetori?
            hi how+are+2ndSG?
            hi, how are you?
04  CD:     خو[بـم.
            khoo[bam
            well[am+1stSG.
                [I am well.
                 [حـالـت خوبـه سلامـتی؟
05  CR:         [hâlet khoobe salâmati?
                [feeling+your well+is well+are+2ndSG?
                [how are you? are you well?
06  CD:=>   هـا حـالـم خوبـه
            HÂ, HÂLAM KHOOBE
            yes feeling+my well+is
            yes I feel well
07  CR:     چرا؟
            Cherâ?
            why?
08  CD:     هـا؟
            hâ?
            what?
09  CR:     چرا حـالـت خوبـه؟
            cherâ hâlet khoo[beh?
            why feeling+2ndSG  well[is?
            why do you feel well?
10  CD:              [چی چرا حـالـم خوبـه [پـه بـد بـاشم؟
                     [chi cherâ khoobam dige[pa bad bâsham?
                     [what why well+am else [then bad to be+1stSG?
                     [what why do I feel well shall I be bad then?
11                                        [آخه-
                                          [âkhe-
                                          [after all-
12  CR:     نـه آخه یـه جور خاصی گفتی هـا حـالـم خوبـه
            na âkhe ye jore khâsi gofti hâ hâlam khoobeh
            no after all one manner+of special+one said yes feeling+my well+is
            no, after all in a certain way, you said yes, I feel well
13          فکر [کردم اتفـاق خاصی افتـاده.
            fekr[kardam etefâghe khâsi oftâde.
            thought[did+1stSG happening+of special+a fallen.
```

```
                     I thought something particular has happened.
14  CD:        [نـه فکر کردم مـثلا دیگه بـاز حرف نـزدیم
              [na fekr kardam masalan dige bâz harf nazadim
              [no thought did+1stSG for example no more again talk+not hit+1stPL
              [no I thought as we did not talk again any more
15            تـو اینسـتا اینـا فکر کردم نـگران شدی الـبته
              to instâ inâ fekr kardam negarân shodi albate
              in insta these thought did+1stSG worried became+2ndSG of course
              in instagram I thought you were worried of course
                          ...
16  CR:   گوشیـم دستـه سعید بـودا تقریبـا سعید [داشت بـازی مـی‌کرد
         gushim dase saeed buda taghriban saeed    [dasht bazi mikard=
         cell phone+my hand+of Saeed was almost Saeed[had play was+making
         my cell phone was with saeed almost saeed   [was playing
17  CD:=>                                  [سعید مـی‌زد؟
                                          [saeed mizad?
                                          [saeed was+hitting+3rdSG?
                                          [saeed was playing?
18  CR:     نـه اون‌موقـعکه دیگه شما رفتین دیگه سعید از خواب بـیدار شد
          NA oonmogheke dige shomâ raftin dige saeed az khâb bidâr shod
          no when else you went then saeed from sleep awake became
          no after you left saeed woke up then
19  CD:    هـا
          ha=
          PART
20  CR:   دیگه بـا سعید داشتیـم بـاهم مـی‌زدیم دیگه گوشی
         dige bâ saeed dâshtim bâham mizadim dige gooshi
         then with saeed having together were hitting then phone
         then with saeed we were playing and then the phone
21        دسه سعید بـود دیگه سعید مـی‌زد بـیشتر.
         dase saeed bood dige saeed mizad bishtar.
         hand+of saeed was then saeed was hitting more.
         was with saeed and he was then playing more.
22  CD: =>   آهـا (خب) خواسم بـرم مـاکارونی درس کـنم.
         âhâ (khob)khâsam beram mâcâroni doros konam.
         PART (ok)wanted+1stSG+to go macaroni preparation to make.
         PART (ok) I wanted to go and make macaroni.
23  CR: =>  خب بـرو بـرو مزاحم نمیشم مـنم میخوام بـرم بـاشگا.
         khob boro boro mozâhem nemisham manam mikhâm beram bâshgâ.
         ok go go bothering not to be I+too want+1stSG to go club.
         ok,go go I don't want to take your time I want to go to the club too.
24  CD:    خب بـاشه بـرو
         khob bâshe boro
         ok then go
25  CR: =>  کاری بـاری نـداری فلا؟
         kâri bâri⁶ nadâri felan?
         work work don't have now?
         anything else?
26  CD:=>  نـه مـواظب خودت بـاش
         na movâzebe khodet bâsh
         no careful+of yourself be
         no take care
                  ...
```

In this call, there is no indication that a single topic will be talked about. Neither does this become clear as the call unfolds, which is due to the nature of the call. Thus, this excerpt is not expectably monotopical and it cannot be said when the parties are done with the

---

⁶ The repeated word is the same as the one immediately preceding it in meaning and only differs in the initial sound, which is characteristic of colloquial Farsi.

main business(s) of the call. They first talk about the called's exaggerated tone in greeting on Line 6 and then proceed to talk about playing online games. On Line 17, a repair is initiated by the called, occasioning the caller's going on at some length on Lines 18, 20, 21 about what he and his friend have been up to. On Line 22, the recipient of the call, who has initiated the repair, produces a receipt token, signaling receipt of the information/clarification. Given that from the outset, it has not been clear that a single topic will be talked about, the call could continue by either the caller or the called starting a new sequence on the same topic or topicalizing something new. However, on Line 22, even if the called is given the turn, she confirms the receipt of the information and the answer provided by the caller to her earlier enquiry (Line 17 arrowed) by using a minimal expansion token of confirmation (i.e. *âhâ* meaning *oh*) and goes on to refer to an action outside the telephone call (i.e., making an announcement), which necessitates both parties getting off the call and warrants closing the call. Acting accordingly, the caller ratifies the warrant on Line 23 and raises his intention to do something, too, which, indicates alignment with the called and further conditions the exit from the call. The nature of the action raised by the called does not warrant immediate closure. In ratifying the call-closing warrant, the caller produces the form *mozâhemet nemisham* meaing 'I don't want to take your time'. The caller's reference here is to the action just raised by the caller and there has been no previous reference to the called's plan to do something in earlier stages of the call, which would require exiting the call. In addition, he raises his plan to go to a club. Given the intimate relationship between the two, it seems the caller pointed this out to indicate he would not be resented by the called's possible early exit from the call, as the call could continue. Given that the caller reciprocates by indicating agreement on Line 24, they converge to bring the call to closure.

There are some Farsi pre-closing tokens which are similar to their English counterparts, but behave differently in terms of their sequential placement and function. These rather frequently used pre-closing tokens are *kheili khob* (*alright*) and *kho(b) bâshe* (*ok then*), accounting for about 28% of closedown practices in the data. Unlike other pre-closing tokens, they are overwhelmingly used in the closing-implicative environments, and in terms of sequential organization, predominantly in sequence-closing third position, to bound a topic or close down the call.

In the following excerpt, which exemplifies *kheili khob* (*alright*), a man has called his wife from his office to seek her advice on taking some medication (not transcribed here) and goes on to ask her when she will go home.

Exc. 3. Making Enquiries (Call No. 26, 00.39∕1:07)

```
01   CR:    میری خونه بدش؟
            miri khone badesh?
            go+2ndSG home after+3rdSG?
            will you go home then?
02   CD:    آره
            âre
            yes
03   CR:    تا کی موسسه‌ای؟
            tâ key moseseiy?
            until when institute+are+2ndSG?
            when will you leave the institute?
04   CD:    حالا نمره‌ها را که من وارد نکردم تو کارنامه
            hâlâ nomrehâ râ ke man vâred nakardam to kârnâme
            now scores OM that I entrance didn't do+1stSG in profile
            now I haven't entered the scores in profiles
05          قرار شد برم رستگار می‌گفت
            gharâr shod beram rastegâr migoft
            arrangement became to go+1stSG rastegar was saying
            I have arranged to go myself rastegar said
06          نمره‌ها را وارد نکن
            nomrehâ râ vâred nakon
            scores OM entrance not+do
            do not enter the scores
07          بیا اینجا که باهم ببینیم چه کار کنیم
            biâ injâ ke bâham bebinim che kâr konim
            come here that together to see what work to do
            come here so we will decide what to do
08          برم ببینم می‌خواد چکار کنه
            beram bebinam mikhâd che kar kone
            to go+1stSG to see+1stSG want+3rdSG what work to do
            I will go to see what she wants to do.
09   =>     احتمالا تا هفت بیشتر نیست.
            ehtemâlan ta haft bishtar nist.
            perhaps until seven more not to be.
            perhaps it won't last longer than seven.
10 CR: =>   خیلی خب موا(خمیازه)ظب خودت باش
            kheil khob movâ(yawns)zebe khodet bâsh
            very good, careful yourself be
            alright, take care
11 CD: =>   قربانت
            ghorbânat
            sacrifice+myself+of+you
            may I be sacrificed in your place
12 CR:      خدافظ
            khodâfez
            bye
13 CD:      خدافظ
            khodâfez
            bye
```

In this excerpt, the first pair part of the core adjacency pair appears on Line 3. In the answer, the called takes a long turn spanning a few lines, constituting the second pair part, detailing why it will take her some time before she goes home. Towards the end of her turn, she provides an approximate time when she will be done, implicating that she can be home then. On line 10, the caller betokens the receipt of the information. However, it seems that this token is double-barreled in Farsi in this context in that, in addition to acknowledging the receipt of the information, the caller goes on to unilaterally produce the first pair part of the pre-terminal exchange without waiting for the incipient ratification from the called. The endearment term used by the called suggests that she orients to closure, too.

A similar pre-closing token in Farsi is *kho(b) bâshe* (*ok then*). It is used in different positions (i.e., first pair part, second pair part and as minimal expansion) in the data corpus to suggest closure. In the following excerpt, a boy has called his friend to see whether she is ready.

Exc. 4. Checking on a Friend (Call No. 24, 00.54⁄1:08)

```
01   CR:        آماده ای؟
                âmâdeiy?
                ready+are+2ndSG?
                are you ready?
02   CD:        ها
                hâ
                yes
03   CR:        حالا [میام
                hâlâ [miyâm
                now come+1stSG
                I will come now
04   CD:               [لباسم بپوشم
                       [lebâsam bepoosham
                       [clothes+my to wear
                       [let me put on my clothes
05   CR:  =>    زود باش
                zood bâsh
                quick be
                be quick
06   CD:  =>    خب باشه
                khob bâshe
                ok then
07   CR:        خدافظ
                khodâfez
                bye
08   CD:        خدافظ
                khodâfez
                bye
```

The conversants in this call have already made arrangements to go out together. The call transcribed above is a follow-up one by the boy to check on his friend. After exchanging

greetings, the caller goes on to deal with the main business of the call. After finding out that the called is not quite ready yet (Line 4), in spite of her affirmative answer on Line 2 to the inquiry made by the caller (Line 1), the caller asks her to be quick. In the answer to the request as a first pair part, the called produces the token of *khob bâshe* (*ok then*) on Line 6, as a second pair part of the adjacency pair. Given that the call is monotopical and that the main business of the calls has already been taken care of, the closing-implicativeness is interactionally achieved and the relevant next action is bringing the call to closure. Even if the special circumstances of the caller and possible earlier arrangements made may occasion the closure of the call, the production of the first pair part of the terminal exchange on Line 7 indicates that the caller has taken the first pair part as initiating closing and goes on to produce the first pair part of the terminal exchange.

While the characterization above suggests that the pre-closing component of telephone calls in Farsi is similar to that of American English and some other languages, closer examination of closedown ritual in Farsi telephone calls shows that the pre-closing component is organized in a more complex and different structure, as illustrated in the following sections. Unlike English in which possible pre-closings become actual when they are reciprocated by recipients, providing the relevance of the initiation of a closedown, in Farsi some pre-closings are typically treated as actual pre-closings by virtue of their occurrence. As instantiated in the following sections, the token of *Bâshe bâshe* (*ok ok*) is typically used to close a topic, and the interrogative form *kâri nadâri?* (*Anything else?*) and endearment terms appear in the closing-implicative environment and overwhelmingly place the call on a closing track.

4.2 Topic Closing-Implicative Token of *Bâshe bâshe (ok ok)*

A recurrent pattern of closedown of topics in the present data set is the use of *bâshe bâshe* (*ok ok*), uttered in a rush-through manner, without any lapse of time between the two parts in second pair part or sequence-closing third position. In such a sequential environment, in addition to indicating receipt of information, confirmation or acknowledgement, it serves topic-closing functions and closing the call typically becomes the relevant next action. Having gone through the routinized sequence(s) of opening a telephone call and having worked through other sequences in the middle, Farsi conversants frequently choose to bring a sequence to closure by using the token of *bâshe bâshe* (ok ok). This token is used by the interactant who undertakes to do something,

confirms an arrangement or acknowledges the receipt of some instruction in the course of the call, whether the caller or the called, with great regularity, betokening the tail end of the preceding extended sequence of conversation on a topic. Given its topic closing-implicativeness (Button, 1991), it advances the course of the talk toward pre-closing, and subsequently, by using pre-closing tokens parties mutually converge on closing the call. Out of the total number of 39 calls in the data set, *bâshe bâshe* (*ok ok*) is used in 14 cases (about 36%), suggesting a preference for its use.

In the following illustrative example, which is about making arrangements to meet in order to exchange some print-outs, the conversants have jointly established a closing-implicative environment, occasioned by the completion of the core activity of the call (Schegloff and Sacks 1973).

Exc. 5. Campus Talk (Call No. 3, 00:27)

```
01   CR:    الـو
            alo
            hello
02   CD:    الـو سلا]م
            alo, sal[âm
            hello   h[i
03   CR:            [سلام خوبـی خوشی؟
                    [salâm khoobi khoshi?
                    [hello well+2ndSG fun+2ndSG?
                    [hello are you well are you having fun?
04          میگم مـن ایـن دوتـا را پـریـنت گرفـتم
            migam man in dotâ râ perint gereftam
            say+1stSG I this two OM print got+1stSG
            look I printed out these two
05          ای میخوای دستی تـا دستی بـت بـدم
            ay mikhây dasti tâ dasti bet bedam
            if want+2ndSG manual so by hand to+2ndSG to give+1STSG
            if you want I will hand them to you
06   CD:    آهـا پـریـنت گرفتی؟
            âhâ perint gerefti?
            PART print got+2ndSG?
            PART did you print (them)?
07   CR:    آره عکس هم میـتونـم حـالا ازشون بـگیـرم ولـی
            âre aks ham mitoonam hâlâ azeshoon begiram vali
            yes, photo too can+1stSG now from them to get but
            yes, I can take a photo as well but
08          پـریـنت هه کـاغذی دیـگه ازشون گرفـتم.
            perinte he kâghazi dige azeshoon gereftam.
            print+of PART paper already from+3rdPL got+1stSG.
            PART I printed them out.
09   CD:    الان کجا هستی؟
            alân kojâ hasti?
            now, where be+2ndSG?
            where are you now?
10   CR:    ادبیـاتم
```

```
            adabiyâtam
            humanities+be+1ˢᵗSG
            I am at humanities
11   CD:=>  اااا ادبیـات بـذا مـن الان میـام ازت مـیگیرم.
            eeee adabiyât, bezâ man alân miyâm azat migiram.
            PART humanities, let me now come+1ˢᵗSG from+2ⁿᵈSG get+1ˢᵗSG.
            PART humanities, let me come and take them from you.
12   CR:=>  بـاشه بـاشه قربـانت
            bâshe bâshe ghorbânat
            ok ok, sacrifice+myself+of+you
            ok ok, may I be sacrificed in your place
13   CR:    خداافظ
            khodâfez
            bye
14   CD:    (خداافظ)
            (khodâfez)
            (bye)
```

After the exchange of greetings in the opening sequence, on Line 4, by using the particle *migam*, which seems to be typical of opening a topic in Farsi, the caller informs the called of what he has done. The use of the phrase *in do ta (these two)* makes it clear that they have already made an arrangement requiring the caller to prepare something. Having been informed, on Line 6, the called acknowledges the receipt of the information, followed by what seems to be a question. However, given the choice which the caller offers on Line 7, it seems that the called does not expect to receive the information in print. Following that, on Line 9, the called enquires about the caller's whereabouts, which is essentially a pre to the final arrangement made on Line 11. The answer provided by the caller on Line 10 indicates the caller is in close proximity, prompting the called to decide to go in person and take the print-outs. At this stage, even if the core activity of the call has already been accomplished and a closing-relevant environment has been interactively established, this does not preclude the possibility of the caller bringing up a new topic or 'shading' the topic which is about to end (Schegloff and Sacks 1973). However, the use of the token of *bâshe bâshe* (*ok ok*), in addition to signaling the receipt of the information and agreeing to withhold the previously arranged activity, is potentially closing-relevant, creating a 'juncture' in the topic-in-progress (Button, 1991). It is notable that immediately after the use of this token, the caller proceeds to produce an endearment term which is a pre-closing token used to initiate the closedown of the call.

On some occasions, speakers use this token to signal agreement with some arrangement/suggestion. Given that the main business of the call has been taken care of, the post-receipt position thus created is a natural place to close the conversation.

However, the pre-closing token, which could be an endearment term or any other pre-closing token, is used by respondents. In the following excerpt, a student has called his friend to ask him to return a test paper. Given that the called is actually whispering, the caller guesses that he must be studying in the library, a hunch which the called confirms later (Line 10).

Exc. 6. Library Talk (Call No. 5, 00:28)

```
01   CR:     الـو
             alo
             hello
02   CD:     الـو چطوری؟
             °alo, chetouri?
             hello, how+are+2ⁿᵈSG?
             hello, how are you?
03   CR:     الـو
             alo
             hello
04   CD:     سلام
             °salâm
             hello
05   CR:     خوبی (چه خبـر)؟
             °khoobi (che khabar)?
             well +be+2ⁿᵈSG (what news)?
             are you well? (what's up)?
06   CD:     مـمـنـون
             °mamnoon
             thanks
07   CR: =>  آها کتـابـخونـه‌ای؟
             °âhâ, ketbkhooney?
             PART, library+are+2ⁿᵈSG?
             PART, are you at the library?
08   CD:     آره
             °are
             yes
09   CR:     ااااا خو مـیگم کـاری کن
             °eeee kho migam, kari ko
             PART then say+1ˢᵗSG, something do+2ⁿᵈSG
             PART then look do something
10   CD:     چیـه؟
             °chiye?
             what+is+3ʳᵈSG?
             what is it?
11   CR:     بـرگه مـتـونـو داری؟
             °bargeye motoono dâri?
             paper+of texts+OM have+2ⁿᵈSG?
             do you have the paper of (islamic) texts (course) with you?
12   CD:     آره
             °âre
             yes
13   CR: =>  بـفرس عکسشو چکـارش کنم دیـگه
             °befres aksesho, chekâresh konam dige
             send photo+its+OM, what+3ʳᵈSG to do else
             send its photo, what else can I do
14   CD:     خب داخل واتـسآپ مـیفـرسـتم بـرات
             °khob, dâkhele vâtsâp mifrestom barât
```

```
                ok, in+of whatsapp send+1ˢᵗSG for+2ⁿᵈSG
                ok, I will send it to you by whatsapp
15    CR: =>  باشه باشه الان می‌گیرم .
            °bâshe bâshe, alân migirom.
             ok ok, now get+1ˢᵗSG.
             ok ok, I will get it now.
16    CD: =>  قربانت باشه خدافظ
            °ghorbânet, bâshe, khodâfez
             sacrifice+myself+of+you,ok, bye
             may I be sacrificed in your place ok, bye
17    CR:      فعلا خدافظ
            °felan, khodâfez
             for now, bye
```

On Line 9, the caller's use of the particle *migam*, followed by *kâri kon* (do something), is an indication that his enquiry about the called's whereabouts is a pre to what he is going to get the called to do, which Schegloff (2007) terms 'pre-expansion' of base pair. There is a second pre-expansion pair on Lines 11 and 12. The base adjacency pair spans Lines 13 and 14 where the caller clearly asks the called what to do and the called agrees to do so. By uttering *bâshe bâshe* (*ok ok*) on Line 15, the caller confirms receipt of the instruction. However, even though the core business of the call is accomplished and the call is potentially closing-relevant (Button, 1991), the caller does not initiate the closedown of the call; rather, the call-taker's use of the endearment term and the confirmation token (Line 16) puts the call on a closing track.

Some tokens such as *bâshe* (*ok*) in Farsi, *ok* in English and their equivalents in other languages, for that matter, could be used for purposes of either confirmation or initiation of closing. The placement of these tokens in the closing-implicative environment, coupled with other indicators of closedown initiation, suggests closure. However, after this double-barreled potentially closing-relevant token in Farsi which is regularly used in instruction-receipt and arrangement-confirmation sequences, a pre-closing sequence usually becomes relevant. This is because the main business of the call for which it was made has been taken care of and thereby a post-receipt position may be a natural place for closing the call[7].

Whereas the double-token of *bâshe bâshe* (*ok ok*) is topic closing-implicative in certain calls (Button, 1991), there are some mechanisms frequently deployed by either callers or calleds to bring the call to closure and clearly serve pre-closing functions. Endearment terms and/or the double-barreled interrogative form *kâri nadâri? (Anything else?)* are used in this capacity and provide the relevance of the initiation of closedown ritual.

---

[7] I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for drawing my attention to this point.

4.3 Pre-Closing Tokens

In the data set, a rather frequent mechanism deployed for bounding a topic or shutting down a mobile phone call involves the use of endearment terms, accounting for about 25% of closedown mechanisms. They are used either singly or in combination with the interrogative form *kâri nadâri? (Anything else?)* or single and double tokens discussed so far for bounding topics or shutting down telephone calls. In the following excerpt in which a student has called his friend, who is also his flatmate, to suggest going out together, the endearment terms constitute an entire turn.

Exc. 7. Going Out: (Call No. 19, 00:38⁄00:59)

```
01  CR:        میگم عصر بیکاری؟
               migam asr bikâri?
               say+1stSG evening free+are+2ndSG?
               look are you free in the evening?
02  CD:        عصر من خوابم سعید
               asr man khâbam saeed
               evening I asleep+am+1stSG saeed
               in the evening, I am asleep, saeed
03  CR:        (laugh)
04  CR:        فردا [کجائی؟
               fardâ    [kojâee?
               tomorrow [where+are+2ndSG?
               tomorrow [where are you?
05  CD:                 [جائی می‌خواین برین؟
                        [jâee mikhâyn berin?
                        [place+a want+2ndPL to go?
                        [do you want to go somewhere?
06  CR:        نه همین طوری
               na hamin touri
               no, same way
               no, just asked
07  CD:        فردا بریم بیرون
               fardâ berim biroon
               tomorrow to go+1stPL out
               let's go out tomorrow
08  CR:        فردا می‌ریم بیرون؟
               fardâ mirim biroon?
               tomorrow go+1stPL?
               tomorrow we will go out?
09  CD:        فردا بریم آره پنج‌شنبه عصر
               fardâ berim are, panjshanbe asr
               tomorrow to go+1stPL yes thursday evening
               yes, tomorrow thursday evening
10  CD: =>     آها باشه
               âhâ, bâshe
               oh ok
11  CD: =>     چاکرم قربا[نت
               châkaram, ghorbâ[net
               obedient servant+am+1stSG, I+sacrifice+of+myself+2ndSG
               I am your obedient servant may I be sacrificed in your place
12  CR:        خوش بگذره [خداف-
```

```
                         [khosh begzare[khodâf-
                         [fun to pass  [goodb-
                         [have fun goodbye
                                      [دیشب تـا صب نـخوابـیـدم
13  CD:                  [dishab tâ sob nakhâbidam
                         [last night until morning did'nt+sleep+1stSG
                         [I didn't sleep last night
14  CR:     عیب نـداره[
            eib nadâ[re
            problem not have+3rdSG
            no problem
15  CD:=>        [قربـانـت خدافظ
                 [ghorbânet khodâ[fez
                 [I+sacrifice+of+myself+2ndSG[goodbye
                 [may I be sacrificed in your place goodbye
16  CR:                              [خدافظ
                                     [khodâfez
                                     [goodbye
17  CD:     مخلص خدافظ
            mokhles khodâfez
            humble servant goodbye
            humble servant goodbye
```

The opening phase of the call (not included in the transcript) is truncated, seemingly due to the fact that the called happens to be in an Internet Café, playing online games. After exchanging greetings, the caller enquires about the called's whereabouts in the afternoon. Given that the called is not available, the caller goes on to ask what he will be doing the next morning. Overlapping with the second pre, the called enquires about whether the caller and possibly his friends (suggested by the plural form on Line 5), want to go out. Even if the caller uses two pres on Lines 1 and 4 to suggest going out, and suggestion is heavily in the air, he refrains from making one. This seems to be due to the unavailability of the called, which might be taken by the caller as an indication of his disinterest for going out. Eventually the called does the suggestion on Line 7. On Line 8, the caller displays problem by asking for clarification, forming the first pair part of an adjacency pair, followed by the second pair part on Line 9. Subsequently, the caller minimally expands (Schegloff 2007) the adjacency pair by producing two tokens on Line 10. The first is an informational change-of-state token, and the second is deployed to indicate acceptance of the suggestion[8]. On Line 11, the called uses some endearment terms suggesting closedown. While they could be used on other occasions for different purposes, for example to show affection (Pauletto, Aronsson & Galeano, 2017), in closing-implicative environments, endearment terms seem to be specifically used to indicate closure. Given that they are flatmates, they do not make any arrangements about when

---

[8] I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for drawing my attention to this point.

and where to meet up. Taking the endearments terms on Line 11 as suggestion for closure, the caller goes on to produce the final goodbye, which overlaps with what seems to be an afterthought by the called (Line 13). On this line, the called provides a reason for his unavailability for going out in the evening, given already on Line 2, which the caller accepts. Following this insert-expansion sequence (Schegloff, 2007), the called uses another endearment term on Line 15, followed by the terminal sequence.

In Farsi mobile phone calls, a mechanism which is rather frequently deployed by participants to initiate closing (in 8 cases out of 39 in the data set), is the use of *kâri nadâri? (Anything else?)* in the closing-implicative environment. This expression is used to the effect that the speaker is bringing the call to closure, thus, conveying the intention to end the call in a straightforward manner. Despite its interrogative form, it is rarely taken in its information-seeking function and is overwhelmingly used by respondents to initiate closure. It is usually preceded by *bâshe*, *khob* both meaning *ok* or an endearment term, as in the following example in which a student has called his friend to ask about the time at which a match kicks off.

Exc. 8. Match Timetable (Call No. 11, 00:45)

```
01   CD:     الـو
             alo
             hello
02   CR:     سلام خوبـی جفـر؟
             salâm, khubi jafar?
             hello well+are+2ndSG jafar?
             hello are you well jafar?
03   CD:     سلام
             salâm
             hello
04   CR:     سلامـتی؟
             salâmati?
             healthy+are+2ndSG?
             are you fine?
05   CD:     قـربـونـت بـشم
             ghorboonet besham
             sacrifice+myself+of+you to be
             may I be sacrificed in your place
06   CR:     میگم بـازی سـاعت چنده؟
             migam bâzi sâate chande?
             say+1stSG match time+of what+is?
             look what time does the match kick off?
07   CD:     یـه رب بـه هفـت
             ye rob be haft
             a quarter to seven
08   CR:     یـه رب بـه هفت؟
             ye rob be haft?
             a quarter to seven?
09   CD:     آره آره
```

```
          âre
          yes yes
10   CR:   مـن كلاسم  احتمـالا  نـرسم  بيـام
          man kelâsam ehtemâlan naresam biyâm
          I class+am+1stSG probably not reach+1stSG to come
          I have a class probably I won't make it
11   CD:   بـاشه  مشكل  نـداره
          bâshe, moshkel nadâre
          ok, problem not have+3rdSG
          ok, no problem
12   CR:=> قـربـانـت كـارى نـدارى؟
          ghorbânat, kâri nadâri?
          sacrifice+myself+of+you work+a not have+2ndSG?
          may I be sacrificed in your place anything else?
13   CD:=> خد]افظ
          khod [âfez
             Goodbye
14   CR:   [خدافظ
          [khodâfez
          [goodbye
```

Having exchanged greetings at the beginning of the call, the participants reach the closing locus of the first section of the call on Line 5. Following that, the caller begins by what seems to be a typical token in Farsi to initiate a new section (i.e. *migam*) and proceeds to enquire about the time when the match will start. On Line 7, the called provides the information sought. This adjacency pair and the following enquiry and confirmation form a pre-expansion to the core adjacency pair, spanning Lines 10 and 11, where the caller first provides the reason and then proceeds to inform the called that probably he cannot make it, followed by the second pair part of the base adjacency pair by the called. At this stage, the core activity of the call is accomplished and closing-implicativeness has been established. Given these, on Line 12, the caller clearly initiates closure by using an endearment term, followed by *kâri nadâri?* (*Anything else?*). In the second pair part, the respondent addresses only the closing function without addressing its information-seeking capacity, which is usually the case in Farsi telephone calls, and ratifies call closure.

According to Schegloff and Sacks (1973), an essential property of a possible pre-closing is that it provides the relevance of the initiation of a closedown and that without producing a coherent turn or topicalizing something new, the speaker passes a free turn to a next. According to them, even if the interlocutor receiving the turn has the possibility to raise a new topic, closing the conversation is the central possibility and raising a new topic simply an asymmetrical alternative (Schegloff and Sacks 1973). In English, even if pre-closing tokens are used to indicate one party's readiness to terminate the call, they offer the interlocutor to do likewise or topicalize something new. Given that these indicators could

be used in other positions in the conversation, their placement in a closing-implicative environment established by both parties suggests closure.

The investigation of the trajectory of closedown in Farsi telephone calls implicates that conversationalists select from an inventory of (possible) pre-closing devices. One criterion is the positioning of the device in the trajectory of the call closedown. The availability of alternative mechanisms affords parties the possibility of accomplishing the initiation of a closing section or any other interactionally relevant activity. The selection of one token rather than another depends on the interactional end to be accomplished, which is discernable from the sequential placement a particular token is given. While the study was not primarily concerned with a comparative analysis with English, given that the framework originally developed by Schegloff and Sacks (1973) and later complemented by Button (1987) was taken as the frame of reference, there will necessarily be some comparative conclusions drawn. It turned out that telephone call closedown in Farsi has a trajectory to it even though this trajectory does not map onto the one drawn by Schegloff and Sacks. Unlike American English in which tokens such as *ok* and *alright* could be used in closing- and non-closing-implicative environments alike and only in the former do they invariably betoken closure, the use of some tokens in Farsi is limited to topic-closing and pre-closing components of the close-down ritual. The token of *bâshe bâshe* (*ok ok*) which serves topic-closing functions, has a sense of finality to it and its use may make closing a relevant next action. Moreover, the pre-closing endearment terms and the interrogative form of *kâri nadâri?* (*Anything else?*) betoken the movement of parties to closure, *severely limiting* the possibility of extending the current topic-in-progress and *effectively precluding* the topicalization of a new one. They tacitly initiate the closedown of the call and their use seems to be tied to the core activity which a telephone call is expected to accomplish. These pre-closings help parties to collaboratively achieve termination of the turn transition rule and properly initiate closing the call. While serving as floor-yielding tokens, they regularly provide interlocutors with the opportunity to bound the topic-in-progress. It seems that they are enforceable as explicit marking of a request or offer to bring a conversation to an (immediate) end. Notwithstanding the similarity between explicit marking and pre-closing tokens in Farsi, there are some essential differences between the two in terms of placement and completion of the core business of the call. In the former, closedown is usually 'foreshortened' and is carried out prematurely and unilaterally, without necessarily the core business being accomplished. Second, it is possible that

before actual closure, no foreshadowing has taken place (Schegloff 2002). However, in the latter, even if closedown is initiated unilaterally, the core business of the call may have been accomplished and some foreshadowing may have taken place on the part of interlocutors, preparing the ground for the ensuing closure. In addition, unlike explicit marking of shutting down, the use of pre-closing tokens is quite common in Farsi, accounting for a sizeable number of closedown initiations.

5. Conclusions

Farsi telephone calls exhibit significant differences from the closing archetype worked out by Schegloff and Sacks (1973) and Button (1987). The differences could be attributed to the way in which people in different cultures break contact with each other (Clark and French 1981; Firth 1972; Goffman 1976) or the type of the call and the relationship between parties (Pavlidou 1997). Moreover, the findings suggest that the archetype closing consisting of four turns in American English (Button 1987; Schegloff and Sacks 1973; Schegloff 2007) is pervasive in Farsi, too. However, for some pre-closings, the sequential organization operative in Farsi does not span four turns archetypical of American English and other languages, limiting the possibility of extending the sequence in progress and topicalizing something new. The corollary is that unlike English in which a possible pre-closing becomes an actual one if it is reciprocated by the respondent, in Farsi, on some occasions, given that some pre-closings are an unequivocal part of terminal exchanges and derive their character from their sequential placement, they turn into actual closings on their occurrence and by virtue of their placement; therefore, the extendibility of calls to great lengths after them is not especially relevant. Thus, Farsi exhibits significant degrees of variability in terms of sequential organization of closedown. In most cases, minimal expansion following an adjacency pair is used as sequence-closing third to bring a call to an (immediate) end, which facilitates proper closing of a call.

As a naturalistic observation, the present study was undertaken to provide a rigorous, empirical and formal description of and evidence for a social talk-implemented course of action, i.e., conversationalists collaborating to bring a call to a closure. The findings reveal that key phases of the sequential organization operative in shutting down mundane telephone conversations are negotiated locally on a turn-by-turn basis, suggesting that telephone conversation closedown is orderly and systematic in Farsi. Moreover,

closedown-related practices are fluid and dynamic in that conversationalists engage in social interaction, "as the core root of sociality" (Schegloff 2002: xiii), allowing them to arrive at a jointly oriented, collaborated and negotiated closure.

A major line of research into telephone conversations has been culture- or language-bound particularities. Given that Farsi telephone closings have not been researched from a CA perspective, the findings of the study, which represent generic orders of sequence organization of telephone call closedown, could contribute to the by-now substantial database developed for some languages or cultures. The findings revealed that even if the seminal work carried out by Schegloff and Sacks (1973) remains the relative framework to address closedown of telephone conversations, there are aspects of closing in Farsi indicative of language- or culture-specificity. It was observed that in Farsi, there is a unique category constituting a common way of initiating closure, exhibiting salient differences with other categories in that it has a closing function and in terms of sequence organization, it occurs in closing-implicative environment of telephone calls.

The account provided of opening up closings in Farsi is indicative rather than complete. This is partly due to the fact that the study was carried out in a single geographical area, involving a small number of participants, making or taking calls using mobile phones. In addition, with just three exceptional cases in which the calls were made to catch up, in the rest of the calls which turned out to be predominantly monotopical, the core activity of the call was expectably clear to the parties. Finally, apart from three cases in which the calls were made to strangers, others took place between friends, familiars and family members usually keeping regular contact. Given the limitations and the size of the data set, conclusions about closedown mechanisms in Farsi cannot be definitive, requiring further research in this vein.

References

Atkinson, J. Maxwell, Heritage, John (Eds.), 1984. *Structure of Social Action*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Auer, P., 1990. Rhythm in telephone closings. *Human Studies* 13(4), 361-392.

Bangerter, A., Clark, H. H., Katz, A. R., 2004. Navigating joint projects in telephone conversations. *Discourse Processes* 37(1), 1-23.

Bolden, G. B., 2017. Opening up closings in Russian. In: Raymond, G., Lerner, G. H., Heritage, J. (Eds.), *Enabling human conduct: Naturalistic studies of talk-in-interaction in honor of Emanuel A. Schegloff*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 233-273.

Broth, M., Mondada, L., 2013. Walking away: The embodied achievement of activity closings in mobile interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 47 (1), 41-58.

Button, G., 1987. Moving out of Closings. In: Button, G, Lee, J. R. E. (Eds.), *Talk and Social Organisation*. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, pp. 101–151.

Button, Graham, 1991. Conversation-in-a-series. In: Boden, D., Zimmerman, D. (Eds.), *Talk and Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*. Polity Press, Cambridge, pp. 251–277.

Clark, H. H., French, J. W. 1981. Telephone goodbyes. *Language in Society* 10, 1-19.

Comrie, Bernard, Haspelmath, Martin & Bickel, Balthasar (2015). *The Leipzig Rules: Conventions for Interlinear Morpheme-by-Morpheme Glosses*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.

Coronel-Molina, S. M., 1998. Openings and Closings in Telephone Conversations between Native Spanish Speakers. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* 14(1), 49-68.

Coulmas, Florian, 1981. *Conversational Routine: Exploration in Standardized Communication Situations and Pre-patterned Speech*. Mouton Publishers, The Hague.

Coupland, Justine, Coupland, Nikolas, Robinson, Jeffery D., 1992. How are you?: Negotiating phatic communion. *Language in Society* 21, 207–230.

Davidson, J., 1978. An Instance of Negotiation in a Call Closing. *Sociology* 12, 123–33.

Eades, Diana, 1985. You gotta know how to talk ... Information seeking in south-east Queensland Aboriginal society. In: Pride, J. B. (Ed.), *Cross-cultural encounters. Communication and Miscommunication*. River Seine Publications, Melbourne, pp. 91-109.

Firth, J. R., 1972. Verbal and bodily rituals of greeting and parting. In: La Fontaine, J. S. (Ed.), *Interpretation of Ritual*. Tavistock, London, pp. 1-38.

Goffman, Erving (1971). *Relations in Public*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.

Goffman, Erving, (1976). Replies and responses. *Language in Society* 5, 257-313.

Gumperz, John J., 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Hartford, B. S., Bardovi-Harlig, K. 1992. Closing the conversation: Evidence from the academic advising session. *Discourse Processes* 15, 93-116.

Hayashi, R. 1991. Floor structure of English and Japanese conversation. *Pragmatics* 16(1), 1-30.

Hopper, Robert, 1992. *Telephone conversation*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

Kipers, P. 1986. Initiation and response in service encounter closings. *Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* 2(2), 1-16.

Laver, John, 1975. Communicative functions of phatic communion. In: Kendon, A., Harris, R. M., Key, M. R. (Eds.), *The Organization of Behavior in Face-to-Face Interaction*. Mouton, The Hague, pp. 215-238.

Laver, John, 1981. Linguistic routines and politeness in greeting and parting. In: Coulmas, F. (Ed.), *Conversational Routine: Exploration in Standardized Communication, Situations and Pre-pattered Speech*. Mouton Publishers, The Hague, pp. 289–304.

Levinson, S. C. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lüger, Heinz-Helmut, 1983. Some aspects of ritual communication. *Pragmatics* 7, 695-711.

Moerman, Michael, 1988. *Talking Culture: Ethnography and Conversation Analysis*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Pauletto, F., Aronsson, K., & Galeano, G. 2017. Endearment and address terms in family life: Children's and parents' requests in Italian and Swedish dinnertime interaction. *Pragmatics* 109, 82-94.

Pavlidou, Theodossia, 1994. Contrasting German–Greek politeness and the consequences. *Pragmatics* 21(5), 487–511.

Pavlidou, T. 1997. The last five turns: Preliminary remarks on closings in Greek and German telephone calls. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 126 (1), 145-162.

Pavlidou, Theodossia-Soula, 2002. Moving towards closing: Greek telephone calls between familiars. In: Luke, K. K., Pavlidou, Theodossia-Soula (Eds.), *Telephone calls: Unity and diversity in conversational structure across languages and cultures*. John Benjamins Publishing, Philadelphia, pp. 201-229.

Placencia, María Elena. 1997. Opening up closings - the Ecuadorian way. *Text 17* (1), 53-82.

Saberi, K. 2012. *Routine politeness formulae in Persian: A socio-lexical analysis of greetings, leave-taking, apologizing, thanking and requesting*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Canterbury, New Zealand.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., Sacks, Harvey, 1973. Opening up closings. *Semiotica* 8 (4), 289–327.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., 1979. Identification and recognition in telephone conversation openings. In: Psathas, George (Ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Irvington, New York, pp. 23-78.

Schegloff, Emanuel A., 1986. The routine as achievement. Human Studies 9 (2-3), 111–151.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: Volume 1: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Schegloff, E. A. 2002. Reflections on Research on Telephone Conversation: Issues of Cross-Cultural Scope and Scholarly Exchange, Interactional Import and Consequences. In Luke, K. K., Pavlidou, T. S. (Eds.), *Telephone Calls: Unity and Diversity in Conversational Structure across Languages and Cultures*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 249–281.

Sun, H., 2005. Collaborative strategies in Chinese telephone conversation Closings. *Pragmatics* 15 (1), 109-128.

Raclaw, J., 2008. Two patterns for conversational closings in instant message discourse. *Colorado Research in Linguistics* 21(1), 34-54.

Taleghani-Nikazm, C., 2002. A conversation analytical study of telephone conversation openings between native and nonnative speakers. *Pragmatics* 34(12), 1807-1832.

Takami, T. (2002). A Study on Closing Sections of Japanese Telephone conversations. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* 18(1), 67-85.

Thonus, T., 2016. Time to say goodbye: Writing center consultation closings. *Linguistics and Education* 33, 40-55.

Wong, J. 2007. Answering my call: A look at telephone closings. In: Bowles, Hugo, Seedhouse, Paul (Eds.), *Conversation Analysis and Language for Specific Purposes*. Peter Long, Bern, pp. 271-304.