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The current investigation contributes new data to a growing body of work on cultural universals vs. particularities in the functions performed in telephone opening and closing sequences. While telephone conversations in many languages and cultures have been studied, the Spanish language is conspicuously absent in the literature. The present work addresses this lack, augmenting available linguistic data with the novel contribution of Spanish to the database. In this presentation, I offer my analysis of the opening and closing sequences of 51 dyads in natural telephone conversations conducted in Spanish. I attempt to determine how closely Hispanic cultural patterns of conduct for telephone conversations follow the sequences outlined in previous works by Schegloff, Hopper, and other researchers. I conclude that Hispanic conversational norms do indeed fall within Schegloff’s canonical schemes of universality, while at the same time exhibiting unique sequential variations. These variations may or may not be culture-specific, a point which can only be determined through further investigation.

Introduction

Conversational analysis of telephone conversations is a fairly well-established area of investigation, beginning in the late 1960’s with Schegloff’s (1967) dissertation on conversational openings. Since that time, numerous researchers have advanced the study of telephone interactions, both between members of the same culture (Hopper 1989; Hopper, Doan, Johnson & Drummond 1991; Hopper & Drummond 1989; Lindström 1994; Schegloff 1979, 1970, 1968, 1967; and Schegloff & Sacks 1973) and across cultures (Godard 1977; Halmari 1993; Hopper & Koellati-Doan 1986; and Sifianou 1999). Languages investigated range from English and French to Greek and Finnish. This is clearly a broad range, including some less commonly spoken languages. One would assume that within such a range, most of the more commonly spoken languages would be represented. However, in all the studies I have examined, Spanish, which is one of the five most widely spoken languages in the world, is notable by its absence in the literature. Hopper (1992) offers a brief description of dif-
fert ways of answering the telephone in the Spanish-speaking world, but no formal research seems to have been done in this area.

Many of the researchers cited above concentrate on aspects of the openings and closings of conversations, such as turn-taking, initiation of sequences, etc. Hopper and Schegloff devote two researchers who individually have done much work in this area, and I have relied on their theoretical underpinnings to ground my own work. In all of their investigations, in fact, Schegloff is more specifically interested in sequences involved in the openings of telephone conversations, which he breaks down into four adjacency pairs: (1) summons/response; (2) identification/recognition; (3) a greeting adjacency pair, and (4) "you" adjacency pair.

Godard (1977) offers an objection to Schegloff's work. She argues that his "summons-response" sequence cannot be universally applied, and maintains that it is important to take cultural aspects into consideration. In doing her own analysis of French and English conversations, she found that some of Schegloff's categories and/or theorizing did not fit well with her own data. Godard concludes that some of Schegloff's work is culture specific and it cannot be applied universally to telephone conversations in all languages.

Hopper et al. (1990-91) use Schegloff's work to determine the extent to which Schegloff's set of four opening sequences might be universally applicable and which elements might be specific to North American culture. Hopper et al. disagree with Godard's contention that cultural specificity significantly affects the sequences necessary to open a conversation. Rather, they argue that such cultural differences will have more to do with the actual content, or perhaps the order of the sequences, than with the functions they serve: "We argue that the different sounds of telephone openers in different languages mask similarities to what was sketched in the canonical telephone opening." (Hopper et al. 1990-91: 375)

Hopper (1989) observes another interesting aspect of opening sequences which could be significant in some cases. He describes the different functions that opening sequences may serve, and how those functions are used to serve varying conversational needs. He specifically examines the opening sequence in which the caller (a) asks the answerer (b) how s/he is doing. This sequence, he maintains, serves more as a "pre-invitation" than merely an inquiry into one's state of health. It provides the opportunity to offer other than just health information; for instance, in the case of this article, to inform a that b currently has another caller on hold.

In this paper, I will analyze the interactions of native Spanish speakers in telephone conversations conducted in Spanish - specifically, the etiquette involved in openings and closings of such conversations - to determine to what extent this data fits within Schegloff's theoretical models of sequencing in openings and closings. At the same time, I will look at some cultural implications inherent in my data, in accord with the observations of such researchers as Godard (1977) and Sifianou (1989). Finally, I will highlight the relevance of my investigation for second language teaching and learning.

All of the researchers cited previously raise valid points to keep in mind when analyzing data from another culture based on previous research for English. However, I find very persuasive Hopper et al.'s assertion that "Schegloff's (1979) discussion of identification and recognition includes virtually every format that have [sic] been paraded as being unique to Greece, France or Holland - and all from North American data!" (1990-91:378).

Overall, then, I will rely heavily on frameworks pioneered by Schegloff (1968; 1973), with Sacks; (1979) and further elaborated by Hopper (1989; 1989, with Kolesiat-Doany; 1991, with Doany, Johnson and Drummond; 1992) in structuring my analysis. I will also draw on cultural implications in my discussion and conclusions, keeping in mind points raised by those researchers concerned with cultural specificity.

Methodology

The current work will focus exclusively on data collected from native speakers of Spanish from a variety of Latin American countries. While I am not specifically doing a comparative analysis with English or other languages, there will necessarily be some comparative conclusions drawn. It is through such cross-cultural comparisons that the greatest relevance to second language learning will be realized.

Research questions

I am interested in investigating three questions in particular regarding telephone conversation openings and closings. Two of them deal with the opening sequences. The third focuses on the closing. The questions are:

1. Do these appear to be a standard formula used in beginning a telephone conversation among Spanish speakers as suggested by Schegloff?

2. Do Spanish speakers move immediately to the purpose of the call, or do they follow a pattern of information exchange before the "real" conversation begins?

This is addressed by Schegloff's final adjacency pair sequence, which Hopper and Kolesiat-Doany (1989: 163) list as step 4, a "how are you" or inquiry sequence in which each participant offers an initial inquiry about the other. Some of the cross-cultural studies seem to indicate that the answer to this question is culture-specific. For instance, Halmari (1993) indicates that in business calls, at least, Americans have a tendency to get straight to the point, with little in the way of preliminary pleasantries, while Finns are much more likely to make some kind of polite conversation before talking about business.
a member of that culture. Regardless of the ultimate purpose of a visit or telephone call, Hispanic etiquette requires that the participants first inquire after the health and/or activities of each other's family members. Therefore, at the beginning of a conversation, as long as the participants were asking about each other's families, I considered it to be part of the opening.

Once the topic changed, I determined that to be the end of the greeting, regardless of whether they later returned to discussion of family matters.

Results and Discussion

I examined the data from two perspectives. First, I did a simple count of how many of the categories for openings (Schedluff 1968) and closings (Schedluff and Sacks 1973) appeared in the data, and in what combinations to get an idea of how closely my information fit with the extant theories of universal functions.

As in English, there are certain verbal cues in Spanish that one uses to indicate that s/he would like to terminate the conversation, either face to face or by telephone. These include such interjections as “bueno...” or “pues...” (“well...”) followed by a pause, or phrases such as “muchas gracias por la llamada” (“thank you so much for calling”) or “me da gusto haber hablado contigo” (“it was good to talk to you”). I searched for such clues in the conversations, and transcribed the closings from that point forward to the actual end of the conversation. Very often, closings were much longer than openings, which is also in line with the function that Schedluff and Sacks propose for preclosing sequences. Since a preclosing leaves open the option for the other party to introduce a new topic of conversation, it could result that there are several preclosing gambits before both speakers decide that they no longer have any new topics to discuss. This obviously implies the possibility of a much longer closing sequence than opening.

In general, it turns out that there are close correspondences, although not necessarily exact matches, between the predicted categories and actual occurrence in Spanish. In this sense, I would argue that the correspondences support the idea of universal functions in telephone conversations across cultures, while the lack of exact fit reflects the cultural differences mentioned by such researchers as Godard (1977) and Sifanou (1989). After this initial counting step, I returned to look more closely at the actual text to find examples in support of both concordances and differences between the data and the current theories. It is through this textual approach that specific cultural idiosyncrasies can be identified, and this will provide the most useful information for application to second language learning. After all, highlighting similarities and differences between one's own culture and another brings them to conscious awareness. Once someone is consciously aware of something, it is much easier for him/her to learn and/or remember that information and to have it consciously accessible when it is needed.
Openings

Schegloff identifies four possible adjacency pair sequences in telephone conversational openings: summons/response, identification/recognition, greeting sequence, and inquiry sequence. I have previously defined the first two categories. Schegloff (1968: 1080) limits the definition of the greeting sequence to being specifically a second round of "hello" that follows recognition. He argues that a telephone "hello" in the summons/response sequence does not serve as a greeting per se, but rather an acknowledgment or answer to the summons of the ringing of the telephone. Therefore, once recognition is achieved, in many cases the participants will do an additional "hello" which functions in the same as an actual greeting to a known interlocutor. The inquiry sequence is very often an extension of the greeting sequence, but apparently since both do not always appear together, Schegloff classified them as two distinct steps in the opening process.

I found examples of all four of these opening sequences in my data. In the table below, I summarize the number of occurrences of each sequence found in eleven samples of telephone conversation. Clearly, if we look at nothing but the numbers, there appears to be a strong fit with Schegloff's suggested categories. Out of the eleven total conversations, 100% of them included both a summons/response sequence and an inquiry sequence. I also argue that there is 100% use of identification/recognition strategies as well. As discussed previously, one of the telephone calls actually involved a single person calling her family in Chile and talking to two different family members; in other words, she was involved in two consecutive conversations in a single call. When the telephone was passed to the second member, both parties of course already knew who was going to be on the line, and so there was no need for this sequence between them. Essentially, the identification/recognition was carried out in advance of the beginning of their conversation. This means, then, that the only somewhat variable element was the greeting, or some form of second "hello" after the response to the summons. In only seven of the eleven cases, or 55% of the time, did people make use of it, as opposed to 100% for the other sequences. However, that is still a significant percentage. In the other four cases (45%), the participants went directly from identification/recognition to asking how the other person was, which is a phrase in Spanish that is capable of doing double duty as both greeting and inquiry. In Spanish-speaking countries, as well as asking about the other participant, it is often typical to extend this inquiry sequence to ask about the whole family, especially if one is speaking to either a family member, or a close friend whose family is well known to the speaker. As a result, in Spanish this sequence is often more extended than merely an adjacency pair. The following extract is an example of the most typical opening sequences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1 Aurora:</th>
<th>2 Ursula:</th>
<th>3 Aurora:</th>
<th>4 Ursula:</th>
<th>5 Aurora:</th>
<th>6 Ursula:</th>
<th>7 Aurora:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>«hola, ¿cómo estás?</td>
<td>Hola.</td>
<td>¿Estás ocupada?</td>
<td>¿Estás ocupada?</td>
<td>Hola, little sister.</td>
<td>How are you?</td>
<td>Hola, ¿cómo estás?</td>
<td>How are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>«hola, ¿cómo estás?</td>
<td>Hola.</td>
<td>¿Estás ocupada?</td>
<td>¿Estás ocupada?</td>
<td>Hola, little sister.</td>
<td>How are you?</td>
<td>Hola, ¿cómo estás?</td>
<td>How are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>«hola, ¿cómo estás?</td>
<td>Hola.</td>
<td>¿Estás ocupada?</td>
<td>¿Estás ocupada?</td>
<td>Hola, little sister.</td>
<td>How are you?</td>
<td>Hola, ¿cómo estás?</td>
<td>How are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>«hola, ¿cómo estás?</td>
<td>Hola.</td>
<td>¿Estás ocupada?</td>
<td>¿Estás ocupada?</td>
<td>Hola, little sister.</td>
<td>How are you?</td>
<td>Hola, ¿cómo estás?</td>
<td>How are you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>«hola, ¿cómo estás?</td>
<td>Hola.</td>
<td>¿Estás ocupada?</td>
<td>¿Estás ocupada?</td>
<td>Hola, little sister.</td>
<td>How are you?</td>
<td>Hola, ¿cómo estás?</td>
<td>How are you?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Summary of Opening Sequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number of occurrences</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summons/response</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification/recognition</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in my data to stand out as contrary to the norm. In one case, the caller knew he had awakened the callee, and so an apology was obviously in order. The second case is not so clear cut, since there was no apparent reason for an apology, as evidenced by the following dialogue from dyad 6:

0 〈rin, rin, rin〉
1 Lucifer: ¿Al? (ring, ring, ring)
2 Teresa: ¿Lucas?
3 Lucifer: ¿Sí?
4 Teresa: ¿Ah, ¿con quién estás?
5 Lucifer: ¿Con quién hablo?
6 Teresa: Soy Teresa, Teresa Portales.
7 Lucifer: ¿Ah, ¿con quién estás? ¿Qué tal?
8 Teresa: Bien, Mira, Lucas, ¡qué alegría no te estés molestando. ¡Te llamo, Ger, Lucas, ¡te llamo! No me bottones.

Apparently, this dyad was not as intimate as others, as evidenced by the callee’s failure to immediately identify the caller’s voice. Perhaps this more distant relationship had a role in the callee’s apology. The caller also mentioned before she made the call that she knew her friend was planning to watch a show that was scheduled to start very shortly; this may have been an additional influence on her decision to apologize for interrupting his evening.

The first variable aspect from my data on openings that I would like to discuss is some difference in presentation of the sequence of the elements of openings. The canonical sequence is that proposed by Schegloff which I have cited several times throughout this paper: (1) summons/answer; (2) identification/recognition; (3) greeting token; and (4) initial inquiries (“how are you?”) and answers (Hopper et al. 1991:370). There was only one example in my data of this canonical order of adjacency pairs. The table below summarizes the variant sequences I found. Most of these represent instances of the second part of an adjacency pair not following directly from its logical first part; although, in all cases, all the requisite information of an opening sequence is ultimately included in some way or another. For example, in cases where a sequence is not explicitly used, its function is fulfilled in covert ways, such as one person recognizing another’s voice from the first word, and bypassing the tentative identification routines to go directly to
the greeting or inquiry sequence.

One interesting aspect which can be noted in the above summary is the
frequency with which the recipients answered the opening sequence using

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of sequences</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 4</td>
<td>greeting skipped by both parties</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 4</td>
<td>caller used canonical order; adjacency pairs disrupted</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>&quot;canonical&quot; order with recognizable adjacency pairs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 3, 4, 2, 1, 2, 4</td>
<td>caller inverted order of sequences; caller asked</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 5, 2, 1, 3, 4</td>
<td>caller inverted greeting &amp; ID; callee skipped ID</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 3, 4, 1, 4</td>
<td>callee skipped ID; after initial response, callee only answered inquiry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>secondary conversation; same sequence observed; sequence 1-3 not necessary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers in the left column refer to the sequence number in the list of opening sequences above (in bold).

only the summons response (which is required in Hispanic society), and sequence 4 (inquiries) as the common elements. The use of sequences 2 and 3 varies, with 2 being slightly more common than 3. It seems to be a common occurrence that callers can readily identify the callees' voices just from that brief response to the summons ("hello!"); and their next gambit provides enough information for most recipients to be able to recognize the callees' identity. There is seldom any self-identification, as discussed previously. Even so, in most cases there is still some form of overt recognition before moving immediately into the inquiry phase ("Oh, Teresa! How are you?"); which explains the presence of the second category at all.

Category 4, the inquiry sequence, seems to be able to act as a greeting as well as an inquiry, especially when issued by the callee. This is in contrast to English, where it seems to be much more common to hear, for example, “Oh, Teresa! Hello! How are you?” The second sentence appears to be relatively superfluous for Spanish speakers who are on the receiving end of phone calls, who simply skip from recognition to inquiry, as noted above. While the callers themselves very often use the greeting immediately before the inquiry, without awaiting a response (“Hello! How are you?”), the callee is much more likely to omit it, as seen from information in the table above. It is difficult to postulate why this might be so. Clearly, based on the reactions of both participants in the conversation, this is not perceived as rude or abrupt; it is merely the normal reaction to the callee's greeting and inquiry.

Closings
Conversational closings, which Schegloff and Sacks (1979) call "terminal exchanges," were either more difficult to determine. Schegloff and Sacks (1979: 303-304) identify markers in American English that they call "preclosings," or indicators that one party is ready to terminate the conversation but is offering the other party the opportunity to open another topic of conversation. These "preclosings" can take various forms, which the authors elaborate throughout the paper. They also emphasize the importance of taking into account surrounding context in determining that a certain word or phrase is functioning as a preclosing marker, since words such as "we-see-LT" or "okay then" can also be used in other contexts that do not necessarily implicite the desire to close the conversation.

In addition, Schegloff and Sacks (1979) describe various stages of the closing (without giving precise names to them), and the use of several of them in their article. These parts of a closing do not all necessarily need to be present, as is also the case with the four sequences in openings, and in fact, they are not always all present in my data in both openings and closings. Since Schegloff and Sacks do not offer formal names for their closing sequences, I have tentatively put them into the following simplified categories: (1) preclosing, or initiation of the closing sequence (the only category for which Schegloff and Sacks do offer a label); (2) new topic introduction; (3) recapitulation; and (4) final closing. Preclosings have been discussed above. New topic introduction means simply that an introduction of a new topic of conversation after a preclosing gambit. Recapitulation involves a brief summarizing of the topics discussed and/or arrangements made. I have decided to also include such elements as sending best wishes to other family members and other shutting-down details in this category, for the sake of simplicity. Such recapitulation is often an optional element in a personal conversation, although Halani (1993: 422) indicates that it is almost obligatory in business conversations. Final closings are the actual "goodbyes" or some equivalent appropriate to the specific context of the conversation, such as "Thank you" (generally in business or information-seeking phone calls) or "I’ll talk to you later." I have looked for representations of these categories in determining the closing sequences of Spanish
conversations. Since closing a conversation is not nearly as straightforward as opening one, it is much more difficult to define concrete categories into which one can divide the different tasks involved. This subject was addressed to some extent in a previous section, wherein I also defined the breakdowns I will use for subdividing my data. To review, the categories of closings into which I divided the data are (1) preclosing; (2) introduction of a new topic; (3) recapitulation; and (4) final closing. These sequences are based on Schegloff's categorizations, with some latitude built into the third category, which he does not precisely define. Rather, he enumerates a wide range of possibilities that can fall into a vague category between preclosing and final closing, but which are not exactly new topics of conversation. For that reason, and to simplify the examination of my data, I have accommodated all of these variations under the heading of recapitulation.

As with openings, not all of the elements of closings are evident in all samples. One major difference between openings and closings is that in closings, there is only one element that absolutely has to be present at all times to constitute a terminal exchange: the final closing. While all the other sequences are possible, and even likely, at least in English, they are not required to determine that a conversation has terminated.

Most often, what seems to happen is that one party offers a preclosing word or phrase, and the other party responds to it with initiation of a new topic. As explained above, this is perfectly normal, and actually even perhaps expected in many cases. Such alternations of preclosings and new topics will continue until both parties have decided they have nothing new to add. Then the preclosing gambit will be met with a similar preclosing response, and the two participants may either go into a recapitulation routine, or move immediately to the final closing.

My own data reflects patterns very similar to this. In all, there were 37 preclosing gambits, 26 initiations of new topics, 16 recapitulations, and 11 final closings. This last figure, of course, is entirely expected, since there are 11 conversational dyads in the data set, and each one must end with a final closing. Following is a table that outlines the various combinations of sequences identified in the data.

As the table illustrates, and Schegloff predicts based on his proposed purpose of them, preclosings lead in the vast majority of instances to the initiation of a new topic not directly related to anything previously discussed in the conversation. However, there are a few variations which I found rather interesting. Clearly, a preclosing does not have to lead to either a new topic or a recapitulation. In two cases, the preclosing resulted directly in the final closing. Nor do either of these need to follow directly after a preclosing, as we can see by the few cases in which a series of functions started with recapitulation rather than preclosing.

What is most intriguing, from my perspective, is the circular nature of the process. This is displayed in the cases where a preclosing might look like it was headed into the final countdown, so to speak, only to take a turn and have a new topic introduced after the recapitulation, or go through a series of alternating preclosings, recapitulations, and/or new topics. This variability emphasizes the individuality and unpredictability of the communication process and highlights the difficulty of trying to analyze the process. However, it is still possible to make some tentative predictions based on the data above.

For instance, despite the two exceptions where a closing segment began with the recapitulation, it is evident that the vast majority of such sequences began with preclosing statements of some kind. Hence, one could reasonably predict that it is difficult to close down a conversation without a preclosing. In fact, the instances that begin with recapitulations arise from previous instances of a preclosing plus new topic initiation. After a few exchanges on the new topic, one of the speakers utters a recapitulative statement instead of returning all the way to the preclosing. An example of this from dyad 1 follows:

49 Ana: Está bien. Muchísimas gracias porque todavía no estoy completamente bien del callo que me dieron. Ok, then. Thanks a lot, because I'm not completely over that cold I caught.

50 María: SI. Amí también me tornó como tres semanas. Bueno, tú también te acercaste... por el que me moría. Yes, it took about three weeks also. Well, you remember too, I thought I was going to die.

51 Ana: Sí

52 María: Pero esa medicina china que me mamá me lo compré me dio un buen resultado... bueno, lástima... y mañana si te sientes mal, no te puedes concentrar... y se va barbiando, así es que no te olvides de tomar. But that herbal medicine my mom bought for me worked
which she then converts to a more drawn-out reason why her friend should remember to take the medicine. Ana offers another terse reply: "No, I won't forget." And so the conversation continues on, with Ana replying shortly, professing little encouragement for continued conversation, and Maria refusing these preclosing gambits.

Finally, Maria herself utters a statement that could be interpreted as a recapitulation: "Well, it's not like I won't see you. Good luck tomorrow!" Ana follows this with another brief reply, "I hope so." But then, once again Maria introduces a new topic, the offer to bring Ana a Coke during her exam. They discuss this for one or two exchanges, and then Maria presents another recapitulation, and a statement that can easily be construed as a final closing: "Okay. I'll bring it to you then. Say hello to Bernardo for me." At this point, Ana replies with a goodby, and the conversation terminates.

It is interesting, although perhaps not significant, that this particular conversation did not end until the caller herself finally decided she was ready to terminate it. Does this mean, then, that it is up to the caller to give final closure to a conversation? Not necessarily, according to the rest of the data. While the caller typically offers more preclosing gambits than the callee (as compared to 11 for the callee), the final closings are initiated approximately equally between the two, with callers performing six of them and callee, five.

In addition, new topics were initiated almost equally, with a slight advantage to the callee: callers introduced 11 new topics as compared to the callees' 15. Recapitulators were offered 10 times by callers, and 6 times by the callees. These numbers are summarized in the table below.

Finally, an interesting little phenomenon occurred in the final closing itself. Scheffler speaks of adjacency pairs, in which an initial utterance prompts a coordinated response from the hearer. In the final closing, I did find such pairs. However, I also encountered, with equal frequency, final closings in triples rather than pairs. One person would utter "Goodbye,"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Frequencies of Termination Exchanges: Dynamic of Termination Exchanges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who initiates preclosing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who initiates new topics?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who initiates recapitulations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who initiates final closings?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the second would respond in kind, and then the first person would repeat it once more before hanging up. There did not appear to be any attempt by the other interlocutor to match this repetition by the first person, which leaves the interaction in a triplet rather than a pair. The following excerpt is an example of this:
35 Natalia: Chao. Bye.
37 Natalia: Chao. Bye.

In the data set there are five such examples of final closing triplets, compared to six for adjacency pairs. So, clearly, such occurrences of triplets are fairly natural and common. In trying to determine a possible reason for this, the numbers do not appear to offer any significant help. I have tabulated them below to aid in visualizing the breakdowns. In addition, I have shown whether it is caller or callee who wants to capture this last word.

There is little mention of such triplets in the telephone exchange literature, although one researcher, Amy Tsui (1989), makes a strong case for their importance in conversational exchanges in general. Perhaps it is much more common in face to face exchanges than in telephone conversations. Alternatively, it could merely be that other researchers have not felt it significant enough to report in their data. For me, it is an interesting phenomenon that might or might not have greater significance. There is no way to know this without exploring further and seeing just how widespread an occurrence it really is. In the same way, it is difficult to say why it might have occurred with such regular frequency in my own data, since I do have so little data on which to base any definite conclusions. One possibility could be as simple as personal style; perhaps those people who did it just had a need to get in the last word before hanging up the phone.

Based on the limited data, it is difficult to definitively say that one participant or the other tends to play a greater role in terminating the interaction. Perhaps the best interpretation for these numbers is that they prove, once again, to what extent the act of communicating is a socially constructed experience, and the importance of the active participation of all the interlocutors.

Another notable point I found in looking at the data is that the international calls generally had much longer closings than local calls or domestic long distance calls. For example, one call from the United States to Peru had eight preclosing attempts before the call finally terminated, another to Peru, between different interactants, had five. Similarly, the woman who called Chile attempted four preclosing gambits with her daughter, and five with her mother before successfully terminating the respective conversations. On average, local calls and domestic long distance calls required about two preclosing gambits before closure was reached.

One reason for this could be that there is a much greater possibility that people will call locally or domestic long distance more often than they will call internationally. Hence, there is less "new" news that happens between telephone calls, and it is consequently easier to terminate the conversation. On the other hand, when the length of time increases between phone calls, not only is there more time for new things to occur in the respective lives of the participants, but there could also be an increased anxiety to talk to the other party. For this reason, people will look for reasons or excuses to maintain contact with their loved ones for as long as possible.

Summary and Conclusions

The data presented in this current work supports Schegloff’s and Hopper’s assertions of certain conversational universals across languages and cultures, especially relating to telephone discourse. Both of these researchers outline elements of telephone openings and closings, focusing on similarities across cultures. Hopper and Köchel-Dozy (1989:176) state it plainly in regard to openings: “Certainly we do not claim that every telephone opening sounds just like those in the United States. Rather, there is a certain set of jobs that must get accomplished to do the opening of a state of conversational speaking.”

This certain set of jobs is performed by the informants in my data, in accomplishing both openings and closings. The four standard opening sequences identified by Schegloff and summarized by Hopper recur constantly in the conversations, and the same is true of the four basic phases of a closing. The only significant difference is that such sequences may not occur in Schegloff’s canonical order, or may not be explicitly present. In the latter case, the function performed by the explicitly missing sequence is always implied in another sequence.

In regard to the original questions I set out to answer, it is quite apparent that there is indeed a formulaic approach to both opening and closing a conversation. The easy manner in which the data analyzed in this study fits into the typologies which Schegloff has elaborated verifies the routinized nature especially of conversational openings. On the other hand, it was somewhat more challenging to try to match the data to distinct closing sequences, since a single utterance could potentially be interpreted in various ways. Even so, it is still fairly clear that there are certain strategies that conversational partners use to indicate their readiness to terminate a conversation. I have identified a few of these potential preclosing indicators in my data set, and then followed them through the rest of the conversation.
to determine how they function within the context of the dialogue, in conjunction with initiation of new topics of conversation, recapitulation techniques as other indicators of desire to terminate, and final closings. As a result of these analyses, it is clear that there is a process, but it is not clear which interlocutor is preferred for which part of the process. According to my data, either participant can initiate any stage of the closing process, and either partner also has equal right to ignore such closing attempts to introduce new topics of conversation.

I think that the differences that have been noted between English, French, Greek and Spanish conversational patterns, according to the various investigations to which I have compared my data, can be safely related to the specific cultural paradigms within which telephone usage has developed in those cultures. I agree with Hopper, however, that such local, specific differences do not significantly alter the conversational functions being performed within those varying sociolinguistic constructions. The evidence presented by the researchers arguing from a cultural specificity standpoint does not stand up under close scrutiny in terms of representing some new aspect that Schegloff has missed, or of trying to undermine the universalist argument. Rather, it serves merely to reinforce the fact that, yes, there are cultural differences between societies, and different ways of performing essentially the same communicative work.

I recognize that there are limitations to my own work. The most significant of these, of course, is the small size of my data sample. Due to the small sample, my conclusions can be considered suggestive rather than conclusive. Another possible constraint is the very broad, pan-Hispanic focus I have taken. Because this is such a preliminary work, I felt it was more important merely to get some information into the field on Spanish as a whole, since it was so conspicuously lacking in the literature. However, perhaps the debate can also be enlightened by a focus on specific regional differences within the Spanish speaking world itself. Latin American Spanish is not a uniform, monolithic entity. It is possible that some of the differences I have described in responses within the dyads has some relation to such regional differences. However, I do not have enough data to elucidate this issue, and thus the present work tends to simplify the case into universals.

Additionally, cross-cultural studies which have already begun could further benefit from the inclusion of data on Spanish. It is to be hoped that my own contribution will offer some ideas for other researchers to follow, so that they may design their own cross-cultural studies which include Spanish data. Even something as close to home as more studies involving bilingual Spanish speakers in the United States would contribute to this effort.

My work presents information on only one type of telephone discourse, that of personal phone calls among intimates. Similar work on other types of telephone discourse, such as generational differences in telephone usage or business conversations in Spanish, would also further this field of research.
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The study presented in this paper examines how Chinese characters, hanzi, was taught and learned in a first-year Chinese language class in a major American university. The teaching of Chinese in an American context to students of non-Chinese ethnic background is relatively new since the 60s (Moe, Wallen, and Lambert, 1992). Traditionally the teaching of Chinese characters in a university setting has taken one of the following four approaches: the radical approach, the high-frequency-hanzi approach, the phonetic approach, and the non-teaching approach. This paper analyzes the four approaches from second language acquisition perspective, specifically the L1-L2 transfer and orthographic depth effects in comparing native Chinese letter-and second language learners of Chinese. In this study, participant observation, interview, and survey were used to collect data. Answers to the following research questions were searched: (1) what approach/belief does the teacher under study follow? What is the relationship between her belief and her teaching? (2) what learning strategies do students of this class develop and adopt in studying hanzi? Some pedagogical implications were also discussed in view of the findings of the study.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, due to the rise of the economic and political influence of Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore, and the People's Republic of China, the Chinese language has enjoyed an increased popularity as a subject of second/foreign language (CSL/CFL) study in the States. However, because of its non-alphabetic writing system, in addition to its tones in pronunciation, the Chinese language has had a reputation of being difficult. While many students are attracted to Chinese because of the Chinese characters, called "hanzi," many more students are afraid of studying the language for the same reason. The learning and teaching of hanzi thus present a great challenge to students and teachers alike. This paper, therefore, examines some aspects of the learning and teaching of hanzi to students of language backgrounds other than character-