

# opción

Revista de Antropología, Ciencias de la Comunicación y de la Información, Filosofía,  
Linguística y Semiótica, Problemas del Desarrollo, la Ciencia y la Tecnología

Año 35, 2019, Especial N°

# 19

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales  
ISSN 1012-1537/ ISSNe: 2477-9385  
Depósito Legal pp 198402ZU45



Universidad del Zulia  
Facultad Experimental de Ciencias  
Departamento de Ciencias Humanas  
Maracaibo - Venezuela

## Sequence of telephone openings in the workplaces in a Kazakh community

**Nuraisha Bekeyeva**

Candidate of Sciences in Philology, Senior Lecturer, Language Center,  
KIMEP University Almaty, 4, Abai ave 050010

[nuraicha@kimep.kz](mailto:nuraicha@kimep.kz)

**Dina Kucherbayeva**

Master of Science in Applied Linguistics, Lecturer, Language Center,  
KIMEP University, Almaty, 4, Abai ave, 050010

[k\\_dina@kimep.kz](mailto:k_dina@kimep.kz)

**Fauziya Orazbayeva**

Doctor of Science in Pedagogy, Corresponding Member of Kazakhstan,  
Academy of Sciences, Kazakh language and literature  
Abay Kazakh National Teacher Training, University, Almaty, 13, Dostyk  
ave, 050060

[f\\_arazbaeva@mail.ru](mailto:f_arazbaeva@mail.ru)

**Zharkynbike Suleimenova**

Doctor of Science, Professor, Kazakh Language, Kazakh National  
Women's Teacher Training University, Almaty, 111, Aiteke Bi  
Street, 050000

[zharkin123@mail.ru](mailto:zharkin123@mail.ru)

### Abstract

The current study examines telephone conversation openings in the workplace in a Kazakh community via comparative qualitative research methods. The study shows that despite the fact that the core sequences of Schegloff's model are present in the analyzed data, it could be argued that the Kazakh telephone discourse construction is culturally specific. In conclusion, each opening telephone conversation is dependent on factors, such as co-interactants' age, gender, position at work and a type of relationship.

**Keywords:** Telephone Sequence, Kazakh Community, Discourse.

## Secuencia de aperturas telefónicas en los lugares de trabajo en una comunidad Kazaja

### Resumen

El estudio actual examina las aperturas de conversaciones telefónicas en el lugar de trabajo en una comunidad kazaja a través de métodos de investigación cualitativa comparativa. El estudio muestra que a pesar del hecho de que las secuencias centrales del modelo de Schegloff están presentes en los datos analizados, se podría argumentar que la construcción del discurso telefónico kazajo es culturalmente específica. En conclusión, cada conversación telefónica de apertura depende de factores, como la edad, el sexo, la posición en el trabajo y el tipo de relación de los coactantes.

**Palabras clave:** secuencia telefónica, comunidad kazaja, discurso.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Telephone conversations are considered, by the overwhelming majority of people, as a valid alternative to personal communication (Baksansky, 2013), and one of the most natural things in the world that belongs to our daily life (Fritz, 2014). There are standard phrases characterizing the beginning of a conversation. In the corporate telephony, most often the caller displays his/her name, or/and sometimes his/her position (Borozdina, 2016). However, users of modern mobile phones with an address book normally skip self-identification if they know the recipient quite well, or if the caller knows that the recipient might see the his/her number on the other side of the display, along with information on the device's phone book (Borozdina, 2013; Lin & Chen, 2018).

It is a well-established fact, however, that the sequence of telephone openings is culturally variable. For example, according to Schegloff's (1968) distributional rule, it is suggested that the answerer is the one who speaks first as a response to a summons, namely to the phone ring, as the first element of the opening sequence. However, there are cultures where callers are usually expected to speak first, e.g. Japanese. In the analysis of telephone openings in Korea, at least in those conversations illustrated in the English school textbooks, no summons-answer sequence is present, and callers start the talk from the identification sequence (Jang, 2013). Dutch people, for example, tend to self-identify themselves as an answer to summon (Hootpooksteenstra, 1991), whereas Americans commonly prefer displaying their voices as a preference for other-recognition over self-identification (Schegloff, 1986). As a result of such differences in discourse organization of telephone conversations, there might be cases of mutual misunderstandings in cross-cultural communication. As Trudgill (1974) points out it can readily be imagined that differences of this type between cultures can often lead, in cross-cultural communication, to misunderstanding and even hostility .

The aim of the current study is to examine telephone conversation openings in a Kazakh community in the workplace settings since there has not been done any studies on telephone openings in this context. Firstly, it outlines the main findings of telephone opening sequences within different cultures. Secondly, the study reports and discusses the sequence organization of telephone openings on the analysis of the recorded conversations in two different workplaces in the Kazakh community on the basis of Schegloff's (1986) framework as a benchmark. The study shows that despite the fact that the core sequences of Schegloff's model

(1986) are present in the telephone openings in a Kazakh community; their discourse construction is culturally specific. It is appeared to be dependent on the factors, such as co-interactants' age, gender, position at work and type of their relationship.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Schegloff's study (1986) on American telephone conversations the typical pattern of opening sequences consists of the following adjacency pairs (Figure 1.):

No	Name of the sequence	Examples
1	Summon-Answer sequence	<i>Phone rings – 'Hello'</i>
2	Identification and/or Recognition sequence	<i>'Bill'/'Hey Sally!'</i>
3	Greeting sequence	<i>'Hi!/'Hi!'</i>
4	How-are-you-sequence	<i>'How are you?' – 'Good, how about you?'</i>

Figure 1. Schegloff's (1986) model for telephone openings sequence.

Schegloff's study (1986) on the American data appeared to be an impetus for other studies on telephone openings across other linguistic communities. Thus, there has been done a number of studies (Godard, 1977; Halmari, 1993; Hootpooksteenstra, 1991; Lindström, 1994; Saadah, 2009) that showed that the sequential organization of telephone openings, in fact, are culturally variable. Godard (1977) argues that in France, people do not regard an answer for a summon as an indication that the answerer is ready to talk, but as a disturbance, namely an indication of the answerer's availability to be interrupted in the middle of what he/she was doing, not

his availability as a partner of conversation. Thus, the caller is usually expected to recite the number he/she dials and ask for excuses. Despite the fact that the analysis on the researchers' data based only on the French culture member intuitions and no examples are provided on these sequences, it is argued that French people are more prudent than Americans in the discourse construction in the telephone openings.

Analysis on Greek telephone openings Sifianou (1989) shows that there are more linguistic options available to choose for answering the telephone call in Greece. Thus, it is possible for the answerer to develop his/her own distinctive personal style to answer the phone, thus providing the overt cue for his/her recognition. Also, in terms of cross-cultural differences in the telephone usage as a whole, Sifianou's (1989) findings suggest that in Greece, the function of telephone conversation is believed to be interactional, namely to establish and maintain social interactions, whereas in England people use telephone interactions with the aim to convey information to each other. Moreover, Greece is regarded to be a positive politeness society since Greek is more likely to sound optimistic regarding to the outcomes of the encounters and prefer employing direct constructions in talk (Sifianou, 1989), whereas in England, for example, is considered to be a negative politeness society due to the preferences for pessimistically sounded linguistic devices (Brown & Levinson, 1978) .

In terms of cultural differences in the Identification-Recognition sequences, the studies on Dutch Hootpooksteenstra (1991) and Swedish Lindström (1994) telephone openings might be outlined. In the Dutch data, Hootpooksteenstra (1991) points out a strong contrast to American data Schegloff (1968) in the self-identification pattern. Dutch people start off

their conversations with their name mentions, thus they are inclined to self-identify themselves, whereas the Americans answer to summon by Hello as to provide a voice sample alone for recognition; thereby the Americans exhibit the preference for other-recognition over the self-identification. However, the Hallo (Hello) answer to summon in Dutch data appeared only 4 times out of 87 telephone conversations. Moreover, this type of answer causes puzzlement for the caller to proceed with the conversation further, since in most cases the answerer's self-identification is commonly followed by caller's self-identification in Dutch telephone openings.

In Lindström (1994) the preference in the Identification-Recognition sequence in Swedish telephone openings is appeared to be between American and Dutch extremes. It is argued that Swedes overwhelmingly self-identify themselves similarly to Dutch interactants in their first turn. It is believed that answerers both in Swedish Dutch telephone conversation are more trusting, since they do not screen the calls by providing their overt identification regardless of their callers' identities, whereas American answerers display only limited information when they pick up the phones. However, there is a possibility in Swedish telephone openings when the callers, like Americans, withhold their explicit identification and provide their voice samples alone for recognition. However, this peculiarity in the telephone discourse construction is accounted for Swedes' cultural orientation towards formality of the telephone talk. Thus, the callers' withholding of the self-identification sequence in their first turns might be attributed to the fact that the relationship between interactants is less formal.

Some cultural peculiarities in the construction of how-are-you sequence in the telephone openings are observed in Arabic, Persian and Finnish communities. For instance, in Saadah (2009) studies, it is shown that the how-are-you sequence is expanded by inquiring of well-beings of the interactants' immediate family members. Also, it might be extended by inquiring on the latest events of an interactant and his/her immediate relatives and close friends. Thus, Saadah (2009) argues that the expanded version of how-are you sequence is a sign of intimacy, whereas the shortened version of how-are-sequence might be regarded as impolite and rigid. In Halmari's (1993) study on business telephone conversations in the case of Finns and Anglo-Americans, it is found that how-are-you sequence functions as a part of the formal openings for English speakers, whereas for Finnish interactants, it accounts as an introduction for non-topical sequence.

Additionally, cultural peculiarities on phatic inquiries sequence of telephone openings should be noted. In Sun (2004), for example, it is suggested that What are you doing phatic inquiry is attributed to the to the category of questions-after-you in the established interactional moves on Chinese data by adopting model of interactional moves in opening and closing phases in German and English dialogues (House, 1982, cited in Sun, 2004). Moreover, Sun (2004) argues that in Chinese the phatic inquiries on answerer's state might be produced in different forms, such as so you are back or Is it your day off today, is not it? However, phatic inquiries in English, specifically Wh-questions in social interactions are less acceptable and might sound imposing (Schneider, 1988). Thus, the exiting literature on telephone openings shows that the cross-cultural distinctions in the telephone opening might be found over the all core



sequences and each linguistic community has its norms in constructing the discourse of the telephone openings.

### **3. METHODOLOGY**

The factors influence discourse construction of the telephone openings such as gender and a high position in workplace are borne in mind, thus the particular two informants are selected through the researchers' friendship network. One of the informants, 25-year-old male, works as an IT technician at a telecommunication company; the other informant, 30-year-old female, works as a senior clerk at one of the state's organization. Both institutions are located in Astana, Kazakhstan. The informants provide self-recorded telephone calls, both incoming and outgoing, from/to randomly selected colleagues in their workplaces in March, 2015 - November, 2016. The database for the current study consists of 10 landline telephone calls. Despite the fact that all the analyzed conversations are conducted by Kazakh native speakers, the conversations are mostly in the Russian language with some occurrences of code-switches to the Kazakh language. The reason of language mixing in the analyzed conversation is that Kazakhstan is one of the post-Soviet countries, and in nowadays' sociolinguistic situation, both languages are in common use. Thus, it is inevitable to elicit pure data recordings only in one language in naturally occurred talk. However, the occurrence of code-switches from one language to another in the data does not impede to establish the patterns of the telephone openings since only pragmatic functions of all utterances are analyzed. Moreover, no any inferences on the language choice are not drawn upon analyzing the telephone openings,

since the aim of the current paper to depict the sequence of telephone openings in workplaces only. Thus, the current study is considered to be the analysis of the telephone openings in a Kazakh community rather than in Kazakh language. Additionally, it should be mentioned that, the nature of analyzed telephone conversations is formal, however, the degree of formality of the talks varies depending on the familiarity and closeness of the relationship between the colleagues to whom they communicate .

The informed consents are obtained from the informants' colleagues after being recorded as an intention to record phone openings as natural as possible and to guarantee the authenticity of the telephone talks. All the participants are the colleagues of the two aforementioned informants who provided the self-recorded telephone openings, therefore the consents are likely to be obtained. Also, to adhere to the ethical norms of the conducted study, the participants are informed that the data they supplied will be completely deleted upon the study completion. In the negative case, they are also informed that they can withdraw the data at any point of the conducted study. Additionally, the 2 participants, who self-recorded their telephone opening conversations, are required to keep diaries for their recorded conversations by entering name, age and gender of their callers/answerers and a degree of familiarity or the type of relationship (formal/less formal) with them to enable the researcher to elicit the follow-up interpretation from the data.

Results on the analyzed telephone openings are investigated on the basis of Schegloff's benchmark and the relevant findings are reported separately sequence by sequence in the next sections of the current paper. Also, some excerpts from the transcribed telephone conversations are

exemplified where they are relevant in the analysis section. Generally, the transcription of the recorded conversations consists of two lines; the first line is presented in transliterate English characters from Kazakh/Russian language, whereas the translation from Kazakh/Russian into English is presented in the parentheses, in italics. The transcription conventions are adapted from Jefferson's transcript (Jaworski & Coupland, 2000). The detailed conventions on the transcription is illustrated in Appendix 1.

## **4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### *4.1. Summon-Answer sequence*

As it is common across different cultures (American, British, Greek, Arabic etc.), in a Kazakh community as well, telephone rings are perceived as a summons for answerers to receive phone calls. Schegloff's (1968) distribution rule of the telephone conversation when an answerer speaks first, appears to be applied to the telephone openings in a Kazakh community. However, according to the personal observation and intuition of the researchers as members of Kazakh community and the current data analysis, there are a greater variety of answers to the summons both in Kazakh and Russian discourses, such as *Da/ Da-Da (Yes)/ (Yes-Yes)*, *Slushayu (I am listening)* in Russian, *Iya (Yes)* and also the answer for summon as *Allo (Hello)* which uses equally in both languages, i.e. Kazakh and Russian and carries the same meaning .

The data analysis depicts *Da (Yes)* is by far the most common answer to the summons (7 out of 10), whereas *Allo (Hello)* appears only 2

times in the analysed conversations. Despite observing a strong preference for the Da (Yes) answer over the Allo (Hello) in the current analyzed conversations, it is suggested that a choice is quite dependent on a particular answerer's habit or mood at the moment of answering the phone. Thus, neither of these answers, i.e. Da (Yes) or Allo (Hello) is dependent on age, gender, a degree of formality of the conversation, nor closeness of the relationship between the interlocutors, but only on the occasional alternations. Consider the following Example (1) below:

Example (1)

1	Telephone rings	Summon
2	S1: Da (Yes)	Answer
3	(0.1)	
4	S1: Allo (Hello)	Repaired answer

The Da (Yes) answer is produced by the answerer. However, the caller does not proceed with the conversation any further, thus the delay in 0.1 pause occurs. Not receiving any utterances from the caller, the answerer repairs the turn-taking system by repeating his response to summon with another type of answer Allo (Hello). Thus, it is suggested that these two responses are interchangeable in their pragmatic functions. Additionally, it could be noted that in a Kazakh community people almost never answer the telephone call by reciting their phone number, but it is possible to produce their last names, especially in the institutional talks, such as military or government organizations. However, neither of these instances seems to be present in the current analyzed data.

#### 4.2. Identification – Recognition sequence

To report on the observations and peculiarities of the Identification-Recognition sequences in the telephone opening in Kazakh community the following examples should be considered and discussed. In the Examples (2-3) it is illustrated that the answers to the summons provide voice samples for recognition; they are transparent for the callers to recognize to whom they are talking, so they proceed further with Identification-Recognition sequence.

##### Example (2).

1	Telephone rings	Summon
2	S1: Allo ( <i>Hello</i> )	Answer/Voice sample for recognition
3	S2: Ehmm: Aynura?	Recognition

##### Example (3).

1	Telephone ring	Summon
2	S1: Da ( <i>Yes</i> )	Answer/Voice sample for recognition
3	S2: Shinar?	Recognition

However, in case when there is no recognition is followed after the Summon-Answer sequence, the answerer could repair his answer by providing an extra-voice sample to display it for recognition. Consider, the following Example (4):

Example (4).

1	Telephone rings	Summon
2	S1: Da (Yes)	Answer/Voice sample for recognition
3	S2: Allo (Hello)	Voice sample for recognition
4	S1: Da (Yes)	No recognition/ Extra Voice sample for recognition
5	S2: Yerkhata? (Yerkhata?)	Recognition
6	S1: Au? (Yeah?)	Confirmation

In this instance the answerer utters Da (Yes) response for summon. Thus, the caller proceeds further with the Identification-Recognition sequence and provides his voice sample to solicit reciprocal recognition from his co-interactant. However, no recognition is followed and thereby the answerer repairs his first answer to summon by producing an extra-voice sample by Da (Yes) answer again. The caller in his turn utters the name of the answerer Yerkhata? for the confirmation of being sure of whether he reaches the intended person or not. In fact, the exact type of repairment is witnessed almost in the 7 telephone openings out of 10 analyzed conversations. Thus, it is argued that in a Kazakh community there is a strong preference for other-recognition over the self-identification since the interlocutors tend to employ repairment and provide extra-voice samples in a case no recognition is followed after the Summon-Answer sequence. Interestingly, however, that the providing of answerer's extra-voice sample in case of failing of the recognition might be pre-empted by a caller as soon as he/she recognizes that the intended person is reached on the phone. Consider the following Example (5):

## Example (5)

1		Telephone rings		Summon
2	S1	Da	Yes	Answer
3	S2	Allo (.) Shinar (.) Salem. Kak dela?	<i>Hello (.) Shinar(.) Hi. How are you?</i>	Voice sample for recognition/Recognition/Greeting (informal in Kazakh)/How are you sequence
4	S1	Privet. Normalno, Kak u tebva?	<i>Hi. I am all-right. How are you?</i>	Greeting (Informal in Russian)/Recognition/How are you sequence

In this instance (Example (5)), the answerer replies to summon by the Da (Yes) answer. The caller, in his turn, starts his recognition sequence by Allo (Hello) displaying his voice as a sample for recognition. However, he instantly realizes that he is talking to the intended person to whom he has called. This is why a noticeable pause is followed after Allo (Hello), and only then the name of the answerer is produced by the caller, as to show that he has recognized the answerer; all of these utterances are produced in one caller' turn. In case the caller fails to recognize the answerer after the provided extra-voice samples, he/she could proceed with the greeting sequence by producing a neutral formal greeting as to elicit more voice samples for recognition. In case there is no recognition is followed after greeting, only then the caller might finally self-identify himself/herself.

(Example 6)

Example (6)		
1	Telephone rings	Summon
2	S1: Da (Yes)	Answer/Voice for recognition
3	S2: Allo (Hello)	Voice sample for recognition
4	S1: Da (Yes)	Answer/Extra-voice sample for recognition
5	S2: Zdravstvuite (Hello)	Greeting (Formal, Russian)
6	S1: Zdravstvuite (Hello)	Greeting (Formal, Russian)
7	S2: Eto Qanat (This is Qanat)	Self-identification

However, not only failing of recognition might elicit callers' self-identification, but also self-identification might occur in a case when the caller is not sure of whether the answerer recognizes him, too. In the Example (7) the caller recognizes the answerer, as in the line 5 he produces his name in rising intonation to elicit confirmation that the intended person is reached. Interestingly, however, that in line 7, the caller prefers to self-identify himself, although the recognition is almost might be obtained at that point. It is suggested that the self-identification in this instance fulfills a dual function. Firstly, it might be attributed to the fact that the caller does not expect the answerer to be able to recognize him from his voice sample alone, thus he provides self-identification. Secondly, it should be noted that people in a Kazakh community are expected to behave appropriately to their position at work and the type of the interactants' relationship, due to the extremely hierarchal nature of the society as a whole. Thus, by producing his name, the caller exhibits his respect to the answerer as to the colleague and thus admits that their interpersonal relationship is not on the intimate terms, in spite of the interlocutors are of the same age and therefore, informal greetings Zdorovo (Hi, informal in Russian) are employed.



## Example (7):

	Telephone rings	Summon
1		
2	S1 Da (Yes)	Answer/Voice sample for recognition
3	S2 Allo (Hello)	Voice sample for recognition
4	S1 Da (Yes)	Answer/Extra-voice sample for recognition
5	S2 Yerkhat? (Yerkhat?)	Recognition
6	S1 Au? (Yeah?)	Confirmation
7	S2 Z.dorovo! Eto Qanat (Hi! Thus is Qanat)	Greeting (males' informal in Russian)/Self- identification
8	S1 Z.dorovo! (Hi!)	Greeting (males' informal in Russian)

It is also suggested, however, that the occurrence of the self-identification sequence is dependent on the degree of the familiarity with the person to whom the caller communicates and the nature of their relationship, but not the age of the interlocutors, as the data analysis shows. The depicted pattern of this suggestion is illustrated in the Example (8) below:

## Example (8)

	Telephone rings	Summon
1		
2	S1 Da (Yes)	Answer/Voice sample for recognition
3	S2 Allo (Hello)	Voice sample for recognition
4	S1 Da-Da (Yes-Yes)	Answer/Extra voice sample for recognition
5	S2 Assalam ahaleikum (Peace be upon you)	Greeting (formal, Kazakh)
6	S1: Ahaleikum assalam (Peace be upon you too)	Greeting (Formal, Kazakh)
7	S2 Qalaisyz Talgat? (How are you Talgat?)	How are you sequence/Recognition
8	S1 Nichogo (.) Normalno (Nothing (new). Normally (I am alright))	Neutral response
9	S2 Chto delaesh? (What are you doing?)	Phatic question
10	S1 Po rabote(.)>Kto eto?< (by my work (working) (.)>Who is this?<)	Answer/Identification inquiry
11	S2 Eto ya Qanat (It's me Qanat)	Self-identification

Due to the reason that the answerer is older than the caller, the answerer is greeted in a formal way in Kazakh, and then the how are you inquire in Kazakh is constructed grammatically by adding the morpheme of a formal and polite form to the Kazakh stem Qalai + syz. This is believed to be a common expectation in a Kazakh community to talk with seniors in a formal and polite way. However, no self-identification sequence has been introduced by the caller voluntarily until the answerer himself inquires with the direct question who is this? According to the diary notes provided by the informant, who self-recorded this telephone conversation, the interpersonal relationship between these two co-interactants are on a close term in spite of the age differences between them. Thus, it is suggested that, additionally to the preference for other recognition over the self-identification, the degree of familiarity is also one of the main factors of non-occurrence of self-identification in the opening sequence. Also, it is worth noting that in the all analyzed instances the callers do not check the numbers they dialed. Also, the callers never ask excuses for the disturbing the answerers by making calls and the conversational openings are quite direct. Thus, it might be inferred that, in general, in Kazakh community, a positive value is attached to the act of the telephone call.

To summarize the Identification-Recognition sequence in the analyzed data, the following is suggested. The data analysis of telephone calls in the workplaces in a Kazakh community shows that there is a strong preference for other-recognition rather than for self-identification. However, self-identification is produced by the caller in a case when he/she is unable to recognize the answerer. Also, self-identification is

might be employed by the callers when the relationship between colleagues is quite formal.

### 4.3. Greeting-Greeting Sequence

Formal greeting in Kazakh. The formal Hello greeting as *Salemetsyz be* in Kazakh language is usually used to greet unfamiliar and older people or colleagues who have a higher position. By producing this type of greeting, the interlocutors try to be polite and thus they exhibit their respect for the person to whom this greeting is addressed. In case of Kazakh language, this formal greeting is suggested to be neutral and common between female/female or female/male conversations. The instance of a formal Kazakh greeting is exemplified below in the Example (9):

#### Example (9)

1	Telephone rings	Summon
2	S1: Da ( <i>Yes</i> ) (0.1)	Answer/Voice sample for recognition
3	S1: Allo? ( <i>Hello</i> )	Repaired answer/Voice sample for recognition
4	S2: Allo ( <i>Hello</i> )	Recognition/Voice sample for recognition
5	S1: Da ( <i>Yes</i> )	Answer/Extra-voice sample for recognition
6	S2: <i>Salemetsyz be!</i> ( <i>Hello!</i> )	Greeting (Formal in Kazakh)
7	S1: <i>Salemetsyz be!</i> ( <i>Hello!</i> )	Greeting (Formal in Kazakh)

According to the diary notes provided by the informant who made a self-recording, this conversation is going on between colleagues; the caller

(a male) has not recognized the answerer (a female), because he does not often contact this particular person on the phone. Thus, talking with an unfamiliar person to him at that point, the caller, therefore, employs a neutral and formal greeting in Kazakh *Salemetsyz be*. The answerer in her turn also returned the same formal greeting back to the caller. In the scenario where the greeting is addressed to someone who is of older age and both interlocutors are Kazakh males, there is a strong tendency to greet each other in a religious way as the most Muslims usually do *Assalam ahaleikum – Ahaleikum assalam* (Peace be upon you – Peace be upon you too). This type of greeting in the opening sequences is typical for Islamic communities; and commonly is employed both by males and females (Saadah, 2009). However, the *Assalam ahaleikum* (Peace be upon you) greeting in Kazakh community is employed by Kazakh males only, but not females. Perhaps, it might be explained by the historical reasons, when a religious lifestyle was adhered by most males in the past. Nowadays, despite the fact that Kazakhstan is officially proclaimed to be a secular country and does not support any religion or irreligion, the Kazakhs consider themselves to be the Muslims mostly. In fact, though, the vast majority of them do not maintain a religious lifestyle.

Example (10)

1	Telephone rings	Summon
2	S1 Da (Yes)	Answer/Voice sample for recognition
3	S2 Allo (Hello)	Extra-summon
4	S1 Da-Da (Yes-Yes)	Answer/Extra voice sample for recognition
5	S2 Assalam ahaleikum (Peace be upon you)	Greeting (males' formal in Kazakh)
6	S1: Ahaleikum assalam (Peace be upon you too)	Greeting (males' formal in Kazakh)
7	S2 Qalaisyz Talgat? (How are you Talgat?)	How are you sequence/Recognition

The interlocutors sometimes could also use one more formal way of greeting such as Qaiyrly tan/kun/kesh (Good morning/afternoon/evening), addressed in greetings both to males and females. It is also suggested that this type of greeting conveys more formality to the nature of the talk. However, no instances are witnessed in the analyzed conversations. Informal greetings in Kazakh. Informal Salem (Hi) is used to greet a person of around the same age, the same position at the workplace or someone with whom an interlocutor has close/friendly relationship. The instances are exemplified in the Example (11) below:

#### Example (11)

1	Telephone rings		Summon
2	51 Da	(Yes)	Answer
3	52 Allo (.) Shinar (.) Salem. Kak dela?	(Hello (.) Shinar(.)) Hi. How are you?)	Voice sample for recognition/Recognition/Greeting (informal in Kazakh)/How are you sequence
4	51 Privet. Normalno. Kak u tebva?	(Hi. I am all-right. How are you?)	Greeting (Informal in Russian)/Recognition/How are you sequence

The opening conversation in the example above is going on between female and male, who work together and are approximately of the same age. Despite the fact that the answerer holds a higher position at their work, the interpersonal relationship between these two interactants is less formal. Thus, the informal greeting is used. Formal

greeting in Russian in a Kazakh community. Similarly, to formal greetings in the Kazakh language, the formal greetings in Russian in Kazakh community, are usually employed when co-interactants are unfamiliar to each other; also, if there is an age difference between them and if one of the interlocutors holds a senior position in the workplace and in the society as a whole. There are two ways to produce formal greetings in Russian: Zdravstvuite (formal Hello) and Dobroe (-yi) utro/den/vecher (Good morning/afternoon/evening). Both instances are witnessed in the analyzed data.

Example (12)

1	Telephone openings	Summon
2	S1: Da (Yes)	Answer/Voice for recognition
3	S2: Allo (Hello)	Recognition
4	S1: Da (Yes)	Answer/Extra-voice sample for recognition
5	S2: Zdravstvuite (Hello)	Greeting (Formal, Russian)
6	S1: Zdravstvuite (Hello)	Greeting (Formal, Russian)
7	S2: Eto Qanat (This is Qanat)	Self-identification

In the Example (12), the caller fails to recognized the answerer after the Summon-Answer sequence and he thus, prefers greeting the unrecognized answerer in a neutral formal way Zdravstvuite (formal Hello). As it is seen from the transcription below, the caller, in the Example 13, on the contrary to the Example (12), has recognized the answerer. However, there is also a preference for the formal greeting as Dobryi vecher (Good evening) in Russian. This preference is

explained by the fact that the answerer has a higher position in the workplace rather than the caller. Moreover, the interpersonal relationship between them highly formal, according to the informants' diary notes. Thus, the respect for the senior colleague is exhibited by this formal greeting.

### Example (13)

1	Telephone rings	Summon
2	S1: Allo ( <i>Hello</i> )	Answer
3	S2: Allo ( <i>Hello</i> )	Recognition
4	S1: Da-Da ( <i>Yes-Yes</i> )	Answer/Extra-Voice sample for recognition
5	S2: Shinar (.) Dobryi vecher ( <i>Shinar (.) Good evening</i> )	Recognition/Greeting (Formal, Russian)
6	S1: Dobryi ( <i>Good</i> )	Greeting (Formal, Russian)

Informal greeting in Russian in a Kazakh community. Privet (Hi) is a more generic type of informal greeting in Russian and could be used both in female/female or female/male conversations. The instance has already been exemplified in the Example (11) when the answerer returned her greeting back in Russian as to response for the caller's informal greeting in Kazakh. The choice on the informal greeting is made because there is no difference in the interactants' age and their close interpersonal relationship. However, it should be noted, that if both interlocutors are males of around the same age; thus, they are inclined to greet each other in an informal way employing particular males' greeting Zdorovo (Hi). According to the researchers'

intuition as a member of the Kazakh community, it is suggested that this type of greeting is quite common between males from their teenage years up to 30-35 years old. The instance of this kind of informal males' greeting is exemplified below:

Example (14)

1	Telephone rings	Summon
2	S1: Allo ( <i>Hello</i> )	Answer/Voice sample for recognition
3	S2: Zdorovo, Sayan! ( <i>Hi, Sayan</i> )	Greeting (males' informal, Russian)/ Recognition
4	S1: Zdorovo! ( <i>Hi!</i> )	Greeting (males' informal, Russian)

To summarize, the greeting sequence in telephone openings is present in the analyzed 7 conversations out of 10. The omission of the greeting sequence might occur due to the fact if the greeting has already been done prior to the telephone conversation, e.g. face-to-face interaction or in the instances where participants have already been in the telephone conversation not too long ago. Also, in workplaces the greeting sequence of telephone openings, both in Kazakh and Russian languages could be produced in the formal and informal ways. In general, the choice on the appropriate greeting between interlocutors appeared to be dependent on their age, gender and the type of the relationship.



#### 4.4. How-are-you-sequence

The analyses of telephone transcriptions show that the how are you sequence is present only in 3 out of 10 recorded conversations. It might be argued that the how-are-you sequence in telephone openings in the workplace in a Kazakh community, is generally omitted and pre-empted by establishing the anchor position. The samples of the how-are-sequence omission are exemplified in the following Examples (15-16):

##### Example (15)

1	Telephone rings	Summon
2	S1: Da (Yes)	Answer
3	S2: Allo (Hello)	Voice sample for recognition
4	S1: Da (Yes)	Answer/Extra-voice sample for recognition
5	S2: Zdravstvuite (Hello)	Greeting (formal, in Russian)
6	S1: Zdravstvuite (Hello)	Greeting (formal, in Russian)
7	S2: Eto Qanat (This is Qanat)	Self-identification
8	S2: Aha(.) uznala (Yeah (.) I have recognized)	Recognition
9	S1: Vy zvonili mne? (Have you called me?)	Reason for call/Initiating topic

##### Example (16)

1	Telephone rings	Summon
2	S1: Da (Yes)	Answer/Voice sample for recognition
3	S2: ( ) Alloo: (Hello;)	Voice sample for recognition
4	S1: Da-Da (Yes-Yes)	Answer/ Extra-voice sample for recognition
5	S2: A mne Shinar (I need Shinar/ I'd like to speak to Shinar)	Request for availability
6	S1: Da (.) slushayu (Yes (.) I am listening)	Response
7	S2: Ya vot k Vam zvonu... (I am calling you on...)	Anchor position

According to the data analysis and informants' diary notes, the how-are-sequence in the telephone conversation in the workplace might be initiated by the caller, if the interlocutors have a close and friendly relationship. Moreover, it is believed that the shortened version of how are you sequence, in the informal mundane conversations between the immediate family members and the interlocutors who have close social ties, might give an impression of the callers' impoliteness, similarly to findings of opening sequence in Arabic (Saadah, 2009). Therefore, the function of the how-are-you sequence in the telephone calls in workplaces in the Kazakh community is merely phatic. The responses to how-are-you inquiry are expected to be neutral and short. In the analyzed conversations the answers to the how-are-you are typically the same, such as Nichego/Poidet/Normalno/Po-tihonku which mean nothing (new)/Normally/it goes/It goes slowly and pragmatically imply that there is nothing important to tell.

Interestingly that the answers' neutral response might be pursued by the callers, and thus the opening sequence might be extended by the phatic questions, such as what are you doing? The function of this phrase is a phatic contribution to the communication as a way to start the conversation similarly to the function of the how-are-you sequence. In fact, there is no pragmatic intention of what are you doing as a genuine query on the answerer's factual engagement at the moment of calling, since the caller presupposes that the answerer could be busy with his workload issues. The instances are given in the

examples (17-18). This is a very common behavior of the callers, specifically if there is no urgency in the phone call and the relationship between colleagues is quite friendly.

## Example (17)

Telephone rings			Summon
1	S1	Da ( <i>Yes</i> )	Answer/Voice sample for recognition
2	S2	Allo ( <i>Hello</i> )	Voice sample for recognition
3	S1	Da-Da ( <i>Yes-Yes</i> )	Answer/ Extra voice sample for recognition
4	S2	Assalam ahaleikum ( <i>Peace be upon you</i> )	Greeting (males' formal in Kazakh)
5	S1:	Ahaleikum assalam ( <i>Peace be upon you too</i> )	Greeting (males' formal in Kazakh)
6	S2	Qalaisyz Talgat? ( <i>How are you Talgat?</i> )	How are you sequence (in Kazakh)/ Recognition
7	S1:	Nichego(.) Normalno <i>Nothing (new).</i> <i>Normally (I am all right)</i>	Neutral response
8	S2	Chto delaesh? ( <i>What are you doing?</i> )	Phatic question (in Russian)
9	S1	Po rabote ( <i>By my work/Working</i> )	Response

## Example (18)

Telephone rings			Summon
2	S1	Allo ( <i>Hello</i> )	Answer/Voice sample for recognition
3	S2	Zdorovo. Sayan! ( <i>Hi, Sayan!</i> )	Greeting (males' informal in Russian)/Recognition
4	S1	Zdorovo! Kak dela? ( <i>Hi! How are you?</i> )	Greeting (males' informal in Russian)/ How are you sequence
5	S2	Nichego >poidet< Sam kak? ( <i>Nothing (new) &gt;allright&lt; How are you?</i> )	Neutral response/How are you exchange
6	S1	Poidet (.) Po-tihonku(.). Chto delaesh? ( <i>It goes (All-right)(.) Slowly (nothing new) (.)</i> <i>What are you doing?</i> )	Neutral response/Phatic inquiry
7	S2	Ya tolko prihal ( <i>I have just come</i> )	Response

To sum up, the how-are-you sequence seems to be less applicable for telephone calls in the workplaces in the Kazakh community. However, it is present in the telephone conversation between colleagues in case their relationship on the intimate terms; thus, serving an important function in the opening sequence.

## **5. CONCLUSION**

The database on the telephone openings in a Kazakh community comprises from the outgoing and incoming self-recorded telephone calls of the two informants of the current study at two different workplaces in Kazakhstan. The analysis shows that in a telephone conversation in workplaces in a Kazakh community the pattern of a strong preference for other-recognition over self-identification is observed. In case the voice sample fails to be recognized by the callers, the answerers' extra-voice samples might be produced. Apart from the preference for other recognition, self-identification is suggested to be quite dependent on the type of the relationship between the interlocutors, but not age or gender. However, the choice on formality/informality of greeting is dependent on the age and gender and the type of the relationship of the interlocutors as well. Proceeding further with the how-are-you sequence in the formal talk in workplaces is scarcely present. However, it is suggested that this sequence could be produced in the conversation between the interlocutors who have a less formal relationship in the workplaces. Overall, it is suggested that

the core sequences of the telephone openings of Schegloff's (1986) benchmark are present at the telephone openings in workplaces in a Kazakh community. However, a Kazakh community has its own cultural distinctions in the construction of telephone opening discourse and each opening telephone conversation is constructed according to the gender, age and the degree of formality of the relationship of the interlocutors.

## REFERENCES

- BAKSANSKY, O. 2013. **Modern psychology: theoretical approaches and methodological grounds**. Moscow: CD Librokom. Russia.
- BOROZDINA, G. 2013. **Psychology of business communication**. Moscow: Alfa-M, SIC INFRA-M. Russia.
- BOROZDINA, G. 2016. **Psychology and ethics of business communication: A textbook and a workshop for academic bachelor**. Moscow: Yurait. Russia.
- BROWN, P., & LEVINSON, S. 1978. **Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena**. In E.N. Goody (ed.), Questions and politeness. Cambridge: CUP. UK.
- FRITZ, E. 2014. **Conversational Analysis: Openings in Telephone Conversations**. Retrieved from [https://www.academia.edu/29716469/Conversation\\_Analysis-\\_Openings\\_in\\_Telephone\\_Conversations](https://www.academia.edu/29716469/Conversation_Analysis-_Openings_in_Telephone_Conversations). Russia.
- GODARD, D. 1977. **Same Setting, Different Norms: Phone Call Beginnings in France and the United States**. Language in Society. Vol. 2. P. 209. UK.

- HALMARI, H. 1993. **Intercultural business telephone conversations: a case of Finns vs. Anglo-Americans.** Applied Linguistics. Vol. 14, pp. 408-430. UK.
- HOOTPOOKSTEENSTRA, H. 1991. **Opening sequence in Dutch telephone conversations.** In D. Boden and D. H. Zimmerman (Eds) **Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis.** Cambridge: Clarendon Press. pp. 232-250. UK.
- JANG, Y. 2014. **The Analysis of the Beginning of the Telephone Conversations from the Middle School English Textbooks in Korea.** Retrieved from [http://space.snu.ac.kr/bitstream/10371/81471/1/08\\_Yu%20Jin%20Jang.pdf](http://space.snu.ac.kr/bitstream/10371/81471/1/08_Yu%20Jin%20Jang.pdf). Russia.
- JAWORSKI, A., & COUPLAND, N. 2000. **The Discourse reader.** London: Routledge. UK.
- LIN, C., & CHEN, S. 2018. **The influence of product presentation mode and academic major on the motivation of haptic.** Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews. Vol. 6, N<sup>o</sup> 2: 21-26. India.
- LINDSTRÖM, A. 1994. **Identification and recognition in Swedish telephone conversation openings.** Language in Society. Vol. 23, pp. 231–252. UK.
- SAADAH, E. 2009. **The how are you? Sequence in telephone openings in Arabic.** Studies in the Linguistic Sciences: Illinois Working Papers. PP. 171-186. Illinois.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. 1968. **Sequencing in conversational openings.** American Anthropology. Vol. 70, pp. 1075-1095. USA.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. 1986. **The routine as achievement.** Human studies. Vol. 9, pp. 111-151. Germany.

- SCHNEIDER, K. 1988. **Small talk: Analyzing Phatic Discourse.** Hitzeroth, Marburg. Germany.
- SIFIANOU, M. 1989. **On the telephone again! Differences in the telephone behavior: England versus Greece.** *Language in Society*. Vol. 18, N° 4: 527-544. UK.
- SUN, H. 2004. **Opening moves in informal Chinese telephone conversations.** *Journal of Pragmatics*. Vol. 36, pp. 1429-1465. Netherlands.
- TRUDGILL, P. 1974. **Sociolinguistics: An introduction to language and society.** Harmondsworth: Penguin. UK.



**UNIVERSIDAD  
DEL ZULIA**

---

**opción**

Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales

Año 35, Especial N° 19, 2019

Esta revista fue editada en formato digital por el personal de la Oficina de Publicaciones Científicas de la Facultad Experimental de Ciencias, Universidad del Zulia.  
Maracaibo - Venezuela

[www.luz.edu.ve](http://www.luz.edu.ve)

[www.serbi.luz.edu.ve](http://www.serbi.luz.edu.ve)

[produccioncientifica.luz.edu.ve](http://produccioncientifica.luz.edu.ve)