

The opening sequences in the radio phone call-in conversations in Behdini-Kurdish

Dilveen Ahmad Majeed¹, Aveen Hassan²

^{1,2}College of Languages, Department of English language, University of Duhok, Kurdistan Region, Iraq

ABSTRACT

Verbal interaction is organized into sequences of utterances which are understood according to their sequential context. One of them is the opening sequences which are the initiation chunks of speech in order to start a conversation. Much work has been done on the opening sequences in other languages, whereas these sequences have not received attention by researchers in Kurdish. The study is the first attempt to identify the structure of the opening sequences in one variety of Kurdish, namely, Behdini. Besides, it will show the forms of each sequence identified in the structure and how the structures and sequences vary according to gender. The study is based on the analysis of the opening sequences of 77 radio phone call-in conversations. The data has been analysed qualitatively and quantitatively using the conversation analysis approach. Two structures of opening sequences in Kurdish are identified depending on whether the call is known or unknown. For the caller-unknown conversations, the structure is summons answer, greeting, how are you sequence, identification, and greetings sending/compliments/ guest welcoming sequence. In the caller-known, identification sequence is not realized. The study identified the common forms of each sequence realized in the structure of the opening sequences. Some gender variations are realized in the structure of the opening sequences, their sequences and forms.

The study is important because it will help identify language-specific conventions of opening sequences and to which extent they vary according to social factors. Besides, it will enrich the typological studies of opening sequences by adding another language-specific convention of opening sequences to the ones already investigated and to pave the way to formulate general or even universal principles of organisation of talk in interaction.

Keywords: opening sequences, conversation analysis, phone call-ins, Behdini Kurdish, gender differences.

1. Introduction

Conversation as a form of verbal interaction is organized into sequences of utterances which are understood according to their sequential context. One of these sequences are the opening sequences. Opening sequences refer to the initiation chunks of speech in order to start a conversation.

Much research has been done on the opening sequences in other languages. Most of these works have been conducted on phone calls (Schegloff, 1968, 1979, 1986 for American English; Hutchby and Branett 2005 for British English; Arminen and Liononen, 2006 for Finnish; Mahzari, 2019 for Saudi Arabic; Taleghani-Nikazm, 2002 for Persian and Germany), a few have been one on face to face conversations (Emery, 2000 for

Omani Arabic; Akindele, 2007 for Basotho community of South Africa; Kpogo and Abrefa, 2017 for Akan society in Ghana), and no studies have been conducted on radio phone call-in programs. Meanwhile, no studies have been done on the opening sequences in Kurdish language. This study is the first attempt to analyse the structure of the opening sequences in Kurdish and it contributes to fill this gap in Kurdish linguistic studies.

Schegloff (1968, 1979, and 1986) identified four canonical sequences in opening American telephone calls: a summons answer sequence, identification/recognition, greetings and exchange of *how are you* based in northern American data. These opening

sequences in American English described by Schegloff (1972, 1979, and 1986) are used as a template in previous studies in order to explore how telephone conversation openings in other cultures are carried out (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1991; Lindström, 1994; Hopper and Chen, 1996). Although there are similarities in the opening sequences of telephone conversation, the opening sequences may vary according to different parameters such as culture, medium of communication, gender, and formality of the situation. This study aims to analyse the structure of the opening sequences in radio phone call-in conversations in Kurdish to identify the Kurdish specific sequences of these utterances and in what way they are different from those of other cultures and communities. Besides, it aims to identify the forms of each sequence identified in the structure and the way the structures, sequences and their forms vary according to gender.

The study will attempt to provide answers to the following research questions:

- What are the most common structures of the opening sequences of phone call-ins in Kurdish?
- In what way the Kurdish opening sequences are different from those of other cultures?
- Are the opening sequences of phone call-ins in Kurdish affected by gender?

This study is limited to the analysis of the opening sequences in one Kurdish sub-dialect, namely the Behdini subdialect of Northern Kurmanji. Other dialects are excluded from the scope of the study. Additionally, it is limited to the analysis of the opening sequences of radio phone call-in programs and other mediums of communication are left for future researchs and it concentrates on one social factor, namely gender.

This study is significant, for it shows to what extent social factors affect conversations. This will help to understand the variations in sequences of talk better. Besides, the study helps to identify the common

structures of the opening sequences used in Kurdish culture and in what way they are different from those of other cultures. The identification of similarities and differences between cultures may help to device universal aspects of talk in interaction (Schegloff, 2002).

The following section provides a literature review of previous studies. Section three will present the main methodological issues used in the data collection and analysis. Section four describes and discusses the main findings of the study. Finally, section five provides the main conclusions arrived at, recommendations and suggestions for further study.

2. Literature review

2.1 Conversation analysis

The method used to analyse the data in this study is known as conversation analysis (henceforth CA). CA is a field of social interaction study which has been established in the early 60s by Harvey Sacks and his colleagues Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson (Godwin & Heritage, 1990, p 283; Have, 2007, p. 5). "Social interaction is the primordial means through which the business of the social world is transacted...cultures are transmitted, renewed, and modified. Through processes of social interaction, shared meaning, mutual understanding, and the coordination of human conduct are achieved" (Godwin & Heritage, 1990, p283).

The emergence of CA goes back to early 1960s in California, in which Erving Goffman through observing people interaction has developed a style of sociological analysis (Have, 1990, p. 5). This step of Goffman has influenced the researchers to investigate the area of face to face interaction (Have, 1990, p. 5). Garfinkel developed a 'research policy' called 'ethnomethodology' that focused on the study of methods on everyday activities and social order, and this research policy did a great force in CA's emergence as a social analysis style (Have, 2007, p. 6).

Later on, Sidnell (2016) mentioned that in 1974, Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson published a paper under the title "A simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation" and this paper did not only provide a detailed explanation to both turn-taking and conversation analytic method, but also attracted linguists' attention to the study of CA (p. 1).

CA has been defined differently by different scholars. Psathas (1995) defined it as an approach that "studies the order/organization/orderliness of social action, particularly those social actions that are located in everyday interaction, in discursive practices, in the sayings/tellings/doings of members of society" (p. 2). Have (1990) defined it as a research tradition which has grown out of ethnomethodology and been used to study everyday conversations (p. 23). On the other hand, Huisman (2001) defined it as "a powerful tool by which to study talk-in-interaction...Conversation analysis involves the detailed, mostly qualitative, study of naturally occurring talk between or among two or more people on a turn-by-turn" (p. 70).

The data used in CA approach are records of naturally occurring social interaction and the researcher is supposed to give detailed transcription of the records in order to facilitate the analysis and find generalizations (Sidnell & Stivers, 2013, p. 2). Most CA studies, as those mentioned above, have only focused on the study of everyday speech. Though the field has adopted the name CA, for the analysis of everyday conversations, rather it could also be applied to the analysis of speech in different contexts, such as courts, medical settings, academic settings, and political speeches (Godwin & Heritage, 1990, p. 284).

Thus, in this study CA is adopted as a qualitative method used to analyse naturally occurring conversations in the context of radio phone call-ins. The data has been transcribed and then inductive data-driven analysis has been performed to find recurring patterns of interaction. These patterns have been

supported by quantitative analysis to identify the regular and most commonly used patterns to make generalisations. CA has been adopted because it has been used by many scholars, such as Schegloff, (1968); Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson, (1974); Schegloff, (2007); Have, (2007). The researcher aims to continue in the same line that these scholars have worked on.

2.2 Opening sequences

Opening sequences refer to the initiation chunks of speech in order to start a conversation. Schegloff (2007) mentioned that opening sequences as greetings are minimal adjacency pairs in talk-in-interaction (p. 22). It can be noticed by the researcher that most of the researches that have tackled opening sequences have specified their studies to opening sequences of phone calls. Opening sequences of phone calls consist of four basic components which are summons-answer, identification/recognition and the third and fourth components are the greeting exchange and *how are you* sequence (Schegloff, 1986, p. 146; Heritage, Steven & Clayman, 2010, p. 61-62). Heritage and Clayman (2010) mentioned that summons answer refers to the telephone's ring and the recipient's first "hallo" and it indicates that both parties of conversation are ready for conversation and are in mutual engagement (p. 62). When the answerer fails to recognize the caller, usually callers identify themselves. The identification sequence, usually consists of a frame and name of the caller; frame refers to expressions like "this is___", "my name is___", or "I am___" (Schegloff, 1986, p 1078). As far as greeting is considered, Heritage and Clayman (2010) said usually greetings follow identification/recognition sequence, because greeting means that the answerer has recognized the caller (p. 62). *How are you* sequence follows greeting. Heritage and Clayman (2010) mentioned that "how are you provide each party with an opportunity to introduce some pressing matter in advance of the official reason

for the call" (p. 62). Mahzari (2019) mentioned that these four components of opening sequences are majority sequences of American English. Studies on opening sequences of telephone conversations argue and disagree on the question of whether these components of opening sequences mentioned by Schegloff are universal or cultural specific (Taleghani-Nikazm, 2002, p 3). Houtkoop-Steenstra (1991) in his research on opening sequences of Dutch follows the idea that opening sequences are cultural specific since the opening sequences of Dutch are different from those of the English (p. 246). Dutch speakers self-identify by name when answering the phone and the caller also self-identifies (Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1991, p 246). On the other hand, Coronel-Molina (1998) follows the idea that the opening sequences' components mentioned by Schegloff are universal since his study tackled the Spanish and in the results of his study, he found that Spanish and English are the same as far as opening sequences are considered (p. 65). However, even languages that follow the universal structure presented by Schegloff as in English, not all the conversations consist of all the four components. There are conversations that lack one or two of the opening sequences' components (Heritage, Steven & Clayman, 2010, p. 62).

2.3 Previous studies on variations in the opening sequences of conversation

People usually do not speak the same way all the time, but they speak differently for different purposes. Speech in any society can take different forms because of different cultural and social factors, such as social groups, speech communication, language, dialect varieties, and style which are relative to particular cultures (Purba, 2016, p. 28). Opening sequences as chunks of speech also undergo variations according to different parameters, such as culture, medium of communication, gender, and formality of the situation. Some cross-cultural studies on telephone conversation

openings in various speech communities (France, Egypt, Greece, Australia, German, Iran, China, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Taiwan) (Godard, 1977; Schmidt, 1986; Sifianou, 1989; Grieve and Seebus, 2008; Taleghani-Nikazm, 2002; Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1991; Lindström, 1994; Hopper and Chen, 1996) indicated that although there are similarities in the opening sequences of telephone conversation, some cultural variations exist as well. Godard (1977 cited in Mahzari, 2019) explored the organization of the opening sequences in French and claimed considerable variation between summons-answer sequences in French versus American telephone openings. According to Godard, Americans interpret the answer to summons as an indication that the channel of communication is open; the French see it as an indication of the answerer's availability to be interrupted in the middle of what s/he was doing, not of her or his availability as a partner in the conversation. Similarly, Schmidt (1986) finds that telephone conversational openings of Cairene Egyptian Arabic differ from French and Americans in that identification is problematic in Egypt because neither the answerer nor the caller provides any self-identification before assuring the identity of each other; however, Schegloff (1986) indicated that the intercultural difference is not strong. Sifianou (2002) compares between British English and Greek in the sequences of opening telephone calls. She found cultural differences in that the Greek callers do not introduce themselves, whereas the British identify themselves by mentioning their surnames or phone number. Sifianou (2002) adds that the four canonical sequences suggested by Schegloff occur only when the relationship between the callers is formal in Greek. Grieve and Seebus (2008) work on Australian and German and find cultural differences when they compare between opening private and business telephone calls. The results show that Germans use

self-identification more than Australians. On the other hand, Hopper and Doany (1989 cited in Mahzari, 2019) argue for the universal structure of canonical opening telephone conversations and examine this aspect in three languages: English, French, and Arabic which show similarity in the opening sequences. Taleghani-Nikazm (2002) demonstrates that the four canonical sequences occur in both formal and informal calls in Persian. In Chinese, Hopper and Chen (1996) found that the ordered tasks of Schegloff's analysis occur in telephone openings of Mandarin speakers in Taiwan. Taleghani-Nikazm (2002) analyses the cultural differences of telephone conversation opening in Iran and Germany. He focuses on the organisation of the *how are you* sequence in both cultures. He found significant differences between the two cultures in that Iranian openings involve *how are you* sequence and are expanded to ask about the family's well-being, while German telephone conversation openings do not often include the ritual *how are you*. In Dutch, Houtkoop-Steenstra (1991) found that in telephone openings, the speakers overwhelmingly self-identify by name in answering the phone. The caller in the subsequent turn also overwhelmingly self-identifies. Furthermore, the callers use a voice sample alone only if the caller is the spouse or a close relative of the person called. In doing so, the callers display intimacy. In Sweden, the most common answer to summons in the Swedish data is self-identification followed by a phone number (Lindström, 1994). Swedes self-identify by first and/or last name, greeting and self-identification, station identification (i.e. phone number) and "hello". In Swedish telephone conversation openings, greetings are closely linked to the identification-recognition issue. In Taiwan, Hopper and Chen (1996) explain that summons/answer, identification/recognition, and greeting sequences in telephone conversation seem to be similar to the American English, however, there seems to be some cultural variation in the greeting. In

general, Hopper and Chen suggest that speakers in Taiwan use three distinctive greeting tokens and relative formality of address terms for family members. In doing so, speakers display their orientation to their interpersonal relationship. In addition to culture, the opening sequences vary according to other parameters, such as medium of communication, and gender.

According to Svennevig and Johansen (2011), variation may be addressed according to the medium of communication being used. Studies have compared the opening sequences of mobile phones and landline calls and they show similarities and differences in the sequences of opening between the two mediums (Hutchby and Barnett, 2005 for British English; Arminen and Leinonen, 2006 for Finnish; Laursen and Szymanski, 2013 for United States and Denmark Mahzari, 2019 for Saudi Arabic). Schegloff (2002) adds that these ordered sequences of opening conversation in telephone calls, especially identification/recognition, may change in mobile calls as the caller ID is known before answering the mobile. Arminen and Leinonen (2006) through their study on opening practices in Finnish mobile call openings and Mahzari (2019) in his comparison of the opening sequences in landline and mobile calls for Saudi Arabic confirm that the opening sequences of mobile phone differ from landline telephone opening in that for the mobile phone calls they are reduced to three sequences: summons answer, greeting exchanges, and how-are-you exchanges due to the impact of caller ID. Additionally, some types of opening sequences are preferable in face to face conversations rather than telephone conversations as "I am ..."; "this is...", the latter one is used for identifying a third person, while "My name is..." is usable in both face to face and telephone conversations (Schegloff, 1968, p 1093). Furthermore, it is worth to mention that the third and fourth components of opening sequences which are

greetings and *how are you* inquiry are common in mobile phone, landline phone, and face to face conversations. Though *how are you* sequence might be used instead of greeting to start conversation in face to face communication, while this is not true when it comes to opening conversation using telephone (Schegloff, 1986, p. 129).

Regarding gender, gender differences in opening telephone calls are also found. In a study by Grieve and Seebus (2008) in Australian and German, they illustrate that men use self-identification more than women in business calls.

As for formality, openings in institutional encounters between experts or service providers and clients or customers mainly differ from openings in informal conversation in that the exchange of *how are you's* is absent (Svennevig and Johansen, 2011).

In this study, the opening sequences of Kurdish will be analysed in radio phone call-in conversations to demonstrate the language specific sequences and to identify in what way they are different from other cultures. Besides, gender variations will be examined.

3 Methodology

3.1 Participants

The participants of this research are presenters of radio programs and people who call the radio programs. Eight presenters of eight radio programs are the participants of this research, along with 77 female and male participants from the public who called the radio programs.

3.2 Data collection

The data are radio programs broadcasted in Duhok from Duhok and Waar Radio Stations during 2009-2019. These programs involve phone call-ins from public people to comment and participate in the topic of the program. 12 programs are selected for the purpose. These programs have been chosen because they involve lots of interaction between the presenters and the phone callers. Each program is more than 50

minutes long. Table (1) shows the names of the programs, and the date of the broadcasting with the number of conversations that have been selected from each program.

Table 1: Radio programs as the data used in this study

Name of the program	Date of broadcasting the program in radio with the name of the radio	Number of conversations that have been collected in each program
Bajêrvanî	16/11/2009- Duhok radio	7 conversations
Şev baş	8/5/2013- Duhok radio	21 conversations
Genc	13/5/2013- Duhok radio	2 conversations
Êvar baş	12/5/2009- Duhok radio	6 conversations
Wezişy	4/5/2013-Duhok radio	7 conversations
Demê azad	15/5/2013-Duhok radio	15 conversations
Elinda war	20/7/2015-Waar radio	1 conversation
Warê azad	17/10/2019-Waar radio	1 conversation
Warê azad	12/11/2015-Waar radio	3 conversations
Warê azad	26/8/2018-Waar radio	3 conversations
Warê azad	1/1/2019-Waar radio	4 conversations
Warê azad	10/6/2018-Waar radio	6 conversations

The total number of conversations is 77 conversations of different lengths. 24 are female-female conversations, 26 are female-male conversations, and 27 are male-male conversations.

3.3 Transcription

The transcription model adopted in this study is the one by Schegloff (2007). The reason behind choosing this model is that, to the best knowledge of the researcher, Schegloff's (2007) transcription criteria are believed to be detailed and easy understood. Following Schegloff (2007), the transcription conventions used in the study are presented in Table (2).

Table 2: Transcription conventions used in the study

Symbol	Description
// *	When talk is put between a double slash and an asterisk that indicates overlapping. The beginning of overlap is indicated by the double slash and the end of the overlap is indicated by the asterisk.
=	Equal signs are usually used in pairs one is usually put at the end of a line and the other at the beginning of another line by the same speaker to indicate that these two lines are continuous talk of the same person that has been broken up for overlapping by another person.
(0.5)	Numbers in parentheses indicate silence by speakers and numbers indicate seconds of silence, while (.) Indicates that the pause was less than 2 seconds.
.	The dot indicates falling or final intonation.
?	Question mark indicates rising intonation.

,	Comma indicates continuing intonation.
¿	Inverted question mark is used to indicate rise intonation that is stronger than a comma but weaker than a question mark.
:	Colons are used to indicate prolongation or stretching of the sound just preceding them and the more colons means the longer the stretching is.
<u>Word</u>	Underlying letters indicate stress or emphasis on that sound either by increased loudness or higher pitch.
°	The degree sign means the talk following it is quiet or soft and when a talk is put between two degree signs, it means that the talk is softer than the talk around it.
-	A hyphen after a word or part of a word indicates a cut-off or self-interruption.
↑↓	The up and down arrows indicate that high intonation either rises (↑) or falls (↓).
> <	When talk is between 'more than' and 'less than' signs, it means than speech is rushed.
< >	When talk is between 'less than' and 'more than', it means that speech is slowed.
<	The 'less than' symbol by itself preceding a talk means that the talk has started with a rush.
hhh	Indicates breathing or laughter sometimes when the aspiration is within a word, it is usually enclosed in parentheses so as to set it apart from the letters of the word.
.hh	When the aspiration is inhalation, it is usually indicated by putting a dot before h.
(())	Are used to indicate transcriber's descriptions of events and not the real representation of events.
()	Speech that is in parentheses indicates that the transcriber is not very sure of what he/she has heard, while when the parentheses are empty, it means that the transcriber has heard something but he/she does not know what it is.
(a)/(uh)	When the transcriber is not sure between two transcriptions of the same talk, he/she can put both alternatives, each of which in parentheses that are parted by a slash.

Example (1) shows the use of some of these transcription symbols.

- (1) Zîad
- pre: alo.
(hello)
(.)
- zyad: .hh êvara we başbît bira.
(good evening brother)
- pre: êvara te baştir bît Zîad(.) bixêrbêy
(a better evening Zîad, welcome)
- zyad: supa::s kak Xelî::l
(thank you my brother Xelîl)

Line 1, contains (.) which means there was a pause, but the pause was less than 2 seconds. Line 2 contains this symbol (.hh), which indicates that there is an aspiration and it is inhalation. In line 5, it can be noticed that the word (supas) has two colons after the letter (a), which means that the sound has been

stretched, and the more colons, the longer the stretching is.

3.4 Procedures of data Analysis

All the radio programs have been listened to by the researcher and the opening sequences have been identified by the ear. These sequences and the surrounding contexts have been extracted and then transcribed by the author according to the CA conventions described in Section 3.3. The orthographic transcription has been first carried out using the Latin Kurmanji writing system because it is very close to the English writing system. Then, all the conversations have been translated to the English.

The data have been analysed qualitatively and quantitatively. Firstly, the common opening sequences have been identified and described qualitatively. This process has helped to find out the sequences that are specific to Kurdish. Then, the quantitative analysis has been carried out by measuring the frequency of each sequence type. This has helped to identify the most common sequences (with high frequency) and those which are speaker specific (with low frequency).

Finally, gender differences in sight of the opening sequences have been examined. The conversations have been classified into three groups: female-female conversations, female-male conversations, and male-male conversations.

4 Results and discussion

4.1 The Structure of the opening sequences

This section provides the structure of the opening sequences of radio phone call-in conversations in Kurdish. In Kurdish, two structures have been found depending on whether the caller is known to the presenter or not. Table (3) shows the number and frequency of each type of structure.

Table 3: Types and frequency of the structure of opening sequences in radio phone call-in conversations

Structure	Frequency	
	N	%

Caller known: Summons answer, greeting, <i>how are you</i> sequence, and greetings sending/ compliments/ guest welcoming sequence.	57	74%
Caller unknown: Summons answer, greeting, <i>how are you</i> sequence, identification, and greetings sending/ compliments/ guest welcoming sequence	20	26%
Total	77	100%

When the caller is known, the structure is summons answer, name of the caller with greeting, *how are you* sequence and greetings sending/ compliments/ guest welcoming sequence. This was the case of 57 conversations, which means 74% of the calls. See Example (2):

- (2) Sumeya
- Pre: fermu.
(Yes, please)
- Sum: °Selame e'elikum°
(Peace be upon you)
- Pre: e'elikume selam, serçava Sumeya
(Peace be upon you too, welcome)
- Sum: ↑çewanî çantrîn gul ((she means the presenter))
(how are you, the most beautiful flower?)
- Pre: zur supas bu: te: >tu her hebî<
(Thank you so much, I wish you live forever)
- Sum: ishella li hemî ciha hemî sala ya serkeftî bi xishka Rêjeen
(May God grant you success wherever you are and forever Sister Rêjin)
- Pre: <zur supas> gel we yên eziz jî, (.)
(Thank you so much dear ones, wish you the same)
- Sum: belê (.) rêz u silavet min bu hemy karmendên radio ya Waar () o telefzyona Waar o tevaya //karmenda*
(Yes my greetings and respect to all those who work in Waar radio and Waar TV and all the staff)
- Pre: >zur supas Sumeya<
(Thank you so much, Sumeya)

Example 2 shows that, though the presenter knows the caller, she started the conversations with summons answer <fermu> as in line 1. The caller, in line 2, greeted the presenter and they exchanged greeting. However, in line 4, the caller asked about the well-being of the presenter and the presenter thanked her in line 5. Moreover, in line 6 and 8 the caller wished success for the presenter and sent respect and greeting to the people who work in this radio.

However, in these 57 caller known conversations, only in 5 conversations all the sequences identified were present. In some cases, one or more of these sequences were absent. Table (4) shows the number of cases of the missing sequences together with their percentages.

Table 4: Frequency of absence of sequences in the opening sequences of the caller known conversations

Opening sequences structures	Frequency	
	N	%
Absence of summons answer sequence	34	60%
Absence of greetings sending/ compliments/ guest welcoming sequence	25	39%
Absence of the <i>how are you</i> sequence	22	39%
Absence of the greeting sequence	6	11%
summons answer +greeting + <i>how are you</i> + greetings sending/compliments/guest welcoming	5	9%

The table above shows that all the sequences are not found in all the conversations. In some conversations, although the caller is known, the presenter started the conversation with summons answer. That might be because the presenter wants the caller to know that she/he can start talking. This was the case of 34 calls, i.e., 60% of the conversations, but in the majority, the summons answer sequence is absent. The absence of the summons answer is due to the fact that the call control center in the radio station receives the calls before they are directed to the presenter, but sometimes the caller uses summons to make sure that the presenter is hearing him or her. Example 3 illustrates the absence of the summons answer sequence.

- (3) Dîlan
- Pre: Dîlan (.) şevbaş.
(Dîlan, good evening)
(.)
- Caller: >şevbaş Şîlan xan eziza min< Tu ya çewanî tu başî?
(Good evening Ms Şîlan, my dear, how are you? are you good?)
- Pre: zor supas bu te (.) ↑tu ya çewanî Dîlan?
(Thank you so much, how are you Dîlan?)
- Caller: geleş supas bu te Şîlan xan(.) Her gaveka başdaryê di nava prugramê te yê >can o qeşeng da dikem< hast bi xoşyeka: mezin dikem
(Thank you so much Ms Şîlan, whenever I participate in your beautiful and gorgeous program, I feel so happy)
- Pre: ↑zor supas bu heste te yê nazik >Fermu<
(Thank you for your beautiful feelings, yes please)
- Caller: belê Şîlan xan >destxoşî bu te o karê te yê can< (.) Sl'av bu stafê karî li ser hêla peywendya
(Yes, Ms Şîlan, well done for you and your beautiful work. Greetings for the team that works on receiving calls)
- Pre: zor supas bi navê wan jî.
(Thanks on their behalf)

Example 3 shows the three components of opening conversations of radio phone call-in conversations. The presenter of the program already knows the name of the caller and the caller already knows the program presenter. The conversation started with the answerer of the call (presenter) with mentioning the name of the caller and greeting as in line (1) (Dîlan şevbaş/ (Dîlan good evening), where the name might be mentioned to let the caller know that she already knows her or to introduce her to the listeners. The caller answers the greeting and starts *how are you* sequence as in line (2) (şevbaş şîlan xan tu ya çewanî tu ya başî? good evening Ms Şîlan my dear how are you? are you good?). Then the presenter answers *how are you* sequence and asks

the caller's well-being. The caller answers the presenter's question about her well-being. Then the caller praises the presenter and her beautiful program and also sends greetings to the people who work on the program and receives calls (lines 4 and 6). Thus, as it is clear in the above example, this conversation lacks summons answer sequence which means that not all conversations contain all the sequences, there are cases where one or more sequences are missing.

Greetings are found in the majority of the caller-known conversations except in 11% of the cases. *How are you* sequence is also found in the majority of the caller-known conversations except in 39%. *How are you* exchange is missing in most of the conversations and it was absent in 77% of the cases. Greetings sending/ compliments/ guest welcoming sequence is again found in the majority of the conversations except in 39% of the calls. The absence of some sequences in conversations might be due to time limitations. It is known that in radio calls-in, each caller has some limited minutes for speaking because usually other people are waiting to call the program.

However, when the caller is unknown to the presenter, usually the structure is summons answer, greeting, *how are you* sequence, identification, and greetings sending/ compliments/ guest welcoming sequence; This was the case of 20 conversations, i.e., 26% of the calls. See example 4:

- (4) Macîda
- pre: fermu..
(yes please)
(.)
- maj: êvar baş Rejeen xan. çewanî başî?
(good evening Ms Rejeen, how are you? Are you good?)
- pre: êvara te baştir o xoştir bît (.) Kij hevale di gel me?
(a better and nicer evening to you, which friend is with us?)

(.)

- maj: belê bu jara êkêye di sala nîda↑: Macîda di gel teye
(yes for the first time in the new year, Macîda is with you)
- pre: Macîda xa:n bo cara ekê o di sala nîda serçava haty Macîda o> hîvya berdewamyê bu te di xazim</.hhh*
(Ms Macîda for the first time and in the new year, welcome and we wish that you remain with us)
- maj: gelek supas chavê te //her saxbn*=
(thank you so much, you are most welcome)
- Pre: te çi //peyv hebun?
(what do you have to say?)
- maj: =Ez destxoşye li bernamê te dikam
(well done for your program)

In example 4, the presenter started the conversation with summons answer which was (fermu/yes please) in line 1. Then the participants exchanged greeting and *how are you* sequence. And usually in cases when the caller is unknown, the presenter does not ask the caller's well-being but instead asks identification as in line 3 (kyj hevale di gel me?/ which friend is with us?). And then the caller praises the presenter for the program (line 8).

However, within these 20 caller-unknown conversations, only in 9 cases, all the sequences are present. There are cases in which one or more of the sequences identified are absent. Table (5) highlights the frequency of the absence of each type of sequence.

Table 5: The frequency of the absence of each type of opening sequences

Opening sequences structures	Frequency	
	N	%
summons answer+ greeting+ how are you+ identification+ Greetings sending/compliments/guest welcoming sequence	9	45%

Absence of greetings sending/ compliments/ guest welcoming	6	30%
Absence of Greeting sequence	4	20%
Absence of <i>How are you</i> sequence	4	20%

It can be noticed that in all the 20 caller-unknown conversations, the summons answer and identification sequences are identified and the reason behind that might be due to the fact that the presenter does not know the caller. The greeting sequence is found in the majority except in 20% of the cases. The *how are you* sequence is also found in the majority of cases except in 20%. However, the exchange of *how are you* sequence is absent in the majority of the caller-unknown conversations. The reason behind that might be because the caller is unknown, and the presenter instead of exchanging health inquiry, she/he asks identification. Additionally, greetings sending/ compliments/ guest welcoming sequence is found in the majority of the cases.

It is worth to mention that there are a few cases where the caller was not able to get the voice of the presenter well or the other way round. This was the case of 12 conversations which are 15% of the known and unknown structure. The structure of the opening sequences varied, which usually contains a series of summons answer as (alo "hello", belê "yes", fermu/keremke "yes please"). Consider example 5:

- (5) Merîem
- Pre: belê fermu.
(yes please)
(.)
- Mos: alo.
(hello)
- Pre: bel:ê
(yes)
(.)
- Mos: êvar baş xişka Rêjîn (.) ?Çewanî başî
(Good evening sister Rêjîn, how are you? are you good?)
- Pre: îêvar baştir bîtn (ehh) Kij heval bo di gel me::?

↑di salanîda

(Have a better evening, which friend is with us in the new year?)

(0.3)

Normally, it is the presenter (answerer) who talks first and usually starts with greeting. This was the case of 91% of the conversations. However, it can be noticed that in six conversations, the caller starts speaking first, and this was the case of 9% of the total conversations and the reason might be that the presenter of the phone does not speak immediately after answering the phone, so the caller starts talking as in example 6:

- (6) Menaf
(0.3)
- Mena: ev demê we baş↑
(good time)
- pre: serçav:a bixêr bêy.
(You are welcome)
- Mena: çewanin başn↑
(how are you? are you good?)
- pre: >zor supas<
(thank you)
(.)
- Mena: em bi xêrhatna mamostay dikeyn
(we would like to welcome the guest/ the sir)
- Pre: //memnon*
(thank you)
- Mena: >serçava <
(welcome)

Notice line 1, the caller is the one who started the conversation and this contradicts with the distribution rule mentioned by Schegloff (1968) when he indicated that it is the answerer who is supposed to start talking: "A first rule of telephone conversation is: the answerer speaks first Whether the utterance be "hello," "yeah," "Macy's," "shoe department," "Dr. Brown's office," "Plaza 1-5000," or whatever" (p. 1077).

Thus, the structures of opening sequences in the Kurdish are similar in many parts to the one provided

by Schegloff (1986). Schegloff (1986) provided a template for the opening sequences of American calls which is summons answer, identification/recognition, greetings, and an exchange of *how are you* (p 146). The opening sequences in Kurdish have the summons answer, greeting, *how are you* sequence, and identifications. However, they are different in that the identification comes after the greeting and *how are you* sequences not after the summons answer as in Schegloff's structure of the American opening sequences. In this respect, the opening sequences in Kurdish are also different from Finnish. Arminen and Leinonen (2006) pointed out that Finish people when answering phones of unknown callers usually start with self-identification. However, in Kurdish when the caller is unknown, they usually starts with summons answer (alo "hello", belê "yes", fermu/keremke "yes please") which gives the opportunity to the caller to start talking, then greeting, *how are you* sequence, then identification. This difference might be due to the context of the conversation. In Finnish, they are normal private landline phone calls, whereas in Kurdish, they are radio phone call in conversations and they are broadcasted. Furthermore, the opening sequences in Kurdish are different from the American ones because these types of calls have another sequence which is greetings sending/ compliments/ guest welcoming sequence. Again this is because Schegloff tackled ordinary phone conversation and it seems that this sequence is absent in normal phone calls. It can be only found in radio phone call in conversations to express to what extent the caller is interested in the program.

4.1.1 Summons answer

Summons answer is the first sequence found in the opening sequences of radio call-in conversations. It is found in all the caller-unknown conversations (20) and in a few known caller ones (22). The participants in the study used different types of summons answers. Table (6) shows the forms of the summons answers used,

number of their occurrence, and their percentages.

Table 6: Types and frequency of Summons answer sequence

Types of summons answers	Frequency	
	N	%
Fermu/keremke	18	42%
Silence of the presenter	9	21%
Belê fermu/keremke	7	16%
Alo	5	12%
Belê	4	9%
Total	43	100%

Table (6) shows that the most common summons answers is (fermu) followed by the silence of the presenter, (Belê fermu), (alo), and (belê) which got the least number of occurrences. The forms of the summons answer in Kurdish are different from those of English as Schegloff (1986) mentioned “hello” as the most common one and from those of Arabic in which hala/merhaba plus the name of the caller (Mahzari, 2019).

4.1.2 Greeting exchange sequence

Greeting exchange sequence is the second sequence in the opening sequences in radio call-in conversations in Kurdish. It is found in most caller-known and caller-unknown conversations. Greeting exchange sequence was found in 67 conversations, i.e., 87% of the total conversations. On the other hand, in only 13% of the conversations, no greeting has been noticed, and the speakers moved to *how are you* sequence without greeting each other, as illustrated in example 7:

- (7) Babê Ahmadi
- pre: babê Ahmadi fermu,
(Yes please father of Ahmed)
(0.3)
- bab: (eh) hîn çewanin ba:şin?
(How are you? are you good?)
(.)
- pre: serçava (.)zor supas
(Welcome, thank you)

Consider line 2 where the caller and presenter did not greet each other, instead they rushed to asking about

the well-being of each other.

Four types of greetings are identified in the study: time related greetings (roj baş, spêde baş, êvar baş, şev baş), dem baş, merheba and selame e'elikum. Table (7) shows the number of occurrences and percentages of these greeting forms and their main responses.

Table 7: Greeting forms and their responses in Kurdish

Greeting form	Frequency		Response	Frequency	
	N	%		N	%
Dem baş/(ev) demê te baş xişka/bra/ka k or (name)(xan)(berêz)	25	37%	1-(Zor sopas) dem baş/ dem baştir/ dem baştir o xoştir (bi xêrbêy serçava)(bi xêr u silamet)(saxbi) 2-(Saxbi)serçava(dem baştir)(bixêbêy) 3-no response	15	60%
				7	28%
				3	12%
			Total	25	100%
Şev baş (xişka/bra 'name') or ('name' xan)	22	33%	1-(Zor sopas) baştir/ Şev baştir/ Şev baştir o xoştir/ Şev baştir o xoştir o geştir(bu te)(tu bi xêrbêy)(xişka 'name')('name' xan) 2-zor sopas 3.no response	19	86%
				1	5%
				2	9%
			Total	22	100%
Êvar baş/êvara te baş(xişka 'name')	12	18%	1- (zor supas) êvara te baş u xoşbit/ êvar baştir/ êvar baştir u xoştir/(xişka 'name')(kak 'name')	11	92%
			2- jian baş	1	8%
			Total	12	100%
Spêde baş(xişka 'name')	2	3%	1- Spêde baştir/ Spêda te baştir u xoştir (zor supas) 2- no response	1	50%
				1	50%
			Total	2	100%
Selamu e'elikum Merheba	3	4%	e'elikume selam (serçava)	3	100%
	2	3%	Serçava	2	100%
Roj baş	1	2%	Serçava	1	100%
Total	67	100%			

The most common greeting forms are time related greetings: (şev baş) has been used by 33% of the conversations, (êvar baş) by 18%, (spêde baş) by only 3% and (roj baş) has been used by 2% of the conversations. The frequency of such greetings might refer to the time of the conversation. It seems that people use time related greetings more frequently than other types of greetings. The second common greeting form is (dem baş). Other types of greetings as (merheba) and (selame e'elikum) which have been

used in very few cases. These results are different from those of Arabic. Mahzari (2019) stated that the most common greeting type in Arabic is (Asselamu alaykum) "peace be upon you" as 62% of the participants exchanged greeting with this type. It is realized in the data that greetings are accompanied by components, such as the name of the caller, or the name plus some honorifics like (berêz, bra, xan, babê 'name', deyka 'name', xişka 'name'). Consider example 8:

- (8) Muhemed
- pre: Muhemed ev demê te baş
(Muhemed, good day)
- (.)
- Moh: demê we baştir bit.=
(a better day for you)
- pre: <serçava (.) Fermu:
(welcome, yes please)
- moh: =o xoştir bit
(and a nicer one)

Line 1, shows that the presenter has mentioned the name of the caller and then greeted him with (dem baş/ good day).

As for the responses to the greeting forms, it can be observed that the participants have responded with the same greeting forms or with something better or nicer of the greeting they received. However, in some cases, the greeting is not responded to or might be answered with the some expressions like (serçava/ serçava bi xeru slamat) 'welcome/welcome stay healthy'. For example, for (dem baş) different responses are identified: response with the same greeting form (dem baş), with better greeting forms like (dem baştir) (dem baştir o xoştir) (bi xêrbêt serçava) (bi xêr u silamet) (saxbî) or by using (serçava) or with no response which is very rare. See Table (5) for the responses of each type of greeting. It can be observed that in Kurdish culture, due to the impact of religious principles, people usually respond to a

greeting with the same or a better one. As Mahzari (2019) mentioned that "Based on the Islamic principles and credo in the Holy Quran, Muslims must respond to the greeting by a better one or return it" (p 227).

4.1.3 How are you sequence

How are you sequence is the third sequences in the opening sequences in Kurdish. They are found in 51 (66%) of the examined conversations, and they are absent in only in 26 (34%) of the conversations in which the participants did not ask about the well-being of each other. The question of the well-being has been expressed in some different ways. The main forms of *how are you* sequences and their responses in Kurdish are illustrated from the highest to the lowest percentage in Table (8).

Table 8: Types and frequency *how are you* sequence and their responses

<i>How are you</i> sequence	Frequency		Response	Frequency	
	N	%		N	%
çewanî başî	41	80%	1-(zor)(gelek) supas	20	49%
			2-serçava (bixêr bêt)(zor supas)	10	24%
			3-no response	9	22%
			4-(her) Saxbî	2	5%
			(serçava)(memnun)		
Total	41	100%			
Başî (inşaAllah) (seheta te)	4	8%	1-supas	3	75%
			2- serçava memnun	1	25%
			Total	4	100%
Çewanî başî	4	8%	1- serçava (bixêr bêt)	2	50%
			2-memnun Saxbî ez başim	1	25%
			3- supas her hebi	1	25%
			Total	4	100%
chi hiale başî	2	4%	Serçava	2	100%
Total	51	100%			

Table (8) shows all the forms of *how are you* sequence in this data with their responses. The most common form is (çewanî başî?) 'how are you? are you good?' used in 80% of the conversations. (başî) 'are you good' and (çewanî) 'how are you?' have been used in 8% of the conversations, respectively. (chi hiale başî) 'how are you doing? are you doing good?' has been used in only 4% of the conversations. In addition, (çewanî başî) 'how are you? are you good' is used with the name of

the person or a pronoun. For example, you can find the name of the person as in (çewanî Şermin? başî?) 'how are you Şermin? are you good?' or (çewanî başî Şermin?) 'how are you? are you good Şermin?' or (Şermin çewanî başî?) 'Şermin how are you? are you good?' or pronoun (tu) 'you' as (tu çewanî). Consider example 9:

- (9) Şermîn.
- Pre: Şermîn.
(.)
- Şer: şevbaş.
(Good evening)
- pre: > baştir<
(A better one)
- Şer: ↑çewanî başî:
(How are you? are you good?)
- Pre: supas bu te (.) Saxbî
(Thank you, be healthy)

So line 2 shows that the caller used the expression (çewanî başî) 'how are you? are you good' for asking about the well-being of the presenter.

Thus, the *how are you* sequence varies to a great degree from Arabic. In Arabic, Mahzari (2019) stated that people ask about the well-being of the family and kids after asking about the well-being of the person they talk to. And the reason why people in this study have not asked about the well-being of the family and kids goes back to the fact that they are participating in a radio program and they might be acting like strangers not as relatives or friends as in Mahzari's study.

As for the responses, Table (8) shows the main responses of each form of the *how are you* form. Mostly, the responses are thanking (zor/gelek) (supas) (her hebi/saxbi) or (mamnun), or by using (serçava) (bixêr bêy) or with no response. 10% of the *how are you* sequences have got no responses. Usually, this is the case when the caller is unknown, so the callee instead of asking about the well-being of the caller, he/she asks identification, as in example 10:

- (10) Peyman
- Pey: °alo
(Hello)
- pre: ↑belê fermu
(Yes, please)
- Pey: dem baş. Çewanî başî
(Good day, how are you? are you good?)
- pre: dem baştiru xoştir bît. (.) Kij hevale di gel me?
(A better and nicer day to you, which friend is with us?)
(.)
- pey: belê bi rêz u silav ve Peyman di gel teyê
(Yes, with greetings and respect, Peyman is with you)

Line 2 shows that the caller greeted and asked the well-being of the presenter in one turn (line 3). On the other hand, the presenter replied to the greeting but not the *how are you* sequence. The reason might be because she does not know who the caller is.

As mentioned before, *how are you* sequence was found in 51 calls. However, only 29% of the participants after responding to the *how are you* sequence asked about the well-being of the other person, and this was the case of 15 calls. 71% of the participants did not ask the other person about his/her well-being after responding to the *how are you* sequence, see example 9.

4.1.4 Identification

Identification is a sequence in the opening sequences of all caller-unknown conversations. This sequence comes after the *how are you* sequence. The most frequent form of identification sequence is (kye di gel me?/ kij hevale di gel me?) 'Who is with us?/ which friend is with us?' used in 85% of the conversations. Another form (me to ne nyasy) 'we do not know you?' has been used in 5% of the conversations. however, when the presenter is not sure about the correct name of the caller, the types of asking identification could be ('name' di gel me bo?) 'name' is with us?' or (kak 'name?') 'brother 'name'?', this was the case of 10%

two types of the conversations. Consider the following example:

- (11)
- pre: belê fermu.
(Yes please, you can speak)
- shr: êvar baş xişka Rêjîn (.) Çewanî başî
(Good evening sister Rêjîn, how are you? are you good)
- pre: êvara te baştir u xoştir byt >kij hevale di gel meda<
(Wish you a better and nicer evening, which friend is with us?)
- shr: belê bi rêz u silaveve Şîrîn Dêwalî di gel teye ji <Duhoka dasnya
(Yes with respect and greeting Şîrîn Dêwalî is with you from Duhok)

In this conversation, the identification is found in line 3 after greeting response.

4.1.5 Greetings sending/ compliments/ guest welcoming sequence

The last sequence before topic initiation is greetings sending/ compliments/ guest welcoming sequence. This sequence has been seen in 46 (60%) of the conversations. In this sequence, the caller of the program either sends greetings to the staff of the program or praises and thanks the presenter/staff for the good topic/program or when there are guests in the program, the caller welcomes them. Consider Table (9) for the frequency of each type of these sequences.

Table 9: Types and frequency of greetings sending/ compliments/ guest welcoming sequence

sequence forms	Frequency		Responses	Frequency	
	N	%		N	%
praising the program/topic/program presenter	28	61%	1-Supas(memnun) (bu pşikdarya te)(bu hestê te)	20	71%
			2- No response	6	21%
			3- Saxbî	1	4%
			4- Destxoştir bit	1	4%
			Total	28	100%
Sending greetings to staff of the program or people	13	28%	1- Supas (Saxbî)(bu hestê te)	8	62%
			2- Supas bi nave wî	2	15%

		3- Belê	2	15%	
		4- No response	1	8%	
		Total	13	100%	
Welcoming guests of the program	5	11%	1- Supas(memnun)	4	80%
			2- Bi xêrbêy serçava	1	20%
			Total	5	100%
Total	46	100%			

Table (9) shows that praising the program/topic/program presenter is the most frequent sequence that has been used in 36% of the conversations. This sequence is expressed by (destxoşyê li te u programê te dikam) 'well done to you and your program' or (sebareb babetê hewe gelekê di cihê xudaye, destxoşyê li hewe di kem) 'concerning your topic, it is very appropriate well done'. Sending greetings to the staff of the program or people has been expressed by (silav bo wan hemî hevalên evro beşdardbn di programida) 'greetings to all the friends who participates in the program today' or (rêz u silavê min bo hewe hene u bo kak Karwanî) 'my greetings and respect to you all and brother Karwan' or (ciwantrîn silav u rêz arasteî xêzana program dikam) 'I send the most beautiful greetings and respect to the family of the program'. As far as welcoming the guest of the program is considered, this form has been used only in 6% of the conversations and that is because only two programs of this study had guests. It is expressed by (bixêrhatna herdu mêvanê we dkeyn) 'I welcome both your guests' or (em bi xêrhatna mamustay di keyn) 'we welcome the guest'. Consider example 12:

- (12) Alan
- pre: ↑Alan
(Alan)
(.)
- Ala: ↑şev Baş şîlan xan >Çewanî başî<
(Good evening, Ms Şîlan, how are you? are you good?)
- Pre: baştir o xoştir bu te (.) >Tu bixêr bêy<
(A better and nicer one to you, welcome)
- Ala: gelek Saxby: Rêz o silav hene bu karwanî (.)

(Thank you so much, my greetings and respect to Karwan)

Example 12 shows that the caller, after asking about the well-being of the answerer, has moved to greetings sending, compliments and guest welcoming sequence. This is the last sequence before topic initiation. The speaker used sending greetings to a person as in line 4.

4.2 Gender differences in the opening sequences

In this section, the study highlights some obvious differences between genders in their conversations. As stated in section 3, the conversations are classified into three groups according to gender: 24 female-female, 26 female-male, and 27 male-male. Firstly, the structures of the opening sequence across gender groups will be compared, then the summons answer, greeting, *how are you*, identification, and greetings sending/ compliments/ guest welcoming sequence.

4.2.1 Structure of the opening sequences

Firstly, the structures according to gender groups will be compared. Table (10) summarises the differences.

Table 10: Gender differences in the structure of the opening sequences

	Caller-unknown		Caller-known	
	N	%	N	%
Female - female	15	75%	9	16%
Female - male	1	5%	25	44%
Male-male	4	20%	23	40%
Total	20	100%	57	100%

Table (10) illustrates that the structure of the caller-unknown is used most frequently in female-female conversations by 75%. However it is used least frequently in female-male conversations by 5%. As far as the structure of the caller-known is considered, it is used most frequently in female-male conversations by a high percentage which is 44%. However, in female-female conversations it is used less frequent by 16%. Caller-known structure is used by 40% in the male-male conversations which is still a high frequency. The results can show that structure of radio calls-in in Kurdish is affected by gender.

4.2.2 Summons answer

The summons answer is mostly used in the female-female conversations. Table (11) shows the number of occurrence of the summons answer forms by different gender groups.

Table 11: Gender differences of summons answer sequence of radio phone call-in conversations

Gender groups	Summons answers frequency		Fermu		Belê fermu		Belê		Alo		Silence of the presenter	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Female-Female	19	44%	7	39%	7	100%	1	25%	-	-	4	45%
Female - male	5	12%	1	6%	-	-	2	50%	-	-	2	22%
Male-male	19	44%	10	55%	-	-	1	25%	5	100%	3	33%
Total	43	100%	18	100%	7	100%	4	100%	5	100%	9	100%

The table above shows that all forms of summons answer are realized in the female-female conversations, except for (alo). However, in female-female conversations, both (belê fermu and alo) are missing. And in male-male conversations, only (belê fermu) is missing. These results show that the type of summons answer and also its frequency are affected by gender in Kurdish.

4.2.3 Greeting exchanges

This section examines the gender variations in the frequency of greetings and their forms. Table (12) presents the main results.

Table 12: Gender differences of greeting of radio phone call-in conversations

Gender groups	Greeting frequency		Dembaş		Êvarbaş		Sevbaş		Spêdebaş		Roibaş		Merheba		Selame e'elikum	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Female - 20	30%	4	16%	10	83%	4	18%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	67%
Female - 23	35%	4	16%	-	-	18	82%	2	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Male - 23	35%	17	68%	2	17%	-	-	-	-	1	100%	2	100%	1	33%	-
Total	67	100%	25	100%	12	100%	22	100%	2	100%	1	100%	2	100%	3	100%

Table (12) shows that greeting is exchanged least frequently in female-female conversations by 30%. However, in male-male and female-male conversations, greeting is exchanged with the same frequency (35%). As far as forms of greeting are considered, êvar baş is the most frequent type of

greeting in female-female group, while in female-male group şevbaş is the most frequent one. As for male-male conversations, dembaş is the most frequent one. This means that the frequency of greeting exchange and types of greetings in Kurdish are bound to gender.

4.2.4 How are you sequence

The gender groups have an effect also on the usage of the *how are you* sequence and its forms. Table (13) presents the frequency of the sequence and *how are you* forms according to gender groups.

Table 13: Gender differences of *how are you* sequence of radio phone call-in conversations

Gender group	<i>how are you</i> frequency		Çewanî başî		Çewanî		Başî		Çi hîle başî	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
female-female	18	35%	16	39%	1	25%	1	25%	-	-
female-male	18	35%	15	37%	1	25%	2	50%	-	-
male-male	15	30%	10	24%	2	50%	1	25%	2	100%
Total	51	100%	41	100%	4	100%	4	100%	2	100%

Table (13) illustrates that the *how are you* sequence is mostly used in female-female and female-male conversations (35%). It is least used in male-male conversations. Regarding the forms of the *how are you* sequence, all forms identified are used in the male-male conversations, while (chi hîle başî) is not used in the other gender groups. (çewanî başî) is the most frequent form of *how are you* sequence in all groups. The second most frequent type of *how are you* sequence is (çewanî) male-male conversations, (başî) in female-male conversations. And in female-female conversations, (çewanî) and (başî) get the same frequency 4%.

4.2.5 Identification

This section examines the gender variations in the frequency of identification sequence and its forms. Table (14) presents the main results.

Table 14: Gender differences of identification sequence of radio phone call-in conversations

Gender group	Identification frequency		Kiye di gel me		Me to ne niyasy		'x' di gel me bo//kak 'x'?		Identification frequency	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
female-female	15	75%	14	82%	15	75%	14	82%	15	75%
female-male	1	5%	1	6%	1	5%	1	6%	1	5%
male-male	4	20%	2	12%	4	20%	2	12%	4	20%
Total	20	100%	17	100%	20	100%	17	100%	20	100%

Table (14) shows that the identification sequence, is most frequently used in female-female conversations. However, in female-male conversations, identification sequence has been used least frequently. Concerning types of identification sequence, in female-male conversations, only one type of identification sequence has been used which is (kye di gel me? "who is with us"). In male-male conversations, all the types of identification sequence have been used. While in female-female conversations, two types of identification sequences have been used which are (kye di gel me? "who is with us") and ('name' di gel me bo? "name" is with us?) or (kak 'name'? "brother 'name'). Results of identification sequence also show that gender has an impact on the frequency of identification sequence and the frequency of its forms.

4.2.6 Greetings sending/ compliments/ guest welcoming

As for the greetings sending/ compliments/ guest welcoming sequence, it is also used differently across the gender groups. Table (15) shows the frequency of the presence of this sequence and its forms across gender groups.

Table 15: Gender differences of greetings sending/ compliments/ guest welcoming sequence of radio phone call-in conversations

Gender groups	greetings sending/ compliments/guest welcoming frequency		Praising the program/topic/program presenter		Sending greetings to staff of the program or people		Welcoming guests of the program	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Female-female	13	28%	12	43%	3	23%	1	20%
Female-male	15	33%	7	25%	7	54%	1	20%
Male-male	18	39%	9	32%	3	23%	3	60%
Total	46	100%	28	100%	13	100%	5	100%

Table (15) illustrates that the male-male conversations uses this sequence most frequently 39%. On the other hand, it is less frequently used in female-female conversations 28 %. As far as the forms of the sequence are considered, praising the program, topic or presenter is the most frequently used form as it is found in all gender groups, but it has the highest percentage of occurrence in the female-female conversations 43% and the least one in female-male

conversations 25%. Regarding sending greetings to staff of the program or people, it is most frequent in female-male conversations by 54% and least frequent in male-male conversations by 23%. Meanwhile, welcoming guest of the program is used least frequently in all the groups, while it is highly used in male-male conversations by 60% rather than female-female or female-male conversations.

These results show that opening sequences in Kurdish vary according to gender and this is claimed by Mahzari (2019) in his research on opening sequences of Arabic phone calls. Mahzari (2019) mentions that gender variables showed differences in forms and frequency of opening sequences of conversations.

5. Conclusions

This paper has analysed the structure of the opening sequences and their gender variation in radio phone call-in conversations in Kurdish. Two structures have been identified depending on whether the caller is known or unknown. The structures of the opening sequence in Kurdish are similar to those suggested by Schegloff for American English in the summons answer, greeting, and *how are you* sequence, identification. However, it is different in that in Kurdish, the greetings sending/ compliments/ guest welcoming sequence is identified before topic initiations which is not true of American English. Moreover, in Kurdish the identification follows the summons answer, greeting and *how are you* sequences not after the summons answer as in American English. This is because the mediums of the phone calls are different: normal personal phone calls in Schegloff, while phone call-ins in a radio program in this study. This suggests to what extent the medium of communication affects the opening sequences and leads to the realization of new sequences that serve the purpose of the medium of communication.

The summons answer sequence is used in all caller-unknown conversations, but it is used in some few

caller-known conversations as a means to ask the caller to start talking. The greetings exchange sequence is used in most of the conversations except in a few cases. The study identified different forms of greetings in Kurdish and different responses for each form, but time-related greetings are the most frequently used forms. As for the *how are you* sequence, again it is realized in most of the conversations except in a few cases. Different forms of this sequence are identified and the most common is (çewanî başî?) or (çewanin başin?), and also different responses are identified. Additionally, different forms of identification and sending greetings are realised. Thus, it becomes clear that in Kurdish more than one form is used for each sequence and this indicates to the extent to which the language varies in the use of expressions for each purpose.

As far as gender variation is considered, the study has shown some variations in the structure of the opening sequences and the frequency of sequences and their forms across gender groups. For example, the structure of the caller-unknown is most frequently used in female-female conversations, while it is least frequently used in female-male conversations. This result supports the claim that social factors, such as gender, affect the opening sequences as indicated by Grieve and Seebus (2008) in Australian and German business calls. However, this result needs to be further examined using more data.

6. References

1. Arminen, I., & Leinonen, M. (2006). Mobile phone call openings: tailoring answers to personalized summonses. *Discourse Studies*, 8(3), 339-368. DOI: 10.1177/1461445606061791
2. Coronel-Molina, S. M. (1998). Openings and Closings in Telephone Conversations between Native Spanish Speakers. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 14(1), 49-68. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED428555>
3. Grieve, A., & Seebus, I. (2008). G'day or Guten Tag?: A cross-cultural study of Australian and German telephone openings. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(7), 1323-1343. DOI:10.1016/j.pragma.2007.11.005

4. Hall, J. K. (2009). Language learning as discourse practice. In Cook, V., & Wei, L. (2009). *Contemporary Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 1: Language Teaching and Learning. MPG Books: London.
5. Have, P. (1990). Methodological issues in conversation analysis. *BMS: Bulletin of Sociological Methodology / Bulletin De Méthodologie Sociologique*, (27), 23-51. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/24358657
6. Heritage, J. (2009). Conversation analysis as social theory. In Turner, B. S. (Ed.), *The new blackwell companion to social theory* (pp. 300-320). West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.
7. Heritage, J., & Clayman, S. (2010). *Talk in Action: Interactions, identities, and institutions*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
8. Hopper, R., & Chen, CH. (1996). Languages, Cultures, Relationships: Telephone Openings in Taiwan. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 29(4), 291-313, DOI: 10.1207/s15327973rlsi2904_1
9. Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (1991). Opening Sequences in Dutch Telephone Conversations. In Boden, D., & Zimmerman, D. H. (Eds.), *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis* (pp 232-250). California: University of California Press.
10. Huisman, M. (2001). Decision-Making in Meetings as Talk-in-Interaction. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 31(3), 69-90. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/40397509
11. Hutchby, I., & Barnett, S. (2005). Aspects of the sequential organization of mobile phone conversation. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 147-171. DOI: 10.1177/1461445605050364
12. Kpogo, F., & Abrefa, K. B. (2017). The Structure of Face-To-Face Casual Conversation Among the Akans. *Ghana Journal of Linguistics*, 6(2), 56-84. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/gjl.v6i2.4>
13. Laursen, D., & Szymanski, M. (2013). Where are you? Location talk in mobile phone conversations. *Mobile Media and Communication*, 1(3), 314-334. DOI: 10.1177/2050157913493773
14. Lindström, A. (1990). Identification and recognition in Swedish telephone conversation openings. *Language in Society* 23(2), 231-252. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/4168515
15. Mahzari, M. (2019). Conversation Analysis: Opening Sequences and Ritual Expressions of Informal Mobile Phone Calls between Saudis. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on CALL*, (5), 220-251. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/call5.16>
16. Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction* (Vol. 35). London: Sage Publications.
17. Purba, R. (2016). Lexical Variation on Students' Daily Conversation at Campus by First Year Students of English Department FKIP HKBP Nommensen University. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)* 21(9), 28-39. DOI: 10.9790/0837-2109032839
18. Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696-735. doi:10.2307/412243
19. Schegloff, E. (1972). Notes on a conversational practice: formulating place*. In Sudnow, D. (ed). *Studies in Social Interaction* (pp 75-119). New York: The Free Press.
20. Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings 1. *American Anthropologist*, 70(6), 1075-1095. DOI: [10.1525/aa.1968.70.6.02a00030](https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1968.70.6.02a00030)
21. Schegloff, E. A. (1986). The routine as achievement. *Human Studies*, 9(2-3), 111-151. DOI: 10.1007/BF00148124
22. Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A primer in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
23. Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 8(4), 289-327. DOI: 10.1515/semi.1973.8.4.289
24. Schmidt, R. (1986). Applied Sociolinguistics: The Case of Arabic as a Second Language. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 28(1), 55-72. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/30027945
25. Sidnell, J. (2016). Conversation analysis. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. 1-19. DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.40
26. Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (2013). Introduction. In Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 1-8). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
27. Stivers, T. (2013). Sequence Organization. In Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 191-209). West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
28. Svennevig, J., & Johansen, R. (2011). Social and pragmatic variation in the sequential organization of talk. In Andersen, G., & Aijmer, K. (Eds.), *Pragmatics of Society* (Vol. 5, pp. 473-500). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
29. Teleghanim-nikazem, C. (2002). A conversation analytical study of telephone conversation openings between native and nonnative speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(12), 1807-1832. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00049-8