

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the address terms in Kurdish language within the theory of politeness. It deals with the six major groups of terms of address. The most vital forms are identified through this study concerning each category, their social sense, and the factors that govern their usage. The number of participants were 100 Kurdish adults who were randomly selected from various public places. The main used methods for collecting data are questionnaire and interviewing participants. The reflection of the Kurdish terms of address on complex social relationship is highlighted through the results of the study between interlocutors. Various social factors have a great role in selecting a given term's determination, for instance, gender, intimacy, formality, age, social status and familiarity between the interlocutor and the addressee. Each category of address terms are utilized by a specific group of users in various social domains.

Keywords: (Address terms, Social context, interlocutors, Kurdish).

1. Introduction

When individuals take part in communicating with other people, they define their identities intentionally or unintentionally, their tendencies for becoming more or less social persons specified depending on their belonging to particular group or a specific culture. Social interaction is one of the essentials in linguistic interaction in which using the entails of language is enormous as compared to an only simple exchanging knowledge regarding factual things and thoughts among individuals.

Terms of address is counted as vital area in linguistics that performed various functions. Oyetade (1995: 516) states that a person's choice of address terminology reveals how language and society interact as well as how they perceive their relationship to the addressee in that society. As a result, address phrases convey sociolinguistic and pragmatic aspects of the context about the interlocutors. Through interaction process interlocutors use terms of address for referring to or attracting each other. Some address terms hold different meaning depending on social and lexical meanings, which do not surely have a close connection. Two different kinds of meanings are hold by them which are social and lexical meaning that are not essentially related to each other. For instance, sister as a term is used for referring to a girl or a woman of the same paternities, while the same term could be deals with a nun. Thus, Braun (1994) asserts that the address behavior denotes to how utterers use the form of address variants obtainable to them. Address terms can be examined within the politeness theory framework in which the choice of address form in particular is determined by the sound of polite in a given situation. According to Brown and Levinson (1987) address terms are crucial linguistic mechanisms by which a utterer's attitude toward, and assessment of other individual's relationship.

According to Wardhaugh (2006: 272), a variety of societal factors affect how address phrases are used. These varied elements are equivalent to the difficulties in employing address phrases in various cultures. In addition,

the address terms' system is affected by some dominant factors. Firstly, the speakers and the addressee's gender, identity, age and social relations have a great impact on selecting the right terms of address. Secondly, the context that deals with the audience and setting specified as a vital issue in verifying the suitable terms for addressing process. Despite the differences between cultures in using terms of address, the pragmatic meanings are also variant. Because of having culture-dependent feature. In addition, the historical change in each society may affect stability in using terms of address.

Focusing on using appropriate terms of address by interlocutors performing effective communication. While these terms of address used in many contexts and becoming the core subject for many studies, which usually examining the nature of used terms, the main categories and the major factors behind using them. Hence, it appears plausible to investigate Kurdish terms of address in the form of practical perspective. Accordingly, Pearson (1985: 14) states that communication can be considered as a medium of interaction that performed by speaker and hearer to satisfy social, individual and practical needs as well.

2. Literature review

Mardiha (2012:173) states that terms of address counted as a linguistic form which utilized in a course of conversation for addressing individuals for attracting their attention or revealing with them. Address terms can be a word, phrase, title or name or combinations of these items used for addressing a person in writing texts or speaking. Using terms of address counted as crucial feature of the interface between language and social groups. Community members use language depending on their behavior toward using the selected language. Interlocutors are variant based on their age, sex, profession, marital group, ethnic group and social class that may affect their utterances in using forms of address.

Many studies follow the developed principles by Brown and Gilman (1960) that deal with the importance of utilizing pronouns in terms of power and solidarity in different communities. Power signified as a crucial factor in determining pronouns used for addressing terms in English language like first name, family name and title. Moreover, the superiority feature among people in every society has an effect in selecting forms of address known as solidarity. In sense of intimacy between peers' different terms of address could be served, which are different form one society to another.

Many researchers investigated form of address in various studies that serve different social aspects. Artika (2008: 1) asserts that the addresser and addressee could maintain the social relationship with referring to terms of address in the society. Communicators can take part in any communication process with using greeting terms and phrases. Some participants consider addressing the opposite person before starting conversation. Indicating individuals' name showing the interest between communicators in addressing.

In addition, in different languages, address terms have been categorized in various ways. Wardaugh (2000:

263) confirmed that the classification is vital in addressing, like addressing due to using kinship terms, respectful terms, intimate terms, names and mockeries. According to Holmes (1992: 297) different kinds of addressing forms specified and used by people, such as, using Mr. and Mrs. served for addressing in formal situation. While, nick names are used as terms of address in relax situation among peers or close friends, for example, Alex for Alexander and Carol for Caroline.

Undoubtedly, there are variables that affect using terms in address and in reference. Dickey (1997: 256) examined the factors that control the differences between using terms in address and in reference. German, English and Italian native speakers participated through observation and interviewing. the results indicate that both terms of reference and form of address are affected by power and solidarity. Hwang (1991: 117) studies variables in orientations and ordering in form of address constituents that used in American and Korean cultures. Using first names are restricted in Korean culture while in American culture first names are commonly used.

According to a study by Nevala (2004: 272), the appropriate choice of addressing terms and forms of reference are complex from the socio-pragmatic's perspective in sixteenth century. The equal validity of positive and negative politeness cannot be determined simply.

Similarly, Afful (2007) examined spontaneous speech discourse among numbers of undergraduate students in Ghana. Consequently, he affirmed that variants in term of gender, purpose, domain, mood and setting have a great role in selecting terms of address. Moreover, Salihu (2014) explore the system of addressing terms in Hausa community. the results point out that non-relatives are sometimes addressed in the light of kinship terms. The study provided list of Hausa terms despite of having distinctive usage by particular group of people under certain conditions.

Finally, terms of address have examined in various languages. whereas, there is no particular study that aimed to examine the Kurdish terms of address, the reasons behind each term's usage and their impressive role in making interpersonal relations.

2.1 Theoretical background of sociopragmatics

Sociopragmatics depend in part of one's view of pragmatics that include a "general cognitive, social, and cultural perspective on linguistic phenomena in relation to their usage in forms of behaviour" (Verschueren, 1999: 7). In this quite broad point of view, all phenomena that covered by pragmatics are social. Therefore, the label of "sociopragmatics" looks redundant, unless we claimed that sociopragmatics is considered as a part of pragmatics that places a stronger emphasis on the social issues. Furthermore, pragmatics pragmatics is counted as another basic component in a theory of language, different from other parts in its deal with context. Hence, the development of sociopragmatics can be directly attributed to the work of Geoffrey Leech and Jenny Thomas.

According to Leech (1983: 10) that distinguishes three fields of pragmatics which are "general pragmatics", relating "the general conditions of the communicative use of language", "sociopragmatics", regarding "more specific 'local' conditions on language use" and "pragmalinguistics", about "the particular resources which a given language provides for conveying particular illocutions". Finally, historical social pragmatics mostly focused on interactions between certain aspects of social contexts and certain historical usages that lead to practical meanings. The use of language in its situational setting, and becoming those situational settings create norms that speakers use or abuse for pragmatic determinations.

2.2 Address terms and politeness

It is interesting to mention that politeness counted as a part of others' feeling. A polite individual selects utterances properly in order to make others feel more comfortable. Address terms' choice can be referring to politeness since it is closely depending on the relationship among interactants or social distance (Holms, 1992: 268). In politeness theory (Brown and Levison, 1987), terms of address are utilized to indicate either negative or positive politeness. Negative politeness performed in distant situations when interactants are formal to each other that realized as a distance oriented and power. Whereas, positive politeness maintained when speakers are intimate and performing a close relationship to other which realized as solidarity oriented. Positive politeness aims at enhancing the positive face of addresses that achieved by closeness through the use of intimate address forms. Negative politeness aims at showing and supporting awareness for the face of addresses during social distancing.

1.3 Research questions

After taking into account the aforementioned knowledge concerning selecting the proper terms of address in various cultures, the study aimed to answer some ideal questions that mentioned below:

1. What do Kurdish forms of address mean in society and how are they used?
2. What social determinants affect the usage of terms of address?
4. Research method

In conducting this study, the descriptive qualitative approach used by the researcher in order to describe main objectives of this research. Also, this research supported by qualitative and quantitative data for analyzing types and functions of address terms in Kurdish language.

4.1. Participants

This study was conducted in Kurdistan Region, Sulaymaniyah city. One hundred participants have been chosen randomly from public places and different governmental organizations. Both genders have participated in the study, %50 males and the other %50 of informants were females. The range of the participants' age is between eighteen to sixty years old.

4.2. The tool of the study

The informants were invited to fill out a questionnaire designed by the researcher with a reasonable quantity of data on Kurdish terms of address. Besides, twenty participants were interviewed for supporting the conducted results. Two different sections were included in the designed questionnaire. In the first section, personal information was collected, such as, age, sex and the level of participants' education. However, the second part aimed to investigate Kurdish terms of address in a variety of social settings, for instance, family, work, neighbors, strangers and university. Later, the survey is disseminated, filled out and collected from participants.

4.3 Data collection and data analysis

The number of interviewed participants for fifteen minutes were 20, which were twelve males and eight females. The purpose behind interviewing process is for reliability purpose the participants' responses in the questionnaire, also for identifying more alternative addressing terms that need to add and their usage in specific social contexts.

After analyzing the participants' responses statically through Microsoft excel software, six various categories of terms of address pointed out through the study, which are first names, kinship terms, teknonyms, religious terms, titles, and zero terms.

4. Results and discussion

Mostly terms of address never stand neutral in the interpersonal communication, therefore choosing the particular terms lead to express explicit attitudes and feelings (Moghaddam, 2013). Politeness category covers majority of discussions allied to term of address. According to House (1998) being polite is a sociocultural phenomenon that denotes concern and respect for other people when engaging in interpersonal communication. Within the context of politeness theory, this section analyzes the social uses of terms of address, the circumstances that influence their usage, and the social meaning they communicate.

4.1 First name

Family names are rarely used in Kurdish community for addressing one another. However, the phenomenon of the wide use of first name in Kurdish society is embedded. In table (1) the

Gender	family		Neighbors		University		Work		Strangers	
	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.
Female	96	80 %	36	30 %	84	70 %	84	70 %	4	4 %
Male	108	90 %	48	40 %	72	60 %	72	60 %	10	8 %

Fre. = Frequency Pre. = Percentage

Table (1) using first names in variant social domains

In the first table using first names are commonly used for addressing people in different social contexts. However, first names rarely used by both genders for addressing strangers. Family members tend to use first names to address each other. The younger sister and brothers are addressed with their first names from the older siblings. Furthermore, married participants reported that they use first names for addressing the younger or the same age of sister- and brother-in-law.

It is interesting to underline that 30% of females and 40 % of males mentioned their neighbors' first names when they are younger, the same age or having the similar gender. In contrast, depending on the symmetrical and hierarchal relationship first names are used in formal social settings. Consequently, it is clear that the maximum number of participants reported employees inside or outside their workplace with using subordinates, while few numbers of adults addressing their mates using the first names only. In addition, rarely informants addressing their manager with their first names.

It is vital to highlight the fact that the usage of first names with both genders were very common and has an effective role. Same genders generally use first names for reporting others. Stating non-relative first names are avoided with Both females and males at any circumstances.

The frequent use of addressees' first name depends on the familiarity with the addressers. when they become more familiar with each other the use of first names increase between interlocutors in different social domains.

To sum up, it is clear that the factors affecting the usage of first names with addressers govern through four main social features, which are the age of addresses, social status, familiarity and gender.

4.2. Terms of Kinship

Family members are addressed by using terms of kinship. For instance, mum, uncle, aunt and cousin. Table (2) indicates the percentages and frequency of those terms in particular domains of society.

Gender	Relatives		Neighbors		University		Work		Strangers	
	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.
Male	110	92%	21	18%	8	7%	10	8%	48	40%
Female	108	90%	13	11%	6	5%	12	10%	60	50%

Fre. = Frequency Pre. = Percentage

Table (2) using kinship terms by people in various social domains

Kurdish people used to address their relatives with utilizing kinship terms. The system of addressing paternal and maternal relatives differ from each other in the Kurdish society. Examples are provided below for clarifying this point:

Kinship terms	Relations
Babe بابە	Father
Bauke باوکه	
Baue باوه	
Babo بابۆ	
Daye دایه	Mother
Daike دایکه	
Dayei دایێ	
Mame مامه	Father's brother (Uncle)
Mama ماما	
Pure پوری	Mother's sister (Aunt)
Ple پله	
Mîmî میمی	
Xale خاله	Mother's brother (Uncle)
Xalo خالۆ	
Babe gawre بابە گهواره	Grandfather
Bapîre باپیره	
Bawe gawre باوه گهواره	
Daye gawre دایه گهواره	Grandmother
Dapîra داپیره	
Nene نهنه	
Kake کاکه	Brother
Kakm کاکم	
Xushke خوشکه	Sister
Dade داده	

The kinship above are not used for addressing relatives only, but also used to address family members in various social settings. Sometimes the term Kake is used for addressing father in some Kurdish families to be more respectful. First names are commonly extended with Kurdish families for addressing their mothers. Married males stated that they address their father-in-law with using the term Mame, which is used for addressing uncles as well. Moreover, Married Kurdish females reported that the term Daye or Amozhn (Mamozhn) used for addressing their mother-in-law, while originally those terms are used to call their mothers and their uncle's wives. Furthermore, the results indicate that Kinship terms are not widely utilized for addressing neighbors.

However, the results state that Kurdish people are rarely used kinship terms for addressing neighbors. Eighteen percent of males use Mame for addressing their neighbors and 11% of females utilize Pure/Ple for the same purpose. Similarly, both males and females at universities or governmental institutions are rarely use kinship terms for addressing others which are 7% of males and 5% of females. Also, 8% and 10% of Kurdish males and females' employees trying to use subordinate terms instead of using kinship terms at their workplace for addressing their manager or coworkers.

However, the findings indicate that the limited numbers of kinship terms are frequently used for addressing strangers with both genders. Forty percent of males use Mame or Xale to address unfamiliar older males and Bra for addressing the same ages. In addition, 50 % of female informants reported that they use Pura/Pla for addressing older unfamiliar females. However, the terms Mame, Xale and kake are utilized by females to address older males. Both elderly Kurdish males and females use Kurekem and Kchekem/kizhm for addressing unfamiliar younger males and females. It is interesting to mention that factors affected using limited numbers of kinship terms based on the social acceptance, respect and politeness.

4.3. Teknonyms

Adults are addressed through driving the eldest child's name of the family known as teknonyms. In Kurdish language teknonyms are formed with a combination of a lexical item as Daiki or Bawki + the eldest male/female name in the family. Table (3) indicates the percentage and the frequency of teknonyms used in variety of social settings:

Gender	Family		Neighbor		University		Work		Strangers	
	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.
Male	30	25%	6	5%	4	3%	6	5%	8	7%
Female	41	34%	5	4%	0	0%	2	2%	5	4%

Fre. = Frequency Pre. = Percentage

Table (3) The percentage and frequency of using teknonyms in various social settings

It is clear that teknonyms are not utilized by informants frequently as compared to other types of addressing terms. Teknonyms are widely used in the public between spouses. The main factor behind the usage of this type of address term between elder parents for showing respect and may be shyness. The existence of this cultural phenomenon belongs to the past times. Twenty-five percent of male and 34% of females stated that they use teknonyms when they were young married and cannot use first names for addressing each other. While, the results point out that the limited number of teknonyms used by informants from other social domains. Both males and females rarely used teknonyms for addressing their neighbors which are %5 and 4%. In addition, the findings indicate that both genders avoid to use teknonyms frequently at public places such as universities and workplace but generally first names with social subordinates are more preferable. Lastly, 7% and 4% of Kurdish males and females used teknonyms for addressing strangers which are their superior. The fixed numbers of teknonyms detected from the study that are used by young informants in both genders to address their superiors in different social domains, for instance, Bauki-Aahmad and Daiki-Muhammed.

From the findings the limitation of using teknonymic terms realized in Kurdish community. Families are the only social setting that teknonymic terms used in more than other domains. The main cause of using this category for indicating respect, familiarity, intimacy and politeness. Moreover, it was noted that the most crucial factors that governing the teknonyms' pragmatic meaning were the age of the partner; the mother's status, and the social context.

4.4. Religious terms

Religious terms are enormously used in Kurdish community for instance, the term H'acî used for addressing old aged people from both genders in Kurdish community. another used term H'acî jin for addressing the partner of a man who has undertaken the pilgrimage to Macca. However, the term H'acî refers to both old males and females whether they made pilgrimage or not but this phenomenon become rare recently.

Gender	Family		Neighbor		University		Work		Strangers	
	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.
Male	72	60%	78	65%	1	1%	2	2%	36	30%
Female	60	50%	66	55%	0	0%	1	1%	24	20%

Fre. = Frequency Pre. = Percentage

Table (4) the percentage and frequency of using religious terms H'acî in various social domains

The findings show that elderly people in the Kurdish community as relatives, strangers and neighbors

addressed with using the term H'acî or H'acî jin. The half percent and 30% of males and females indicate that they use the same terms for addressing their grandparents in the family. Furthermore, 70% of males and 60% of females tend to address their elderly neighbors from both genders with using the religious terms. Moreover, 30 % and 20% of males and females; reveal that addressers use religious terms for addressing aged strangers, alternatively they tend to use some fixed religious terms for this purpose, such as, Mame, Xale and Purê for males and females.

In contrast using religious terms in formal settings such as universities and workplaces are rare which produce a remarkable difference as compared to other social contexts.

4.5. Titles

As indicated from the results of this study two Kurdish titles identified namely gender titles. For instance, Xatûn or Xanim (Miss or Mrs.) are used as titles for addressing married and unmarried females. Similarly, Kçake is another informal term that used for addressing unmarried females. Also, the social subordinate Xan and ya used before and after the original female's name, such as Hanna xan. However, the term Kake, kak and Berêz (Mr.) utilized as a common title for addressing adult males. Table (5) shows the percentages of the used titles for addressing people according to social setting:

Gender	Family		Neighbor		University		Work		Strangers	
	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.
Male	0	0%	96	80%	90	75%	108	90%	66	55%
Female	0	0%	102	85%	94	78%	110	92%	72	60%

Fre. = Frequency Pre. = Percentage

Table (5) The title terms' percentage and frequencies in verity of social domains

Titles are the most widely used as addressing terms at the most of social settings. Eighty percent and 85% of Kurdish male and females reported that titles need to be used with neighbors for showing respect and intimacy. Moreover, academic organizations and workplaces marked as extra domains that titles broadly used to address other people; 75% of males and 78% of females utilize titles to address their superior friends and administration staffs as well. Educators at universities use Duktur for addressing their professors or instructors even outside the lecture. Students use Mamosta is to address their school director or teachers. In addition, considerable numbers of informants 90% and 92% of males and females reveal that it is impossible to address their manager or supervisor without titles. More than half of percent of males and 60% of females stated that generally strangers addressed by the addressers with using titles. The term Mamosta used to address strangers who seem educated from both genders in Kurdish society. As it indicated form the findings

none of the informants reported that they use titles for addressing purpose among family members even parents. The results highlighted the fact that the Kurdish culture is more job-oriented in using titles for addressing as being gender-oriented one. The determination of using titles more affected by the addressees' formality, familiarity and social status.

4.6. Zero terms

Sometimes speakers refer to stranger or any other individuals in various social domains without using any address terms for the purpose of asking questions or getting their attention. Afull (2007) affirmed that two methods can be used to perform this: using attention-getting phrases like sorry, pardon and excuse me. Next, using greeting expressions counted as an effective way to address both genders without opting any terms, such as Hi, Hey and Hello. The table below indicates the percent's of utilizing zero terms in various social settings.

Gender	Family		Neighbor		University		Work		Strangers	
	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.	Fre.	Per.
Male	4	3%	42	35%	66	55%	18	15%	102	85%
Female	2	2%	30	25%	54	45%	30	25%	114	95%

Fre. = Frequency Pre. = Percentage

Table (6) The zero terms percent's and frequencies' in several social settings

Kurdish informants used zero terms widely for addressing strangers and workmates in different social contexts while seldomly used for addressing acquaintances and family members. Furthermore, the findings reveal that Kurdish females registered the highest percentages in using zero terms for addressing as compared to male informants.

Getting addresses attention with using particular expressions, for instance Bêzeh'met (Excuse me!), Bbûre (Pardon! Or sorry!), Xulakêk ba yarmatît (A moment if you don't mind!) and Be yarmatît (can you help me?). Besides, using some fixed terms concerning greeting words and phrases such as, em katet baş, bashî (Hi or Hello), beyanî bash (Good morning) nîwaro bash (Good afternoon), Eware bash (Good evening) and Shau bash were underlined by Kurdish informants for getting the addressees' attention.

Lastly, the use of zero terms for addressing employees at most of governmental organizations are obvious, particularly post offices, police stations, public transportation's stations and banks. It is interesting to mention that some specific terms utilized for addressing politicians or military personnel like Balê, gaurem! (Yes, Sir!). However, some kinship terms used for the same purpose to address employees as strangers in

Kurdish society, such as Bezeñ'met, brakem! (Excuse me, brother!), Bbûre, Mame! (Sorry, Uncle!).

On the other hand, the informants criticized the use of zero terms as inappropriate terms for addressing members of a family and mates. There is no doubt about that using zero terms are more focused on the type of social domains in Kurdish society as social status, familiarity and gender.

5. Conclusion

The Kurdish address system is examined in this study. The main six categories of terms of address are emphasized that examine their meanings in variety of social settings and their usages in the society. The paper also identifies the variables influencing how each type of addressing terms is used. Through analyzing the data, the results showed in the following points:

- Social connotations of Kurdish address terms depend on their context. Kinship concepts, for instance, behave peculiarly. In order to maintain positive image, they are used to interact with both relatives and non-relatives. The terms Mame and xale (uncle) can also be used to refer strangers and neighbors in addition to their literal meaning "relatives".
- Teknonyms as another type of address terms are rarely found to be embedded in Kurdish culture. However, in the majority of social settings in the past, the same terms were used to express courtesy and respect for elderly people.
- The first names and titles reveal symmetrical and asymmetrical relationships between speakers.
- Kurdish people have a strong inclination to address strangers with zero terms (greetings and attention-getters), instead choosing to employ terms of kinship or religion.
- Both males and females reveal the way of using most of categories in addressing terms differently.
- The age, social status, authority, and social distance of the interlocutors influence the choice of a particular Kurdish term of address in a given scenario. So, the social domain has a significant impact on the way of using these terms.
- Differences found between men and women in applying terms of address in various social contexts.

References

1. Afful, J. Address Terms among University Students in Ghana: The Case of Descriptive Phrases. *The International journal of Language Society and Culture*, 20, 50, (2007).
2. Braun, F. *Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures*. Berlin: Mouto De Gruyter, (1998).
3. Brown, P., and Levinson, S. *Politeness: Some language universals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, (1987).
4. Brown, R. and Gilman, A. The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity. In Thomas A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in Language* (p.253-276). Massachusetts: MIT Press, (1966).
5. Culpeper, J. Historical sociopragmatics. *Historical Sociopragmatics*, 1-144. (2011).
6. Dickey, E. Forms of address and terms of reference. *Journal of Linguistics*, 33(2), 255-274. doi:10.1017/S0022226797006488, (1997).
7. Dunkling, L. *A Dictionary of Epithets and Terms of Address*. New York: Routledge, (1990).
8. Ervin-Tripp, S. Sociolinguistic Rules of Address. In J.B. Pride, & Janet Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (p.225-240). London: Penguin Education, (1970).
9. Esmae'li, S. Terms of Address Usage: The Case of Iranian Spouses. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1 (9) 183-188, (2001).
10. Holms, J. *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. London: Longman, 1992.
11. House, J. (1998). Politeness and Translation. In *The Pragmatics of Translation*, Kickey, L. (ed), pp.54-71. UK: Cromwell Press Ltd.
12. Hwang, S. Terms of address: in Korean and American culter's. *International Communication studies* 1(2). <http://web.uri.edu/iaics/files/08-Shin-Ja-J.-Hwang>.
13. Keshavarz, M. The role of social context, intimacy and distance in the choice of forms of address. *International of the Society of Language*, 148, 5-18, (2001).
14. Leech, Geoffrey N. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman, (1983).
15. Mazzon, G. Pronouns and Normal Address in Shakespearian English. In Irma Taavitsainen, Andreas H. Jucker (Eds.), *Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems* (p. 223- 250). Philadelphia: John Benjamins B.V., (2002).
16. Mahzad Mardiha. *The Role of Age and Gender in the Choice of Address Forms: A Sociolinguistic Study*. Retrived from: <http://www.journals.aiac.org.au/index.php/IJALEL/article/view/765>, (2012). 1,(4), 172-182.
17. Moghaddam, A. S., Yazdanpanah, L., and Abolhassanizadeh, V. *The Analysis of Persian Address Terms*

Based on the Theory of Politeness. SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics, 10(3), p55 (2013).

18. Nevala, M. Inside and out. Forms of address in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century letters. Journal of historical pragmatics, 5(2): 271–296 (2004).
19. Oyetade, S. O. (1995). A sociolinguistic analysis of address forms in Yoruba. Language in society, 24(4), 515-535.
20. Parkinson, D. Constructing the Social Context of Communication: Terms of Address in Egyptian Arabic. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, (1985).
21. Pearson, J. C. Gender and Communication. Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, (1985).
22. Salihu H. The Sociolinguistics Study of Gender Address Patterns in the Hausa Society. International Journal of Social Science and Humanity, 4 (1), (2014).
23. Taavitsainen, I. and Jucker A. Diachronic Perspectives on Address Term Systems. Pragmatics & Beyond New Series. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, (2002).
24. Verschueren, Jef. Understanding Pragmatics. London: Arnold, (1999).
18. Wardhaugh, R. Introduction to Sociolinguistics. 5 th edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, (2006).
25. Yule, G. Pragmatics. Oxford University Press: New York, (1996).