| RESEARCH ARTICLE

A Study of Address Terms in a Workplace Speech Community (SC)

Saliu A. Shittu

Assistant Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, University of Bahrain, Zallaq, Kingdom of Bahrain
Corresponding Author: Saliu A. Shittu, **E-mail**: sshittu@uob.edu.bh

| ABSTRACT

The present paper examines personal address terms in a workplace speech community (SC). The study considers the extent to which the address terms in this SC align with the suggestion that choosing a particular address term among multiple others shows how the speaker views the relationship between himself and others. The study also shows how societal norms tend to contribute to, or deeply influence, the choice of address forms. In this speech community, some address terms, which may be taken as exceptions in other contexts, are in fact the norms here. Thus, any deviation from this norm may lead to misunderstandings and subsequently, to disruptions in the interaction, due to what the term chosen may connote. Speakers might shift from one reference term to the other depending on who the other interactant is. The study further examines other factors that may affect the choice of address terms, such as power and solidarity derived from the nature of work, age, country of origin or perceived closeness among the interlocutors.

| KEYWORDS

Address / reference terms, Speech Community (SC), Power and solidarity, Culture

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

1. Introduction

1.1 Address / Reference terms

Yule (2020:318) defines address terms "as words or phrases used to label the person being talked to or written about." In other words, they are words or expressions used by the speaker to refer to the co-interactant while the talk is in progress. An indirect reference term would indicate the type used to designate a non-present referent (technically, third person). It may be argued that no society exists without its own peculiar rules of personal address. The form of address used can define the nature and state of the interlocutors' relation to each other and to their larger social structure. For instance, introducing someone as Dr. X, Mr. Y, Miss Z, or Captain A, has indeed given more information about the person, that anyone receiving such information can appropriately use in subsequent interaction with the person so introduced. As the study progresses, examples may be drawn from other languages such as English and Yoruba with a view to clarifying some points.

The speech community for the study is a boys' Middle School in Kuwait. Hence, it is a male-dominated community. It is comprised of both academic and administrative staff as well as students. Out of about sixty members of staff, only four are female. These female staff, all Kuwaiti citizens, work either as secretaries or as student affairs officers. The male staff consists of Kuwaitis, non-Kuwaitis, teaching, and administrative staff (high-ranked and low-ranked). Additional details about the speech community are provided later in the study.

1.2 Using an address term: Power and Solidarity

Early works on personal address reveal that power and solidarity are the two major social considerations that govern the use of address forms. Brown and Gilman (1960), in their study of the 2nd person pronoun usage in French, German, Italian and Spanish, found that the person who has more power over the other uses the T(u) formula and is addressed with the V(ous) format by the

interactant who, in this case has less power. Thus, a non-reciprocal relationship obtains, as no two people may have the same direction of power over each other. The same may be found in such instances of non-reciprocal relationships as teacher-student, parent-child and boss-subordinate. Power direction is further defined by other social factors such as age, caste, race or occupation. However, the person with more status may employ the 'dispensation rule' Ervin-Tripp, (1972) at his/her disposal, thereby excusing or exempting the subordinate from using the formal address format that highlights the power direction. Thus, informality will be established. It is also claimed that, in time, there could be a normative shift in address forms, from the mutual title-plus-last name (TLN), to a non-reciprocal TLN and first names (FN) and finally to FN calling. Contrastingly, solidarity as a phenomenon is found to be reciprocal. It is usually characterized by the use of a somewhat informal address term (e.g. T(u) in Brown & Gilman's (1960) study, as the interlocutors are either bound by equality (in age, rank or occupation), closeness, or intimacy.

Studies conducted by Brown and Ford (1961) on the American address system also found that first names (FNs) and teknonym and last names (TLNs) are used either reciprocally or non-reciprocally. The choice is guided by the power and solidarity phenomenon. Age and occupational status are seen to be prominent in the non-reciprocal forms of address. Assessment of the right situation precludes the choice of the address term by the interactants. Brown and Gilman (1960) found that the choice of the pronominal address forms is made on a patterned rather than on a random basis; their uses follow rules that are understood by the members of the community. These rules and patterns provide a system of social meaning. Thus, social meaning greatly determines the choice of the address term in a fixed manner.

In addition to the solidarity and power approach (Brown and Gilman (1960), address terms may also be connected to the face theory by Brown and Levinson (1987). According to the study, while not using the appropriate address term may result in face-threatening to the addressee, using the appropriate term tends to contribute to maintaining politeness in the encounter.

1.3 Negotiability in the choice of address terms
Kendall (1981) suggests that the social meanings that are expressed and derived from the choice of personal address terms undergo some processes of interpretation and negotiation. This is borne out of the basic conviction that human social existence itself is full of inconsistencies and ambiguities and tends to be characterized by fluidity and temporaneity. The study finds some support in Muhlhausler and Harre's (1990) work on the use of personal pronouns in address systems. They present a negotiational approach, in which forms and patterns of personal address are chosen by individuals for particular goals, based on the context of the situation and interpersonal relationships between the interlocutors. Sequeira (1993) further suggests that although the choice of language being used for personal address among the interlocutors follows a pattern, the rules of interpretation of the social meanings of personal address choice depend on a combination of such factors as context, public and private meaning and the beliefs of the interlocutors. Her study of an American church community identifies the tradition of silence or lack of direct address within this speech community. Members greet one another with only 'Good morning', after which they sit quietly or kneel or pray before the service. She further claims that the plausible social meaning of this 'limited' level of interaction is reverence for the Anglican heritage, for the myth surrounding the old church building, and for the senior members of the church.

Even within this church community, the social meaning of personal address is still negotiable. Sequeira (1993) reports instances of a shift in address form from FN to TLN in the presence of a visitor or a non-member. A junior clergy of the church reported that he only reciprocates FN to a senior clergy, not necessarily out of closeness but because he doesn't want to be slighted.

1.4 Beliefs and personal address
The choice to adopt certain forms of address terms may be traceable to a person's belief in the suitability of the address term in certain contexts. This is mostly true in communities where respect is held in high consideration, and in which every member of the community shares a similar belief. Oyetade (1995) in his work on address forms in Yoruba, a major language in Southwestern Nigeria, reveals that in any Yoruba community it is considered impolite, and highly disrespectful, to address an older person by name, whatever the context. Anyone committing such impropriety is instantly called to order by anyone present even if s/he is younger than the culprit. An exception to this norm may be found in the case of the king's poets or praise singers who have what might be called 'poetic license', allowing them to call anybody by name. Thus, in Yoruba, solidarity does not necessarily imply equality, and it is a rarity among Yoruba interlocutors to evoke any form of dispensation rules.

Muhlhauser and Harre (1990:134) also report that in the English tradition, it was once forbidden to use the word '*you*' to address one's mother or grandmother, or to refer to one's mother as '*she*' in a conversation with a third person. Brown and Gilman (1960) further observe that a status change from a doctoral student to a full doctor sometimes results in the new doctor being uncomfortable with calling his former teachers by their FNs, as is the norm among learned colleagues. Such reluctance gradually dissipates as s/he gets used to the new state of things (i.e. FN calling with colleagues). However, we may have cases in which

cultural differences continue to override this norm and a colleague belonging to a culture which values respect cannot merge comfortably into the new first-name calling dispensation.

1.5 Address terms in academic settings

Several studies on address term in academic settings have revealed various results ranging from avoidance of address terms in cases of student – faculty address (e.g. McIntire,1972), to the role played by solidarity and power factors in conjunction with factors of age, gender, academic degrees, and regional affiliation in determining the use of address terms (Harris et al., 1999). The findings by Murphy (1988) highlight the importance of the type of relationship existing between the speaker / addressee and the referent as well as the presence of bystanders. In a related study, Formentelli (2009) found that power factors mainly determine the type of address. For example, the use of Title (T) / Last Name (LN) is more likely the address term to be observed in a student-lecturer interaction, with First Name (FN) often used as a reference term in fewer instances. In other findings involving British and American participants, reference terms and address terms are not differentiated (Dickey,1997). Thus, the study of address and reference terms in both academic and non-academic contexts has enhanced our understanding of how cultural differences influence human behavior, as well as how they guide verbal behavior.

One of the earliest studies on address term usage in Arabic speaking communities is Parkinson (1985). Adopting a sociolinguistic approach, he investigated the Egyptian speech community using naturally occurring data elicited from different speech events in different settings. His findings align with Brown & Gilman's (1960) which suggests that address term usage is determined on the basis of power and solidarity factors. Another study by Farghal and Shakir (1994) examines the use of kin terms as well as titles of address that designate distance and affection. They found that distant honorifics are mostly used to address strangers while affectionate terms are employed in addressing relatives, friends and, sometimes, strangers. In an elaborate description of address terms in Jordanian Arabic (JA), Al-Khatib (2003) reports that the usage of address terms in JA is particularly governed by such factors as social distance, socio-economic status, gender, age, and occupation.

1.6 Public and private meaning and personal address

Any address term has a stable public meaning shared and known by the community. However, individuals do sometimes attach other private, inside meanings to the address term, based on personal feeling or the context. Though this claim may not be easy to measure due to its psychosocial dimension, Sequeira (1993) cited an interesting example involving a senior cleric 'Joe' in the church community she studied. Some of the parishioners in the study do not have much respect or affection for Joe and hence they believe he does not deserve the honorific title (T). Instead, they use first name (FN) (traditionally an indication of closeness) with him as they do with other clerics for whom they have much admiration and respect. In an interview, one of the parishioners explained that she attaches a different meaning to her use of FN with Joe. She said she doesn't want to hurt Joe's feelings by not addressing him by T. Although she refuses to accord Joe the honorific T, addressing him in the FN (another form of politeness) helps to maintain the relationship.

In sum, it has been shown that although power and solidarity mainly determine the choice of address terms, dispensation rules may be employed to waive the power phenomenon. It has also been revealed that the processes of interpretation and negotiation may also affect the choice. Moreover, some address terms, when used by interlocutors in certain contexts, carry meanings different from the shared public meaning. The case study that follows seeks to take all the above claims into consideration. Further, it will show that societal norms may sometimes play important roles in the use of address terms.

2. The case Study

2.1 Method

The present research is mainly descriptive. Data were obtained through the anthropological method of participant observation, reflecting the type carried out by Blom and Gumperz (1986) in their work in Norway. This technique, according to Burton (1978), involves the researcher / observer immersing him/herself in the social world being studied. I have the advantage of being an active member of the speech community under observation. This gives me more opportunity to undertake direct observation of actual usage for an extended period of time.

During the observation, I take notes at every opportunity to record the terms being used by the interlocutors in any given situation. In some situations, I adopt the 'attribution theory' as proposed by Lalljee, M. (1987), seeking explanation or interpretation for a particular address term used by interlocutors. In other instances, I refer to my recollection of a telephone conversation that transpired between myself and some of the members of the SC. The information obtained from the technique above was augmented by my own limited knowledge and experience of address terms in a Kuwaiti Arab society.

The Kuwaiti society is Arabic-speaking, belonging to the regional Arabian Gulf culture. It is a conservative society which is mostly patriarchal. Respect is accorded across family, tribal, and professional ranks. Other Arabic-speaking communities share similar cultures of respect for elder family and tribal members as well as higher-ranked professionals.

2.2 The School Community (SC)

The school is a male school; hence, it is a male-dominated community. Out of about sixty members of staff, only four are female. These females work at the administrative section - two secretaries and two student affairs officers. I have been a member of staff in the SC for more than five years up to the time of conducting this research. Arabic language and the nature of the profession form the major determinant of the community as an entity. With the exception of the students, all the other members of this SC are adults with ages ranging from 23 to 65 years. The school, as a macro-SC can further be broken down into various micro SCs along the affiliations of citizenship, gender, and professional status as follows: - Kuwaiti staff (Kuwaiti citizens); non-Kuwaiti staff (Egyptians, Syrians, Tunisians, Lebanese, a Nigerian, a Saudi Arabian,); male staff; female staff; teaching staff and administrative staff (high-ranked and low-ranked), and students. The Kuwaiti staff comprises different tribal and sectarian affiliations that are representatives of the Kuwaiti society. They form the majority of the administrative staff and a sizeable number of the teaching staff. The non-Kuwaiti staff comprises nationals from other Arab countries as well as one non-Arab (a Nigerian). The female staff are all Kuwaiti citizens, and they are all administrative staff. Apart from two social workers, all the expatriate staff are teachers. They all come from different cultural backgrounds. The students are all teenagers aged between 13 and 16 years old. They are citizens of the following Arab countries, namely Kuwaitis, Saudi Arabians, Omanis, Egyptians, Syrians, Lebanese, and one non-Arab country namely Somalis. All the members of the SC mentioned above need to interact at various levels as a members of this close-knit speech community. Thus, they are bound to operate within the culture of the larger Kuwaiti community.

3. Address terms within and among the members of the school SC

3.1 Teknonyms / Mr. & Teknonym

Teknonym is the most common form of address system in this SC. It refers to the habit of calling someone by the name of one of his/her children, usually but not always, the first child. In some society, like the Yoruba, teknonymous system of address is usually used reciprocally between husband and wife as a means to put each other on an equal level in address terms (Oyetade,1995). In the Arab culture, it is a very common form of address, represented by the formulas **Abu** (father of) and a proper name (usually a male child) or in the case of females **Umm** (mother of) and a proper name. According to Farghal and Shakir (1994), married people are addressed with teknonyms, an absolute social honorific as an acceptable means of address instead of their other titles of address. This form of address inherently has a social meaning, and it tends to enhance the social atmosphere as well as effectively minimizing the formality parameter among interactants. In the Arab culture, teknonym may also be used for an unmarried person. When it is used as such, it is meant to wish the person such an offspring in the future or as a reminder of his / her future role as a parent.

In the SC observed for the present study, all the categories of workers (except the students) address both the principal and the vice-principal (VP) with teknonyms. However, its reciprocity or lack of it depends on both power and solidarity factors. The principal and the vice-principal use the reciprocal form among themselves and with other Kuwaiti members of staff who maintain a close relationship with them. Between the principal and the VP on one hand, and the non-Kuwaiti staff and the female workers on the other, non-reciprocity is the rule. Moreover, depending on the closeness, Kuwaiti teachers may use the reciprocal teknonyms among themselves. Non-Kuwaiti teachers as well as non-Kuwaiti administrative staff may also address the Kuwaiti teachers in a non-reciprocal teknonymous form. Among the female staff, anyone with a child is accorded the non-reciprocal teknonym by her female colleagues and mostly by the non-Kuwaiti teachers. A situation where a Kuwaiti teacher uses a teknonym for non-Kuwaiti teachers, though not uncommon, is rarely recorded.

An instance of 'Mr.' with teknonym (Mr. Abu Ahmad) was recorded in one female staff's address to an elderly male Kuwaiti staff. This is meant to maintain the formality and respect represented by both the title 'Mr' and the teknonym respectively.

3.2. First Name (FN) / Last Name (LN) / First Name and Last Name (FN & LN)

The use of FN reciprocally is commonly accepted as the rule among students. It does not matter whether there is an age difference or not. Occasionally, students who form closer associates either from within the school community (school friends, classmates, acquaintances) or from outside (family or same-community relationships) tend to refer to each other by LN only, or by a diminutive form of their FNs (e.g. Azooz for Azeez; Ruzeiqa for Razzaq). Kuwaiti teachers also address each other on FN or LN basis if they are within the same age range, so are the expatriate teachers and the female staff, among themselves. Thus, solidarity is affected by the age factor. All the other groups conspicuously address the student group with the non-reciprocal FN. Moreover, the principal as well as the VP are the only ones who use the non-reciprocal FN to address the female staff. FN & LN are only used in the classroom while taking the class attendance or to summon a student. When the use of reciprocal FN is observed between a Kuwaiti teacher and an expatriate teacher, the expatriate teacher explained to me that they have been acquaintances for some time at their former place of work.

3.3. Mr(s). & FN / Mr(s). & LN

The second most common form of address system in this SC after teknonyms is when the term Mr or Mrs is followed by the first name or the last name of the addressee. It is usually used on a reciprocal basis within and among teachers, both natives and expatriates, except in the individual case mentioned above (acquaintanceship). The female staff use the non-reciprocal form while addressing the teachers (natives and expatriates) and the expatriate administrative workers. Both the principal and the VP use this term mostly to address almost all teachers (natives and expatriates) as well as the expatriate administrative workers. This is the most common. However, as mentioned above, teknonyms are sometimes used for some Kuwaiti staff depending on the degree of closeness that exists between them. Meanwhile, it is an unwritten rule for students to address the teachers by this term.

In a telephone conversation that transpired between the principal and myself, the following excerpted interaction was recollected:

Me: *Hello*
Principal: *Hello, who's on the line?*
Me: *Shittu (My LN) with you.*
Principal: **Mr. Shittu**, *please tell* **Mr. Basem** (a Kuwaiti teacher) *to come to my office*.

What is noticeable in this interaction is that even after introducing myself to the principal by the informal LN (traditionally an offer of closeness), he still reciprocates with Mr. & LN. The possible explanation is that he wishes to maintain and sustain the power direction. He chooses not to employ any dispensation rule that could have broken or reduced the cycle of formality. This is not unexpected as studies show that most superiors rarely choose to give up their power. However, they may resort to other acts such as jokes or light news while interacting with their subordinates to reduce the formality.

3.4 Kin terms (KT) / Kin term & FN

Conventionally, kin terms (KT) are used to address relatives. A KT such as Dad, Mom, uncle, aunt, Grandma, grandpa, brother, sister and others are commonly used. However, some studies on personal address terms found that kin terms may be used fictively for non- relations (Sequeira 1993). In Nigerian communities, for instance, it is a common trend for children to address male and female adult friends of the family as 'uncle' and 'aunt' respectively. Any aunt or uncle older than the parents tends to be addressed as 'mother' or 'father' respectively, while any person older than the speaker tends to be addressed as 'brother' and 'sister' as forms of respect. The kin terms 'brother' and 'sister' are also used in certain religious settings (e.g. a Christian / Islamic community) to denote the concept of brotherhood and sisterhood in the religion. The only instance of the use of a fictive kin term in the present study is when addressing the female secretaries. They are either addressed as 'my sister' or sister & FN. While the expatriate male staff may choose between KT & FN or Mrs. & FN to address the female staff, the Kuwaiti male staff mostly use the KT & FN to address the female staff. This probably calls for an explanation. The Kuwaiti society operates on a familial orientation. One could even hear the school community being referred to as the school 'family'. Based on this fact, each member of this 'family' naturally sees the other as his or her brother or sister.

Moreover, the male-dominated characteristic of the Kuwaiti society may account for the fact that male subjects use the fictive KT most. This reflects the societal norm in which male members of the family traditionally have the edge. This patriarchal system of the Arab community may also account for the fact that in this SC, female staff do not reciprocally address the male staff by KT or by KT & FN. An alternative explanation for the use of KT & FN for the female staff is that it is an indication of 'respect' for them as colleagues in the same workplace. Its formality lies midway between Mrs & FN and FN only. However, FN is not admissible in this context; its reciprocal use in male-female interlocution might create some uneasiness as it violates the societal norm in a workplace. The only possible scenario which may warrant the use of KT & FN by the female staff towards the male staff is when both interactants are siblings working in the same place.

3.5 Titles

Principal, Vice-Principal (VP), Secretary, Social Affairs Officer, Student Affairs Officer, Head of Department, and Teacher are among the professional titles held by the members of the school speech community. Few of them are, however, used in direct address terms. The titles of Principal and VP, if used at all, usually feature in a semi-direct manner. They are used in formal contexts where the common teknonyms for these referents are not the appropriate address terms as in, for example, an opening address or part of an address in a prepared speech being given in their presence or absence. Other members of staff also use these titles to address the Principal and the VP directly during scheduled staff meetings. Sometimes they are prefixed to such honorifics as 'your mastership', your revered' etc. These titles, as well as all the other titles mentioned above, are mostly used to refer to their bearers indirectly in the third person. One instance when using the title as a form as address is the norm is in

students - teacher address. Students use the title 'teacher' (instead of 'sir') to address their teachers of English, directly or indirectly. This is equivalent to 'Ustadh' (teacher, tutor, instructor), which is used to address the non-English-teaching staff.

3.6 Banaat (girls)
This address term, which translates to 'girls', is observed being used to refer to the female staff collectively in an indirect address. The term is used despite the obvious fact that these referents are married adult females. However, it is observed that only the Principal and the VP used this term to refer to the female staff in the third person as observed in the following statements:

> '*Go to the girls*' or
> 'They (the records) *are with the girls*' etc.

Other male Kuwaiti members of staff as well as a few non-Kuwaiti male members of staff address the female staff with the fictive kin term *Sister,* or *Sister* & *First Name.*

3.7 Non-address
This is a phenomenon noticed in the students' interaction with the administrative employees, including the principal and the VP. As is obvious, the setting, as well as the social factors of the age of the participants, and tradition determine the choice. The students, being the youngest members in the school community hierarchy, have all the factors above working against them. Thus, in any direct contact with the administrative staff, they go directly to the topic of the interlocution without any direct address term. The plausible meaning of this choice is respect. It is not uncommon, however, for the students to refer to the administrative staff by their titles in the third person i.e. when not directly addressing them.

4. Discussion
We have seen how the address terms used in this SC are mostly influenced by the norms and values of the society. The use of a teknonym, which is a peculiar Arab usage, is a means of showing respect for the familial orientation on which the whole society is based. Although power as a factor does play some part in the choice of address terms, especially the age factor, it is not as prominent as the solidarity factor. This is because most of the teaching staff are colleagues and also due to the fact that the administrative staff are relatively not considered as higher in rank than the teachers. Thus, familiarity is always quickly established to reflect the familial setting of the community. The notable power holders in the SC namely the principal and the VP have their power marker submerged to some extent, by the teknonymous form of address which almost all the members of the SC choose to address them (See Appendix A). This also reflects and greatly enhances the family atmosphere of the SC accorded to it by the societal norm.

There is a notable difference between the address terms used by native staff among themselves and those of expatriate teachers. The native staff mostly use the FN format while the expatriate staff adopt the common format of Mr. & FN. Cases of native-expatriate cross mixing reveal address terms usage ranging from formality to informality, based on the perceived closeness between the interlocutors and the extent to which they wish to adhere to the societal norm and to the characteristic family setting of the SC.

The case of addressing the female workers using the fictive kin term, '*Sister*' by the male Kuwaiti staff members and as '*Girls*' by the Principal and the VP calls for some discussion. One plausible explanation for the use of this type of address term may be related to the suggestion made by Thornborrow (1999) in Thomas & Wareing (1999) that some groups who may be in a more powerful position tend to impose social categories or labels of identity on others who are less powerful than they are. They may also be using the label to make some social judgment about them. However, this seems not to be the case in this speech community. In contrast, this type of address further adds more proof to the claim made on the strong effect of societal norms on the choice of address. Considered within the Kuwaiti context, this label probably reflects the fatherly posture the Principal and the VP assume toward the female staff as well as the brotherly posture the other Kuwaiti male staff assume toward them within the school Speech Community micro-family. It may also denote an attempt to address them by an easily recognizable term reflecting their gender identity.

However, this may raise the question of why the male staff are not addressed as either 'brother' or 'boys. Could this have anything to do with either 'attitudes' (how men / women speak; how they are spoken of or not spoken of), or 'self-representation' (how men/women represent themselves) McConnell-Ginnet (1988)), especially within the larger Kuwaiti / Arab culture? This might make an interesting study in the future.

5. Conclusion

The study of address terms in this SC reveals an interesting description of how members, belonging to different gender, age groups, professional rankings as well as cultural backgrounds, address one another. It reveals that the existence of these hierarchies among the workers largely necessitates that power and solidarity should determine the choice of address term between the members. However, what is observed is that, in addition to power and solidarity factors, a more forceful factor determining the choice of address term is the societal norm, namely the norm in the larger Kuwaiti society. Thus, despite having members from various cultural backgrounds in the SC, none of the expatriate members of the community deviates from the identified norms of address of the host community. The findings of this study could be something to consider for syllabus designers of Arabic as a foreign language (AFL) as well as those of English as a foreign language (EFL), while preparing syllabi meant for the Gulf /Arab countries. Additionally, this is an important aspect of Arab society's culture; hence, mastering it will further enhance the learners' communicative competence.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

[1]   Al-Khatib, M. (2003). Address Norms in Jordanian Arabic: A Sociolinguistic Perspective. *Grazer Linguistische Studien, 59*, 1–20.
[2]   Blom, J.P & Gumperz, J.J (1986). Social Meaning in linguistics Structure: Code-switching in Norway. In Gumperz and Hymes (1986) (eds.) pp.407-434.
[3]   Brown, R. and Ford, M. (1960). Address in American English. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62*: 375 – 385.
[4]   Brown, R. and Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of Power and Solidarity. In: Giglioli (1972) pp. 252-282.
[5]   Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena (E. Goody Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[6]   Burton, F. (1978). The Politics of Legitimacy- Struggles in a Belfast Community. In: Milroy, L. (1987) pp. 60.
[7]   Dickey, E. (1997). Forms of address and terms of reference. *Journal of Linguistics*, 33: 255-274.
[8]   Ervin-Tripp, S. M. (1972). On sociolinguistic rules: alternation and co-occurrence. In Gumperz & Hymes (1986) (Eds.), (pp. 213–250).
[9]   Ervin-Tripp, S.M. (1986). On Sociolinguistic rules: Alternation and Co-occurrence. In Gumperz & Hymes (1986) (eds.) pp. 213-250.
[10] Farghal, M. and Shakir, A. (1994). Kin Terms and Titles of Address as Relational Social Honorifics in Jordanian Arabic" *Anthropological Linguistics, 36:2, pp.240-253*.
[11] Formentelli, M. (2009). Address strategies in a British academic setting. Pragmatics, 19 (2): 179-196.
[12] Giglioli, P.P. (1972) (ed.). *Language and Social Context*. London: Penguin Group.
[13] Gumperz, J.J. and Hymes, D. (1986) (eds.). *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
[14] Harris, H., McCready, V. & Herr, D. (1999). Address forms and their implications in communication sciences and Disorders University programs. Contemporary Issues in Communication Science and Disorders, 26: 82-93.
[15] Kendall, M.B. (1981). Toward a semantic approach to terms of address: A critique of deterministic models in sociolinguistics. In Sequeira (1993).
[16] Lalljee, M. (1987). Attribution theory and Intercultural Communication. In Knapp, K. et al (1987) (eds.) *Analysing Intercultural Communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 37-49.
[17] McConnell-Ginnet, S. (1988). Language and Gender. In Newmeyer, F. J. (1988) (ed.). *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey IV. Language: The Sociocultural Context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 75-99.
[18] McIntire, M. L. (1972). Terms of address in an academic setting. Anthropological Linguistics, 14 (7): 286-291.
[19] Milroy, L. (1987). *Observing and Analyzing Natural Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
[20] Muhlhausler, P. and Harre, R. (1990). *Pronouns and People: The Linguistic Construction of Social and Personal Identity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
[21] Murphy, G. L. (1988). Personal reference in English. Language in Society, 17 (3): 317-349.
[22] Oyetade, S.O. (1995). A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Address forms in Yoruba. *Language in Society*, Vol. 24: No. 4, 515-535.
[23] Parkinson, D. B. (1985). Constructing the Social Context of Communication: Terms of Address in Egyptian Arabic. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin, New York, Amsterdam. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110857351.
[24] Sequeira, D-L. (1993). Personal Address as Negotiated Meaning in an American Church Community. *Research on Language and Social Interaction Vol. 26, No. 3, 259-285*.
[25] Thomas, L. and Wareing, S. (1999) (eds.). *Language, Society and Power: An introduction.* London: Routledge.*36:2 pp240-253*.
[26] Thornborrow, J. (1999). Language and Identity. In Thomas, L. and Wareing, S. (1999) pp. 135-149.
[27] Yule, G. (2020). The study of language. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix 1

Table showing the commonly used direct address terms in a school Speech Community in Kuwait.

Addressee → Addresser ↓	Principal	VP	Admin. workers	Female staff	Kuwaiti teachers	Expatriate Teachers	Students
Principal	-	Tekn	Mr. + FN	FN/ Banaat	Mr. + FN / Tekn	Mr. + FN	FN
VP	Tekn	-	Mr. + FN	FN Banaat	Mr. + FN/ Tekn	Mr. + FN	FN
Admin workers	Tekn	Tekn	Mr. + FN	FN KT. + FN	Mr. + FN/ Tekn	Mr. + FN	FN
Female workers	Tekn	Tekn	Mr. +FN	FN/Tekn	Mr. + FN	Mr. + FN	FN
Kuwaiti teachers	Tekn	Tekn	Tekn (to natives) Mr. + FN (to expats)	KT/ KT + FN	FN/LN/ Tekn	Mr. + FN	FN/ FN+LN
Expat Teachers	Tekn	Tekn		Tekn/Mrs. + FN	Mr. + LN/ Tekn/	Mr. + FN / FN	FN/ FN + LN
Students	none	none	none	none	Mr. + FN	Mr. + FN	FN/LN

Key abbreviations used:

Tekn (teknonyms); Mr. (Mister); Mrs. (Misses); FN (first name); LN (Last name); KT (Kin Term); Banaat (English: girls)