

Mister, bro, or ada? Styles of Addressing among Multilingual Pakistani Students

Muhammad Arif Soomro ^a

muhammadarif@quest.edu.pk

Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University),
Moscow, Russia

&

Department of English, QUEST,
Nawabshah-Sindh, Pakistan

Tatiana Larina

larina-tv@rudn.ru

Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University),
Moscow, Russia

ABSTRACT

Address forms are an important component of communication with a wide range of socio-cultural differences across languages and cultures. In a multilingual context, their variety creates problems in comprehending their pragmatic meaning and appropriate usage. The study aims to define the categories of address forms used by multilingual Pakistani students speaking in English in an academic setting and to highlight the impact of socio-cultural context and identity on their choice in different situations. We have limited our study to the interaction between students in three social contexts and explored addressing a peer (a classmate), a junior student, and a senior student. The data were collected through a questionnaire with the participation of 252 students and were analysed with a mixed-method approach both quantitative and qualitative. Our results show that Pakistani students use a creative mixture of different categories of English and native address forms while speaking in English to express their values, attitudes, and identity. They demonstrate a strong sensitivity to the asymmetrical relations and adherence to hierarchy among junior and senior students resulting in variations of formality and informality. The findings illustrate the impact of context, values, and identity as well as the native language on address forms and their functioning in a bi-multilingual context and contribute to sociolinguistics, pragmatics, variational linguistics, bi-multilingualism, and cultural linguistics.

Keywords: address forms; academic discourse; university setting; bi-multilingual identity; Pakistani English

INTRODUCTION

Address forms are an important component of communication which have a wide range of socio-cultural differences (see e.g. Braun, 1988; Clyne, 2009; Norrby & Wide, 2015; Wierzbicka, 2020; among many others). In an intercultural context, their variety creates problems in understanding their pragmatic meaning as well as appropriate usage. The selection of address forms is governed by interlocutors as a result of the relationship between them and depends on the context both social and cultural. The social organization of society and the values of interlocutors are reflected in their

^a Main & corresponding author

communicative behavior including the choice of address forms (e.g. Norrby & Wide 2015, Wierzbicka 2003). As Clyne (2009) notes “issues of identity, inclusion and exclusion and face are at the fore in the choice of address mode” (Clyne, 2009, p. 398).

The sociocognitive nature of the address forms demonstrates how culture and cognition function and shape the styles of communication (Larina, 2015). It is particularly interesting to observe the impact of culture on communication when we analyze different varieties of the same language (e.g. Formentelli and Hajek 2016; Larina & Suryanarayan, 2013; Ozyumenko, 2020).

This study is part of an ongoing research project on addressing forms in Pakistani English with a focus on the academic setting. English traveled by colonization to Pakistan afterward remained its official language. Therefore, the notion of ‘World Englishes’ (Kachru, 1985) has established the case for considering Pakistani English as a variety of English. Due to the continuous use of English in Pakistan, it has gone into the indigenized, and address forms can be one of the main indicators of indigenization. The pragmatic nativization of English in South Asian countries like India has been explored by several scholars (e.g. Larina & Suryanaryan, 2013; 2023). No research has been conducted on address forms in Pakistani varieties of English.

The paper focuses on the university setting and aims to investigate contextual and socio-cultural dimensions which guide the choice of address forms among multilingual students speaking Pakistani English. The reason for choosing an academic setting lies in communicative problems in multicultural and multilingual classes which are not uncommon nowadays due to academic mobility as well as multicultural societies. A multilingual environment creates the necessity to understand what attitudes the interlocutors convey with address forms and why they switch from English to their native language. We hypothesize that communicative values embedded in identity of multilingual the students guide their choice of address forms in a particular context. We aim to answer the following questions:

1. What categories of address forms do Pakistani students use to address each other in a university setting and what is their preference?
2. What contextual and socio-cultural factors guide their choice of an address form?
3. In what situations and for what pragmatic purposes do the students switch from English to their native language while addressing each other?

The paper begins with an introduction to the study followed by a brief overview of the literature. It then specifies the data and methodology adopted in this study and presents the findings and their discussion followed by the concluding remarks.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

To investigate address forms that are used in Pakistani English in a university setting and their contextual and socio-cultural variations it is important to start with the linguistic scenario and language policy of the education system in their cultural and linguistic contexts.

MULTILINGUALISM IN PAKISTANI UNIVERSITIES

Pakistan is a multi-linguacultural country and culture influences the interlocutor's language and communication. As it is well-known culture is an important factor in language use that influences a speaker's behavior, in Hofstede's words culture is “software of the mind” (Hofstede, 1991). Theoretically, we focus on Pakistani linguaculture formed by a variety of languages and cultures.

As Risager (2012) states linguaculture (or languaculture) is “a concept that focuses on culture in language or the cultural dimensions of language. It has been developed to contribute to a more differentiated conceptual frame in the interface between studies of language and studies of culture” (Risager, 2012, p. 596). Moreover, linguaculture centers on and identifies the connection between language and culture to designate the cultural dimensions of language in a globalized world (Risager, 2012; Sharifian, 2017). Cultural studies in linguistics suggest cultural frameworks that help shape language uses, and explain and draw parameters. (Sharifian, 2017). Pakistani communicative values are essential for investigating address forms and knowing how culture affects language use and the speaker's mind.

Pakistan is mainly a Muslim (96.4%) populated country with a people of nearly 207.77 million (Pakistan Bureau of Statistics, 2017). The national language is Urdu, whereas, English remains the official language. The other indigenous languages are Punjabi (38.78%), Pashto (18.24%), Sindhi (14.57%), Seraiki (12.19%), Urdu (7.08%), Balochi (3.02%), Hindko (2.44%), Brahui (1.24%), Kashmiri (0.17%) and “other languages” (2.26%) (Census, 2017). Among “other languages” there are at least 65 languages (Rahman, 2008); overall 77 languages are spoken in the country (Eberhard et al., 2020). It is noteworthy to mention that Sindhi used in the Sindhi-speaking parts of Sindh province, is the only language that has provincially official status. The high linguistic diversity results in multilingualism in Pakistan. While the language of education adopted by schools are native language, Urdu is the most widely used medium of instruction in public-sector schools and colleges. Whereas, English is the medium of instruction in elite schools, private colleges, private schools, and universities (Rahman 2008).

Thus, the Pakistani university environment is multilingual as the students come from different provinces and speak different languages. Despite the variety of languages, the culture has a lot in common. Speakers of all these languages share basic Islamic values such as belief in one Allah and the Muhammad PBUH is the last prophet, brotherhood, respect for elders, and social justice due to their religious following (Ashraf et al., 2021). These values are reflected in borrowings of administrative posts, in education, and marriage, as well as in the discourse (Mahboob, 2008).

MULTILINGUALISM, CODE-SWITCHING, AND CODE-MIXING

Multilingualism is "the use by an individual or a group of people of multiple languages, each of which is selected following a specific communicative situation" (Sadykova et al., 2018, p. 18). A person who can possess the ability to speak and understand more than one language is known as multilingual. The multilingual environment in Pakistani educational institutes is a common phenomenon. Students in Pakistan belong to different areas urban and rural which results in linguistic diversity.

Multilingual ability increases the cognitive experience of the individual, which consists in enriching knowledge of linguaculture. As a result, it enhances the achievements, and norms of native and national cultures and languages. Multilinguals cognition is reflected through the understanding of one's cultural association, hence, significant for understanding bilingual students' immersion in culture (Qureshi & Aljanadbah, 2021). Consequently, multilinguals reflect their background, thinking patterns, and inclusive cognitive interpretation and self-determination when they communicate. Address terms are important due to their meanings display communicators' thinking patterns and their shaping understanding of reality including social and cognitive ones (Wierzbicka, 2013). Therefore, it can be stated that reality is shaped and reflected through terms

of address with some essential distinctions in prioritizing and consistency of using address forms that show a level of formality or intimacy while communicating in a bi-multilingual society.

Pakistani speakers of English use code-switching and code-mixing often depending on the context and their intentions in a particular situation. This tendency of the mixture is due to the interlocutors' socio-cultural and linguistic reasons and they adjust their message appropriateness while performing code-switching and code-mixing. This code-switching practice among Pakistani students and teachers seems to have developed a different 'language' and it reflects their socialization in a multicultural and multilingual environment (Shah, et al., 2020). However, the continuous practice of code-switching between English and the native language brings the case of Pakistani English to certain own peculiarities in phonology, morphology, syntax, and pragmatics (Rahman, 2008; Mahboob, 2008 among others). The peculiarities of code-switching and mixing demonstrate interlocutors' communicative strategy, and cross-cultural understanding of relations between multicultural and pluralistic communities (Zipagan, et al., 2022). We use the terms of variances of codes across sentences, and code-mixing within sentences (Kachru & Nelson, 2006). Due to students' multicultural and multilingual backgrounds, we aim to explore socio-cultural and bi-multilingual identity in the usage of address forms.

ADDRESS FORMS AND NAMING IN PAKISTAN

Address forms are "the words speakers use to designate the person while they are talking to them" (Fasold, 1990:2). They are indicators of individual identities, and the interlocutor's communicative values, and display an attitude toward the addressee. Address forms are used differently in various communities and their linguistic repertoire expresses what is socially, culturally, and semantically permitted in communication. On the whole, address forms an important part of communication that reflects the socio-cultural values of interlocutors.

According to Braun's scheme of address forms categorization (Braun, 1988), the main address categories are names, kinship terms, endearment terms, honorifics, and titles.

Names "belong to the nominal repertory of address in all kinds of languages," (Braun, 1988: 9-10). They consist of several classes in Pakistani naming. Names are identities assigned to individuals based on their cultural norms. In Pakistan which is mainly a Muslim country (96.4 %), the naming relies on religion. Names are associated with the rural and urban perception of identity; ethnic identities; level of religiosity and its type and social class (Rahman, 2013). Names can be first names for males *Muhammad* or *Ahmed* for instance are most commonly used as a given name. These first names are followed by the second name *Ali* or *Usman*, resulting in a unique combination name typical of Pakistani names for instance *Muhammad Ali* or *Usman Ahmed* or vice versa. Similarly, for females, *Fatima* is the given name but takes the second name also as *Noor* i.e. *Fatima Noor* or vice versa. Thus names in Pakistan tend to be combined and are usually given two names for one person and it is considered Islamic by ordinary people. The use of combined names is common in Pakistan and their usage shows formal relations and tokens of respect in comparison to first names. However, people in Pakistan may not have adequate knowledge of Arabic or other religious practices except for local customs and lack Arabic language knowledge but there is a general desire to give Islamic names to children in Pakistan (Rahman, 2013; Schimmel, 1989).

Kinship terms are "terms for blood relations and affine," and its fictive use of non-blood relatives is called fictive use of kinship terms expressing a relation different from the biological one (Braun, 1988: 9-10). Kinship terms are an important category used in communication between interlocutors in Wierzbicka's words kinship terms are "seen as an essential guide to ways in which

speakers of many languages understand their social world” (Wierzbicka, 2013, p. 302). Pakistani interlocutors use this category in different ways for the addressee of blood relation and in-laws, with non-blood relations to show closeness, and with a stranger out of courtesy. Thus, kinship terms are markers of linguacultural identity and represent social reality (Suryanarayan & Khalil, 2021).

Endearments are defined by their usage in the context and the function with differences in formal or semantic characteristics. They are "conventionalized, but linguistic creativity and individual imagination play an important part here" (Braun, 1988, pp. 9-10). Endearment terms are expressions that convey intimacy. They are defined as words of address "that speakers use to address others such as people with whom they regard their relationship to be intimate" (Crystal, 2011:169). This category in our study was used by multilingual students from both English and native languages varying across different contexts and functions.

Honorifics are general forms that are in common use in English, however, this category "would involve language-specific properties." (Braun, 1988, pp. 9-10). Honorifics can vary in different languages e.g. English Mr/Miss has an equivalent in Arabic "'*al syed* (Mr), *al anessa* (Miss)' (Braun, 1988). In Sindhi '*mohtaram / mohtarma* (respectable) and *sain* (honorable)' and in Urdu '*janab* (Sir/Gentleman)', etc., can be used usually as variants relying on different contexts and social characteristics. Titles as a category differ in every language and the lack of consent on what should be classified as a title. However, the use of titles refers to those forms of address which are bestowed, attained by appointment (e.g. *Engineer, Doctor, senior, junior*, etc.), or inherited.

Additionally, in our study, another identified category of address term is caste used to address the interlocutor in Pakistan. Caste is another socially constructed identity (Mumtaz et al., 2022) and a prestigious component of identity (Rahman, 2013). Historically, it constructs as a structural stratification and proceeds from Hindu traditions in Pakistan, but in Muslim culture, caste is seen as a regressive symbol of Hinduism (Mumtaz, et al, 2022). Though caste in Muslim culture is discouraged because it segregates society from the socio-economic point of view. In Pakistan, it is still an important component of culture and is seen as a cultural factor and identity marker of interlocutors. Caste shows the socio-economic background and is an identity-constructing component in communication. Pakistan has varieties of castes varying in provinces and different ethnicity like Punjabi, Pathan, Sindhi, Seraiki, Balochi, etc. For instance, in Sindh province, Bhutto, Soomro, Talpur, Qureshi, Memon, Arain, etc, are common.

Zero address forms are used to avoid any names or other categories of address forms for the addressee. This category does not correspond to any particular pattern. Interlocutors can use greetings such as hi/hello, *Assalam-o-alykum*, *Sallam*, *adab* (means respect and politeness), etc., and attention seekers/getters like excuse me.

METHODS AND DATA

The present study followed an interdisciplinary theoretical framework based on cultural studies (Hofstede 1991;) cross-and intercultural pragmatics (Wierzbicka, 2003; Kecskes, 2014), cultural linguistics (Risager, 2012; Sharifian, 2017), bilingualism and multilingualism (Rahman, 2008; Ashraf, et al. 2021 to mention a few), code-switching and code-mixing (Kachru & Nelson, 2006; among others) and studies on address forms (Braun, 1988, Formentelli, 2009; Norrby & Wide, 2015 to mention a few).

The study aims to specify the set of address forms used in Pakistani academic settings by multilingual students while speaking English and define the role of context (situational, social, and cultural) in their choice and preference. Particular attention was paid to the choice between English and native form of address and the identification of their stylistic and pragmatic differences. We have limited our study to the interaction between students in three social contexts and explored addressing a peer (a classmate), a junior student, and a senior student to see the role of social factors.

The data set was obtained from the questionnaire on address forms in an academic setting through the adapted questionnaire from Larina and Suryanarayan (2023) as a primary tool for the data collection. It was further supplemented and verified by ethnographic observation. 252 undergraduate students from public sector universities participated in the survey (the names of universities are kept anonymous for ethical considerations) located in the Sindh province of Pakistan. The respondents' participation was voluntary and a consent form was provided. The responses showed that the majority of the students were bi and multilingual speaking English and 1, 2, or even 3 local languages, namely, Sindhi, Urdu, Balochi, Punjabi, and Seraiki.

The questionnaire contained nineteen questions aiming to find address forms used in different university settings, namely, in the classroom and department (formal situations), café (informal situations), and digital communication i.e. SMS. The participants were asked to indicate address forms while addressing a specific person such as a classmate, junior student, and senior student in different settings. It is worth mentioning that in Pakistani educational institutions, the students studying in a lower year like the first year are titled "junior" when equated to the students who are studying in the second to the fourth year are titled "senior". Thus, our goal was to explore address forms in symmetrical and asymmetrical relations distinguishing between formal and informal contexts.

A sample of address forms (see Table 1) was provided for a better participants' understanding and to get desired outcomes from the respondents. We used purposive sampling for data collection as it simplifies the analysis method and helps to find suitable outcomes for the study (Creswell and Plano, 2007). A data cleansing strategy was used to refine data and exclude incomplete responses and eliminate errors made by respondents before coding.

TABLE 1. Analytical scheme of address forms

Sr. No	Address forms category	Examples
1	Names	<i>First Name</i> Adeel, Shakeel, Shamsa, Safeena, etc.
		<i>Combination Names^b</i> Hassan Mustafa, Mehrosh Fatima, etc.
2	Titles	Junior, Senior.
3	Honorifics	Mr. Miss. Sir, Madam, Ma'am, etc.
4	Kinship terms	Brother, Bro, Ada/Bha/Bhao ' <i>brother</i> ' (in Sindhi), Bhai ' <i>brother</i> ' (in Urdu), Adi/Bajee ' <i>sister</i> ' (in Sindhi) Aapa/Aapi/Behen ' <i>sister</i> ' (in Urdu), etc.
5	Endearment terms	Dear, Dilbar ' <i>beloved</i> ' (in Sindhi), Mitha ' <i>sweetheart/sweetie</i> ' (in Sindhi), Pyara ' <i>beloved</i> ' (in Sindhi), Yar/Yaar ' <i>close friend</i> ', (in Sindhi/Urdu), etc.

^b Combination names are commonly given naming practices in Pakistan, e.g. Hassan Mustafa, for a one-person. It shows more respect for addressing a person with combination names.

6 Caste terms of Soomro, Qureshi, Talpur, Bhutto, Jamali, Memon, Arain, etc.
address

The data gathered from a total of n=252 questionnaires were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Part-1 data which contain information about gender, age, education qualification, and linguistic background were analyzed through SPSS v.20, and findings were measured in the descriptive statistics form. We acknowledge that gender is a significant variable, whereas, gender differences and preferences in addressing have been excluded in this study. Part-2 data were analyzed through descriptive percentage and frequency through SPSS v.20. As the data set contained English address forms as well as the address forms borrowed from Sindhi, Urdu, Balochi, Punjabi, Seraiki, and other local languages, we considered them under the term 'native' address forms for the holistic presentation of the data.

For analytical purposes, we followed Braun's (1988) scheme of address categories which is widely implemented by scholars who study address forms across cultures (Forementelli, 2009; Khalil & Larina, 2022; to mention a few). We assumed that the notion of address forms may be new to participants, thus, we proposed to explain the address forms notion. However, if any query occurred regarding the analytical scheme from the participants it was responded to.

Based on categorization and different contexts our findings were analyzed in three subsections for clarification and a better understanding of the results. Subsequently, the first findings subsection explores address forms between peers (classmates), the second subsection presents address forms for the junior from senior-students bottom-up contexts, and the last subsection shows address forms for senior from junior-students top-down contexts. The findings are presented in descriptive statistics run through SPSS v.20 in percentages and frequency for each identified address form. Additionally, the finding subsections are shared in qualitative form also.

FINDINGS

Based on the analysis of collected data, the findings on addressing practices in multilingual students were identified as names, kinship terms, terms of endearments, honorifics, titles, caste, and zero address (see Table 2). Kinship terms and terms of endearment were represented both by English address terms and the terms borrowed from native languages. The context and frequency of their use will be described further.

ADDRESSING A PEER (CLASSMATE)

The analysis of data reveals that the most frequent address form between classmates as expected is the first name. It was used by 51.1% of respondents in the formal context with few variations (informal (49.6%), and digital communication (40.1%). We also observed some nicknames^c in informal (2.0%) and digital (4.4%) communication which are markers of informality. The second highest frequency point is kinship terms which are quite interesting on the whole. Students use kinship terms in the formal contexts (33.0%), which decreased a little in the informal contexts (26.5%) and was higher in digital communication (29.0%). It is worth noting that kinship terms were used in English and native languages. English kinship terms ranged from informal 'bro/sis' to more formal address 'brother/sister' and some employed combination of 'sister + FN' (e.g. *sister Mehrosh*). However, according to our findings, students give preference to native kinship terms

^c Nicknames in our study are defined as substitute addressing terms for a known person, which can show affection and endearment. Short names should not be replaced with nicknames here.

taken from their native language e.g. *ada / bha / bhao* (Sindhi) ‘brother’ and *adi / bajee* (Sindhi) *aapa / aapi / behn* (Urdu) ‘sister’. It can be noticed that the use of native kinship terms is most frequent in formal contexts (25.8%) and decreases to (17.8%) in informal situations and is observed less frequently in digital communication (10.4%) which suggests some pragmatic and stylistic differences between English and native kinship terms which will be discussed further.

Another category that shows friendship is terms of endearment which was also observed in English and native languages. In English, it was the only term *dear* used in all the contexts, while native languages' endearment terms appeared to be more variable but less frequent, e.g. *pyara / jani / mitha / dilbar* (Sindhi) ‘beloved’ (for male only) and *pyari / jana* (Sindhi) ‘beloved’ (for females only), and *yar / yaar* (Sindhi and Urdu) ‘(close)friend’. It is worth mentioning that ‘dear’ was mostly used by itself without the first name while native endearment terms were often followed by the first name of the address (e.g. *yar / yaar Hassan*). Terms of endearment were used most frequently in digital communication (18.7%) whereas the English term ‘dear’ was domineering and accounted for (10.7%) of uses. As expected they were less typical for the formal context (English ‘dear’ accounted for 4.4% and native for 3.2%).

It was rather unexpected to observe the use of the English honorifics ‘Mr/Miss’ 4.0% among classmates, though it is used mostly for teachers and people with some office responsibilities. In our data, we have only observed English honorifics which is uncommon in the rest of the findings.

Caste as a term of address between peers is a category used along with other categories. Though it was used less frequently (see Table 2) however, it can be considered an indicator of Pakistani tradition to use cast terms (e.g. Soomro, Bhutto) to address an interlocutor as a marker of closeness and mutual understanding. The caste category was used for 3.1% in informal contexts and decreased in formal and digital communication.

The last category found was zero address form which was observed in all contexts. As our findings show some students limit themselves to greetings (e.g. Hi/Hello) and avoid nominal address forms. It seems to be more typical of digital communication where zero address form accounted for 9.0% (see Table 2).

TABLE 2. Descriptive statistics for addressing a peer (classmate)

Address forms category	Identified address form/s	Contexts			
		Formal	Informal	In digital communication	
		%	%	%	
Names	First name	51.1	49.6	40.1	
	Nickname	0	2.0	4.4	
Kinship terms	English	<i>brother/bro sister/sis</i> <i>sister+first name</i>	7.2	8.7	18.6
	Native	<i>Ada / Bha / Bhao</i> (Sindhi) ‘brother’ <i>Adi / Bajee</i> (Sindhi) / <i>Aapa / Aapi / Behn</i> (Urdu) ‘sister’	25.8	17.8	10.4
			7.6	15.2	18.7

Terms of endearments	English	<i>dear</i>	4.4	4.0	10.7
	Native	<i>yar / yaar</i> (Sindhi/Urdu) '(close)friend' <i>pyara / jani / dilbar / mitha</i> (Sindhi) 'beloved' (for males) <i>pyari / jana /</i> (Sindhi) 'beloved' (for females only)	3.2	11.2	8.0
Honorifics	English	<i>Mr/Miss</i>	4.0	3.2	1.6
	Native		0	0	0
Caste		<i>Soomro, Bhutto, etc.</i>	1.3	3.1	1.6
Zero address form			3.0	3.6	9.0
Total			100.0	100.0	100.0

ADDRESSING A JUNIOR

While addressing a junior, students use different categories of address forms, the most common being first names (see table 3). They were observed in formal (48.0%), informal (48.0%), and digital communication (42.7%). Additionally, 1.6% use nicknames in digital communication whereas, no student used nicknames in formal and informal contexts.

The second most frequent category was kinship terms with a decreased use of 25.0% in formal situations as compared to classmates (33.0%). The use of kinship terms for juniors in English 'bro/sis or brother/sister' ranged between 12.3% to 13.8% in all contexts. On the other hand, the decreased use of native languages kinship terms *ada / bha / bhao* (Sindhi) 'brother' and *adi / bajee* (Sindhi) 'sister', and *aapa / aapi / behn* (Urdu) 'sister' were noticed for the juniors in contrast to classmates.

The use of endearments for junior students ranged from 5.6% (in formal context) to 15.1% (in digital communication) with the preferences for native endearments *pyara / jani / mitha / dilbar / pyari / jana* (Sindhi) 'beloved'. The use of native endearments indicates increased closeness in contrast to the English address form.

The most intriguing finding is the use of honorifics 'Mr/Miss' (6.0%) in formal contexts which shows the speaker's Anglicized attitude in interactions. Another finding is the use of the title 'junior' (6.3%) in formal contexts and its decrease in informal and digital communication.

There were also a few cases of the usage of caste as a term of address in formal situations (1.6%). Zero address form increased in the informal contexts by 8.0% for juniors, and it remained constant in formal and in digital communication (see Table 3).

TABLE 3. Descriptive statistics for addressing a junior

Address forms category	Identified address form/s	Contexts			
		Formal	Informal	In digital communication	
		%	%	%	
Names		49.6	49.2	44.3	
	First name	48.0	48.0	42.7	
	Combination name	0.8	0.4	0	
	Nickname	0	0	1.6	
Kinship terms		25.0	28.5	26.1	
	English				
		<i>brother/bro</i>	12.7	12.3	13.8
		<i>sister/sis</i>			
		<i>sister+first name</i>			
	Native	<i>Ada / Bha / Bhao</i>	12.3	16.2	12.3
		(Sindhi) ‘brother’			
		<i>Adi / Bajee</i> (Sindhi)			
		<i>/Aapa / Aapi / Behn</i>			
		(Urdu) ‘sister’			
Terms of endearments		5.6	8.0	15.1	
	English				
		<i>dear</i>	1.6	5.6	9.1
	Native				
		<i>yar / yaar</i>	4.0	2.4	6.0
		(Sindhi/Urdu)			
		‘(close)friend’			
		<i>pyara / jani / dilbar</i>			
		<i>/ mitha</i> (Sindhi)			
		‘beloved’ (for males)			
		<i>pyari / jana</i>			
		(Sindhi) ‘beloved’ (for females only)			
Honorifics	English	<i>Mr/Miss</i>	6.0	3.6	3.6
	Native		0	0	0
Titles	English	<i>Junior</i>	6.3	1.2	0.8
	Native		0	0	0
Caste		<i>Soomro, Bhutto, etc.</i>	1.6	1.5	1.4
Zero address form			5.9	8.0	8.7
Total			100.0	100.0	100.0

ADDRESSING A SENIOR

In line with the other findings for addressing a senior, we have observed a salient decrease in the usage of 'names' in all three contexts. They have only accounted for 24.6% in the formal context, 26.2% in the informal, and 23.8% in digital communication. These findings indicate a decrease in informality in addressing a senior. There were also a few cases of the use of combination names

(e.g. Hassan Mustafa) which shows respect to the addressee who is older. No nicknames have been observed.

While addressing a senior, the most frequently used category is kinship terms (48.0% in informal situations, with some differences in formal and digital communication). It is important to note that the use of native kinship terms increased in contrast to English for seniors in all contexts. Thus, the native kinship terms as *ada / bha* (Sindhi) ‘brother’, *adi / bajee* (Sindhi) ‘sister’, *aapa / aapi / behn* (Urdu) ‘sister’ was the most commonly employed by students for the senior addressee (see table 4).

The use of terms of endearments on the contrary has decreased for seniors by (6.4 %) in formal contexts with a slight difference in informal situations, and an increase in digital communication by (12.7%). Moreover, it is noticed that students relied on using more English endearment term ‘dear’ against native language endearments. This tendency of native address forms like *yar / yaar* (from both Sindhi and Urdu) is suitable at the peer and junior levels. However, it is discouraged for seniors.

Honorifics as address forms for senior students is another main finding in contrast to previous data of a peer (a classmate) and a junior. In all formal and informal contexts, students use the honorific ‘sir/miss’ more frequently (14.3% in digital communication, with some decrease in formal situations and informal contexts). Another interesting finding is the use of the title ‘senior’ by students in their communication in formal situations (6.0%). It decreased in informal situations and digital communication. The findings show that students prefer to use titles and honorifics to address terms in their conversations with senior students to show respect and honor together.

There is no use of caste as a term of address for seniors. The zero address forms usage for seniors was noticed at 9.4% in informal contexts. Which decreased in formal contexts to 6.5%, and in digital communication to 8.3 %.

TABLE 4. Descriptive statistics for addressing a senior

Address forms category	Identified address form/s	Contexts		
		Formal (%)	Informal (%)	In digital communication (%)
Names	First name	24.6	26.2	23.8
	Combination names	23.4	23.8	22.2
	Nicknames	1.2	2.4	1.6
Kinship terms	English	0	0	0
	Native	43.7	48.0	39.7
	English	17.5	17.0	16.7
	Native	26.2	31.0	23.0

Terms of endearments			6.4	6.0	12.7
	English	<i>dear</i>	3.2	3.6	10.7
	Native	<i>yar / yaar</i> (Sindhi/Urdu) '(close)friend' <i>pyara / jani / dilbar / mitha</i> (Sindhi) 'beloved' (for males) <i>pyari / jana /</i> (Sindhi) 'beloved' (for females only)	3.2	2.4	2.0
Honorifics	English	<i>Sir/Miss</i>	12.8	8.8	14.3
	Native		0	0	0
Titles	English	<i>senior</i>	6.0	1.6	1.2
	Native		0	0	0
Caste			0	0	0
Zero address form			6.5	9.4	8.3
Total			100.0	100.0	100.0

DISCUSSION

As the findings show, in all the settings explored Pakistani students use various categories of address forms interacting with each other with some variation in their preference. Names and kinship terms appear to be the most dominant categories. However, salient differences have been observed in their frequency and priority. For instance, the use of the first name indicating intimacy and close relationships is frequent among peers (51.1%) but it decreases in addressing a senior student (24.6%) where the kinship form of address seems to be the most preferable (47.3%). The usage of kinship terms in addressing a junior student has appeared to be twice less frequent. These findings corroborate the studies which argue that kinship terms substitute names in contexts where more respect and formality are needed (e.g. Suryanarayan & Khalil, 2021; Khalil & Larina, 2022).

The findings show that although students represent a social group with no power distance and a minimal age difference Pakistani students demonstrate a strong sensitivity to the context and variations in formality and informality by using different categories of address forms. Besides some limitations to the use of first names in addressing a senior, we have observed such markers of formality as combination names, and honorifics (Sir/Miss). The titles *senior* and *junior* demonstrate hierarchy among students, and adherence to asymmetrical relations and formality. These findings suggest that the value of respect for the elders plays a crucial role in communication even among those who belong to the same social group and are considered equals in many other countries.

It is also worth mentioning that some of our data particularly concerning the use of nicknames and honorifics seem contradictory at first glance. Nicknames have only been used to address a classmate and have not been observed in addressing a junior. Honorifics *Mr/Miss* have appeared in addressing juniors more often than to peers with an expected increase in their number when addressing seniors. These findings suggest that social distance (horizontal distance) also plays a role. Informality seems to be acceptable among those who belong to the same group (as classmates). Out-group members are treated with more formality even if they are juniors. Further study is needed to verify and elaborate on this idea.

Address forms used in digital communication appear to be more informal in comparison with face-to-face communication. We can observe the increase of terms of endearment in all the settings (in addressing a peer, a junior, and a senior), a decrease in titles and zero address forms, and addressing a peer and junior by some nicknames. We suggest that the increased informality found in digital communication in students' interactions might be due to the modernized medium of communication and the tendency to short messages typical of digital communication genres.

Another research question raised in the study concerns the use of address forms borrowed from native languages. Although English is a medium of instruction in Pakistani universities the use of native address forms by students is consistently practiced on the whole. We have observed native address forms among kinship terms and terms of endearment. The nativized kinship terms *ada / bha / bhao* (in Sindhi) 'brother' and *adi / bajee* (in Sindhi) *aapi / behn / aapa* (in Urdu) 'sister' for a senior student are broadly used. They show a stronger bond of relationships as compared to English 'bro/sis' or 'brother/sister' and make students' culture and values and identity evident in their interaction. Additionally, students want to maintain a certain degree of closeness and adherence to conventional norms in their interaction by changing from English to their native languages. This can also be seen in the use of the terms of endearment where along with the only English term *dear* a variety of native terms has been observed, e.g. *pyara / jani* (in Sindhi) 'beloved', *mitha* (in Sindhi) 'sweetheart/sweetie', *dilbar* (in Sindhi and Urdu) 'beloved', *pyari / jana* (in Sindhi) 'beloved' (for female). To show more intimacy to the addressee Pakistani students prefer the term *yar / yaar* ('friend' or 'close friend' in Sindhi and Urdu) to the English *friend* which does not have the same meaning. In contrast to *a friend* which means a person I know and like, in our context, *yar / yaar* is a person with whom the addresser shares all life matters i.e. family, social and emotional, etc. Predominantly similar tendencies for the terms *yar / yaar* as well as kinship terms *bhaiya* 'brother' *didi* 'older sister' used as address forms by bilingual students observed in Indian English (Larina & Suryanaryan, 2013; 2023). The use of kinship terms beyond the family is a salient marker of the we-identity of the speakers and their belonging to we-culture which values closeness of relations (Larina, 2015; Larina, et al., 2017) and where individuals are seen as members of a big family (Khalil & Larina, 2022; Suryanarayan & Khalil, 2021).

We suggest that code-mixing and native forms of address are used to express the attitudes and values of bi-multilingual which cannot be conveyed through English terms. Native terms of address in face-to-face interactions highlight intimacy (Keshavarz, 2001; Larina & Suryanarayan, 2013; 2023; Suryanarayan & Khalil, 2021) while English terms seem to be more typical of formal contexts (e.g. Sir/Miss to address a senior student). On the other hand, the use of English terms (bro/sis, Mr/Miss) among students may demonstrate students' intention to show Anglicized behavior, English language skills, and educated background. It has been noted that English terms of address, in general, are more typical of digital communication which may suggest that the usage of modern technical devices encourages them to be more Anglicized.

In addition, in our study, a few cases of the use of caste as a term of address has been found in students' interaction. They have been observed addressing a peer and a junior as a marker of frankness, intimacy, and gesture of understanding. With limitations in the use of caste, our study needs to explore the phenomenon in detail as this research work is part of the ongoing research project.

Thus, our findings emphasize the role of socio-cultural factors affecting the use and choice of address forms in specific communicative contexts (situational, social, and cultural). The study confirms that socio-cognitive reasons are reflected in multilingual students' communication, which guides their usage of address forms in the academic setting in Pakistani English. It shows

how “large-scale ideologies as well as norms developed in different contexts and on different levels [...] inform and shape politeness” (Locher & Larina 2019: 876-877).

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this study, we aimed to define the categories of address forms used by multilingual Pakistani students speaking in English in an academic setting and to trace the impact of socio-cultural context and identity on their choice in different situations both symmetrical and asymmetrical. We have limited our study to the interaction between students in three social contexts and explored addressing a peer (a classmate), a junior student, and a senior student. Among the categories of address terms, we have observed names, kinship terms, endearment terms, honorifics, titles, zero address forms, as well as some cases of the use of caste as a term of address.

The study shows that while speaking in English Pakistani bi-multilingual use a creative mixture of different categories of address forms both English and native ones to express their attitudes and values. Our findings indicate a strong sensitivity of Pakistani students to the context and asymmetry of relations. Even though students represent a social group with no power distance, Pakistani students demonstrate their adherence to hierarchy among junior and senior students resulting in variation of formality and informality, which is a verbal confirmation of the high power distance index in Pakistani society (Hofstede 1991).

To show formality and respect they prefer kinship terms to names, and use compound names, titles, and honorifics. The results testify to the fact that closeness of relations on the one hand and respect for those who are older, on the other hand, are dominant values of Pakistani society that guide the communicative behavior of people including those who in many other cultures are considered equals. It is worth emphasizing that these different directional strategies aimed at showing closeness and respect can be used simultaneously. The same was previously observed in Indian English by Larina and Suryanarayan (2013) which allowed them to define the Indian English style of communication as "solidarity-hierarchical" or "kinship-hierarchical" (Larina and Suryanarayan, 2013:206).

The study gives new facts about the impact of context, values, and identity as well as the native language on address forms and their functioning in a bi-multilingual context. It also confirms that “multilingual language users have more options of codes, strategies, and nuances since they control more than one linguistic system” (Kachru and Nelson 2006:19).

Despite some limitations concerning the context discussed as well as the material, the study provides some new data of address form variations and its findings might contribute to sociolinguistics, pragmatics, variational linguistics, bi-multilingualism, and cultural linguistics. For further research, we intend to explore the sociocultural aspects of students' interaction with teachers and other staff members focusing on natural interaction and the analysis of politeness strategies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This publication has been supported by the RUDN University Scientific Projects Grant System, project № 050734-2-000.

REFERENCES

- Ashraf, M., Turner, D., & Laar, R. (2021). Multilingual language practices in education in Pakistan: The conflict between policy and practice. *SAGE Open*: 1-14. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211004140>
- Braun, F. (1988). *Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Census-2017. Census report of Pakistan. Islamabad: Population Census Organization. <https://www.pbs.gov.pk/content/final-results-census-2017>
- Clyne, M. (2009) Address in intercultural communication across languages. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 6(3), 395–409. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/IPRG.2009.020>
- Creswell, J., & Plano, V. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Crystal, D. (2011). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (Vol. 30). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Eberhard, D. M., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (ed.). (2020). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (23-rd ed.). SIL International. <http://www.ethnologue.com>
- Fasold, R. (1990). *Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford.
- Formentelli, M. (2009). Address strategies in a British academic setting. *Pragmatics*, 19 (2), 179-196. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.19.2.02for>
- Formentelli, M., & Hajek, J. (2016). Address practices in academic interactions in a pluricentric language: Australian English, American English, and British English. *Pragmatics*, 26(4), 631-652. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.26.4.05for>
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. Limburgat Maastricht, The Netherlands: The McGraw-Hills Companies.
- Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk and H.G. Widdowson (ed.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, Y. & Nelson, C. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian Contexts*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kecskes I., 2014. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keshavarz, M.H. (2001). The role of social context, intimacy, and distance in the choice of forms of address. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 148, 5-18. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2001.015>
- Khalil, A., & Larina, T. (2022). Terms of endearment in American English and Syrian Arabic family discourse. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 13(1), 27-44. doi: <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2022-13-1-27-44>
- Larina, T. (2015). Culture-specific communicative styles as a framework for interpreting linguistic and cultural idiosyncrasies. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 7(2), 195-215. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1163/18773109-00702003>
- Larina, T., & Suryanarayan, N. (2013). Madam or aunty ji: address forms in British and Indian English as a reflection of culture and cognition. In Monika Reif, Justina A. Robinson, Martin Putz (ed.) *Variation in Language and Language Use: Linguistic, Socio-Cultural and Cognitive Perspectives*. Peter Lang.
- Larina, T., & Suryanarayan, N. (2023). Address forms in academic discourse in Indian English. In Nicole Baumgarten and Roel Vismans (ed.) *Forms of Address in Contrastive*

- Contexts. 142-170. John Benjamins Publ.
- Larina, T., Ozyumenko, V. & Kurteš, S. (2017). I-identity vs we-identity in language and discourse: Anglo-Slavonic perspectives. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 13(1), 109-128. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/lpp-2017-0006>
- Locher, M. A. & Larina T.V. (2019). Introduction to politeness and impoliteness research in global contexts. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 23 (4). Special issue: Politeness and Impoliteness Research in Global Contexts. 873—903. doi:10.22363/2687-0088-2019-23-4-873-903
- Mahboob, A. (2008). Pakistani English: Morphology and syntax. In R. Mesthrie, B. Kortmann & E. Schneider (Ed.), *4 Africa, South and Southeast Asia*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110208429.2.578>
- Mumtaz, Z., Jhangri, G., Bhatti, A., & Ellison, G. (2022). Caste in Muslim Pakistan: a structural determinant of inequities in the uptake of maternal health services. *Sexual and Reproductive Health Matters*, 29(2), 1-23. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/26410397.2022.2035516>
- Norrby C., & Wide C. (2015). Introduction: Address practice as social action across cultures and contexts. In *Address Practice as Social Action: European Perspectives*, Catrin Norrby, Camilla Wide (ed.). Houndsmills—Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. doi: 10.1057/9781137529923.0006
- Ozyumenko, V. (2020). Addressing a judge in national varieties of English. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 24(1), 137–157. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-2020-24-1-137-157>
- Pakistan Bureau of Statistics (2017). <https://www.pbs.gov.pk/content/final-results-census-2017>
- Qureshi, M.A., & Aljanadbah, A. (2021). Translanguaging and reading comprehension in a second language, *International Multilingual Research Journal*, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2021.2009158>
- Rahman, T. (2008). Language policy, multilingualism and language vitality in Pakistan. In A. Saxena & L. Borin (ed.), *Lesser-Known Languages of South Asia: Status and Policies, Case Studies and Applications of Information Technology*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197785.1.73>
- Rahman, T. (2013). Personal names of Pakistani Muslims: An essay on onomastics. *Pakistan Perspectives*, 18(1), 33-57.
- Risager, K. (2012). Linguaculture and transnationality: The cultural dimensions of language. In Jackson, J. (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication* (1st ed-n.). Routledge. doi: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203805640>
- Schimmel, A. (1989). *Islamic Names: An Introduction*. Edinburgh University Press. doi: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctvxcrhx>
- Shah, M., Pillai, S., & Sinayah, M. (2020). Identity construction through code-switching practices at a university in Pakistan. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, 20(4), 1-17. <http://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2020-2004-01>
- Sharifian, F. (2017). *Cultural Linguistics: Cultural Conceptualizations and Language*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Suryanarayan, N. & Khalil, A. (2021). Kinship terms as indicators of identity and social reality: A case study of Syrian Arabic and Hindi. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 25 (1), 125–146. doi: <https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-2021-25-1-125-146>
- Wierzbicka A. (2003). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*. 2-nd ed-n. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wierzbicka, A. (2020). Addressing God in European languages: Different meanings, different

cultural attitudes. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 24(2), 259-293.
doi: <https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-2020-24-2-259-293>

Zipagan, M.N., Tak, J., & Kwak, E. (2022). A diachronic study of code-switching patterns in the language of a third culture Filipino kid in Korea. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, 22(3). 24-42. doi: <http://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2022-2203-02>

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Muhammad Arif Soomro is an assistant professor of linguistics at Quaid-e-Awam University of Engineering, Science & Technology, Nawabshah-Sindh Pakistan. His research interest focuses on socio-psycholinguistics, multilingualism, address forms, and discourse analysis. Currently, he is a candidate of PhD at RUDN University, Moscow. He authored and co-authored research articles in communication and applied linguistics also.

Tatiana Larina is Doctor Habil., a Full Professor at RUDN University. Her research interests and publications deal with cultural linguistics, cross-cultural pragmatics, intercultural communication, communicative ethnostyles, and (im)politeness theory with a focus on English and Russian. She has numerous publications in Russian and English which comprise monographs, book chapters, and articles in peer-reviewed journals, including the International Review of Pragmatics, Intercultural Pragmatics, Journal of Politeness Research, and Lodz Papers in Pragmatics among others. She is currently the Editor-in-Chief of the Russian Journal of Linguistics.