PEOPLES' FRIENDSHIP UNIVERSITY OF RUSSIA NAMED AFTER PATRICE LUMUMBA

As a manuscript

ARIF Muhammad

ADDRESS FORMS IN PAKISTANI ENGLISH ACADEMIC DISCOURSE: A SOCIO-COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE

5.9.8 – Theoretical, applied, comparative and contrastive linguistics

THESIS

for a PhD Degree

in Philology

Scientific Supervisor:

Doctor Habil. of Philology, Professor

Tatiana Viktorovna Larina

Moscow-2024

ФЕДЕРАЛЬНОЕ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЕ АВТОНОМНОЕ ОБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНОЕ УЧРЕЖДЕНИЕ ВЫСШЕГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ «РОССИЙСКИЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ДРУЖБЫ НАРОДОВ имени ПАТРИСА ЛУМУМБЫ»

На правах рукописи

АРИФ Мухаммад

ФОРМЫ ОБРАЩЕНИЯ В АКАДЕМИЧЕСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ В ПАКИСТАНСКОМ ВАРИАНТЕ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА: СОЦИОКОГНИТИВНЫЙ АСПЕКТ

5.9.8 – Теоретическая, прикладная и сравнительно-сопоставительная лингвистика

ДИССЕРТАЦИЯ

на соискание учёной степени
кандидата филологических наук

Научный руководитель:

доктор филологических наук,

профессор Т.В. Ларина

Москва-2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The present thesis is a study of address forms[1] (hereinafter AFs) in Pakistani English (hereafter PakE) academic discourse used in symmetrical and asymmetrical contexts and explored through discursive, pragmatic, socio-cognitive and socio-cultural analyses.

The relevance of the study. Forms of address are among the most important linguistic means used to establish and maintain relationships between interlocutors. In the process of communication, they convey important information of a psychological, social, axiological and cultural nature, indicate the social status of the interlocutors, the level of distance or proximity between them, formality or informality, they signal their attitudes to each other and the values they share. In the process of communication, speakers constantly make decisions about choosing an AF to show how they position themselves and others in interaction. This choice depends on many factors, and the success of further interaction largely depends on its appropriateness.

Addressing is the most context-sensitive category. Forms of address vary due to the situational, social and cultural context. Each language has its own system of forms of address, which demonstrate culture-specific features of functioning in various situations and discourses (e.g., Baumgarten & Vismans 2023; Clyne, 2009; Hughson 2009; Kluge & Moyna 2019; Larina & Khalil 2018; Leech 1999; Norrby & Wide 2015; Norrby et al. 2019; Rendle-Short, 2007; 2011, to mention a few). These features are determined by social norms, as well as the sociocultural values of interlocutors, which are an important component of their lingua-cultural identity.

AFs differ not only across languages, but also across the varieties of the same language, which is a clear evidence of the impact of culture on language and

---

[1] Address forms and forms of address are used interchangeably in the present study.

5

its functioning. Studies conducted within the framework of socio-cognitive linguistics, pragmatics and bilingualism (e.g. Larina & Suryanarayan 2013, 2023; Mulo Farenkia 2019, Wong 2006, among others) demonstrate how bilinguals manipulate English and resort to their native language when they do not find the means to express the norms and values of their native culture. However, the study of AFs in a bilingual context has been paid no or little attention (Hughson 2009: 104). Moreover, in general, the discursive and pragmatic features of the varieties of pluricentric languages are insufficiently studied.

Such studies may reveal the unique peculiarity of the influence of one language over the other and their interrelation at the functional level, as well as give new evidences of the influence of the value system of bilingual identities on language use.

This work explores forms of address in Pakistani English. For our research, we chose academic discourse, which due to the growth of academic mobility, as well as various demographic and migration processes, has become increasingly heterogeneous in linguistic and cultural terms. Knowledge of the ethnocultural characteristics of forms of address and their functioning in various cultural contexts is an important component of intercultural communicative competence, which both students and teachers must have.

The relevance of the study is thus determined by the following main factors: (1) the importance of AF treatment in interpersonal interaction; (2) the dependence of AFs on the social and cultural context that determines their ethnocultural specificity, (3) the importance of identifying the ethnocultural characteristics of AFs and their functioning which can create difficulties in intercultural communication; (4) the need to study academic discourse from a cross-cultural perspective; (5) the insufficient study of the pragma-discursive features of the varieties of pluricentric languages ; (6) the need to continue research to identify the

influence of culture on language, consciousness and communication.

The degree of scientific development of the research problem. Forms of address and their functioning in various linguistic and cultural contexts are a relevant topic that attracts the attention of many researchers. However, their focus is mainly on European languages and cultures (e.g. Braun, 1988; Clyne, 2009; Formentelli, 2009; Hughson, 2009; Kretzenbacher, Norrby & Warren 2003; Norrby & Wide 2015; Tchesnokova, 1996, etc.). Not enough attention has been paid to research into other languages and cultures. Among the relatively some studies on forms of address in dialects of Arabic (Abalkheel, 2020; Ajlouni & Abulhaija, 2015; Alenizi, 2019; Al-Qudah 2017, Farghal & Shakir 1994, Khalil & Larina 2018), in Australian languages (Rendle-Short, 2007; 2011; Wierzbicka 2013).

AFs in varieties of pluricentric languages in multilingual contexts have also been understudied. There are studies of AFs in Chilean Spanish (Fernández-Mallat 2020), in Singaporean French (Mulo Farenkia 2019), in American, Australian and British English in academic discourse (Formentelli & Hajek 2016; Norrby, Schüpbach, Hajek & Kretzenbacher 2019), in British, American and Indian English (Abrar-ul-Hassan, 2010, Bruns, Hanna & Svenja Kranich 2021, Larina, Suryanarayan 2013, 2023), in Singapore English (Wong 2006), in Indian English (Larina & Suryanarayan 2013; 2023, Larina et al. 2019). However, no studies on AFs have been conducted in Pakistani English, especially in the sociocognitive and sociopragmatic perspectives. This research explores AFs in Pakistani English in the aforementioned perspectives.

Research hypothesis. Sociocultural, pragmatic and cognitive factors influence the system of forms of address used in Pakistani English and determine their variability.

The study aims to identify forms of address used by speakers of Pakistani

English in academic discourse, specify their pragmatic, functional and stylistic characteristics as well sociocultural and cognitive factors influencing their choice.

The following research **objectives** have been undertaken to meet this goal:

1) to what identify sociocultural factors that shape the identity of speakers of Pakistani English and are reflected in it;

2) to clarify the categories of forms of address used in academic discourse by speakers of Pakistani English, and identify their preferences in various social contexts, both symmetrical and asymmetrical;

3) to identify the pragmatic, functional and stylistic characteristics of English and native forms of address used by Pakistani bilinguals;

4) to find out why and in what situations Pakistani students and teachers mix English and native forms of address in English-language discourse, and what determines influencing their choice;

5) to identify the axiological components of the identity of Pakistani bi-/multilinguals, manifested in the functioning of forms of address in academic discourse in various contexts;

6) drawing on the findings to trace the interrelation of language, culture, cognition and communication observed in the forms of address in Pakistani English.

The study explores AFs in Pakistani English used by bilinguals[2] in academic discourse. It focuses on the categories of forms of address and their functioning in academic discourse in symmetrical (linear) and asymmetrical (bottom-up and top-down) contexts, as well as sociocultural and axiological factors that predetermine their choice

Data and methods. The data for the study were collected among students

---

[2] Although speakers of PakE typically speak three or more languages, we use the term 'bilingual' because we are considering English and one of their native languages.

and teachers of three public-sector universities in Sindh province of Pakistan, namely the Quaid-e-Awam University of Engineering, Science and Technology (QUEST); Peoples' University of Medical and Health Sciences for Women (PUMHSW), and Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University (SBBU).

It was carried out in three stages using three different methods. At the first stage, in order to collect AFs used in academic discourse in Pakistani universities and specify their main categories, a survey was conducted with the participation of 342 respondents (252 students and 90 teachers). Respondents were asked to indicate which AFs they use in symmetrical, linear and asymmetrical contexts. Two questionnaires were compiled for students aimed at identifying the AFs they use (1) when addressing each other and (2) when addressing the teacher, and two questionnaires for teachers aimed at identifying the AFs they use (3) when addressing students and (4) when addressing superior and subordinate personnel. On the whole 4950 answers to the questions referring to the use of AFs in academic context were received and analyzed. Following analysis, it was discovered that in addition to English the participants could speak at least two or three languages, namely mainly *Sindhi,* and *Urdu.* The term *'native'* has been used throughout this study to refer to all AFs borrowed from local languages.

Next, to clarify the pragmatic and stylistic characteristics of AFs, a written interview was conducted with the participation of 145 students and 50 teachers.

At the final stage, during participant observation, verification of the obtained data was carried out. An audio recording of academic discourse (13 hours) was carried out followed by transcription, resulting in 193 cases of the use of AFs in natural communication.

The collected material was analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively using discourse analysis, including pragmatic, sociolinguistic, sociocognitive and cultural analysis. Implementing the multidisciplinary approach, we draw on the

idea that discourse-analysis deals with "multiple and multifarious variables which interact with one another" (Alba-Juez, 2016: 57). The focus was on English and native AFs in symmetrical, linear and asymmetrical contexts, as well as their pragmatic and stylistic differences. Considerable attention was paid to the analysis of the context, both situational and sociocultural, which made it possible to determine the role of situational, social and cultural dimensions in the choice and preference of a form of address, as well as to identify the cultural values that determine their choice. We admit that gender is also an important social factor, but gender differences were not taken into account in this study.

      Theoretical background. The study employed an interdisciplinary theoretical framework based on:

- *Sociolinguistics* (Ervin-Tripp, 1986; Fasold, 1990; Holmes, 2013; Labov, 1972; Trudgill, 2000; Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2021; Wardhaugh, 2006).

- *World Englishes paradigm* (Baumgardner, 1995; Kachru, 1992; Kachru and Nelson, 2006; Mahboob, 2008; 2009; Proshina and Nelson, 2020; Rahman, 2020).

- *Bi-multilingualism* (Ashraf et al., 2021; Canagarajah and Ashraf, 2013; García, 2009; Jabeen, 2020; Rahman, 2008).

- *Translanguaging, code-switching and code-mixing* (Canagarajah, 2012; Kachru and Nelson, 2006; Lewis et al., 2012; Larina and Suryanarayan, 2023; 2023; Liu and Fang, 2020).

- *Cross-and intercultural pragmatics* (Kecskes, 2014; Wierzbicka, 2003).

- *Discourse analysis* (Fairclough, 2003; Schiffrin, 1994; van Dijk, 2006).

- *Theory of address forms* (Baumgarten & Vismans 2023; Brown and Gilman, 1960; Braun, 1988; Clyne, 2009; Formentelli and Hajek, 2016; Larina and Suryanarayan, 2023; Norrby and Wide, 2015;).

- *Studies on identity and cognition* (Atkinson, 2002; 2014; Eslami et al.,

2023; Ellis, 2007; Phinney, 2003; Phinney and Ong, 2007; van Dijk, 2006).

- *Cultural studies* (Hofstede, 2011; 1991; Triandis, 2018; Triandis and Gelfand, 2012) and *Cultural linguistics* (Sharifian, 2015; 2017).

Novelty of the study. This dissertation is the first study of forms of address in Pakistani English in academic discourse. It continues to explore the impact of culture on language and communication in a bilingual context, using previously unexplored material and providing new data. The novelty of the study is seen in the identification of culture-specific forms of address used by speakers of Pakistani English in academic discourse, which are the FAs borrowed from native languages and hybrid forms; in clarifying the functional and stylistic features of the FAs used by Pakistani bilinguals, and determining the contexts of their use; and in identifying the axiological (system of values) components of the lingua-cultural identity of Pakistani bilinguals, manifested in FAs.

Theoretical implications. The study further explores forms of address and their functioning in a bilingual context. It identified the main categories of forms of address used in academic discourse by bilingual speakers of Pakistani English, which, in addition to categories, typical of the English varieties of the inner circle, include culture-specific categories. It revealed hybrid forms of address, representing a combination of English and local forms; clarified the pragmatic, functional and stylistic characteristics of English, local and hybrid forms of address and the contexts of their use; identified sociocultural factors influencing both the system of forms of address and their functioning in academic discourse of Pakistani English. The study provides frequent linguistic and discursive evidences, indicating the influence of the axiological components of bilingual identity when choosing a form of address in academic discourse, and once again confirms the interconnectedness of language, culture, cognition and communication. The findings may contribute to sociolinguistics, WE paradigm, cultural linguistics,

11

cross-cultural pragmatics and discourse analysis, by providing new data and expanding the understanding of the impact of culture and cognition on language and its functioning in a bilingual context.

Practical implications. The main findings and conclusions can stimulate further studies of the varieties of English as well as varieties of forms of address across discourses, languages and cultures. They can be used in research and teaching activities in theoretical courses and course books on sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, cross-cultural pragmatics, as well as on the theory and practice of intercultural communication and translation.

Propositional statements for the defence*:*

1. Pakistani English, like other Englishes, is influenced by local language(s) and culture(s) which is noticeable at both systemic and functional levels. This impact among other things, can be observed in the categories of AFs and their usage by bilingual speakers of Pakistani English in academic discourse.

2. Along with the categories typical of the Englishes of the Inner circle (names, honorifics, titles, professional terms) which demonstrate culture-specific peculiarities in functioning in Pakistani English, Pakistani bilinguals use kinship terms and caste terms.

3. Regarding the language three types of AFs can be identified—*English*, *native* and *hybrid*. They differ in pragmatic, functional and stylistic characteristics predetermined by bilingual identity of Pakistani English speakers, their native traditions and values. When English AFs fail to express them, Pakistani bilinguals resort to native or hybrid terms.

4. The use of AFs in Pakistani academic discourse shows a strong adherence to social hierarchy and intimacy in both asymmetrical and symmetrical contexts and testifies to the fact that hierarchy and intimacy are among the most important values in Pakistani linguaculture and essential axiological components of identity

12

of its representatives.

5. Native and hybrid AFs contribute to the formation of Pakistani English as an English variety and demonstrate a strong interdependence of language, culture, cognition and communication.

The scientific validity and reliability of the findings. The comprehensive review and critical analysis of the relevant literature on the topic of the dissertation form the foundation of the validity and reliability of the current study. Additionally, carefully chosen, designed, and piloted research tools were used to collect empirical data. The study is more reliable and valid from a scientific viewpoint due to numerical statistics descriptive findings, and the results gathered from classroom observation and interviews.

Approbation of the dissertation. The main results and conclusions of the research were presented in *eight* publications that include 3 articles indexed in the international databases of Scopus and Web of Science, 3 in peer-reviewed journals included in the List of RUDN and VAK, and 2 related publications. Some of the findings were also presented at 3 international conferences: (1) International scientific conference "Bi-, Poly-, Translinguism and Linguistic Education", December 2-3, 2022. RUDN University, Moscow, (2) IV International Scientific and Practical Conference "Language. Culture. Translation. Communication", 27-28 October 2022. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, (3) The International Scientific and Practical Conference VI Firsova Readings "Modern Languages and Cultures: Varieties, Functions, Ideologies in a Cognitive Perspective", October, 19-21, 2023. Department of Foreign Languages of the Faculty of Philology, RUDN University.

Structure of the dissertation. The dissertation consists of an Introduction, three Chapters, Conclusion, a list of References (236 sources) and six Appendices. The text of the dissertation contains 163 pages.

I.   Scopus and Web of Science indexed publications/articles:

1. Soomro, Muhammad Arif and Larina, Tatiana. 2022. Categories of address forms in Pakistani English in a multilingual academic setting. Philological Sciences: Scientific Essays of Higher Education, 6s*. 50-55. ISSN: 2310- 4287 https://doi.org/10.20339/PhS.6s-22.050 (WoS).

2. Soomro, Muhammad Arif and Larina, Tatiana. 2023. Mister, bro, or ada? Style of addressing multilingual Pakistani students. GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies, 23(2). 241-257. e-ISSN: 2550-2131 p-1675-8021. http://dx.doi.org/10.17576/gema-2023-2302-13 (Scopus Q2 and WoS)

3. Soomro, Muhammad Arif. (2023). Sociocultural Values and Pragmatics of Caste Address Form in Multilingual Pakistani Student and Teacher Discourse. Integration of Education, 27(4). 694–703. p-ISSN: 1991-9468 e-ISSN: 2308-1058 https://doi.org/10.15507/1991-9468.113.027.202304.694-703 (Scopus Q2)

II. The articles published in VAK-indexed journals:

4. Soomro, Muhammad Arif. 2023. The Use of Pakistani English Address Forms in an Academic Setting: University Teachers to Non-Teaching Staff. Gramota: Philology. Theory & Practice, 16(2). 597-601. e-ISSN 2782-4543, p-ISSN 1997-2911. https://doi.org/10.30853/phil20230075 (VAK).

5. Soomro, Muhammad Arif. 2023. Students and Administrative Staff Interaction: A Socio-cultural Competence of Pakistani English Address Forms in Academic Discourse. Current Issues in Philology and Pedagogical Linguistics. 2. 240–247. p-ISSN 2079-6021, e-ISBN 2619-029X. https://doi.org/10.29025/2079-6021-2023-2-240-247 (VAK).

6. Soomro, Muhammad Arif. 2024. Value of Hierarchy in Address Forms among the Bilingual Students of Pakistani Universities. Cognitive Studies of Language. Modern Languages and Cultures: Variability, Functions, Ideologies in The Cognitive Aspect. 1(57). 148-152. ISSN 2071-9639. ISBN 978-5-209-12191-6

(Vol. #1 (57). Part I), ISBN 978-5-89016-442-1. (VAK).

III. Related publications:

7. Soomro, Muhammad Arif. 2023. Categories of address terms in academic setting. Language. Culture. Translation. Communication: a collection of scientific papers. Volume IV. Linguistic and Cultural Communicative Codes and the Study of Foreign Languages in Modern Education. – Moscow: "KDU", University Press. 2023. 291-295.

8. Soomro, Muhammad Arif., Rajper, Mukhtiar Ali., & Koondhar, Mansoor Ali. 2023. An Axiological Discussion: Address Forms as Reflectors of Values in Multilinguals. Sir Syed Journal of Education & Social Research, 6(1). 147-158. e-ISSN 2706-6525, p-2706-828. https://doi.org/10.36902/sjesr-vol6-iss1-2023(147-158) (Pakistan Higher Attestation/Education Commission, recognized.)

VI. Conference participation:

9. International scientific conference "Bi-, Poly-, Translinguism and Linguistic Education", December 2-3, 2022. RUDN University, Moscow.

10. IV International Scientific and Practical Conference "Language. Culture. Translation. Communication", 27-28 October 2022. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow.

11. The International Scientific and Practical Conference VI Firsova Readings "Modern Languages and Cultures: Varieties, Functions, Ideologies in a Cognitive Perspective", October, 19-21, 2023. Department of Foreign Languages of the Faculty of Philology, RUDN University.

The ***Introduction*** outlines the research problem and relevance of the study; proposes hypothesis, goal and objectives along with propositional statements for the defence; provides information of the data collection and methods adopted for analysis. It substantiates the novelty of the research, its theoretical and practical applications; outlines its structure and approbation of the results.

Chapter 1. *Sociocultural and socio-cognitive factors affecting bilingual academic discourse* discusses the World Englishes paradigm, Pakistani English as a variety of English, social organization and cultural values of the Pakistani society, impact of sociocultural and socio-cognitive factors on language and communication, bi-cultural and bilingual identity, multicultural and multilingual environment of Pakistani universities, as well as bi-multilingualism, translanguaging, code-switching and code-mixing.

The first section describes *the notion of the World Englishes (WE) paradigm* which was introduced by an Indian American linguist Braj B. Kachru in 1985. The paradigm consists of three circles of English: (1) the Inner Circle which includes Englishes of native English-speaking countries (the UK, Ireland, the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand) (2) the Outer circle which involves Englishes of the colonized and post-colonial countries that use English for educational and non-educational institutes and official correspondence (e.g. India, Pakistan, Nigeria, Singapore, etc. and (3) the Expanding Circle which includes the varieties of English used as a lingua franca for tourism, business, technology, Internet and other purposes (e.g. Russia, China, Poland, Germany, etc.). We also discuss the nativization features of English and its expansion in localized and colloquial variety.

The second section discusses the status and nativized features of Pakistani English in the World Englishes paradigm. Pakistani English (PakE) has been characterized as a non-native variety of English mainly due to morphological, phonological, syntactical and grammatical characteristics. However, pragma-discursive features of PakE have not been paid much attention by scholars and they are understudied.

The third section describes the social organization and cultural values of Pakistani society. Pakistan belongs to a collectivist high power culture,

characterized by a distinct hierarchy and we-orientation, which predetermines the axiological system of its people and the type of social relations. Pakistani culture values strong power and respect for age and authority, as well as closeness, intimacy and brotherhood. The hierarchical organization of Pakistani society is manifested in the caste system. Though according to Pakistani official policy there are no castes in Pakistan, caste-based differences can still be observed in profession, income and status. Belonging to a caste along with the shared cultural values are important components of social and axiological identity manifested in the communication behaviour of the Pakistanis.

The fourth section describes social (age, status, social roles, etc.), sociocultural (horizontal and vertical distance) and socio-cognitive (cultural values, understanding of politeness) factors that influence on how interlocutors think and interact.

The fifth section discusses *bi-cultural and bilingual identity in discursive practices*, as identity is one of the main objects of this study. Identity is a person's individuality, uniqueness, and his/her belongingness to a particular community, ideological, sociocultural, professional or otherwise. Identity is a multi-layered phenomenon shaped by different variables, e.g. gender, class, religion and ethnic affiliation. Therefore, in this study, bi-cultural identity is defined as a person's belonging to more than one culture, and bilingual identity is defined as a person's ability to speak and understand two or more languages.

The sixth section describes the *multicultural and multilingual environment of Pakistani universities*, where the students, teachers and other staff have different linguistic, cultural and social belongingness. Historically, geographically and socially the Pakistanis are multicultural ethnic groups like Baloch, Punjabi, Sindhi, Brahui, Hazara, Kashmiri, Balti, Gilgiti, etc. who speak a few languages. As a result, though English is an official and state language, Pakistani universities are

17

characterized by a multicultural and multilingual environment, where representatives of different languages and cultures communicate in English, expressing their bilingual and multilingual identity.

The last section of this chapter discusses *multilingualism, translanguaging, code-switching and code-mixing* which are observed in Pakistani English in general and academic discourse in particular due to bi-multilingual and multicultural environment.

Chapter 2. *Address forms in sociocultural and axiological perspective,* entails four main sections. It discusses functions of address forms in interpersonal interaction, cultural values and variability of AFs in cross-cultural perspective, the taxonomy of AFs and their categories in Pakistani English.

The first section on *functions of forms of address in interpersonal communication* shows the relationships between interlocutors and AFs that are significant linguistic means to establish, maintain, and continue relations. Forms of address are the words interlocutors use to address or designate the individual they speak to. They are among the most reliable linguistics means of how interlocutors of a particular language conceptualize their relationships, mindset and sociocultural values. They function as promoters of the negotiation among interlocutors and develop the socialization between them.

The second section focuses on *socio-cultural values and address forms from a cross-cultural perspective*. It discusses how cultural values and relational factors affect the usage and choice of AFs across cultures and overviews literature on cross-cultural contexts describing the variations in addressing practices. AFs express social and cultural norms and attitudes, e.g. level of formality, degree of intimacy, respect, etc. and vary across-cultures due to the differences in values, social organization, norms and politeness strategies. They are explored in cross-cultural perspective within workplace, family discourse, and beyond.

The third section, *the taxonomy of address forms*, presents the classification of AF categories and gives a brief overview of address studies. It presents different taxonomies of AFs in various linguacultural settings, emphasizing the specificity of each scheme and provides an overview of address research characterizing sequential connection between categories of AFs and factors affecting them in a given context. Special attention is paid to the use of AFs and their interrelation with socio-cultural dimensions such as power and solidarity, as well as lingua-cultural identity. The examined sources demonstrate that the taxonomy of AFs relies on a systematic description, where each scheme is influenced by different sociocultural and linguistic features of a speech community.

The last section discusses *categories of forms of address in Pakistani English*. It starts with the description of main categories of AFs identified by Brown and Gilman (1960) which are observed in many European languages and are further supplemented by the categories observed in PakE. When describing the categories, attention is drawn to the features of their culture-specific functioning in PakE, which are illustrated with examples.

Names in Pakistan are a complex set due to religious, regional and ethnic diversity. Naming involves societal factors such as power, beliefs and social class. Personal names usually consist of three units based on religious, regional or tribal association. For instance, in an ordinary male name the first component is the personal name, the second one is religious affiliation and the third one is a caste term adopted only from the father. Whereas, female names typically involve one or two units like *Mahwish* (personal name) or *Mahwish Soomro* (personal name with caste adopted from the father). Pakistani names and the naming system show a complex set of trends influenced by local values.

Kinship terms in PakE consist of both English and native terms used for addressing inside and outside the family. The Pakistani kinship system adheres to

Sudanese kinship terminology—which is an elaborative system consisting entirely of descriptive and separate designation for almost every distinct relative based on the relationship and gender. Paternal (father) and maternal (mother) relatives are addressed by separate kinship terms, e.g. *massi/khala* 'maternal aunt', *booa/phupho* 'paternal aunt', *chachu* 'paternal uncle', *mamu* 'maternal uncle'. The category serves for social and communicative needs of interlocutors who find it important to give a specific name to each family member depending on the relationship. Since Pakistani society is a family-oriented society, kinship terms of address are widely used beyond family in other social contexts, including university setting where both English and native kinship terms are observed, e.g. *bro/brother; sis/sister; uncle; aunty*, and *ada/bha* 'brother' (Sindhi); *adi 'sister'* (Sindhi); *baji* 'sister' (Urdu); *beta* 'son' (Urdu).

Terms of endearment are contextual and can be significantly influenced by linguistic creativity and personal imagination. PakE interlocutors use both English and native endearments. We found English endearment 'dear' only, whereas, native terms of endearments i.e. *mitha* 'sweetheart or sweetie'; *pyara*—for male (M) 'beloved/my love'; *pyari / jana*—for female (F) 'loveable/lovely' (Sindhi); *yar/yaar* 'close-friend' (Sindhi/Urdu), for both male and female.

Honorifics in PakE are used to show social rank, hierarchy and formality. We observed English honorifics like *Mr./Miss; sir, madam/ma'am* and native honorifics *sain* 'a spiritual guide' to some extent equivalent to sir, and colonial honorifics *sahib* (M) */ sahiba* (F) 'a token of respect' which can be used in combination with other categories.

Titles show assigned positions, e.g. official, social, educational, e.g. *Dr.* and *professor*. Among students' titles like *senior* and *junior* are used.

Occupation/profession-based terms are used to address an individual related to their job, or profession. Among PakE categories of AFs it is only presented by

teacher in student-teacher communication.

Caste address terms are an important category in PakE influenced by sociocultural values. They indicate a socially built identity based on social and economic status transferred only from the father. PakE speakers use caste address terms to show different sociopragmatic characteristics, such as respect, intimacy, closeness and informality.

In addition to English and native terms of address there are *hybrid terms of address* in PakE which combine English and native terms. Pakistani hybrid AFs are presented by a variety of models, e.g. Honorific + FN *Sir Aslam,* Honorific + caste *Sir Memon*; English honorific + first name + Native honorific S*ir Awais sahib.* Hybrid AFs are a result of the impact of sociocultural and axiological system of Pakistani bilinguals on addressing and show how they adapt the English language to their local values.

Chapter 3. Addressing practices in Pakistani university settings, the chapter discusses a comprehensive research methodology and data collection procedure used in this study to obtain the desired findings and to test the main hypothesis. It presents the results of a comprehensive analysis of the categories of address forms used in student-student interaction, student-teacher interaction, teacher-student interaction, and students and teachers' interaction with administrative staff.

We draw attention to the preference in choice of categories between student-student, student-teacher, teacher-student, student-administrative staff, and teacher-administrative staff interactions. Furthermore, these categories were analysed in line with different university settings by highlighting their sociocultural, semantic, pragmatic meanings, social hierarchy and intimacy, native cultural values, and bilingual identity. This chapter concludes with verification of the results from recordings obtained qualitative data and discussion of the results.

Conclusion summarises the main findings and predominant tendencies in the choice and preference of address forms used by Pakistani English speakers in multicultural university settings and interpret them through cultural values and identity. It provides the research limitations as well as a recap of the key findings, and potential research suggestions.

The main findings and conclusions can stimulate further studies of the varieties of English as well as varieties of forms of address across discourses, languages and cultures.

Chapter 1. SOCIOCULTURAL AND SOCIO-COGNITIVE FACTORS AFFECTING BILINGUAL ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

The chapter presents a literature overview of the theory of World Englishes (WE) and nativization of Pakistani English. Social hierarchy and cultural values of Pakistani society are explored and the role of social, cultural and cognitive factors in language and communication are highlighted. Moreover, a special attention is paid to the bi-cultural and bilingual identity in discursive practices along with Pakistani universities' multilingual and multicultural environment where code-switching and code-mixing are regular practices due to *the nativized* usage of English and translanguaging.

1.1. World Englishes paradigm

The notion of *the World Englishes (WE) paradigm* was introduced by an Indian American linguist Braj B. Kachru in 1985. His model consists of the three Circles of English. The first **inner circle** involves native English-speaking Countries i.e. the UK, Ireland, the USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

The second **outer circle** includes most of the colonized period and post-colonial countries, or who use it in educational and non-educational institutes and offices like India-Pakistan, Nigeria, Malaysia, etc.

The third **expanding circle** covers the countries which use English as a linguafranca for business, tourism, internet and technology, and other purposes e.g. Brazil, Russia, China, Poland, Germany, etc.

However, before presenting his three circles model he positioned that:

"The strength of the English language is in presenting the *Americanness* in its American variety, and the *Englishness* in its British variety. Let us therefore appreciate and encourage the Third World varieties of English too. The individuality of the Third World varieties, such as the

Indianness of its Indian variety, is contributing to the linguistic mosaic which the speakers of the English language have created in the English speaking world." (Kachru, 1976: 236).

Epistemological debate on *indigenization* of English language is developing after Kachru's (1992) WE paradigm emergence and expansion into the cross-intercultural communication.

The *notion of World Englishes* is expanding due to increased intercultural communication with people from other countries (Proshina and Nelson, 2020: 524). This position on varieties of Englishes by Kachru established the notion of World Englishes as a field of discipline (Kirkpatrick, 2014). English among other non-native varieties of English, its role, status, and importance in the subcontinent (India, Pakistan) has gone through *nativization* of English due to local needs and uses of the English (Kachru, 1985).

According to Proshina and Nelson (2020: 530), the World Englishes Paradigm is the acceptance and recognition of speakers' linguacultural identity, worldview, cultural values and norms, culture-loaded words, syntactic structures, and collocations. Among these means lingual identity of one's can be noticed in phonetic (accent) and grammar categories. Moreover, cultural diversity can affect the variability of clear models which might be typical of the Expanding circle (Proshina, 2020: 232). Socio-psychological awareness of linguacultural identity is expressed in these Englishes and its educational codification dominates their unique characteristics (Kachru, 1985).

The WE paradigm in this study refers to all local/non-native English varieties irrespective of which of Kachru's three circles they come from (Kachru, 1985). Braj Kachru's (1985) opposition to the single standard form of English—British English, positioned by Quirk (1985), that "there were many varieties of English, all of which were linguistically equal". (Kirkpatrick, 2014: 33). As a

result of WE dimensions the English language has had a significant impact on the creation of other non-native varieties of English language in teaching and learning, and interpersonal interaction.

The WE paradigm views varieties of Englishes used in diverse sociolinguistic contexts, critical of Western monolingual-cultural frameworks and language variations (Bhatt, 2001). This conceptual move brings a "**pluricentric**" perspective reflects sociolinguistic histories of diversity, multilingual cultural identities, diverse norms of use and acquisition, and distinct contexts of function (ibid: 527).

The philosophical, theoretical, methodological, and analytical frameworks seek to transform the notion of World Englishes radically in non-native speakers' linguistic practices and beliefs. The WE paradigm aims to represent the "cross-cultural and global contextualization of the English language in multiple voices" (Kachru et al., 2006:1). Presently, it addresses a wide range of constructs of fundamental importance, such as:

i. historical context—colonial vs non-colonial waves;

ii. variational contexts— "the great laboratory of today's sociolinguist" (Kahane, 1986: 495);

iii. acculturation—adaptations in new settings;

iv. crossing borders—the realm of cultures, multiplicity, and pluralism;

v. grammatical complexities and standards;

vi. ideology, identity, and constructs—the social development of identity in linguistic action, styles of thinking (cognition), imagination, and analytical representation with epistemological issues;

vii. World Englishes and globalization—the roles Englishes play in global contexts (media, advertising, commerce) and how they shape their Englishes;

viii. World Englishes and applied theory—academic pursuits i.e. national language policy, English teaching and learning (applied linguistics), communicative competence, pedagogy and language testing, and dictionaries, prescriptive and descriptive approach, as well as cultural, bibliographic, and linguistic heritage of a language community.

ix. The Futurology—that English has come to bear – its *karma* — and its evolution and continuous development — the cycle (Nelson et al., 2020: 28-31).

Thus, WE is in a continued process of exploring the world of English in variety of cross-intercultural contexts and paving new pathways for understanding each variety of Englishes. These directions have occurred in decades resulting in nativization/indigenization process.

The term ***"nativization"*** or ***"indigenization"*** refers to the process of adapting a language to suit the communicative requirements of the people who are adopting it. However, nativization of English needs to be admitted as the "means to express our self-identity in the intercultural settings and a creative linguistic tool for the domestic use" (Proshina, 2016: 205).The process of nativization occurs through the use of language in more informal contexts, leading to the expansion of localized, colloquial variety (cf. Platt and Lian, 1982: 267).

The nativization process becomes an integral part of linguistic diversity (Larina and Suryanarayan, 2023), and it does not necessarily show British or American culture (Kachru and Nelson, 2006). Bhatt (2001) analyses views on Englishes that reflect sociolinguistic, multicultural identities, a variety of norms of use, and indigenized contexts of function.

To communicate in English "*multilingual users of English who operate regularly in international settings tend to be extremely adept communicators in English, often more so than some speakers of inner circle varieties of English*"

(Kirkpatrick, 2014: 43). A nativized variety of Indian English has been shown in institutionalized use with a predominance of non-native tendencies (Coelho, 1997). Kubota and Ward (2000) noted that the colonial and the post-colonial spread of English faced increased cultural and linguistic diversity in social settings. Singaporean English uses Chinese particles, Chinese-type tagging, and an existential-locative verb (Platt and Lian, 1982).

Thus, in World Englishes, it can be analysed that each variety of English has been influenced by the native/local languages and cultures. These varieties differed in phonological, syntactical, and semantical components as well as pragmatic and discursive (Rahman, 2008; Proshina, 2016).

Consequently, English's "global spread as the language of intercultural communication, English has reached the majority of the counties, *acquiring an ethnic name and serving as a means of local culture expressions to the international community*" (Proshina, 2016: 201).

The research on WE paradigm has been investigated in multidimensionality over the decades to this day. Among other multi-dimensions is creation of local varieties of English.

1.2. Pakistani English in the World Englishes paradigm

One of the less studied varieties of English is that spoken in Pakistan. Pakistani English in the multilingual context has provided "cultural capital" which facilitates the status, functions, and features of language of power (Rahman, 2020: 279). The argument for nativizing ***Pakistani English (PE)*** in the World Englishes paradigm is similar to other Englishes. It is characterized as a non-native variety of English with indigenization/nativization features by eminent Pakistani linguist Tariq Rahman (1990who provided morphological, syntactical, and grammatical aspects of Pakistani English (Rahman, 1990) within pluricentric languages.

According to Mahboob (2008), Pakistani English lexical items have

indigenized meanings, and their syntax, morphology, and lexical variations are what set it apart from other varieties of English. Lexical variations of Pakistani English switch semantically to *'Urdu-ized'* meaning (Talaat, 1993).

Pakistani English speakers differ in phonological and lexico-semantic dimensions and it also varies in the usage of words under the influence of Islamic and Pakistani culture. Mahboob (2009) noted English as an Islamic language in Pakistan, Pakistani English reflects Islamic values and symbolizes South Asian Islamic sensitivities. Moreover, one must be familiar with local and Islamic culture to understand English in Pakistan as noticed by Baumgardner (1993). Therefore, it essential to understand linguistic functions or elements as they express or imply differences. For instance, Sindhi English speakers differed phonologically and displayed Sindhi language influence on pronunciation which differs from received pronunciation (cf. Ansari et al., 2016). In other words, the Sindhi English speakers' pronunciation adheres to *the 'Sindhish'* variety within Pakistani English.

Nativization and variations in Pakistani English negotiate the context-based meanings and reinforce the functional multiplicity, certain features of reflect indigenization, influence Urdu and Pakistani society (cf. Noor and Anwar, 2021). Pakistani English is impacted by the sociocultural characteristics of multilingual society. For instance, some nouns take the plural suffix –s, *infrastructures, transports, fictions, and vacations*, etc.

Sociocultural factors influence lexico-semantic variations of Pakistani English infusing within indigenized multifaceted functions. For instance, *lota culture*[3]. Metaphorically it highlights that someone who—especially a politician/s, changes their loyalties to another person or party. In standard English, an alternative expression could be *turncoats* or *weathercocks*. The use of copula

---

[3] lota—a term in the Punjabi language, 'is a vessel for everyday use made of brass, copper, or plastic used for personal hygiene' (Merriam-Webster's Online Dictionary).

deletion in Pakistani English is 'to be' as non-native variety, for instance, '*Babaji* **why** **making* noise *haan*?'; I'm careless, **I * sorry**, etc.

In addition, Pakistani English speakers regularly practice innovative nativized lexico-semantic variations in usage and have their idiosyncratic characteristics (Jilani and Anwar, 2018). Butt et al., (2021) found that Pakistani English syntax particularly prepositional verbs, e.g. *discuss about*, *talk about*, *and demand for*, are systematic structural differences that adhere to certain nativized aspects within pluricentric perspective.

Pakistani English is influenced by Pakistani society norms and indigenized features are reflected at different levels. The features of Pakistani English have been analysed over the decades in terms of vocabulary, phonetic and phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexical features. Among other features, the discourse features of Pakistani English show verbal politeness, for instance:

"*Sir Akram is our teacher*. 'Sir' is not a title as the person referred to is not a knight of the realm. It is being used for respect since in Pakistani English and Indian English, 'Mister' is not considered polite enough. *Madam Shazia is our boss in the bank*. With 'Madam' and 'Miss,' the latter is often used for young women or those in subordinate or less powerful jobs (school teachers, clerks in banks, and so on)" (Rahman, 2020: 285-86).

The discourse features of Pakistani English follow verbal politeness by changing the semantic and pragmatics of '*standard*' English terms, often considered not respectable enough during any formal interaction, in some cases, even at family interaction. As highlighted by Rahman (2020) that 'miss' vs 'madam', the 'miss' is used for younger individuals with powerful job descriptions, school teachers, clercial staff, etc.

The cultural aspect of Pakistani English is mixture of colonial rules, the

symbol of modernity, urbanization, Western education, and an extent of Anglicization (Rahman, 2020). For instance, one of the cultural manifestation among others is Anglicization or Westernized attitude of Pakistani English speakers.

English in Pakistan is used differently based on ethnicity, age, literary background, gender, socio-economic status, etc. These features are reflected in their dialects and varieties of English they speak. For instance, ethno-lingual affiliation between Urdu and Sindhi languages in Pakistan resulted in linguistic strife in Pakistan. The conflict between Sindhi and Urdu speakers resulted into violence which claimed thousands of lives. Therefore, English being '*neutralizer*' occupies important place in Pakistani society (Mahboob, 2009: 178). English, or more suitably *Englishes*, differ from one another in a number of dimensions. "They reflect the variations in the use, meanings and structures of the language as they have evolved in different parts of the world to achieve different goals and purposes over a period of time" (Mahboob, 2014: 3). These variations evolved due several reasons, among others, one of the domineering reason is multilingual contexts.

In today's multilingual and multicultural South Asia, English is still adjusting to its new environments (cf. Baumgardner, 1993:42) such as:

i. interrogative word order in indirect questions; ii. hybrid vocabulary (e.g. *lotacracy*, *lota* culture, discuss about, *lathi*-charge 'baton charge', etc.), distinctive use or non-use of articles; iii. altered use of phrasal and prepositional verbs; iv. the use of the present continuous tense in contexts where other varieties would use the simple present tense; and v. use of adjectives as adverbs (cf. Irfan, 2022: 89).

English in multilingual and multicultural environment like Pakistan is influenced in variety of areas. The use of hybrid vocabulary e.g. *lotacaracy*, *lathi*-charge, *loot* (rob), *hifi* (posh, fancy), etc; omission of articles e.g. 'He said that *

Education Ministry is revising * English syllabus; interrogative sequence of word order i.e. Where are you coming from?; phrasal verbs e.g. students *eligible for entering* the competition; the continuous tense e.g. I am doing every time; and the usage of certain adjectives e.g. The department has not *succeeded to decrease* the concerns of the employees.

The nativization of English in multilingual and multicultural setting have distinct features not only in spoken but in written discourse also. By analysing indigenized and variant characteristics, Pakistani English features differ between individuals, from situation to situation (Mahboob and Ahmar, 2004). Anwar et al. (2020) found the influence of Urdu and the non-native Pakistani context. They noticed that the sociocultural elements of a bilingual society have an impact on English in Pakistan for instance, Urdu particle '*na*' and '*haan*', '*Baba ji* why making noise *haan*?'; She said *na* for emphatic meanings. While some lexical and grammatical characteristics of Pakistani English have attracted scholars' attention (Mahboob, 2008).

The foundation for how English is used across cultures lies in the cultural presumptions regarding the types of language behaviour that are appropriate for particular contexts and the expectations people have regarding efficient information structuring. Moreover, exploring the multicultural aspects of Pakistani English, Adnan and Tehseem (2022) found that textbooks in Pakistani English represent multicultural, linguistic, and cultural reality. The textbooks focus native culture like teaching lesson on Faithfulness, Dignity of Work, The Inheritors, The Khyber Pass, The Customs of Different Regions of Pakistan, Handicrafts of Baluchistan, Unity, Faith and Discipline, etc. Hence, the status of English in Pakistani multilingual society is manifested across professions, academia, and businesses. However, it is likely to remain in the quest of modernity and maintainer of social mobility.

In our study context, Pakistani English involves various localized, colloquial, and linguistic items implying the nativized variety. English spread among people of various nations as a result of colonization, globalization, and the Internet. The main areas of language where these variations can be seen are phonetics, phonology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and other related sub-components. Hence, in this section, we attempted to explore how English is nativized under the influence of local/native languages and culture, which further validates the notion of Nativization and Acculturation of English among non-native English speakers (Kachru, 1986), and the theory of World Englishes and Pakistani variety of English.

1.3. Social organization and cultural values of the Pakistani society

Social hierarchy depends on how interlocutors communicate, employ, and how they are related to others (Yule, 2020: 221). Social groups exist in many societies. Several studies have concluded that address forms that refer to a particular social group, can be used while addressing others who do not fall under the close category. Dittrich et al., (2011) emphasized that the psychological characteristics of people and their relationships may also better fit a social categorization of contemporary changes in norms, power, and respect as a universal patterning.

The hierarchical organization in relationships of interlocutors describe symmetrical (linear-at peer level) and asymmetrical (bottom-up, top-down) directions based on the degree of social distance (Clyne, 2009).

"A hierarchical system of stable social groups, differing greatly in wealth, privilege, power, and the respect accorded to them by others. In any such system the organization of one stratum may only meaningfully be described with reference to its relations to the other

strata" (Barth, 1960: 131).

Social groups are based on hierarchical relations across societies, the dimensions and degree of power distance and social distance. Such hierarchical social groups among others existed in Pakistani society. These hierarchical differences are windows to the minds of interlocutors behaviour and feature of distinctiveness which emerges with mutual influence in social interaction.

Social classification is influenced by a culture's axiological system, which can be defined in terms of a society's relationships and how its members interact to cultivate a sense of community (Smith, 2015). The social hierarchy of a society is variable in determining the nature of politeness and its strategies, phraseology , lexis, grammar and communicative styles (cf. Khalil and Larina, 2022; Larina, 2015, Larina and Suryanarayan 2013). Human society is rife with hierarchical group identities, whether they are founded on caste, ethnicity, race, or religion.

To understand Pakistani hierarchy and cultural values of society, Hofstede's (1991) cultural dimensions defines well-shaped variations of cultural identity. *Pakistani society values collectivistic culture relatively high power distance, and uncertainty avoidance. Pakistanis adhere to collectivism and follow norms of their in-group aspects* (Merkin, 2016: 173). Consequently, Pakistani society strong power distance is cultural belief which is the respect authority, and the degree of un-comfortability to change, risk and ambiguity—uncertainty avoidance (ibid).

The social organization of a society reflects the cultural values of the speech community or group. Social organisation determine individual's "social interactions, which in turn shape their cognition, beliefs, attitudes, and perception of reality" (Miller, 2011: 198). van Dijk (2009) considers the regional, situational values and attitudes that influence language and culture. The meanings and interpretations change depending on the culture and language. Pakistani social hierarchy and cultural values of society show their cultural values i.e. respect for

elders, intimacy/closeness, and brotherhood when addressing someone older or younger depending on relationships, contexts, and communicative needs. Pakistanis value social hierarchy, intimacy, and respect (Soomro, 2023).

Pakistani society has strong power distance for cultural belief that a person must respect authority (Merkin, 2016) and a patriarchal society. For instance, the use of proverbs illustrates cultural values and tendencies of transmitting norms. Pakhtuns in Pakistani province Baluchistan used proverbs to reinforce patriarchal social structure and gender inequalities to preserve the age-old gender imbalance for instance *The khan is angry, his wife is happy*—implies that men are constantly troubled by the lavish spending of their wives (Khan et al., 2015).

The organisation of cultural values in Pakistani universities existed among all ranks and a moderate change in power distance orientation (Bashir et al., 2012). Social organisation of Pakistani society comprises of variety of ethnic composition, *biradri* (caste or clan), Islamic features (Mezzera and Aftab, 2009). Analysing wedding invitation, the study found that religious affiliation and cultural influence in Pakistani society shapes textual selection (Yasmin et al., 2019). Hence, social hierarchy and power dimensions are based in large part of Pakistani society which emphasize high level of social division (Gazdar and Mohmand, 2007).

Caste is defined as an identity developed in society and its prestigious constituent of identity (Mumtaz et al., 2022). Caste is one of the main identity of social hierarchy in Pakistani society. Caste in Pakistan is much more extensively explored phenomenon of social hierarchy and it is embedded within professional differences (Jacoby and Mansuri, 2015:139). Each caste embodies sub-castes and its widespread acceptance in Pakistani society is the continuation social hierarchy.

Caste in Pakistan is used in addressing a person in variety of social contexts, and public places, however, it indicates variations in socio-pragmatics and cultural values (see details, 2.4.7. Caste as terms of address). A further distinction of sub-

castes is based on social income and profession, each sub-caste demonstrates social hierarchy and status in Pakistani society values. Caste is a different system of social stratification of Pakistani society classify individuals into powerful, privileged, and respected. The most important factor of social organisation is culture and norms. The caste system in South Asia shows powerful classes, communities, and some castes have lower social status. However, to avoid caste aspects of identity some social groups "became literate and rose in affluence and power, they left their communities and even started using names of groups with higher social respect" and the occupational caste "groups registered a sharp decline" (Ahmad, 1981: 115).

Culture is viewed as a core tool that shapes peoples' actions in line with socially acceptable norms, prototypical practice, and influence human behaviour (Triandis & Gelfand, 2012). The values, beliefs, and rituals that distinguish one speech community from another are referred to as culture (Griswold, 2013:3). Culture is one of the main factors influencing sociolinguistic systems, or social communication systems (cf. Smakman, 2019: 210). Culture vary within the same varieties of languages reflecting variations in the choice and use of address forms under the influence of sociocultural factors and reflecting interlocutors' unique identity (Bilá et al., 2020; Larina, 2015 among others). Local cultures including ethnic values are altered and this transformative process is mutually developed in interaction.

Cultural dimensions theory of Hofstede (1991) helps to understand the differences in cultures among interlocutors of different backgrounds, countries and differentiate between national cultures and their impact communicative etiquettes. Pakistan's cultural tendencies show "*the moderate change in power distance orientation and significant change in masculinity and long term orientation. On the other hand, the cultural orientation of collectivism and uncertainty avoidance*"

(Bahir, 2012: 3686).

Cultural differences result in value types, perceptions and the relations such as individualism and collectivism: **Individualist cultures** demonstrate self-reliance, exchange of relations, attitudes and personal goals; whereas, **collectivism construct** interdependence communal relations, norms, and in-group goal. Moreover, horizontal orientation emphasizes equality and vertical relations demonstrate hierarchy (Triandis and Gelfand, 2012: 499-502).

A further distinction that divides cultures into those with a 'horizontal' as opposed to a 'vertical' orientation. "*Horizontal cultures* value benevolence, equality and the common good, whereas *vertical cultures* place store in the achievements that people have reached and the roles that they occupy" (Triandis, 1996: 407). According to Dittrich et al. (2011: 3), "power is the relative status difference between the speaker and the hearer, whereas social distance is the degree to which the speaker and the hearer are close or relatively strangers". Individual roles can differ from culture to culture, and power and status are viewed differently in common cultural perspectives. Despite the roles that are prescribed for people, there are differences within a society (Hofstede, 1991, Scollon and Scollon, 2001). In bi-multicultural contexts the semantics and pragmatics of address forms result in changes under the influence of sociocultural and situational differences (Larina and Suryanarayan, 2019).

In short, Pakistani cultural characteristics indicate cultural dimensions varied to name few among others are ranks/status, gender, socioeconomic, power-orientation and uncertainty avoidance. The social organisation and cultural values of Pakistani society considered potential factors affecting the communicative behaviour and language usage across contexts.

1.4. Impact of sociocultural and socio-cognitive factors on language and communication

Multidisciplinary research increased with rapid interdependence of disciplines and researchers' drawing on their disciplinary knowledge. In multidisciplinary approaches researchers belonging to different research domains work together to accommodate, coordinate and borrow theories. Exploring the sociocultural and socio-cognitive factors influence may adequately reveal the complex and multivariate dimensions intervening in the interconnectedness between language and communication. In this part we aimed to describe main two areas of sociocultural and socio-cognitive factors, how these conceptual aspects impact on language and communication.

Sociocultural factors play a significant role in a speaker's communicative behaviour. Kotorova (2018) states that sociocultural factors impact and shape speakers' pragmatics—meaning in discourse (*text + context*, Schiffrin, 1994) of addressing practices. Sociocultural refers to "*social and cultural contexts of human activity*" (Thorne, 2005: 394). Bucholtz and Hall (2005: 586) define sociocultural framework in broader interdisciplinary domain related to the "intersection of language, culture and society".

Sociocultural positions "looks beyond formal interests, to the social and cultural functions and meanings of language use" (Nilep, 2006: 2). In addition:

> "as daily interaction – professional, public, mediated, or otherwise – in an ever more globalized world requires finely developed intercultural skills, pragmatic competence and cultural fluency, having a deeper insight into the intricate relationship between language, communication and (ethnic) identity is of critical importance" (Larina et al., 2017: 109).

Sociocultural positioning and functions vary across contexts, and they need a proper attention in research domain and among interlocutors. Interlocutors should be aware be of sensitivity to the daily interaction in different contexts like family, public, workplace, online, etc. due to the increased changing world. The

technological advances and migration waves, and the need for social mobility has resulted in more intercultural communication. Intercultural communicative competence is required to understand and enable intercultural skills under the different cultural backgrounds. Crucially, these interactions reproduce and change the linguistic insights and build a complex interdependence between language, ethnic identity, and communication in daily discourse.

Language variation helps introduce new words at all levels (Labov, 2001). The social and stylistic variations set alternative ways of expressing the same linguistic function. Labov (2001: 271) shows the social significance: "social and stylistic variation presuppose the option of saying 'the same thing' in several different ways: that is, the variants are identical in reference or truth value, but opposed in their social and/or stylistic significance".

Sociocultural factors play an important role in understanding the different ways in language system i.e. forms, functions, and social usage are intertwined. Therefore, these factors impact to the understanding of different communicative acts. For understanding language system, one must understand that "language is inextricably bound to context" and language user prioritize the frequency and productivity in the language in relation to functions (formal vs informal) and social contexts (O'Connor Di Vito, 1998: 71). Thus, speakers evaluate their "own language norms in order to understand how to go beyond their native language and culture" by adopting new norms of communication (ibid: 72).

Our position within sociocultural dimension "looks beyond formal interests, to the social and cultural functions and meanings of language use" (Nilep, 2006: 2). Therefore, our study could familiarize Pakistani English speakers' sociocultural feature through language in context (in-group and out-group) and social manners, attitudes, local values.

Sociocognition in general terms shows how people think and interact both "**in the head**" and "**in the world**" (Atkinson, 2002: 225). It plays a prominent role in communication as social action. Since our study's nature is interdisciplinary, we, therefore, adopt definitions of sociocognition from Teun van Dijk (2016), Goddard and Anna Wierzbicka (2002) in this study.

In linguistics, *social cognition* involves evaluating and reasoning intentions, psychological processes, interaction patterns, and the processing of physical reality (Goddard and Wierzbicka, 2002). In short, it identifies the relationships between a person's knowledge and what is socially shared, as well as the importance of these relationships for the creation and comprehension of discourse (Gyollai, 2020: 540). Moreover, Adger (2001: 521) stated that the process of creating social meaning in light of a group's historical memory is examined by social cognition, as is the process by which an individual internalizes or appropriates social meaning. Hence, cognitive factors are essential to the learning process, i.e. thought and feelings.

Cognition is considered as "ADAPTIVE INTELLIGENCE, enabling our close and sensitive ALIGNMENT to our ecosocial environment in order to survive in it" (Atkinson, 2014: 467). Therefore, human interaction is functionally integrated with environment and adaptation which is continuously changing as per the needs and contexts.

Cognitive aspects in linguistics focus on two social variations: i. semantics, focus on meaning constitutes and are related to derive from a mutual set of underlying basics—that language is all about meaning. ii. *the usage-based* aspects focus on dialectic nature of the relation between language use and the language system (Geeraerts et al., 2010: 4). However, form these two cognitive aspect, our study draws more attention to usage-based linguistics which is the product of language use. It considers usage events are regarded as distinct, real-world instances of the language system. This view holds that by examining the usage

events that give rise to the language system, one can learn more about it. This tendency is a strong motivation for our empirical study that usage of language may slightly redefine "a person's internal language system" (Geeraerts et al., 2010: 4).

Language has been considered an abstract and logical instrument for dealing with factual information, moreover, socio-cognitive perspective shows that pragmatic, cognitive and emotive dimensions of human communication go beyond lingual identity (Alba-Juez and Larina, 2015: 10). Interpersonal interactions reveal that how abstract information is processed when absorbing facts, and how cognition, pragmatic meanings become recognizable. The sociocognitive approach (SCA) defines intercultural pragmatics constructs and relies on "cultural models and norms that represent the speech communities to which the interlocutors belong" (Kecskes, 2020: 107) and it focuses on discourse segment rather than utterance.

The intercultural pragmatics explores factors on how language systems are used for social interaction between speakers who have different first languages and cultures, but communicate in the same language (Kecskes, 2013). However, Anna Wierzbicka (1991) defines as:

> "in different societies and different communities, people speak differently; these differences in ways of speaking are profound and systematic, they reflect different cultural values, or at least different hierarchies of values; different ways of speaking, different communicative styles, can be explained and made sense of in terms of independently established different cultural values and cultural priorities. (Wierzbicka 1991: 69).

The cross- intercultural pragmatics of social interaction is influence by lingual (dialectic) and cultural factors among interlocutors. As explained by Wierzbicka (1991) that speech of communities varies within same communities

with profound and systematic patterns. These variations can reflect the impact of cultural values, the hierarchical values, and dialectal differences. The social groups communicative styles (formal vs. informal) could be defined and corroborated with in terms of unique *ethno-communicative styles* under cultural norms and cultural preferences. Thus, the cross- intercultural pragmatics illustrates difficulties not only what but how the message is communicated—encoding and decoding, deals with the meanings in interaction, and sematic equivalence between speech communities.

The *socio-cognitive approach* to this study emphasizes the attitudes and ideologies of language users as engaged members of social groups and communities, active participants in communicative situations, as well as the shared social knowledge and ongoing Common Ground of communication (cf. van Dijk, 2016: 3). Moreover, sociocognitive terms refer to interaction between individuals within social systems undertake a variety of human processes, and how acquiring and adopting, evaluating information and knowledge is produced and interpreted in sociocultural context (Badura, 2009).

Socio-cognitive approaches have explored literature on address forms (Wierzbicka, 2013; 2016; 2020; Larina and Suryanarayan, 2013 to mention a few), and it is growing more on the relationships of cognition, society, language, and culture. The status of address forms in the field of socio-cognitive linguistics shows how well a contextualization of the specific socialization and value systems depend on them and how it manifests in social classification automatically in language, and in communicative ways (Vodak, 2006). Thus, socio-cognitive perspective in discourse studies is interested:

"in the interconnections between knowledge, discourse and society while placing subjectivity in the centre of its framework. It looks into the correlative relationship between personal- and socially shared

41

knowledge, and the significance of these correlations to discourse production and interpretation" (Gyollai, 2020: 539).

The interplay between cognition, culture, and society has some specificities of discourse. The socio-cognitive studies aim to explore the interconnection between personal, social, and group knowledge in the discourse production and interpretation.

Among others, an important reflector of society and linguistic richness is proverb. They are social and cultural cognition of speakers. Pakistani society shows variety of choices in the use of proverbs to demonstrate their values. For instance, a Sindhi proverb, *broken arm belongs to the owner (bhagal baan maalik jee)*— implies a person who is defaulter or fraudulent and the person family bear the all responsibilities of such person. The proverbs emphasize that its collective responsibility of community. Another example form Sindhi language says like *the wise bears pain (akul khaaey gam)*—implies that wise person swallows own pains and pride for the benefit of the majority (Shaikh, 2009). The proverbs emphasize core values of Pakistani society and confirm the collectivist culture.

In this part, we have attempted to evaluate the role of sociocultural and socio-cognitive factors in language and communication. The review of literature shows that significant developments have occurred, consequently, interlocutors adapt their communicative etiquettes under the impact of a variety of sociocultural factors. The notions of "how communication works as a social process, and to what purpose, are culturally variable and need to be discovered rather than simply assumed" (Bauman, 1983: 16).

Thus, social, cultural values of Pakistani society are inherited and adhered with slight adaptability from fundamental to modern—but not westernized and kinship (*rishtaydari* 'Urdu)', *Mitt-Mait* 'Sindhi') is an as traditional value of social system. However, among others, one of the most essential factors is the context

which also affects language and communication etiquette.

Hence, due to sociocultural and socio-cognitive factors, the bi-cultural and bilingual identity evolves which may not be overlooked.

1.5. Bi-cultural and bilingual identity in discursive practices

Identity according to Fairclough (2003: 160) is one's social identity as the result of early socialization which takes place within social circumstances, and it relates to personality an individual acquires in later stage of life. In other words, the differences which separate a person or a group from another becomes it identity. It is a sense of particularity as member of the human race which encompassing values of an individuals or speech community (Thiongo, 1986).

> "The notion of identity, understood in more general terms, refers to an individual's awareness of his or her belonging to a particular community, socio-cultural, professional, ideological, or otherwise. Based on a particular sense of belonging, an individual decides how he or she will engage with the community in question and determines the nature of the engagement" (Larina et al. 2017: 112).

Identity is awareness of self and affiliation to a specific group of people. This awareness relates to social, cultural, ideological, professional, etc. which shapes individual's interaction and decides nature of communication.

Identity in Pakistan according to Rahman (2009: 233) is construction with relevance to a number of variables—ethnicity, gender, class and religion. Suryanarayan and Khalil (2021) established the fact in their study that kinship terms show inclusive meanings and cultural values, and are more part of lingua-cultural identity.

Identity "*encompass macro-level demographic categories, temporary and interactionally specific stances and participant role, and local, ethnographically emergent cultural positions*" (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005: 585). Identity must be

viewed as relational because it is created through interaction with other interlocutors. Identity is one of the important principles that represent the variation in the choice of address forms (Clyne, 2009).

Among other layers of identity, one the most prominent manifestation is ethnic identity. Pakistani society is multiethnic society, therefore, "identity is a multifaceted notion" (Larina et al., 2017: 112). Ethnic identity is fundamental construct which develops over the time in different aspects (Phinney and Ong, 2007: 271). Moreover, components of ethnic identity are relatable to the process of acculturation, both construct ethnic identity and acculturation relationship is complex due to overlapping changes over a time in new culture (Phinney, 2003).

Analysing identity in language and communication, a bifurcate shown that *we*-orientation is still typical of among Russians, while an *I*-orientation is an inherent feature of English (Larina & Ozyumenko, 2017). Language and identity are intertwined social factors, linguistics identities "are multiple and people are capable of constructing as well as reconstruction multiples identities within and across Discourses". (Abrar-ul-Hassan, 2010: 29).

Pakistani English speakers retain their "identity, they try appropriate English language to underpin their own culture/s through English language" (Habib & Inayatullah, 2017: 130). Moreover, an individual's lingual identity is building blocks in linguistics and intercultural communication (Larina et al., 2017). Identity influences intercultural communication and expands the complex relationships between language and culture. Thus, identity is "the process of construction of meaning on the basis of a cultural attribute, or a related set of cultural attributes, that is given priority over other sources of meaning" (Castells, 2010: 6).

Discursive practices are a linguistic reflection of social practice and are defined '*as a relatively stable form of social activity*', such as in-person, online, or public communication (Fairclough, 2001: 231). Contexts such as situation and

culture, play an important role to determine discursive practices between interlocutors (Goddard, 2013; Kotorova, 2018). Besides, the relationships of "language, culture, ideology are intertwined in diverse discursive practices and these practices are shaped by people representing various cultures, ideologies and social entities" (Bilá & Ivanova, 2020: 219).

Discursive practices are shaped among interlocutors which reflect their linguacultural identities but also indicate different their value, norms and local traditions (ibid). The discourse results in putting 'language, action, interaction, values, beliefs, symbols, objects, tools, and places together in such a way that others recognize you as specific type of who (identity) communicates in a particular type of what (activity), situation, and when (time) (Gee 1999: 27).

Thus, human language functions testify to the fact that ""discourse analysis is in constant evolution, and continues to expand in the range and scope of its research activities" (Ponton and Larina 2017: 12)". Kecskes (2014: 17) investigates discourse-based understanding of local knowledge (values) and the roles between interlocutors. He explains "how actual communicative meaning is created as the result of the interplay between prior context encoded in the words used in the utterance and actual situational context in which the interaction takes place".

A person's *lingua-cultural identity* is shaped by how they recognize and use communication models of discourse events that are accepted in a particular culture and that they acquire through socialization (Natalya, 2009: 224). *Bi-cultural identity* in broader sense is defined as someone identifies and experiences with more than one cultural heritage, whereas, *bilingual* is a person's ability to speak two languages (Ragavan and Cowden, 2020). *Bi-lingual identity* "includes not only the use of two languages, but in most cases, also management of two cultures in the sense that bilinguals might feel they are part of two different cultures to varying degrees" (Bakić and Škifić, 2017: 36).

Bi-cultural and bilingual scenario of speakers leads to readjustment of their identity in academic setting. They negotiate their lingual and cultural identities in the universities when speaking English and adjust in the hybrid identities. Identity is not a simple choice of one language and culture rather it's a continuous balancing act of multi languages and cultures (Kanno, 2003), however, cultural identity is inclusive of both national and ethnic identities. Examining students' bilingual and bicultural identity, Fielding and Harbon (2013) found that individual and social factors, and the three interrelated factors namely connection, interaction, and investment influenced their languages and cultures.

Bi-cultural and bilingual attitudes exist in social hierarchy and power relations, and the teachers show strong relationship between value of native language and culture reaffirming their identities (Weisman, 2001). The interactions between interlocutors not only reflects the uniqueness of each speaker's culture but also highlights the practical significance of managing interpersonal relationships in line with what each speaker considers appropriate for their sociocultural context.

However, similar comparison of bi-cultural identity among university students. The cultural identity is relatable to bi-cultural direction. Young Pakistani negotiate their bilingual identities in urban cities which constitute their hybrid, local, ethnic, and global bilingual identities and they rely on code-switching depending on the contexts and situations (Khalid and Khan, 2022). Bi-cultural identity has axes for describing identity across social situations. However, the diversity of identity expressed among bi-cultural individuals ensures hybridity and alternation (Ruxandra-Silvia et al., 2018).

We can state that bi-cultural and bilingual identity of English speakers remain hybrid. Their reliance on code-switching and negotiation for establishing identity varies across social, situational, and contextual settings. However, in our study Pakistani English speakers adjust their identities and carry the local

communicative values when interacting in multicultural and multilingual environment.

Thus, identity in our study to be viewed as "the emergent product rather than the pre-existing source of linguistic" and therefore, it is "fundamentally a social and cultural phenomenon" (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005: 588). The discursive approach of this study enables us to incorporate within bi-cultural and bilingual "identity not the broad sociological categories associated with the concept, but also more local positionings, both ethnographic and interactional" (ibid, 607).

1.6. Multicultural and multilingual environment of Pakistani universities

Pakistani universities are growing hubs of multilingual and multicultural speakers. Students, teachers, and other staff belong to different rural and urban areas inheriting a variety of languages and cultural norms. The bilingual environment of Pakistani universities reflects the linguistic situation in the country.

Historically, geographically, and socially Pakistan is a multicultural and multicultural country, it consists of the autonomous regions of Gilgit-Baltistan (GB) and Azad Jammu and Kashmir (AJK), in addition to the four provinces of Punjab, Sindh, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK), and Baluchistan. There is a variety of ethnic groups and geographical affiliations in the provinces and autonomous regions e.g. Punjabi, Sindhi, Pashtun/Pakhtun, Baloch, Brahui, Seraiki, Hazara, Urdu speakers, Kashmiri, Balti, Gilgiti, etc. Pakistani society's predominant ethnic groups include 44.7% Punjabis, 15.4% Pashtun/Pakhtun, 14.1% Sindhis, 8.4% Seraiki of the southern part of Punjab, Urdu speakers 7.6%, Baloch 3.6%, and 6.2% other groups (Misachi, 2019).

There are 77 languages spoken in Pakistan with 38.7% Punjabi; 18.2% Pashto; 14.5% Sindhi; Seraiki 12.1%; Urdu 7.0%; Balochi 3.2%; Hindko 2.4%; Brahui 1.2%; Kashmiri 0.1%; and 2.2% *'other languages'*. However, Urdu is national and English is official state languages.

The linguistic scenario in general tends to be diverse according to the Census (2017), *native or local* languages, one of the most prominent Pakistani sociolinguists Tariq Rahman reported among identified *'other languages'* at least 65 languages (Rahman, 2008), however, approximately 77 languages are spoken in Pakistan (Eberhard et al., 2020).

An ordinary Pakistani due to their ethnic diversity and geographical affiliation can speak a minimum of three to four languages being a member of a multiethnic and multicultural society. Pakistani universities are the epicentre of multilingualism and multiethnic identities that establish and maintain their distinctiveness and unity in diversity (Bughio, 2014). Furthermore, according to Wierzbicka (2003: 330), in a multicultural society, various cultures can coexist without significant inter-penetration. Multilingualism in educational settings in Pakistan takes multilinguals group into consideration. Pakistani provinces have singles or several identities of people and languages spoken by the majority (Ashraf et al., 2021).

It is noteworthy to mention that among all languages only Sindhi language has the provincial official status. In general Pakistani private schools and colleges use English only, and the public sector uses both English and Urdu and local languages for teaching and learning purposes. However, English as a medium of instruction is dominantly used in elite private educational institutes (Rahman, 2009) and public universities also.

Students synthesize lingual identities which shows the belongingness to different regions and cities, moreover, students "will no longer identify" themselves as monolinguals (Ashraf et al., 2021: 45). Multiethnic, multicultural, and multilingual educational settings have adopted culturally and linguistically diverse system, which result in both as symbol of unity and linguistic identity (Bughio, 2014).

The national of Pakistan is Urdu, limited to urbanized areas of educational institutes i.e. universities rarely use Urdu as medium of instruction. However, English in multicultural and multilingual Pakistan occupies main role and is used as medium of instruction along with vernacular languages—Urdu medium, Sindhi medium, Pashto medium, etc. For instance, if an ordinary Pakistani university student shows proficiency in dominant language of the region and people disregard of mother tongue.

Multicultural and multilingual society create multiple identities. Pakistani students encounter several lingual and cultural ideologies which affect their ethnic affiliation and view of language in use. In Pakistan, ideology of an individual is associates with group mediated by the linguacultural factors. Pakistani students have ethnic grouping, each has its "own language and culture" which considered an important component of their "ethnic values" (Ashraf et al., 2021: 3). Multilingual environment of Pakistani universities indicates that students, teachers, and other stakeholders encounter ethnic diversity equipped with 'own language and culture and ideologies'. Hence, multicultural and multilingual settings of Pakistani universities influence the communication process between interlocutors, featuring some indigenized variations and utilize their linguistic repertoire from *own languages* when speaking Pakistani English.

Pakistani universities are advantageous and facilitating environment for the study of multilingualism and multiculturalism. Moreover, the relationship between multicultural and multilingual phenomenon becomes one the key sources/agents of impact on cognitive and linguaculture identities. Thus, the multilingual context of Pakistani academia shows the domains of power and solidarity which has helped to determine the language ideologies, informal interaction, and ethnic identity assertion (Rahman, 2020).

This scenario of Pakistani universities and Pakistani English speakers

demonstrate their multilingual identity and use of more than one language turns to code-switching, and code-mixing in their interaction.

1.7. Multilingualism, translanguaging, code-switching, and code-mixing in Pakistani academic discourse

Multilingualism is defined as the ability to understand and speak more than two or several languages simultaneously, and speakers of multiple languages are known as multilinguals or as polyglots (Diamond, 2010). Sadykova et al., (2018: 18) defined it as the use of multiple languages by an individual or group of persons based on the communication situation and the addressee. A person who understands and speaks two languages is considered a bilingual and the ability to understand and speak two languages is *bilingualism* (Sadykova et al., 2018: 18).

We use the term *bilingual* here as the ability of an individual to understand and speak two or more languages depending on communication needs and environment. Moreover, bilingual reflect their association with specific cultures, backgrounds, worldviews, and lingual identities when they communicate. The notion of bilingualism has been researched in multicultural societies (Canagarajah and Ashraf, 2013; Diamond, 2010; Jabeen, 2020; Rahman, 2008 to mention a few).

Languages are actually very different in all respects, and these differences generally follow the lines demarcated by the local/traditional boundaries that are permeable distinctions between languages (Singleton, 2016). In short, the physical environment, social context, gestures, and multimodal resources corroborate in communication among bilinguals (cf. Canagarajah, 2009). Consequently, the bilingual paradigm shifts into linguistic mediation between local/native languages and the English language where translanguaging, code-mixing and code-switching are regularly practiced.

Translanguaging refers to "act performed by bilinguals of accessing different linguistic features or various modes of what are described as autonomous

languages, in order to maximize communicative potential" (García, 2009: 140). In other words, bilinguals use a variety of discursive strategies known as translanguaging to make sense of their bilingual environments.

Translanguaging deals with the complexity of language production, function, communication, and thought processes behind language use (Lewis et al., 2012). According to Canagarajah (2013: 41) the term "multilingual" refers to the relationship between different languages in an additive way (i.e., a combination of different languages), the term "translingual" refers to the synergy, treating languages as constantly in contact with one another and developing new grammars and meanings.

Translanguaging focuses on the learners' flexible language use and it is inevitable in bilingualism and facilitates bilingualism in classrooms of different contexts (cf. Atta and Naqvi, 2022). Pakistani English speakers experience translanguaging due to bilingualism and co-construct meanings (Portolés and Marti, 2017). Translanguaging benefits the increased comprehension, critical understanding, and retention levels of low-proficiency students (Lau et al., 2017). It shows interlocutors use bilingual practices regarding vocabulary, and self-governing for inner and outer speech (cf. Velasco and García, 2014), to build bilingual identities and sociolinguistic perspectives (Lee and García, 2021).

It is assumed that Pakistani English speakers in bilingual university classrooms may maintain unique features in the linguistic repertoire and semiotic repertoire. They use their complete *linguistic repertoire*—the set of skills and knowledge one possesses regarding one or more languages, as well as their varieties (Oostendorp, 2022). *Semiotic repertoire*—which includes speech, image, text, gesture, sign, gaze, facial expression, posture, and objects—is the full range of semiotic resources that people use to communicate (Kusters, 2021: 183).

The concept of the translanguaging centres for both linguistic and semiotic

repertoires in bilingual classroom discourse. Atta and Naqvi (2022) found that students negotiate meanings, build metalinguistic competence, and communicate confidently without anxiety in various settings. The linguistic repertoire and translanguaging have significantly changed teaching and learning with a focus on new trends in the multilingual environment (Cenoz and Santos, 2020), and translanguaging facilitates bilingualism and multilingualism, sociolinguistics, and applied linguistics (Canagarajah and Ashraf, 2013; Cenoz and Santos, 2020; García, 2009; Portolés and Martí, 2017). It is used to refer to everyday cognitive processes, a theory of language, and personal and social transformation in addition to bilingual language practices (Jasper, 2018).

To prevent colonialist ideologies, teachers' translanguaging disrupted the naturally monolingual and colonial tendencies of English classrooms, reflected their own linguistic and cultural identities, and integrated students' varied language practices (de los Ros and Seltzer, 2017: 55). Larina and Suryanarayan (2023: 146) found that address forms used in Indian English possess exceptional linguistic creativity. When speaking in English, Hindi forms of address are frequently used, showing that translanguaging is a predominant discursive practice.

Speakers of different languages mark the influence on English to create a single uniform code despite speaking different Englishes for intelligibility and effective communication which increases English as a translingual notion (cf. Canagarajah, 2013: 69). English language teaching in the light of multilingual encounters challenges traditional monolingual teaching practices, therefore the role of translanguaging in English language classroom has increased (Liu and Fang, 2020). As a result, Pakistani English speakers at universities frequently draw on their diverse linguistic and cultural resources when speaking, demonstrating how translanguaging affects communication behaviour.These peculiarities in discursive practices of interlocutors bring our attention to the indigenization or nativization

process of English, particularly in the Pakistani context.

Code-switching and code-mixing are common phenomena of bilingualism. *Code-switching* is the ability to engage in a fluent switch from one language to another with flexibility and creativity (Beatty-Martínez, et al. 2020). Code switching practice "this contextualization may *relate to local discourse practices*, such as turn selection or various forms of bracketing, or *it may make relevant information beyond the current exchange, including knowledge of society and diverse identities*" (Nilep, 2006: 1).

According to Kachru (1986), *mixing* is the conversion of code A unit into code B at both the intersentential and intrasentential levels.

Code-mixing assists speakers in mixing word/s, phrases, or smaller units of language from one language to another (Mushtaq and Zahra, 2012). However, our analysis of empirical findings focused on the description of code-mixing.

Pakistani English speakers employ both strategies with flexibility and creativity when interacting. English colloquialisms like *dressing table, thank you, television,* etc. are frequently used in conversation by individuals who have never even studied the language (Ehsan and Aziz, 2014). Urdu language is clearly under-influenced by English and code-mixing and code-switching take place frequently as Rasul (2013) investigated borrowing and code-mixing in Pakistani children's literature. He observed frequent tendencies of code-mixing from English into Urdu not only in spoken discourse but also evident in the written discourse. Analysing a nine-year-old child case in a multilingual society of Pakistan, found social interactions, native language, bilingual environment, communication partners, and medium of instruction main factors that specify the child's code-switching and code-mixing speech (Bhatti and Sartaj, 2019).

Individuals typically choose a specific set of codes whenever they choose to speak. They choose to switch between codes or mix codes, sometimes even within

asingle utterance, which results in the creation of a new code (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2021). In multilingual societies, speakers regularly switch from one language to another to meet communicative needs, similar practices occur in EFL classrooms in Pakistan (Bhatti and Sartaj, 2019). In classroom discourse, Pakistani teachers and students practice both code-mixing and code-mixing to translate new vocabulary, maintain discipline, and develop solidarity and intimacy with each other (ibid).

Code-mixing impact on teachers' attitudes indicating choice in proper nouns, verbs, adjectives, and abbreviations significantly used to facilitate the communication process among bilingual (Younas et al., 2020). Jabeen (2020) found that bilingualism influences creating varieties and variations in a language, where borrowing, code-mixing, and code-switching ordinarily convey cultural aspects. Analysing social aspects of code-switching in the language of advertisements reflects variations in linguistic practices and preferences (Khan, 2014). Ramzan et al., (2021) reveal that students mix and switch words, clauses, and sentences from Punjabi to English in their communication. In the multilingual environment, code-mixing and code-switching are frequent, and English words are used commonly by Pakistani speakers (Amjad and Shafiq ur Rehman, 2020). Pakistani English speakers encounter code switching and code mixing, and their usage habits follow the norm for the speech community.

The multilingual environment in academia enriches and encourages Pakistani English speakers to adapt their communication styles creatively. Canagarajah (2009) investigated the creative use of the strategies among multilinguals to communicate in English during interpersonal communication. He emphasized six points including the fact that multilinguals maintain their:

"(i) linguistic distinctiveness in social interactions, (ii) co-construct intersubjective norms of communication, (iii) communicate using

hybrid codes, are (iv) consensus-oriented and supportive, (v) draw on ecology for meaning-making, and that (vi) language use and learning are interconnected" (Canagarajah, 2009: 18-20).

Interpersonal interaction of multilinguals adheres to ethno-communicative styles, and corroborate the interpretative communication norms by using hybrid communication codes. Moreover, their communication displays a general agreement of decoding messages using the contextual, situation, and social values developing the interdependence between language, communication, and environment.

When possible they switch and mix codes between their native languages and English to meet communication needs. However, Pakistani bilingual and multicultural education environment characteristics remain influential and result in the translanguaging and nativization of English. The bilingual environment, translanguaging foster code-switching and code-mixing in the choice of addressing practices in Pakistani academic discourse. The bilingual environment of Pakistani universities facilitates adaptation in the form of code-switching and code-mixing in the choice of address forms of both English and native languages i.e. Urdu and Sindhi.

Summary

In the World Englishes paradigm Pakistani English belongs to the second outer circle which includes Englishes spoken in the post-colonized countries, where English is used as medium of instruction in educational and non-education institutes and offices.

Pakistani English like other Englishes is characterized as a non-native variety of English due to its nativized/indigenized features. In addition to phonetic, lexical and grammatical items it has also nativized some pragmatic and discursive features which are shaped by bilingual identity, namely its axiological components.

Pakistan belongs to collectivist high power cultures. It is a hierarchical status-oriented society with power distance sensitivity which must be displayed to person with authority. In other words, Pakistan can be described as a status-oriented and family-oriented culture. As a result, the main cultural values shared by the Pakistani are respect of elders and those with a higher status on the one hand and intimacy, closeness and brotherhood on the other.

Cultural and socio-cognitive factors shape identity and the communicative behaviour of interlocutors. Language, cognition and communication are interconnected which shows how a person thinks and interacts. Speech communities adhere to their norms and shared knowledge to create common ground of communication.

Identity is a multi-layered construct which is expressed through a range of semiotic resources including linguistic ones. Linguacultural identity consists of individual, social and cultural characteristics including religious, ideological, axiological, communicative among others. Individuals acquire and demonstrate their identity through their interaction with other members of the community and the nature of this interaction is reflected in language and its use, i.e. in discourse.

Bicultural and bilingual scenario of Pakistani English speakers leads to adaptation in their identity where they negotiate lingual and cultural identities. Pakistani English speakers adapt English to their native communicative values and their identity.

Pakistani universities have multicultural and multilingual environment, which is due to the students, teachers, and staff backgrounds. who belong to different rural and urban areas inheriting local values and cultural norms. Urdu is national and English is official state languages (Rahman, 2008). An ordinary Pakistani due to their ethnic diversity and geographical affiliation can speak a minimum of three or four languages being a member of a multiethnic and

multicultural society. Pakistani universities are the epicentre of multilingualism and multiethnic identities that establish and maintain their distinctiveness and unity in diversity. Hence, Pakistani universities are advantageous and facilitating environment for the study of multilingualism and multiculturalism. In this scenario the speakers demonstrate their multilingual identity and use of more than one language turns to code-switching, and code-mixing in their interaction.

To meet the communicative needs, Pakistani interlocutors demonstrate translanguaging, code-switching, and code-mixing which results into the nativized features of Pakistani English. Pakistani bilinguals use variety of native language words and communicative strategies in their discursive practices to express their self-identity. Translanguaging disrupted colonial trends and assist language learners to develop own linguistic and cultural identities. Code-switching and code-mixing is common notion among Pakistani English speakers, they switch between English and native language with creativity and flexibility. Hence, bilingual scenario of Pakistani universities facilitates code-switching and code-mixing in multicultural education environment.

Chapter 2. ADDRESS FORMS IN SOCIOCULTURAL AND AXIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

2.1. Functions of address forms in interpersonal interaction

Forms of address are the most important linguistic means used to negotiate the relationship between interlocutors. They represent an important relationship between language and society and show how people position themselves and others in social interactions.

Address forms demonstrate the interrelationship between cognition in interpersonal interactions and greeting behaviour. The cognition demonstrates that the formation of social identity and ongoing social structures cannot be separated from how address forms are used in everyday conversation (Dittrich et al., 2011). An important role of address forms as expressions in developing relationships (Khalil and Larina, 2022), moreover, address terms are crucial for keeping and developing closeness socially (Leech, 1999).

Address forms express the complexities of lingua-cultural relationships and replicate vital relations (Holmes, 2013). Address forms systems are linguistics systems that reveal how interlocutors of various languages perceive their social norms and values in life. Social norms are omnipresent, and "norms are culture particularized, but they can also overlap form culture to culture" and rules of address exchange the "cultural differences and social change governing the pragmatics of communication" (Dittrich et al., 2011: 3807). On a similar note, linguistic repertoire prevails in our minds and it is systematically arranged in a way through which mutual understanding occurs (Sharifian 2017). Forms of address have an important role to show the social status of the communicators and the nature of relationships between them.

Address forms not only reflect society and language but also interlocutors' learned behaviour mindset, and socio-cultural values (Afful, 2006). Wierzbicka

(2016) highlighted that terms of address are the most reliable source of how communicators of a specific language conceptualize their relationships. Language structure and social interactions in a community can be learned by observing how people use language, including the use of address forms, in various social contexts (Holmes, 2013: 1). Therefore, forms of address are defined as reflectors of the linguistic and social system of the culture and language used in the given settings.

The addressing practices demonstrate the communicators' as part of a social group, to show a common association of degree of social distance among them, by keeping the speech event they are communicating in. In other words, address terms are foundations for defining and establishing human relations and indicate a close link between them (Prakova, 2017). A shared language does not mean that the speakers have the same needs or ideas in mind rather speakers possess a specific set of sociolinguistic norms.

The choice of address forms is contextual and it is based on various social factors like the transactional status and working hierarchy (Wardhaugh, 2006) as well as intimacy or respect. Address forms in communication are determined by social factors like educational background. Wierzbicka (2013: 302) finds address forms an essential guide to the paths in which interlocutors to understand their social world. *Interlocutors* are the speakers and the addresses influence address behaviours, language and communication (Keshavarz, 2001). Cultural codes determine lingual choices related to an entire system of culture that expresses different values in a given context and language. In other words, different speaking styles and communication strategies can be defined in terms of various cultural values and priorities that have independently been established (Wierzbicka, 2003). Forms of address stand for sociolinguistics rules which determine the correct usage under the right situations (Holmes, 2013). Moreover, address terms are foundational indicators of human relationships and are intertwined with one's

cultural value system (Clyne, 2009). They are perceived as initiators of mutual understanding of relations between interlocutors, and members of a community, and their relationships depend on social and strategical contexts. Etaywe (2017) discusses the impact of culture and society on language use as well as how sensitive language is to situational context.

The choice of address forms is influenced by norms and axiological (*the knowledge of values*) systems. Indian English bilinguals choose specific address forms like "*ji* or *jee*, a mark of respect". The use of native terms by the interlocutor, such as *sir ji/jee* or *madam ji/jee*, show how functional differences affecting the pragmatics of terms and how axiological factors play a part in addressing norms (Larina and Suryanarayan, 2023: 160).

The main factors of particular address forms in the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) Hadeeth (traditions) was essentially based on when, where, and whom when others were addressed. These variety of functional tendencies suggests that the address forms were used with complete conscious knowledge, consequently, which traces back to notions of distance, intimacy, status, age, superiority, etc. Thus, social, cultural, and axiological systems impact the choice of address forms.

2.2. Cultural values and address forms in cross-cultural perspective

The section deals with the most influential literature describing cultural values, and relational factors that affect the use and choice of address forms in the discourse in cross-cultural context.

Forms of address in cross-cultures express a variety of social and cultural norms, values, and attitudes. Factors like age, gender, socioeconomic status, level of formality, degree of intimacy, and occupation were all social variables that affected the use of address forms (Alenizi, 2019). A norm that can be expected to differ in various languages and cultures and the standards and norms vary in cultures and speech communities, even in communities that speak the same

60

language (Schneider, 2017). The relationship between culture and language provides a solid basis for identifying "*culturally constructed conceptualisations and world views*", and "*underlying level of cultural conceptualisations*" (Sharifian, 2015: 515). Furthermore:

> the "ethnic culture is transmitted to the outer space i.e. expands the territory of its existence, through language vested with high functional authorities" and "the language must be permanently filled with new ethnic content. The content does not displace or replace the content, but are in synergy interactions" (Bakhtikireeva et al., 2017: 117)

Languages are endowed with higher functional authority and the ethnic culture is transferred, expanded, therefore, the language requires to be continuously researched and updated with ethnic content. The ethnic content of language interacts synergistically with other content instead of replacement or displacement.

Cultural shows worldviews and underlying practices of individuals such ethnicity. Ethnic conceptualisations spread due to the prevalent linguistic styles and functions, and ethnic contents and language synergize communicative behaviour. Brown and Gilman (1960) demonstrate that many European languages are formal and informal when choosing a forms of address. The vertical and horizontal distance notion reconceptualized with different contexts in English and non-English sociocultural settings.

Therefore, the ethnicity, lingual conceptualizations can be explored in the usage of address forms. Forms of address are important linguistic repertoire to understand cultural values, "social concepts, and human relationships in society" (Yuryeva, 2018: 687). Moreover, address forms are investigated in multidisciplinary research, one them in the field of socio-cognitive linguistics "as they demonstrate how a context reflects in the communication etiquettes and in language" (ibid: 687).

In intercultural context, "culture is the most important extralinguistic factor shaping its members communicative style and behaviour" (Larina, 2015: 200). Address forms in Australian political discourse indicate differences both in choice and positioning. For instance, journalists tend to use pre-positioned forms of address when addressing politicians i.e. Prime Minister; Mr. Howard. On the other hand, politicians used first names and have more flexibility when positioning in the choice of address terms (Rendle-Short, 2007: 1503). Moreover, forms of address can occur in any position in the Australian context between both journalists and politicians' interaction.

> "Address terms occur in any position within turns at talk, whether that be at the beginning of a turn, in the middle of a turn or at the end of a turn. Sequential analysis of the turns prior to and following the address term turns demonstrates how participants within the political news interview position address terms in order to achieve particular interactional outcomes" (Rendle-Short, 2011: 93).

The placement of address forms in interaction vary across cultures and languages, and it can appear at any point in Australian context in the conversation. In political news interviews, both interlocutors i.e. the politicians and the interviewers shown a sequential analysis of the turns that precede and follow specific address terms.

According to Koul's (1995) study on the Kashmiri language, the choice of which address forms to use is influenced by a variety of social and historical factors, including geographical contexts, social structures, and cultural norms. As Wardhaugh (2006) emphasized the social factors such as family relationships, social status, transactional status, occupational hierarchy, family relationships, level of intimacy, and communication context influence how address forms are selected. Aliakbari & Toni (2008: 11) opined that forms of address in Persian

culture are gender-specific, moderately formal, and politically, socially, and culturally significant. No matter their native tongue or country of origin, learners' peculiarities manifest in language and discourse, which shapes their communicative ethno-styles (Larina, 2015). We have examined the main studies related address forms in cross-cultural contexts. Forms of address are investigated in cross-cultural perspectives within family discourse, workplace, and beyond (Khalil and Larina, 2022; Larina et al., 2019 among many others).

The choice of address forms in an academic setting where students address their teachers and teachers address their students is far from clear-cut and predefined (Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2018). The participants of communication i.e. students, teachers, and administrative staff must be aware of the interpersonal communication norms for the effectiveness of message sharing in academic settings. Specifically, the classroom offers more important casual encounters between students and teachers such as rapid responses and context, providing better situations to reflect sociolinguistic values and norms.

Interlocutors i.e. teachers and students use different address forms for instance, Saudi universities students avoid using first and last names (Abalkheel, 2020), whereas, in British academic setting its common to use firs and last names for teachers (Formentelli, 2009) in cross cultural contexts. In Nigerian universities forms of address are relatable to the sociocultural heritage of Nigerians, where titles are significant cultural elements (Opata and Asogwa 2017; Unuabonah 2018).

Address forms depend on factors like culture, relationships, level of formality and informality, and distribution of power based on the hierarchical structure of academic interactions and solidarity (Larina and Suryanarayan, 2023). Larina and Suryanarayan (2013; 2019; 2023) have investigated ways to address people in different academic contexts. The authors found that interlocutors show outstanding creativity in linguistics by creating hybrid forms of address in line with

socio-cognitive behaviour, values, and understanding. This choice of hybrid address terms establishes the fact that speakers maintain politeness strategies as cultural tendency. Moreover, this can also be stated that "*we-culture*" (Larina et al. 2017: 114) encode the idea that people's social cognition is a key concept in theorizing the world around them. Investigating address practice of God in European languages, the users offer a wide range of options when addressing God based on languages and broader historical phenomena (Wierzbicka, 2020: 259). Hence, addressing practices depend on cultural values, cognition, and ethnocultural styles of interlocutors.

To investigate preferences in the choice of an address form a variety of contextual and demographic factors influenced the teacher-student interaction, as Poproski et al., (2021) found students use titles in formal settings to show solidarity with female teachers in American colleges. In another study in African contexts, found the impact of Hausa culture on expressing politeness, respect, and honour by selecting titles, and kinship terms among faculty members of Bayero University, Kano (cf. Chamo, 2019). Exploring address forms as reflectors of language ideologies in a southwestern Nigerian university. Various categories of address forms derived from English, Nigerian Pidgin, Yoruba, and other indigenous Nigerian languages were discovered through analysis (Unuabonah, 2018).

Addressing practices in the British academic setting reveals asymmetrical patterns in choosing titles + surnames, and honorifics by students. Whereas, lecturers choose first names and other informal expressions in verbal and non-verbal patterns of address (Formentelli, 2009) and might give the students permission to be called informally, i.e. by first name (Larina, 2008). This indicates that equality prevails over hierarchy in the British academic culture. Addressing practices depend on both function and context, forms of address are considered

linguistic means of developing the interlocutors' relations by expressing their attitudes and feelings across culture. In short, forms of address have distinctiveness and vary across cultures in after analysis of the relevant literature.

2.3. Taxonomy of address forms

There are two major types of address forms: relational and absolute when describing the taxonomy of address forms. *Relational types* of taxonomy or classification show relationships between the speaker and addressee. *Absolute types*, on the other hand, show that some summon terms are reserved for the speaker for instance, *your excellency*, and *Mr. President* (Levinson: 1983: 90-91). The taxonomy of address forms consists of several relational aspects and promote negotiation, involvement, or dependence between interlocutors for creating social relationships between them in spoken and written communication (Félix-Brasdefer, 2015: 204).

This section provides a concise review of the literature on classification and categories of address forms that we find most relevant for the current study. The connections between group ideology, social structure, and address forms was emphasized by Brown and Gilman (1960). They investigated the meaning of pronominal address forms in French, Italian, Spanish and German and noticed the change from the use of familiar and polite pronouns with a power semantic to one with a solidarity semantic. The power semantics of pronominal address forms i.e. *V* characterize hierarchy used for the master, and *T* for common people. On the other hand, the solidarity semantic of pronominal address form *V* to a person of superior power and *T* differ in strength, age, wealth, sex or profession (Brown and Gilman, 1960: 257). Moreover, the relations which are symmetrical correspond to norms of address which become more possible are solidarity declines. Thus, they suggested that the modern direction of change in pronominal forms of address usage expresses an intention of the solidarity ethic to everyone in Europeans (ibid: 280).

After Brown and Gilman's (1960) preliminary work of address forms, Brown and Ford (1961) explored the relationship between interlocutors and the choice of address forms in American English. It was found that American English includes two main kinds of address forms i. the first name (FN) and use of the last name (TLN). FN and TLN in two reciprocal patterns emerge with the distinction between them is one degree of acquaintance, mutually FN exchange among younger people than for older people. To put this way, FN and TLN seems to have two reciprocal patterns on a path which moves from acquaintance to intimacy, and the principle reason for this shift is intimacy due to shared values such as nationality, gender, etc. and regular contact. On the other hand, nonreciprocal pattern in Brown and Ford (1961) involves two main different dimension with age and occupational status with the proof of dyads match on a one dimension but not on the other. Thus, their study finds a variety of tendencies used multiple names to address intimacy with friends with semantic-psychological perspective. The studied concluded that addressing practices are categorical level, and constitutes the individuality.

Ervin-Tripp (1972) developed a modal which shows factors affecting the order to produce a given address forms. Her study identified three categories of address forms. (1) first names and (2) titles with last name. The study shown address system mainly shared by some American society or speech community and can serve variety of uses based on the occasion with regard to the formality or informality, hierarchical relationships, and social identity among interlocutors. In another study focusing on explaining the pragmatic choice of address forms relating to horizontal and vertical distance,

Leech (1983) identified English nominal address forms as (1) family terms i.e. *mama, daddy*, (2) endearment terms e.g. *honey, sweetie*, (3) familiarized first names i.e. *Billie, Kev*, (4) familiarizer e.g. *mate, buddy*, (5) honorifics, e.g. sir,

madam, (6) titles + names i.e. *Mr. Black, Miss Sophia,* (7) full first name i.e. *Johnson, Elizabeth*, and (9) attention getters/seekers e.g. *Hey, Hello/Hi*. He found the functions of address forms to maintain or establish the social relationships between interlocutors. Investigating Egyptian dialect of Arabic, Parkinson (1985) found traditional linguistic and social structure dominant tendencies in the choice of addressing practices. His taxonomy in Egyptian Arabic consisted of family terms, respect terminology, second person pronominal forms, friendly and funny terms, and abuse terms.

Daba (1987) identified as: (1) names, (2) titles, (3) kin terms, (4) pronouns, and (5) epithets. Hausa community shown hierarchy and considered gender differences in the use of address forms. Their choice is influenced by Cultural Revolution in Hausa land and emphasized contexts, relationships, cognition, and ideological reality which determined the choice and shift in forms of address.

The most widely used scheme of address forms is of Braun (1988) in most languages. It includes address system, their totality, and the interrelations. The scheme consisted of (1) names, (2) kinship terms, (3) titles, (4) abstract nouns, (5) terms of endearments, (6) occupation terms, (7) corresponding terms to the English Mrs. and Mr., (8) specific words relating to the relationships, and (9) teknonyms. Šubová (2010) investigates individual languages differing in the production of address forms and number of variations in across linguacultures. Moreover, her distinction focused on syntactic: as free and bound forms of address. Bound forms that are integrated part of communication like *you* in "*Do you like it*"; free forms can occur in initial, central or final position in communication for instance, *Mr. Brown* (Šubová, 2010: 11). However, she questioned the universality in address forms as,

> "universals of this kind are not satisfactory, but address is so varied
> that, possibly, one may not find anything beyond the most of

correspondence… in most languages concerned address inversion is used for expressing affection and authority, especially in talking to children" (Braun, 1988: 304;309).

The variations in the categories of address forms is universal fact, however, the usage is so diverse that it is possible that more than the majority of correspondence will be found. Moreover, Address asymmetry is a common way to convey authority, love, and affection in most languages particularly when speaking to young people.

The modern Chinese address system consisted of (1) official title, (2) title of a technical or professional post, (3) occupational title, (4) honorifics, (5) general address, (6) intimate address, (7) name, and (8) kinship term (Gu, 1990). The study focused on noticeable differences between Chinese and English address system and asymmetry in address. The study observed that Chinese address system adhered to social hierarchy in comparison to American, moreover, it was noticed that values and norms are attached of every culture in communication behaviour which demonstrate culture-specificity and lingual-specificity (ibid: 256). While in Korean language, Lee's (1991) ethnographic observation identified Korean honorifics included: (1) addressee honorifics, (2) subject honorifics, and (3) object honorifics along with two main categories of terms of address and terms of reference. The study analysed honorifics used to develop relations between interlocutors and reflect directly the social hierarchy.

In addition, some other categories in the Jordanian context were identified as (1) titles of address, and (2) kin-type terms (Farghal and Shakir, 1994). They investigated relational social honorifics in the light of the socio-pragmatic constraints ruling their usage. The study emphasized that both categories involved distance and affection, titles were exclusively used among strangers, kin terms mainly used among friends and relatives, and occasionally for strangers. These

tendencies show that interaction between language and social coordinates in Jordanian Arabic (ibid: 240). Another study from Indian context focused on to understand the social structure of Kannada language speakers. Her study identified following forms of address (1) caste-based, (2) status-oriented, (3) personal name, (4) professional names, (5) kinship term, (6) professional terms for exaltation, (7) personal name-kinship term, (8) personal name-professional term, and (9) non-respectable term (Manjulakshi, 2004). The study observed intimacy correlated with social structure and cultural behaviour, however, people tend to use non-honorific forms of address in rural areas due to the social reforms.

Afful (2006) studying non-kinship address forms in the Akan language in Ghana categories consisted of (1) personal names, (2) catchphrases, (3) titles, (4) descriptive phrases, (5) zero address forms, (6) occupational terms, (7) attention seekers, and (8) pronouns. The study explored linguistic repertoire among Ghanaian university students' interactions. The findings reveal use of non-kinship address terms influenced by Westernized behaviour and modernism in choice of personal names and catch phrases dictated by sociocultural and pragmatic factors and relationship of the interactants. Investigating the relationship between address forms and socio-cultural factors and contexts in Arabic, Khalil and Larina (2018) found several categories among those mainly (1) kinship terms, and (2) Teknonyms were used differently across contexts. They find cultural-orientations in the choice and use of both categories which were determined by culture and cultural values. For instance, the use of kinship terms was not limited to family only, but within the circle of acquaintances and strangers. Teknonyms— 'Kunya' an Arabic equivalent, is another culture-specific form of address used widely. It demonstrates their belonging to the group, social net, and suggest pragmatic functions of closeness and respect (ibid: 305).

To summarize, aforementioned research studies show the taxonomy of

address forms provide a systematic description of diverse linguacultural settings. Each scheme investigated in a specific address system across cultures and languages found both sociocultural and pragmatic features of different speech communities. Therefore, in our study we focused on categories of forms of address in Pakistani English.

2.4. Categories of forms of address in Pakistani English

In our study we mainly draw on the typology of address forms by Braun's (1988) scheme which is widely implemented by researchers who investigate forms of address across linguacultures. Considering the Pakistani contexts, we also added to the set of categories. On the whole 8 categories used by Pakistani English speakers in bilingual academic settings have been explored in the study: (1) first names; (2) kinship terms; (3) terms of endearments; (4) honorifics; (5) titles; (6) occupation/profession based terms (7) caste as terms of address; and (8) hybrid address forms.

2.4.1. Names and naming system

In all languages, names are a part of the nominal repertory of addresses (Braun, 1988). There are numerous varieties of naming systems and functions in different languages and cultures when addressing.

Pakistani naming system is complex due to regional, religious, and ethnic diversity. Pakistani names are connected to societal elements like power, identity, and belief systems (Rahman, 2013). In Pakistan, naming practices are influenced by social class, type of religion, level of religiosity, ethnic identity, and urban or rural upbringing. A greater Islamization, Arabization, or Westernization is manifested in naming patterns in Pakistan. Names play a key role in both identity construction and identity change (ibid).

Personal names in Pakistan play a significant role in identity construction

70

and serve as markers of a person's position within social networks. They ultimately have a direct connection to historical, cultural, and economic factors and how society's members use these factors to create their social realities. They frequently have something to do with the social belief structure (see Rahman, 2013: 34). Proper, personal, or first names are characterized as personal labels in Western identities that do not reveal any aspect of the person identified by the name (Gardiner, 1957). Rahman (2013) discovered that Pakistanis thought of their names as a liability, burden, or even a trap because of their rural or traditional public perceptions and non-modern identities, and even some names as a source of embarrassment. Thus, names complex tendencies driven by local traditions. Pakistanis' naming practices traditions are based on local and religious customs, but the parents want to give their children Islamic names in order to show closeness with religious affiliation (Rahman, 2013).

A typical name in Pakistan consists of three components based on tribal, regional, or religious affiliation e.g. a Muslim name can be *Muhammad Sameer Soomro* (with three morphological components); the first component *Muhammad* shows the level of religiosity (means practicing sharia/Islam or an orthodox); *Sameer* shows personal identity; *Soomro* is caste adopted only from father. In addition, Pakistani naming generally goes with the combination/full name *Muhammad Sameer* describing religious affiliation and personal identity. From European, American, or Eurasian naming practices the first name/given name from the above example can be *Sameer,* however, this is known as a *'personal name'* in the Pakistani naming system (Rahman, 2013). Female names typically consist of one component or two components such as *Mahrosh*, *Mahrosh Khan, or Mahrosh Soomro*. Mahrosh is the first/personal name; *Khan* is tribal affiliation; or *Soomro* (caste) is given to females in most cases. Therefore, the Pakistani naming system consists of the following patterns:

- *Sameer* (male) or *Mahrosh* (female) (first/personal/given name)

- *Muhammad* (religious affiliation)

- *Muhammad Sameer* (combination name-male)

- *Soomro* or *Khan,* (Caste, tribal/clan, or geographical affiliation)

- *Muhammad Sameer Soomro* (full name-male)

- *Mahrosh Soomro* (full name-female)

Pakistani names and naming system demonstrates a complex set of tendencies driven by local traditions, such the use of names shows intimacy or closeness when used at the same level of age, social status, and elders. However, the usage of first names is considered impolite, bad-mannered, and highly discouraged to address an individual with higher social status, older people, or aunts, uncles, etc.

Thus, names and naming practices in Pakistan construct identity, describe relations with race and ethnicity, religion, class, and regional identities, and describe how power is exercised. In Pakistani society, names offer insights into the addressee's identity and contain information about their cultural values and communication behaviour.

Table 2.1. Name Types

Names	Examples	
	Male	**Female**
Personal/First name	Sarang, Safeer, Jamil, etc.	Mahrosh, Fatima, etc.
Combination name	Sarang Ali, Safeer Ahmed, Muhammad Jamil, etc.	Mahrosh Arif, Fatima Noor, etc.
Caste, tribal/clan affiliation	Soomro, Baloch, Khan, etc.	Soomro, Baloch, Khan, etc.
Full name	Sarang Ali Soomro, Safeer Ahmed Baloch, Muhammad Jamil Khan, etc.	Mahrosh Soomro, Fatima Baloch, etc.

2.4.2. Kinship terms

Kinship terms are linguistic expressions that can be used to describe both blood (lineage) and non-blood relationships, such as in-laws (Braun, 1988). Kinship terms suggest a biological connection, however, it can be used as both literally and metaphorically (Fitch, 1991). According to Wierzbicka (2013: 302) "kinship terms are once the crucial category among categories in interlocutors' communication". The use of kinship terms is thought to be crucial among interlocutors and they show to how the speakers of various languages comprehend their social structure.

Kinship terms and other forms of address serve as indicators of linguistic culture and as representations of social reality (Suryanarayan and Khalil, 2021: 125). Kinship terminology of Indo-European languages, kin terms choices vary depending on the language and its use (Kullanda, 2002). However, kinship terms are also used in fictive/metaphorical way for non-blood relatives which differs from one society to another. The kinship terminology correlates between lexicon and society which provides reliable information about speakers of different languages (Kobzová, 2019).

This category serves the social, semantic, and pragmatic needs of Pakistani English speakers. The system of kinship address forms in Pakistan has enriched as a comprehensive option available to address the various family relations at various levels, Moreover, the use of kinship terms is replaced in situations requiring more respect and politeness (Suryanarayan and Khalil, 2021).

Kinship address forms are an illustration of Pakistani local cultures (Aslam et al., 2011). In Pakistani Punjab, Ramsha and Hidayat (2019) investigated how social factors influenced the choice of kinship terms. They found that interlocutors' regional differences reflected through the choice kinship terms. In Pakistani society, the choice of kinship terms is influenced not only by regional, religious,

and cultural norms but also by linguistic diversity and historical context (ibid, 2019).

Pakistani kinship term follows the Sudanese kinship terminology in which almost every distinct depending on how they are related to other people (Althen, 2001). Pakistani kinship terms have distinct terms for instance, maternal aunt i.e. *Massi/Khala*; paternal aunt i.e. *Phupho/Booa*; etc. Whereas, English kinship terms are generic like uncle, aunt, etc. not relatable to specific relationships.

In our study, we found both English and native kinship terms used by interlocutors. The choice of native/local kinship terms (see Table 2.2.) like *ada/bha* 'brother' (Sindhi); *Adi* 'sister' (Sindhi); *Baji* 'sister' (Urdu); beta 'son' (Urdu); etc.

Table 2.2. Kinship Terms

Kinship terms	Examples
English	Bro/Brother, Sis/Sister, Uncle, Aunty
Native/Local	*Ada/Bha/Bhao* 'brother' (Sindhi); *Adi* 'sister' (Sindhi); *Bhai* 'brother' (Urdu); *Bajii* 'sister (Urdu); *Aapi/aapa* 'sister' (Urdu); *Beta* 'son' (Urdu); *Massi* 'maternal aunt' (Sindhi); *Chacha* 'paternal uncle' (Sindhi/Urdu)

2.4.3. Terms of Endearments

Endearment terms are bound to the context and function when communicating rather than semantic characteristics (Braun, 1988). According to Braun (1988: 9), the choice of endearment terms can be significantly influenced by linguistic creativity and personal imagination. Terms of endearments or endearments terms are defined as words or phrases that are used to refer to or describe a person that the speaker has feelings of love or affection for. Endearing expressions like *beauty*, *love, dear, darling, mate*, *honey*, etc. imply intimacy (cf.

74

Crystal, 2011: 169).

Terms of endearments can convey affection and love in interpersonal interactions (Afful, 2010), in contrast, it may also convey foolishness and lack of integrity (Grząśko, 2015). Interlocutors may choose living and non-living objects for the addressee with whom the speaker has a strong bond and for which they feel love or affection (ibid). The use of endearment terms varies in line with interlocutors' relationships and situations (e.g. family, friends, workplace, university, etc.). Choosing terms of endearment for family or friends demonstrates intimacy and understanding (Al Aghbari and Mahrooqi, 2019).

Pakistani English interlocutors use terms of endearment of both English and native/local endearments. Our study found a set of linguistic repertoire containing variety of expressions. They limited to English endearment 'dear' only, whereas, native/local endearment terms e.g. *mitha* 'sweetheart/sweetie' (Sindhi); *pyara* 'beloved/my love' for males (Sindhi); *pyari/jana* 'loveable/lovely' (Sindhi); *yar/yaar* 'close-friend' (Sindhi/Urdu). The socio-pragmatics of each endearment terms in Pakistani English were linguaculture oriented (see details in Chapter 3) used among students, teachers, student-teacher communication.

Table 2.3. Terms of Endearments

Terms of endearment	Examples
English	Dear
Native/Local	*Mitha* 'sweetheart/sweetie' (Sindhi); *Dilbar* 'my heart; a lover' (Sindhi); *Pyara* (M) / *pyari/jana* (F) 'lovely/loveable' (Sindhi); *Yaar/yar* 'close-friend' (Sindhi/Urdu)

2.4.4. Honorifics

Honorifics are designated terms that can be found in a wide variety of languages around the world (Braun, 1988). The term honorific refers to a

language's specific affixes, words, or phrases used to express honour or respect of the addressee (Brown, 2015: 1).

Honorifics *al-sayed* 'Mr.', *al- Syeda* 'Mrs.', *al-anessa* 'Miss', *al-saada* 'Missers'; in German *Herr/Frau*, *Pan/Pani* in Polish are common equivalent honorifics to the English *Mr./Mrs*. This category characterizes different features in different languages (Braun, 1988).

According to Agha's (1994) review of honorification phenomena, may involve participants in communication demonstrating social status. The role of the honorifics category is essential in making and maintaining interpersonal interaction in intercultural communication. Honorifics pragmatic interpretations may act as a channel for linguistic ideologies, the language being used both the influence contextual meaning (Chen and Lee, 2021). While analysing language-specific means through honorifics show directness indicating social meaning and socio-cultural constraints unique to interlocutors' communicative values (Byon, 2006). Brown (2015) discovered that the hearer honorific indicates the connections between interlocutors. From these perspectives, it is evident that language and culture influence their choice of honorifics and they are governed by a complex set of pragmatic rules and reflect cultural sensitivity (Bhatt, 2001).

Honorifics in Pakistani English are used to reflect culture of mutual understanding and relationship among interlocutors on variety of factors such as formal and informal styles, social rank of the addressee, social hierarchy, and the situation. We noticed both English and native/local forms of address in this study, for instance, English honorifics were *Mr.; Ms.; Sir; Madam; and Ma'am*, however, the usage of *madam* seen serious with less intimacy, whereas, *ma'am* shows more intimacy/closeness. Native/local honorifics were *sain* 'a spiritual guide' (Sindhi) to some extent equivalent to sir. It expresses cultural bound interconnection between interlocutors and Pakistani society, another honorific

from native/local languages was *sahib* (M) / *sahiba* (F) 'a token of respect' (Sindhi/Urdu).

However, Pakistani honorific system based on culture-sensitivity and express cognition, knowledge, and experience of interlocutors' language and culture as part of communication with variety of pragmatic features (see details in Chapter 3).

Table 2.4. Honorifics

Honorifics	Examples
English	Mr. Ms. Sir, Madam, Ma'am
Native/Local	*Sain* 'spiritual guide' (Sindhi); *sahib* (M) / *sahiba* (F) 'a token of respect' (Sindhi/Urdu)

2.4.5. Titles

Titles are assigned to reflect positions (official, educational, social, workplace positions) or relations (Fitch, 1991). There is no universal agreement on what qualifies as a title, and it can be challenging to distinguish between abstract nouns and occupational terms (Braun, 1988). The titles can be ascribed (*i.e. Prince, Duke, Count, etc.*), and achieved (*e.g. Judge, Professor, Manager, Ph.D., etc.*).

Titles differ from personal terms they are absolute instead of relative as *shiang.sheng* 'teacher' considered polite gesture in comparison to 'professor' (Chao, 1956). Hwang (1991) noticed that titles are culture-oriented as 'doctor,' 'professor,' and 'teacher' with or without family names. Murray (2002) found titles seem to be preferred as a *title + first name* i.e. Dr. Luke. Titles like Agha *'lord'* Janom *'lady'* displays interlocutors' behaviour toward some family members, relatives, or close neighbours to indicate respect, intimacy, and friendship (Afghari & Karimnia, 2007).

The term "أبلتة" meaning female "teacher" is used relationally to give a

positive and valued status to the addressee (Ethelb, 2015). Titles do correlate with linguistic, cultural, and socioeconomic qualities (Hodel et al., 2017). Malik (2018) analysed categories of address forms in Urdu, and found titles describing an individual social value, rank, or gender. For instance, *hazrat* is 'presence, dignity or power' (Urdu) for males, and for females *mohtrama* is 'Ladyish' (Urdu).

Titles in Pakistani English were noticed Dr. (Doctor of Philosophy); and Professor among teacher-teacher interaction and student-teacher interaction. An interesting fact was the use of senior and junior titles among students (see details in Chapter 3).

The pragmatics of each title varies as they are one of the complex categories which vary in different languages and cultures. However, their choice and use are lingua-person oriented and show the social structure of interlocutors.

Table 2.5. Titles

Titles	Examples
English	Senior, Junior, Dr. (Doctor of Philosophy), Professor

2.4.6. Occupation/profession-based terms

Occupation or profession-related terms are employed for an addressee related to their job, or professional functions (Braun, 1988), for instance, chef, waiter, driver, chauffeur, etc. Depending on the rules of the particular address system, they may occasionally be combined with other nominal variants (ibid). Profession-related terms seem to be very often in every language. Profession related terms indicate higher social status when addressing someone of the profession. For instance, ministers of religion are addressed as 'Rector', 'Vicar', and in academia, 'Teacher', 'Dean', and 'Tutor' are frequently used (Gao, 2013: 193).

Occupational/professional address terms are influenced by the addressee's position in the workplace. Individuals with higher status in the workplace

environment receive *professional terms + last name* e.g. Chief Barry (Widiatmaja, 2014). According to Wardhaugh and Fuller (2021), in hierarchical organizations, those at the top aim to maximize the difference which indicates that individuals prefer to maximize and minimize their status.

Therefore, interlocutors often choose professional terms like *secretary*, *sheriff*, *detective*, etc. in the workplace (Zavitri, 2018). Thus, the choice of occupation terms is relevant to the rank of a person and describes the role of language, culture,and values of interlocutors.

Pakistani categories of address forms include a variety of occupation or profession-based terms indexed of sociocultural values. The interlocutors varied in contexts (see Chapter 3), however, main terms were teacher, chairperson/HoD (Head of the Department) which show higher positions in organizational hierarchy, office superintendent; clerk or computer operator, attendant/peon, and waiter such terms are used for less powerful employees.

Thus, the choice and preferences in usage were noticed in pragmatic features differed based on organizational hierarchy (see details in Chapter 3).

Table 2.6. Occupation/profession-based terms

Occupational/professional terms	Examples
English	Teacher

2.4.7. Caste address terms

Caste address term is a common practice among Pakistani English speakers. The caste is another category of address forms as evidence of native cultural values' impact on the choices of address forms. In this part, we discuss caste as a manifestation of the cultural and axiological system.

Caste[4] (*zaat/zat*) as a category is a socially built phenomenon. identity and

---

[4] Zaat/zat is a Sindhi word and it shall be taken as an alternative to the English word caste. The English word 'caste' consists of several definitions due to geographical, religious, and sociological

marker of prestige. Caste highlights social, economic, and identity markers of interlocutors among Pakistani bilinguals. Caste address terms are a key component of Pakistani English, which is strongly influenced by social, cultural, and native values, according to the findings of the current study (see Table 2.7.). Pakistani English is influenced by native culture, creating a unique lingual identity for its users. Caste address terms are frequently used as a marker of identity to show different sociopragmatic features.

The choice depends on the contexts convey closeness/intimacy, respect, and informality among interlocutors. The social and cultural values influence students' language choices and show sociopragmatic distinctions between caste address terms when speaking in Pakistani English (see details in Chapter 3). Hence, the current study also emphasizes how the choice of caste address terms is influenced by native cultural values in a particular situation.

Table 2.7. Caste address terms

Caste address terms	Examples
Native	*Soomro, Memon, Qureshi, Pathan*, etc.

2.4.8. Hybrid address forms

This category of address forms includes creative patterns for address forms that take into account the users' interpretation, relationships, and contextual factors (Al-Khawaldeh 2023: 10). Hybrid address terms TLN indicates inequality and unfamiliarity (Brown and Ford, 1961). Hybrid address forms compose a variety of models such as title + last name; title + full name; honorific + first name; honorific + full name, etc. However, there are no set models or patterns of hybrid address forms because of the interlocutors, their roles, relationships, sociocultural

---

implications. However, in this study, zaat/zat (Sindhi language) word should be understood as an alternative to English caste. Moreover, we do not associate or support any social stereotypes, taboos, or caste hegemony-related notions prevailing in speech communities.

contextualization, and pragmatic interpretation.

Hybrid address forms like title + last name (TLN) in formal situations and title + surname for instructors' expressed level of formality and distance with higher social rank, however, they can express solidarity when used for friends Hybrid address forms show social power a significant variable affecting the choice of address forms, for instance, students usually used title + last name for their lecturers (Formentelli, 2009: 182). When addressing teachers use *a combination name* or *surname* with the immediate addition of the honorific *sir* or *madam* e.g. *Nagpal sir* or *Anju madam* (cf. Larina and Suryanarayan, 2023: 150). Hybrid address forms to interpreted in light of strategically and socially constructed relationships and contextual effects of interlocutors.

Pakistani hybrid address forms have variety (see detail in Table 2.8) in uses. We present some examples of Pakistani hybrid address forms:

(1) **Sain Ali**, it's a very complex question to answer. I need some time to think about it. (Native honorific + first name)

(2) **Sir Awais sahib** has arrived for the next lecture. (English Honorific + first name + Native honorific)

(3) **Sir Memon** we think that major problems during partition were… (Honorific + caste)

(4) **Sir Kazi sahib** memory is an important component of the human mind. (English honorific + caste + Native honorific)

These mixture choices of hybrid address forms in Pakistani English speakers highlight the socio-pragmatic variations. The use of hybrid address forms is unique to Pakistani English speakers influenced by sociocultural, and axiological systems. The choice of English honorific + first name (e.g. *Sir Haroon*); English honorific + first name + Native honorific (e.g. *Sir Aslam sahib*, *Madam Jamila sahiba*); title + first name + Native honorific i.e. *sahib* (Male) / *sahiba* (Female) (Sindhi/Urdu) 'a

token of respect' *(e.g. Dr. Jamil sahib / Professor Jamila sahiba)*; etc., see Table 2.8. These variations in the choice of address forms show tendencies that Pakistani English speakers adhere to local values and adapt their communication behaviour based on addressee and context.

Pakistani English speakers in bilingual university settings reflect their linguacultural identity. The hybrid address forms choice from a variety of models suggests the impact of socio-pragmatic factors on English. Thus, this category has no standardized set rules, it varies in line with creative models considering the interlocutor's interpretation, contexts, and relationships. To summarise, hybrid address forms in our study occur with innovative patterns (see Table 2.8.) involving both English and native address forms. However, we noticed leading six models consisting of 2-3 components in each address form as under:

Table 2.8. Hybrid Address Forms

Hybrid address forms	Examples
1. Honorific + first name (FN)	*Sir Safeer; Madam Arbeena, etc.*
2. Honorific + first name + Native honorific	*Sir Sameer sahib/sahiba, etc.*
3. Honorific + caste	*Sir Rajper; Sir Soomro, etc.*
4. Honorific + caste + Native honorific	*Sir Kazi sahib (M); Madam Mahwish sahiba (F)*, etc.
5. Titles + FN + Native honorific	*Dr. Ali sahib* (M)*; Professor Jamila sahiba* (F), etc.
6. Occupational terms + Native honorific	*Chairman sahib, Chairperson sahiba, Dean sahib/sahiba*

Summary

Chapter 2, discusses functions of address forms in interpersonal interaction, cultural values and address forms in cross-cultural perspective, the taxonomy of

address forms and their categories in Pakistani English.

Forms of address are significant linguistic means to establish, maintain, and continue relations. *They* are the words interlocutors use to address or designate the individual they speak and to show the relationships between them. The address forms are among the most reliable linguistics means showing how interlocutors of a particular language conceptualize their relationships, mindset and sociocultural values. They function as promoters of the negotiation among interlocutors and develop the socialization between them.

Address forms in each culture have uniqueness and they vary due to the differences in values, social organization, norms and politeness strategies. Cultural values and relational factors affect the set and usage of address forms across cultures.

Address forms are presented by different categories. Scholars have devised the taxonomy of address systems in a variety of linguacultural settings, emphasizing the specificity of each scheme across cultures.

Categories of forms of address in Pakistani English, are observed in many European languages/ however they are supplemented by some culture-specific categories found in Pakistani English. Kinship terms and cast terms are among them.

Kinship terms in Pakistani English consist of both English and native/local terms used for addressing inside and outside the family. the Pakistani kinship system adheres to Sudanese kinship terminology—which is an elaborative system consisting entirely of descriptive and separate designation for almost every distinct relative based on the relationship and gender. The category serves for social, semantic, and pragmatic needs of Pakistani English interlocutors who find it important to give a specific name to each family member depending on the relationship. Since Pakistani society is a family-oriented society, kinship terms of

address are widely used in other social contexts, including university.

Caste address terms are an important category of Pakistani English influenced by sociocultural values. They indicate a socially built identity based on social and economic status transferred only from the father. Pakistani English speakers use caste address terms to show different sociopragmatic characteristics, such as respect, intimacy, closeness and informality.

In addition to English and local terms of address there are *hybrid address forms* in Pakistani English which combine English and native terms and categories. Hybrid address forms highlight the socio-pragmatic variations due to local cultural values which result in creation of hybrid address forms have a variety of models: English Honorific + first name + Native honorific (e.g. *Sir Awais sahib; Madam Jamila sahiba*); *Sir Memon* (English honorific + caste); English honorific + caste + Native honorific (e.g. *Sir Kazi sahib*), etc.

Pakistani address forms are influenced by sociocultural and axiological system of Pakistani bilinguals and show how they adhere to local values and adapt the English language to them.

Chapter 3. ADDRESSING PRACTICES IN PAKISTANI UNIVERSITY SETTINGS

3.1. Data and methodology

The study goal is to find out the set of address forms in Pakistani bilingual academic settings and define the role of sociocultural, pragmatic, and axiological factors in their choice and preference. Furthermore, we focused on the socio-pragmatic differences in meanings, and situational and cultural contexts that affect the choice between English and native forms of address.

Data collection and instruments: The data set for the analysis were collected by developing three research instruments (1) a survey, (2) open-ended written interviews, and (3) classroom observation, and supplemented through personal observation.

The reason for employing the survey was to identify the main categories of address forms used by Pakistani English speakers in bilingual academic settings. The survey was structured into two parts: the first part involved demographic information about age, gender, qualification, and linguistic information. The second part consisted of fifteen questions for students (see Appendix 1) and thirteen questions for teachers (see Appendix 2). The questions aimed to find address forms used in different university settings, namely in formal contexts (classroom, department, office) and informal contexts (café, teachers' common hall) by students and teachers. To identify the influence of social factors on the choice of forms of address, different social contexts we considered, namely linear context, bottom-up context and top-down context, and. The students were asked to choose address forms when addressing a specific addressee e.g. a classmate, junior, senior, teacher, chairperson of the department, office superintendent, clerk/computer operator, peon/attendant). Similarly, the teachers were required to indicate particular forms of address when addressing a specific person like a

colleague of a younger, older, and same-age, and superior staff (chairperson of the department) and lower staff, (office superintendent, clerk, computer operator). The survey was developed in Google Forms and distributed online in different WhatsApp groups

Open-ended written interviews (195) were conducted alive/in person with the participants. Interview contained thirteen questions (see Appendix 3 and 4). Its aim was to find out the pragmatic meaning for an address form (in other words what the speaker wanted to express by choosing a particular address form) and to explore the influence of social, contextual, and axiological factors on their selection.

The participants of the survey belonged to public-sector universities of the district Shaheed Benazirabad (SBA) central part of Sindh province. The responses were received from the Quaid-e-Awam University of Engineering, Science and Technology (QUEST), Nawabshah-SBA; Peoples' University of Medical and Health Sciences for Women (PUMHSW), Nawabshah-SBA, and Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University (SBBU), Nawabshah and Sanghar campus-SBA.

Furthermore, to verify the data in natural communication the random classroom observation was conducted at Quaid-e-Awam University of Engineering, Science & Technology (QUEST), Nawabshah, Sindh Pakistan. This university was chosen for the sake of convenience, in addition, the researcher has been teaching (faculty member) at the university for a decade. Classroom interactions from three different departments were observed: Mechanical Engineering, Telecommunication Engineering, and English department and the data of total 13 hours were audio-recorded. The recording of students and teachers' discourse objective was to verify the results in natural interaction. After listening several times to the audio-recorded data from classroom discourse, 193 interaction counts of address forms from 61 excerpts of natural interaction were identified.

As a result, students (252) and teachers (90) filled out the online survey, overall a survey of 4950 questions from 342 respondents, and 145 students and 50 teachers responded to the open-ended written interviews. Overall, for analytical purposes, a total of 537 participants' responses were accounted for. Both the Survey and interviews were supplemented and verified by 13 hours of classroom observation in person which were also audio-recorded.

The participants reported 16.7% bilinguals and 83.3% multilinguals, the linguistic background of participants reveals that the majority of participants in the study were bilingual, speaking different languages like Sindhi, Urdu, Punjabi, Balochi, Brahui, Seraiki, etc. However, the address forms were borrowed namely from Sindhi and Urdu.

Therefore, we used the term '*bilingual*' for holistic presentation. *Bilingual* in our study means an individual with the ability to understand and speak two or more languages. In this study, we also use the general term "*native language*" as a holistic expression referring to all native languages as in this study our goal was to distinguish between English and native terms of address used by bilingual English speakers. Consequently, the umbrella term "*native language*" was also used for holistic coverage of loaned forms of address from local languages.

The sociolinguistic information about the participants was collected to ensure broad coverage of participants and their diversity and identify some general trends. For this purpose, we strived for a balanced number of participants differing in gender. As a result, we had 55.6% males and 44.4% females. Though we acknowledge the gender is an important variable, we did not set task of identifying communicative differences between them in terms of the use of forms of address., Moreover, the qualification of students was undergraduate, and 48.9% of teachers were Ph.D., 51.1% possessed MS/MPhil degrees.

We aimed to identify the categories of address forms excluding the contents/topics of lectures and ignoring the teaching methods.

Sampling techniques and participants: We followed a sequential data-gathering technique (Ivankova et al., 2006). First we conducted the quantitative survey to identify the categories of address forms which was followed by qualitative data in-depth analysis of choices and the impact of social, pragmatic, and axiological factors. Moreover, the purposive sampling technique was adopted for data collection. Hence, the current study adheres to research ethics and integrity by following COPE ethics. To maintain the anonymity of the participants all names, and castes are pseudonyms. Additionally, consent for research participation was obtained from them.

The analytical basis of this empirical study relies on the data set in both quantitative and qualitative manners. For analytical purposes, we followed Braun's (1988) five-category taxonomy of address forms which is widely implemented by researchers who investigate forms of address in different languages and cultures (e.g. Afful, 2006; Aliakbari & Toni, 2008; Formentelli, 2009; Khalil & Larina, 2022; Larina et al., 2019, to name a few). It comprises names, kinship terms, terms of endearment, honorifics, titles, occupation/profession-based terms, and two more categories, namely caste and hybrid address forms have been added to it as result of our data analysis (see Table 3.1).

As we assumed that the notion of address forms could be new to the participants we provided them with a sample of the analytical scheme with examples for their clarity. Though, if any query occurred regarding the analytical scheme it was answered by the participants.

Analysis of the data set was run through the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 20. The findings were measured in descriptive statistics using frequency and percentage. The quantitative analysis assisted in determining

the frequency of the categories of address forms used in academic settings. The qualitative analysis resulted in the description of forms of address subject to their pragmatic and stylistic characteristics, as well as situational, social, cultural, and axiological contexts.

Moreover, the data were verified by classroom observation and supplemented by personal experience based on categories and different contexts the findings were analysed in student-student interaction (linear context); student-teacher interaction (bottom-up context); teacher-student interaction (top-down context), and students' and teachers' interactions with superior and inferior administrative staff. The findings were discussed with relevance to sociocultural, pragmatic, and axiological factors.

3.2. Categories of address forms used in Pakistani university settings

The analysis of the surveys revealed 8 categories of the AFs used in the Pakistani academic discourse. In addition to the traditional English AFs, such as names, honorifics (*Sir, Miss*) and titles (*Dr, Professor*), there were kinship terms, (e.g. *Bhai 'brother'*; *Adi* 'sister'; *beta* 'son'; *Massi* 'maternal aunt'), and terms of endearment *(Mitha* 'sweetheart/sweetie'; *Dilbar* 'my heart')* observed. In terms of the language, we identified three groups: English Ads, native AFs and hybrid AFs which were combinations of English and native AFs (See Table 3.1).

Table 3.1. Analytical scheme of identified categories of address forms (AFs)

No	Address forms category		Examples
1	**Names**	*First Name*	*Hassan, Mahrosh,* etc.
		Combination Names	*Hassan Mustafa, Mahrosh Khadija,* etc.
		Full Name	*Hassan Mustafa Soomro, Mahrosh Khadija Soomro,* etc.
2	**Kinship terms**	*English*	*Bro/Brother, Sis/Sister, Uncle, Aunt*
		Native	*Ada/Bha/Bhao* 'brother' (Sindhi); *Adi* 'sister' (Sindhi); *Bhai 'brother'* (Urdu); *Baji* 'sister (Urdu);

			Aapi/aapa 'sister' (Urdu); *Beta* 'son' (Urdu); *Massi* 'maternal aunt' (Sindhi); *Chacha* 'paternal uncle' (Sindhi/Urdu)
3	**Terms of endearment**	*English*	Dear
		Native	*mitha* 'sweetheart or sweetie'; *pyara*—for male 'beloved/ my love'; *pyari/jana* 'loveable/lovely' (Sindhi); *yaar/yar* 'close-friend' (Sindhi/Urdu)
4	**Honorifics**	*English*	*Mr. Ms. Sir, Madam, Ma'am*
		Native	*Sain* 'spiritual guide' (Sindhi); *sahib* (M) / *sahiba* (F) 'a token of respect' (Sindhi/Urdu)
5	**Titles**	*English*	*Senior, Junior, Dr., Professor*
6	**Occupation or profession-based**	*English*	Teacher
7	**Caste terms**	*Native*	*Soomro, Qureshi, Talpur, Bhutto, etc.*
	Hybrid AFs		Honorific + FN (e.g. *Sir Hassan, Sain Ali, Madam Mahrosh*); English honorific + first name + Native honorific (e.g. *Sir Awais sahib)* Honorific + caste (e.g. *Sir Soomro*); English honorific + caste + Native honorific i.e. *sahib* (M) / *sahiba* (F) (e.g. *Sir Soomro sahib*;); Title + FN + Native honorific (e.g. *Dr Mustafa sahib, Professor Jamila sahiba*). Occupational terms + Native honorific *e.g. Chairman sahib, Chairperson sahiba, Dean sahib/sahiba*

Further the usage of these terms will be analysed in symmetrical, symmetrical and linear contexts, namely in:

(1) student – student interaction,

(2) student – teacher interaction,

(3) teacher–student interaction,

(4) student–administrative staff interaction and student-administrative staff interaction.

3.3. Student-student interaction

This part of the study presents findings of student-student interaction. It is noteworthy to mention that the categories that have been identified are presented as the most frequent categories used in student-student interaction in a bilingual university setting in two main contexts in-class and out-class.

The category-wise findings of English and native address forms (see Table 3.2.) are presented in the median of percentage with the higher frequency of choice. The findings reveal the major categories which include first names (41.5%), kinship terms (26.6%), and terms of endearments (11.4%). Other categories as honorifics (8.0%), titles (6.6%), and caste address terms (6.0%) were also observed though less often.

Both English and native forms of address were used in the categories of kinship terms and endearment terms. Students choose kinship terms from English 10.3% (e.g. *bro/brother* and *sis/sister*) and native languages 16.3% (e.g. *Ada / bha* 'brother' (Sindhi); *Adi* 'sister' (Sindhi)*; baji* 'sister' (Urdu) whereas, they select English terms of endearments (4.0%) (e.g. *dear*) and native terms of endearments (7.3%) (e.g. *yaar/yar* 'close friend' (Sindhi); *pyara* 'beloved' *jani* 'love' *mitha* 'sweetheart' (Sindhi).

Table 3.2. Categories of address forms in student-student interaction

Category	English		Native	
	%	**AFs**	**%**	**AFs**
First names	0	—	41.5	Jamil, Ali (M); Mahwish, Mahrosh (F)
Kinship terms	10.3	*Bro/brother; sis/sister*	16.3	*Ada / bha* 'brother' (Sindhi); *adi* 'sister' (Sindhi)*; baji* 'sister' (Urdu)
Terms of Endearments	4.0	*Dear*	7.3	*Yaar/yar* 'close friend' (Sindhi); *pyara* 'beloved' *jani* 'love' *mitha* 'sweetheart' (Sindhi)
Honorifics	8.0	*Mr/Miss*	0	—

Titles	6.6	*Junior, senior*	0	—
Caste address terms	0	—	6.0	*Qureshi, Soomro, Jamali,* etc.
sub-total	28.9		71.1	
Total	100%			

Though English honorifics *Mr/Miss* and titles *junior, senior* were observed in our data set, they were used in the atypical for them context, i.e. as Forms of address used by students addressing other students. Students represent a social group with no power distance and a minimal age difference of one year Pakistani students use titles like junior, senior.

3.3.1. First names

The data analysis of the current study indicates that within student-student interaction first names as expected appeared to be the most frequent AF. 41.5% of students choose first names when speaking in Pakistani English in all contexts.

(1) ***Hassan,*** what's your opinion on this? (First name, M)

(2) ***Mahrosh***, please come forward for the presentation. (First name, F)

However, the frequency varied due to a social status or age. As the data show they are mainly used to address a junior students and classmates, while for senior students they are hardly used. This shows the role of sociocultural norms. In Pakistani culture, it is avoided to address someone elder with the first name even if the age difference is minimal.

The findings show while having a year difference the younger students prefer to use senior as address form to students.

3.3.2. Kinship terms

The second most frequent category in student-student interaction was

kinship terms. The results of the analysis show that students use 26.7% kinship terms from both English (10.3%) and (16.3%) native. Kinship terms from English were bro/brother and sis/sister, whereas, from native languages *ada / bha* 'brother' (Sindhi); *adi* 'sister' (Sindhi); *bhai* 'brother' (Urdu); and *baji* 'sister' (Urdu).

The findings of classroom observation confirmed that the students addressed each other with English and native kinship terms.

(3) ***Bro,*** how do Richardson's poems raise impulses or internal emotions?

(4) ***Sister,*** as we know poetry helps us to raise our psychological states...

(5) ***Ada,*** wait for the next presenter. ('brother' Sindhi kinship term)

(6) ***Baji,*** I think we invite our next presentation partner. ('sister' Urdu kinship term)

Native address terms were namely from Sindhi language (*ada / bha* 'brother' (Sindhi); *adi* 'sister' (Sindhi) *and Urdu language (baji* 'sister' Urdu). Students used them in accordance with their native language. The pragmatic meaning of native terms of address to English were preferred as they express more intimacy and closeness and more respect.

The findings demonstrate that English kinship terms in *'bro/brother'* and *'sis/sister'* were used in both in-class and out-class interaction, i.e. in formal and informal situations. Among classmates and juniors, the frequency remained nominal, however, it increased for seniors. This tendency shows that students value the relationships of closeness and intimacy and respect which cannot be expressed by first names. Moreover, usage of English kinship terms demonstrate the students Anglicized behaviour and their literate background.

On the other hand, when compared to English kinship terms, students' native kinship terms appeared to be more prominent in our findings. For instance, the use of native kinship terms e.g. *ada/bha* 'brother' (Sindhi); *adi* 'sister' (Sindhi); *baji*

'sister' (Urdu) between peers and senior is higher, in contrast to juniors. The analysis of native kinship terms used to address classmates and senior students revealed more closeness and intimacy.

In open-ended interviews students respond *"We show, informality + distance + respect by using the terms ada/bhai or adi/aapi"*. Thus, by choosing native kinship terms students express more intimacy/closeness and respect for senior students despite no or little age difference and social power.

3.3.3. Terms of endearments

Terms of endearments appeared to be the third most common category in the student-student interaction. The findings revealed that 11.3% of students use both English (4.0%) and (7.3%) native terms of endearment in-class and out-class contexts. There is only one English term dear in our data used for both males and females. The native terms of address were rather numerous and they were mainly used to address males, whereas, females were addressed with only one term of endearment yar/yaar 'close friend' (Sindhi/Urdu).

The terms of endearment generally show cordial relationships in both English and native languages. However, it was observed that classmates used English endearment 'dear' mostly in in-class context.

(7) **Dear** any topic that we have not studied yet?

Whereas its use decreased for senior and junior students in out-class interaction were native endearments were more frequent.

(8) **Yaar** I told you we should get permission first. ('a close friend' Sindhi/Urdu endearment term)

(9) I informed you **mitha** in advance that tests are to be held today. ('sweetheart' Sindhi endearment term)

(10) ***Jani*** this semester is near finishing. ('love' Sindhi endearment term)

(11) ***Pyara*** let's go the hostel class is over. ('beloved' Sindhi endearment term)

The pragmatic meanings of terms of endearments varied among interlocutors. For instance, when students were inquired in an open-ended interview that why do they prefer using native terms of endearments such as *yaar/yar* 'close friend' (Sindhi/Urdu); *pyara* 'beloved' *jani* 'love' *mitha* 'sweetheart' (Sindhi) instead of English 'dear'. They responded that native endearment terms express more closeness and intimacy. However, English 'dear' fails to express intended pragmatic meanings of communication among interlocutors, therefore, they limit it to in-class usage to express closeness.

The findings showed a clear tendency towards more native endearments (7.3%) e.g. *yaar/yar* 'close friend' (Sindhi/Urdu); *pyara* 'beloved' *jani* 'love' *mitha* 'sweetheart' (Sindhi) while addressing the other students in all the contexts. Whereas, the English term 'dear' only remained a dominant choice among classmates. Thus, overall, the findings reveal that endearments terms for seniors are frequently used in both in-class and out-class situations in contrast to juniors and classmates.

The overall finding within student-student interaction suggests that they use more native endearment terms and limit to English 'dear' in-class and out-class contexts.

3.3.4. Honorifics

Honorifics as address forms in student-student interaction is another main finding from the data analysis. Although it is typically reserved for teachers and those with some office duties, it was rather unexpected to observe that 8.0% use of honorifics among students.

The use was common when students used the honorifics "Mr." and "Miss." for classmate students and with a little decrease in the out-class situations. The classroom observation confirmed that students used honorifics:

(12) **Mr,** would like to read the third stanza. (between classmates)

(13) **Miss**, why are you in a hurry for final exams… (between classmates)

The pragmatic meanings for the use of English honorifics *'Mr./Miss.'* in student-student interaction shows the speakers' Anglicized attitude and literate background. We asked students what they express by using English honorifics when addressing others. They responded (8.0%) that by using *Mr./Miss* they express formality and respect in both the in-class and out-class contexts. However, no native honorifics were used in their interaction.

In addition, in open-ended interviews the students gave another interpretation of honorifics as *"Sometimes we use Mr./Miss only to make fun for entertainment purposes"*, *"When we classmates are very friendly then we call Mr./Miss as fun"*. As findings suggest that students use English honorifics to display anglicized behaviour, however, other students use them make fun of each other. Thus, the usage of honorifics is interpreted differently among students based on in-class and out-class contexts, relationships, and communicative needs.

3.3.5. Titles

It is worth noting that students with a year or two years' age difference tend to emphasize it by using terms senior and junior. Titles are restricted to 'junior' and 'senior' between first-year students to someone who is studying in the second, third, and fourth year. Moreover, it is noteworthy to mention that the use of titles is a general practice in Pakistani universities based on the year of study.

In our data students (6.6%) used titles 'senior' and 'junior' of in both in classrooms and out of classrooms. However, they express more respect for senior

students despite no or little age gap. The classroom observation confirmed that within students' titles are commonly practiced.

(14) Junior student: Thank you, *senior* brothers.

(15) Senior student: Hello *juniors*, we are organizing a welcome party…

When the students were inquired about the choice of titles 'senior' and 'junior' within students' interactions their responses to express *respect and formality* in the relationships in both in-class and out of class. No native titles are used by students. On the other hand, adding brothers in (14) the students are likely to express closeness and in-group relationships as well.

Thus, the usage of titles demonstrate that students adhere to sociocultural norms and emphasize the importance of age differences in communication even they are minimal.

3.3.6. Caste address terms

Caste address terms in student-student interaction were noted by 6.0%.

The findings from classroom observation confirmed that students practice caste in addressing each other.

(16) *Soomro* you asked a nice question. (Caste address terms)

(17) *Qureshi* is new entry to this presentation group. (Caste address terms)

First of all, caste address terms indicate students' social status, and hierarchy, their belonging to a particular social group. However, the analysis of interviews aimed at clarifying the pragmatic meaning transmitted by this form revealed a variety of possible meanings. In students' opinion caste shows informality in the relationships, closeness and intimacy, and respect at the same time. For instance, for classmates the usage of caste shows intimacy, and for

juniors it is a sign of intimacy and mutual understanding, and when addressing a senior student, it expresses respect.

Thus, depending on the context, cast AF can convey various relationships, and also indicate the status of the interlocutor, prescribed by their belonging to a particular caste.

Findings' summary. Thus, the main findings relating to the AFs in student – student interaction are as follows.

Addressing each other students use AFs which refer to 6 categories. The most frequent categories are names (41.5%) and kinship terms (26.6%) which were used in English (10.3%) and native languages (16.3%). In addition, endearment terms, titles, honorifics and cast AFs were also used.

The variety of the categories of AFs used among students suggests their need to convey various relationships and attitudes. We have identified two main sociopragmatic goals. Firstly, the desire to show closeness and intimacy, which is expressed by kinship terms and terms of endearment. Secondly, despite the insignificant difference in age, students demonstrate the need to emphasize this age difference using the terms 'senior' and 'junior. The importance of information about social status is also reflected in caste forms which indicate a student's belonging to a particular social stratum. Thus, social characteristics of an addressee seem to be important in addressing practices.

Another important finding concerns the language. The study shows that students use both English and native AFs addressing each other. Native AFs related to kinship terms and terms of endearment show greater frequency and greater diversity in comparison with English terms. They also differ stylistically. The results of the interviews have revealed that English terms (e.g. *dear, brother, senior, junior, Mr*) are used to show more formality, while native AFs are used to

show more closeness and intimacy (e.g. *yaar/yar* 'close friend', *ada / bha* 'brother'; *adi* 'sister'; *baji pyara* 'beloved' *mitha* 'sweetheart').

The analysis of data revels that classmates use first names in the formal context as the most frequent, it decreased for senior students in the both formal and informal context to express respect as cultural norm. On the other hand, for junior students first names remain lower as compare to classmates. Moreover, kinship terms decreased in the informal context between classmates and for senior students, whereas, for junior students it increased to express intimacy/closeness. Thus, these variations suggest that student-student addressing practices are influenced by various social contexts including both symmetrical and asymmetrical.

The next section of the study, presents our findings regarding students and teachers' interaction. It is divided into two parts. The first part provides findings of student-teacher addressing, and the second part deals with teacher-student addressing. It is important to mention that the results of the identified categories presented in both sections are per the most frequent categories used by the interlocutors.

3.4. Student-teacher interaction

This section covers description of the findings of student-teacher addressing practices. The findings are presented in-class and out-class contexts namely e.g. classroom, office, department premises.

Based on the analysis of collected data of student-teacher addressing practices. Honorifics appeared to be the most frequent category 71.5%. The second most common category was hybrid address forms (13.4%), followed by caste address terms (9.1%) and (6.0%) occupation-based terms.

Honorifics from English were 50.0% e.g. *sir*, *madam/ma'am*, and 21.5% used native honorific *sain* 'spiritual guide' (Sindhi). We notice variety of

independent category into hybrid address forms 13.4% patterns i.e. honorific + FN (*sir Hassan; madam Mahrosh*) see details in 3.3.1 section. Caste address terms from native address forms e.g. *Soomro*, *Syed*, *Arain*, etc. were used of 9.1%. The last category was occupation-based terms 6.0% limited to English 'teacher'.

Table 3.3. Categories of address forms in student-teacher interaction

Category	English		Native		Hybrid address forms	
	%	AFs	%	AFs	%	AFs
Honorifics	50.0	*sir, madam, ma'am, professor*	21.5	*Sain* 'spiritual guide'(Sindhi)	13.4	Honorific + FN (e.g. *Sir Hassan, Madam Mahrosh*); English honorific + first name + Native honorific (e.g. *Sir Awais sahib)* Honorific + caste (e.g. *Sir Soomro*); English Honorific + caste + Native honorific i.e. *sahib* (M) / *sahiba* (F) (e.g. *Sir Soomro sahib*); Title + FN + Native honorific (e.g. *Dr Mustafa*

						sahib, Professor Jamila sahiba).
Caste address terms	0	—	9.1	*Soomro, Memon, Arain,* etc.	0	—
Occupation-based terms	6.0	*Teacher*	0	—	0	—
sub-total	**56.0**		**30.6**		**13.4**	
Total	**100%**					

3.4.1. Honorifics

Our findings of student-teacher interaction indicate that to address their teacher students use honorifics from both English, e.g. *sir, madam* and *ma'am* (50.0%) and native languages (21.5%).

The most frequent native term is *sain* 'spiritual guide' (Sindhi) which is roughly equivalent to English 'sir' though differs from it pragmatically and stylistically.

The findings of classroom observation confirmed that the students address teachers with English and native honorifics.

(18) **Sir,** the problems that are common during partition… (Honorific)

(19) **Madam,** do you mean Russian formalism focuses on text structures rather than context?

(20) **Ma'am,** in the previous class you asked to bring assignments. (Honorific)

(21) **Sain,** it means Pakistan's progress is still decades behind… (Honorific in Sindhi)

Addressing by honorifics students want to demonstrate respect. However, there is some variation in their pragmatic meaning and style between them. e.g. *madam* as formal, whereas, *ma'am* is informal and indicates a relaxed atmosphere.

The native AF *sain* 'spiritual guide' (Sindhi) according to students' responses conveys more respect than English Sir. Moreover, it also indicates some closeness/intimacy at the same time. Thus, when students want to express more respect they switch to native terms. Moreover, functional purpose of native *sain* 'spiritual guide' (Sindhi) shows social authority and status embodied in it, due to the sociocultural and cognitive factors.

3.4.2. Hybrid address forms

A series of mixed patterns/models of hybrid forms were observed in the data analysis. Hybrid address forms in students' addressing practices with teachers remained the second most common category. Our findings reveal that 13.4% of students chose different categories and used hybrid models. We noticed five hybrid models/patterns in student-teacher interaction.

➢ Honorific + FN e.g. *Sir Hassan, Madam/Ma'am Mahrosh, Sain Wasim*, etc.

➢ Honorific + FN + Native honorific *e.g. Sir Hassan sahib; Madam Mahrosh sahiba,* etc.

➢ Honorific + Caste e.g. *Sir Soomro, Sir Memon,* etc.

➢ English honorific + Caste + Native honorific *e.g. Sir Soomro sahib, Madam Memon sahiba,* etc.

➢ Titles + FN + Native honorific e.g. *Dr Mustafa sahib, Professor Mariam sahiba,* etc.

We observed in these models that students used honorific form both English i.e. *sir, madam/ma'am* and native *sain* 'spiritual guide' (Sindhi) combined with first names (FN) of teachers. This model appeared to the most common among all hybrid address forms, the second common model was the mixture of English honorific + first name + Native honorific i.e. *sahib* (M) */ sahiba* (F) a token of respect e.g. *Sir Hassan sahib or Madam Mahrosh sahiba*. The third was title + first name + Native honorific e.g. *Dr Musa sahib, Professor Sana sahiba*. The last two models were of honorific + caste e.g. *Sir Soomro*, and caste followed by native honorific i.e. *sahib/sahiba* e.g. *Sir Memon sahib*, *Madam Soomro sahiba*.

These variation of hybrid address forms contrast to English tradition where interlocutors' communication is limited to the use of honorifics like *sir*, *madam* to express respect.

We present examples for each variation of this category from our findings of classroom observation which confirms that the students addressed teachers with hybrid address forms is a common practices of students addressing their teacher.

(22) **Sir Hassan,** we can use terms like participant or respondent but not the real names… (Honorific + FN)

(23) Can you define it more **Madam Khadija**? (Honorific + FN)

(24) **Ma'am Amber**, in the last class you asked to bring assignments. (Honorific + FN)

(25) **Sain Turab,** it means Pakistan's progress is still decades behind? (Native honorific + FN)

(26) **Madam Jamila sahiba**, there are many theories of literary criticism… (English honorific + FN + Native honorific)

(27) **Sir Soomro,** I promise it won't happen again. (Honorific + caste)

(28) ***Sir Qureshi sahib*** spoke of the role of literature review… (English honorific + caste + Native honorific)

(29) According to thesis groups, you all have been referred to ***Dr. Mustafa sahib***. (Titles + FN + Native honorific)

The findings showed that students used a variety of hybrid address forms by choosing from different categories when addressing teachers to meet their pragmatic needs and to convey a high level of respect. The fact that students accompany the English *Sir* with a native ***sahib/sahiba*** might suggest that they find the level of respect conveyed by *Sir* unsatisfactory for their communicative culture where teacher deserves the highest level of respect. On the other hand, in the most cases honorifics were accompanied by the first name of addressee, which indicates to the tendency of conveying some closeness and intimacy in addition to respect.

3.4.3. Caste address terms

Based on the analysis, we found (9.1%) caste address terms used by students for teachers. The use of caste e.g. *Soomro, Memon*, etc., was noticed with '*sahib*' (as a token of respect). However, the use of caste without *sahib* for teachers would be considered disrespectful and its use is avoided in most cases by the students in both in-class and out-class situations.

The findings form classroom observation confirms that students address teacher by caste address terms.

(30) ***Memon sahib,*** how do critical and creative thinking differ? (Caste + sahib)

Following the results of interviews, using caste address terms for teachers' students show respect and closeness.

However, in student-student interaction, they use for intimacy, closeness and mutual respect.

3.4.4. Occupation/profession-based terms

The last category of AFs used by students to teachers, is occupational or professional terms. The data findings reveal 6.0% of students who used it, however, their choice was limited to English *teacher* only, and no native address terms were used.

(31) **Teacher**, no**,** we have covered several topics according to the syllabus. (Occupation-based term)

By these form students show formality in relations with teachers, and only indicate their professional attitude.

Furthermore, it appears that native cultural influence on students' relationships is evident that they preferred other categories like honorific and hybrid address forms instead of occupation/profession-based terms when addressing teachers. This tendency demonstrates that students' social values influence their use and preference of address forms.

Findings' summary. The results in ***student-teacher interaction*** show students' adherence to the native culture while addressing their teacher. There are different manifestations of this fact. First, in addition to English *sir, madam/ma'am* other categories and other forms borrowed from native languages are used (e.g. *sain* which is 'spiritual guide' in Sindhi). Second, the impact of native language and culture can be observed not only in the native AFs but also in how English AFs are used. As our findings show, they are hardly used by themselves. Instead they are accompanied by the teacher's first name (e.g. *Sir Hassan*) which adds some intimacy to the AF. Third, the 5 types of hybrid address forms we have identified, which are a mixture of English and native forms of address are a clear confirmation of the fact that Pakistani bilinguals are strongly influenced by their native language and culture. They add native forms to English ones (e.g., *Sir Arif sahib, Madam*

Jamila sahiba,) to express the attitudes towards the teacher that their culture and values prescribe and they are an emphasized respect for their teachers and at the same time some closeness to them.

3.5. Teacher-student interaction

This part includes the description of teacher-student interaction findings in-class and out-class contexts namely classrooms, office, department premises. The identified categories from analysed data were presented with higher frequency of choice and it reveals the first names (61.5%) appeared to be most frequent category. The second category kinship terms (29.5%) in academic discourse seemed to be interesting, followed by caste address terms (9.0%).

It is noteworthy to mention that teachers relied on native languages address terms when addressing students. First names e.g. *Mustafa, Hussain,* (M), etc., *Mahwish, Mahrosh,* (F), etc., followed by native kinship terms e.g. *beta* 'son' (Urdu); *ada* 'brother' (Sindhi), we found caste address terms i.e. *Qureshi, Talpur, Syed*, etc.

Table 3.4. Categories of address forms in teacher-student interaction

Category	English		Native	
	%	AFs	%	AFs
First names	0	___	61.5	*Mustafa, Hussain* (M)*, Mahrosh, Arbeena* (F), etc.
Kinship terms	0	—	29.5	*Beta* 'son' (Urdu); *ada* 'brother' (Sindhi)
Caste address terms	0	—	9.0	*Channa, Syed, Qureshi,* etc.
sub-total	**0**		**100.0**	
Total	**100%**			

3.5.1. First names

The analysis of results shows first names in teacher-student interaction are the most commonly used address form. In our data 61.5% of teachers addressed the students by their first names e.g. *Samar, Mahrosh*, etc.

(32) **Bilal**, What's the climax in a story?

(33) **Jamila,** what's your opinion of the importance of plot order in the event of a story?

First names used by teachers' expresses closeness and intimacy. Moreover, the teachers use first names to show polite attitude towards students as well.

3.5.2. Kinship terms

The analyzed data shows native kinship terms the second most frequent category used by teachers when addressing the students. The use of kinship terms by teachers for students is an interesting finding among others as its uncommon in English tradition, whereas, common in Pakistani English speakers.

We observed 29.5% of teachers addressed their students by using mainly two native kinship terms i.e. *beta* 'son' (Urdu); and *ada* 'brother' (Sindhi). The study shows that teachers prefer native kinship terms when they want to express more closeness/intimacy and the at the same time more respect.

Our classrooms observation data confirms what we found in the survey.

(34)   Teacher: Oh! Yes, **beta** I did read it but couldn't reply. (native kinship term 'son' in Urdu)

(35)   Teacher: Good question **beta.** I am going to talk about in a while… (native kinship term 'son' in Urdu)

(36)   Teacher: **ada** in research, replication of findings is important… (native kinship term 'brother' in Sindhi)

(37)   Teacher: **ada,** what is the gist of this stanza. (native kinship terms 'brother' in Sindhi)

Such addressing practices reveal Pakistani values. In family-oriented Pakistani society teacher is perceived as father, therefore, teachers demonstrate

such attitude by choosing kinship terms in communication with students. Kinship terms express closeness in their relations with non-relatives, and polite attitude when interacting in English in both in-class and out-class contexts.

Beta 'son' (Urdu) and *ada* 'brother' (Sindhi) terms are not age bound, therefore, teachers use of native kinship terms for students without considering age differences.

3.5.3. Caste address terms

The last category in our findings was caste address terms. Caste is another common category used by teachers for addressing students in both in-class and out-class situations. In our data (9.0%) of teachers choose caste address terms when addressing students.

> (38)   Teacher: ***Talpur,*** you are right that participants' identity to remain anonymous in research. (caste address term)

> (39)   Teacher: ***Memon,*** is the next presenter… (caste address term)

When asked by teachers what pragmatic, functional features they express by using caste address terms with students, they indicate closeness, respect, and informality in the relationships. Moreover, the usage of caste e.g. *Soomro, Memon, Talpur,* etc., is limited to those students with whom teachers have a better understanding in terms of communication and relations. For every student, teachers would not use caste, they would prefer first name instead.

Findings' summary. The findings in ***teacher-student interaction*** have revealed the same features of address practices. In addition to first names Pakistani teachers address their students by native kinship terms and cast terms. kinship terms *beta* 'son' (Urdu) and *ada* 'brother' (Sindhi) in-class and out-class contexts are among the main components of polite attitude, they express intimacy and

closeness in interaction. By using kinship terms, the teacher builds a close family relationship with the students and shows intimacy.

Caste address terms e.g. *Soomro, Talpur, Syed,* etc. serve the same purpose. Moreover, they are limited to those with whom they are close and close understanding.

Caste address terms indicate social stratum of interlocutors, some caste terms are considered superior and inferior, however, in this study we do not include such superiority and inferiority stratum. In this study, caste usage has been seen as address terms and identity marker, no social taboos are considered.

3.6. Students' and Teachers' interaction with administrative staff

This section presents the findings of ***students' and teachers' interaction with administrative staff***. They are limited to the survey data only. Regarding each category, we used the same methodology for data analysis; the categories below are present and correspond to how the interlocutors used them most frequently.

The administrative staff hierarchy in Pakistani universities is classified into two main categories:

i. ***Higher-administrative staff*** (vice chancellor, pro-vice chancellor, dean, chairman, office superintendent) ranging between 22 to 17 pay/job grade.

ii. ***Lower-administrative staff*** (clerk, computer operator, peon or attendant) ranging from 4 to 16 pay/job grade. However, in some universities term *supportive staff* is used for *lower-staff*.

This division can guide us to determine how the choice of address forms categories varies due to the role of each staff members in university setting. We focused on the role of social hierarchy i.e. top-down and bottom-up contexts as an important factor in the choice of address form.

3.6.1 Student-administrative staff interaction

The analysis of the data has revealed the major categories used by students in addressing higher and lower administrative staff which demonstrated significant differences.

Students when addressing higher administrative staff used mainly honorifics (68.0%), and hybrid address forms (32.0%).

When addressing lower administrative staff, they used mainly two categories i.e. kinship terms (82.1%) and first names (17.9%).

We observed both English and native forms of address used in the categories of kinship terms and hybrid address forms. Student when addressing lower staff choose kinship terms form English 27.7% (i.e. *uncle, aunt,* and *brother*) and native languages 54.4% (i.e. *ada / bha* 'brother' (Sindhi); *bhai* 'brother' (Urdu); *chacha* 'uncle' (Sindhi), *massi* 'aunt'(Sindhi). Whereas, they select first names 17.9% (e.g. *Abdullah, Rustam* (M), *Sabina, Malika* (F), etc.)

Interaction with higher staff, students use English honorifics (68.0%) (e.g. *sir, madam, ma'am*); and the last category was hybrid address forms (11.0%) (e.g. Title + FN + Native honorific *e.g. Dr Mahmood sahib; Dr Jabeen sahiba*, Occupational + Native honorific i.e. *sahib* (M) / *sahiba* (F) 'a token of respect' (Sindhi/Urdu) e.g. *Chairman sahib*; *Chairperson sahiba*.

Table 3.5. Categories of address forms in student-administrative staff interaction

Category	Students-higher staff						Students-lower staff			
	English		Native		Hybrid address forms		English		Native	
	%	AFs	%	AFs	%	AFs	%	AFs	%	AFs
Honorifics	68.0	*sir, madam, ma'am*	0	—	32.0	Title + FN + Native honorific i.e. *sahib* (M) / *sahiba* (F) 'a token of respect' (Sindhi/Urdu) *e.g. Dr Hussain*	0	—	0	—
Kinship terms	0	—	0	—			27.7	Uncle, aunt, brother	54.4	*Ada/bha* 'brother' (Sindhi); *bhai* 'brother' (Urdu);

					sahib; Professor Aslam sahiba Occupational terms + Native honorific *e.g. Chairman + sahib or Chairperson sahiba*				*chacha* 'uncle' (Sindhi), *massi* 'aunt'(Sindhi)
First names	0	—	0	—		0	—	17.9	Sultan, Najam (M); Malika, Sabina (F), etc.
Sub-total	68.0		0		32.0		27.7		72.3	
Total	100%					100%				

Honorifics

Student-higher administrative staff interaction: The study findings of student-higher staff interaction show 68.0% English honorifics e.g. *sir, madam, ma'am* is used.

The use of English honorifics expresses respect and formality when they encounter higher staff.

Moreover, in our data students did not use any native honorifics for higher staff as they used for teachers. This trend shows that students preferred honoring and showing more respect by choosing native address terms like *sain* 'a spiritual guide' (Sindhi).

As higher administrative staff has higher authority and distance, with little or no direct interaction with students, so students relied English honorifics i.e. *sir, madam/ma'am* for displaying respect and formality.

Hybrid address forms

The study findings show that 32.0% students choose hybrid address forms when addressing higher staff. Hybrid address forms are mixture of other categories combined together in hybrid forms. The findings showed   the following models:

- Title + FN + Native honorific (e.g. *Dr. Aamir sahib*; *Dr Sabina sahiba*

- Occupational terms + Native honorifi*c e.g. Chairman sahiba chairperson sahiba* 'a token of respect' (Sindhi/Urdu).

By hybrid AFs students want to express a professional attitude and show respect at same time. This category is essential for revealing how students combine pre-existing categories of address forms to meet their communication needs when only English or native address terms fail to achieve it.

Student-lower administrative staff interaction

Addressing lower administrative staff students use kinship terms and first name.

Kinship terms

Our findings demonstrate that students (82.1%) used kinship terms of both English and native languages when addressing lower staff.

We noticed 27.7% English kinship terms e.g. *uncle, aunt, brother* when addressing lower staff, these tendencies for using English kinship terms expresses Anglicized attitude and literate background. Whereas, 54.4% students choose native address terms e.g. *ada / bha* 'brother' (Sindhi), and *bhai* 'brother' (Urdu) to clerical staff and office attendants/peons to show closeness and respect.

On the other hand, the choice of *chacha* 'uncle' (Sindhi); *massi* 'aunt' (Sindhi) are used for older age person e.g. peon or attendant to express intimacy and closeness.

The choice of kinship terms by students shows impact of sociocultural values on their choice of address forms which resulted in selecting both English and native address forms with some prevalence of native ones.

First names

Our findings in student-lower staff interaction shows 17.9% use of first names e.g. *Jamal, Karim* (M); *Sabina, Malika* (F), etc. for addressees like peon,

112

attendant, and clerical staff. The use of first names were observed for lower staff only that indicates closeness/intimacy and informality.

This trend of using kinship terms reveals that students on the one hand want to show the relationships close as relatives with older people, whereas, they used the first names for younger addressees to express closeness/intimacy. It is important to state, that these socio-pragmatic variations indicate the influence of culture and axiological factors driving the choice and use of different categories of address forms in student-staff interaction.

Findings' summary. The analysis of AFs used by students to administrative staff revealed the role of social factors in the choice of address forms. This choice significantly depends on the social status of the addressee. When addressing higher staff, students use English honorifics (*sir, madam, ma'am)*.

While addressing lower staff members' students use kinship terms both English. e.g. *uncle, aunt,* and *brother*, and native language kinship terms, e.g. *ada / bha* 'brother' (Sindhi); *bhai* 'brother' (Urdu); *chacha* 'uncle' (Sindhi), *massi* 'aunt' (Sindhi) which show intimacy/closeness, whereas, no such terms were used for higher staff.

Hybrid address forms usage indicate that students switch between English and native languages to express a professional attitude with the addressee of higher social status and power.

Moreover, depending on the context, in addition to of *sahib (M) / sahiba (F)* 'a token of respect' (Sindhi/Urdu) with higher administrative staff. For instance, title + FN + Native honorific (e.g. *Dr. Aamir sahib; Dr Sabina sahiba* 'a token of respect' (Sindhi/Urdu); Occupational terms + Native honorific e.g. *chairman sahib* (M), *chairperson sahiba* (F) 'a token of respect' (Sindhi/Urdu). In contrast, they do not use *sahib/sahiba* with lower administrative staff.

3.6.2. Teacher-administrative staff interaction

Teacher-higher administrative staff interaction. The analysed data findings reveal both English and native languages forms of address used in this context. Major categories include honorifics (52.3%), hybrid address forms (47.7%), kinship terms (70.6%), and first names (29.4%). As in the previous context where students addressed staff members, the choice of these categories depends greatly on the status of the addressee.

When addressing higher administrative staff members' teachers used mainly English honorifics (52.3%), and hybrid address forms (47.7%). When addressing lower administrative staff, they used kinship terms (70.6%) and first names (29.4%). Moreover, we found (47.7%) hybrid address forms used by teachers for higher administration.

Table 3.6. Categories of address forms in teacher-administrative staff interaction

Category	Teachers-higher staff						Teachers-lower staff			
	English		Native		Hybrid address forms		English		Native	
	%	AFs	%	AFs	%	AFs	%	AFs	%	AFs
Honorifics	52.3	*sir, madam, ma'am*	0	—	47.7	Title + FN + Native honorific *(e.g. Dr Hussain sahib; Professor Mahrosh sahiba)* Occupational terms + Native honorific *e.g. Dean sahib* (M) *or Dean sahiba* (F)*; Chairperson sahiba, Chairman sahib*.	0	—	0	—
Kinship terms	0	—	0	—			0	—	70.6	*Ada/bha* 'brother' (Sindhi); *bhai* 'brother' (Urdu); *chacha* 'uncle' (Sindhi), *massi* 'aunt'(Sindhi)
First names	0	—	0	—			0	—	29.4	Sultan, Najam (M); Malika, Sabina (F), etc.
sub-total	**52.3**		**0**		**47.7**		**0**		**100.0**	
Total	**100%**						**100%**			

Honorifics

The data analysis reveals that teachers used of English honorifics (52.3%) such as *sir, madam, ma'am* with higher staff. The choice of English honorifics expresses respect and formality in the relationships when addressing higher authority and powerful individuals e.g. chairperson or chairman, and dean. These tendencies of teachers-higher staff interaction show that they value formality (seriousness) in addressing those who possess g high social status and authority.

Hybrid address forms

47.7% of teachers' use hybrid address forms when addressing higher staff. We noticed the use of hybrid terms like title + FN + Native honorific e.g. *Dr Hassan sahib* (M)*; Dr Jamila sahiba* (F) *'a token of respect'* (Sindhi/Urdu); *Dean sahib/sahiba*. This mixture of established categories is used to meet the hierarchal (bottom-up) needs of the speaker, to indicate social power and authority of addressee, and show greater respect with the addition of *sahib/sahiba 'a token of respect'* (Sindhi/Urdu). Teachers when addressing higher staff show formality by choosing hybrid address forms e.g. *Dr Aliza sahiba, Professor Samir sahib*.

Teacher-lower administrative staff interaction

Addressing lower administrative staff teacher also use kinship terms and first name like students.

Kinship terms

Addressing lower administrative staff (clerk, computer operator, peon, attendant), teachers use native language kinship terms (70.6%). e.g. *ada* 'brother' (Sindhi), *adi* 'sister' (Sindhi); *baji* 'sister' (Urdu). which express intimacy and closeness. Native kinship terms were used to indicate pragmatic meanings of intimacy and deeper bond, therefore, teachers avoided using English kinship terms

that may not fulfill their pragmatic, social, and axiological needs in interaction. Thus, teachers are conscious of the interlocutors and contexts and show cultural sensitivity.

First names

29.4% were used only for lower staff as they indicate closeness and informality e.g. *Mustafa (*M), *Hafsa* (F), etc.

Findings' summary. The analysis of AFs used by teachers to administrative staff demonstrated the same tendencies observed in student-administrative staff interaction. revealed in the choice of hybrid address forms category is a vivid evidence of respecting the higher authority and maintaining distance. On the contrary, no such hybrid forms or honorifics were used to address lower staff, the use of first names and native languages kinship terms e.g. *ada* 'brother' (Sindhi), *adi* 'sister' (Sindhi); *baji* 'sister' (Urdu) reveals that teachers value intimacy/closeness in relations with lower staff (bottom-up contexts). The findings suggest that cultural values are manifested in the choice of address forms in Pakistani academic discourse in various contexts, both symmetrical and asymmetrical.

Table.3.7. Language and category variation

No		Names	Kinship terms	Endearment terms	Honorifics	Titles	Occupational terms	Caste address terms
1	**English**	—	*Bro/Brother, Sis/Sister, Uncle, Aunt*	*Dear*	*Mr. Ms. Sir, Madam, Ma'am*	*Senior, Junior, Dr. (Doctor of Philosophy), Professor*	*Teacher*	—

2	**Native**	*Hassan, Mahrosh, etc.*	*ada/Bha/Bhao* 'brother' (Sindhi); *Adi* 'sister' (Sindhi); *Bhai* 'brother' (Urdu); *Baji* 'sister (Urdu); *Aapi/aapa* 'sister' (Urdu), etc.	*Mitha* 'sweetheart or sweetie'; *pyara*—for male 'beloved/ my love'; *pyari/jana* 'loveable/lovely' (Sindhi); *yaar/yar* 'close-friend' (Sindhi/Urdu)	*Sain* 'spiritual guide' (Sindhi); *sahib* (M)/ *sahiba* (F) 'a token of respect' (Sindhi/Urdu)	—	—	*Soomro, Qureshi, Talpur, Bhutto, etc.*
3	**Hybrid**	<td colspan="7"> - Honorific + FN e.g. *Sir Hassan, Madam Mahrosh, Sain Turab;* - Honorific + FN + Native honorific i.e. *sahib* (M) / *sahiba* (F) 'a token of respect' (Sindhi/Urdu) e.g. *Sir Jamil sahib, Madam Khadija sahiba;* - Honorific + caste e.g. *Sir Soomro;* - Honorific + caste + *Native honorific* e.g. *Sir Soomro sahib* - Title + FN + Native honorific e.g. *Dr Mustafa sahib; Professor Jamila sahiba* - Occupational terms + Native honorific *e.g. Chairman sahib, Chairperson sahiba, Dean sahib/sahiba* </td>						

Verification of the results

The analysis of recordings in a natural environment verified the results of our study. The main purpose of classroom observation was to show the use of identified categories among Pakistani English speakers in natural communication. Within 13 hours of the audio-recorded data from classroom discourse we identified 193 (100%) interaction counts of address forms from 61 excerpts of natural interaction. Corroborating the classroom observation findings with survey, our study verified that students and teachers use first names, kinship terms, endearment terms, honorifics, titles, occupational terms, caste address terms, and hybrid address forms in natural communication. It is noteworthy to mention that all the identified categories in classroom observation varied across contexts, and relationships.

Classroom observation

The results show that student-student interaction use both English and native forms of address. We observed first names (21.5%) used in natural interaction in the classrooms, kinship terms. (8.5%) kinship terms from English i.e. *bro/brother* and *sis/sister*, and from native languages (15.7%) e.g. *ada / bha* 'brother' (Sindhi); *adi* 'sister' (Sindhi); *baji* 'sister' (Urdu). Terms of endearments were also observed in both English and native languages, we noticed 20.0% native languages address forms. e.g. *yaar/yar* 'close friend' (Sindhi); *pyara* 'beloved' *jani* 'love' *mitha* 'sweetheart' (Sindhi). Whereas, English endearment term (8.5%) was limited to 'dear'. 11.5% honorifics e.g. *Mr./Miss* for fellow students were used to show their educational background. The use of titles '*senior*' and '*junior*' among students (4.8%) has also been observed i.e. The last category identified Caste address terms among students in natural communication data totaled 10.0%.

Student-teacher interaction in natural environment also corroborate with survey findings. We observed both English and native language address forms, students used 45.6% English honorifics (e.g. *sir, madam/ma'am)*, whereas, 27.9% native language address form e.g. *sain* 'spiritual guide' (Sindhi) for teachers when addressing them. 5.6% hybrid address forms i.e. sir/madam + FN, Honorific + FN (e.g. *Sir Hassan*, *Madam Mahrosh*); Title + FN (e.g. *Dr Mustafa*) Honorific + caste + saab/sahib, (e.g. *Sir Soomro sahib/saab*); Honorific + caste (e.g. *Sir Soomro*) were noticed in the classroom observation. Students used English 'teacher' occupational term (14.8%) during classrooms when addressing them, followed by caste address terms (17.7%) with addition of *sahib* (M)/ *sahiba* (F) 'a token of respect' (Sindhi/Urdu).

Teachers when addressing students used first names (54.5%), kinship terms (29.6%), e.g. *beta* 'son' (Urdu); *ada* 'brother' (Sindhi), and caste address terms (15.9%). Thus, we present the results on the address forms observed from the

recordings in tabular form as under:

Table 3.8. Verification of the results through classroom observation

Category	Student-Student		Student-Teacher			Techer-Student	
	ENG AFs	Native AFs	ENG AFs	Native AFs	Hybrid address forms	ENG AFs	Native AFs
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
First names	—	21.5	—	—	5.6	—	54.5
Kinship terms	8.5	15.7	—	—		—	29.6
Endearment terms	8.5	20.0	—	—		—	—
Honorifics	11.5	—	45.6	27.9		—	—
Titles	4.3	—	—	—		—	—
Occupational terms	—	—	14.8	—		—	—
Caste address terms	—	10.0	—	17.7		—	15.9
sub-total	36.4%		35.3%		5.6%	22.7%	
Total	100%						

Open-ended interviews

The goal of open-ended interview which consisted of 8 questions was to specify the pragmatic meaning of some forms and their stylistic features (formality vs. informality). Moreover, we focused on the perception of English and native language address forms by students and teachers. To characterize an AF, the respondents were asked to choose among the following options: formality, informality, distance, closeness/intimacy, respect and other. More than one option was possible. We listed responses of students and teachers on the questions asked in written open-ended interviews and analysed their responses quantitatively and qualitatively.

Though students and teachers chose almost the same options some variation in their opinion has been noticed (see Table).

The only significant difference concerned English kinship terms *bro/brother, sis/sister* (question 3). Though most of the teachers (78%) and students (71%) indicated that these terms express "closeness", some teachers (22%) perceived them as markers of distance, while some students (28.9%) chose the option "respect".

When students and teachers were asked what they express by using first names e.g. *Jamal, Ali* (M); *Jamila, Sabina* (F) addressing a student (Question 1) the responses were "closeness/ intimacy", and "respect". However, teachers' responses showed the increased number for closeness/intimacy when using first names (72%) in comparison to students (41.3%) while students showed the increased number for respect (56.8% to 28%). The similar tendency was observed in the questions concerning the pragmatic meaning of native kinship terms (Question 4). Characterizing them teachers gave preference to closeness/intimacy (78%) along with respect (22%), while students found respect to be the main pragmatic meaning which they express (67.5%), giving "closeness/intimacy" a lower position (32.4%).

Concerning the difference between native and English kinship forms of address (Question 5) and native and English endearment terms (Question 6) both students and teachers found that native forms express more closeness/intimacy and respect than English ones. In other words, English terms are perceived as more distant.

Another confirmation can be found in the answers to the questions about the use of English honorifics *Mr/Miss*, *Madam/Ma'am* (Question 2) and their comparison with native honorifics *Sain, Saab/Sahib, Sir sahib/Madam sahiba* (Question 8). Both students and teachers answered that English honorifics express formality and respect while native honorifics express more respect and more closeness/intimacy, in other words, both students and teachers want to maintain

distance in relationships by using English terms and switch to native terms of address when they want to show closeness and intimacy.

These trends suggest that students and teachers mix English and native forms of address based on the situations.

They show their linguacultural identity by giving preferences to native forms of address in various social contexts.

The cultural manifestation can be observed when students and teachers use caste address terms i.e. *Talpur, Bhutto, Shaikh, Memon*, etc. in addressing. Their pragmatic meaning was identified as "closeness/intimacy" by students (46.8%) with little decrease by teachers (34.0%), "respect" (students 30.3%, teachers 40.0%) and "informality" (22.7% and 26%) However, to interpret the answers further research is needed as it would be important to see the cast belonging of the addresser among other factors.

Table 3.9. Verification of the results through open-ended interviews

Questions	Options: *You can choose more than one option.*	Responses	
		Students	Teachers
		%	%
1. What do you want to express by using first name (e.g. *Rafique or Zeenat*) while addressing?	Formality		
	Informality		
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy	41.3	72.0
	Respect	58.6	28.0
	Other		
2. What do you want to express by using *Mr/Miss* or *Madam/Ma'am* when addressing?	Formality	15.8	36.0
	Informality		
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy		
	Respect	82.7	64.0
	Other		
3. What do you want to express by using English kinship terms (e.g. *bro/brother, sis/sister*) in	Formality		
	Informality		
	Distance		22.0
	Closeness/intimacy	71.0	78.0

addressing?	Respect	28.9	
	Other		
4. What do you want to express by using local kinship terms while addressing?	Formality		
	Informality		
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy	32.4	78.0
	Respect	67.5	22.0
	Other		
5. What do you want to express when you prefer to use native kinship e.g. *ada / bhai or adi / aapi* instead of *brother/bro* or *sister/sis* while speaking in English?	More formality		
	More informality		
	More distance		
	More closeness/intimacy	30.3	54.0
	More respect	69.6	46.0
	Other		
6. What do you want to express by using local native endearment terms (such as *yaar/yar* or *mitha / dilbar / pyara / pyari)* while speaking in English?	Formality		
	Informality		
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy	71.0	90.0
	Respect	28.9	10.0
	Other		
7. Do you use caste terms of address (e.g. *Talpur, Bhutto, Shaikh, Memon*) in addressing? If your answer is **yes**, what do you want to express by using caste terms of address?	Formality		
	Informality	22.7	26.0
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy	46.8	34.0
	Respect	30.3	40.0
	Other		
8. What do you want to express when you use *sain, sahib/sahiba* or *madam/ma'am sahiba* instead *sir / madam/ma'am* while speaking in English?	More formality		
	More informality		
	More distance		
	More closeness/intimacy	29.6	24.0
	More respect	70.3	76.0
	Other		

Verification summary, of the results of open-ended interviews reveal that Pakistani English speakers' choice of English and native languages address forms varies in their pragmatic meanings, and stylistic characteristics). English AFs are associated with more formality while native AFs with more closeness and

intimacy. Characterizing the meaning of native AFs of different categories (honorifics, kinship terms, and endearment terms) two options were chosen by respondents, namely "closeness/intimacy" and "respect". For English honorifics *Mr./Miss* or *Madam/Ma'am* the respondents chose "formality" and "respect" while for cast terms "informality", "closeness" and "respect". These findings suggest that respect is associated by Pakistani bilinguals with closeness and intimacy rather than distance and formality. Thus, respect and closeness in the cognition of Pakistani bilinguals go together which presumably is due to sociocultural characteristics of Pakistani society.

3.8. Address forms and bilingual identity

This part of the study discusses some prominent tendencies in the choices and preference of address forms used in Pakistani English in bilingual university settings. This part of the study highlights how native culture, values, and language affect the choice, preference, and mixture of address forms with a focus on native address forms, identifying socio-pragmatic differences between English and native in a variety of situations and relationships, to highlight the social hierarchical differences in asymmetrical and symmetrical contexts, stylistic differences, and pragmatic functions of Pakistani English.

The study findings demonstrate that despite English being a medium of instruction in Pakistani universities. The influence of native culture and values is noticeable when interacting in Pakistani English among interlocutors due to the bilingual and multicultural environment. For instance, the choice of mixed address forms (i.e. Honorific + FN; title + FN + Native honorific) was observed, and hybrid forms were used, e.g. *Sir Hassan* or *madam Khadija*; *Professor Hassan sahib*. The addressing practices also include some native/local terms, such as '*sain*'—a spiritual guide (Sindhi), as well as native kinship terms *ada* 'brother' (Sindhi); and *baji* 'sister' (Urdu). In students' discourse the use of the Sindhi/Urdu

term *yar/yaar* 'a close friend' can also be noticed. Interlocutors in our study show functional differences like addressing teachers with hybrid forms which reflect respect and honour. On the other hand, among students' conversation kinship terms and native terms usage demonstrate intimacy/closeness.

The choice of such categories of forms address reflects the bilingual identity of Pakistani English speakers. The preference for native terms in interactions with Pakistani interlocutors shows that native cultural values affect the choice of address forms. Similar practices of address forms were observed in Indian university contexts with the addition of *ji* (a token of respect) at the end of hybrid terms to show respect and use of kinship terms like *didi* 'older sister' *bhaiya* 'brother' (Larina and Suryanarayan, 2023: 160). However, the British academic setting seems to be limited in comparison to the Pakistani university context (Formentelli, 2009). Code-mixing and native forms of address are used to express the attitudes and values of bilingual which cannot be conveyed through English terms.

Analysing socio-pragmatic and axiological differences between English and native forms of address we observed that students preferred kinship terms for the administrator of older age. For instance, students addressed older individuals with both English 'uncle', and native *chacha* 'paternal-uncle' (Sindhi), and used the native endearments *yar/yaar* 'a close friend (Sindhi/Urdu) address forms between student-student interactions. Moreover, the preferences of kinship terms in students' interaction from both English (i.e. *bro/brother* and *sis/sister*) and native languages (i.e. *ada/bha* 'brother' in Sindhi; *aapi/aapa* 'sister' in Urdu). For the junior students' native terms *ada/bha* 'brother' (Sindhi) and *adi/baji* 'sister' (Sindhi/Urdu) in Pakistani universities were used based on formal situations as English kinship terms lack seniority status in kin terms (Gao, 2013).

The choice is observed by the social hierarchy, context, and level of

formality and informality. While analysis Pakistani English speakers demonstrate strong sensitivity to hierarchical differences and intimacy in both asymmetrical and symmetrical contexts which shape their communicative ethnostyles. A main reflection of social hierarchy is caste address terms used among peer and junior students are seen as a sign of frankness, intimacy, and deep understanding. However, in casual settings (cafés), the choice of caste among students increased. Social, cultural, and communicative contexts have an impact on student's choice of caste address terms.

We asked students to identify whom they addressed using caste address terms in symmetrical and asymmetrical relations (e.g., seniors, juniors, classmates, or all). This social structure among students predominates in the year of studies, with first-year students being *juniors* to other second-, third, and fourth-year students, despite there being no or little age difference. Similar to other academic years, second-year students are *seniors* to first-year students and *juniors* to third- or fourth-year students. The higher-year students patronize the first, second, and third-year students, which is general practice in Pakistani universities. The use of the titles senior and junior in addressing practices of students in a bilingual university setting is a marker of honour/respect and gesture of understanding (cf. Soomro and Larina, 2023). However, the results indicate that teacher-student interaction shows *informality* in the relationships and adheres to sociocultural values of *closeness/intimacy* and *respect* simultaneously. Whereas, addressing practices in European and other academic contexts indicates either intimacy or closeness (Formentelli, 2009; Norrby and Wide, 2015).

Our findings testify that the choice of address forms is mainly influenced by native culture and values. These values in Pakistani culture emphasize respect for addressee who are of higher status, and solidarity and intimacy to those of lower or equal in the social hierarchy.

Addressing styles of bilingual Pakistani English speakers used endearment terms showing friendship, intimacy, and a polite attitude. Students employed both English i.e. dear and native languages such as *pyari/jana* 'beloved' (Sindhi/Urdu) for females, *jani* 'beloved'/ *mitha* 'sweet pie'/ a lover' / *pyara* 'lovely' in Sindhi. However, to meet the needs of communication, interlocutors switched to native endearments based on context, intimacy, and friendliness which were not possible in English (cf. Soomro and Larina, 2022). When addressing senior students, *Mr.* and *Miss* have been seen more frequently addressing junior students than their peers, despite an anticipated rise in their numbers. These results imply that social distance—or horizontal distance—also matters. Among people who are in the same group, informality appears to be acceptable (as classmates). Even junior members of the outgroup receive more formal treatment.

These preferences and uses in the choice of native address terms like '*ada*' show a polite and respectable gesture whereas, the use of '*beta*' shows not only code-mixing but parental patronage for the students in the classrooms. Thus, these findings suggest that the English and native address forms have different pragmatic and cultural values. Both students and teachers typically use English to convey a professional attitude, but choosing native terms demonstrates a deeper understanding and increased intimacy where English fails to do so. We found that the collectivist nature of interlocutors and their trend towards we-culture and we-identity (Larina et al., 2017),

Overall, the findings have shown mixture of both English and native address forms in Pakistani English reflects bi-cultural and bilingual identity. Our study findings confirm that multilingual language speakers "have more options of codes, strategies, and nuances since they control more than one linguistic system" as noticed by Kachru and Nelson (2006: 19). The interlocutors demonstrate the social hierarchy, pragmatic differences, the impact of native sociocultural values and

axiological factors on communication behavior and relationships.

Summary

This chapter presents the findings of the analyses of address forms categories among Pakistani English speakers in the university setting. The findings were obtained by three research tools: i. survey, verified the results by ii. open-ended written interviews, and iii. classroom observation. Moreover, data and methodology adopted in the study was based on quantitative and qualitative design drawing on interdisciplinary theoretical framework.

The findings were compared to the results by focusing on the frequency of address forms of both English and native language, the main similarities and differences in perception of English and native address forms by students and teachers.

In our study, the use of first names for an addressee is found to be common in university settings. Within students' interaction, first names were used, in comparison the teacher-student interaction, teachers use of first names increased. Whereas, in student-teacher interaction, students never addressed their teacher by first names. the use of the first name is restricted at peer level (linear context) and it describes intimacy when used. However, the use of first names for older addressees (i.e. teachers, administrators, or older age) is discouraged and seen as impolite and bad-mannered. Moreover, first names have a restriction among students who in the situation of an age difference prefer to use the terms *senior* and *junior* to the addressee's name. This tendency demonstrates that students adhere to social hierarchy and show respect for an addressee in academic discourse.

The findings show that the use of kinship terms in the university setting is not uncommon. Teachers addressing students choose kinship terms from their native languages, e.g. *beta* 'son' (Urdu); *ada* 'brother' (Sindhi). On the other hand, students pick a variety of kinship terms from both English were *bro/brother*;

sis/sister, and native languages to address other students e.g. *ada/bha* 'brother' (Sindhi); *bhai* 'brother' (Urdu); *adi* 'sister' (Sindhi); *baji/aapi/aapa* 'sister' (Urdu). With lower administrative staff, the most common English kinship terms e.g. *uncle*, *aunty*, were used, however, students preferred native languages kinship terms e.g. *chacha* 'uncle' (Sindhi/Urdu), and *massi* 'aunt' (Sindhi).

No kinship terms were used for higher administrative staff which suggests that students show a strong sensitivity to the hierarchical differences in both symmetrical—at peer level, and asymmetrical—bottom-up and top-down contexts. The verification confirmed our results and showed that hierarchy and intimacy are among the most significant cultural values in Pakistani linguaculture and important part of their identity representation.

To meet the interpersonal needs of communication Pakistani English speakers used terms of endearment. We identified that students' choice was limited to English '*dear*', whereas, a wide range of native endearing expressions were used by between students. Among others the most common were *yar/yaar* 'close-friend' (Sindhi/Urdu); *pyara/jana* 'loveable/lovely' (Sindhi). They used more metaphorical and descriptive manners to show love, care, and polite behavior toward the addressee. The variations in the choice of native language endearment terms when speaking English shows that functional features like intimacy/closeness, which also reveals the cultural values are manifested in the choice of forms of address in Pakistani academic discourse across contexts.

Pakistani English interlocutors used honorifics from both English and native languages The tendency among the students to address *Mr. Ms.* to other fellow students is unique to Pakistani English. Moreover, this tendency highlights their socio-pragmatic variations by demonstrating Anglicized attitudes and educational background. Whereas, English *sir*, *madam*, or *ma'am* were limited to the teachers and higher administrative staff.

In addition, teachers, and students, choose native *sain* 'spiritual guide' (Sindhi) somewhat equivalent to 'sir'; and the colonial term *sahib* (M) / *sahiba* (F) 'a token of respect' (Sindhi/Urdu). The pragmatic meanings of '*sain*' expresses more respect and honour than the English 'sir'. It shows the addresser's desire to demonstrate respect to authority and maintain hierarchical differences in communication.

Another empirical evidence of cultural and lingual influence can be observed in the caste address terms and hybrid forms of address. Caste address terms e.g. *Soomro, Memon, Talpur, Shaikh, Shah,* etc. are frequently used as a marker of identity to convey different sociopragmatic meanings. The choice in preference of caste address terms depends on the interlocutors' social status, authority. In addition, when students address teachers by caste address terms they added *sahib* (M) / *sahiba* (F) 'a token of respect' (Sindhi/Urdu), e.g. *Soomro sahib* to show more respect. The usage of caste address terms is a clear evidence of sociocultural, axiological, and cognitive factors which influence the system and usage of address forms in Pakistani English.

Hybrid address forms are unique mixtures of languages and categories in bilingual academic discourse. The findings suggest some models/patterns of hybrid addressing e.g. Honorific + FN e.g. *sain Arif, madam Mahwish*; titles + FN + Native honorific *sahib* (M) / *sahiba* (F) 'a token of respect' (Sindhi/Urdu) e.g. *Professor Salim sahib; Dr. Shamsa sahiba,* etc. among others. The choice of each identified model varies due to the situation, addressee and context.

The use of hybrid address forms reveals that Pakistani English speakers mix English and native language address forms in English-language discourse when other address forms fail to express their pragmatic, functional, and stylistic purpose.

These tendencies in the choice and preferences of English or native address

129

forms reveal that students' communication is influenced by axiological components of their linguacultural identity. The use of AFs in academic discourse testifies to the fact that hierarchy and intimacy are important sociocultural and cognitive factors which impact interpersonal communication of bilingual Pakistani English speakers.

To sum up, the findings were verified with audio-recorded classroom observation. which confirmed that the identified categories and forms of address are used in bilingual academic settings. Their choice and preferences are influenced by native languages and axiological system of native culture,

CONCLUSION

The study was aimed to identify the main categories of forms of address used by speakers of Pakistani English in academic discourse and specify sociocultural and cognitive factors influencing their choice, as well as their pragmatic, functional and stylistic characteristics. The findings of the study showed that Pakistani English, like other Englishes, is influenced by local language(s) and cultures which manifests at both systemic and functional levels. This influence can be observed, among other things, in the categories of forms of address and their use by bilingual speakers of Pakistani English. The encoding and decoding of social, cultural, cognitive features can be conceptualised through the use of address forms which indicate speaker's attitudes, values and identity. Address forms are basic foundation of communication, they reflect interlocutors' cultural specificities, social hierarchy, age, gender, power and distance along with levels of formality and informality of the situation.

In academic discourse bilingual Pakistani English speakers use various categories of address forms. Along with the categories typical of the Englishes of the inner circle (names, honorifics, terms of endearment, titles, professional terms), Pakistani English speakers also use such categories as kinship terms, and caste

terms. Regarding the language three types of address forms were identified – English, native and hybrid which are a combination of both English and native address forms and categories.

The findings showed that English, native and hybrid forms of address differ in pragmatic, functional and stylistic characteristics and their preference is predetermined by bilingual identity of Pakistani English speakers, their native traditions and values. When English terms of address fail to express them, Pakistani bilinguals resort to local terms or their combination. English terms are perceived by Pakistani bilinguals as more formal, while native terms express more closeness and intimacy. Thus, Pakistani English speakers adapt their communication by code-mixing. They move fluidly and creatively between their native language and English.

The usage of address forms in Pakistani academic discourse shows their strong sensitivity to the context. The adherence to hierarchy and demonstration of respect to those who is older or higher in status can be observed both in asymmetrical and symmetrical contexts, even in the interaction of students. The findings show that in the situations of 1-2-year-old difference the students address each other by the terms *senior* or *junior* rather than by the names. To show more respect the Sindhi word *sain* 'a spiritual guide' is used whereas the English 'sir' fails to meet the sociopragmatic requirment. A noticeable finding are also hybrid address forms which are mixed patterns used by students when addressing teachers. For instance, *sain Hassan* (Native honorific + FN); *sir Soomro sahib* (honorific + caste + native honorific).

Another value expressed by the forms of address is closeness and intimacy. It is prescribed by *we*-orientation of Pakistani culture and *we*-identity of its representatives. *Family*-orientation of Pakistani culture is manifested in the use of kinship terms beyond family. In academic discourse kinship terms are observed

131

among students, e.g. *Ada / bha* 'brother' (Sindhi); *adi* 'sister' (Sindhi)*; baji* 'sister' (Urdu), as well as in addressing a lower staff by students and teachers, e.g. *bhai* 'brother' (Urdu); *chacha* 'uncle' (Sindhi), *massi* 'aunt'(Sindh) and in addressing students by teachers (*beta* 'son').

These findings indicate that respect to hierarchy as well as closeness and intimacy are among the most important values in Pakistani culture and essential axiological components of identity of its representatives. It is important to note that in contrast to the Englishes of the inner circle where either respect to the status or closseness/intimacy are expressed by an address form, in Pakistani English we can observe the tendency to express both respect and intimacy simultaneously, i.e. by the same form of address in the same context. This suggests that politeness in Pakistani English is associated with respect and closeness which go together. in other words it is performed by the use of different directional politeness strategies, i.e. negative strategies which are distance based and positive strategies which are solidarity based (Brown & Levinson 1987). Our findings corrabrate with the idea of Larina and Suryanarayan regarding Indian English who state that "politeness in India is demonstrating intimacy and showing deference to those who are older or higher in status" (Larina and Suryanarayan 2013).

 The usage of native and hybrid address forms contributes to the formation of Pakistani English as an English variety and once again demonstrates a strong interdependence of language, culture, cognition and communication.

The findings show that the bilingual and multicultural environment of Pakistani universities reflects bi-lingual and bi-cultural identity and inheritance to their native/local language and discursive practices which confirms that bilinguals merge their languages and values with English in developing their unique varieties of English (Canagarajah, 2013). This validates the argument that English

expressions adhere to linguacultural features and its educational codification dominates their unique characteristics (Kachru, 1985).

The study provides numerous linguistic and discursive facts which indicate the influence of the axiological components of bilingual identity when choosing a form of address in academic discourse, Thus, it sheds more light "on the role that language, and particularly discourse, plays in constituting (ethnic) identity and, conversely, how identities could possibly assume an active role in the construction of discourse" (Larina et al., 2017: 119). The results of the study demonstrate how speakers of a different linguistic culture adapt the language they borrowed to their communicative needs, which contributes to the formation of varieties of pluricentric languages.

The study once again confirms the interconnectedness of language, culture, cognition and communication. The findings may contribute to sociolinguistics, WE paradigm, cultural linguistics, cross-cultural pragmatics and discourse analysis, by providing new data and expanding the understanding of the impact of culture and cognition on language and its functioning in a bilingual context. They can be used in research and teaching activities in theoretical courses and course books on sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, cross-cultural pragmatics, as well as on the theory and practice of intercultural communication and translation.

The main findings and conclusions can stimulate further studies of the varieties of English as well as varieties of forms of address across discourses, languages and cultures. We anticipate to conduct further research to gain a more complete picture of addressing practices in other settings and discourses of Pakistani English with a particular focus on status, age and gender differences.

References

1. Abalkheel, A. (2020). How to Address Your Instructor: An Analysis of Classroom Discourse at Saudi Arabian Universities? Studies in English Language and Teaching, 8(4). 122-129. https://doi.org/10.22158/selt.v8n4p122

2. Abrar-ul-Hassan, S. (2010). Nativized Varieties of English and the Linguistic Identity: A Case of Indian English Speakers. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 7*(2), 29-68.

3. Adger, C.T. (2001). Discourse in Educational Settings. In Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., and Hamilton, HD (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. 503-517. Massachusetts, USA: Blackwell Publishers.

4. Adnan, U., & Tehseem, T. (2022). Exploring English as a Multicultural Language in Pakistan: A Sociolinguistic Profile. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 10*(2). 435–447. https://doi.org/10.52131/pjhss.2022.1002.0208

5. Afful, J. (2006). Non-kinship Address Terms in Akan: A Sociolinguistic Study of Language Use in Ghana. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 27*(4), 275-289. https://doi.org/10.2167/jmmd425.1

6. Afful J. (2010). Address forms among university students in Ghana: a case of gendered identities? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *31*(5). 443-456, https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2010.505655

7. Afghari, A., & Karimnia, A. (2007). A Contrastive Study of Four Cultural Differences in Everyday Conversation between English and Persian. *Intercultural Communication Studies, 14*(1). 243-450.

8. Agha, A. (1994). Honorification. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *23*. 277–302. DOI:10.1146/annurev.an.23.100194.001425

9. Ahmad, R. (1981). *The Bengali Muslim 1871-1906: A Quest for Identity*. 2nd ed, Delhi: Oxford UP.

10. Alba-Juez, L. (2016). Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics: Their Scope and Relation. *Russian Journal of Linguistics, 20*(4), 43-55. https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-15147

11. Alba-Juez, L., & Larina, T. (2018). Language and Emotion: Discourse-Pragmatic Perspectives. *Russian Journal of Linguistics, 22*(1), 9-37. https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-9182-2018-22-1-9-37

12. Al Aghbari, K., & Al Mahrooqi, R. (2019). Terms of endearment in Omani Arabic. *Anthropological Linguistics, 61*(3). 389-404. https://doi.org/10.1353/anl.2019.0022

13. Aliakbari, M. and Toni, A. (2008). The Realization of Address Terms in Modern Persian in Iran: A Sociolinguistic Study. *Linguistik Online, 35*(3). 3-12. https://doi.org/10.13092/lo.35.520

14. Al-Khawaldeh N.N, Olimat S.N, Mashaqba B.M, Al-Omari M.A, Alkhawaldeh A.A. (2023). Normativity and Variation in the Address Terms System Practiced among the Jordanian Youth Community. *Languages, 8*(1). 8-15. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8010031

15. Althen, G. (2001). American values and assumptions. *The Negotiation Sourcebook*, 341.

16. Amjad, S., & Shafiq ur Rehman. (2020). Code switching and code mixing in multilingual societies: a case of Pakistan. *Science International,32*(6). 655-659.

17. Ansari, S., Buriro, G.A. & Mallah, GM. (2016). Phonological Differentiation Between Pakistani English and British English: Analysis of Sindhi Speakers Cognitive Management of Received Pronunciation. *Journal of Grassroot, 50*(2). 39-58.

18. Anwar, B., Rasool, S., & Kamran, M. (2020). Indigenization in Multilingual Setting: Evidence from Pakistan English Written Discourse. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review, 4*(1). 65-78. http://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2020(4-I)06

19. Alenizi, A. (2019). The Norms of Address Terms in Arabic: The Case of Saudi Speech Community. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 9*(5). 227-241. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n5p2277

20. Ashraf, M.A., Turner, D.A., & Laar, R.A. (2021). Multilingual Language Practices in Education in Pakistan: The Conflict Between Policy and Practice. *SAGE Open, 11*(1). 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211004140

21. Aslam, M.A., Abbas, N., Shahzad, K., & Iqbal, N. (2011). A Sociolinguistic Study of the Realization of Address Forms in Urdu Language. ECONSPEAK: *A Journal of Advances in Management, IT and Social Sciences, 1*(3). 210-231.

22. Atta, A., Naqvi, S.B. (2022). Exploring Translanguaging Praxes in Pakistani Multilingual ESL Classrooms of First-Year Students at University Level. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*® *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 28*(3). 149-167. http://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2022-2803-10

23. Atkinson, D. (2002). Toward a Sociocognitive Approach to Second Language Acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal, 86*(4). 525–545. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1192723

24. Atkinson, D. (2014). Language learning in mindbodyworld: A sociocognitive approach to second language acquisition. *Language Teaching*, *47*(4), 467–483. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444813000153

25. Bakhtikireeva, U. M., Valikova, O. A., & King, J. (2017). Translingualism: Communicative Bridge or "Cultural Bomb"?. *Polylinguality and Transcultural*

Practices, 14(1), 116-121. Https://Doi.Org/10.22363/2312-8011-2017-14-1-116-121

26. Bakić, A. & Škifić, S. (2017). The Relationship between Bilingualism and Identity in Expressing Emotions and Thoughts. *Medellín Colombia, 22*(1). 33-54. DOI: 10.17533/udea.ikala.v22n01a03

27. Bashir, M., Jianqiao, L., Abrar, M., & Ghazanfar, F. (2012). The organization's cultural values: A study of public sector universities in Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management, 6*(10), 3686-3693. doi: 10.5897/AJBM11.2677

28. Barth, F. (1960). *The System of Social Stratification in Swat, Northern Pakistan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

29. Bauman, R. (1983). *Let Your Words Be Few: Symbolism of Speaking and Silence Among Seventeenth-Century Quakers*. New York: Cambridge University Press

30. Baumgardner, R.J. (1993). *The English Language in Pakistan*. Karachi:Oxford University Press.

31. Baumgardner, R.J. (1995). Pakistani English: acceptability and the norm. *World Englishes, 14*. 261-271. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1995.tb00355.x

32. Baumgarten, Nicole & Roel Vismans (eds.). (2023). *It's Different with You: Contrastive Perspectives on Address Research*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

33. Beatty-Martínez, Anne L., Navarro-Torres Christian A., Dussias Paola E. (2020). Codeswitching: A Bilingual Toolkit for Opportunistic Speech Planning. *Frontiers in Psychology,11*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01699

34. Bhatt, R.M. (2001). World Englishes. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 30*. 527–550. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3069227

35. Bhatti, J. & Sartaj, S. (2019). An Ethnographic Investigation of Code Switching and Mixing in Pakistan: A Case Study of Nine-Year Old Child, Alia. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 9*(2). 210-218. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n2p210

36. Bilá, M., & Ivanova, S. V. (2020). Language, culture and ideology in discursive practices. *Russian Journal of Linguistics, 24*(2), 219-252. https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-2020-24-2-219-252

37. Braun, F. (1988). *Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures*. Contributions to the Sociology of Language, 50. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110848113

38. Brown, L. (2015). Honorifics and Politeness. In *The Handbook of Korean Linguistics* (eds L. Brown and J. Yeon). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118371008.ch17

39. Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T.A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in language*. Cambridge: MIT Press. 253-276.

40. Brown, R., & Ford, M. (1961). Address in American English. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62*(2). 375–385. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0042862

41. Bruns, H., & Kranich, S. (2021). Terms of address: A contrastive investigation of ongoing changes in British, American and Indian English and in German. *Contrastive Pragmatics, 3*(1), 112-143. https://doi.org/10.1163/26660393-bja10025

42. Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: a socio-cultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies, 7*(4–5). 585-614.

43. Bughio, M. (2014). Determining the Status and Use of Languages Spoken in Pakistan. *Sustainable Multilingualism, 4*(4). 46-56. http://dx.doi.org/10.7220/2335-2027.4.3

44. Bursell, M. (2012). Name change and destigmatization among Middle Eastern immigrants in Sweden. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 35*(3). 471-87.

45. Butt, B., Anwar, B., Tariq, S., & Kanwal, S. (2021). Structural Nativization in Pakistani English: Exploring Prepositional Verb Idiosyncrasies. *Harf-o-Sukhan 5*(4). 392-402. Retrieved from http://harf-o-sukhan.com/index.php/Harf-o-sukhan/article/view/329

46. Byon, A. (2006). The role of linguistic indirectness and honorifics in achieving linguistic politeness in Korean requests. *Journal of Politeness Research, 2*(2). 247-276. https://doi.org/10.1515/PR.2006.013

47. Campbell, Y. (2021). Kinship terminology of the bau-jagoi bidayuh in Sarawak, Malaysia. *Studies in English Language and Education, 8*(2), 833–847. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v8i2.19035

48. Canagarajah, S. (2009). Multilingual Strategies of Negotiating English: From Conversation to Writing. *JAC, 29*(1/2), 17–48. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20866885

49. Canagarajah, S. (2013). Negotiating Translingual Literacy: An Enactment. *Research in the Teaching of English, 48*(1). 40–67. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24398646

50. Canagarajah, S., & Ashraf, H. (2013). Multilingualism and Education in South Asia: Resolving Policy/Practice Dilemmas. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 33*. 258-285. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000068

51. Castells, M. (2010). *Power of identity: The information age: Economy, society, and culture* 2nd Ed. Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

52. Cenoz, J., & Santos, A. (2020). Implementing pedagogical translanguaging in trilingual schools. *System, 92.* 102273. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102273

53. Census-2017. Census report of Pakistan. Islamabad: Population Census Organization. https://www.pbs.gov.pk/content/final-results-census-2017

54. Chamo, I. (2019). The use of address forms among faculty academic staff of Bayero University, Kano. *Studies in African Languages and Cultures*, 2019(53). 9–27. https://doi.org/10.32690/SALC53.1

55. Chao, Y. (1956). Chinese Terms of Address. *Language, 32*(1). 217–241. https://doi.org/10.2307/410666

56. Chen, X., & Lee, J. (2021). The relationship between stereotypical meaning and contextual meaning of Korean honorifics. *Journal of Pragmatics, 171.* 118-130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.10.011

57. Clyne, M. (2009). Address in intercultural communication across languages. *InterculturalPragmatics 6*(3), 395–409.https://doi.org/10.1515/IPRG.2009.020

58. Coelho, G. (1997). Anglo-Indian English: A Nativized Variety of Indian English. *Language in Society, 26*(4). 561–589. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4168803

59. Creswell, J., & Plano, V. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods approaches.* Thousand Oaks. CA: Sage Publications.

60. Crystal, D. (2011). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (Vol. 30). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

61. Daba, H.A. (1987). *Sociolinguistic study of address terms in Hausa*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

62. de los Ríos, CV., & Seltzer, K. (2017). Translanguaging, Coloniality, and English Classrooms: An Exploration of Two Bicoastal Urban Classrooms. *Research in the Teaching of English, 52*(1). 55–76. http://www.jstor.org/stable/44821287

63. Diamond, J. (2010). The benefits of multilingualism. *Science, 330*(6002), 332–333. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1195067

64. Dittrich, W., Johansen, T. & Kulinskaya, E. (2011). Norms and situational rules of address in English and Norwegian speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(15). 3807-3821. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.09.006

65. Eberhard, DM., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (ed.). (2020). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (23-rd ed.). SIL International. http://www.ethnologue.com

66. Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2018). "Mr Paul, please inform me accordingly": Address forms, directness and degree of imposition in L2 emails. *Pragmatics: Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA). 28*(4). 489–515. https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.17025.eco

67. Ehsan, A., & Aziz, S. A. (2014). Code-mixing in Urdu news of a private Pakistani channel. *Academic Research International, 5*(1), 160-169.

68. Ellis, D. (2007). A discursive theory of ethnic identity. In Richard Mole (ed.), *Discursive construction of identity in European politics*, 25–44. Palgrave Macmillan.

69. Eslami, Z.R., Tatiana, L., & Pashmforoosh, P. (2023). Identity, politeness and discursive practices in a changing world. *Russian Journal of Linguistics, 27*(1). 7–38. https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-34051

70. Ervin-Tripp, S. (1972). Sociolinguistic Rules: Alteration and Co- Occurrence. In: J. Gumperez, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics* (pp. 213-250). Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.

71. Ethelb, H. (2015). Using Address Terms in showing Politeness with Reference to Their Translation from Arabic into English. *International Journal of Comparative Literature & Translation Studies, 3*(3). 27-37. http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijclts.v.3n.3p.27

72. Etaywe, A. (2017). A Sociolinguistic Study of Husband-to-Wife Address Forms and Functions in Rural Jordanian Community: Signaling politeness, power, solidarity, status and intimacy. *Macrolinguistics, 5*(7). 84–117. https://doi.org/10.26478/ja2017.5.7.5

73. Fairclough, N. (2001). The dialectics of discourse. *Textus 2*(14). 231–242.

74. Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge: London.

75. Farghal, M. & Shakir, A. (1994). Kin Terms and Titles of Address as Relational Social Honorifics in Jordanian Arabic. *Anthropological Linguistics, 36*(2). 240-253. http://www.jstor.org/stable/30028294

76. Fasold, R. (1990). *The Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford.

77. Félix-Brasdefer, C. (2015). *The language of service encounters: A pragmatic-discursive approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

78. Fitch, K.L. (1991). The interplay of linguistic universals and cultural knowledge in personal address: Columbian Madre terms. *Communication Monographs, 58*. 254 –272.

79. Fielding, R. & Harbon, L. (2013), Examining bilingual and bicultural identity in young students. *Foreign Language Annals, 46*: 527 544. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12051

80. Formentelli, M. (2009). Address strategies in a British academic setting. *Pragmatics, 19* (2), 179-196. https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.19.2.02for

81. 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. https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.26.4.05for

82. García, O. (2009). Education, Multilingualism and Translanguaging in the 21st Century. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. Mohanty & M. Panda (Ed.), *Social Justice through Multilingual Education* (pp. 140-158). Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691910-011

83. García, O, & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*. London: Palgrave Pivot.

84. Gardiner, A. (1957). *The Theory of Proper Names: A Controversial Essay*. London: Oxford University Press.

85. Gao, C. (2013). A contrastive study of Chinese and English address forms. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3*(1). 190–194. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.1.190-194

86. Gazdar, H., & Mohamand, S.K. (2007). *Social Structures in Rural Pakistan*. Asian Development Bank, Pakistan Resident Mission, Islamabad.

87. Gee, J.P. (2007). *Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. New York and London: Routledge.

88. Geeraerts, D., Kristiansen, G., & Peirsman, Y. (2010). Advances in Cognitive Sociolinguistics. In *Advances in Cognitive Sociolinguistics* (Eds.), Dirk Geeraerts, Gitte Kristiansen, Yves Peirsman. De Gruyter Mouton, GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin/New York.

89. Goddard, C., & Wierzbicka, A. (2002). 'Semantics and cognition'. In L Nadel (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Cognitive Science*. Nature Publishing Group. pp. 1096–1102.

90. Goddard, C. (2013). The semantic roots and cultural grounding of 'social cognition'. *Australian Journal of Linguistics 33*(3). 245–256. https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2013.846454

91. Griswold, W. (2013). *Cultures and societies in a changing world*. SAGE Publications, Inc., https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452240534

92. Grząśko, A. (2015). On the semantic history of selected terms of endearment. *Linguistics Beyond and Within (LingBaW), 1*(1). 104–118. https://doi.org/10.31743/lingbaw.5626

93. Gyollai, D. (2020). The Sociocognitive approach in critical discourse studies and the phenomenological sociology of knowledge: intersections. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11097-020-09704-z

94. Hodel, L., Formanowicz, M., Sczesny, S., Valdrová, J., & von Stockhausen, L. (2017). Gender-Fair Language in Job Advertisements: A Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Cultural Analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 48*(3). 384–401. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022116688085

95. Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind.* Limburgat Maastricht, The Netherlands: The McGraw-Hills Companies.

96. Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2*(1). https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014

97. Holmes, J. (2013). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. 4th ed. Routledge.

98. Hwang, S. (1991). Terms of address in Korean and American Cultures. *Intercultural Communication Studies, 1*(2). 117-134.

99. Irfan, H. (2022). English in Pakistani Universities: An Analysis of Linguistic Features. In: Ali Raza, N., Coombe, C. (eds.) *English Language Teaching in Pakistan. English Language Teaching: Theory, Research and Pedagogy*. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-7826- 4_7

100. Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W., & Stick, S. L. (2006). Using Mixed-Methods Sequential Explanatory Design: From Theory to Practice. Field Methods, 18(1), 3–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05282260

101. Jabeen, S. (2020). Language planning and policy, and the medium of instruction in the multilingual Pakistan: a void to be filled. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 20*(2). 522-539. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2020.1860064

102. Jacoby, H.G., & Mansuri, G. (2015). Crossing boundaries: How social hierarchy impedes economic mobility. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization, 117*. 135-154. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2015.05.003.

103. Jilani, S.F., & Anwar, B. (2018). Lexico-Semantic Features of Pakistani English Newspapers: A Corpus-Based Approach. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 8*(4). 50-63. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v8n4p50

104. Kachru, B. (1976). "Models of English for the Third World: White Man's Linguistic Burden or Language Pragmatics?" *TESOL Quarterly, 10*: 221–39.

105. 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.

106. Kachru, B. (1986). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pargamon Press.

107. Kachru, B. (1992). World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching, 25*(1). 1-14. doi:10.1017/S0261444800006583

108. Kachru, B. (2005). *Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon*. Hong Kong University Press.

109.	Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian Contexts*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

110.	Kachru, B., Yamuna, K., & Nelson C. (eds.). *The handbook of world Englishes*. Oxford: Blackwell.

111.	Kahane, H. (1986). A typology of the prestige language. *Language 62*(3). 495-508.

112.	Kanno, Y. (2003). *Negotiating Bilingual and Bicultural Identities Japanese Returnees Betwixt Two Worlds*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers Mahwah, NJ.

113.	Kecskes, I. (2013). *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press USA.

114.	Kecskes, I. (2014). Word, Context and Communication Meaning. *Russian Journal of Linguistics, 4*. 7-18. https://journals.rudn.ru/linguistics/article/view/9561

115.	Kecskes, I. (2020). Interculturality and intercultural pragmatics. In Jackson, J. (Ed.). *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003036210

116.	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. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2001.015

117.	Khan, Q., Sultana, N., & Naz, A. (2015). The Linguistic Representation of Gender Identities in Pakhtu Proverbs. *NUML Journal of Critical Inquiry, 13*(2), 73-87.

118.	Khan, A.M. (2014). Social aspects of Code-Switching: An analysis of Pakistani Television advertisements. *Information Management and Business Review, 6*(6). 269-279.

119.	Khalid, A., & Khan, A.A. (2022). Negotiation of bilingual identities: A case of young migrant Pashtuns in Lahore. *Ampersand*, 9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2022.100098

120.	Khalil, A. & Larina, T. (2018). Arabic forms of address: sociolinguistic overview. The European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences EpSBS, V. XXXIX – WUT 2018: *Word, Utterance, Text: Cognitive, Pragmatic and Cultural Aspects*. Future Academy. 299- 309. http://dx.doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2018.04.02.44

121.	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. https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2022-13-1-27-44

122.   Khalil, A. (2022). *Forms of address in American and Syrian Lingua-Cultures: A Socio-pragmatic Perspective*. PhD dissertation, Peoples' Friendship University Russia, Moscow.

123.   Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). World Englishes. In Constant Leung and Brian V. Street (ed.) *The Routledge Companion to English Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge

124.   Kobzová, J. (2019). Kinship terminology in Western Slavic languages based on corpora analysis. *Journal of Linguistics, 70*(22). 89 – 298. https://doi.org/10.2478/jazcas-2019-0059

125.   Kotorova, E. (2018). Analysis of Kinship Terms Using Natural Semantic Metalanguage: Anna Wierzbicka's Approach. *Russian Journal of Linguistics, 22*(3). 701-710. https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-9182-2018-22-3-701-710

126.   Koul, O.N. (1995). Personal Names in Kashmiri. In Koul, Omkar N. (ed.) *Sociolinguistics: South Asian Perspectives*. New Delhi: Creative.

127.   Kubota, R., & Ward, L. (2000). Exploring Linguistic Diversity through World Englishes. *The English Journal, 89*(6). 80–86. https://doi.org/10.2307/821267

128.   Kullanda, S. (2002). Indo-European "Kinship Terms" Revisited. *Current Anthropology, 43*(1). 89–111. https://doi.org/10.1086/324127

129.   Kusters, A. (2021). Introduction: the semiotic repertoire: assemblages and evaluation of resources. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 18*(2). 183-189. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2021.1898616

130.   Labov, W. (2001). *Principles of Linguistic Change: Social Factors*. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell.

131.   Larina, T. (2008). Directness, imposition and politeness in English and Russian. *Cambridge ESOL Research Notes*, 33. 33-39.

132.   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.

133.   Larina, T. (2015). Culture-specific communicative styles as a framework for interpreting linguistic and cultural idiosyncrasies. *International Review of Pragmatics, 7*(2), 195-215. https://doi.org/10.1163/18773109-00702003

134.   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. https://doi.org/10.1515/lpp-2017- 0006

135.	Larina T., Suryanarayan N., & Yuryeva Yu. B. (2019). Socio-Cultural Context, Address Forms and Communicative Styles (A Case Study of British and Indian Englishes). *Science Journal of Volgograd State University. Linguistics*. Vol. 18(3). 39-51. (in Russian). https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2019.3.3

136.	Larina, T., & Ponton, D. (2020). Tact or frankness in English and Russian blind peer reviews. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *17*(4), 471- 496. https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2020-4004

137.	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.

138.	Lau, S.M.C., Juby-Smith, B., & Desbiens, I. (2017). Translanguaging for Transgressive Praxis: Promoting Critical Literacy in a MultiAge Bilingual Classroom. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 14*(1). 99–127. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2016.1242371

139.	Lee, H, (1991). *Tense, aspect and modality: A discourse pragmatic analysis of verbal affixes in Korean from a typological perspective.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles.

140.	Lee, C., & García, G. (2021). Understanding Korean-American first-graders written translanguaging practices. *Linguistics and Education, 66*.1- 16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2021.100998

141.	Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

142.	Leech, G. (1999). The distribution and function of vocatives in American and British English conversation. In Hasselgård, H., Oksefiell, S. (Eds.). *Out of Corpora: Studies in honour of Stig Johansson*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Rodopi, pp. 107-118.

143.	Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

144.	Lewis, G., Jones, B., & C. Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: origins and development from school to street and beyond, *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*(7). 641-654. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718488

145.	Liu, Y., & Fang, F. (2020). Translanguaging Theory and Practice: How Stakeholders Perceive Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language. *RELC Journal, 53*(2). 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220939222

146.	Mahboob, A., & Ahmar, N. H. (2004). Pakistani English: Phonology. In B. Kortmann (Ed.), *A handbook of varieties of English: A multimedia reference* (pp.1003–1016). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

147.   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. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110208429.2.578

148.   Mahboob, A. (2009). English as an Islamic language: A case study of Pakistani English. *World Englishes, 28*(2). 175-189. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01583.x

149.   Mahbood, A., (2014), Englishes in Multilingual Conexts. In Mahboob, A., & L. Barratt (eds.), *Englishes in Multilingual Contexts, Language Variation and Education* (pp.1-12), Springer Science + Business Media Dordrecht, DOI 10.1007/978-94-017-8869-4_1

150.   Malik, N. (2018). Use of Address Terms in Urdu as Spoken in Western Uttar Pradesh (Specially in Rampur and Adjoining Districts): A Sociolinguistic Study. *Language in India, 18*(8). 154-163.

151.   Manjulakshi, L. (2004). *Modes of address in Kannada: A sociolinguistic study of language use in Mysore District*. Available at http://www.languageinindia.com/sep2004/manjulakshitermsofaddress1.html (accessed March 2023).

152.   Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Lota. In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary. Retrieved February 29, 2024, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/lota

153.   Merkin, R. (2016). Pakistani Cultural Characteristics: Updated VSM Scores and Facework Geared towards Increasing Women's Access to Education. In: Roy, S., Shaw, I.S. (eds) *Communicating Differences*. Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137499264_11

154.   Mezzera, M., & Aftab, S. (2009). *Democratisation and Transitional Justice Cluster Country Case Study: Pakistan, Pakistan State–Society Analysis*. The Initiative for Peacebuilding (IfP).

155.   Miller, P. (2011). *Theories of developmental psychology* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Worth Publishers.

156.   Misachi, J. (2019). Ethnic Groups in Pakistan. Retrieved from https://www.worldatlas.com/articles/ethnic-groups-in-pakistan.html on 5 September, 2023.

157.   Mulo Farenkia, B. (2019). Nominal address strategies in Cameroon French: Between lexical creativity and pragmatics. In Bettina Kluge & María Irene Moyna (eds.) 2019 *It's not all about 'you': New perspectives on address research,* 335–354. Amsterdam: John Benjamins https://doi.org/10.1075/tar.1.13far

158.   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. https://doi.org/10.1080/26410397.2022.2035516

159.   Murray, T. (2002). A New Look at Address in American English: The Rules Have Changed, Names. *A Journal of Onomastics, 50*(1), 43-61. https://doi.org/10.1179/nam.2002.50.1.43

160.   Mushtaq, H. & Zahra, T. (2012). An Analysis of Code-Mixing in Television Commercials. *Language in India, 12*(11). 428-439.

161.   Natalya, P. (2009). Criteria of Mutual Understanding in Cross-Cultural Communication. Journal of Siberian Federal University. *Humanities & Social Sciences, 2*(2) 222-226.

162.   Nelson, C.L., Proshina, Z.G., & Davis, D.R. (2020). *The Handbook of World Englishes*. 2nd edition. Wiley-Blackwell.

163.   Nilep, C. (2006). "Code Switching" in Sociocultural Linguistics. *Colorado Research in Linguistics,* 19, 1-22.

164.   Noor, M., & Anwar, B. (2021). Nativisation and Variation of Discourse Markers in Pakistani English. *University of Chitral Journal of Linguistics & Literature [S.l.], 5*(2). 112-136. https://doi.org/10.33195/jll.v5iII.297

165.   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

166.   Norrby, C., Schüpbach, D., Hajek, J., & Kretzenbacher, H. L. (2019). Introductions at international academic conferences: Address and naming in three national varieties of English. In Bettina Kluge & María Irene Moyna (eds.) *It's not all about 'you': New perspectives on address research*, 375–396. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tar.1.15nor

167.   O'Connor Di Vito, N. (1998). Applications of sociolinguistic and sociocultural research to the French language classroom. *The American Association of University Supervisors, Coordinators and Directors of Foreign Languages Programs (AAUSC)*. 71-107. http://hdl.handle.net/102015/69540

168.   Oostendorp, M. (2022). Raced Repertoires: The Linguistic Repertoire as Multi-Semiotic and Racialized, *Applied Linguistics, 43*(1). 65–87, https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amab018

169.   Opata, C., & Asogwa, O. (2017). Title, Rituals, and Land Use: The Heritage of a Nigerian Society. *SAGE Open*. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016689129

170.   Pakistan Bureau of Statistics (2017). https://www.pbs.gov.pk/content/final-results-census-2017

171. Parkinson, B. (1985). *Constructing the Social Context of Communication: Terms of Address in Egyptian Arabic*. New York: Mouton,

172. Phinney, J.S. (2003). Ethic identity and acculturation. In K. M. Chun, P. Balls Organista, & G. Marín (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (pp. 63–81). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/10472-006

173. Phinney, J.S, & Ong, A. (2007). Concuptualization and Measurement of Ethnic Identity: Current Status and Future Directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*(3), 271–281. DOI: 10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.271

174. Platt, J., & Lian, M. (1982). A case of language indigenisation: Some features of colloquial Singapore English, *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development, 3*(4). 267-276. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1982.9994089

175. Ponton, D., & Larina T. (2017). Discourse Analysis in the 21st Century: Theory and Practice (II). *Russian Journal of Linguistics, 21*(1), 7- 21. https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-9182-2017-21-1-7-21

176. Poproski, R., Seeley, J., & Robert, J. (2021). The Position of Instruction: Faculty Perspectives on Forms of Address. *College Teaching*, 70(2). 255-267. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2021.1920881

177. Portolés, L., & Martí, O. (2017). Translanguaging as a teaching resource in early language learning of English as an additional language (EAL). *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature, 10*(1), 61-77. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/jtl3.698

178. Prakova, D. (2017). *Intercultural differences: varieties of address strategies in a British academic setting*. Master thesis, University of Huddersfield.

179. Proshina, Z.G. (2016). Legitimacy of Russian English. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 236*, 201-206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.12.005

180. Proshina, Z.G. (2020). Russian Englishes. In Cecil L. Nelson, Zoya G. Proshina, and Daniel R. Davis (ed.) *The Handbook of World Englishes*, 2nd Edition. 232-247. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

181. Proshina Z.G., Nelson C.L. (2020). Varieties of English and Kachru's expanding circle. *Russian Journal of Linguistics, 24*(3). 523–550. https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-2020-24-3-523-550

182. Ragavan, M.I., & Cowden, J.D. (2020). Bilingual and Bicultural Research Teams: Unpacking the Complexities. *Health equity*, *4*(1). 243–246. https://doi.org/10.1089/heq.2019.0111

183.   Rahman, T. (1990). *Pakistani English: The linguistic description of a non-native variety of English*. Islamabad: National Institute of Pakistan Studies.

184.   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. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197785.1.73

185.   Rahman, T. (2009). Language ideology, identity and the commodification of language in the call centers of Pakistan. *Language in Society, 38*(2), 233-258. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404509090344

186.   Rahman, T. (2013). Personal Names and the Islamic Identity in Pakistan. *Islamic Studies, 52*(3-4). 239–396.

187.   Rahman, T. (2020). Pakistani English. In *The Handbook of Asian Englishes* (eds K. Bolton, W. Botha and A. Kirkpatrick). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118791882.ch11

188.   Ramsha, A., & Hidayat, S. (2019). The Role of Social Parameters in the Choice of Address Forms used in Kinship domain in Punjab, Pakistan. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics, 4*(1). 73-87. https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v4i1.101

189.   Ramzan, M., Aziz, A., & Ghaffar, M. (2021). A study of code-mixing and code-switching (Urdu and Punjabi) in children's early speech. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 17*(2). 869-881. Doi: 10.52462/jlls.60

190.   Rasul, S. (2013). Borrowing and Code Mixing in Pakistani Children's Magazindes: Practices and Functions. *Pakistaniaat: A Journal of Pakistan Studies, 5*(2). 46-72.

191.   Rendle-Short, J. (2007). "Catherine, you're wasting your time": Address terms within the Australian political interview. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*(9). 1503-1525. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.02.006.

192.   Rendle-Short, J. (2011). "Address Terms in the Australian Political News Interview." In *Talking Politics in Broadcast Media. Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Political Interviewing, Journalism and Accountability*, ed. by Mats Ekström, and Marianna Patrona, 93–111. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.42.09ren

193.   Ruxandra-Silvia C., Noels, K.M., & Dewaele, J.M. (2018) Bicultural identity orientation of immigrants to Canada. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 39*(6), 526-541. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2017.1404069

194. Sadykova, A., Beisembayeva, A., & Hkalel, A. (2018). Towards the Issues of Multilingual Competence Formation. *Revista ESPACIOS, 39*(17). 14-26.

195. Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

196. Schneider, B. (2017). Community and language in transnational music styles. Symbolic meanings of Spanish in Salsa and Reggaeton. In: Mühleisen, Susanne (ed.). *Contested Communities*. (Series: Cross/Cultures. Readings in Post/Colonial Literatures and Cultures in English). Leiden/Boston: Brill. 239-260.

197. Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (2001). Discourse and intercultural communication. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 538-547). Oxford, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

198. Shaikh, A. (2009*). Poorbi Pahaka* (Proverbs of East). Part 1.

199. Sharifian, F. (2015). Cultural Linguistics and world Englishes. World Englishes, 34. 515-532. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12156

200. Sharifian, F. (2017). *Cultural Linguistics: Cultural Conceptualizations and Language*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

201. Singleton, D. (2016). A critical reaction from second language acquisition research. In V. Cook & Li Wei (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic multi-competence* (pp. 502–520). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

202. Smakman, D. (2019). Cultural bias and Sociolinguistics. *Russian Journal of Linguistics, 23*(1). 9-22. https://doi.org/10.22363/2312-9182- 2019-23-1-9-22

203. Smith, E.B. (2015). Understanding Culture, Social Organization, and Leadership to Enhance Community Engagement. *Leadership & Organizational Management Journal, 3,* 1-11.

204. Soomro, M.A., & Larina, T. (2022). Categories of address forms in Pakistani English at a multilingual academic setting. *Philological Sciences: Scientific Essays of Higher Education*. 6s*. 50-55. DOI: 10.20339/PhS.6s-22.050.

205. Soomro, M.A., & Larina. T. (2023). Mister, bro, or ada? Styles of Addressing among Multilingual Pakistani Students. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies, 23(2).* 241-257. http://dx.doi.org/10.17576/gema-2023-2302-13

206. Soomro, M.A. (2023). Sociocultural Values and Pragmatics of Caste Address Form in Multilingual Pakistani Student and Teacher Discourse.

Integration of Education, 27(4). 694–703. https://doi.org/10.15507/1991-9468.113.027.202304.694-703

207.   Šubová, M. (2010). *Addressing across Cultures*. MA Thesis. Retrieved from https://theses.cz/id/j51iir/55781-523134129.pdf

208.   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. https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-2021-25-1-125-146

209.   Talaat, M. (1993). Lexical variation in Pakistani English. In R.J. Baumgardner (Ed.), *The English language in Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.

210.   Thiongo, N.W (1986), *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature.* James Currey Ltd: Heinemann.

211.   Thorne, S.L. (2005), Epistemology, Politics, and Ethics in Sociocultural Theory. *The Modern Language Journal, 89*. 393-409. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2005.00313.x

212.   Triandis, H.C., (1996). The psychological measurement of cultural syndromes. *American Psychologist 51*, 407–415.

213.   Triandis, H.C., & Gelfand, M.J. (2012). A theory of individualism and collectivism. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology*, 498–520. Sage Publications Ltd. DOI: 10.4135/9781446249222.n51

214.   Triandis, H.C. (2018). *Individualism and collectivism*. Routledge.

215.   Unuabonah, F. (2018). Forms of address and language ideologies: The case of a southwestern Nigerian university. *Linguistik Online, 91*(4). https://doi.org/10.13092/lo.91.4398

216.   van Dijk, T. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 11*(2). 115—140. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310600687908

217.   van Dijk, T. (2009). *Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

218.   van Dijk, T. (2016). Sociocognitive Discourse Studies. In, John Richardson & John Flowerdew (Eds.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 1-27). London: Routledge.

219.   Velasco, P., & García, O. (2014). Translanguaging and the writing of bilingual learners. *Bilingual Research Journal, 37*(1). 6-23. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2014.893270

220.   Vodak, R. (2006). Vzaimosviaz' 'diskurs – obschestvo': kognitivnyy podhod k kriticheskomu diskurs-analizu. In E.V. Budayev and A.P. Chudinov (eds.). *Sovremennaya politicheskaya lingvistika, 19*. 123-136. Ekaterinburg.

(Translation: Interrelation "discourse - society": cognitive approach to critical discourse analysis. Political linguistics).

221.   Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. 5th edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

222.   Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2021). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. John Wiley & Sons.

223.   Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

224.   Wierzbicka, A. (1992). *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition: Universal Human Concepts in Culture-Specific Configurations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

225.   Wierzbicka A. (2003). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*. 2nd ed. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

226.   Wierzbicka, A. (2013). Kinship and social cognition in Australian languages: Kayardild and Pitjantjatjara. *Australian Journal of Linguistics 33*(3).302–321. https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2013.846458

227.   Wierzbicka, A. (2016). Back to 'Mother' and 'Father': Overcoming the Eurocentrism of kinship studies through eight lexical universals. *Current Anthropology, 57*(4). 408—429. https://doi.org/10.1086/687360

228.   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

229.   Weisman, E.M. (2001). Bicultural Identity and Language Attitudes: Perspectives of Four Latina Teachers. *Urban Education, 36*(2). 203-225. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085901362004

230.   Widiatmaja, A. (2014). *A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Address Terms Performed by the Main Character in Runaway Jury Movie*. MA Thesis. Yogyakarta State University. Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

231.   Wong, J. (2006). Contextualizing aunty in Singaporean English. *World Englishes, 25*(3-4), 451-466. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2006.00481.x

232.   Yang, C. (2010). Translation of English and Chinese Addressing Terms from the Cultural Aspect. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1(5), 738-742. doi:10.4304/jltr.1.5.738-742

233.   Yasmin, M., Naseem, F. & Sohail, A. (2019). Religious and Socio-cultural Influences on the Pakistani Wedding Invitation. *Open Linguistics, 5*(1), 354-368. https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2019-0019

234.   Younas, M., Afzaal, M., Noor, U., Khalid, S., & Naqvi, S. (2020). Code Switching in ESL Teaching at University Level in Pakistan. *English Language Teaching, 13*(8). 63-73. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n8p63

235.   Yule, G. (2020). *The study of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

236.   Zavitri, I. (2018). *Address Terms in English and Selayarese: A Sociolinguistics Perspective*. MA, Thesis. Hasanuddin University. Makassar, Indonesia.

Appendices
Appendix 1:

<div align="center">

Survey for Students:

Address Forms in Pakistani English Academic Discourse: A Sociocognitive Perspective
</div>

Dear participant, I would be grateful if you could take part in this research project aimed at exploring and understanding the worldview of bilingual through the description of address forms in Pakistani English in a University setting.

All information will be used anonymously for research purposes only.

Give the information below, please.

Age: 17-19 ☐   20-23 ☐   24-26 ☐

Gender: Male ☐   Female ☐

How many languages can you speak and understand at the minimum?

1. ☐ 2   2. ☐ 3   3. ☐ 4   4. ☐ 5 or   more ☐

Are your parents' multilinguals?   Yes ☐   No ☐

Which language do you consider as your native language/s?

_____

What language/s do you speak at home?

_____

What language/s do you speak at University?

With classmate/s in class

…………………………………………………

With classmate/s in informal situations

………………………………………….…..

Questions: Please fill in the answers to the questions given below by choosing appropriate address forms/terms according to the situation and person you are addressing. You are requested again to notice the situation in question and the person you are addressing/talking to.

I would be grateful if you could take part in our research project and answer the following questions. You may give more than one answer.

1. **How do you address your classmates in class?**
   Male_____
   Female_____
2. **How do you address your classmates at the cafeteria/café or hostel?**
   Male_____
   Female_____
3. **How do you address your junior fellow in the department?**
   Male_____
   Female_____
4. **How do you address your junior fellow in the cafeteria/café or hostel?**
   Male_____
   Female_____
5. **How do you address your senior in the department?**
   Male_____
   Female_____
6. **How do you address your senior in the cafeteria/café or hostel?**
   Male_____
   Female_____

7. How do you address your teacher in class?
Male_____
Female_____

8. How do you address your teacher in the office?
Male_____
Female_____

9. How do you address your teacher in a group of friends?
Male_____
Female_____

10. How do you address the chairperson of the department in the office?
Male_____
Female_____

11. How do you address the chairperson of the department in a group of friends?
Male_____
Female_____

12. How do you address the office superintendent in the department office?
Male_____
Female_____

13. How do you address the clerk/computer operator (typist) in the department office?
Male_____
Female_____

14. How do you address the peon/attendant in the department office?
Male_____
Female_____

15. How do you address helper/service providers at the cafeteria/café?
Male_____
Female_____

Thank you for your valuable time and participation

Appendix 2:

Survey for Teachers:
Address Forms in Pakistani English Academic Discourse: A Sociocognitive Perspective

Dear colleague, I would be grateful if you could take part in this research project aimed at exploring and understanding the worldview of bilingual through the description of address forms in Pakistani English in a University setting.

All information will be used anonymously for research purposes only.
Give the information below, please.

Age: 27-30 ☐   31-34 ☐ 35-40 ☐   40 or above ☐
Gender: Male ☐   Female ☐
What is your highest degree qualification? _____
How long have been teaching, in years, please? _____
How many languages can you speak and understand at the minimum?
1. ☐ 2   2. ☐ 3   3. ☐ 4   4. ☐ 5 more ☐
Are your parents' multilinguals?   Yes ☐   No ☐
Which language   do you consider   as   your   native language/s?

154

_____
What language/s do you speak at home?

_____
What language/s do you speak at University?
With students in class ……………………………………………
With students in informal situations ………………………………….
With your colleagues (formal situation/s) ………………………….
With your colleagues (informal situation/s) ………………………….
Questions: Please fill in the answers to the questions given below by choosing appropriate address forms/terms according to the situation and person you are addressing. You are requested again to notice the situation in question and the person you are addressing/talking to.
Dear Colleague(s),
I would be grateful if you could take part in this research project and answer the following questions. **You may give more than one answer.**

1. **How do you address your colleague younger than you at work? (Juniorfaculty member).**
   Male_____
   Female_____
2. **How do you address your colleague younger than you at an informal place i.e. mess/tea hall? (Junior faculty member).**
   Male_____
   Female_____
3. **How do you address your colleague older than you at work? (Senior faculty member).**
   Male_____
   Female_____
4. **How do you address your colleague older than you at an informal place i.e. mess/tea hall? (Senior faculty member).**
   Male_____
   Female_____
5. **How do you address your colleague the same age as you at work? (Peer level faculty member).**
   Male_____
   Female_____
6. **How do you address your colleague the same age as you at an informal place i.e.mess/tea hall? (Peer level faculty member).**
   Male_____
   Female_____
7. **How do you address the HoD/chairperson of the department in the office?**
   Male_____
   Female_____
8. **How do you address the HoD chairperson of the department in an informal place i.e.tea hall, etc.?**
   Male_____
   Female_____
9. **How do you address the office superintendent in the department office?**

Male_____

Female_____

10. How do you address the clerk/computer operator (typist) in the department/office?

Male_____

Female_____

11. How do you address the dean of your faculty in the office?

Male_____

Female_____

<u>Thank you for your valuable time and participation</u>

Appendix 3:

Open-ended Interviews for Students

Could you please answer the following questions? The following questions are concerned with addressing forms used in Pakistani English in a university setting. You can choose more than one option. If you choose OTHER, your comment would be appreciated.

Confidentiality: All information will be used anonymously for research purposes only.

1. **What do you want to express by using your first name (e.g.** *Rafique or Zeenat*)**when you address your classmate? You can choose more than one option.**

   ☐ Formality   ☐ Informality ☐ Distance   ☐ Closeness/intimacy

   ☐ Respect   ☐ Other

   Your comment

   Who do you address by using your first name?

   ☐ Senior students,   ☐ Junior students ☐, or all

2. **What do you want to express by using a combination name (e.g.** *Zulfikar Ali or Zeenat Parveen)* **when you address your senior or other university students? You can choose more than one option.**

   ☐ Formality   ☐ Informality ☐ Distance   ☐ Closeness/intimacy

   ☐ Respect   ☐ Other

   Your comment

   Who do you address by using a combination name?

   ☐ Junior students   ☐ Your classmates   ☐ or all

3. **What do you want to express by using** *Mr./Miss* **or** *Madam/Ma'am* **when you address your classmate?**

   ☐ Formality ☐ Informality ☐ Distance   ☐ Closeness/intimacy ☐ Respect   ☐ Other

   Your comment

   Could you please specify who you address by this term (e.g. Mr. Miss or Madam/Ma'am)?

   ☐ Senior students,   ☐ Junior students ☐, or all

   If you address other students by this term what else do you want toexpress?

156

☐ Joke   ☐ Anglicized behavior   ☐ Educational background ☐ Other

Your comment

----

4. What do you want to express by using English kinship terms (e.g. brother/bro) when you address your classmate? You can choose more than one option.

☐ Formality   ☐ Informality ☐ Distance   ☐ Closeness/intimacy

☐ Respect   ☐ Other

Your comment

Who do you address by using English kinship terms?

☐ Senior students,   ☐ Junior students ☐, or all

5. What do you want to express by using local kinship terms when you address your classmate? You can choose more than one option.

☐ Formality   ☐ Informality ☐ Distance   ☐ Closeness/intimacy

☐ Respect   ☐ Other

Your comment

Who do you address by using local kinship terms?

☐ Senior students   ☐ Junior students   ☐ or all

6. What do you want to express when you prefer to use *ada/bhai or adi/aapi* instead of *brother/bro* or *sister/sis* while speaking in English? You can choose more than one option.

☐ More formality   ☐ More informality ☐ More distance

☐ More closeness/intimacy ☐ More Respect   ☐ OtherYour comment

Who do you address by using local kinship terms over English kinship terms?

☐ Senior students,   ☐ Junior students   ☐ Your classmates   ☐ or all

7. What do you want to express by using local native endearment terms (such as *yaar/yar* or *mitha / dilbar / pyara / pyari)* while speaking in English? You canchoose more than one option.

☐ Formality ☐ Informality ☐ Distance   ☐ Closeness/intimacy

☐ Respect ☐ OtherYour comment

Who do you address by using local/native endearment terms?

☐ Senior students   ☐ Junior students   ☐ Your classmates   ☐ or all

8. Do you use caste terms of address (e.g. Jamali, Shaikh, Memon, etc.) whenaddressing other university students?

☐ Yes   ☐ No

If your answer is yes, what do you want to express by using caste termsof address?

☐ Formality   ☐ Informality   ☐ Distance   ☐ Closeness/intimacy

☐   Respect   ☐ Other

☐   Your comment

Who do you address by using caste terms of address?

157

□ Senior students, □ Junior students □ Your classmates □ or all

9. **What do you want to express by using local terms *sain, sahib/sahiba, or madam sahiba* in addressing your teacher while talking in English? You can choose more than one option**

□ Formality □ Informality □ Distance □ Closeness/intimacy □ Respect

□ Other

Your comment

What do you want to express when you use *sain, sahib/sahiba, or madam sahiba* instead of Sir / Madam while speaking in English?

□ More formality □ More informality □ More distance

□ More closeness/intimacy □ More Respect □ OtherYour comment

Thank you for your valuable time and participation

Appendix 4:

Open-ended Interviews for Teachers

Could you please answer the following questions? The following questions are concerned with addressing forms used in Pakistani English in a university setting. You can choose more than one option. If you choose OTHER, your comment would be appreciated.
Confidentiality: All information will be used anonymously for research purposes only.

1. **What do you want to express by using your first name (*e.g. Rafique or* Zeenat) when you address your colleague? You can choose more than one option**.

□ Formality □ Informality □ Distance

□ Closeness/intimacy □ Respect □ Other

Your comment…………………………………………………………………….

2. **What do you want to express by using a combination name (*e.g. Zulfikar Ali or Zeenat Parveen*) when you address your colleague? You can choose more than one option.**

□ Formality □ Informality □ Distance

□ Closeness/intimacy □ Respect □ Other

Your comment…………………………………………………………………….

3. **What do you want to express by using Mr./Miss or Madam/Ma'am when you address your colleague?**

□ Formality □ Informality □ Distance

□ Closeness/intimacy □ Respect □ Other

Your comment…………………………………………………………………….

4. **What do you want to express by using English kinship terms (*e.g. brother/bro*) when you address your colleague? You can choose more than one option.**

□ Formality □ Informality □ Distance

□ Closeness/intimacy □ Respect □ Other

Your comment…………………………………………………………………….

5. **What do you want to express by using local kinship terms when you address your colleague? You can choose more than one option.**

158

☐ Formality   ☐ Informality   ☐ Distance
☐ Closeness/intimacy   ☐ Respect   ☐ Other
     Your comment……………………………………………………………….

6. **What do you want to express when you prefer to use *ada/bhai or adi/aap*i instead of *brother/bro or sister/sis* while speaking in English? You can choose more than one option.**

☐ More formality ☐ More informality   ☐ More distance
☐ More closeness/intimacy   ☐ More Respect   ☐ Other

Your comment………………………………………………………………………

7. **What do you want to express by using local native endearment terms (*such as yaar/yar or mitha/dilbar/pyara/pyari*) while speaking in English? You can choose more than one option.**

☐ Formality   ☐ Informality   ☐ Distance
☐ Closeness/intimacy   ☐ Respect   ☐ Other
     Your comment……………………………………………………………….

8. **Do you use caste terms of address (e.g. Talpur, Bhutto, Shaikh, Memon, etc.) when addressing university colleagues? ☐ Yes ☐ No**
   If your answer is yes, what do you want to express by using caste terms of address?

☐ Formality   ☐ Informality   ☐ Distance
☐ Closeness/intimacy   ☐ Respect   ☐ Other
Your comment…………………………………………………………………

9. **What do you want to express by using local terms *sain, sahib/sahiba*, or *madam sahiba* in addressing your teacher while talking in English? You can choose more than one option.**

☐ Formality   ☐ Informality   ☐ Distance
☐ Closeness/intimacy   ☐ Respect   ☐ Other
     Your comment……………………………………………………………….

10. **What do you want to express when you use *sain, sahib/sahiba, or madam sahiba* instead of *sir / madam/ma'am* while speaking in English?**

☐ More formality ☐ More informality   ☐ More distance
☐ More closeness/intimacy   ☐ More Respect   ☐ Other
  Your comment………………………………………………………………

11. **What do you want to express when you use names with students while speaking in English?**

☐ Formality   ☐ Informality   ☐ Distance
☐ Closeness/intimacy   ☐ Respect   ☐ Other
     Your comment……………………………………………………………….

12. **What do you want to express when you use native kinship terms with students while speaking in English?**

☐ More formality ☐ More informality   ☐ More distance
☐ More closeness/intimacy   ☐ More Respect   ☐ Other
  Your comment………………………………………………………………

13. Do you use caste terms of address (e.g. Talpur, Bhutto, Shaikh, Memon, etc.) for addressing your students? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If your answer is yes, what do you want to express by using caste terms of address?
☐ Formality ☐ Informality ☐ Distance
☐ Closeness/intimacy ☐ Respect ☐ Other
Your comment……………………………………………………………….
Thank you for your valuable time and participation

Appendix 5:

Classroom Observation

Category	Student-Student				Student-Teacher						Techer-Student			
	ENG		Native		ENG		Native		Hybrid address forms		ENG		Native	
	*Frq	%	Frq	%	Frq	%	Frq	%	Frq	%	Frq	%	Frq	%
First names	—	—	(15)	21.5	—	—	—	—	(11)	5.6	—	—	(24)	54.5
Kinship terms	(6)	8.5	(11)	15.7	—	—	—	—			—	—	(13)	29.6
Endearment terms	(6)	8.5	(14)	20.0	—	—	—	—			—	—	—	—
Honorifics	(8)	11.5	—	—	(31)	45.6	(19)	27.9			—	—	—	—
Titles	(3)	4.3	—	—	—	—	—	—			—	—	—	—
Occupational terms	—	—	—	—	(10)	14.8	—	—			—	—	—	—
Caste address terms	—	—	(7)	10.0	—	—	(8)	17.7			—	—	(7)	15.9
sub-total	**(70) 36.4**				**(68) 35.3**				**(11) 5.6**		**(44) 22.7**			
Total	**(193) 100%**													

*Frequency

Appendix 6:

Open-ended interviews of Students and Teachers
Students Open-ended Interviews

Questions	Options	Responses	
		Frequency	%
1. What do you want to express by using first name (e.g. *Rafique or Zeenat*) when you address your classmate? You can choose more than one option.	Formality		
	Informality		
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy	60	41.3
	Respect	85	58.6

160

	Other		
2. What do you want to express by using *Mr/Miss or Madam/Ma'am* when you address your classmate?	Formality	23	15.8
	Informality		
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy		
	Respect	120	82.7
	Other		
3. What do you want to express by using English kinship terms (*e.g. bro/brother or sis/sister*) when you address your classmate? You can choose more than one option.	Formality		
	Informality		
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy	103	71.0
	Respect	42	28.9
	Other		
4. What do you want to express by using local kinship terms when you address your classmate? You can choose more than one option.	Formality		
	Informality		
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy	47	32.4
	Respect	98	67.5
	Other		
5. What do you want to express when you prefer to use *ada / bhai or adi / aapi* instead of *bro/brother* or *sis/sister* while speaking in English? You can choose more than one option.	More formality		
	More informality		
	More distance		
	More closeness/intimacy	44	30.3
	More respect	101	69.6
	Other		
6. What do you want to express by using local native endearment terms (such as *yaar/yar or mitha / dilbar / pyara / pyari*) while speaking in English? You can choose more than one option.	Formality		
	Informality		
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy	103	71.0
	Respect	42	28.9
	Other		
7. Do you use caste terms of address (e.g. *Talpur, Bhutto, Shaikh, Memon*) addressing university students? If your answer is yes, what do you want to express by using caste terms of address?			
	Formality		
	Informality	33	22.7
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy	68	46.8
	Respect	44	30.3
8. What do you want to express by using local terms *sain, sahib/sahiba or madam sahiba* in addressing your teacher while talking in English? You can choose more than one option.	Other		
	Formality		
	Informality		
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy	43	29.6
	Respect	102	70.3
9. What do you want to express when	Other		

you use *sain, sahib/sahiba or madam/ma'am sahiba* instead *sir / madam* while speaking in English?	More formality		
	More informality		
	More distance		
	More closeness/intimacy	43	29.6
	More respect	102	70.3

Teachers Open-ended Interviews

Questions	Options	Responses	
		Frequency	**%**
1. What do you want to express by using first name (e.g. *Rafique or Zeenat*) when you address your colleague? You can choose more than one option.	Formality		
	Informality		
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy	36	72.0
	Respect	14	28.0
	Other		
2. What do you want to express by using *Mr/Miss* or *Madam/Ma'am* when you address your colleague?	Formality	18	36.0
	Informality		
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy		
	Respect	32	64.0
	Other		
3. What do you want to express by using English kinship terms (e.g. *bro/brother, sis/sister*) when you address your colleague?	Formality		
	Informality		
	Distance	11	22.0
	Closeness/intimacy	39	78.0
	Respect		
	Other		
4. What do you want to express by using local kinship terms when you address your colleague? You can choose more than one option.	Formality		
	Informality		
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy	39	78.0
	Respect	11	22.0
	Other		
5. What do you want to express when you prefer to use *ada / bhai or adi / aapi* instead of *brother/bro* or *sister/sis* while speaking in English? You can choose more than one option.	More formality		
	More informality		
	More distance		
	More closeness/intimacy	27	54.0
	More respect	23	46.0
	Other		
6. What do you want to express by using local native endearment terms (such as *yaar/yar* or *mitha / dilbar / pyara / pyari)* while speaking in English? You can choose more than one	Formality		
	Informality		
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy	45	90.0
	Respect	5	10.0

option.	Other		
7. Do you use caste terms of address (e.g. *Talpur, Bhutto, Shaikh, Memon*) addressing university colleagues? If your answer is *yes*, what do you want to express by using caste terms of address?	Formality		
	Informality	13	26.0
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy	17	34.0
	Respect	20	40.0
	Other		
8. What do you want to express by using local terms *sain, sahib/sahiba or madam/ma'am sahiba* in addressing your colleague while talking in English? You can choose more than one option	Formality		
	Informality		
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy	5	10.0
	Respect	45	90.0
	Other		
9. What do you want to express when you use *sain, sahib/sahiba or madam/ma'am sahiba* instead *sir / madam/ma'am* while speaking in English?	More formality		
	More informality		
	More distance		
	More closeness/intimacy	12	24.0
	More respect	38	76.0
	Other		
10. What do you want to express when you use first names with students while speaking in English?	Formality		
	Informality		
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy	36	72.0
	Respect	14	28.0
	Other		
11. What do you want to express when you use native kinship terms with students while speaking in English?	More formality		
	More informality		
	More distance		
	More closeness/intimacy	39	78.0
	More respect	11	22.0
	Other		
12. Do you use caste terms of address (e.g. *Talpur, Bhutto, Shaikh, Memon*) for addressing your students? If your answer is *yes*, what do you want to express by using caste terms of address?	Formality		
	Informality		
	Distance		
	Closeness/intimacy	30	60.0
	Respect	20	40.0
	Other		