

LIN-3990 - Master's Thesis in linguistics

Address forms in Persian based on Iranian movies

Tina Derakhshan Rokni

*Master's Degree Programme in Theoretical Linguistics
Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education
University of Tromsø
November 2012*

Table of Content:

CHAPTER TITLE	PAGE
CHAPTER ONE: AIM AND PURPOSES	
1.1.Aim and purpose	2
1.2.Definitions of Research Terms	4
1.3.Limitations of the Study	4
The structure of the study	5
CHAPTER TWO: BACKGROUND	
Introduction	7
Background to Sociolinguistics	7
2.1. Language and social context	7
2.2. Language and Politeness	11
2.3.Aspects of address theory	13
2.4.Some research on address terms	17
2.5.Language and politeness in Iranian setting	18
2.6.Terms of addressee in Persian	20
Chapter Summary	28
CHAPTER THREE: DATA and METHODOLOGY	
Introduction	30
3.1.Population and Sample	30
3.2. Research Variables	30
3.3.Data collection	31
3.4.Data Analysis	32
CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS	
Introduction	36
4.1. THE TENANTS	36
4.1.1. Plot	36
4.1.2. Characters and their social class	37
4.1.3. Linguistic analysis	39

4.1.4. The Tenants' Addressing	51
4.2. MOM'S GUEST	53
4.2.1. The Plot	53
4.2.2. Characters and their social classes	54
4.2.3. Linguistic analysis	55
4.2.4. Mom's Guest Addressing	65
4.3. A SEPARATION	66
4.3.1. The plot	66
4.3.2. Characters and their Social class	67
4.3.3. Linguistic analysis	68
4.3.4. Addressing of "A Separation"	77
Chapter summary	78
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS	
Summary of findings	82
Recommendations	84
REFERENCES	86

TABLES:	PAGE
Table 3.1: Sample table for categorize data in chapter 4	33
Table 4.1: Neighbors'Conversation (young and old woman)	39
Table 4.2: Neighbors'Conversation (young man and old woman)	40
Table 4.3 : Neighbors'Conversation (Honorific title + KT term)	40
Table 4.4 : Neighbors'Conversation (woman and man)	41
Table 4.5: Neighbors'Conversation (two men)	42
Table 4.6: Neighbors'Conversation (two men)	43
Table 4.7: Neighbors' Conversation (two men)	44
Table 4.8: Husband and Wifes' Conversation	45
Table 4.9: Grandmother and Grandsons' Conversation	46
Table 4.10: Conversation between mother and son	46
Table 4.11: Brothers' Conversation	47
Table 4.12: Uncle and Nieces' Conversation	48
Table 4.13: friends' Addressing	48
Table 4.14: Worker and his Boss' Conversation	49
Table 4.15: Worker and his Boss' Conversation	50
Table 4.16: Sstrangers' Conversation (man and woman)	51
Table 4.17: Sstrangers' Conversation (man and woman)	51
Table 4.18: Children and their parents' Conversation	55
Table 4.19 :Spouse' Conversation	56
Table 4.20: Young Spouse'Conversation	57
Table4.21: Spouse' Conversation (upper middle class couple)	57
Table 4.22: Father and Sons' Conversation (upper middle class)	58
Table 4.23: Aunt and her Daughter in laws' Conversation	59
Table 4.24: cousins	59
Table4. 25: Aunt and Nieces' Conversation	60
Table 4.26: Close Neighbors' Conversation (young and old woman)	61
Table4. 27: Close Neighbors' Conversation (two young men)	62
Table 4.28 :Close Neighbors' Conversation (opposite gender)	63
Table 4.29: Non-close Neighbors (two women)	64
Table 4.30: Non-close Neighbors (one woman and one man)	64

Table 4.31: Spouses' Conversation	68
Table4.32: Mother in law and Son in laws' Conversation	69
Table4.33: Father and Daughters' Conversation	70
Table4.34: Mother and Daughters' Conversation	70
Table4.35: Teacher and Parents' Conversation	71
Table4.36: Teacher and Pupil's conversation	71
Table 4.37: Teachers' Conversation	72
Table 4.38: Judge and his Visitors' Conversation	72
Table4.39: Police officer and Naders' Conversation	73
Table4.40: Police officer and Razihs' Conversation	74
Table4.41: Soldier police and Razihs' Conversation	74
Table4.42: Caretaker and her female Employer	75
Table4.43: Caretaker and her male Employer	76
Table 4.44.Neighbors	77

Abstract:

The present thesis: “Address forms in Persian focused on Iranian movies”, investigates address forms as socio-linguistic forms which are directly related to social factors such as age, gender and social class.

In the Persian language there is a strong tradition of addressing each other in various ways, changing from one context to another. Addressing is a universal phenomenon, but the rules that govern the choice are different from one language to another. So, the hierarchical structure of a country’s society, the nature of peoples’ relationship, social class, the degree of intimacy and peoples’ attitudes effect on language specially in addressing form.

In Iran, addressing title of a working class could be differ from a middle class addressing: a woman in working class, address her husband Mr. before his first name, but generally in middle class, she calls her husband only with his name. Education is a subcategory of social class is another factor which affects address terms. When an educated person addresses somebody, he or she tries to be more polite than ordinary people even in anger which is a fact for changing address term and turn it to discourteous addressing.

Another factor which is important in addressing is age. As Iranian culture respects elder people, addressing form which is used towards them is more polite than compare to younger addressee.

The context of situation and the level of intimacy are two other important factors which have an effect on addressing terms. When members of family address each other only by name, strangers address each other by honorific titles like Mr., Mrs or their family name. Strangers also use plural form of pronoun to address each other.

Key Words: Address Terms, Social Class, Gender, Age, Politeness, Intimacy, Context of Situation.

CHAPTER 1
AIM AND PURPOSES

1.1. Aim and purpose

The current study tries to analyze terms of address from a sociolinguistic point of view, the data being the terms of address in three Iranian movies.

Sociolinguistics, by analyzing language structures in relation to their situational context, tries to demonstrate the relation between language and society (Modaresi: 2012). Since as Wodak (2001:2) mentioned ‘address terms are specific instances of language use’; therefore, this study tries to show the influence of social factors on terms of address. Forms of address are those linguistic elements, words and phrases used for addressing, which refer to the collocutor and thus contain a strong element of deixis. In most languages forms of address concentrate on three word classes including (1) pronoun (2) verb and (3) noun, which are supplemented by words that are syntactically dependent on them (Braun 1988:7).

Terms of address are mainly known as a good example of reflection of social construction on language forms. Since information about the social class, gender and age of collocutors as well as their level of intimacy and formality of context can be coded in terms of address, the influence of social / non-linguistics factors on the choice of address forms should be taken into consideration.

Terms of address can be a challenging category to describe and analyze since there are several non-linguistic factors which interact with each other for choosing the proper form. It seems that in the domain of address terms it is quite complicated and it is difficult to make a generalization which works for every situation. To make it clearer, it might be said that first of all, address terms are context-dependent items, which means that the context itself has a great influence in the choice of proper terms of address. Next, the series of social factors such as gender, age and social class and interaction of them also cooperate to determine the suitable choice.

It should be mentioned that sometimes social factors interact with each other while other times there is one factor which wins over others in certain contexts. It seems that native speakers of the language make correct and right choices based on their social intuition and social competence. The terms of address are not stable and fixed categories and they are influenced by undergoing changes in society.

The purpose of this research has been intended to:

Determine the relationship between usage of address pronouns and social variables (age, gender and social class).

It would have been interesting to study the changes of address patterns in a changing society, but the data provided by these three movies are too limited for a language change study.

1.2. Definitions of Research Terms

There are three main terms which are important in social issues and also, in linguistic studies. These terms are: “gender”, “age” and “social class”:

Gender: The term gender means the cultural differences of women and men, based on the biological division between males and females (Connell, 2009). In this study gender is defined as male and female.

Age: According to Braun (1987) age is the decisive factor governing address behavior. In present study various age groups were assessed including young, middle age and aged.

Social class: Social class was defined based on privileges and position of each members of a society such as profession, wealth, education and social position. In the present study social class was defined based on education, profession and wealth. Then based on those factors interlocutors’ mainly classified into three categories low, middle and high classes (Keshvarz, 2001).

It should be noted that since the data of the present study consist of movies, these definitions depend on an assessment of the characters' age and status, etc.

1.3. Limitations of the Study

Similar to other research, several limitations need to be considered in this study. The first limitation in this study refers to the scarcity of relevant literature. Although plenty of research has been conducted in the field of sociolinguistics, only a limited number of studies have considered the issues of change in address term behavior, particularly in Iranian context. The second limitation of present study deals with the subjects of the study, which covered those movies produced after the Islamic revolution. Although the researcher wished to conclude movies produced before Islamic revolution, but this proved difficult. First the limitation to access to the original sample of selected movies and secondly most of the movies which were in access have a kind of dramatic language rather a norm language.

The next limitation was relevant to generalizability of the findings. Since the analysis was based on a limited number of movies it was not possible to make a generalization on Persian address behavior and so the findings and conclusions were limited to the selected data. Another limitation concern about the lack of native speakers to assist in data analysis, since the analysis of the data was conducted in Norway, therefore not many native speakers

with sociolinguistics skills were around. Finally, as these data are limited to three movies which cannot be generalized to all Iranian address behavior.

The structure of the study

The organization of present research is given in order to help the readers understand the content of the study as follow:

Chapter I: Introduction, it consists of introduction to the study, statement of problem, research questions, research objectives, conceptual and operational definition of research terms and limitations of the study.

Chapter II: Literature review, it consists of a review to the language in social context, aspects of politeness, and a review to social class, power, Linguistic politeness markers, Address pronoun and previous studies in Iranian context.

Chapter III: Research Method, it consists of subject of research, research variables, method of data collection, and technique of data analysis.

Chapter IV: Research Result and Discussion, it consists of data analysis and the discussion of the findings.

Chapter V: Conclusion and Recommendation.

CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND

Introduction

This chapter discusses past studies and literature related to the address forms and related topics. The chapter provides a background to sociolinguistics, language in social context, aspects of politeness, linguistic politeness markers and finally a review of Iranian studies.

It should be considered as terms of address are the overlap domain of both linguistics and non-linguistics in the following section some prominent concept in both areas will be given.

Background to Sociolinguistics

Language is a social phenomenon. According to Trudgill (1974), verbal communication is not only limited to the exchange of information, but involves as one of its major functions, the shaping of interpersonal relationships. Therefore, in sociolinguistics the strong relation between language and society is taken into consideration. By taking a sociolinguistic approach, one can show how an appropriate linguistics form is selected by a speaker according to a certain context of situation and social factors.

Therefore, it has to be said that language cannot be studied in isolation. In other words, there is a mutual relation between language structures and the rules which govern the structure of the society, they constantly influence each other.

The above-mentioned relations are encoded in terms of address, since they convey a lot of information concerning nonlinguistic factors such as age, gender and social class of Interlocutors. "Cultural norms and values can be reflected in an address system". Braun (1988: 12). Thus, by analyzing address terms one can investigate the socio-cultural norms including the attitude of participants toward each other. It should be also noted that, since the social norms differ from one society to another, their function is relatively different as well.

2.1. Language and social context

According to Goodenough (1964), culture is a set of behaviors which every members of society should follow in order to be accepted by other members. In other words, the set of norms and rules which are acquired by society members plays an important role to make a successful and acceptable interaction for interlocutors. Language is known as a crucial tool of

most interaction and communication; therefore, one cannot investigate and analyze it apart from its situational context.

As Gumperz (1982) mentioned, in addition to grammatically well-formed structure, an appropriate way of talking plays an important role for each utterance to be accepted. Consequently, in any sociolinguistic investigation mutual relations between language and social context should be taken into consideration.

Since language allows a variety of alternatives, the choice of an appropriate form is influenced by various social factors. In other words, social structures have a strong influence on the linguistic forms and the variety in a language is a reflection of heterogeneous society. It could be noted that, in most situations proper forms are those which do not violate society norms. Thus, by investigating the linguistic forms such as terms of address the social constituent can be described as well.

Sociolinguistics emphasizes also the influence of formality and informality of the context in language choices. In other words, the rules which exist in formal contexts, differ from those of an informal contexts which result in variety of style in the languages (Modarresi: 2009) .

Language and Social Class

It is believed language variation exists in each society. Social relation and the structure of the society have an enormous influence on the language use. Therefore, Social factors have a great influence to make language varieties. It can be noted that the more complicated social constituents and heterogeneous groups the society has, the more language variety exists. Social class, gender, age, ethnic, religious and education are well known social factors which can make variety in a society.

Among aforementioned social factors, social class usually considered as “the most complicated factor” Wardhaugh (2002: 145). This is one of the sociolinguistic terms which have a controversial definition among the sociolinguistics, since it is difficult to draw a clear border around social variable. Some of scholars define it, based on privileges and position of each members of a society such as profession, wealth, education and social position. Others mention that every member of a society has a general image of his/her own position and social role in the society which determines his/her own social class.

In this study “a group of people which has a common and similar socio-cultural or economical background and features is classified as a same social class” (Trudgill, 1974:35). As the most important parts of a society are work and money, people who have similar jobs (like tradesman, craftsman, administrative Officers) without mention how they exactly doing,

are classified in one group. Also people who have the same amount of money are categorized in common group.

Wardhaugh also believes that "Sociolinguistics use a number of different scales for classifying people when they attempt to place individuals somewhere within a social system" (2002:145). An occupational scale and an educational scale are two main scales which each of them has different categories inside. Moreover, as Wardhaugh mentioned, the level of income and the place of residence needed to take into consideration for classifying social-class membership.

It should be mentioned that the correlation of language usage and social factors is relative. One parameter can coincide with certain linguistic form in one society is contrast; it can be irrelevant to that form in another society. Since the social constituent and social rules are varied from one culture to another one, in any society, it should be mentioned to specific scales which are related to that society. For example, usage of language in Democratic societies differs from who are Totalitarian and want more respect than Democratic societies. This respect is related to the age, social class, wealth... from lower to upper class. And they are constantly undergoing of gradual changes.

According to Labov (1972), there is a relationship between language behavior and social class. By quantitative measurement of a certain linguistic variable among different groups, Labov argued that every social group has their own social and linguistics behavior. In other words, every social group has a relatively distinctive linguistic behavior from other groups. For instance, the upper class tend to use the linguistic patterns and forms which are more close to standard language whereas the usage of those forms which are closer to non-standard language is more frequent among working class. In addition, the usage and frequency of some linguistics forms could be a characteristic of special social class. In other words, a group of people can be categorized on the basis of their language similarity and via those similarities one can find out what social feature they have shared.

Based on this research, Labov (1972) mentioned that the upper middle class are more concern with their language behaviors therefore the tendency to use the high standard language and norms is more frequent among them compare with working class. Since the language of upper middle class usually is considered as a standard form and carries prestige, then sometimes working class of the result in imitating the language of upper middle class by working classes. In addition, since the latter groups are less conscious/aware of the correct usage of standard language therefore sometimes they use certain linguistics forms even more than the first group which is called hyper correction.

In sum, it should be repeated that there is considerable correlation between linguistic variable and social classes. Therefore, some of the language variations could be explained by social class variable.

Language and Power

Critical discourse regarded language not only as a means of communication but also as an instrument of control. (Hodge and Kress, 1996: 6). Therefore the interlocutor who can control the interaction is normally the more powerful member of the interaction.

Here power should be redefined: power is a result of hierarchical relationship which superior partly imposes his/her own power to subordinator one (Chen and Ibrahim, 2006). Power also defined as the “freedom of action to achieve one’s goals, regardless of whether or not this involves the potential to impose one’s will on others to carry out actions that are in one’s interest” (Watts, 2003: 276). For Brown and Levinson (1987) power is a vertical relation between speaker and addressee which is along with social distance and impose. Power also, is used either through various kinds of enforcement/pressure inclusive of physical violence, or through the manufacture of consent (Fairclough, 1989).

In the modern world, we do not execute power through physical coercion; we use language to succeed in achieving our means. Power makes asymmetrical relation since two persons cannot impose their power over each other at the same time in one setting. Power shows asymmetrical and unequal relation in the society then this social inequality is reflected in the language use. Power inherently makes an unequal relation while the relation in solidary state is equal between participants. There is a strong relation between power and the choice of appropriate address terms. In other words, Power is one of the factors which could make different language options.

It is often assumed that men are more dominant in the speech than women. In a Different theory, Tannen (1993) states that power and solidarity are two parameters in society and in any interaction men are more concerned with achieving power in their interaction while women tend to maintain solidarity.

Sociolinguists believe that usually we are more polite to those who are related or belonged to status of power in the society. Thus, it should be said that power has strong relation with the notion of politeness.

As Braun (1988) expressed, Brown and Gilman believed that it is power and solidarity parameters that control the choice of pronoun. Their argument is based on studying different languages and the notion of face. The aim of their study was to show the relation of social constituent with the choice of address pronoun. Brown and Gilman introduced the symbols T

and V from Latin “tu” and “vos” for the “familiar” second person and the “polite” pronoun. When one participant has power and in a superior status he/she will be addressed by V form and will address the subordinate participant with T form. While in equal situation both participants address each other with T form. Moreover, the upper class people address each other with V form. According to their study in asymmetrical relation it is a superior member who can control and determine whether the relation should move from distance to intimacy.

2.2. Language and Politeness

Politeness is defined ‘as a communicative strategy used in all cultures in daily conversation’ (Asdjodi, 2001:71). When a person considers the feeling of others it can be considered as politeness. Politeness is the expression of the speakers’ intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face threatening acts toward another (Mills, 2003: 6)

Politeness includes both verbal and nonverbal behavior. The way that people talk and behave with each other shows their evaluation of themselves and also of the other interlocutors in the interaction. In a verbal interaction it can be said that people should choose proper linguistic forms according to the context of the situation and the status of other participants, in order to keep politeness in the language. In other words the language is considered as one of the means of expressing politeness.

Politeness Theory

Based on linguistics approach, a polite behavior is referred to a proper manner of talking to people with considering their relation to the speaker and sometimes, considering the condition, meanwhile impolite linguistic choices may be considered as rude and inappropriate behavior (watts, 2003).

There are two important theories of the politeness as Goffman (1995) and Grice’s maxims were mentioned; one believes politeness is different in various cultures, and the other one defines that politeness as a universal phenomenon. Referring to the first viewpoint, ‘the rule for polite behavior differs from one speech community to another, therefore linguistic politeness is culturally determined’ (Holmes, 1992: 285), but the second idea believes that politeness belong to the whole world.

By combination of these two ideas it can be said, the politeness phenomenon is universal; the way it is experienced differs culturally. Each language contains some politeness markers, but the politeness markers and the usage of them are relatively different from one language to another language.

One important politeness marker is the category of address terms. In address terms aspects of politeness are more high light. Although languages are different in their selection and use of address terms, it seems that in most languages “age”, “gender”, “social status” and “level of formality” are major determining factors in this respect. “In Persian language like some other languages “formality of the context”, “power”, “social distance”, “sincerity/solidarity” factors, determine the usage of politeness marker in the language” (Modarresi, 2009 :323).

Another notion in politeness theory is the debate among sociolinguistics’ regarding whether utterances are inherently polite or is it the people or the situation that make them as polite expressions? Although, there are some expressions that are more polite than others, it could be said that it is the situation that even could make neutral expressions as a polite one. In other words, linguistic forms themselves do not convey the politeness interpretation but it is the context and the participants of the speech that make a politeness interpretation of expressions. Therefore, it can be said that politeness is relative; certain expressions could be interpreted as polite expression in one situation and have an opposite function in another situation. For example, if the speaker in a formal situation uses the linguistic form which should be used in informal context, this misusing can result in an impolite behavior.

So, any interaction politeness is unmarked behavior while over politeness and impoliteness are considered as marked behavior. In fact, people by being polite are following the norms of their own society. It can be said that politeness has strong relation with the inequality and variety in the society which those affected language choices. The more the society is heterogeneous the more variety of language is found. Therefore, participants in order to be polite should choose linguistic forms properly and correctly according to social status of the participants. It can be noted that politeness behavior is more obvious in the situation where there is an inequality in relation.

As Modarresi (2009) mentioned people are more polite towards those who have higher status in the society. It is worth to mention that societies are different in the degree of influences of social status on the language choices.

It should be considered that various languages use different degree of politeness; this fact can be confirmed that each language is the reflection of its society; generally politeness and power is considered in a deep relationship. The languages of societies which governments are more powerful than others, are more politeness than other. For example, in those cultures and societies that the hierarchical system exists, language is one of the way to present this asymmetrically and unequally of the society (Bateni, 1975).

As mentioned in the previous section, politeness theory of Brown and Levinson is one of the most important in the area of politeness with regards to the notion of face and based on analysis of several languages they argue that politeness is a universal phenomenon.

Face

Face is an image which a person assumes for himself and expects the society recognize for him as well. Face is a social evaluation of a person and related to the notion of prestige and respect to other. In any interaction, participants usually try to maintain their own and the face of other participants. This is considered as a polite behavior since politeness is a showing respect to the other person social face (Wardhaugh, 2002).

Goffman (1955) was the first person who mentioned the notion of face in his work. He also stressed that the two face orientation, the defensive orientation towards saving his/her own face, and the protective orientation towards the saving the others' will co-exist in practice, even though at any one time one of them may predominate.

Face is a crucial concept in politeness theory of Brown and Levinson. For them face is "The public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself" (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 61). They introduced "positive face" which needs of each member of a society to be accepted and to receive attention from the other members and "negative face" which is a tendency that each person wants to be independent in her/his action and not be imposed on.

In any communication participants try to protect their own face and at the same time to avoid behaving in a way which might endanger other participants' face. For instance, starting questions with apologies terms is one of the ways to respect other person's negative face. Since it gives a choice to the addressee to either refuse or accept the request. On the other hand, greeting and giving complement is mostly considered as maintaining and preserving someone's positive face (ibid).

Another concept which related to face was the notion of face treating act and face saving act. In face treating act which is related to negative face speaker tend to show respect to the addressee's interest on the other hand, face saving act is related to positive face which speaker try to show sympathy and accomplish with the addressee and try to focus on their mutual and common interest (Yule,1996).

2.3. Aspects of address theory

In the following section a short description of address terms will be given. Then different forms of address will be described briefly.

Basic concept and terminology

Terms of address are words or phrases used to address or refer to someone or something: “linguistic forms that are used in addressing others to attract their attention or to referring to them in the course of conversation” (Keshavarz, 2001: 6). In sociolinguistic, the category of address terms is the best to see and examine the social relation and structure of the society reflected on the language (Trudgil,1974)

Languages are different in the usage, function and behavior of their terms of addressee and pronouns. The existence of several variants of address terms in a language allows a detailed encoding of differences in age, gender, social status. Although languages are varied in their selection and usage of terms of addressee, “age”, “social classes”, “gender” and “level of intimacy” are major determining factors in most languages. In this section, the choice of address terms will be surveyed according to participants “social”, “economic”, “education”, “religion background” as well as “gender” and “age”.

Among the linguistics forms, terms of address are good example of social variation. Since the relation of people is constructed in the society, the social attitude and ideology and the cultural norms can be described through analyzing terms of address. For example, the choice of certain terms of addressee could show the attitude of speaker toward the addressee as well the setting which the utterance is taken place. Therefore in analyzing the above mentioned linguistic forms the context and the participants should be taken into account. Because the choice of terms of address is based on some non-linguistics factors such as age, gender, social status, education, wealth as well as the level of intimacy. In addition, in any interaction if those factors won't be equal the result leads to inequality in relation. In the other words, the relation is based on the power dimension; the asymmetrical usage of those patterns shows an equality of relationship between participants.

It should be mentioned again that there are some social factors govern and influence for the proper choice of address terms. Thus, they are different ways to address another participant such as “by title (T), by first name (FN), by last name (LN), by a nick name, by some combination of these or by nothing at all.

According to Braun's (1988) classification terms of address can be driven into three main categories three word classes as follow: “pronoun”, “verb” and “noun, which briefly describes as follow:

I. Pronouns of address

Pronouns of address are pronouns referring to the interlocutor(s). Second person pronouns are the most important example of this category such as English *you* and French *tu* and *vous* (ibid).

II. Verb forms of address

Verb forms of address are verbs in which reference to the collocutor is expressed, e.g., by means of inflectional suffixes (ibid: 8) In some languages the use of subject is not obligatory therefore it is the inflectional suffix that carries the collocutor reference. Moreover, in the case of imperative the pronoun can be dropped.

III. Nouns forms of address

“Nouns of address are substantives and adjectives which designated collocutors or refer to them in some way” (ibid:9). The noun of address is the most varied type of address forms. Largely based on Braun (1988: 6-10) some of the nouns of address which were observed in the selected data will be as described as below:

- 1) Names belong to the nominal repertory of address in all kinds of languages. Some cultures the usage of them for addressing could be tabooed or restricted.
- 2) Kinship terms (KT) are terms for blood relations and for affine. When a KT is used for addressing someone who is not related to the speaker in one way or other, this is called a fictive usage of a KT.
- 3) Honorific title in many language there are form of address which correspond to English Mr. /Mrs. These general forms which need not to be regarded as particular titles and in common use.
- 4) Abstract nouns which are forms of address which originally referred to some abstract quality of the address, e.g., (Your) Excellency, (Your) Grace, (Your) Honor.
- 5) Occupational terms are those terms which designating an addressee’s profession or function serves as forms of address. They are sometimes combined with other nominal variants.
- 6) Religious terms of address are an area which an ideological attitude of participant can be best highlighted in them. Such as *Hain* Islamic cultures.
- 7) Terms of endearment are defined by context and function rather than formal and semantic characteristics. In addressing small children or persons to whom the speaker feels close, almost any noun- whether previously existing or invented for this purpose- can serve as a form of address.

It should be noted that terms of endearment are context-dependent and to some extent are conventionalized, but linguistic creativity and individual imagination play an important part here.”

Address inversion

Address inversion is a special pattern of nominal address. Mostly it is a use of a KT, which expresses the speaker's role instead of addressee, e.g., a mother addressing a child as mama. This phenomenon may occur with fictive kinship (ibid: 12).

The system of address

The system of address comprises the totality of available forms and their interrelation in one language. But the repertory of address and the variants differ from one language to another. “In some language there is only one pronoun of address for an individual addressee (English), in others two (German), three (Romanian), or many (Sinhalese) (ibid: 13).

The existence of several variants makes nonreciprocal usage easier and more frequent and allows a more detailed encoding of differences in age, sex, social, or occupational status. Moreover cultural norms and values can be reflected in an address system. If kinship terms of address express, e.g., juniority and seniority even within one generation, conclusions may be drawn concerning the importance of age in the respective culture. The same applies to the marking of status or sex in forms of address. If a number of nominal variants in an address system refer to religious contexts this means the status of religion in the community (ibid: 13).

Address behavior

“Address behavior is the way individual speakers or groups of speakers use the repertory of address available to them” (ibid: 13). This is meaningful when there are several grammatically correct choices available for the speaker then extra-linguistic factors determine the choice of proper forms. Then a speaker's social and linguistic background also made another influence on the address behavior as well.

Reciprocity and Symmetry

Braun mentioned from Brown and Gilman (1960) in study of address forms “reciprocity use of address must be distinguished from nonreciprocal use and symmetrical relationship of address from asymmetrical ones” (ibid: 13). When participants address each other with the same forms of address it is reciprocity while when different forms of address are exchanged by participants it is asymmetrical usage of address forms.

2.4. Some research on address terms

Brown and Gilman (1960) studied forms of address is one of the initial study in this field. The T/V symbol was first introduced by them which T form stand for Latin *tu* “familiar” second person and V form for *vos* for the “polite” pronoun. The study is focusing and describing on pronouns of address in a number of European languages. It should be noted that.

They tried to demonstrate the relation between social structure such as solidarity and power and the usage of address pronoun. They believed that power and solidarity are two important factors which govern the selection of appropriate pronoun. If the relation is based on the power, the asymmetrical usage of T/V forms is observed. As they mentioned in the middle ages power dimension had a control over solidarity which resulted in an asymmetrical usage of V/T form, which means the superior used the T form towards the addressee in turn, was received the V form. In such an unequal relation it was the more powerful interlocutor who can decide and initiate for the mutual usage.

When the solidarity control the relation there are two cases could happen; either the mutual T form are exchanged between interlocutors in the case when there is a high level of intimacy exist between speaker and addressee. The other one is the mutual usage of the V form which shows the politeness towards addressee and in the case of social distance. The latter usage mostly observed among upper middle class member of the society.

Fasold mentioned: (1990: 6) “By the mid-twentieth century, solidarity had almost won over power as the dominant governing semantic”. The mutual usage of V form, rooted in 4th century when Roman emperors address each other with V form, since they were as a representative of their own country.

Another work on the address terms was the study of Brown and Ford (1961) which was researched the address terms of English. Brown and Ford formulated the different pattern of address system in American English and they mentioned that the choice of this pattern is affected by social factors such as acquaintance, intimacy, age, superiority and occupational status.

Some investigation on address terms of English, approves also the influence of social factors on choice of address terms. Paulston (1976) by studying address pronoun and their usage in Swedish language shows the tendency of increasing the mutual usage of T form in Swedish after democratic changes in the regime. This could confirm the fact that how languages and linguistic variables are influenced by sociocultural structures and norms.

From Fowler (1991) point of view Brown and... theory is a symbol of hierarchal society which injustice distribution of power and wealth exist among various group of people. Therefore some people are dominated over others. As sociolinguistics mentioned people are normally more polite toward that are in a status of power. Therefore, asymmetrical usage of address form is one of the mechanisms for maintaining this phenomenon in the society. While, mutual usage of T form is a strategy to keep solidarity among inferiors.

2.5. Language and politeness in Iranian setting

Here, in the rest of this chapter, is focused on Iran's linguistic study. So, the following chapter is divided into three parts. In the first section in below, some special features of the Iranian politeness concept and social factors which affect the choice of address forms will be briefly explained. Then, in the next section will be concerned on the address terms in Persian. And in the last section and actually at the end of chapter, some data which conducted on Persian address forms will be given.

General notion of Iranian society

Modern Iran, as developing Asian country with old history and rich culture is an excellent field for sociolinguistics studies. The use of the language in sociocultural context is a good field in studying Persian language. As Beeman (1986) mentioned, language is used as a strategic tool in Iranian sociocultural interactions. With regards to the characteristic of Iranian society, in any sociolinguistic study of Persian language the following notions should be taken into consideration. Variation in the linguistics behavior of Persian speaker (like other languages) is not only related to the speaker special characteristics (such as age, gender, class, education, etc.) but also to the sociocultural contexts of the discourse. Some important factors such as the relationship between interlocutors and the formality of the context, are involved here. In Persian like most languages, politeness and power have strong and complicated relation with each other.

Context of situation, social distance and closeness with addressee, the degree of formality and informality and the level of intimacy are very effective social parameters of power and politeness in Iran. Those parameters have a strong and important influence on the choice of proper linguistic forms specially the choice of proper address terms. In Iranian culture inequality in economic status (occupation, wealth), social and political status, age and physical power are linked to the power (Modarresi, 2009).

Education and age mostly are regarded as spiritual power while wealth, occupation and physical power are considered as a material power. Although they can be considered as two types of power, still they make an inequality in verbal interaction. In Iranian culture a process of “other-raising” vs. “self-lowering” is important device to show respect and politeness to the addressee (Beeman, 1986:90). This is related to the concept of modesty which is an important aspect of Iranian culture. The language representation of this aspect can be explained as “when the speaker make himself lower and put the addressee higher, basically, one uses terms that serve to place oneself in an inferior status and the other person in a superior status” (ibid:93), which is the signal of unequal relation as well.

According to Beeman research, Persian encompasses many stylistic devices that assist people with expressing their own judgment on the nature of relationship. Such devices mainly help to highlight the type of relationship on the basis of status differentiation. The asymmetrical relation resulted in inequality usage of pronoun in Persian. So, Persian consist of three directions of pronoun and verb “which correspond to the basic orientations in social relation. There are some linguistic forms which are used in interaction with superior, some for inferior and there are series of substitutions for neutral forms when participants are in equal (ibid: 41).

Regarding to the importance of social factors on the choice of proper linguistic terms, specifically address terms shows, in Iranian society mostly the criteria for determining low or high social classes is the amount of education, occupation and place of residence. Those with a high level of education and an occupation with high salary and having a house in the center of city are considered high class and vice versa.

Ta’arof

Ta’arof is defined as kind welcoming, praising, and presenting (Dehkhoda, 1966). As Koutlaki (2001) mentioned Ta’arof is the main manifestations of Persian ritual politeness. Ta’arof generally means to pay respect to someone and is counted as social etiquette (Beeman, 1986). Ta’arof refers to the most common principle in interpersonal interaction in Iran which is to indicate lower status for oneself while elevating the status of the person being addressed. Ta’arof is a famous concept of Iranian culture and it is the language of politeness and praise in Persian.

As Ta’arof is unknown for non-Iranian culture, seems necessary to explain it more for non-Iranian readers. By Ta’arof, people want to show their self-deference and social rank. Ta’arof has linguistic and non-linguistic faces. In non-linguistic one, some Iranian’s behavior shows their politeness. For example, not sitting when somebody is behind the person and if

they have to be in this situation, should apologize or, when a host offers something to the guest, he/she is equally obliged to refuse it however he/she wants it. Linguistic Ta'arof happens when two person are talking and want to show their sincere to each other. For example, when a customer is paying money, the seller always says: It doesn't need to pay.

Ta'arof is studied by Beeman (1986) as a socio-linguistic phenomenon. He demonstrated that by the effect of social factors such as status, age, education, profession, and wealth social distance and closeness in Iranian society, Ta'arof applies in four forms as follow:

- “1. when the speaker is non-intimate and enjoys a higher status;
2. When the speaker is intimate and enjoys a higher status
3. When the speaker is non-intimate and has an equal status;
4. When the speaker is intimate and enjoys an equal status.” (Asjodi, 2001: 75)

2.6. Terms of addressee in Persian

The following section deals with the terms of address in Persian. For presenting it, forms of address will be given and briefly described based on their usage. Some important terms will also present as well.

General notion of Persian Address System

Although languages are different in their selection and use of address terms, it seems that in most languages age, social status and level of formality are major determining factors in this respect. As mentioned before, in Persian like some other languages, social factors such as power, social distance, sincerity and solidarity determine the usage of politeness marker in the language.

Persian has a complicated system of honorific titles and terms of address which apply in different context of situation. But in Iranian society by changing the social and interpersonal relationship pattern, it seems that those complicated forms are getting simpler; moreover, their frequency is getting reduced specially among youth and adult. The pattern is undergoing of changes because of democratization tendency (Modarresi 2009).

It should be noticed to the Iran's major social changes in recent decades such as Islamic revolution (1979), war (1980-1988), and a great immigration during the past 35 years in Iran have had major sociolinguistics consequences as well. Other factors which effected in Persian, are international relationship occurred by satellites and internet which deeply changed the manner of talking, especially in young people.

Some of Address terms in Persian are, pronouns of address, kinship terms, titles, names, occupational terms, endearment terms which was observed in the data will be briefly explained as below.

Persian pronouns of address

In Persian, as in many other languages (e.g. French, Italian, Spanish, German and Russian), speakers have to make a choice between two forms of “you”: the deferential “you”, and (II) the familiar “you”. In an asymmetrical relationship between participant the one participant with a superior social position received *shoma* ,the deferential “you”, in return, the inferior one was addressed with “to”, the familiar you. The mutual usage of *shoma* is the case when the participants do not have a close relationship with each and applies in the case of lack of intimacy. Whereas, in symmetrical and equal relationship and when there is a high level of intimacy between participants “to”, the familiar ‘you’, is used. The list of the pronouns is given in table 2.1:

Table 2.1: Pronoun of address in Persian

<i>Persian pronoun of address</i>	<i>English equivalent</i>
To	You singular
Shoma	You plural

In sum, we can say that the pronoun system in some context works as means of keeping social distance and social ranks between interlocutors, while in different context applies as a tool of solidarity between the members. Therefore pronoun has two different functions: one is that they are means of solidarity e.g., the familiar form: T form, another function is that they work as a device of superiority among the participants, e.g. polite form: V form.

In The table 2.2 at the right Column the equal and unequal usage of address pronoun is shown and in the right column the social function that they served is given. Possible mode that they serve regarding to various contexts.

Table 2.2: Exchanged pronouns and their function

Exchanged pronouns	Function
T/T	an equal relation, closeness, intimacy
T/V	an unequal relation, social distance, unfriendly, power
V/V	an equal relation, respect, politeness, intimacy

Persian verb form of address

In Persian, verb forms have an inflectional suffix which is changing according to subject and verb should be agreed in number and person. Verb agreement in Persian is a suffix which is added to the root of the verb. Since Persian is a language which unfocused on context the emphasis subject will be deleted from the sentences because it can be traced in the ending of the verb.

The grammatical function of this category is not the focus of this study, but the same function as address pronoun can be seen in singular and plural second person ending.

Table2.3: Second Person Verb in Persian

<i>Written and formal forms</i>	<i>Colloquial and informal forms</i>
To goft-i. You(singular) said- (verb agreement)	goft-i (You) said- (singular verb agreement)
Shoma goft-id You(plural)said- (verb agreement)	goft-in (You) said- (plural verb agreement)

The above example which is shown in table 2.3, is a demonstration of second person verb agreement in Persian. In the table, the verbs constitutes of a form of address. An undergoing change in Persian verb agreement pattern shows the tendency of combination of polite form pronoun *shoma* with singular verb agreement especially among young generation. This pattern shows the gradual decreasing of social distance and inequality in social interaction.

Persian nouns of address

In Persian, honorific Title and names, *xanom* means Mrs. and *aqa* means Mr. are two important honorific titles in Persian which are used for addressing or reoffering. They can be used in different contexts and serves different function and their meanings sometimes vary in different contexts. Sometimes in turn they are equivalent of English terms "lady" and "sir" that both may serve as a means of showing respect and politeness towards an addressee.

In addition, *xanom* and *aqa* are also titles of honor and were used to refer and address the nobles especially before revelation. Furthermore, these titles can be used to attract the attention of an addressee. Another usage is to address two strangers for example in a street may call each other *aqa* and *xanom* based on their gender.

The combination of honorific titles with other nouns of address is also common in Persian language. Based on social factors there are different possibilities of combination of address terms with FN and LN in Persian. For example, with regards to formality of the

context there are different address terms which used in each context. In very formal situations, intimate friends may call each other with TLN, in semi-formal settings they may address each other with T + FN, while in informal situations the mutual usage of FN or nickname is common (Keshavarz,2001). It should be noted that in Iranian culture the mutual usage of FN is the sign of high level of intimacy between interlocutors.

Some of the most important multiple usage of honorific title with FN and LT is given as follow:

- Aqa / xanom + Ø
- FN+ aqa / xanom
- Xanom / aqa + FN
- Aqa / xanom+LN
- Aqa / xanom+ professional title
- Aqa / xanom + professional title + LN

With regards to notion of power and solidarity the address pattern could be illustrated/ formulated as follow:

1. An equal and respectful relation, mutual usage of title and last name:

$$T + LN \leftrightarrow T + LN$$

2. An equal and sincere relation, mutual usage of first name:

$$FN \leftrightarrow FN$$

3. An unequal and power-based relation, asymmetrical usage of first name to address subordinator and title and last name to address superior:

$$T + LN \leftrightarrow FN$$

As Batnei (1975) mentioned, when the degree of social distance is increasing between interlocutors, especially in formal context they address each other with more polite forms of address and those form which shows more respects towards address. It should be noted that a multiple usage of address is common in Persian. The multiple address form is a combination of other variant of address with FN.

Persian occupational terms of address

Some occupations can be used also as terms of address in Persian. In Persian mostly those occupation are used as a terms of address which carry prestige and show the high status of the addressee. As mentioned before, education is one of the main factors which is linked to higher status in Iranian society, therefore normally those occupations which show a higher education is used for addressing. Some titles like *doctor* “doctor”, *særhæg* “colonel”,

mohændes “engineer”, *ostad* “professor” are some of the main occupations which are used for addressing regardless of age and gender of addressee. Sometimes, the above mentioned cases may be used to address any addressee who seems to have high education.

This can be explained as an overgeneralization of the term which is mostly common among lower class. It should be noted that occupational terms are not always used for addressing upper / middle class; there are some terms such as *usta /ussa* which is used to address the practitioners of many jobs, to a skillful and experienced male addressee. Although, normally a person whom is addressed with *usta* is not from upper/middle class, the term serves as a mode of respect and politeness towards the addressee.

An occupation title can be used alone or with a combination of honorific title as follows:

- Occupation title+ ø
- Honorific title + occupation title: *aqā-ye doktor / xānom mohændes* ‘Mr. doctor / Mrs. Engineer’

Persian religious terms of address

Persian language has a great system of religious terms of address which demonstrates the importance of religion among majority of the society.

It should be noted that the usage of religious terms is relatively based on gender, age and socio-cultural background of participants. For the usage of some religious terms even the regional and religious background of both participants is important.

One of the most important and common religious term of address in Persian is *haji* and its variants. “In Persian, *hāj-i*, a person who have undertaken the pilgrimage to Mecca, serves as a mode of address and common term to refer to an old Persian speakers. Among strangers, *hadji* can be employed as an address term for old people in general” (Braun, 1987: 39).

The combination of *haj* with fem/masc. honorific title is also common in Persian. The difference is that *haj-i* is more colloquial and shows a higher level of intimacy towards the addressee. Other common religious titles are *mola*, *sheix*, *kal*, *mæsh*, *seyed* and so on.

Persian kinship terms of address

As mentioned before, there is a mutual relation between society and language. An example is Iranian culture as a family-based society which has a rich system of kinship terms. For example in the past a person used to live with the whole family including grandparents and parents and own aunt and uncle and cousin therefore in Persian language there is a separate terms for addressing them.

Apart from the rich system of kinship term, there is a great variety to address a relative. For instance, there are many ways to address parents based on the socio-cultural background of family, age and gender of interlocutors and even formality of the context. For example there are varieties of forms for the core words of father and mother in Persian. *Baba* “papa” or dad and *maman* “mama” are mostly used by young generation to address their father and mother.

In some traditional families the phrase *aqā jun* which literally mean (dear sir) is used to address father in the family which conveys honor and respect to the head of the family. To address an old mother in traditional families *xān jun* is used *pedār* “father” and *madār* “mother” (are also common terms to refer or address parents in relatively formal context.

Two other important kinship terms are *doxtær* “daughter/girl” and *pesær* “son/boy” and the equivalent terms for brother and sister in Persian are *bæradær* and *xahær* in turn. In some traditional families *dadash* and *abji* are used to address the elder brother and sister (keshavarz, 2001).

Diminutive forms of first name or kinship terms in Persian are also used to signal the level of closeness, degree of intimacy and affection especially towards the young members of the family.

With regards to address inversion, The KTs *bæradær* (brother) and *xahær* (sister) in Persian have a symbolic meaning and are used widely among those who have Islamic beliefs. They are also used between nationalists and those with patriotic feelings (Braun,1987).

Persian terms of endearment

The most common Persian endearments terms are *æziz* and *jan/jun* which the English equivalent of them could be “dear”. Among above-mentioned forms *æziz* is safer and more neutral to use, while *jun* is mostly used to address younger participants and is more gender-based form. In other words, female will be more addressed and used the above mentioned word *jun* rather than male. It should be mentioned that in Persian the changes *an* syllable into *un* make colloquial forms .The pattern of usage of endearment terms in Persian is as follow:

- FN+ endearment terms : *Bæhare jun* (dear Bæhare).

Obviously, Persian language same as other languages has other words to express closeness and affection feeling by the languages. This function applies by using words which are belongs to other semantic field such as words with sweet flavor, animal or parts of the body such as *æsæl* which means “honey”, *juju* diminutive form of “chicken” and *jigar* which

originally means “liver” but in fact means “you are my liver”. Those terms are generally used by parents when calling their children or by lover.

Iranian Studies

As mentioned before, the choice of proper address term in Persian is based on two socio-psychological factors; “power” and “solidarity” (Bateni 1975). Therefore, the differences in age, education, wealth, gender, social class result in equality in relation and create power. While, these factors similarity could result in solidarity.

Beeman (1986) from an anthropological studied, shows the perceptive Iranian relation in culture and language. He also emphasized on the importance of power and solidarity in Iranian interaction. He mentioned that Ta’arof is one of the prominent features of Iranian culture. According to Beeman Ta’arof is a polite way of using language to achieve social and personal benefits and privileges. Self-lowering and other-rising are more noticeable strategy of Ta’arof. He believes that in Iranian culture Ta’arof is a result of existing of power in a relation. In Iranian interaction by self-lowering and other-rising a speaker could put addressee in higher and superior status in order to ask a request and willing to achieve it. He classified Iranian verb and pronoun into three levels which are neutral level, polite level and modest level.

Mosavi(2007) in her thesis, studied gender differences in Persian linguistic politeness (studied linguistic politeness with focus on gender differences). Her finding showed that the linguistic politeness features such as address pronoun and verb of address, are more frequently used by women compare to men. Moreover, she mentioned that in interaction between men and women, women tend to be more polite with men and also try to keep social distance with them. She argued that because of relatively unstable and uncertain position of women in society, therefore women are more sensitive to follow the standard norm of the culture and language.

Keshavarz (2001) in his article with focus on address pronouns colloquial Persian language tried to show the importance of social parameters on linguistic forms. According to Keshavarz, the following factors have a great influence for selecting an appropriate term:

1. The social factor of interlocutors such as age, gender, education, social status and occupation.
2. The relation between speaker and addressee such as family, college, friend relation or not timid and having social distance regarding to each other.
3. Formality and informality of context of situation.

Jahangiri (1999) conduct a research on Persian terms of address and verbs with focus on power and solidarity. In his study Jahangiri categorized those items into three different levels with three various social values; upper level shows superiority, neutral level indicates equality and lower level demonstrates either inferiority or modesty.

Koltaki (2002) on her study of Ta'arof tried to examine in which extent the Brown and Levenison's politeness theory are cope with Persian data. Then she mentioned that it is difficult to imagine linguistic politeness in Persian without using Ta'arof which is one of the crucial behavior in making successful interaction.

Another study which focus on gender differences and usage of power linguistic feature in interaction conducted by Mostafavi (2005). She concluded that the frequencies of usage of powerful linguistics elements are more common in men speech even in higher position. While Koreyi's (2007) study with the same concept shows another result. She mentioned that there is no significant linguistic differences among men and women regarding to use power signals in language among Tehrani's people.

The reason could be the wild spread of technology and social network especially in big cities. Modaresi (2009) in study of politeness marker in Persian language also mentioned that there is a changes regarding to politeness marker in Persian. Although the Iranian culture considered as a traditional and conservative culture but the changes could be noticeable between different generations. According to him, therefore the more complicated and hierarchical manners gradually will be replaced with more simple and equal behavior.

Chapter Summary

The chapter was concerned on the literature and some of the most important related concepts to address forms. The importance of sociolinguistic study of a language, the language in a social context, some social factors govern the choice of proper forms of address such as power and social class was given as well. Since address forms are regarded as one of the politeness markers the politeness theory was briefly explained. The address forms and the different category of address were discussed as well. Moreover, some of the most important studies on address form were reviewed. The type of address terms in Persian language and most influential social factors of Iranian society was shortly given. At the last part some of the Iranian works in this filed reviewed.

CHAPTER 3
DATA and METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the procedures that were used in conducting this research. The following topics are discussed: research subject, research variables, data collection and data analysis.

This study carried out to describe the address behavior of Persian address terms. Address terms are those linguistics forms which are used for addressing. One of their main features is that they are highly related to the context of the situation and social factors.

In addition, the degree of formality of the context is regarded as a related factor in the choice of appropriate address terms. Furthermore, in the Iranian culture the level of closeness and social distance is a crucial factor in choosing the proper form; therefore, it was considered as a relevant variable in the data analysis as well.

It is believed that it is not just enough to use the language in a correct way but it is also important to use it in a proper way and to adjust it to the context of the situation. Generally, terms of address are regarded as politeness marker. Therefore, to choose a proper form of address with regard to the addressee and the context is considered as polite behavior, related to the fact that language is one of the means to express politeness.

3.1. Population and Sample

One of the aims of the study is to show the influence of social factors such as age, gender, education and social class on Persian address term. Iranian Films are one of the good categories to help us for finding address terms in Persian, especially those are related to the public culture and are used ordinary people's language for their dialogues.

As a native speaker, I can judge and decide which films will be selected as the case studies based on dialogues and actually film languages. I found three films which have natural language; life like, every day, background in linguistics.

3.2. Research Variables

The following description explains the research variables including social class, age, gender and education:

The social class

The social class of a movie character is defined by his or her privileges and position in society, such as profession, wealth, education and social position. Classifying social class is an ambiguous and challenging task in social research since it is difficult to draw a clear and distinctive border between social groups. In this study, education, occupation and/or wealth are considered as factors of classification.(footnote). The social classes are divided into three categories; working class, middle class, upper middle class. Other factors that have played a part in deciding the social class of the characters are their appearance, lifestyle and in some cases, the way they speak.

Gender

Gender in present study was referred to the male and female characters of research subjects. In General, gender is an important factor influencing the choice of address terms, but in temporary Iran (after Islamic Revolution), female position in society and after that in films is deeply changed. Now, censors have made a great a gap between men and women in films. It seems no touching, not sleeping in one bed, putting polite women, etc. have Influenced on the film dialogues and peoples language. Therefore gender was important that the chosen movies were representative for both genders.

Age

Age is defined as the length of time that one has existed, which in present study various age groups were assessed including young, middle age and aged.

3.3. Data collection

In order to find proper case studies, ten Persian/ Iranian were examined and three of them were chosen carefully to study for this thesis: “*Ejareneshinha*” (1986) means (The tenants) directed by Daruish Mehrjouie, “*Mehman-e maman*” (2003) means (Mom’s guest’) directed by Daruish Mehrjouie and “*Jodayi*” (2010) or (A Separation) directed by Asghar Farhadi. Each of film have characteristics which causes to put in our case studies. The criterion is to choose movies that presented Iranian society in natural way and the everyday life of people; as close to natural interaction and settings as possible.

Since the language of movies is not the same as natural language, it is important to select movies in which the language is as similar as possible to the colloquial Persian in Iran. Therefore, movies with a literary language style of Persian were ignored even if they have

other relevance such as variety of social classes. An attempt was made to have a variation of as well.

Although the majority of the scenes from the movies are set in informal contexts, such as family gathering, neighbor interactions, on the whole, they cover some formal settings as well. To show the influence of age variable on address terms, it is attempted to choose movies with almost variety of different age ranges and their interaction; Ranging from youth, adult and older generation.

Data is selected from three of them are chosen for this thesis. Iranian movies, which are approximately covered a period of twenty years. Normally it has been suggested that the data obtained through ethnographic observation seem to be more repressive of the language used in natural setting. It should be mentioned that lack of enough of Persian speaking informant was one the main reasons for not collecting data from ethnographic observation.

Therefore, the data is obtained from the movies is still closer to natural language in comparison with the data collected from text. To collect the data at first ten movies which are assumed to be proper for data collection were selected and watched. Then, out of the ten, four movies were chosen to be analyzed. As the next step, some of the most important scenes from the movies selected for analyzing. The redundant scenes and address forms were ignored.

It is tried to describe those scenes which showed the notable and remarkable features of address terms. It should be noted that regarding to study variable, the movies were chosen based on the filmography knowledge of the researcher as well as recommendation from two experts. Those movies were selected in which they contain various scenes of exchanging address forms. Moreover, among all of address form was exchanged between interlocutors in the movies, it was important to choose those address terms which the influence of social factors in choice of them was also prominent. Therefore, some scene with a good example of address behavior or revealing some changes in address pattern is selected and analyzed.

It should be considered, it will be focused to describe the main and prominent character of the movie. Because usually the frequency of address forms exchanged was higher.

3.4. Data Analysis

Since the data is obtained from movies, thus estimating social factors such as age and social class was based on the researcher intuition as a native speaker and based on the information given from the movie scenes. It should be mention that, in selecting and

analyzing the address terms from the movies, it could be said that focus was more on the qualitative than the quantitative. The format of presenting and analyzing of the data was approximately similar to Braun's methods (1988) on address terms. Then after taking note of the selected scenes, the linguistic and social factors were presented in a separate table (schematic way) for each scene. The table like the sample table as bellow(3.1.) will present these materials.

Table 3.1: Sample table for categorize data in chapter 4

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender			
Age			
Social Class			
Pronouns			
Address forms			
EX			
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns			
Address forms			
EX			

In addition, those scenes were chosen which contain the conversation between two interlocutors with exchanging the address terms. Therefore, the above information needed to be written in the charts as well. In addition, the social variable such as gender, approximate range age and social class of both interlocutors also were presented in the tables. For each movie, first, all of the tables were presented, and then the analysis for scenes was given referring to the scene's number. In other words, the data of each movie were presented and described separately. Then each movie discussed separately and at the end a conclusion based on all the presented data was given.

Chapter Summary

This chapter provides an overview of the methodology used to conduct this study. The chapter begins with the research subject which was included three Iranian movies. The chapter was followed by a description of the research variables including age, gender, social class and education. Moreover the chapter provides the basis for data collection and analysis for the research findings.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS

Introduction

In the following chapter the address behavior (insert footnote) of selected terms of address will be discussed and analyzed. The address term material was collected from three Iranian movies. The structure of the data analysis will be as following: For each movie the plot will be described before the language analysis of the data.

In the analysis section, the interlocutors will be classified by their relation followed by the way they address one another. Their main address patterns and address behavior will be discussed in separate paragraphs. A short social class description of the interlocutors will be included. Then, after each paragraph the language analysis will be presented in tables containing the address forms exchanged between the interlocutors, as well as social factors such as social class, age and gender, since a choice of address term is related to social factors and the context of a situation. Then, after each movie a brief summary of the analysis will be given. Finally, the last section will contain a summary and conclusion of the chapter.

4.1. THE TENANTS

The Tenants or Ejareh-Nesheeha, is a comedy film whose events take place in the capital city of Iran (Tehran) in the 1980's. This film which is slapstick and metaphorical simultaneously, has been produced in 1986 by Daruish Mehrjui (1939-...) one of the famous Iranian directors and also most famous actors and actresses have played in it. It's the story of some unlike people with unusual habits but with one similar interest; their apartment which creates plot's conflicts referred as below:

4.1.1. Plot

An old, crumbling building with unknown heirs and passed away owner, is rented by the owner house steward. This apartment complex whose owner passed is a set of cheaply built modern apartment block located in a suburb of Tehran and follows the rebellion of a wildly disparate group of tenants. The whole mess begins when the owner of the building dies in a train wreck with no children or family of his own, the building falls under the aegis of Iran's vague "heir-uncertain" law. The apartment manager, "Mr. Abbas¹" who lives on the ground floor, is trying to seize the house and refuses to overhaul apartments by cooperation of

¹ Played by Ezzatolah Entezami

a group of developers which are located in the real estate brokers and sales agent. But they have some rival who wants to develop the building.

When a rival group of developers informs the tenants of the building manager's plans, tenants have realized that the situation and to solve the problem called to the other real estate which is in high completion to seize the apartments. Then the rival informs them that according to the law, if they put up the money to make the building's badly needed repairs, they can claim the building themselves.

So, the tenants decide to repair the apartments and hire some construction workers. Meanwhile the owner steward complained to the tenants' decision and forced to construction workers to stop repair. When the tenants learn that they can gain title to the building if they are judged to have made substantial improvements, the tenants are not particularly interested in improving the building, they just want the building to show evidence of major modifications.

Suddenly in a rainy night, a major source of water which is located above the roof, falls and setup it all falls together. So, the house crumbles and occupants are physically and financially hurt and at the end of the film, some government officials show up and put a stop to the rambunctious contest among the tenants.

4.1.2. Characters and their social class

The main figures in this film can be divided in to four groups such as: "Æbbas and his family", "The other Tenants", "The Swindlers" and "The Workers". Here is a brief introduction of these groups.

1. Æbbas and his family:

- Æbbas is a middle-aged (in 40's) widower who occupies the ground-floor apartment with his mother and his younger brother and his wife. Æbbas works in a city meat shop, but he is also the manager of the apartment building on behalf of the offshore owners. He has recently gone from rags to riches and does not seem to handle it well. Because of his wealth he can be classified as belonging to the middle class.
- The "Engineer", Æbbas's brother and the original designer of the building, represents the technical elite. He is not corrupt, but he washes his hands of responsibility and says he was just doing what he was told to do.
- Æbbas's mother represents as a social conscience; when people are quarreling, she frequently urges the others to be more honorable. She always tries to make

a peaceful situation. If there was a quarrel between her son and other neighbors it was her that initiates to make peace among them. She is a carrying character.

2. The Other Tenants:

There are three sets of tenants who occupy the apartment on the upper floors of the dilapidated building. They are informed by some shady business advisors that they can consequently claim ownership of the apartment complex, if the building is officially deemed to be heir uncertain. The tenants on the three floors of the building:

- Qændy represents the corrupt business class. His disabled brother, Salek, represents the neglected needy sector of society who required more support.
- The Tævæsoli family represents the educated middle class who carries some elements of intellectual class and ordinary people simultaneously. Mr. and Mrs. Tævæsoli are government employees with an average income. Considering their education they can also be placed in the middle class, even though from economical scale they were in average level of income.
- The top-floor resident is a would-be opera singer and is shown to be something of an artistic buffoon. His pretentious impracticality and generally irrelevant preoccupations suggest that he satirically presents the Iranian intellectual class. So, then opera singer seems to mostly care about his cultural life and gardening. Like other artist.

3. The Swindlers:

There are two competing, semi-gangster business operators who deal with real estate, but they are also engaged in all sorts of corrupt practices. One of gangsters is Qolam, who advises Abbas, and the other swindler is Baqery, who advises the tenants. They represent the corrupt but unavoidable insiders in society who undermine the activities of honest citizens. The boss of the real state seems to be a fraud. He is a rich man but doesn't have any cultural background. In the arguments he could be very rude and impolite.

4. The Workers:

These are lower-class construction workers who are engaged at times to work on the building and try to fix it – or, it seems, to destroy it, depending on who employs them. The construction workers represent the working class and are generally in a sympathetic portrait. *Mæsh Mehdi* is the chief of the worker is a person from countryside with a simple/pure personality. Towards his bosses he was polite and

respectful. Sometimes overgeneralization of polite behavior was observed. He feels he is not in the same social class, because he is non-educated. When he get angry just complain in a polite way.

4.1.3. Linguistic analysis

Although I have categorized characters and their social classes in last section, for linguistic analysis, it's better to list characters by their relationships and amount of their dialogue to each other. So, in this section conversation between these four groups is analyzed: Neighbors, Family, Friends and Strangers.

• *Neighbors' Addressing*

In The Tenants, five persons address an older woman in the neighborhood and three examples are presented here. And also there are some men and women addressing is this term. In sum, all of neighbor's addressing is presented in this section.

The first group or addressing is two ladies with 30 year age difference. As table 4.1, we see the address pattern between a female middle class worker around her 30s and the older woman having an everyday conversation:

Table 4.1: Neighbors' Conversation (young and old woman)

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Female		Female
Age	Around 57		Around 30
Social Class	Middle class		Middle class
Pronoun		V	
Noun of address	Honorific title + family name		
Example	"Xanom Tævæsoli" (Mrs. Tævæsoli)		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronoun		V	
Noun of address	Kinship term		
Example	"Madær" (mother)		

The term serves as a mode of respect and affection, since using the KT to address the older woman is related to her character in the movie; a woman that shows motherly care toward the other neighbors.

The second group is conversation between an old woman with a young man which is shown in the second table (4.2). As it is seen, a middle class man is also addressing the older woman with the kinship term *madær* in a fictive usage. In return, he is addressed with the combination of an honorific term and his family name, *aqa-ye Sædri* Mr Sædri. Regarding to the pronouns of address, the mutual V form is exchanged between them.

Table 4.2: Neighbors' Conversation (young man and old woman)

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Male		female
Age	Around 35		Around 57
Social Class	Middle class		Middle class
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Honorific title + family name		
EX	"Aqa Sædri"(Mr. Sædri)		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Kinship term		
EX	"Madær" (mother)		

The third part of addressing refers to a situation where the old woman uses a different address form towards a young man too but with an honorific title and last name.

This occurs in a scene where she tries to make peace between her older son and Mr. Qændi after a bad quarrel. In order to show affection she addresses Mr. Qændi as *madær jan* "dear mother", a combination of a kinship term and an endearment term. The kinship term is an address inversion of a term in a fictive usage, meaning that a speaker replies with an address term he or she has been addressed by. For instance, a Persian-speaking mother could refer to her own son or daughter as *maman* "Mama".

Table 4.3 : Neighbors' Conversation (Honorific title + KT term)

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Female		Female
Age	Around 57		Around 30
Social Class	Middle class		Middle class
Pronoun		V	
Noun of address	Honorific title + family name / kinship term +endearment term		
Example	"aqaye Qændi" (Mr. Qændi) / "madær jun" (dear mother)		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronoun		V/ T	
Noun of address	Kinship term		
Example	Madær 'mother'		

So, table 4.3, presents the address forms exchanged between the older woman and another neighbor, a young man called Mr. Qændi. As in the situations above, he is being

addressed with the combination of an address form and his family name. The older woman is again receiving the KT from the younger neighbor.

Generally, neighbors, regardless of their age and gender and social class, address the older woman by the kinship term *madær*, which is a fictive usage of the term. In return, the neighbors are addressed with the combination of honorific term and family name in everyday situations. With regards to pronouns of address the mutual V form is exchanged between them. Concerning the asymmetry of age the older person usually receives the polite form of the pronoun. Additionally, since the interlocutors are not in a close circle of the older woman, the default pronoun which is exchanged is the V form.

Regarding to pronouns of address the older woman shifts to the T form in order to console Mr. Qændi while she is still receiving the V form from him. In this case, the asymmetrical usage of the pronouns serves as a familiar usage of the T form, increasing the level of intimacy. This shows that context is one of the factors that play an important role in the choice of address forms. There are several examples in the movie where we see address forms changing dependent on the context. Quarrels are one example on how the context influences an address term as seen in tables 4.3- 4.5 describe the address patterns of tenants with the house owner representative, mostly in situations of disagreement.

Table 4.4 : Neighbors'Conversation (woman and man)

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	female		Male
Age	Around 30		Around 40
Social Class	Middle class		Middle class
Pronouns		V / T	
Noun of address	Frist name + honorific title / abstract noun		
Eample	“Æbbas aqa” (Mr. Abbas) / “jenabali” (your excellency)		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	honorific title + family name		
Example	xanom Tævæsoli ‘Mrs. Tævæsoli’		

Table 4.4 is showing the address behavior of Ms. Tævæsoli and Mr.Æbbas. As Mr. and Ms. Tævæsoli, have an argument with the apartment owner’s representative ,Æbbas aqa Mr. Æbbas, about the renovation of the house.

In the scene, during the argument, the female once uses an abstract noun *jenabali* “your excellency”, The abstract term, *jenab* could be translated as “excellency” to address the

apartment owner’s representative. The term normally shows a high level of respect toward addressee and is mostly used in formal contexts, but since she was trying to question his position, this address term applied as a sarcasm mode in this context. It should be added that the way that she pronounced the word also supported this sarcastic meaning. In this case the polite term loosed its polite meaning and sound more impolite and ironic.

It should be noted that, in a normal situation she addresses him with FNT, *Æbbas Aqa* Mr. *Æbbas*. Therefore, the woman did not behave as a passive participant in the argument and did not let the apartment owner representative to dominate the conversation. In return, she is addressed with the combination of honorific address term and his husband family name.

With regard to pronoun of address she is addressed with the V form by Mr. *Æbbas*, while in return there is alternative usage of the pronoun regarding to context. In other words, she shifted from the V form into the T form in the argument. By using the T form it can be said that she tried to be a dominant participant in the argument and shows that she is right.

Table 4.5 presents the address forms exchanged between two man: Mr. *Tævæsoli* and Mr. *Æbbas* in the above-mentioned argument. When Mr. *Tævæsoli* joined the conversation in order to confirm his wife argument, he was addressed with *jenab-e Tævæsloi*, by *Æbbas aqa*.

In this scene the abstract term, serves as a means of showing distance rather than respect. Therefore, it can be said that because of the above-mentioned argument the normal address behavior which was addressing with TLN: *Aqa-y-e Tævæsoli* was changed. With respect to pronoun of address in this argument Mr. *Tævæsoli* was addressed with the stressed second person plural pronoun, *shoma*.

Table 4.5: Neighbors’Conversation (two men)

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	male		Male
Age	Around 35		Around 40
Social Class	Middle class		Middle class
Pronouns		V	
Noun of address	Frist name + mas honorific title		
Eample	“Æbbas aqa” (Mr. Abbas)		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V/ T	
Address forms	honorific title + family name / abstract noun + family name		
Example	“Aqa-ye Tævæsoli” (Mr. Tævæsoli)/ “jenab Tævæsoli” (excellency Tævæsoli)		

So, as seen in table 4.5, the strong emphasis on V form with a loud intonation shows lack of respect toward his addressee, it sounds more ironic than polite. In another argument in order to make Mr.Tævæsoli lower and humiliate him, the apartment owner’s representative addressed him with stressed T form, while Mr.Tævæsoli tries to keep the same address form, V form. With a shifting from V form to T form in addressing, Mr.Æbbas tried to make an unequal and asymmetrical relation and wanted to be a superior in the argument.

Table 4.6 presents the address pattern of Mr. Æbbas with another neighbor, Mr.Sædri (opera singer). For explanation of this scene of film it should be said, Mr. Æbbas tried to show his disagreement towards the changes that Mr.Sædri made in his apartment. When their conversation turns into quarrel, Mr.Æbbas tries to be dominant and superior participant in the argument.

Table 4.6: Neighbors’Conversation (two men)

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Male		male
Age	Around 35		Around 40
Social Class	Middle class		Middle class
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	First name+Honorific title		
Exapmle	“Æbbas Aqa” (Mr.Æbbas)		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	title / honific title+family name		
Example	“Shazde” (prince) / “aqa-ye Sædri” (Mr. Sædri)		

At the beginning of the argument he addresses Mr. Sædri with the title of *shazde*² means prince, is trying to tease him and make fun of him. The context shows that here a polite and a respectful title applied as an offensive mode and ironic meaning. In other words, the terms applied as a mean of lowering the addressee. As an argument got more serious, Mr. Æbbas started to address him with swearing words such as *ashqal* “rubbish” instead of addressing him with the name. While, in the normal situation he is addressed with *aqaye Sædri* Mr. Sædri by Mr. Æbbas .In return, Mr. Sædri who seems not to be satisfied to be addressed in this way does not use the same way of addressing toward the apartment manager. He just raises his voice to show his disagreement.

² a short and more colloquial form of *Shahzade*

With regard to address pronoun Mr. Sædri used the V form to address Mr. Æbbas the usage serving to keep a social distance. While, Mr.Æbbas addressed him with the stressed T form which applied as a means of lowering the addressee.

The next group of address forms, exchanged between Mr.Æbbas and another neighbor Mr. Qændi. In the scene when they were having argument both avoid addressing each other with their name, instead they use swear words in order to make the addressee down.

With regard to pronoun of address, the mutual T form was observed. The apartment owner's representative tried to keep his superiority that is why he used the T form toward the tenant, while when Mr. Qændi addressed him with the T form he tried to make their relation equal and to not let his addressee being in the power position. Mr.Qændi seems to have very little education and liked to act like a tough guy. He has a short temper and quiet often he thinks he is being conned by people around him. When cornered he does away with a little bit of culture that he has and starts cursing and yelling. This makes him feel important. He quickly got overly friendly with strangers and had no sense of the red lines. Therefore it was natural for him to argue the same way as Mr. Æbbas.

As it seen, in table 4.7 another type of address form exchanged is presented. The reason for alternative address form can be because of the changes in the context of situation.

Table 4.7: Nneighbors' Conversation (two men)

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Male		Male
Age	Around 40		Around 30
Social Class	Middle class		Middle class
Pronoun		T	
Nominal form	honorific title+ last name		
Example	“Aqaye Qændi” (Mr.Qændi)		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronoun		V/T	
Free form of address	Frist name+Honorific title		
Example	“Æbbas aqa” (Mr.Æbbas)		

The scene shortly can be described as follow. In one scene when the elderly woman tried to bring his son, Mr. Æbbas, and Mr. Qændi together since they stop to talk after their serious argument. Mr. Qændi who seems to regret of his previous behavior, tries to apologize to the house owner representative. Considering their age differences Mr. Qændni mentiones the importance of giving respect and being polite towards the elderly people. Therefore, one of the strategies is to use the polite form of address pronoun: *shoma* toward Æbbas aqa who is

older than him. In this case age factor seems to be a crucial factor in the choice of address pronouns.

- ***Family members' Addressing***

In this part, family members' addressing is surveyed. These members are husband and wife, grandmother and grandson, mother and son, brothers and uncle and niece in apartment.

The first item is the address pattern exchanges between the couple, Mr. Tævæsoli and Ms.Tævæsoli, as shown table 4.8 who addressed each other with FN. With regard to pronoun, the T form was exchanged between them.

Table 4.8: Husband and Wives' Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Male		Female
Age	Around 35		Around 30
Social Class	Middle class		Middle class
Pronoun		T	
Noun of address	First name		
EX	"Pærvín"		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronoun		T	
Free form of address	Frist name		
EX	"Jævad"		

Another family which is seen in the film is the owner's representative's family. In table 4.9, the address behavior is described below. With regard to pronoun of address, all of the house representative family members used T form to address each other regardless of their age and gender.

The mother, the elderly woman, is addressed by KT term *madær* "mother" by her sons and her grandchild. In return, they were addressed with two different address patterns; either with their FN in most of the situation or with KT: "*madær*" (mother). The later form was address inversion of the kinship term. It should be noted that the usage of KT *madær* as an address term is decreasing among young generation for addressing their mothers as it became dated and formal. The usage of address inversion towards her sons was observed mostly in situation when she wanted to console her sons, then she used the same address form which they would use to her. The combination of KT and endearment terms was observed in some situations when she wanted to increase the level of intimacy towards them.

Table 4.9: Grandmother and Grandsons' Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	female		Male
Age	Around 57		Around 15
Social Class	Middle class		Middle class
Pronoun		T	
Nominal form	Frist name / kinship term (+ endearment term)		
Example	Ækbær / madær (jun) ' (dear) mother'		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronoun		T	
Free form of address	Kinship term		
Example	Madær 'mother'		

Another address, which is shown in table 4.10, describes as another situation different address behavior is happened between the mother and the apartment owner's representative. The scene is after a serious argument which the mother tries to convince her older son to accept the apology of one of the tenants: Mr.Qændi. One of her strategies is addressing him with FNT, the point was focusing on his position and his age in order to give him respect in front of other tenants.

Table 4.10: Conversation between mother and son

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Female		Male
Age	Around 57		Around 40
Social Class	Middle class		Middle class
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Kinship term / first name(+ honorific term)		
Exaple	Madær / Æbass (aqa) 'mother / (Mr.)Æbbas'		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Kinship term		
Exapmle	Madær 'mother'		

With regard to addressing brother, the apartment owner representative used different forms of address towards his brother regarding to different context when it comes to argument both avoid using address terms toward each. Addressing pattern is different outside the circle of the family. Table 4.11 shows this address form: for example, in one scene other tenants discussed with Mr.Æbbas about the renovation of the apartment; then he addresses his younger brother, who is a university civil engineer, with combination of honorific title and

professional term of address: *aqay-e mohændes* “Mr. engineer” in order to show them that it is his brother who is qualify to decide about the renovation and destruction of the apartment not them.

Table 4.11: Brothers’ Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Male		Male
Age	Around 40		Around 25
Social Class	middle class		Middle class
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Honorific title + Profession tile / kinship term		
Example	“Aqa-ye mohændes” (Mr. engeener)/ “bæche” (kid)		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Kinship term		
EX	“Dadash” (brother)		

As mentioned in chapter 2, some professions carry prestige since a high position actually expressed in the term. For example, an engineer at least has a high educational degree. A person could be addressed by his/her profession in a situation which a speaker wants to be more polite and give respect toward the addressee. The usage could be real or fake. But as mentioned above their address behavior changed based on different contexts, for example in the scene when the apartment owner’s representative argues with the couple, the younger brother support the couple for their argument, then he is addressed with *bæche* “kid” by his older brother as seen in table 4.11. The usage of the address form works as a mode of humiliating the younger brother since he wanted to show his disagreement towards the brother’s behavior. In return as mentioned above in argument the younger brother avoid to address the older brother. While in the end of the movie when the younger brother wanted to show his sympathy towards Mr.Æbbas, he addresses him with the kinship term *dadash* “brother”. The term is a traditional kinship term for addressing older brothers. This is common in traditional families.

In The Tenants, another address inversion among family members is observed in the scene when the uncle asked his niece to do a favor for him. In this scene, the uncle addresses his niece, with the kinship term *æmu* “uncle” (i.e. the brother of the father). To make the situation softer he added the endearment term *jun* “dear”. It seems that the usage here showed the difference in authority aspect of address inversion. Table 4.12 shows this addressing.

Table 4.12: Uncle and Nieces' Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Male		Male
Age	Around 25		Around 15
Social Class	Middle class		Middle class
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Kinship term+ endearment term / first name		
Example	“Æmu jun” (dear amu) / Ækbær		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Kinship term		
Example	“Æmu”		

- ***Friends' Addressing***

Addressing of friends has an important role in the film. In table 4.13 it can be seen friends' addressing. As it presented, the apartment owner representative exchanged the T form with his friend, the real state chief. They both address each other with FN. Apart from closeness and intimacy; it seems that they had also the same benefit toward the apartment. Therefore, the solidarity level is important in their choice of address as well. But the alternative address form was showed in the relatively formal context in real estate agency.

Table 4.13: friends' Addressing

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Male		Male
Age	Around 40		Around 40
Social Class	Middle class		Middle class
Pronoun		T	
Nominal form	first name (+honorific title)		
Example	“Æbbas (aqa)” (Mr.)Æbbas		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronoun		T	
Free form of address	First name+Endearment term		
Example	“Qolam jun”, (dear Qolam)		

- ***Strangers' Addressing***

The address behavior of interlocutors toward the people whom they had just met is described below. In table 4.14, With regards to workers, whom just came for house renovating, there were two different scenes which two different address behaviors of interlocutors is observed.

Table 4.14: Worker and his Boss' Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	male		Male
Age	Around 35		Around 35
Social Class	Middle class		working class
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Religious title+ first name		
EX	Mæsh mehdi		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Honorific title +Profession title		
Exapmle	Aqa -ye mohændes ‘ Mr. engineer’		

In the scene, describing the disagreement of apartment owner's representative for renovation of the apartment and his serious discussion with tenants, Mr.Æbbas addressed workers whom just met, with the T form in order to show them his superiority and his disagreement. As regard nominal form of address, in this scene the chief of the worker was addressed with a combination of a religious term of address and FN. As regards to FN: Mr.Æbbas and Mr.Qændi, addresses him with an alternative form of his name: “*Meti*” while, Mr.Tævæsoli and Mr.Sædri addresses him with the original form: “*Mehdi*”. It seems the frequency of using variation form (phonological changes) of name and title is less among upper middle class. It can be said that the alternative form which shows phonological changes is not very common among conservative speakers which prefer to follow the more standard variation of the language. The religious term refers to a person who pilgrimage a religious city Mæshhæd in Iran. *Mæsh* is normally used with FN and can be used to address both genders. The address term is mostly used for addressing a traditional religious person especially with a rural background. However, the usage is getting decrease. In return, all of the male tenants received *aqa-ye mohandes* “Mr. Engineer”.

It seems that he considered the term as a default term to address superior addressee who seem educated, in order to show respect towards them. As mentioned before, engineer is one of the occupations which carry prestige in Iran. By this usage he made an asymmetrical relation between himself and addressee, it seems overgeneralization of address terms is more frequent among the working class. For example in one of the scene *mæsh Mehdi* address Mr.Æbbas's, a teenager son with this title.

Two different address behaviors is observed in the scene describing the apology of tenants and Mr. Æbbas to *Mæsh Mehdi*. With regards to nominal form of address, the house

owner's representative addressed *mæsh Mehdi*, the chief of the workers, with a professional term of address: *ussa*. The term is used to address skilled worker and mostly means being a master of the job. The usage showed respect towards the addressee. As regards pronoun of address, Mr. *Æbbas* addressed him with V form which showed the modesty of house owner's representative and his respect towards *mæsh Mehdi*. While in this scene address behavior of Mr. *Sædri* towards *mæsh Mehdi* was different. When Mr. *Sædri* wanted to make up with him addressed him with T form in order to focus on equality and closeness and decrease the level of intimacy.

As table 4.15 points, another scene is an argument between the chiefs of two real estates and their gangs. After a while the argument turns into fighting. Two groups of rowdy males, simply addressing each other with stressed T form and swearing at each other and using swearwords as a mode of address term. Because they were trying to make the addressee lower and humiliate their addressee. In this situation the T form works as an unpleasant and embarrassing

Table 4.15: Worker and his Boss' Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Male		Male
Age	Around 45		Around 35
Social Class	Middle class		Working class
Pronouns		T/ V	
Address forms	Profession title		
EX	Ussa 'master'		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Honorific title		
EX	Aqa 'sir'		

Another form of stranger addressing is related to a woman and a man. As wealthy young female who is engineer, wanted to buy the apartment is called *xanom mohændes* which means "Ms.engineer" by tenants regardless of their gender and age.

Since she introduced herself with this title and expected to be addressed by the term. As mention before addressing a person with a profession which carries prestige shows the respect of speaker towards the addressee.

Table 4.16: Sstrangers' Conversation (man and woman)

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Male		female
Age	Around 45		Around 30
Social Class	Middle class		Upper middle class
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Profession title+ Honorific title		
Exapmle	"Xanom mohændes"(Mrs. Engineer)		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Honorific title (+ first name)		
Exapmle	Aqa (Abbas) 'Mr (Abbas)'		

There is another scene when she had a conversation with Mr.Sædri. They just call them by Ms. And Mr. With regards to pronoun of address the mutual V form was exchanged. The pattern is a common address behavior between strangers.

Table 4.17: Sstrangers' Conversation (man and woman)

Scene9:	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Male		female
Age	Around 35		Around 30
Social Class	Middle class		Upper middle class
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Honorific title		
EX	Xanom 'Mrs'		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Honorific title		
EX	Aqa 'Mr'		

4.1.4. The Tenants' Addressing

With respect to the linguistic analysis of the tenants, the following overview of the influence of social factors on the choice of address form can be given. One of the findings is that the socio-cultural background of the interlocutors, specifically the speakers played an important role in the choice of address forms. In other words, it should be said that it is the individual characteristic of the speaker that was the crucial factor to influence the address behavior of the interlocutors.

Another relevant factor which made a dramatic shift in choice of address forms is a context of situation. Argument and compromise are the examples of situations when the shift in usage of the address pronouns was observed. For example, by changing the context into

argument address behavior of interlocutors suddenly had shifted. It should be noted that, the more the speaker was educated the more he/she concerned to follow the politeness principle of the interaction. For instance, the tendency to keep the V form even in arguments was more common for educated people.

Additionally, social class was an important factor to make asymmetrical usage of address forms. This concerns unequal relation stranger-stranger. However, with regards to family members, the data showed there was a mutual usage of the T form. With respect to gender factor, the tendency of gender verbal differences decreased. For example, women were not passive while arguing with opposite gender.

Furthermore, it seems that the age factor was under the influence of the level of intimacy and social distances. It means that it was not a significant factor. Summarizing, it is important to note that none of the factors should be ignored. It is crucial to realize that the influence of social factors was different depending on the context of the situation.

Another point of the address for of The Tenants is, although the age and gender factor does not play an important role in the address behavior of the interlocutors but compared to her husband, Mrs. Tævæsoli is short-tempered and more over she had a very dominating personality during the arguments. It is commonly assumed that women follow the standard language more than men and they are more conservative in use of the language as well, especially in some societies like Iran. The following example is showing that differences in address behavior between two genders are getting smaller. Thus, regarding to gender there is a gradual change in female languages towards equality in interactions. Another document regarding to diminishing the gender differences in the language was with respect to verb form of address; considering the fact that typically in Iran opposite gender with social distance do not address each other with singular form.

One of the reasons for different of address terms in the same is different level of social scales, both in educational scale and economical scale. Therefore, these differences reflected on address behavior, especially in argument. Their different personality and manner should be considered as an affecting factor in their choice of address forms in the same context of situation. Mr.Tævæsoli was representative of a righteous person who behaves politely in all his interaction, while Mr.Æbbas was an aggressive man who uses a rough style of language and swearing whenever he got angry with someone regardless of their age and social class and even their gender.

4.2. MOM'S GUEST

Mom's guest is the 18th Daruish Mehrjui's film which is directed in 2003. The screen play is so simple: a woman has some guests and no money to make food for them. In this film Ta'arof (which is pointed in chapter two) as one of the Iranian tradition is seen too much.

4.2.1. The Plot

Guests are on the way of entering and the mother is nervous and worried. Despite efforts to prepare this condition, there is a chaotic. The father is not coming and anytime the mother's niece and her new bride are coming. Minutes after the father, the guests arrive and it's the beginning of the problems. Yadollah (the father) tells his private memories about his life without regard for the bride and groom and his insists to stay the guests has exasperated mother since there is no reception at home appliances. Meanwhile Amir - The little boy's family- which tries to move out his cousin's car, is late. Just next door, Sediqe -the pregnant woman which after disposing the drugs of her addicted husband-Joseph, is severely beaten by him. In order to protect Sediqe the mother's cousin, -who called Sir. Colonel by mother is involved in their discord. Yadollah then, to entertain the guests says his memories and watching movies with them. By insisting of Yadollah, the guests' decide to stay and more and more anxious forward to mother to prepare dinner.

Therefore, all residents of the home falling search to prepare stuff for dinner. Chicken is important for mother to add it to dinner menu, so Amir, along with his friend, go to the father's shop secretly to steals chicken and fish. But the confrontation, the father shows off and son seems to be penalized by father. Amir returns to home without chicken and fish. Yousef's parents are rich, therefore he suggests going to his parents' home along with Amir.

Entering to Yousef parents' home, the Yousef mother starts to question him and curses him and insists that Sediqe is the reason of Yosef addition. Yousef is not care about his mother and takes foods from their fridge and returns. Other neighbors also provide the needed materials and finally dinner is ready, and all the inhabitants of the house sitting on the dinner table.

After dinner, the guests are ready to leave which the foolishly insist of Yadollah to stay there for night, change their mind and guests decide to stay at home for sleeping. Mother and the others are on the verge of insanity, however, mother can't bear this stress and anxious and falls. The mother is taken to the hospital and the doctor advises for full day rest.

After returning home, the bride and groom have to sleep in separate rooms instead. Neighbors go to their homes and the lights go off.

4.2.2. Characters and their social classes

The main figures in Mom's guest film can be divided into six groups such as: the residents of the old house (or neighbors), the guests, Yousef's parents, hospital staffs, kids and the workers who work on the neighborhood building.

1. The residents: There are four small houses in the big yard which in each of them, one family is occupied³. These families may be including a single man or woman, or a couple with or without children.
 - *Effat's* family including a woman (mom or *Effat*), a man (her husband: Yadollah), a 17 years girl (her daughter: Bæhare) and a younger boy (her son: Amir). *Effat* is a non-educated housekeeper, Yadollah has a low work in non-governmental office. They belong to the working class and in traditional part of society.
 - The young doctor is a pharmacy student who lives alone. He is an educated person but it seems to belong to the low social class.
 - Yousef's family is a couple Joseph and his pregnant wife, Sediqe. Yousef is addicted and although belongs to a higher level of society, but lives like poor people.
 - "*Mæsh Maryam*" and her Chicken and Rooster. She is a non-educated, old woman whose family was killed in war. She moved from a small city. She is a little abnormal in social relationship and belongs to the low class of society.
2. The guests are a young (in 20's) couple which married recently and are in a kinship relationship with *Effat's* family. The groom is educated and has a governmental job (a police officer). They are from upper middle class.
3. Yousef's parents are in higher class of society. They are rich and maybe educated family with an addicted son, who leaves them and earn his families' money by colportage.
4. The hospital staffs are some educated people who are nurses and doctors and belong to the middle class of society.

³ There are two neighbors in the film who live in other building but mom invite them for dinner.

5. Kids who belongs to a low class society of Tehran’s district. They are divided to three groups:

- Amir (*Effat*’s son).
- Amir’s friend whose father is a meat-man and is richer than Amir.
- Street children who are in the same social class as Amir.

6. Workers who works on the neighborhood building and are in low class.

4.2.3. Linguistic analysis

In the following section the address behavior of the interlocutors in mom’s guest will be discussed. Most of the scene was happening inside of the house. Most of the address forms were exchanged between either the members of the family or neighbors interactions. Therefore, the address behavior will be discussed under the two main relations: family members and neighbors and their subcategories.

- ***Addressing of the family members***

Family members are divided to two parts: close and far family as discussed in this part.

Inside the circle of the family

In Ms.Effæt’s family with regards to free form of address the following analysis is observed. As shown in table 4.18, the children used *maman* “mom” for their mother. *Baba* “dad” is used to as father. The children received FN by their parents. Between siblings FN was exchanged. With regards to pronoun of address the mutual T form was exchanged among them.

Table 4.18: Children and their parents’ Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Male		Female
Age	Around 40		Around 15
Social Class	working class		working class
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	first name		
Example	Bahareh		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Kinship term		
Example	“Maman” (mom)		

It should be noted that the intimate variant: *maman* and *baba* is getting more common and replacing the formal term: *madær* and *pedær* among young generation. Although, the kinship term *madær* is observed when Ms.Effæt used the term toward her daughter, an address inversion usage. It probably was an address term which she would use to her mother.

As it seen in table 4.19, and with regards to addressing the spouse, the husband was addressed with TFN: *aqa Yædollah* Mr. Yædollah. In return, the wife, Ms.Effæt, received the honorific address term: *xanom*. The strange address behavior is based on the fact that in arranged marriage there is a limited chance for the couple to get to know each other well and getting more intimate before their marriage.

Therefore, it could be happened that after their marriage keep addressing each other with rather formal and distant form which used to exchange before their marriage. It should be noted that the formal form which normally serves as a means of keeping social distance between two genders before marriage, do not apply the same function after the marriage; it seems it is rather the matter of habit than lack of intimacy between them.

Table 4.19 :Spouse' Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	male		Female
Age	Around 42		Around 40
Social Class	working class		working class
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	honorific term		
Example	"Xanom" (lady / Mrs.)		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	honorific title+ first name		
Example	"aqa Yædollah" (Mr. Yædollah)		

As it is shown in table 4.19 and with regards to pronoun of address the T form was exchanged between them. Another explanation for honorific term as an address term for addressing wife is that it is common in Iranian society that husband, especially in traditional families, avoid addressing their wives with FN in front of other men or in public. This is a verbal aspect of a reflection of man-dominated society. Though still the term conveyed a mode of respect towards the wife.

It should be noted that the aforementioned address behavior towards a spouse is decreasing specially among young generation and it is more common among the family with traditional background.

This kind of addressing is shown in the address behavior of the young bride and groom (Ms.Effæt niece and his wife) that belongs to the younger generation. Showed the new pattern of address form towards spouse. They address each other with FN.

Table 4.20: Young Spouse' Conversati on

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Male		Female
Age	Around 25		Around 22
Social Class	middle class		middle class
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	first name		
Example	Kokæb		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	First name		
Example	Hæmid		

Another form of the address behavior belongs to the young couple's neighbor which is different from the traditional couple. It is shown in table 4.21.

Table4.21: Spouse' Conversation (upper middle class couple)

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	male		Female
Age	Around 26		Around 23
Social Class	/upper middle working class		working class
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	first name (+ endearment term) / endearment term		
Exapmle	Sedique (jun) ' (dear) Sedique / juju 'chiken'		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	First name		
Example	Yousef (Joseph)		

As it is referred before, Joseph is from a rich and high class family but he have left them and live in a poor region of the city and that's why, he doesn't want to accept any financial help of his family. Referring to this fact, it can be concluded he and his wife are not from low class society and it's natural their addressing form differs from others. As mentioned above the address behavior of the traditional couple was rather formal. The young

couple addressed each other with FN, even outside of the circle of the family. With regards to pronoun of address the mutual T form was exchanged.

In the scene when she is feeling bad, the husband adds the endearment term *jun* “dear” to his wife’s name: *Sediqe jun* in order to console her. In another scene inside their house when she is getting prepared for the dinner, she is addressed with *juju* “chicken” by her husband. The term serves a special feeling and affection of the speaker toward the address in this context. As mentioned in chapter two, the endearment terms are based on the context and the relation of the interlocutors and they are conventionalized terms of address.

Another address form is related to the Yousef. As it was mentioned in plot, the addicted guy, Yousef, goes to his parents’ house in order to take food for party, he avoids to address his mother in order to show her his irritation.

The quarrel between mother and Yousef is because she was not satisfied with Yousef’s marriage; mother thought the wife should be from as social class as them or at least a higher class.

So, in addressing Joseph and in order to convince him to get back home and live with the parents again the father addressed him with a variation of address terms: the kinship term *baba* which was an address inversion usage in affection aspect, *pesær-æm* “my son” which was a kinship term in genitive usage, and sometimes with his first name Yousef FN. The terms served as means of increasing the level of closeness and he tried to show the son a high level of affection and intimacy. All information is shown in table 4.22:

Table 4.22: Father and Sons’ Conversation (upper middle class)

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Male		Male
Age	Around 50		Around 26
Social Class	Upper middle class		Upper middle / working class
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	First name / kinship term / / endearment term		
Example	Yousef / “baba” / “pesær-æm” ‘yousef/ dad/ my son’		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	∅		
Example	∅		

Distant relative

The newly married female is addressed with a combination of the female wedding title and female honorific title by the family members of her husband's aunt. The aforementioned address behavior is common in Iranian traditional culture. Since it is the first time that she visits her husbands' family and still they need more time to get to know each other, therefore they use a more distant address form rather addressing with name. In return she addresses the aunt, Mrs. Effæt, with *xale jun* dear Aunt: the combination of kinship term and endearment term. In one of the scene Mrs. Effæt used *æruse gol-am* which means my dear bride to address her. It should be mentioned that in the Persian language the word for the daughter in law is the same as the word for bride: *ærus*. In Persian *gol* means flower and in the phrase as an adjective with genitive suffix serves as a means of the high level of affection (table: 4.23).

Table 4.23: Aunt and her Daughter in laws' Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	female		Female
Age	Around 40		Around 22
Social Class	Working class		middle class
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Kinship term + endearment term		
Example	<i>æruse gol-am</i> 'my nice daughter in law'		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Kinship term+endearment term.		
Example	Xale jun 'dear aunt'		

The address behavior of two cousins who had approximately 15 years age difference was as follow (table 4.24).

Table 4.24: cousins

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	male		Male
Age	Around 25		Around 10
Social Class	middle class		working class
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Kinship term		
Example	"Pesær xale" (cousin)		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	First name		
Example	Æmir		

The small guy addresses his cousin with kinship term *pesær xale* which means the mother's sister's son. In return, he receives FN.

The above example shows the influence of age factor the asymmetrical usage of pronoun of address exchanged between them. The older revived the polite form of the verb as well.

The address behavior of the aunt and his niece is as follow. With regards to nominal form of address, Mrs. Effæt receives *xale jun* "dear xale" in return, she used *jenab særhang* "excellency colonel" to address his niece. Their strange address behavior could be explained as follow. In one scene he complained to his aunt to be addressed with this term, since he is not still hold the title in reality (table 4.25).

Table4. 25: Aunt and Nieces' Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	female		Male
Age	Around 40		Around 25
Social Class	Working class		middle class
Pronouns		V/ T	
Address forms	abstract term +Occupation term		
Example	Jenab særhæng 'excellency colonel'		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Kinship term+endearment term.		
Example	Xale jun 'dear aunt'		

Aunt explains that the title bring her prestige as well and also mentioned that she wants to give him respect and confident. It should be mentioned that colonel is one of the profession which carried prestige. And sometimes people from working class try to relate themselves to upper class in order to be get respect. When it comes to the pronoun of address as regards to age factor in Iranian culture the older get more respect.

Therefore the aunt receives the V form. In return, it is an alternative of usage of pronoun towards his niece. In most of the situation she addresses him with V from, based on aforementioned reason. But in the scene when she tries to explain him her address behavior and wanted to give him confidence, she shifts to the T form. The changes show an attempt to increase the level of closeness and breaking the social distance between them.

- ***Addressing neighbor***

As it was seen in part characters, neighbors are divided to two parts: one who are living in the same house which Effat's family lives in it that can be called close neighbors and

other neighbors who Effat invites them for dinner which call them people from neighborhood. In this section, the address form of these two groups is surveyed.

Close neighbor

As mentioned before in Iranian culture, addressing someone with only FN shows either a high level of intimacy or lack of respect. In order to avoid addressing a neighbor with only FN adding endearment term *jun* “dear” to the name is a common strategy. Therefore, it can be said that in most of the contexts the terms serves as a means of avoiding to address the neighbors by their only FN .But there is some restriction towards the usage of endearment terms which is mostly related to the age and gender and the level of intimacy of interlocutors. Thus in this part some of the usage of the term will be described as follow.

In the movie, with regards to addressing the neighbors the most common usage of endearment term *jun* “dear” as a part of address form, is towards young female neighbors; female neighbors towards the same gender neighbors approximately up to approximately 30 years old, added the endearment term *jun* to their FN. Another usage is sometimes in order to sympathize a speaker may combine TFN with the endearment term *jun* “dear” to make the form of address more soft and friendly or to show a higher degree of intimacy towards the addressee. For example, in one of the scene which is the conversation between the young female *Sedique* and her few years older female neighbor, Mrs.Effæt, at the begging of the conversation the younger one addressed her with *Effat xanom* Mrs.Effæt, her usual address form .

The address form changes from each situation to the other (see table 4.26).

Table 4.26: Close Neighbors’ Conversation (young and old woman)

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	female		Female
Age	Around 40		Around 23
Social Class	Working class		Working class
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	First name+ endearment term		
Example	“Sediqe jun”		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	First name+honorific title (+endearment term) / kinship term		
Example	“Effat xanom jun” ,(dear) Mrs. Effæt / “doxtær” (daughter)		

When the conversation follows and they start to talk about their problems, the address behavior is changed as well. The younger one switches to the softer version: *Effat xanom jun* “dear Mrs. Effæt”. As mentioned before, the younger one receives a combination of FN and endearment: *Seduqe jun* dear Sediqe regarding to age factor. In this situation another address term is exchanged between them which is a kinship term *doxtær* “girl” in a fictive usage. When *Mrs.Effæt* tries to console her young female neighbor after her argue with her husband addresses her with kinship term *doxtær*.The usage, seems to apply as a means of showing sympathy and kindness. With regards to pronoun of address the mutual T form was exchanged between them. The usage of the familiar form of the pronoun towards the older neighbor serves as a mode of closeness.

The endearment term could also combine with a profession as an address term. An example is the address behavior of two young male neighbors. The one who is university pharmacy student is addressed with *doktor jun* ‘dear doctor’ by his neighbor Yousef.

Table 4.27 shows address forms of two male neighbors with regards to pronoun of address the mutual T form was exchanged.

Table4. 27: Close Neighbors’ Conversation (two young men)

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	male		Male
Age	Around 23		Around 26
Social Class	middle class		Upper middle/Working Class
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Frist name + endearment term		
Example	Yousef (yousi) jun ‘ dear yousef’		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Occupation term+ endearment term		
Example	Doktor (doki) jun ‘dear doctor’		

Another usage of combination of endearment term in the film is towards the teenager girl who is addressed with *Bähare jun* by her older female neighbors, the pattern shows kind of affection and care toward her. While her younger brother who seems to be a rogue boy generally is addressed with only FN.

With regards to gender and social distance, when the male university pharmacy student had a conversation with his teenager female neighbor, he uses variation of address forms toward her. At the begging of the conversation he addresses her with FNT: *Bahareh*

xanom Mrs. Bæhareh. As conversation continued, he addresses her with only FN *Bahareh*. (table 4.28)

Table 4.28 :Close Neighbors' Conversation (opposite gender)

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	male		Female
Age	Around 23		Around 15
Social Class	middle class		Working class
Pronouns		V/T	
Address forms	Frist name (+ honorific title)		
Example	Bæhare (xanom)		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Honorific title + Occupation term		
Example	“Aqa-ye doctor” (Mr. doctor)		

It should be mentioned that in Iran the norm of address behavior of opposite genders with low frequency of contact is keeping social distance. But since using only first name in Iranian culture shows a higher level of intimacy and closeness, then the uncertain situation is made him to shift again to their usual address term. In return, he receives the combination of the male honorific title and profession title *aqay-e doctor* Mr. Doctor from his female interlocutor. The usage of address form serves as a means of respect towards the addressee. With the same reason when it comes to pronoun of address, the male interlocutor uses both forms of pronoun towards the female interlocutor. While, the teenager girl considering her traditional family background still tries to keep the social distance between two genders. Moreover, the male being university pharmacy, student has a higher status which could be another reason to be addressed just by polite form. The aforementioned address behavior shows the tendency towards decreasing the social distance specially with regarding to gender factor. But the partial asymmetry reflected in address behavior also showed the gradual changes in a traditional society.

Towards the neighbors of opposite gender, the combination of honorific title and FN is common. The exception is the pharmacy university student who the pharmacy is addressed with *aqay-e doctor* Mr. Doctor by the rest of the neighbor regardless of their gender. As regards to pronouns of address, towards the older addressee the V form is used regardless of their gender while, the same genders are received the T form. With the neighbors with the approximately of the same of speaker and same gender, the mutual T form is exchanged while with opposite-gender V form exchanged.

- **People from the neighborhoods' Addressing**

With regard to addressing elderly neighbors, an elderly female neighbor was addressed with TLN: *xanom Æxævan* Mrs. Æxævan regardless of the gender and social class of both the speakers. Addressing her with TLN showed a higher respect and politeness than using TFN(table 4.29)..

Table 4.29: Non-close Neighbors (two women)

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Female		Female
Age	Around 40		Around 55
Social Class	working class		working class
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	honorific terms+ family name		
Example	<i>xanom Æxævan</i> (Mrs. Æxævan)		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V/ T	
Address forms	first name + honorific title		
Example	Effæt <i>xanom</i> (Mrs.Effæt)		

When it comes to pronouns of address, asymmetrical usage is observed: the elderly is received the polite form *shoma* and uses the T form themselves with her younger addressees. This asymmetrical usage of the address terms is because of the influence of age factor, since in Iranian culture generally people are more polite towards the old addressee.

In the people from neighborhood, there is a male neighbor in his 50s who seems to be a traditional religious is addressed by his roughly the same age female neighbors with the combination of a religious address form and honorific male title: *haj aqa*. In return, he addresses them with the same term and feminine honorific title:*haj xanom* (see table 4.30).

Table 4.30: Non-close Neighbors (one woman and one man)

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	male		Female
Age	Around 50		Around 40
Social Class	working class		working class
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Religious term + honorific term		
Example	“Haj <i>xanom</i> ” (Mrs. /Haji)		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Religious term + honorific term		
Example	“Haj <i>aqa</i> ” (Mr. /haji)		

As mentioned in chapter two, the term could be referred to an addressee who seems to be religious and old in general. With regards to pronoun of address the mutual V form was exchanged. The combination of influence of gender factor and social distance and also their level of closeness and low frequency of contact is the reason for the choice of abovementioned address forms.

4.2.4. Mom's Guest Addressing

From the data selected and the language analysis of the mom's guest the following finding can be presented. Considering the social class, it can be noted that the social class of the addressee played a crucial role in the choice of address forms. For instance, the data presents that the profession of the addressee is crucial factor to determine the address forms. It should be noted that some professions carries more prestige in Iranian society. In other words, the more the addressees had a higher level of profession, the more he/she got respect from the speaker especially when the speaker is from working class.

Therefore, they are addressed with the profession title which worked as a mode of address. With regards to pronoun of address regardless of age, they are addressed with the V form. Furthermore, the influence of social class on address behavior of spouse was another interesting finding. Couples with different socio-cultural background had different address behaviors. For example, the usage of more intimate forms of address is low between spouses with traditional background. Hence, the influence of age factor in this respect should not be ignored.

Considering the nominal form of address, the younger couples easily uses FN to address each other. Thus, the mutual usage of address pronoun among family members indicated that the age factor is not influential factor in this respect. In contrast, outside of the circle of the family, age plays a significant role in choice of address pronouns. It means older participants receive the polite form of pronoun regardless of the gender and social class of both interlocutors. The common pattern of addressing opposite genders with high degree of social distance is the usage of the V form. Although, an alternative usage of the T form towards an opposite gender is observed in few contexts. The usage could be an indicator of gradual changes towards the decreasing gender verbal differences. It should be briefly mentioned that the high degree of intimacy and social distanced are the two influential in choice of address forms. It means the high degree of intimacy causes the mutual usage of the T form and FN. In contrast, the high level of social distance causes the mutual usage of the V form and TLN.

4.3. A SEPARATION

A Separation or "The Separation of Nader from Simin" is a 2011 drama film written and directed by Asghar Farhadi. It focuses on an Iranian middle-class couple and their problems as it can be seen in the plot. *A Separation* is a very famous Iranian film which won the Academy Award for Best Foreign Language Film in 2012, becoming the first Iranian film to win the award. It received the Golden Bear for Best Film and the Silver Bears for Best Actress and Best Actor at the 61st Berlin International Film Festival, becoming the first Iranian film to win the Golden Bear. It also won the Golden Globe for Best Foreign Language Film. The film was nominated for the Best Original Screenplay Academy Award too, a rare occurrence for a foreign language film (wikipedia, 2012).

4.3.1. The plot

Nader and Simin have been married for 14 years and live with their 11-year-old daughter Termeh in Tehran. The family belongs to the urban upper middle-class and the couple is on the verge of separation. Simin wants to leave the country with her husband and daughter, as she does not want Termeh to grow up under the prevailing conditions. This desire is not shared by Nader. He is concerned for his elderly father, who lives with the family and suffers from Alzheimer's disease. When Nader decides to stay in Iran, Simin files for divorce. Simin leaves her husband and daughter and moves back in with her parents and Nader hires Razieh, a young, deeply religious woman from a poor suburb, to take care of his father while he works at a bank. Whilst Razieh is cleaning, Nader's father wanders out of the apartment and Razieh runs to find him, and sees him at a newsstand from across a busy road.

The next day, Nader and Termeh return to an empty house. Termeh discovers her grandfather lying unconscious on the floor in his bedroom, with one of his arms tied to the bed. When Razieh returns, an argument ensues between her and Nader. He tells her to leave after accusing her of having stolen money from his room (unbeknownst to Nader, Simin was shown taking the money in an earlier scene to pay movers).

Razieh returns to protest her innocence, and to request her payment for the day's work. Outraged, Nader shoves Razieh out of the apartment and she falls in the stairwell and hurries out of the building. Hodjat's sister later calls Simin to inform her that Razieh is in the hospital, and they discover that she has suffered a miscarriage.

Nader is called for court and argued with Razieh's husband Hodjat. Eventually, everyone, including Hodjat's creditors, meets at the home of Razieh and Hodjat to consummate the payment for Razieh miscarriage. Nader, still wary about the true cause of

Razieh's miscarriage (and it is likely he does not know about her getting hit by a car) writes the check and, knowing that Razieh is deeply religious, slyly says he will give it to Hodjat, on the condition that Razieh swears on the Qur'an that his actions were the cause of her miscarriage. Despite Hodjat's urgings, Razieh cannot bring herself to swear, as she believes it will be a sin that could endanger their daughter.

The last scene is at the family court, and the three: Nader, Simin, and Termeh, are wearing black, indicative in Persian culture of a death in the family, implying that Nader's father has died. The couple file for a divorce once again, despite Nader no longer having to take care of his father. The judge makes their separation permanent, and asks Termeh about which parent she chooses to live with. She tearfully says that she has made a decision, but asks that the judge tell her parents to wait outside in the hallway before she tells him. Nader and Simin are shown waiting silently and separately in the hallway, on opposite sides of a glass partition, and the credits roll. Termeh's decision is never revealed to the audience (Wikipedia, 2012).

4.3.2. Characters and their Social class

We can categorize A separation's character by social class, in seven parts as shown below:

1. Nader's Family which consists of Nader, Simin, Termeh and Nader's father.
 - Nader is an educated man with a governmental job, who seems to belong to the middle level of society by thinking and financial issues.
 - Simin is an educated woman, she works in a language school, she plays Piano, she listen to the Shaiarian's song⁴, she wants to emigrate to another country, she has a car for herself and she is not belong to the traditional part of society, and actually, she is an intellectual woman.
 - Termeh is a high school student who belong to the upper mediate family.
 - Nader's father is an old man who has Alzheimer's and needs care because of his disease.
2. Razieh's family consists of Razieh, Hodjat and her sister. All members of this family belongs to the working class of society with some differences:
 - Hodjat is an unemployed and obligor man who loves their family; her five years' daughter and his wife. He is not a traditional man and he only wants to

⁴ Shajarian is the most famous Iranian traditional singer who is s political protester to the government.

protect his family. Also he is poor, but he doesn't want to earn money because of the situation which his wife made.

- Razieh is a woman from a low class of society, but she is not a traditional woman; in bad financial situation she works to help her husband. She is religious too.
- Hodjat's sister is like Razieh and Hodjat by social class, she has a good relationship with her sister in law which usually we can't see in traditional part of society.

3. Teachers who are educated women. Mrs. Qahrai is Termeh's tutor also. who is a religious woman. She wants to tell the truth always.
4. Workers who belongs to the lower class.
5. Simin's family who belongs to the middle class.
6. Neighbors, who seems to belong to the upper mediate class because generally, people who are in one social class live in one apartment.
7. Judge, an educated man.

4.3.3. Linguistic analysis

There are four groups for linguistic analysis: family members, teachers, strangers, employee and employers and neighbors.

- **Family Members**

With regards to social class, the address behavior of both young couples having different social class was the same. In table 4.31, spouses' conversation is categorized.

Table 4.31: Spouses' Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	female		Male
Age	Around 32		Around 37
Social Class	Middle class		middle class
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	First name		
EX	Nader		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	first name		
EX	Simin		

As seen, addressing the spouse with FN and exchanging the mutual T form was the address behavior of both middle class and working class couple towards their spouse. With regards to the formality of context, they exchanged the T form and singular verb form even in formal context such as in a court or police office. For example, in the court the educated couple in their argument tried to humiliate teach other; therefore, they addressed each other with the stressed T form.

The increase of level of closeness between two generations is observed in the interaction of the mother in low and her son in low (table 4.32). With regards to nominal forms of address, the mother in low is addressed with the kinship term *maman* “mom” and used the first name to address her son in low. The kinship term *maman* is a rather new and informal term which is developing and even getting used to address the spouse parents and indirectly shows sort of closeness.

Table4.32: Mother in law and Son in laws’ Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Female		Male
Age	Around 45		Around 37
Social Class	Middle class		middle class
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	First name		
Example	Nader		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Kinship term		
Example	Maman ‘mom’		

As the importance of age factor in choice of pronoun of address, the mother in low is received by her son in law with V form. In return, she uses the T form to address him. The asymmetrical usage of pronoun can be explained as the importance of age factor in Iran which older people should get more respect, while addressing the younger with the T form shows an attempt to increasing the level of intimacy from the mother in low.

The normal address pattern of the middle class man and his teenage daughter was the mutual usage of T from. With regards to free form he receives the KT baba ‘dad’ (table 4.33). In some situation there is an invention usage of kinship term towards the daughter. Two aspects of address inversion are observed when the father, Nader, addresses his youth daughter with “*baba*” (dad); the same kinship term which he is addressed by her daughter. In

one scene which he argues with his daughter instead of addressing the daughter with her FN he addressed her with the kinship term *baba* in address inversion usage.

Table4.33: Father and Daughters' Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	male		Female
Age	Around 37		Around 14
Social Class	Middle class		middle class
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	First name / kinship term		
Example	Termeh		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Kinship term		
Example	Baba		

The usage in this case is the authoritative aspect of inversion. While in another scene when she come to visit her father in the police office she is addressed with kinship term *baba* by his father; the usage shows an affection aspect of the address inversion in this situation. With regards to pronoun of address, in one scene he addresses the daughter with V form. Switching to the V form for addressing, serves as a means of decreasing the level of closeness. With this linguistic device he put himself in a superior position to show his power in order to get his request done.

From the data it could said that with regards to family members the address behavior of both families with two different social classes follows the same pattern. In table 4.34 it can be seen some example of this conversation:

Table4.34: Mother and Daughters' Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	female		female
Age	Around 7		Around 32
Social Class	Working class		working class
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Kinship term		
Example	Maman		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Frist name /kinship term		
Example	Somaye		

Children are received FN and the kinship term *baba* and *maman* are used towards father and mother. With regards to pronoun of address T form is exchanged among the family members.

• **Addressing in the School**

The address behavior of the female teacher in Termehs' school and the parents of her pupil (as seen in table 4.35) are exchanging the mutual polite form of pronoun of address: *shoma* with regards to nominal form of address they address each other with TLN. The address pattern shows the lack of intimacy and keeping social distance. Even though the teacher is the private teacher of their daughter as well, their address behavior at home is the same as the school.

Table4.35: Teacher and Parents' Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	→	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	female		Male
Age	Around 31		Around 37
Social Class	middle class		middle class
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Honorific title + family name		
Example	Aqa-ye		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	→	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Honorific title + last name		
Example	Xanom Qahrayi		

The teacher address her youth pupil (table 4.36) with her first name, in return, she is addressed with TLN..

Table4.36: Teacher and Pupil's conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	□	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Female		Female
Age	Around 31		Around 14
Social Class	Middle class		middle class
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	First name		
Example	Terme		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	□	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Honorific title+Last name		
Example	Xanom Qahrayi		

The form of address is common and normal address pattern for addressing the teacher in Iran. With regards to pronoun of address the asymmetrical usage was exchanged. It means the

teacher revived the V form and addressed the pupil with the T form. Apart from the factor of age the position of her was the reason this unequal address pattern,

In the school because of the formality of the context the same gender teachers used TLN to address their colleges(table 4.37). With regards to pronoun of address the V form was exchanged as an influence of the formality of context

Table 4.37: Teachers' Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	□	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Female		Female
Age	Around 31		Around 38
Social Class	Middle class		middle class
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Honorific title + Last name		
Example	Xanom+.Æmiri		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	□	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Honorific title+Last name		
Example	Xanom Qahrayi		

- ***Strangers' addressing***

The judge is addressed with the religious title of *haj aqa* by the middle class educated couple. In this situation the term is used to an unknown religious addressee with high official position and serves as a mode of respect towards the addressee. It should be briefly mentioned that this address behavior has been got common after the revolution. And also should be considered after Islamic revolution, judges should have a religious position to choose as a judge.(table 4, 38).

Table 4.38: Judge and his Visitors' Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	□	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Female		Male
Age	Around 32		Around 50
Social Class	Middle class		middle class
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Religious title+ honorific title		
Example	Haj aqa		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	□	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Honorific title		
Example	Xamom		

In return, judge addresses them with fem/mas honorific title since they are considered as an unknown address. It means judge wants to have a distance by his visitors to be able to have justice. With regards to pronoun of address the mutual V form was exchanged as an influence of the low level of familiarity and the formality of context

In another scene in police office, the following address behavior can be described (table 4.39).

Table4.39: Police officer and Naders' Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	□	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Male		Male
Age	Around 37		Around 45
Social Class	Middle class		middle class
Pronouns		V / T	
Address forms	Religious title+ honorific title		
Example	Haj aqa		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	□	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V / T	
Address forms	Honorific title		
Example	Aqa		

In this scene the police officer addressed Nader, as an accuser he addresses him with honorific title in return he received the combination of religious term and honorific title: *haj aqa*. The same address terms are exchanged between the police officer and the working class couple. With regards to verb form of address the asymmetrical usage was exchanged; the officer used the second person singular form of the verb since he was in the position of power.

As regards to pronoun of address, at the beginning of their conversation mutual V form is exchanged among them. But as the conversation turns into argument and the accuser started to complain the address behavior of them is changed; The police officer shifts from the V form to the T form regardless of the gender and social class of the accused. The usage of the T form in this situation shows the superiority of the police officer.

In the above-mentioned argument in the police office the address behavior of the female care taker changed towards the police officer (table 4.40). When the police get angry of the husband behavior and wants to arrest him, she switches to the T form to address the police officer and asks him to treat the husband as if he was his brother. It seems she used this shift as a strategy to convince the officer to be kinder with the husband. The T form works as

a mode of increasing the level of intimacy and familiarity. In return, as mentioned above the police officer also switched to T form to address her.

Table4.40: Police officer and Razihs' Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	□	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Female		Male
Age	Around 28		Around 45
Social Class	working class		middle class
Pronouns		V / T	
Address forms	Religious title+ honorific title		
Example	"Haj aqa"		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	□	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V / T	
Address forms	Honorific title		
Example	"Xanom"		

It should be noted that, generally the one who is socially superior initiates to switch from the V form to the T form; especially in the situation which speaker needed to show and his/her position and power.

The asymmetrical usage of pronoun is observed in the scene when the young male soldier easily uses the T form toward the female complainant and the male accuser regardless of their social class (table 4.41). It seems that he simply tried to show his higher status to them. With regards to free form of address the honorific title was exchanged.

Table4.41: Soldier police and Razihs' Conversation

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	□	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Female		Male
Age	Around 28		Around 24
Social Class	working class		middle class
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	honorific title		
Example	"aqa"		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	□	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Honorific title		
Example	"Xanom"		

Generally, stranger or people with low frequency of contact are addressed with only honorific title regardless age and gender. With regards to pronoun of address the mutual V form was exchanged.

In another scene which is a conversation among a young male soldier and the working class couple and Nader as an accuser, the asymmetrical usage of pronoun is observed. The soldier easily uses the T form toward the female complainant and the male accuser regardless of their social class. In return, he receives the V form. It seems that he simply tries to show his higher status to them. With regards to free form of address the honorific title is exchanged.

Generally, stranger or people with low frequency of contact are addressed with only honorific title regardless age and gender of both interlocutors. With regards to pronoun of address the mutual V form is exchanged.

- **Employee and employer's addressing**

The address behavior of two young couples with two different social class and background will be described as follow. It seems that their different social status influenced their address behavior toward each other. The two agemate female interlocutors used the honorific title *xanom* to address each other. (table 4.42)

Table4.42: Caretaker and her female Employer

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	□	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Female		female
Age	Around 28		Around 32
Social Class	working class		middle class
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	honorific title		
Example	xanom		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	□	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		T	
Address forms	Honorific title		
Example	Xanom		

While, with regards to pronoun of address the asymmetrical forms is exchanged; the middle class used the T form toward the working class; in return, she is received the V form. The asymmetrical usage of address term shows that normally those with a higher social status initiate to use the familiar form. The T form in this situation served as a means of decreasing the level of intimacy and try to decreasing the social distance. While, the care-taker who just started to work at their house class kept to address her with polite form of pronoun.

The address behavior of the female caretaker and the man she is caring for his father, Nader can be seen in table 4.43. With regards to nominal form of address is exchanging the fem / mas honorific title in all of the situations. While with regards to pronouns of address, an alternative usage was observed the mutual V form is exchanged in normal situation. But there

is a scene in which the man started to argue with her because she left the house and his father unattended and moreover he accuses her that she had stolen money as well. In this situation he shifts to stress T from with a loud intonation, while the female still was addressing him with the V form.

Table4.43: Caretaker and her male Employer

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	□	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Female		Male
Age	Around 28		Around 37
Social Class	working class		middle class
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Honorific title		
Example	aqa		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	□	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V / T	
Address forms	Honorific title		
Example	Xanom		

As mentioned in chapter 2 in Iranian culture, the norm of address pronoun of opposite gender with low level of intimacy and contact is exchanging the V form. But in this situation the argument was the reason for the violation of address norm. Since, by the usage he made an unequal relation in order to show his superiority position. In contrast, the female did not shifted her address pronoun because of she is socially in a lower position. In addition in Iran generally woman are more conservative than men for violation from language norms therefore she with a traditional and religious background tried to keep the social distance towards opposite gender. An alternative usage of address pronouns is seen in the interaction of the working class man and the middle class. Their normal address pattern is exchanging the honorific title and the mutual V form. But as they start to argue with each other they easily shift to stress the T form in order to humiliate the addressee.

- ***Neighbors' Addressing***

Neighbors who had been living in a flat but having low frequency of contact, regardless of their age and gender exchanged mutual V form.

As a free form TLN is used. In the movie the middle age female neighbor were addressed with the combination of honorific title and family name of her husband. It is mentioned before that usually women are addressed with the husband family name by the people from the neighborhoods.

Table 4.44. Neighbors

	<i>Speaker 1</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Speaker 2</i>
Gender	Female		Male
Age	Around 48		Around 37
Social Class	middle class		middle class
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	honorific title+ last name		
Example	Aqa-ye.....		
	<i>Speaker 2</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Speaker 1</i>
Pronouns		V	
Address forms	Honorific title + last name		
Example	Xanom Kæmali		

4.3.4. Addressing of “A Separation”

The main findings point of the address behavior in “A separation” will be presented as follow. The movie focused on the contrast of two families with two different social classes. Therefore, their sociocultural background obviously affected their address behavior. With regards to addressing families members both family followed the same address pattern.

Furthermore, the asymmetrical usage of pronoun of address is the influence by the inequality of social class, when the one participant considers as a superior participant. In the movie a superior participant mostly seems to be those professions with higher level of power, such as the judge, police officer, and teacher. Then the speaker with abovementioned professions initiate to use the T form.

Moreover, the addressing behavior is affected by the situation, which arguments caused a shift form the V form into the T form. For example, the address pronoun of two opposite genders having different social classes changes as above in the arguments. However, considering the gender factor women are more conservative to follow the norm of address pattern when it is came to arguments. The effect of age factor on address form is significant in the cases when the addressee was old and with a high level social distance. Additionally, the level of intimacy and social distance is easily influenced by the context of situation.

Chapter summary

In this chapter the data analysis of the address forms was presented. The data was selected from three Iranian movies. Each movie was analyzed separately and contains three sections. In the first part the plot of the movie was given. The language data analysis presented in the second. In the data analysis the selected address form was discussed and explained with regards to the influence of social factors. Then after each analysis the data presented in separated table which showed the social factor of interlocutor and the address forms were exchanged. In the last part the short summary of the analysis was presented. In the following paragraph a brief summary of all of the analysis will be given.

The data analysis confirmed that the choice of proper address forms was affected by the influence of social factors and their interaction. Moreover, sometimes certain factor had a significant influence; while, in different context of situation another factor played the main role. Additionally, in some cases it was the combination of factors that made the appropriate address forms to be chosen.

As mentioned before address forms are usually classified into main groups namely pronouns and nominal forms of address (Braun, 1988). Therefore, the study analyzed the pronouns of address and nominal forms of address in Persian language. In the following paragraphs the influence of social factors on the choice of pronouns and nominal forms will be summarized.

The effect of nonlinguistic factors on the choice of proper address pronouns can be summarized as follow. With regards to social class, in normal context the V form was exchanged as a default form. However, by changing the situation into argument or compromise the asymmetrical usage of pronouns was observed. This means the participant who was regarded as a superior received the V form and addressed the inferior with the T form. In the argument the changes showed the increasing the degree of social distance; while, in compromise situation the shift was sign of increasing the level of intimacy. It should be noted that it was the one with higher social status who initiated for the shift. Considering the influence of age factor on the choice of address pronoun, it can be said that age made an asymmetrical usage of address pronoun when the age differences of the speaker and the addressee was big/spread. Considering the fact that in Iranian society the older people get more respect form younger, the older participants revived the V form regardless of the social class and gender of both interlocutors. The mutual usage of the V from showed that the

influence of age was diminished inside the circle of the family. The usage showed the changes towards familiarity and equality.

Gender is the complicated factor in Iranian society. The data showed that the gender is related to the degree of social distance and the level of intimacy. Therefore, when the degree of social distance between two opposite gender was big the mutual usage of the V form was exchanged between them regardless of their age. However, there were some situations such as argument and compromise which made a switch to usage of the T form.

The main points of address behavior of nominal forms will be presented as follow. It should be noted that in the choice of address forms the level of intimacy and social distance played an important role. The data showed that the usage of FN is significantly linked to the high degree of intimacy and closeness. In other words, as long as there was not such level of intimacy, the interlocutors avoided to address each other with FN. For instance, when the interlocutors had a high frequency of contact but that were not in a close circle of acquaintance of each other they did not address each other with only FN. Hence, there were other patterns of addressing exchanged which will be listed as follow. The combination of FN and endearment terms was one strategy for addressing. Addressing the neighbors with TLN, TFN, and FNT were common address patterns. With strangers and people of low frequency of contact the honorific term was exchanged. Religious term of address was used mostly in regards to the addressee with a traditional and religious background. Professions also were used as a mode of address terms. Those terms generally showed the respect and politeness of speaker to the addressee. Kinship terms and FN were common address forms for addressing the family members.

The data also showed that educated people were more concerned to follow the politeness principle, even in arguments. It seems that they are more sensitive to social-cultural codes of politeness behavior. Therefore when it came to usage of address form adjusting the address term with different interlocutors and different contexts was better among educated people. It can be said that the more advanced knowledge of language provide them the more advanced usage of proper form of address.

With regard to context it should be added that in a verbal argument the usage of politeness marker is reduced. Anger and arguments are usually the cases which some norms of society seem to be easier broken rather than under normal condition. For instance, in an argument the tendency to shift from T form to V form was more observed. Based on the data from the movie, generally switching from the V form to the T form was more frequent among men rather than women. In other words, men regardless of either their or addressee's social

class easier switch to the T form even in formal situation and even toward to female addressee. It can be said that the tendency to following the norms could indirectly remind the fragile role of women in man-dominated society, even among upper-middle class female.

The data showed also in Persian language kinship terms can be used in address inversion usage. Moreover, fictive usage of address forms and overgeneralizing of nominal forms of address was also observed among the data. Additionally, increasing the usage of 2nd person singular verb form showed the tendency towards increasing the level of familiarity between interlocutors.

Then we can summarize the data showed and supported that the choice of address form in Persian also are highly linked with the extra linguistic factors such as age, gender, social class of both interlocutors. The influence of context and the level of intimacy and the degree of social distance as relevant factor should be taken into consideration. Furthermore, the data showed the gradual change towards equality and familiarity.

Pronoun of address the mutual usage of the T form is increasing. The usage was significant among the member of the family regardless of their gender and age and it was common among different social classes. This could be a sign towards increasing familiarity and equality. The argument also was the case when the politeness principles easily broken. For instance, normally there was a shift from the V form into the T form was observed. the usage is serves as a mode of humiliating the addressee. The combination of age factor with social distance normally caused the asymmetrical usage of the pronoun. It means the older revived the V form. Superiority was another factor for the downwards usage of address pronoun. This means those who regarded as a superior addressee received the V form. it should be noted that normally superior address is the one who initiate for using the T form.

The combination of gender factor and social distance caused the mutual usage of the V form exchange between two opposite gender. Although, the alternative shifting of T/V forms was observed in collected data which could be indicate the gradual changes on address form in Persian. The level of intimacy and degree of social distance were as relevant factors in the choice of address form.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter includes the conclusions and recommendation for future study by focusing on the research objective set forth in chapter one. These conclusions of the research findings are based on the factors which are mentioned in chapter one; age, gender and social class. In chapter 1 I analyzed three Iranian movies, and in the present chapter I will present the main findings. It was my hypothesis (see chapter 1) that the usage of address pronouns/ address terms would be related to social variables such as gender, age, and social class, but that context also would play a part.

Summary of findings

In order to choose a proper form of addressee any speaker evaluates interlocutors' status with the socially constructed rules.

This study has tried to describe those situations in which the participants' address each other and to show how different social classes address other people and what factors affect the choice of addressing forms, but note again that the findings concern three movies only and generalization to Persian as a whole therefore is not safe.

Below I have summed up the results related to the social factors social class, age and gender (as well as other conclusions related to the Persian addressing forms).

- ***Social class***

Social class has a strong effect on the choice of address forms and is one of the important factors of addressing:

1. Occupation which can be classified as a subgroup of social class, plays an important role in the choice of address forms.
2. Education and occupation have an important position in addressing.
3. Educated people are more concerned to appropriate/adjust the term of address in comparison with a wealthy but less educated group.
4. Middle-class are more advanced on the ability of shifting of addressing regarding on different context and interlocutors.
5. It seems educated people have more variation in address terms, and the address terms may be more differentiated in changing contexts among the upper and middle-class in comparison with the working class.
6. The use of polite pronouns of address and non-use of swearing address forms are more common among the educated group of people. It seems that they may have more

knowledge of social-cultural codes of politeness behavior as well as are more sensitive and aware of the usage of those terms.

7. Although wealth, education and occupation are regarded as main factors in determining social class, from the data it shows that a wealthy person and an educated person can have different in address behavior.

- ***Age and Gender***

Age and gender are also discussed in this research which and may be summarized as follows:

1. Nonverbal factors such as age and gender affect the verbal and linguistic factors such as address forms' pronoun and honorifics.
2. Men regardless of either their own or addressee's social class switch more easily from the V form to the T form even in formal situations and even toward to female addressees.
3. The tendency to follow the norms of society could indirectly remind the fragile role of women in man-dominated society, even among middle class females.
4. In an argument the tendency to shift from the V form to the T form and generally switching to the T form with a loud voice is more frequent among men rather than women.
5. Same gender addressing is different from addressing the opposite gender. Although the degree of formality is important, same gender people generally use more intimate terms to address than different gender collucutors.
6. Regardless of the social class a young child simply addresses her or his parents with the T form. With regards to address a distant relative the T form is common.
7. In general old people still get respect even by the very young generation.

- ***Other conclusions***

1. In order to choose a proper form of addressee any speaker evaluates interlocutors' status with the socially constructed rules.
2. Based on socio-cultural background and personality, speakers choose the form of address regardless of social culture of the address.
3. A verbal argument is a context in which the usage of politeness markers is reduced.
4. Anger and arguments are usually the cases which some norms of society seem to be easier broken rather than under normal condition.

5. All social factors such as age, social class and gender are influenced by the level of intimacy between the interlocutors. The shift into the T form is used when the discourse attempts to be conciliatory, and this increases the level of intimacy.
6. Since address behavior is influenced by the degree of intimacy, when participants do not know each other quite well or with unknown addressee, the mutual usage of the V form occurs.
7. To address someone, who has been met one time, or is totally stranger, using surname and the V form is a default address form regardless of gender, age and social class. One may also address strangers with only honorific title *mas/fam* “*aqa, xanom*.”
8. The importance and influence of the context of situation is also very visible on the changes of address behavior of the interlocutors. Different situations made a great influence on the choice of address term and with regards to nominal form address other interlocutors addressed them with their profession.
9. By choosing certain forms of address the speaker can show his/her own attitude towards the addressee, his own status in the society, the social relation between speaker and address, their background; those are reflected in address forms.
10. If the social distance is great they tend to use the polite address form towards each other regardless of their age and gender and social class.
11. The usage of the T form and the first name is common between those who have a high degree of intimacy regardless of social factors. In addition in an argument the T form is used in order to humiliating the addressee.

Recommendations

This study has addressed the changes in addressing behaviour in Iranian context. Based on the above conclusions, several recommendations are suggested for sociolinguistics educators. The findings of the present research propose two main recommendations:

First, further research should look at other factors and their effect on addressing behaviour. The present study should be considered as a preliminary investigation.

Second, study is needed to demonstrate the relationship between the other factors such as culture, ethnic and even geographic situation on addressing behaviour. The findings of this study are limited to the sample of three movies which produced after Islamic revolution only.

Thus, further research on addressing behaviour concerning the effect of ethnic and other social and cultural factors should be carried out. In addition, as the present study

considered the movies produced after Islamic revolution, it is recommended that future research consider those movies produced before that time.

REFERENCES:

1. Asdjodi, M. 2001. "A Comparison between Ta'arof in Persian and Limao in Chinese". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* .(148) .71- 92.
2. Bateni, M. R. (1975) *Four Article on Language*. Tehran: Agah.
3. Beeman, W. 2001. "Emotion and Sincerity in Persian Discourse: Accomplishing the Representation of Inner States". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* .(148) .31- 57.
4. Beeman, W. (1986) *Language, Status, and Power in Iran*. Bloomington : Indiana University Press.
5. Braun, F. 1988. *Terms of Address: Problem of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures*. Berlin, New York. Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
6. Brown, P. & S. Levinson. 1980. "Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena". *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction*. Esther N. Goody (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Brown, R. & A. Gilman. 1972. "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity". *Language and Social Context*. Pier Paolo Giglioli (ed.). Penguin Education. 252- 281.
8. Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
9. Fasold, R. 1990. *Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
10. Foley, W. A. 1997. *Anthropological Linguistics: An Introduction*. Blackwell Publishers.
11. Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: an Analysis of ritual Elements in Social Interaction. *Psychiatry*, 18: 213-31. In Laver and Hutcheson (1972).
12. Goffman, E. (1976) *Interaction Ritual*. Garden City, NY : Doubledy.
13. Goodenough, M. 1964. "Language and Culture". *Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology*. D. Hymes (ed.). 50-76.
14. Hodge, R. & Kress, G. (1996). *Language as Ideology*. London & New York: Routledge.
15. Holmes, J. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman
16. House, J. 2005. "Politeness in Germany". *Politeness in Europe*. L. Hickey & M. Stewart (eds.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 13-28.
17. 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.

18. Koutlaki, S. A. 2002. "Offers and Expressions of Thanks as Face Enhancing Acts: Tæarof in Persian". *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34, No.12: 1733-1756
19. Labov, W. 1966. *The Social Stratification of English*. New York Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
20. Labov, W. 1972a. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
21. Levinson, S.C. (1987) *Pragmatic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
22. Modarresi Tehrani, Y. 2009. "Changes in the Markers of Politeness and Power in Iranian Culture and the Persian Language". *Journal of Iranian Studies (Iran Kenkyu)*. Vol.5 , 318-342.
23. Modarresi Tehrani, Y. 1391. An introduction into sociolinguistics. Tehran: Institute for Humanities and Cultural Studies.
24. Paulston, C. 1976. "Pronouns of Address in Swedish: Social Class Semantics in a Changing System". *Language in Society*, 5, 356-389.
25. Tannen, D. 1993. "Gender and Discourse". Oxford University Press: Oxford.
26. Tannen, D. 2009. "The Relativity of Linguistic Strategies: Rethinking Power and Solidarity in Gender and Dominance". *The New Sociolinguistics Reader*, N. Coupland and A. Jaworski (eds.). Palgrave Macmillan: 168-186.
27. Trudgill, P. 1974. *Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Penguin Books.
28. Wardhaugh, R. 2002. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. 4th ed. Blackwell Publishing.
29. Watts, R. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
30. Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (eds.). 2001. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage publication Ltd.
31. Yule, G. 1996. "Pragmatics". Oxford: Oxford University Press.

