CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF ADDRESS TERMS

Braun (1988) describe that address terms is an important issue in both theoretical and applied linguistic research, in terms of their usage and patterns. Address terms depend on cultures and languages in their forms, such as the structure of the language (e.g. bound or free forms or pronominal, nominal, verbal) and the socio-cultural relationship appeared via usage of the variant forms. These variations in language and culture make it difficult for linguists to determine the possible universal patterns for the address terms systems. The result of address terms investigation is used in a wide range of application, for example in the formulation of language planning, policy issues within cross-cultural or inter-lingual contexts.

Many studies have researched into the relationship between the use of address terms and other related factors such as cultural, social, and psychological variables in the last four decades. One of these research dimensions is named the co-relational approach, which aims to identify the co-occurrence and co-variation between address terms and factors such as age and sex. However, inherently, the relationship seems to be causal and deterministic, i.e., social and other relevant factors determine and cause the choice of address terms. Brown and Gilman (1960), Brown and Ford (1961), Ervin-Tripp (1972) and many others adapted this idea. The common concept of all these scholars is that address behavior is rule-governed. Brown and Gilman (1960) described the usage of the familiar term (T) and the polite term (V) of the second-person singular pronouns in languages such as Italian, French, German and Spanish, which are reflects

tu and *vous* distinction in French language whereas grammatically there is a singular "you" "tu" (T) and plural "you" "vous" (V) controlled by two semantic factors: "power and solidarity". However, the semantic factors are the co-variation between the pronouns used and the objective relationship existing between the speaker and the addressee. Brown & Gilman (1960) added that, some people may have the power over another people, which enable them to control their behaviors. For example to influence them to use certain polite address terms.

The power semantic is non-reciprocal, for example, the superior may say T and receive V, such, factors like wealth, age, physical strength, sex and institutionalized role in the army can be taken. However, solidarity concerns the common ground and social characteristics that both speaker and the addressee share (e.g. age, regional origin, sex, occupation, race, etc.), and how far they intend to share intimacy. The solidarity semantic is reciprocal. Hence, adding address terms to the turn construction unit (TCU) "within a dyadic interaction can be considered redundant, in that such names do not radically alter the meaning of the utterance, nor do they initially seem to be doing recipiency work" (Rendle-Short, 2007: 1505).

In Brown and Gilman's words, "so long as solidarity was confined to this level, the two dimensional system was in equilibrium [Superior to inferior: T, Inferior to superior: V, Equal and solidarity: T, Equal and not solidarity: V] and it seems that the system has remained here for a considerable time in all European languages" (1960: 258). By means of the extension of the solidarity dimension, which is potentially applicable to all persons addressed, Brown and Gilman (1960: 259) define three categories of persons characterized by their relations to the speaker:

1. (a) Superior and solidarity: T. Ex: Master to faithful servant, parent to son. (b) Superior and not solidarity: T/V. Ex: Employer to employee.

2. (a) Equal and solidarity: T. (b) Equal and not solidarity: V.

3. (a) Inferior and solidarity: T/V. Ex: Son to parent, faithful servant to master. (b) Inferior and not solidarity: V. Ex: Employee to employer.

They also support the opinion that power semantics prevailed until the 19th Century: sons, servants, and employees were called T; parents, masters, and employers were called V (1960: 259). Brown and Gilman's understanding is usefully supplemented by the politeness theories of Robin Lakoff (1973, 1977) and Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987). Lakoff (1973) mentioned that any linguistic choice has to meet the goal of politeness, and the social function of language. The system works the following three principles, the three rules of politeness or rapport: (1) Don't impose (Distance), (2) Give options (Deference), and (3) Be friendly *(Camaraderie). The* use of these rules in interaction creates a style, characteristic of every speaker. For Lakoff (1977), the three strategies are not hierarchical, but form a continuum of communicative preferences. At one end of that continuum is the application of Grice's Cooperative Principle; at the other end is camaraderie.

Brown and Levinson subscribe to some of these ideas in their work *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (1987). According to these authors, the decision about whether and how to employ polite forms depend on the *distance* between the speaker and the hearer (symmetrical relationship), the *relative power* of speaker and hearer (asymmetrical relationship), and the *ranking of impositions* that threaten the *face* of the speaker and the hearer in a particular cultural context.

2.2 TURN-CONSTRUCTION UNIT (TCU)

Sacks et al. (1974), in their paper introduces solution for real challenge facing conversationalists as well as conversational analysts, which is the challenge of avoiding the occurrence of overlapping and gaps during the conversation. However, they introduce the Turn-Construction Unit to organize the turn taking of the conversation. They introduce a mechanism for the organization of turn taking which depends on two components:

(1) a turn-constructional component which deals with the construction of units, turn-constructional units (TCUs), and

(2) a turn-allocation component which deals with the regulation and negotiation of turn allocation at the end of each TCU for the next such unit.

They also divided the turn-construction unit into two main recourses of turn-construction units, syntax and prosody. For syntax the important units in syntax are sentences or clauses "and expansion at their beginnings and ends". Prosody also describes the role of intonation in the turn taking. Tselting (1998: 40) identified TCU as "the smallest interactional relevant complete linguistic unit, in a given context, that is constructed with syntactic and prosodic resources within their semantic, pragmatic, activity-type-specific, and sequential conversational context". However, this study is not concerning with prosody. Schegloff (1996: 55) mentioned that the TCUs are complete turns: "By 'turn-constructional unit,' it may be recalled, we meant to register that these units can constitute possibly complete turns; on their possible completion, transition to a next speaker becomes relevant (although not necessarily accomplished)". Rendle–Short (2009) in his paper found that "mate" is a flexible address term that occurs in the post-TCU position and pre-TCC position. He also identifies how mate-speaker is realized

through the use of address terms. However, he described how mate address term is achieved when attached to acknowledgement, agreement and appreciation.

Park (2010) analyzed the closure relevant *any way as* stand-alone turn construction unit. He found that speaker uses *any way* to close continuing of talk rather than a switch of sequence. However "*any way*" can be found in different potions in pre-position, mid-position and post-position. Each position reflects a different meaning.

Rendle-Short (2009: 1503) describes that the choice of address term and the positioning of address terms varies within the news interview. Journalists seem to use "pre-positioned address terms when addressing politicians either by their institutional role (e.g. Prime Minister) or by title plus last name (e.g. Mr. Howard). Politicians, on the other hand, always address journalists by first name (e.g. Catherine) and have more flexibility in terms of where they position the address term". Whoever, "journalists tend to use address terms as a technique for controlling the organizational aspects of the political news interview, politicians tend to use address terms within adversarial environments, as a resource for taking the turn, for resolving overlapping talk, or for delaying a dispreferred response". This is to say that a politician is more powerful than a journalist, where he is free to address the journalist by his first name or to position address term where he wants during the interview, while; the journalist is less powerful than the politician, where he is committed to address the politician by his institutional role.

2.3 PREVIOUS STUDIES OF ADDRESS TERMS

Ong et al. (1995) in his article addresses the following topics (1) different purposes of medical communication, (2) analysis of doctor–patient communication, (3) specific communication behavior and (4) the influence of communicative behavior on doctor-patient. He identified three different purposes of communication namely (a) creating a good interpersonal relationship, (b) exchanging information and (c) making treatments. The article seems to be much related with this study, where address terms can be used during the exchange of the information between doctors-patients which may create a good interpersonal relationship and solidarity between them.

Archibald (2007) in his study of terms and variation among university students in Ghana investigated the address terms among highly educated youths in a post-colonial contemporary society. The data for this study was derived from observation of both spontaneous and deliberative spoken discourse as well as interview with the university students, The analysis of the data indicates that students generally use naming practices on campus, and besides the academic setting, socio-cultural factors such as gender mood, domain purpose of discourse, presence or absence of a third person and relationship between the speakers influence the use of varied address forms for an addressee.

Xianghong (2006) in his study, A Programmatic Analysis of Address forms in Chinese family and non-family letters, examined how Chinese people formulate their language in addressing behaviors in personal letters according to their social roles and their relationship with recipient. The data of this study consists of 250 actual letters written in Mandarin by native speakers of Chinese. The letters include family letters and non-family letters. The finding reveals that there is a variety of address forms that

Chinese use in personal letters which is a reflection of the diversity elaborateness of their behavior in Chinese written interaction. Chinese people tend to use the kinship term to address non-kin for the sake of establishing and maintaining solidarity and closeness; the choices and distribution of address forms vary with writers of different roles and with their relationship towards recipients; the influence of Chinese culture has a considerable impact on Chinese people's use of address terms in personal letters. However, this article is not concerned with the written form, as the spoken form is more important in the current study where the Sudanese culture influences the way that participants use address terms in Sudanese-doctor-patient communication.

Alrabaa (1985) investigated the influence of social class and political views on changes in address terms. A questionnaire was administrated to 87 Egyptian adults, varied for age, sex and social class. The finding contains predications made by Brown and Gilham (1960), concerning the influence of social class and political view on changes in address system. Age and sex factors are the concerning elements in this study that doctors may use in constructing positive and negative politeness strategies.

Talenoya (1995) provides a comprehensive description of the Japanese address system as used by two groups of speakers: native speakers and American learners of Japanese. A questionnaire was constructed and data were collected from two groups of subjects: Japanese university students in Japan and American student studying Japanese in Indian university. The result of the study shows that the pattern of address used by American learners of Japanese resembled the American system of address. In addition, there is difference in patterns of use between Japanese males and Japanese females. Social status is another important determining factor for both sexes, while closeness of

relationship was seen to be a stronger determining factor among males than among females.

Rendle-Short (2007) in his paper, investigated address terms occurrence among Australian politicians and journalists. The data consists of 16 interviews taken from a corpus of 287 radio and television interviews, described that journalists tend to use pre-positioned address terms when addressing politicians either by title plus last name (e.g. Mr. Howard) or by their institutional role (e.g. Prime Minister). Politicians, however, usually address journalists by first name (e.g. Catherine) and have more flexibility in terms of positioning address terms. Moreover, journalists tend to use address terms as a technique for controlling the organizational aspects of the political news interview, politicians tend to use address terms within adversarial environments, as a resource for taking the turn, for resolving overlapping talk, or for delaying a dispreferred response.

Moreover, Rendle-Short (2009) addressed the use of the term "mate" among the Australian community. The data included 97 examples of talk in which one of the speakers uses the address term 'mate'. He used conversation analysis (CA) to analyze the data. He found that, 'mate' is interpreted positively, for example, when used in opening and closing environments, when attached to assessments, agreements, acknowledgements or appreciations, or when mitigating a speech act. In addition 'mate' is used instead of names or as well as names. 'Mate' is used in conjunction with other address terms such as 'man', 'guys', 'bro' although these are much less common in the Australian context. Moreover, Liu (2009) investigated the use of address forms among customers in Beijing's low-status clothing markets. The data contained 42 stall-holders towards their customers in two low-status clothing markets in Beijing. He found that (1) the quality of address nouns that the stall-holders used is directly determined by the

customers' age and sex, (2) between the stall-holders' age, sex and their use of vocatives, (3) the stall-holders' vocatives usually co-occur with the topic of price, (4) the diversity of address nouns and the prominence of pseudo-kinship terms are considered the special features of the address form choice at the two low-status markets, and (5) address pronouns and self-references reinforce and complement the use of address nouns.

However, Cristobalina (2002) describes the address system in the Spanish of the end of the 16th century and the beginning of the 17th century and in attempting to give an interpretation of this system on the basis of works such as Brown and Gilman (1960), Lakoff (1973, 1977) and Brown and Levinson (1987) .The data are collected from a corpus of several plays from the Spanish Golden Age. The study found out that the relationship between participants in the interaction is not symmetrical; one of them has power or authority over the other. Adding that, the speaker is allowed to choose from a range of possibilities in his/her choice of address forms to reflect and realize his/her intentions. However, regarding address in the family, there are also some differences between different social layers, and the choice of the pronoun forms is socially encoded.

Nevala (2004) also explores the politeness axes, address forms and terms of reference in early English correspondence. He analyzed the Corpus of Early English Correspondence (CEEC), which explored the influence of factors such as relative power and social distance on the use of address forms and reference in the highly stratified society of the Renaissance period. The study found that when the social status of either the addressee or the referent in direct address is very high, it seems to override the influence of social distance. The reasons for the choice of an appropriate term in

reference are more complex, and the parameters set for, e.g., positive and negative politeness is no longer seen as equally valid.

Skewis (2002) analyzed the directive speech acts from dialogue in the novel Ho´nglo´u me`ng. The study shows that other linguistic devices like address terms, particles, the reduplication of verbs, and the presence and sequencing of supportive moves are very important to the communication of politeness. Li (1997) investigated the use of Western-style English names among Chinese Hongkongers to communicate with westerners and among themselves. The data was collected from two sources, (1) newspaper clippings from the Chinese press, and (2) Two questionnaires, for Chinese respondents, and for non-Chinese respondents.

The study found that the Chinese respondents, the use of an English name is very common among young people, and the majority seems to have few or no concern about the missing of Chinese identity. The traditional Chinese address forms do not help to create smooth interpersonal communication on an equal basis. Non-Chinese respondents adopted Chinese names as a way of fitting into the social setup. These adopted, nonetheless, were basically a transliteration of their original Western names into a form that would be pronounceable in Cantonese.

Oyetade (1995) provides a descriptive analysis of the entire system of address forms in Yoruba in western part of Nigeria. The data was collected from short radio and TV plays, unobtrusive observation of actual usage, and introspection. The study shows that the perceived social relationship that exists between the locaters determines the choice made between them. Age, social status, and kinship are the main indicators among the Yoruba. Nevertheless, certain peculiarities are noticeable. For example, the

dichotomy of power vs. solidarity (Brown & Gilman 1960) becomes ambiguous in relation to Yoruba kinship terms of address; therefore, solidarity does not necessarily to show equality among the Yoruba. Compernolle (2008) investigated the use of Second-person pronoun and address strategies in on-line personal ads from Quebec in French language. The data of the study were collected from the on-line dating network Netclub.com during late fall 2006. The study found that there are two main strategies: singular address with *tu* or *vous* singular and plural address with *vous*. *tu* was usually used in general preference for singular address. While young men seem to use plural *vous* fairly often. Moreover, the study found that there are various ways in which *tu* and *vous* are used in on-line personals in utterances such as greetings, descriptions of the desired other, and invitations to contact.

Many sociolinguistic research have found that address terms reflect social relations along the parameters of power and solidarity, with non-reciprocal choice of address terms indicating an asymmetrical relationship (Brown and Gilman 1960), as well as within institutional settings (e.g. Ervin-Tripp, 1972). Poynton (1989) in her discussion of address terms within the Australian context has similarly commented upon the power differential that arises when junior office workers are called by their first name, while also noting that the preference for first name over last name is a typical feature of Australian address terms.

We can conclude that, these studies describe the use of address terms among the societies and within the institutional sittings where explored factors such as relative power and social distance on the use of address terms. Moreover, the relationship between the participants which determines the choice of addresses terms. As well as the choice of address terms can help to create smooth interpersonal communication.

2.4 ASPECTS OF CONVERSATION IN PRAGMATICS

Adigbite (1995) described that pragmatics is concerned about knowledge that participants have and shared. Participants in some positions should be able to use different linguistics patterns in different situations that some time may face, according to the others cultural back ground and mentality, Heritage (1997: 164), such as politician and journalist and doctor and patient. Hence, the way that participants communicate to each other show the degree of social experience those participants have (Hymes, 1962; Saville-Troike, 1987). Pragmatics theory is concerning about the language in use in different social context, where the utterances are achieved in various way of interactions (Hymens, 1962; Austin, 1962; Jacbson, 1960; Searle, 1969). Heritage (1994) describes basic characteristics of conversations as the following (i) there are certain rules that participants have (ii) constitutional texts are impotent for participants, and (iii) inference gives an important marks to "institutional text", (iv). The following elements are necessary to fulfill the above mentioned: (i) evaluation of the role of the participant, (ii) basic structure, (ii) series organization, (iii) lexical choice and (iv) harmonious relationship.

Doctor makes remarkable exchange in diagnostics during doctor-patient communication, because they are powerful to manage the medical interview which can play a big role to improve the patient' condition, Coulthard & Margaret (1976). However, Coulthard & Margaret (1976) added that such conversations are characterized by patients' reaction to the elicited answers, and the matching of all the information to make decisions. Medical personnel, public relations staff, may also contribute to medical communication.

2.5 RELATION BETWEEN DOCTOR AND PATIENT

Patients seem to be subjected to doctors' advice and doctors in their turn give them more information (Davis, 1968). Patients prefer to use doctor terms and expressions because they feel that doctors are not able to understand the description of their illness, and they also feel difficult to describe their illness. Doctors in their turn do not inform patients about their illness in detail, (Shuy, 1976). However emotion sometimes represents a big challenge to doctors in revealing information about patients' illnesses, whereas doctors believe that patients fear about their illness could affect medical decisions and doctors face challenges to inform patients about their illnesses, Ptacek and Eberhardt (1996). Therefore the physician should be more transparent in conveying the information (Milgrom, 1981; Grossman and Hart, 1980; Jung and Kwon, 1988).

Valero-Graces (2002) in his study of interaction between doctor and immigrant of non-speakers of Spanish, comes out with significant findings, e.g. doctors use a lot of bureaucratic expressions, non related information, frequent explanation produce special kind of speech acts, for example: Directive and Commissive. Patients in their turn elicit some information not related with the medical field, use different standards of language, produce unexpected politeness expression, start the conversation, elaborates more than requested in giving the formations of the illness, repeat the same information many times and like doctors to be more direct in their answer, more specific and brief in his answer. Patients sometimes initiate the conversation, but doctors do not show any response (Ashby, 1996).

Adigbite (1995: 502) mentioned that "discourse tact" can be identified as strategies proceeds by participants involved in the discourse in order to provide "value to social interaction". Background knowledge that participant have is considered the basic "source of motivation". Sequence of conversation in social interaction has been identified from the complementing of perspective of "structure and synchronization" (Richardson, 1981; Adegbite, 1995). However, Maynard (1991) described that when authority and expertise providing news and diagnosis the "physicians versions being privilege over the patients versions". Heath (1992) identified that there is a social practice of delivering and receiving diagnosis in medical interaction which can be internationally constitute the physicians as expert and patients in their turn act with them in the same way when they describe their medical conditions.

Nonetheless, Gill (1998) singles out instances in which take faithfully to patients' description of their medical condition. This is despite the fact that patients believe that the doctor is always right, and not the patient. Patients' complete trust of expert diagnosis comes at a price.

Also Perakyla (1998) described that patients' orientation towards physician's authority is equal with patients' orientation towards physicians' accountability for proves of diagnosis. In the hospital when conversation between doctor-patient has taken place, doctors almost initiate the conversation more frequent than patients Coulthard & Ashary (1976). However in a study conducted in Nigeria found that "Unequal power between" herbalists and participants make the herbalists control the turn taking in his benefit (Adigbite, 1995).

2.6 SUMMARY

This chapter deals with addressing behavior and the choice of address terms in various social contexts, and between communicants at various levels of the social status quo. Special attention is given to doctor-patient interactions. Reviewing extensive works on the subject has lent much insight into the determinant factors in addressing behaviors. This knowledge will be crucial in the further construction of the current thesis.