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1. Introduction
Language is essentially a mean of communication. Williamson (1984) sees it as the chief means by which human beings communicate. In the words of Aliakbari and Toni (2008), the first step in every communication seems to be establishing the social relationship which is mostly done via address term such makes the address terms as an important factor in the communication. Language is not only vocabulary and grammar, it is composed of the people’s culture and their norms. Hence, language learning is understanding culture and norms of people who speak it. It manifests the people’s views, opinions and thoughts. According to Hudson (2001), the semantic system of a language is linked to the culture of its speakers. Therefore, the meaning, that a language can express, is tied to the culture of its speakers.

2. Review of the Literature
According to Wei (2005), language has a dual character: both as a means of communication and a carrier of culture. Language without culture is unthinkable, so is human culture without language. A particular language is a mirror of a particular culture. Brown (1994) describes the relation between language and culture as follows: A language is a part of a culture and a culture is a part of a language; the two are intricately interwoven so that one cannot separate the two without losing the significance of either language or culture. In a word, culture and language are inseparable. When it comes to the realm of teaching and learning, as Gao (2006) presents it, the interdependence of language learning and cultural learning is so evident that one can conclude that language learning is culture learning and consequently, language teaching is cultural teaching. Gao further states that foreign language teachers should be aware of the place of cultural studies in a foreign language classroom and attempt to enhance students’ cultural awareness and improve their communication competence. Wang (2008), likewise, asserts ‘foreign language teaching is a foreign culture teaching, and foreign language teachers are foreign culture teachers. Issues of interaction and culture are integral elements of language teaching. Learners must not only be aware of language, but they must be taught how language is used in everyday interaction and what is characteristic in a given culture (Dufva, 1994).
The most general area of the study of language from the point of view of its use is pragmatics. It is primarily concerned with language users - the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction, the effects of their use of language on other participants in an act of communication. Rather than exploring the meaning of words and utterances by themselves, pragmatics deals with what is it those people mean by their utterances in a particular context and how what is said is influenced by the context (the setting, the circumstances, the participants, the distance or closeness (physical, social, conceptual) between them). Pragmatic awareness (i.e. knowledge about language use in the target culture (Dufva, 1994) is very important from the point of view of social interaction. As previously mentioned, learning a language is not only learning the grammar and vocabulary, as the basic grammar is learnt, it comes to learning the pragmatic features it, however, Dufva (1994) believes that when pragmatic awareness is done, it can be claimed that the communication in foreign language is successful. Although in pragmatics, its features are not explicit they are seen in the communicative event and are the central part of it. Some examples of culture-specific features would include mental sets (Sternberg, 1995), schemata (Yule, 1996), scripts (Yule, 1996), speech events (Yule, 1996), sociocultural norms (Barraja-Rohan, 2000), linguistic etiquette (Kasper, 1997), and pragmatic accent (Yule, 1996). Stylistic differences have been mainly studied with reference to the addressee - their age or social group. For sociolinguists especially interesting has been the issue of politeness, the notion developed by pragmatists (Brown and Levinson 1987), which refers to showing awareness of other people's public self-image (face) and can be manifested as positive (showing solidarity) or negative (accepting another's right not to be imposed on). Politeness can be revealed in speaking and writing via using forms of address. The most basic theory about politeness was proposed by Brown & Levinson (1987) which is mainly focused on two aspects of politeness namely positive and negative, and in their theory, address can be used to show both. For example, when the speaker wishes to emphasize his/her close relationship with the hearer or the referent, positively polite formulae like FNs are most often used. In communication, speakers make appropriate linguistic choices in the light of their relationship to the addressee, in order not to make them uncomfortable. In all societies there are sociolinguistic rules for, for instance, polite acceptance or refusal, greetings, conversation topics, forms of address, and these differ cross-culturally. What is acceptable, even desirable linguistic behavior in one society may be unsuitable, even taboo in another. These differences may seem totally random, but they are closely connected with different social values and attitudes of different societies.

One of the most obvious forms of politeness is the forms of address, reflecting social relationships along the social dimensions of distance or solidarity and relative power or status. From Brown and Gilman (1960) on, numerous studies have investigated forms of address, providing significant insights into the social structure, social values and social changes. The choice range between using the first name and the T-pronoun (2nd person singular) to the title + last name formula and the V-pronoun (honorific form, in many languages 2nd person plural) varies not only across different languages and societies, but across social groups of the same society, and through time. For example, the fact that in a certain society V/title+(last) name is used not only for older relatives but parents as well, explained by Brown and Gilman's model (1960) will tell us that it does not indicate only respect for, but also the distance and power of the addressee. Or, the insistence on T/first name address in most American-based multinational companies is a sign not of personal friendships or lack of politeness but of the striving for company solidarity and unity, insistence on shared attitudes and values regardless of the differences in professional status.

Generally speaking, politeness involves taking account of others’ feelings. A polite person selects utterances appropriately to make others feel comfortable. The choice of address terms can be a sign of politeness since it is closely dependent on the interactions’ relationship or social distance (Holms, 1992). In politeness theory (Brown and Levison, 1987), address terms are focused on two aspects of politeness namely positive and negative. Positive politeness is solidarity oriented (it is done when there is intimacy and closeness among people) whereas negative politeness is power and distance oriented it is done when there are power and distance difference among interactants). Positive politeness is achieved via using intimacy and closeness to support or enhance the addressee’s positive face. In such, the speaker is seen as a group member, whose character and personality are known and liked it can be identified via close and intimate address terms. Negative politeness is used when there is socially distance between interactants. Negative politeness is often achieved through address forms of honorifics and titles. Negative politeness is constructed as a means of avoiding face-threatening acts (FTAs), and this can be done by using, e.g., LNs and titles. Watts (1992) repeatedly argues that since forms of address are chosen according to what is usually expected in a social interaction, they cannot be considered as conveying politeness, unless they are used “in excess of what is necessary to maintain the politic behavior of an interaction” (p. 4). Naturally, this raises the whole new range of questions of what linguistic expressions can in the first place be interpreted as being used “in excess” in each communicative situation. Moreover, Watts (2003) generalizes the notion that in “highly institutionalized forms of social interaction” various expressions, such as forms of address,
constitute politic rather than appropriately polite behavior to cover almost all use of address forms. This can hardly be seen as valid in all forms of social interaction, institutionalized or not, and there are bound to be differences, for example, between spoken and written communication. Instead of thinking, as Watts does, that address forms are routinised manifestations of social conventions that can be categorised as politic behaviour, I see that these “conventions” may themselves be looked at from an opposite angle, so that they can be said to work within politeness. Language interaction is not only exchanging information between people. It goes to where the relationship between people is established. Having participated in the conversations, the people’s identities, belongings to a specific culture or group and being close or distance to the others are manifested consciously or unconsciously. All of these can be achieved via address terms that mean the choice of address term shows the intimacy or distance among interactions, it shows the people’s attitudes and feelings to each other. At first sight, the terms used for addressing one another may not seem worthy of so much attention. However, since they play a crucial role in communication and maintaining social relationships between members of a society, they need to be studied in every language and culture. The relationship between people can be easily manifested via the use of address terms, it shows the power and distance among them, sociolinguistics pay much attention to it for findings such relationships all over the world, although several studies were done in Iran in this regard, it needs much attention and more studies in this area.

To Philipsen and Huspek (1985; p.50) “terms of address reflect the social and linguistic background of interactants to a greater extent than other aspects of language”, this is the reason why these items have been the focus of attention by a large number of researchers in the area of sociolinguistics.

According to Yule (2006), address term is a word or phrase for the person being talked to or written to. Oyetade (1995) defines address terms as words or expressions used in interactive, dyadic and face-to-face situations to designate the person being talked to. Leech (1999) considers that terms of address are an important formulaic verbal behavior well recognized in the sociolinguistic literature as they signal transactional, interpersonal and deictic ramifications in human relationships.

To Brown and Levinson (1987) these forms are vital linguistic mechanisms by which a speaker’s attitude toward, and evaluation of, his or her relationship with another speaker is mirrored. By appropriate use of address terms, people identify themselves as part of a social group while an inappropriate choice of address ceases good interaction. They function as an indicator of interlocutors’ social status as well as their social distance, showing their emotions to the other side and a means of saving one’s face (Akindele, 2008).

As a universal concept in all languages of the world, there is little question about the meaning and function of ‘address terms’. Linguistically, Braun (1988) defines the term as a means of “initiating contact.” He indicates that address terms often designate the interlocutors but not necessarily so, since their literal and lexical meanings can differ from or even contradict the addressee’s personal and social features. For instance, in some cultures like Iranian and Arabic communities, a girl may address her friend’s mother as ‘aunt’ to show respect to her though there is no blood relation between them. To Afful (2006b) address terms refer to the linguistic expression by which a speaker designates an addressee in a face-to-face encounter. Oyetade (1995) defines address terms as words or expressions used in interactive, dyadic and face-to-face situations to characterize the person being talked to. Keshavarz (2001) defines the address terms as linguistic forms for addressing others in the conversation. Dickey’s (1996) defines the address terms as linguistic reference to the addressee, and he finds it as a broad term and classifies it. In his classification, he classified them to bind and free forms. Bound morphemes are those integrated into the syntax of a sentence and free forms are those not integrated in this way. Apart from the linguistic definition of terms of address, it is important to consider the social function and meaning of address forms Murphy (1988) view, address forms are socially driven phenomena. This feature is manifested when linguistic forms are used for addressing others and shows the complex relationship between people. (Paulston1976). All meanings of forms of address refer to the fact that these forms have their roots in the socio-cultural context of the community where they are used. Leech (1999) cited in Afful (2006) considered terms of address as “important formulaic verbal behaviors well recognized in the sociolinguistics literature to signal transactional, interpersonal and deictic ramifications in human relationships.” To Afful (2006) terms of address are an important part of verbal behavior through which “the behavior, norms and practices of a society can be identified.” Also, Parkinson (1985) states those terms of address can function as a very important treasure trove of social information. To him, the form of an utterance and the way it is said encode not only a referential meaning, but also “encode much information about who the speaker believes he is who he believes the addressee is what he thinks their relationship is. Forms of address are rooted in sociocultural contexts. Address terms are defined by many scholars. In Oyetade (1995) definition, address terms are words or expressions used in interactive, dyadic and face-to-face situations engaging a person in the talk. Leech (1999) finds I an important verbal behavior for signaling the interpersonal, transactional and deictic splitting within communicative events among people.
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To Afful (2006a) knows it a verbal behavior for manifesting the behavior, norm and practices of society others believed that it can be very good for sociolinguistics since it shows that how interpersonal relationships can be socially and strategically constructed (Morford 1997). Address terms in different speech communities are worth study. They are likely to be different because different languages have different linguistic resources to express what is culturally permissible and meaningful. Moreover, speakers use address terms to negotiate or transform a cultural system (Fitch 1991, Morford 1997) and issues such as sexuality, age, ethnicity and religion can also be inferred and realized from address terms (Afful, 2006a).

Brown and Gilman (1960) pronominal address system highlighted the semantic power and solidarity in relation to address terms. Since then good numbers of studies, with much broader scope and depth, have emerged. Brown and Ford (1964) focused on intimacy and status, Hymes (1967) studied social distance, Pride (1971) approached formality and informality, and Moles (1974) explored confidence and respect. Consequent studies on address terms focused on other languages and support the view that address forms identify and construct cultural beliefs (Manjulakshi, 2004). Terms of address are “words and phrases used for addressing” (Braun, 1988). They show the kind of relations exist between addressee and addressor. These are culture-specific elements that worth being studied cross-culturally. “Terms of address constitute an important part of verbal behavior through which, the behavior, norms and practices of a society can be identified” (Afful, 2006a). As Daher (1984) mentions “terms of address are the best example of the interaction between language and society and the more we understand them, the more we understand language”. Different languages use different systems of terms of address, therefore; translation of them has caused difficulties for translators. The translator should be aware of such differences between the two languages involved in order to show the kind of relationship exists between interlocutors as precisely as possible. Mehrrotar (1981) describes the non-kin forms of address in Hindi in relation to sociocultural setting of dyads using them. He notes that address forms embody a crucial stage in face-to-face interaction and represent a special aspect of relational language. ‘They serve not merely as a bridge between the individuals but also as a kind of ‘emotional capital’; which can be invested and manipulated in order to achieve a specific result.” He further asserts that the differential usage of address terms has been institutionalized as a means of defining and affirming both identity and status of the speaker and the addressee. "In fact, a good deal of information regarding the social structure and psychological makeup of the addressing dyad can be inferred from an examination of these verbal art forms in their two indispensable and interrelated dimensions-linguistic and sociolinguistic."

Similarly, Hudson (1980) points out that an important dimension of variation in address terms has to do with cultural patterns that hold for some particular population in general due to their social values, beliefs and customs. Keshavarz (1988) conducted a study of the forms of address in post-revolutionary Iran. In search for the political function of address terms, he reports that the revolution in Iran which led to the flight of the Shah resulted in the choice of address terms indicating solidarity and the need to express solidarity led to greater use of terms like ‘bother’ and ‘sister’. Exploring Kashmiri language, Koul (1995) points out that a study of terms of address in any language plays a very important role in socio-linguistic research. He further continues that these terms are determined by certain factors as a social structure, cultural pattern and geographical setting. "The role of human beings varies in a particular society according to the requirements of that society [...] the modes of address are determined by socio-economic status, literacy level, caste, age and sex." He continues that the selection of modes of address is influenced by different historical and social factors as well. Manjulakshi (2004) also notes that terms and modes of address are important in any society for purposes of identification and expression of ideas. To her, the use of these terms depends upon the social rank, age, and the sex of the persons involved in any communicative situation. "The relationship that exists or is perceived to exist between persons addressing and persons addressed to come to control and guide the selection and use of terms and related modes of delivery." Wardhaugh (2006) also notes that a variety of social factors usually governs our choices of terms. Among these social factors are the particular occasion, the social status or rank of the other, sex, age, family relationships, occupational hierarchy, transactional status, such as a doctor-patient relationship or priest-penitent, race, and the degree of intimacy. Afful (2006 a) notes that sociolinguistics has done many studies in familial and domestic settings. Moreover, recently such studies were oriented to political and religious settings. In his view, the use of personal names is influenced by western and modernism. These terms are used regarding the age, status, gender and relationship of interactions and also regarding the pragmatic factors.in his view, studies on address terms can be used in theory, intercultural communication and can have implications for further studies. The study was done by a bilingual Chinese English, Zhang (2002), address terms were considered as significant in conveying cultural messages having considered he status and power relationship between interactions. In another study, Afful (2006b) makes a distinction between ‘address terms’ and ‘reference terms’ when a linguistic expression is designated by an addressee to address in a face-to-face interaction, he calls it the address term.
and refer to the social functions in his study, the address terms shows contingency to status, age, sex, and relationship between interactions. Karimi (2005) showed that the verbal agreement markers have to agree with the subjects. Notably, some Persian plural pronouns can also be used for singular referents for the purpose of being polite. The reason is then to convey politeness and respect. There are two pronouns that could be used for politeness purposes in Persian, namely șoma and șan. The corresponding agreement markers are -id and -aend. English-speaking people tend to address others by their first name—e.g. John, Michael, Linda, Jane—rather than calling the person Mr. Jackson, Mrs. Howard or Miss Jones. This usage is especially common among Americans, even when people meet for the first time. This usage applies not only to people of nearly the same age, but also of different ages.

It is also very common to hear a child calling a much older person Joe, Ben, May, Helen, etc. This may even include the child’s parents or grandparents. People of different social status do the same. For example, many college students call their professors by their first names. Their professors do not regard this as a sign of disrespect or familiarity, but rather, as an indication that the professor is considered affable and has a sense of equality. The use of a person’s first name in North America, for example, does not necessarily indicate friendship or respect. First names are used among people who work closely together, even though they may not like each other (Wardaugh, 1986). This first name usage is unacceptable in Persian culture. One can imagine the reactions of adults if a child were to call a grandparent by his or her first name, or a student to do the same in addressing a teacher in such a “rude” manner. A quick reprimand and possibly even a spanking for the child would be sure to follow.

It can be inferred that the Persian behavior of addressing members of one’s family, relatives or close neighbors as “Hasan agha” (Mr.Hassan), “Zahra Xanom” (Mrs.Zahra), “Abjee Molouk” (sister Molouk), “Dadash Amin” (Brother Amin), and “Baba Reza” (Father Reza) should not be carried over into English. In English, the name alone, whether it is for man or woman, would ordinarily be enough. The main exceptions are addressing one’s parents (Dad, Mom, Mum or Mother), one’s grandparents (Grandpa, Grandma) and sometimes an older relative (Aunt Mary or Uncle Jim). Notice that the given name, and not the family name, is used. Even with relatives, Americans tend to use just the first name and leave out the term of relationship. It should be mentioned that in English “Brother Joseph” or “Sister Mary” would commonly be understood as referring to persons belonging to a Catholic group or some religious or professional society. In English and Persian, forms of address are similar. A person’s title, office, or occupation is not used. One seldom hears English speakers addressing others as Bureau Director Smith, Manager Jackson, Principle Morris or in Persian Raees Karimnia, Modeer Khalaj. In English, only a few occupations or titles would be used: “Doctor” is common for those who have qualified in the medical profession or those who teach at a university, and “Judge” for those authorized to try cases in law courts; “Governor” and “Mayor” may be used for those who hold such offices, although often without the name.

In military terms of address, it should be noted that in addressing military officers in Persian and English the rank is used and not the command or duties that he has been as signed: for example, “Captain Johnson” or “Capitan Mohammad” (Sarvan Mohammadi), rather than “Company Commander Johnson,” “Admiral Benjamin,” rather than “Fleet Commander Benjamin.” Terms of address in the teaching profession have long been a problem. Should it be “Teacher” or “Teacher Karimnia”? Neither of these is in keeping with English custom. His first name usually addresses the teacher. In Persian, one should simply call the teacher “Mr. Karimnia,” “Ms. Mousavi” or “Miss Rahimi.” In family structures, terms of address may change and cause problems in knowing how to address both old and new kin. Knowing how to address one’s father-in-law (or mother- in -in law) has often been a problem for many English people: “Mr. Smith” is sometimes felt to be too formal, “Bill” too familiar, and “Dad” pre-empted and unnatural. The arrival of grandchildren is sometimes seen as a way out, it being easier to call a father-in-law “Grandad” than “Dad.” Such a move may also be accompanied in some families with a switch in address for one’s own parents, so that one’s mother is addressed as “Grandma” rather than “Mom;” sometimes this usage appears to be intended only as a temporary help to the grandchildren in learning the right terms of address, but it can easily become a permanent change so that “Grandad” and “Grandma” are used for the maternal grandparents and “Gran” or “Nana” for the paternal one, or vice versa (Wardaugh, 1986). Persian employs what is regarded as kinship terms for use as address terms. According to Reza Zade (2002), in some cities such as Fasa, Darab, Jahrom in Fars province, one addresses his or her father-in-law with terms equivalent to English “uncle” (amount) and his or her mother-in-law, “Zan Amou” (uncle’s wife). In some other cities, one addresses his or her father-in-law with the term equivalent to English “father” (pedar) and his or her mother-in-law, “Maadar” (mother). Interestingly, there is no general term in English for getting the attention of a stranger or of a person whose name we may not know. Then what do people do in English if such a need arises? Depending on the situation, English custom might suggest using some such expression as “Excuse me,” “Pardon me” or expressions like “Hey,” or “Hey you” or “you,” but are not considered polite. Often, people resort to a way that needs no language.
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They simply clear their throat loudly or make some noise or gesture to attract the person's attention. In Persian we say “Behaxsheed” (excuse me), “Ozr meexam” (I am sorry), “Jenab” (sir), “Agha” (sir), “Hajji agha” (Mr. Hajji), “Xanom” (lady), “Hajji Xanom,” “Xahar” (sister) or “Baradar” (brother) but these terms are not considered impolite. Address terms in Persian have been studied too. In one study conducted by Aliakbari and Toni (2008) ten categories for address terms were proposed. They include: "personal names, titles, religious-oriented terms, occupation-bound terms, kinship or family/relative terms, honorifics and terms of formality, terms of intimacy, personal pronouns, descriptive phrases, and zero address terms". They suggested "the abundance and frequency of the application of honorifics in Persian language reveal the importance of courtesy in this language". They also showed that family relations are strong in Persian, and this is important in using kinship terms for nonrelatives. One of the most important levels in which communication takes place is the interpersonal level. The relationship of speaker and addressee consists of both the identity of the speaker and that of the addressee (Dickey, 1997). A number of elements play a part in this identity: age, sex, social status as determined by occupation and education (Qin, 2008), familiarity, kinship, membership and marital status. An individual comes in contact with others through a multiplicity of social roles as a member of brothers, workers, public speakers and so on. These roles involve some degree of linguistic specialisation (Misra, 1977). Afzali (2011) did a study on different address terms used by spouses at different situations in Iran. She found that spouses address each other depends on the power and solidarity in upper-middle, middle and lower-middle classes in Iran. Persian is a null subject or pro-drop language. In this case, number and person are encoded on the agreement marker. Mahootian (1997) notes "When the referent is not being contrasted or emphasized, the pronoun is commonly dropped. The phenomenon of pronoun-dropping is also commonly referred to in linguistics as zero or null-anaphora." Besides using the separate pronominal forms, Persian applies pronominal enclitics that may serve three functions (Nanbakhsh, 2011):

a. Possessive pronoun (inflected on noun)
b. Complement of preposition (inflected on preposition)
c. Direct object of the verb (inflected as a suffix to verb)

Keshavarz (1988) investigates the form of address in post-revolutionary Iranian Persian based on literature reviews of the pronouns and politeness in Persian. This is a sociolinguistic analysis. He reviews the sociolinguistic simplification effects of the Islamic revolution of Iran in 1979. Keshavarz (1988) mentions that: "The sudden shift from power to solidarity in Iran in the face of the sociopolitical upheaval in the country has yielded some interesting changes in the forms of address in Persian. In general, since the Islamic Revolution of 1979, forms of address in Persian have undergone a sociolinguistic simplification. In post-revolutionary Iran plain speech and forms of address marking, solidarity has gained popularity, whereas asymmetrical forms reflecting the complex social class structure of pre-revolutionary Iran have gradually declined." He considered that politeness has two dimensions, i.e. a) self-lowering and b) other-rising. Keshavarz (1988) proposes that the 2SG pronoun /to/ generally speaking is considered a rude form of address to non-intimates. Parents and teachers usually warn children and pupils against the use of this pronoun, particularly when talking to older people, and recommend the polite pronoun /soma/. However, /to/ is used in the following settings as follows:

1. In a very intimate relationship between close friends and colleagues, peers, classmates, and spouses. This use of /to/ is one of solidarity and intimacy.
2. In a familial situation, it is a common practice for parents to address their children by /to/ until they are about fifteen years of age. This downward use of /to/, however, varies according to parents’ attitudes and educational background.

Some educated middle-class parents have been observed to address their children by the polite pronoun /soma/ right from the beginning, a practice that is found anomalous. It should be noted, however, that in the presence of people outside the immediate family there is a general tendency to address children, particularly after the age of puberty, by the polite form /soma/. Elder siblings also make use of the nonreciprocal /to/ when talking to their younger brothers and sisters.

3. Before the revolution, the nonreciprocal use of /to/ by such superiors as government officials and army officers to their subordinates, masters to their servants, and the like was quite common, but the occurrence of this usage of /to/ has become very rare, if not completely absent, under the present circumstances in Iran.
4. One of the interesting uses of /to/ is in one's soliloquizing address to oneself, and also in one's prayers to God in solitude.
5. Moreover, finally, when one wishes to show disrespect or anger to another person, /to/ is deliberately used in an insulting manner. In situations other than these, the polite singular pronoun /soma/ is used instead of the familiar /to/.
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The pronoun /šoma/ can be used reciprocally, but it expresses more respect and distance than to. In other words, the reciprocal use of /to/ is normally associated with relative intimacy, whereas the reciprocal use of /šoma/ is associated with relative distance and formality. /šoma/ is frequently heard in the free speech of different social groups in their daily interactions. It is used between acquaintances, colleagues of equal rank, spouses in the presence of others, and strangers. The upward use of /šoma/ is heard in the speech of children to their parents and elder brothers and sisters. In sum, Keshavarz’s study investigates the form of address in post-revolutionary Iranian Persian, and it defines the application of solidarity /to/ and non-solidarity /šoma/ in Persian contexts. He conducts a study of the forms of address in post-revolutionary Iran from sociolinguistics point of view. He mentions that the revolution in Iran resulted in the choice of address terms indicating solidarity and the need to express solidarity led to greater use of terms like ‘brother’ and ‘sister’. In this sense, his investigation seems plausible.

3. Conclusion
The role of social context, intimacy and distance in the choice of forms of address has been considered by many scholars in the field (e.g. Keshavarz, 2001). The hypothesis is that variation in the form of address is related not only to the age, sex, and social class characteristic of the interlocutors but also to the setting, intimacy, and social distance. The subjects of Keshavarz’s analysis are Persian speakers living in different parts of Tehran (stratified sampled). The subjects were categorized into three age groups (18-25, 26-35 and 36-over), two sex groups (male vs. female) and three social classes (low, middle, and high). The criterion for establishing the social class membership was based on the subject’s education, occupation, and socioeconomic status. In Keshavarz’s study, participants were asked to choose one of the address forms to or šoma in informal familial contexts and in formal contexts. The result of his data analysis indicates that the use of intimate terms of address is inversely proportional to the social distance and formality of the context. That is, as social distance and the degree of formality of context increase, the frequency of the familiar term of address decreases. In Keshavarz’s study, the age is more important than sex in informal familial situation and forms of address identifies the social class among interactants. However, in formal circumstances, sex is a stronger determinant in the use of address form. Sharifian (2009) is also concerned with Persian pronouns, however pointing out that the Persian pronominal and agreement system allows for marking degrees of respect rather than a two-way dichotomy. He says: "conceptualizations are found in entirely different languages, namely Persian, and specifically, in the case of the second-person plural pronoun šoma. This pronoun is used as a second person singular honorific and the third person plural pronoun išan is also used as an honorific for the third person singular. Plurality as a marker of respect is not only marked in the pronoun system but can also be optionally marked by the verb ending. In fact, the interaction between the choice of pronoun, verb ending and the verb can yield a hierarchical system in terms of the degree of respect that each sentence conveys (Sharifian, 2009) ". Nanbaksh (2011) discussed sociolinguistic functions of address pronoun switching and the mismatch construction and tries to answer these two questions by a sociolinguistic data analysis. The main questions, he raises, are:

a) What are the different social functions served by second person singular and plural pronouns and suffixes in Persian?

b) What are the sociolinguistic and pragmatic functions that pronoun switching and mismatch construction (e.g. šoma + 2Sg verb agreement) serve?

Regarding the answer to the first question Nanbaksh mentions that: "a sociolinguistic variable may index a variety of social and pragmatic functions with a change of stance in discourse. The analysis shows that the deferential (respectful) overt pronoun šoma may indirectly index the following three social functions in discourse: a) contrastive emphasis, b) in-group identity marker (deference), and c) topic shift (organizational task and norm). Two social functions were observed to be associated with the deferential verbal agreement (2h and 2p) respectively: attention seeking and the balancing of power. The singular informal verbal agreement marker (2s) was observed to index two social functions: creating in-groups and challenging power and authority (Nanbaksh, 2011)". In sum most of the analysis of the role of social context, intimacy and distance in the choice of addresses (to or šoma) are only quantitative, and the lack of qualitative analysis is evident. The researchers, in a literature review study, reviewed the relative influence of the sociolinguistic features such as gender, age, power and intimacy on the choice of pronominal form in Persian.
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