

The Role of Social Parameters in the Choice of Address Forms used in Kinship domain in Punjab, Pakistan

Ana Ramsha

Lecturer, Faculty of Allied Health Sciences, University of Lahore, Pakistan

e-mail: ana.ramsha@ahs.uol.edu.pk

Samrah Hidayat

M.Phil Applied Linguistics, University of Management and Technology, Pakistan

e-mail: ana.ramsha@ahs.uol.edu.pk

Abstract:

This study examines the role of social parameters in the choice of address forms used in kinship domain in Punjab, Pakistan. The study targeted 140 respondents in order to test the impact of social factors along with the regional differences in the choices of address forms in kinship domain. Statistical analyses are done by applying t-test for gender in relation to choices of address forms and ANOVA for age, income, education and social class. The study finds out that there is a strong connection of different social parameters not only with language use and practice but also in choices and use of address forms especially in kinship relationships. Moreover, it is highlighted that gender does not influence in the choices of address forms, even the participants belonging to young and middle categories show no significant difference with regard to the choices of address form despite the fact that all the factors and parameters exert influence on the choices of address forms. Hence address forms as being one of the major traits of language and society is affected by all the social factors around and regional differences are also most important as they give identity and ethnicity to the society.

Keywords: *Social Parameters, Address Forms, Kinship*

1. INTRODUCTION

There are various forms that are used in speech and writing to address someone. According to Fasold (1990), address forms are used in conversation in order to delegate the person with whom he/she is talking. Address forms sociolinguistically bind and connect the people with one another especially during their conversation and usually depends upon different social parameters such as age, sex, personal relation and social groups. In general address forms are names, title, kinship terms and second-person pronouns.

Analysis of address forms had been a popular subject in sociolinguistics. Social parameters such as age, gender, social stratification, education and income are complex traits that are particularly useful and important with respect to the usage of address forms as each of them indicates a particular social dimension necessary for understanding the impact of society on their usage and also affects the choice of speakers particularly in kinship domain.

The current study investigates the address forms as sociolinguistic markers that are related to social factors. Choices of address forms are determined on the bases of different social parameters like age, gender, social class, income, education and regional differences. Social factors not only help the interlocutor to make their choices in address terms in kinship domain but also help the user to make choices that keep on changing from person to person and area to area. (Xiaomei Yang 2010).

This study focuses on the investigation of impact of different social parameters in the choice of address forms in kinship domain in Punjab, Pakistan. Pakistan, being multicultural and multilingual society, has much cultural and regional diversity at various levels. People living in these areas show their choices in address forms in kinship domain not only according to their regional differences but also according to other social factors around.

The present research is based on the following research questions:

- 1 How do the social factors influence the choice of address forms in kinship domain?
 - a) Is there any relationship between gender and use of address forms?
 - b) Is there any relationship between the social class and address forms?
 - c) Is there any relationship between age and the address forms?
 - d) Is there any relationship between income variation and the use of address forms?
 - e) Is there any relationship between the level of education and the use of address forms?
 - f) Is there any relationship between the regional differences and the use of address forms?

This study will be helpful not only for the sociolinguistic but for anthropology and provide a direction for future research.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Fitch (1991) observed that address forms are the best way to define qualities, standards, and practices of various social factors. Oyetade (1995) characterized address forms as words or titles used as part of intuitive and dyadic part of speech in any conversation. There is a vast diversity and variation in the choices and usage of address forms in Punjab, Pakistan (Claude Lévi-Strauss, 1952), there are many reasons behind such diversity. Pakistan being the part of Sub-Continent and before partition as being with Hindus and Sikhs communities their language use and choices vary accordingly.

According to Larina (2015) speakers of Indian English and Hindi in every day communication keep on switching English and Hindi address forms. They observed Indian bilinguals and noticed that people who follow and adopt Indian traditions and cultural norms show more respect towards Hindi honorifics in address forms. However people while showing attitudes and values to strangers prefer to use English address forms. They both worked on the impact of cultural values, social organizations, communication styles and categorization of reality on use of address forms.

Researches by Delbrück (1889), Hocart (1928), Galton (1957), Friedrich (1966), Szemerényi (1977) and Kullanda (2002) on kin terms and kinship terminology of Indo-European languages, during research they observed that kinship terms and choices varies as per language and its use. During their research they traced out the kinship system of Europe in association with Hindi, non-Indian languages and other languages used in different areas to a cognatic set up followed by English language. It is also discussed that cross marriages between the cousins also affect the use of kinship terms in any society.

According to Redcliffe- Brown (1935) there is a correlation relation between the kin terms and social classification. As forms of marriages, behavior and attitude of relatives along with other social factors make up a kinship system in any society. Domestic values, customs of marriages and social classification of relatives, living areas like village, town or city along with social factors help a society to choose best form of address in kinship domain. Kin system and classification of relatives all together give name to kinship system in any language and society.

Urdu has separate terms for both sides of relatives as compare to those English kin terms reflects the image of paternal side. For-example in English, the son and daughter of mother's and father's sister and brother are nephews and niece, where as in Urdu its *bhanja* and *bhanji* for mother's sister son and daughter . And for fathers' brother the terms like *bhateja* and *bhateji* are used. Researchers examined that Urdu kinship terminology is no doubt extensive as compare to English. It's not just the culture,

region, religion but impact of different languages and historical background along with other social factors that shape the choice of kin terms while addressing other. He also in the following research noted that differences in choices of address forms are also due to new trends in urban areas as compare rural. Level of education, residential areas, level of income, social network and media all are playing vital role and mostly people prefer borrowed terms like *auntie, uncle, wife, hubby*, etc.

In the view point of Fitch (1991) and Morford (1997) use of different address form in any community transfers the culture and social customs of that community, as different languages reflects different culture.

The topic as such has not been tackled and researched in a detail from wider and vast comparative sociolinguistics point of view while comparing address forms and its use according to different region as per their use and choices of address forms in kinship domain. A thorough study and good mastery of address forms is necessary to understand the cultural and intercultural communication of a society. . This process needs not only a good understanding of the rules, but also the taking of all relevant factors into consideration. Thus, it is significant to find out the diversity and choices of address forms present in different regions of Punjab, Pakistan. The present study assumes that address forms in different languages along with different social factors not only reflect the choices, social class but also act as an identity marker.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The current research is quantitative in nature. Random sampling technique was employed for collecting information through 140 respondents, 35 each from four different regions of Punjab with different use of languages are targeted. Lahore, Bahawalpur, Attock, Mianwali from Central, Southern, Northern and Western regions of Punjab are selected with Urdu, Sraiki, Punjabi and Hindko languages spoken in these particular areas. Owing to financial and time limitation, only these particular areas and languages are taken as representatives of four different region of Punjab, Pakistan. The cities were selected which were easily accessible to the researchers and where differences on the bases of culture, language and area are on the higher side.

To test the hypotheses and research questions semi-structured interviews were recorded from four different regions of Punjab, Pakistan. 10-15mins interviews were recorded from thirty-five respondents from each city. As gender is one of the strong variables to determine data is collected from both males and females, though males are 78 and females are 62. Females are fewer than males due to social and cultural constraints.

Criterion for age is from 15 to 100 years. That is divided further into three groups 15-25years, 25-35 years, and 35 years or above. Reason for grouping the age group and selecting the age from 15 to 100 years is because of taking age as a variable to check its influence on the choice of address forms used in kinship domain. A few respondents with age 80 and above during their conversation told few terms that are

not in use now a days as address forms in kinship domain. As they are part of third generation, their language use and choice of address form at home is linked to the basic origin of that particular language. They are the one who are keeping alive those old terms and due to illiteracy, less exposure, old mind setup and old social norms which bound them to use the old address terms. A few of them even want to promote those old address forms used in kinship domain to their young generation. Age wise data collection and recording not only make the research interesting but also highlight the diversity and variation of address forms used in different areas that is different according to age as well.

Social class is also analyzed with regard to its impact on choice of address forms used in kinship domain. To define social class variables like education and income although help the researcher to divide class into three groups that is low class, middle class and upper middle class. Posh and Elite class is not added in this research as their choices are different and especially they use borrowed terms during their conversation.

Income and education are also divided into group so that the researcher is made more viable and effective. Three groups of income were made. For education low to matric , matric to inter, graduation and above are made as a group to evaluate the effect of level of education in the choice of address forms at home in kinship domain. Data is collected in the mother tongue of the participants keeping their regional dialect as a source of conducting interviews.

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Statistical analyses through SPSS t-test and ANOVA are applied in order to testify the research hypotheses as how do the social factors influence the choice of address forms. Is there any relation between gender and use of address forms? Is there any relationship between the social class and address forms used by interlocutor? Is there any relationship between age and address forms used in kinship domain? Is there any relation between income and variation in address forms used in kinship domain? Is there any relation between the level of education and the use of address forms? Is there any relation between regional differences and address forms in kinship domain?

4.1 Analysis of relationship between Gender Differences and choices of Address Forms

To evaluate gender wise difference t-Test is applied. It is observed through results that gender wise there is no significant difference between the choice of address forms according to different social parameters such as class, income, education and area. It means that p value is greater than .005. The use of address forms within kinship domain by the male and female sample of the study that are living together under same circumstances is similar. However, some differences have been found too. These differences lie phonetically, which is not the concern of the present study, yet much significant for future research. In Pakistan, being the male chauvinistic society,

mostly female follows the patterns set by men. It's the culture and society that projects male as a dominant figure and Females as the subordinate. Therefore the study forms a null hypothesis that there is a difference between male and female choice of address forms in home domain.

Table 1: Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
OVERALL	Male	78	2.5903	.74963	.08488
	Female	62	2.5960	.70103	.08903

Table 2: Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
OVERAL	Equal variances assumed	.291	.590	-.046	138	.963
	Equal variances not assumed			-.046	134.353	.963

4.2 Analyses of Class differences and choices of Address Forms

The statistics reveal that there is a significant difference among the choice of address forms of respondents belonging to the low, middle and upper middle class. The p value is less than .005 means there is a significant different among the sample class groups. The results expose that the respondents (class 35 or above years of age) of upper middle and the same age group from lower class use almost the same address forms. Their choice does not differ much. Although both groups, i.e. upper middle class and the lower class differ much in their income and educational background, yet both of them belong to same age group. The same choice of address forms may be due to being the member of same age group regardless of varying socio-economic factors.

Table 3: ANOVA

OVERALL

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	17.244	2	8.622	21.092	.000
Within Groups	56.005	137	.409		
Total	73.249	139			

Table 4: LSD

	(I) class	(J) class	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
LSD	Low	Middle	.79692*	.13054	.000
		upper middle	.64821*	.13279	.000
	Middle	Low	-.79692*	.13054	.000
		upper middle	-.14871	.13412	.004
	upper middle	Low	-.64821*	.13279	.000
		Middle	.14871	.13412	.004

4.3 Analyses of Income and choices of Address Forms

The criterion for defining social class is basically based on education, occupation and socioeconomic status, as stated above. Income plays an indirect yet important role in language use as well choice of address forms. The findings show that the social parameter-income affects the choice of address forms. The higher the income level of the respondents, the more usage of formal and standardized address terms is observed. The people who are earning above 40000 have organized and formal choice of address forms as compare to the 20000-40000 and 5000-20000. This highlights that income plays a vital role and there is a significant difference between the choice of address forms and given income. The p value is less than .005 means there is significant difference among the set income criteria.

Table 5: ANOVA

OVERALL

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	16.526	2	8.263	19.957	.000
Within Groups	56.723	137	.414		
Total	73.249	139			

Table 6 : LSD

	(I) income	(J) income	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
LSD	5000-20000	20000-40000	.77790*	.13137	.000
		40000-above	.65510*	.13498	.000
	20000-40000	5000-20000	-.77790*	.13137	.000
		40000-above	-.12280	.13364	.005
	40000-above	5000-20000	-.65510*	.13498	.000
		20000-40000	.12280	.13364	.005

4.4 Analysis of Age Differences and choices of Address Forms

Analysis of the relationship between the different age groups and their choices in using address forms may help to mirror their social and cultural identity. Impact of education, media, internet, residential area, income are also interlinked with age and gender but here it is observed that as per variable age there is a significance difference between the choices of the respondents of 35 and above years of age as compared to those of belonging to other two age groups, i.e. 25-35 and 15-25, that means p value is less than or equal to .005. Contrary to that, there is no significance difference between the age group 15-25 and 25-35, as significant value p is more than .005. There it is observed that most of the people of age group 25-35 are using more formal and sophisticated address form during their conversation in kinship domain. The reason behind is not just education, media or job, in addition to all these factors the parents want their children to opt and follow the most modern form of address forms.

Table 7: ANOVA

OVERALL					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	10.958	2	5.479	12.051	.000
Within Groups	62.291	137	.455		
Total	73.249	139			

Table 8: LSD

	(I) age	(J) age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
LSD	15-25	25-35	.18441	.14509	.206
		35-above	-.45333*	.14739	.003
	25-35	15-25	-.18441	.14509	.206
		35-above	-.63775*	.13234	.000
	35-above	15-25	.45333*	.14739	.003
		25-35	.63775*	.13234	.000

4.5 Analyses of Level of Education and choices of Address Forms

The analysis of choice of address forms on the basis of level of education is done by applying ANOVA. There is a significant difference as p value is less than .005 in the address forms usage between the below matric respondents as compared to matric, intermediate, graduation and above qualified respondents. It shows that education is one of the social parameters that plays significant role in the choice of address forms especially in kinship domain. An interesting aspect was revealed during the course of the study relating to same age groups of different regions. There was a significant difference in the choice of the address forms of respondents of Lahore (age group: 15-

25) as compared to the respondents of same age group but belonging to different regions as Mianwali, Attock and Bahawalpur. The respondents of Lahore tend to use more formal and standardized address forms on the basis of educational differences than others. It might be due to the reason that Lahore is a hub of educational institutes and education imparts much to the personality growth.

Table 9: ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	17.005	2	8.502	20.710	.000
Within Groups	56.245	137	.411		
Total	73.249	139			

Table 10: LSD

	(I) education	(J) education	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
LSD	below matric	matric-inter	.79045*	.13079	.000
		graduation-above	.65327*	.13373	.000
	matric-inter	below matric	-.79045*	.13079	.000
		graduation-above	-.13718	.13373	.003
	graduation-above	below matric	-.65327*	.13373	.000
		matric-inter	.13718	.13373	.003

4.6 Analyses of Regional Differences and choices of Address Forms

The current research reveals that choice of address forms are also linked with the regional differences. There is a significant difference between all the regions, not only culturally or socially but also on the basis of the choice of address forms they use in their kinship domain. It shows that significant value p is less than .005. It is not just the dialectical difference but there is geographical and cultural impact has been viewed on the choice of address forms.

Table 11: ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	168.764	3	56.255	4.176	.007
Within Groups	1832.057	136	13.471		
Total	2000.821	139			

Table 12: Multiple Comparisons

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

	(I) area	(J) area	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
LSD	Lahore	Bhawalpur	.05274	.16328	.000
		Attock	.14512	.16328	.004
		Mianwali	.66500*	.16328	.000
	Bhawalpur	Lahore	-.05274	.16328	.003
		Attock	.09238	.16328	.000
		Mianwali	.61226*	.16328	.000
	Attock	Lahore	-.14512	.16328	.004
		Bhawalpur	-.09238	.16328	.000
		Mianwali	.51988*	.16328	.002
	Mianwali	Lahore	-.66500*	.16328	.000
		Bhawalpur	-.61226*	.16328	.000
		Attock	-.51988*	.16328	.002

T-test is applied where the variables are divided into two groups such as in case of gender and ANOVA is applied where the variables are divided into more than two groups for example in case of age, class, income and etc. The data is analyzed with different social factors such as income, age, gender, class and education and in second part data analysis is done on regional differences in the choice of address forms. The results from t-test and ANOVA help to find out the best possible results. Factor age and choice of address forms shows null hypotheses, there is a difference in the choice of address forms on the bases of gender. Secondly on the bases of age though there is a significant difference but the respondents of 35 year and above with regard to 15-25 year and 25-35 year of age group. However, there is no significant difference between age group 15-25 years and 25-35 years. The middle age group from 25-35 years tends to use more formal, standard and sophisticated address forms as they want their coming generation to use more advance address forms in their conversation. So it shows that there is a significant difference between age group 35 year and above but there is no significant difference between the age groups 15-25 years and 25-35 years.

5. DISCUSSION

Language use and gender both are interlinked in socio-linguistics. Gender differences with regard to language has been important area of attention since 1970s (e.g. Cameron 1990: Goodwin 1998). The phenomenon that gender differences affect the language use or address forms now a days is controversial as different linguist point out that there is not any difference in use and choice of language use but variation lies in interpretation of that particular language (Tannen 1991: 14; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet 2013). The findings of present study are not different from the previous research findings about the relationship between the gender and the choice of address forms. This research has replaced folk linguistics myths that there is variation gender wise with regard to language use (Coates 1998: 2).

While relating the factor age and choice of address forms it is observed that this part is both significant as well as insignificant. The choices of address forms from 35 years and above age group especially few respondents were found of age group between 80 to 100 years, they use different address terms as compare to their young generation. Apart from upper class the old people tend to use typical words even used by low class 35 years and above respondents. It is inquired that they love to use old and pet terms of address forms like *ama, aba, chichi, chacha*. Some typical old terms like *ama, aba, apa* are also used by new young generation as a fashion. Apart from that there is no significant difference between the age group 15-25 year and 25-35 year. It is observed that the age group between 25-35 year prefer to opt and use those address terms that they think best be adopted by their young ones. They prefer *mama, papa* and *baba* instead of *ammi, abu*. They use *uncle* and *aunti* instead of *chacha* and *chichi*.

Age is one of the major factor linked with language (Yule 2009: 2011). The effect of age and gender on the choices of address forms in Chinese personal language .It is noticed that age is a significant factor that helps to opt the best choice of address forms as female of upper age use more emotional and standard address forms as compare to male (Xianghong Cao 2007). Like other factors age also plays important and show significant differences in the choice of address forms.

Analyzing the level of education and the choice of address forms, it is found that education and plays vital role in the choice of address forms. It is also observed that there lies a significant difference between the address forms used in Lahore as compare to Mianwali, Attock and Bahawalpur. The choice of address forms especially from Lahore is different that more respectful, formal and are more standardize as compare to the rest of areas as Lahore is metropolitan city, multi-cultural and multi-lingual city of Punjab.

Sajad.Shafie, Amir Sabzevari, Nooshafarin Motallebi (2015) investigate that there is a strong relationship between level of education and economic status on the choice of address forms. The findings of current research also formulated that level of education affect the choice of address forms. The more educated and advance in education, the

more formal, standard, modern and sophisticated in the use and choice of address forms.

Analyzing the variable income it is noticed that people with high income use to spend more on their life styles and education. Respondents with high income level and high class, their choices of address forms are more or less different from the people with low income and low class. Apart from that income is positively linked with the choice of address forms though there is an indirect relation but people with high income affects their choice of address forms as people with high income used borrowed word in there address forms like *mama, papa, sister, aunti, uncle, cousin* etc .they prefer to use Urdu or English address forms in their home setting.

Income along with power ,solidarity , lifestyles ,social class ,occupation and education etc. plays a vital role not only in language use but also in choice of address forms used at home .E. Kathleen Gough(1952) Economy necessitates social and spatial change which in return modifies the development of machine technology, occupation chances, entails urbanization and this change affects a matrilineal to a bilateral address form system(kinship terms) that means income is strong marker like other factors that affect the use of address forms in society . The language is affected by income, economic policies and approaches (Vaillancourt, 1985, Lamberton, 2002, Grin, 1996, 2003, 2020).Like previous studies the current research also shows the association between the level of income and choice of address forms .As income is one of strong tool to make a social class.

Social class and the choice of address forms shown significant, positive and clear difference between three class groups that are low, middle and upper middle. But it is also observed that few of the respondents from upper middle class age group 35 year and above use same address forms as the respondents from age group of 35 years and above from low class. Reason behind such similarity as the respondents especially from 60 year and onward love to speak in their mother tongue. Such as respondents of this criterion love to use pet, typical and old address forms like *ama, aba, apa, chacha, mama, dahi, putr*, etc. On another hand it is also noticed that the respondents of middle class show variation in their choice of address forms as merge both the lower, middle and high use of address forms in their conversation at home. It is also examined that age group 15-25 year of low class use more advance terms of address forms like *mama, papa, sister, uncle, aunti* like the same age group of middle class and especially the upper middle class. The main reason behind is most of the respondents who are working as maids, strictly been ordered to use more formal and standardize address forms.

Brown and Gilman (1960) also researched on the social dimension of address terms on the issues of solidarity, power and formality. Wardhaugh (2006) worked on different social factors with regard to address forms and social class and social status are the main areas of his research. Brown and Gilman's (1960) term social class as power and solidarity and studies address forms with regard to their relation with social

class, social change and linguistic choices. Like previous studies and research the current research also shows that there is a significant association between the address forms and the social class. Lyons (1977) observed that the address terms used by socially inferior to socially superior may be different from one another on the bases of their social class. Brown and Levinson (1979) also worked on “T/V usage in order to find out the social relationship and class differences within the society .Current research like previous researches give addition that social class affects the choice and use of address forms.

Regional differences show significant differences between choice of address forms and regional differences. It is viewed that respondents of Lahore apart rich in Punjabi language most of the middle and upper middle class chooses more formal form of address forms as compare to other languages used in Lahore. Apart from that there found some association between Sariaki of Bahawalpur and Saraiki of Mianwali but they are not exact similar to each other in the choice of address forms. For-example most of the respondents from Bahawalpur use term *waderha*, *maa sab*, *hajiyarhi* for their mothers and *waderha*, *lala*, *hajji* for their fathers. They term their *phophoo* as *boa* or *bobo*, and paternal cousins as *soutar*, *muleer* and for maternal cousins used terms like *massat* and *muleer*. While comparing such terms with Mianwali. Respondents of Mianwali though Saraiki speaking use term like *ama* , *baba* for parents , *phophii* ,*bibi* for *phophoo* and for paternal cousins they used *patreer* ,*phopheer* and for maternal cousins they used terms like *malveer* and *maseer*. Apart from that the respondents of Attock use different address forms as compare to other cities of current study. They used term like *mao*, *mannay* for their mothers. For paternal cousins they use *dadputeray*, *phopheeray* and for maternal cousins they use term *muleeray* and *maseeray*. For *phophoo* they used term like *phoah*, *popoo*. Here it is observed that respondent from inner walled Lahore use typical Lahore-Punjabi and the respondents of upper age group 35 year and above and people of low class use term like *ama*, *aba*, *dahi*, *putar*, *masi*, *mama*, *masi*, *kurhi*, *munda*, *masi di kurhi*, *mamay da munda*, *chachay di kurhi*, *phophi da munda*etc as a choice of address forms in their kinship domain.

The results also point out that in targeted sample there found variety of address forms like for father terms like *aba*, *abu*, *lala*, *baba*, *papa*, *hajji*, *waderha*, *piyu*, *walid*etc are found, for mother terms like *ama*, *ami*, *mama*, *baji*, *walida*, *hajjiyani*, *waderhi*, *apa*, *mannay*, *mao*, *ama gee*, *maa sab* etc are used. For bother like *bhai*, *lala*, *barha*, *bhaiya*, *pai*, *parha* , *paraoare* used. Terms for sisters recorded are *apa*, *behan*, *berhan*, *baji*, *paji*, *sister*, *behna*, *perhan*. For children address forms used in particular areas are *bachy*, *baal*, *beta beti*, *kaka kaki*, *mundakurhi*, *jakaat*, *dahiputr*. For grand son and daughter terms like *potapoti* and *dotadoti*, *nawasa* and *nawasi*, *dotara* and *dotari*, *potara* and *potari* are observed for males and females. This over diversity and variation in field of address forms in used in different areas of Pakistan. As compared to English address forms, in Punjab there is a variety of address forms apart from use

of honorifics and endearment terms. This part of current study not only pins out the variation in address forms but also adds to sociolinguistics.

Address forms are also the symbol of regional differences, sex, racial discrimination, social differences etc. It is an important aspect that work as a key to understand social concept and human relationship in society Xiaomei Yang (2000). Wolfson and Manes (1978) also reported regional differences that address forms show differences on regional bases. Previous studies help the researcher to find out those patterns in current research.

6. CONCLUSION

As long as language is alive, its social and cultural aspects remain the part of study and discussion. It is noticed during research that language itself is nothing there are many other factors that make, modify, and nourish the language, its use and practice. Impact of social factors on choice of address forms in kinship domain and regional differences that influence the choice of address forms are interconnected and interlinked with one another. Address forms act as a key to understand not only the people's language but the social and cultural beliefs of the society as well. This research provide comprehensive addition not only in the field of sociolinguistics but lay down important sing posts for other researchers in future not only in particular domain but relating it to other aspects of language and its use.

Present Research contributed much to the field of sociolinguistics in a way that work done in Punjab Pakistan on address forms region wise by catering different social parameters is an addition to the past studies. As current study focuses not only on the Urdu address forms but also mentioned Punjabi, Sariaki, Hindko address forms that in itself add new avenue not only to address forms but to sociolinguistics.

7. REFERENCES

- Cameron, D. (1997). 'Performing gender identity: young men's talk and the construction of heterosexual masculinity', pp.86-107, in eds. Johnson, S. and Meinhoff, U. *Language and Masculinity*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Coates, J. & Cameron, D. eds. (1988). *Women in Their Speech Communities*, London, Longman.
- Delbrück, B. (1889). Die indogermanischen Verwandtschaftsnamen: Ein Beitrag zurvergleichenden Altertumskunde, Leipzig: *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 11/v, 380-606.
- Fasold, R. (1990). *The Sociolinguistics of Language*, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford, UK.

- Fitch, K. L. (1991). The interplay of linguistic universals and cultural knowledge in personal address: Colombian madre terms. *Communications Monographs*, 58(3), 254-272.
- Friedrich, P. (1966). Proto-Indo-European kinship, *Ethnology*, 1(5), 1-36.
- Galton, H. (1957). The Indo-European kinship terminology, *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, 1(82), 121-38.
- Goodwin, M Harness (1998). 'Games of stance: conflict and footing in hopscotch,' pp.22-46, in eds. Hoyle, S and Adger C. eds. *Kids Play: Strategic Language use in Later Childhood*, Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press.
- Hocart, A.M. (1928). The Indo-European kinship system, *Ceylon Journal of Science*, (1), 179-204.
- Kullanda, Se. (2002). Indo-European 'kinship terms' revisited, *Current Anthropology*, 1 (43).
- Lakoff, R. (2000). *The Language Wars*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Larina, T. (2015). Culture specific communicative styles as a framework for interpreting Linguistic and cultural Idiosyncrasies. *International Review of Pragmatics, Volume 7, number 5. Special Issue: Communicative styles and Genres*, 195-215.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1952). *Race et histoire*. UNESCO; Paris.
- Morford, J.P. (1997). From here and now to there and then: The development of displaced reference in homesign and English. *Child development* 68 (3), 420-435
- RADCLIFFE-BROWN, A. R. (1935). 'On the Concept of Function in Social Science', *American Anthropologist*, Vol. XXXVII, pp. 394-402. Reprinted in Radcliffe-Brown 1952: Ch. 9.
- Sadiqi, F. (2003) *Gender and Language in Morocco*, Leiden, Brill
- Szemerényi, O. (1977). Studies in the kinship terminology of the Indo-European languages, with special reference to Indian, Iranian, Greek and Latin, *Acta Iranica*, 1-240.
- Tannen, D. (1991). *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*, London, Virago
- Walsh, C. (2001). *Gender and Discourse: Language and Power in Politics, the Church and Organisations*, London, Routledge
- Yang, X. (2010). Address forms of English: rules and variations. *Journal of language teaching and research*, 1(5), 743-745.