

Variation in Address Forms for Arab Married and Unmarried Women in the Workplace: A Sociolinguistic Study

Mays Qasem Ajlouni

Department of English language and literature
Faculty of Arts, Yarmouk University,
Irbid – Jordan.

Lutfi Abulhaija

Department of English language and literature
Faculty of Arts, Yarmouk University,
Irbid – Jordan.

Abstract:

This study aims at investigating address forms that are usually used in the workplace to address Arab married and unmarried women, from a sociolinguistic point of view. Despite the universality of the notion of using address forms, the elements that make them up and the rules that govern their use are cultural and social bound. It examines the use of address forms in relation to the impact of social variables such as gender, age and status on the form being used. To this end, a discourse completion task (DCT) was used to collect data. Analysis of 2000 occurrences of using address terms was carried out. Occurrences were collected from 100 Jordanian people working for JHAS organization. The collected data were analyzed quantitatively. Data were categorized into ten major categories. Results of the study highlight the most persistent terms of address. Results show that personal 'first name' form was the most frequently used address form, while 'kinship terms' were the least used form of address.

Key words: address form, first name, (un)married woman, social factor, sociolinguistics, workplace

Cite as: Alsulami. S. Q. (2015). Variation in Address Forms for Arab Married and Unmarried Women in the Workplace: A Sociolinguistic Study. *Arab World English Journal*, 8 (3). DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol6no3.25>

Introduction

People in the Jordanian society tend to use learned or borrowed English words while communicating, including address terms such as Madam, Boss, Doctor, and so forth. That is why it is not unusual to hear Jordanian people in the workplace addressing each other by terms such as 'Madam' for addressing married females, 'Miss' for addressing unmarried females, or 'Ms' when not knowing the marital status of a female or having no intention to specify it.

Oyetaide (1995:515) defines a term of address as "a word or [an] expression used in interactive, dyadic and face to face situations to designate the person being talked to". Parkinson (1985:1) also defines terms of address as words that refer to the addressee in a speech event, and can convey social information related to the interlocutors, place and time of the speech event. Forms of address make up an aspect of the role that speech may play in interpersonal relationships (Hymes, 1964).

In other words, forms of address are words or expressions assigned to the addressee, and deemed as conveyors of information about who the speaker is, when and where these words are used, and to whom these words are being used. Forms of address constitute a well established semantic field that involves distinctive lexical categories such as kin terms, titles, personal names, nicknames, pronouns, etc.

The lexical meaning of address terms may differ from "the addressee characteristics" (Braun, 1988:7). That is, if someone uses a particular form of address, this is likely to mean that the speaker would like "to assign [the addressee] a particular role" (Goyvaerts, 1972:4), as being a superior, a subordinate, a stranger, a relative, and so forth.

The notion behind assigning the addressee a certain role might be extended to justify the use of a speaker for many address terms to address a female in a speech event occurring for example in a workplace. A speaker may use the female personal name (for example, Laila), title (for example, Miss), occupational term (Doctor), kinship term (Mama) and polite/respectful term (Madam, *sittorsayyidah* – Arabic terms equivalent to 'Ms or Madam'). Interestingly, such address forms usually follow socially understood and appreciated rules.

This study investigates the address forms that are usually used in the workplace to address Arab married and unmarried women. It is meant to explore the most persistent terms of address, their socially related variations as well as their linguistic features in the Jordanian speech community, as an example, in light of politeness theory.

Address forms are essential for successful communication and are considered a significant sign of how fine a relationship is. However, being socially related and sometimes unpredictable in terms of their use by the speaker or their perception by the addressee, applying the appropriate terms of address is not an easy task. It requires taking into account several factors such as sex, age, formality of the setting, interlocutors' roles and hierarchical status in a workplace, degree of intimacy, interlocutors' emotional state, and even the presence of out-group persons.

Unlike other areas of sociolinguistic research, address forms in Arab societies are not well studied despite their role in initiating effective communication. Today, the complexity of communication in hierarchical organizations seems to exist due to the correlation between the social variables that govern communication, including terms of address usage. Therefore, to gain

an effective communication requires an accurate use of terms for addressing others in different situations in the workplace, which brings the present study to the fore.

In today's workplace dyadic interactions, if the boss is younger than his employee or a friendship between them has developed over the time, for example, this will affect the power, intimacy and solidarity level, and thus affect the used address forms. Such variables are expected to impact the successful employment of terms of address and their structure as well; and various address forms, which correspond to variations across relative societies and speech events, would appear. Accordingly, sociolinguistic variables that govern the use of address terms are language, culture, society and context specific, which make investigating address terms in the workplace of paramount importance.

Departing from research in this sociolinguistic as well as semantic field, the researcher of this study aims to add to the knowledge base by investigating the address forms used by Arabs in the workplace to address the married and unmarried women. It is a description of the sociolinguistic structure of Arabic forms of address as used in the Jordanian society. In an attempt to achieve the study's purpose, the researcher has sought answers for the following three focus questions:

1. In what titles do the Jordanian employees address their companions of Jordanian female employees at work?
2. Do they use first name, titles, polite forms or any combination of these?
3. What are the social factors that affect the speaker to use one term over the other?

Personal address forms constitute "a sociolinguistic subject par excellence" (Philipsen & Huspek, 1985:94). Therefore, although the notion of using address forms is universal, the elements that make up the personal address terms and the rules that govern their employment are cultural and social bound, which makes it worth investigation.

Wood & Kroger (1991:145) mention that studying address forms is a popular sociolinguistics topic because address forms can set the tone for the interpersonal exchanges, and set the relative power and distance between the speaker and the addressee. These reasons behind the study of address forms would establish the foreground of the present study as it is expected to mirror the social relations in Jordanian speech community.

This study is hoped to classify instances of terms of address into major patterns. It shed light on the notion that terms of address do encode much information about the speaker, addressee and the kind of relationship between them. In addition, this study indicates to what extent Jordanian male and female employees are aware of differences in social status.

This study highlights the different concepts of address theory such as power and solidarity, politeness principle, etc. It also shows how these concepts are applied to the Arab culture, in the Jordanian society that is characteristic of Arab and Islamic culture. The researcher clarifies how consistent the Jordanian female-address system in the workplace is with the universal tendencies of address system and with the findings of other researchers in different languages.

This study is believed to be the first in Jordan to address the forms used for addressing females, especially in the workplace. This study, adds to the knowledge base by covering this gap. The researcher hopes to open the door for other Arab researchers to address issues related to

address forms, for example, the effect of using address forms on management and discipline, flow of communication, turn taking, students' performance, and many other applied areas.

The study would construct an analytical framework of address forms in the Jordanian society, and thus, extending the results into the Jordanian organizations. This study is likely to provide evidence for the argument that address forms are sensitive to a variety of factors among Jordanians. The results of this study are hoped to contribute to public and private organizations by providing some vital information on developing a guideline for assessing the address forms that are necessary to be used in work environment.

The study may introduce some pedagogic implications, especially to non-native Arabic learners, by offering some insights for address forms which could be introduced to teaching materials. Such materials are likely to provide learners of Arabic with a framework for good mastery of appropriate address forms to be used in intercultural communication.

Method and Procedures

The participants of this study constituted of a total of 100 randomly chosen Jordanian social workers, data entry-staff, and clinical employees from the northern as well as the central parts of Jordan, working for the Jordan Health Aid Society (JHAS) in different cities, namely: Irbid, Mafrag (northern cities), Amman & Zarqa (central cities).

The choice of those participants is made because they work in different offices, field positions and locations in Jordan, but for the same agency for which the researcher herself works. Thus, they are believed to be more representative and cooperative in providing clear and explicit expression of the forms of address they usually use in workplace, thus help in rendering more reliable elicited data and findings.

The decision to have participants from various groups of age, gender, residential area, educational level and ranks is consciously made to weigh the employed forms of addressing married/unmarried females against such variables. Many researchers such as Brown & Levinson (1987), Broom et al. (1968) and Ray (1971) consider such factors as occupation, rank, education, etc. as determining factors of social interaction and social class. The randomly selected participants are found to belong to three age groups.

Most of the participants (70%) are between 22 and 29 years of age, while participants who are 40 years old and older constitute 6% of the sample. Participants are equally divided into 50% of male workers and 50% of female workers. 67 % of participants come from rural areas and 33% come from urban residential areas. Most participants hold bachelor degrees 81% and 17 % are without a university degree, whereas only 2% of degree holders have an MA or above degree.

Participants were invited to participate in the study with the mediation of friends, colleagues, and friends of colleagues. The use of such network or relations was believed to include more cooperative participants. Following this invitation, 100 employees volunteered. The participants were introduced to a 20-situation Discourse Completion Task (DCT), comprising real-life situations that were designed to evoke the use of address forms.

Prior to the distribution of the DCT forms, the researcher instructed her assistants to approach the participants in a warm manner that allows them to gain their ultimate assistance. Assistants were also asked to explain the goals of the research to the participants and to reassure them that the elicited data will be used for the research purpose and will not be disclosed.

The DCT was chosen as a means of collecting data for this study as it is believed that such technique can capture the required information to trace the study questions. Moreover the DCT would be a reliable means to know the linguistic and social constraints of using address forms. In order to ensure the reliability of the research instrument, it was given to ten participants at a workplace prior to the official distribution of the DCT as a pilot study, they assured the familiarity and reoccurrence of such situations in their real life. The ten participants finished responding to the DCT without facing any difficulties.

Part one of the DCT aimed at gathering personal information about the participants to help in the categorization task. It consisted of personal information, including the age, sex, residential area, and the educational level of the participants. Part two consists of a description of 20 situations prompting the use of some address terms. The social distance variable and the rank level were contained in each situation. Situations were designed to reflect on behavior of addressing married and unmarried females.

Participants were asked to respond to the situations and to provide the response to each real life related situation as if they were in a real situation, where they might be equal, higher or lower in rank, older or younger than the addressee.

The network of friends, aided in data gathering the DCT, were directed to write down all expressions and terms produced by the respondents and any context-related issues that may help in the analysis of the gathered data. Following this method, quite a large number of expressions used by Jordanians in actual social interactions in their workplaces were gathered.

The classification is based on the following broad labeling:

Table 1. Address forms labeling

Ser.	Address Forms
1	Academic title, e.g. Doctor
2	Occupational term, e.g. Boss
3	Endearment term, e.g. dear
4	Title: Madam, Mrs, Ms
5	Title: Miss (and its equivalents)
6	Personal first name
7	Kinship term, e.g. uncle
8	Personal last name
9	Polite words, e.g. please
10	Father and mother of...
11	Combinations, e.g. first name+last name

The used address forms were then counted and their percentages were taken. The strategies resorted to by the participants were compared in order to shed light on any available similarities or differences regarding the various variables: age, gender, social distance, etc.

The provided responses by the participants were checked if related to any of the term categories mentioned in Table 1, and any emerging category was intended to be added as a new category. All identified address forms were tabulated, described, and compared.

Data were categorized and statistically analyzed, following the traditional address forms taxonomies used by Brown & Gilman (1960), Yassin (1975), McConnell-Ginet (1978), Zhou (1998), Okamura (2002), Aliakbari & Toni (2008), Yang (2010), Afzali (2011), and Suryanarayan & Larina (2012) in light of Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness principle.

Results and Discussion

All the responses were gathered, counted and categorized with regard to the address forms used for addressing the married females, those used for addressing the unmarried females, and the combinations of used address terms. Then, the identified address forms were compared according to the speaker's (addresser's) gender group, age group, place of residence (rural vs. urban places), and educational level.

The identified forms used for addressing married females in official situation (such as meetings) and less official situation (as in lunch break) were then compared to those used for addressing the unmarried females. In these situations, the addressee was older and higher in rank than the speaker. The identified forms for addressing married females in official situation (meeting) and less official situation (lunch break) were then compared to those used for addressing the unmarried females, but in situations where the addressee was younger, and higher in rank. The percentages of the findings were based on the 2000 gathered responses. The collected forms of addressing married and unmarried females were then compared with regard to the situations where the addressee was older and equal in rank, younger and equal in rank, older and lower in rank, and younger and lower in rank.

Based on the analysis of the gathered data, the researcher managed to identify the forms of address used for addressing married as well as unmarried females in different situations of workplace. Table 2 below presents the identified forms of address, the number of occurrences of each form of address, and how frequently each form is used by the participants.

Table 2. The identified address forms

Address forms	Total number of occurrences	%
Academic title (e.g. Professor)	86	4.3
Endearment term (e.g. Dear)	103	5.15
Polite words (e.g. please, <i>a'zeezeti</i> , <i>hadratek</i> , <i>ezatakaremti</i> , <i>ezasemehti</i>)	270	13.5

Umm... (mother+of son/daughter's name)	193	9.65
Madam, Sayyidah (literally means Madam), Mrs, Ms, Miss, <i>ʔaniseh</i> (literally means Miss)	266*	13.3
Occupational term (e.g. Boss)	251	12.55
First name	814	40.7
Kinship term (e.g. <i>ʔoxti</i> , meaning my sister; <i>xaltoh</i> , meaning aunty)	4	0.2
Last/family name	13	0.65
Total	2000	100%

* 207 for Miss and its equivalents, and 59 for Madam and its equivalents

Unlike Okamura (2002) who mentioned that combinations of two or more forms of address (such as title+last name) might be used by some people to show respect and independence to others in the organization, the researcher of the present study found that no combinations were used by any of the participants of this study except two times in *ʔoxtMays*, and *xaltohʕelia*. Therefore, combinations will not be mentioned as a pattern in the study.

Apparently, the identified forms used to address both the married and unmarried women in the workplace include the following:

1. The use of academic title (mainly, *ʔostaðeh* for Professor, *Doctorah* for Doctor, *Muhendeseh* for Engineer, and *Sister* for nurses).
2. Using endearment term (mainly, *ʕezizeti* for my dear).
3. Using polite words, exclusively, *law semehtianeðatakaremti* for excuse me, and *men fedlek, ðedretek* for your honour.
4. Using the form 'Umm+son/daughter's name' meaning 'Mother of+...' as in: *Umm Mohammad, Ummhelmi, and Umm Sami*.
5. Using Madam/ Sayyidah/Mrs/Sitt as in: *Madam ʕelia*, and *SittHaya*.
6. Using *ʔaniseh* for Miss, as in: *ʔanesehSuha*.
7. Using occupational terms, mainly, *Mudir* for Director, and *Zemili* for mu colleague.
8. Using first name such as *Mays, Mohammad, Ali, Musʕab*, etc.
9. Using kinship terms, mainly, *oxti* for sister and *xaltoh* for aunt.
10. Using the last/family name such as: *Nawafleh, ʕejlouni, Tahat, Rjoob, ʕalawneh*, etc

In terms of the frequency of employment of the identified address forms, the most frequently address form used to address women in the workplace was utilizing the 'first name' (40%). This finding is in line with Okamura's (2002:76) findings which indicated that interlocutors tend to use the first name as the most common form for addressing. In this study, first name was used more than 40% of the times, followed by three other address forms, including the use of 'polite words', 'titles such as Madam and Miss', and 'occupational terms' that were used almost equally, with an average of about 13% of the total occurrences each. On

the contrary, the least used address forms were 'kinship terms' and 'last/family names', both of which occurred even less than 1% of the total occurrences.

In order to see whether differences or similarities exist in the address forms that are used for addressing the married and the unmarried women, the researcher compared the occurrences and frequency of use of each address form for both the unmarried and the married women based on the 20 situations of the DCT that comprised 10 situations that involved married women, and 10 situations that included unmarried females. Table 3 below shows the similarities as well as the differences in address forms.

Table 3. Married versus unmarried females' address forms

Address forms	Total number of occurrences	Married		Unmarried	
		No.	%	No.	%
Academic title	86	36	41.87	50	58.13
Endearment term	103	70	67.97	33	32.03
Polite words	270	100	37.04	170	62.96
Mother+of...	193	193	100	0	0
Madam, Sayyidah, Mrs, Ms	59	59	100	0	0
?nisety/ Miss	207	0	0	207	100
Occupational term	251	193	76.90	58	23.10
First name	814	337	41.40	477	58.60
Kinship term	4	4	100	0	0
Last/family name	13	8	61.54	5	38.46
Total	2000	1000		1000	

Table 3 illustrates that the same types of address forms are interchangeably used to address the unmarried as well as the married women in the workplace, except for 'Umm/mother + son/daughter's name', and 'kinship terms' which were not used at all for addressing the unmarried female employees.

Interestingly, the dominantly used kinship term was ?oxti(meaning, my sister). The repeated use of ?oxti in Arab societies is usually used to create a feeling of trust and ease in dealing. In addition, the avoidance to use 'mother+of...' form in addressing the unmarried is likely because using it in an Arab Jordanian workplace would be considered impolite behavior as it may badly harm the addressee's face; unmarried females in Jordan usually do not favour being addressed as such.

In line with the universal norm of the use of the terms 'Madam' and 'Miss', speakers did not use the term 'Madam' to address unmarried females; instead, they use 'Miss or ?aniseh'. It should be highlighted that the major difference in the use of the identified forms of address lies in the frequency of using each type.

For example, on the first hand, the most frequently forms used to address married women in the workplace are 'first name', occupational terms' and 'mother+of...', while the least used forms are 'kinship terms' and 'last name' forms.

On the other hand, first name', 'ʔanisety/ Miss' and 'polite words' seem to be the most repeatedly used forms for addressing the unmarried female employees, while 'last name' form of address is rarely used.

From another angle, occupational terms and endearment terms were used to address the married women far more than the unmarried. Nevertheless, polite words and 'first name' form were also used to address the unmarried female employees far more than the married one.

Brown and Levinson (1978:96) discussed the influence of social distance between the speaker and the addressee, the relative power between them, and the rank of imposition. Holmes (1993:159) also indicates to the remarkable effect of social distance in relation to age and gender on the strategies used by people.

This section presents the impact of social variables in relation to gender, age and social context on the use of address forms in the workplace.

To highlight the relationship between age and the employed address forms, see Table 4 below:

Table 4. Address forms by speaker's age group

Address forms	Total occurrences	% Group 1 (22-29)	% Group 2 (30-39)	% Group 3 (40-49)
Academic title	86	60.46%	23.26%	16.28%
Endearment term	103	67.98%	29.2%	3%
Polite words	270	50.55%	44.45%	5%
Mother+of...	193	65.28%	17.61%	17.11%
Madam, Sayyidah, Mrs	59	84.76%	15.24%	0
ʔanisety/ Miss	207	93.72%	6.28%	0
Occupational term	251	71%	20%	9%
First name	814	71%	25%	4%
Kinship term	4	75%	25%	0
Last/family name	13	77%	23%	0
Total occurrences	2000			

Obviously, Table 4 shows that, the address forms 'Madam', 'ʔanisety/ Miss' 'kinship terms' and 'last name' were not used at all by Age Group 3. Other groups used all kinds of address forms with different frequencies. When it comes to Age Group 1, apparently, they used all address forms more than any other group. They used 'ʔanisety/ Miss' nearly 94% of the occurrences of this form. More than three quarters of 'occupational terms', 'first name', kinship terms' and last names' were also used by group 1 participants. Regarding Age Group 2, the frequency of using 'polite words' was about 44% of this particular form of address, which was the highest between the remaining address forms. Age Group 2 used 'academic title',

endearment terms', 'occupational term', 'first name', 'kinship terms', and 'last name' at the average frequency of 25 % of each of these forms of address.

It should be emphasized in this place that 'academic title', 'endearment term', polite words', 'mother+of...', 'occupational term' and 'first name' forms were used by all participants, regardless of their age. However, it can be concluded that the older the speaker, the less varied forms of address are used.

Considering that the total number of occurrences made by Age Group 1, 2 and 3 were 1400, 480 and 120 respectively, the researcher found that the youngest group used 'first name' form of address as their favorite form with an average of 40%, while 'kinship terms' and 'last name' were the least favored forms of address even for Age Group 2. See Table 5 below.

Table 5. Address forms by each speaker age group's occurrences

Address forms	% Group 1 (22-29)	% Group 2 (30-39)	% Group 3 (40-49)
Academic title	4%	4%	12%
Endearment term	5%	6%	3%
Polite words	11%	20%	12%
Mother+of...	9%	7%	27%
Madam, Sayyidah, Mrs	4%	7%	0
ʔanisety/ Miss	14%	3%	0
Occupational term	12%	10%	19%
First name	40%	42%	27%
Kinship term	0.30%	0.3%	0
Last/family name	0.70%	0.7	0
Total occurrences %	100%	100%	100%

Considering that the total number of occurrences made by Age Groups 1, 2 and 3 were 1400, 480 and 120 consecutively, the researcher found that the youngest group used 'first name' form of address as their favorite form with an average of 40%, while 'kinship terms' and 'last name' were the least favored forms of address. Age Group 2 tended to use 'first name' and 'polite words' mostly. The oldest group of participants preferred using 'first name' and 'mother+of...' forms.

In light of studies that highlight gender as a major factor affecting linguistic forms, the researcher presents the frequency of address forms' use in Table 6.

Based on the occurrences of the 100 participants, 50 female speakers used all address forms except for the academic title, while the 50 male speakers left out kinship terms and last name forms unused, and they used no address forms at all 20 times. Frequency of using the forms of address seems to vary according to the gender of the participant. First name represented

about 53% of the female occurrences, 'ʔanisety/ Miss' and 'Mother+of...' represented about 23% of the occurrences. With regard to the male speakers, first name, occupational term, and polite words constituted about 68% of their total occurrences.

Table 6. Address forms by speakers' gender

Address forms	Occurrences in 20 situations	Occurrences of female speakers	Occurrences of male speakers
Academic title	86	0	86
Endearment term	103	73	30
Polite words	270	95	175
Mother+of...	193	106	87
Madam, Sayyidah, Mrs, Ms	59	55	4
ʔanisety/ Miss	207	122	85
Occupational term	251	23	228
First name	814	529	285
Kinship term	4	4	0
Last/family name	13	13	0
No forms of address used	-	-	20
Total of occurrences	2000 (100%)	1000 (100%)	1000 (100%)

Table 6 obviously presents that both male and female in the workplace tend to use the 'first name' most of the time. Nevertheless, female speakers use the 'first name' nearly twice more than male speakers. Male speakers seem to use 'first name' not far differently from the 'occupational terms'. Saying that, male speakers use 'occupational terms' ten times more than female speakers do; and 'polite words' were used by the male speakers two times more than females do. Regarding the female speakers, they tend to use the endearment term twice more than male speakers do. Besides, females use 'Madam, Sayyidah, Mrs, Ms' far more than males. Apparently, female speakers' use of 'kinship terms' and the 'last name' was rare. Male speakers tended to use neither the kinship terms nor the last name when addressing the females in the workplace.

In terms of geographically distributed employment of address forms, Table 7 below shows that participants from Irbid and Mafrag (northern cities of Jordan) as well those from Amman and Zarqa (central cities of Jordan) used all types of address form, but with different frequencies. It is worth reemphasizing that 67 participants came from the northern cities, while 33 participants were from the central cities.

Table 7. Address forms by geography

Address forms	Occurrences of speakers of northern cities	Occurrences of speakers of central cities
	%	%
Academic title	5.03	4.85
Endearment term	7.90	1.67
Polite words	2.90	8.33
Mother+of...	10.90	9.10
Madam, Sayyidah, Mrs, Ms	5.36	2.12
?aniset/ Miss	10.10	12.88
Occupational term	16.40	11.06
First name	40.34	47.57
Kinship term	0	0.61
Last/family name	1.07	1.81
Total occurrences	100%	100%

All participants used the all identified address forms except for those from the northern cities, who did not use 'kinship terms'. The 67 participants of the northern cities used the forms of address 1340 times in 20 situations, while participants of the central cities used forms of address 660 times. Based on the total times made by each group, the percentage of frequency of using each address form is elicited.

First name was the most frequently used address form by both groups, with about 40% of the total occurrences of the northern cities' participants, and more than 47% of the central cities' total occurrences. Occupational terms were the second address form in frequency of use by the northern cities' group, while '?aniset/ Miss' followed by 'occupational terms' were used relatively about the same frequency by the central cities' group. Endearment terms were used much more frequently by the participants coming from the northern cities (7.90%) than those occurrences made by the second group (1.67%). In comparison, polite words were used more frequently by speakers coming from the central cities (8.33%) than those of the northern cities (2.90%), while kinship terms followed by 'last name' address form were of the lowest frequency of use by participants of the central cities.

In an attempt to highlight the relationship between the level of education of speakers and their use of address forms in the workplace, the researcher grouped the participants into a group of participants who do not have a certificate above the general secondary school certificate (Group 1) and the analysis showed that they were 17 speakers; 81 participants with BA degree (Group 2), and 2 speakers with an MA and higher educational level (Group 3), and a group of participants. See Table 8 below.

Table 8. Address forms by academic level

Address forms	% Group 1	% Group 2	% Group 3
Academic title	2.10	4.80	2.5
Endearment term	5.60	5.05	0
Polite words	12.09	12.60	62.5
Mother+of...	9.00	10.11	0
Madam, Sayyidah, Mrs, Ms	3.00	3.02	0
?aniset/ Miss	12.10	10.24	0
Occupational term	16.50	12.03	0
First name	39.40	41.40	25.00
Kinship term	0.30	0.19	0
Last/family name	0	0.56	10.00

Groups 1, 2 and 3 were based on the total occurrences of address forms made by each group: 340, 1620, and 40 occurrences, consecutively. Obviously, speakers of Groups 1 and 2 tended to use all address forms except for the 'last name' which was not used at all by Group 1. Occupational terms were the second preferred address forms for Group 1 speakers (about 17%), while '?aniset/ Miss' and 'polite words' were used relatively with the same frequency and in the third rank, with about 12% each of Group 1 total occurrences. Speakers of Group 2 used occupational words and polite words relatively with the same frequency (12%), followed by '?aniset/ Miss' and 'mother+of...' with a frequency of use at about 10% of their total made occurrences of address forms. Kinship terms were the least used address form by Group 1 speakers, while Group 2 speakers' least used address forms were kinship terms as well 'last name' forms.

As regards Group 3, speakers used only 'academic titles', 'polite words', 'first name' and 'last name' forms. Polite words were the preferred form of address used by people with the highest level of education, as it was used more than half of the times of the group made occurrences, followed by 'first name' as their second choice, with 25% of their used address forms. This might be because people with higher academic degrees receive respect by all employees in the Jordanian workplaces more than any other groups; and they are usually appointed in higher positions than those of other groups, and thus they feel equal if not even higher than some employees.

Therefore, all that seem to qualify them to feel some ease in using just some polite words or even the first names. Bearing in mind the limited number of participants with an MA degree and above in this study, it can be said that the higher the educational level speakers have, the less address forms they tend to use.

The researcher assumed that speakers would tend to use more address forms, especially those related to the occupational terms, when the addressee was higher in rank than the speaker. However, the influence of the rank or the position of the addressee may diminish, especially in cases where the addressee might be younger or equal in age to the speaker. Therefore, she sheds

light on this issue to verify the influence of the rank/position of the addressee along with the addressee's age.

Table 9 below presents how speakers tend to address the unmarried as well as the married women who are older and higher in rank in highly official situation such as meeting (and the total of which were 200 made occurrences, hereafter), and in less official context such as lunch break (and the total of which were 200 made occurrences, hereafter).

Table 9: Addressing 'older and higher in rank' unmarried/ married women

Married addressee	% Highly official situation	% Less official context	Unmarried addressee	% Highly official situation	% Less official context
Polite words	144	85	Polite words	92	65
Academic title	15	30	Academic title	50	68
Mother+of...	7	40	Occupational term	38	40
Madam, Sayedah	11	20	Miss, ?aniseh	20	27
Occupational term	23	25			
Total	200	200	Total	200	200

Analyzing the gathered data related to the DCT situations that were intended to find out the address forms that might be used to address 'older and higher in rank' unmarried/ married women', the researcher found out that in such situations speakers use 'polite words', 'academic title', 'mother+of...', 'Madam/Saydeh', and 'occupational terms' to address the married women.

With regard to addressing the unmarried women, speakers also used 'occupational terms' and 'Miss/?aniseh' besides 'polite words' and 'academic title'. Apparently, the form 'mother of' was not used to address the unmarried women, which might be explained in the general dislike of single women in Jordan to be addressed as such.

Seemingly, 'polite words' were the most repeatedly used address forms. They seem to be used far more in highly official situations such as meetings than in situations like lunch break, and this is probably due to the closeness people may feel when sitting in a dining hall eating together far from the work routine, while in situations like meetings speakers need to show more respect than solidarity. On the contrary, the remaining used address forms were more frequently used in the less official situations.

Nevertheless, things were not that different when speakers addressed the women who were higher in rank but younger than them, except for the tendency of speakers not to use the form of 'mother of', including the married women, unlike the situations where women were older. Table 10 below presents how speakers tend to address the unmarried as well as the married women who are younger and higher in rank than the speakers.

Table 10: Addressing 'younger and higher in rank' unmarried/ married women

Married addressee	% Highly official situation	% Less official context	Unmarried addressee	% Highly official situation	% Less official context
Polite words	150	100	Polite words	120	95
Academic title	20	40	Academic title	20	48
Occupational term	30	60	Miss, ?aniseh	34	31
			Occupational term	26	26
Total	200	200	Total	200	200

Unlike the situations when addressing 'older and higher in rank' married women, speakers used 'occupational terms' twice more in less official situations than in the highly official situations to address the younger married women. Similarly, to address the unmarried women in less official situations, speakers doubled the use of 'academic titles', but when it comes to using 'Miss/?aniseh' and 'occupational terms', speakers tend to use them relatively with the same frequency in all situations.

Moving from the situations where the addressee is higher in rank than the speaker, the researcher also highlights the effect of interaction with women who are equal in rank to the speakers. Table 10 below shows the used address forms when speaking with females, who are older and equal in rank. Table 11 is intended to determine whether variations exist when addressing females who are younger and equal in rank.

Table 11: Addressing 'older and equal in rank' unmarried/ married women

Married addressee	% Highly official situation	% Less official context	Unmarried addressee	% Highly official situation	% Less official context
First name	121	130	First name	160	200
Mother+of...	28	15	Miss, ?aniseh	30	0
Kinship term	13	20	Kinship term	10	0
Last name	8	20			
Madam/Sayedah	30	15			
Total	200	200		200	200

Table 11 presents that, similarly to the situations where the addressees were higher in rank than the speaker, the speakers used 'mother+of...' and 'Madam/Sayedah' to address married women who were equal in rank to them. Yet, the speakers used more different address forms to address females of equal rank, including 'first name', kinship terms', and 'last name'.

Moving away from the situations where the addressees are higher in rank than the speaker, the researcher also highlights the effect of interaction with women who are equal in rank to the speakers. It is worth highlighting that only 'first name' address form was used to address older and equal in rank unmarried females in less official situations.

Regarding addressing unmarried females, Table 10 above also shows that speakers used 'Miss' to address the unmarried females, similarly to those situations where the addressees were

older and higher in rank. However, the other address forms that were used in cases which included females of equal ranks to the speakers were not in common with those situations of women with higher rank. These forms included 'first name' and 'kinship terms'.

When comparing Table 12 below with Table 9 above, it seems evident that 'polite words' were in common in situations that included younger married women, whether of higher or equal rank with the speaker. Similarly when addressing the unmarried females, speakers use 'polite words' and 'Miss'.

However, other different address forms were used in situation where the addressees were younger and equal in rank.

Table 12: Addressing 'younger and equal in rank' unmarried/ married women

Married addressee	% Highly official situation	% Less official context	Unmarried addressee	% Highly official situation	% Less official context
Mother+of...	30	30	First name	133	0
Polite words	30	10	Polite words	47	0
First name	140	160	Miss, ?aniseh	20	0
Total	200	200		200	0

Table 12 shows that in addition to 'polite words', the speakers used 'first name' and 'mother+of...' to address the married younger women of equal ranks. Moreover, in addition to 'polite words' and 'Miss/?aniseh', speakers also used 'first name' to address unmarried younger females of equal ranks. Obviously, 'first name' address form was the most frequently used in both highly official and less official situations. It is also worth mentioning that only 'first name' address form was used to address younger and equal in rank unmarried females in less official situations.

Having reviewed the situations that included unmarried and married women who were higher than as well as equal in rank to the speakers, the researcher moved one step forward to see how things may differ when addressing women with lower rank than the speaker. See Table 13

Table 13: Addressing 'older and lower in rank' unmarried/ married women

Married addressee	% Highly official situation	% Less official context	Unmarried addressee	% Highly official situation	% Less official context
First name	160	170	First name	170	200
Mother+of...	30	30	Polite words	30	0
Polite words	10	0			
Total	200	200		200	200

Table 13 shows that the situations that included married women of lower rank and older than the speakers used the 'first name', 'mother+of...' and 'polite words', where 'first name' forms was used more repeatedly than other used forms in both highly and less official situations.

Similarly, for addressing unmarried females, speakers used 'first name' and 'polite words' in both kinds of situations, but they only used 'first name' in the less official situations. This unique use of 'first name' address form was evident in situations where the addressee was both younger and lower in rank than the speaker. See Table 14

Table 14: Addressing ‘younger and lower in rank’ unmarried/ married women

Married addressee	% Highly official situation	% Less official context	Unmarried addressee	% Highly official situation	% Less official context
First name	200	200	First name	200	200

Only ‘first name’ form was used to address unmarried and married women in the two kinds of situations. This is likely because people in Jordan usually tend to feel closeness and solidarity with females who are younger, especially when their ranks in the workplace will not be a constraint in mutual communication.

In relation to the first two questions of the study, results have shown that the titles and terms that the Jordanian employees use to address their female companions in the workplace fall in different address forms categories, as follows: Academic titles, endearment terms, polite words, using ‘mother+of...’ form, Madam/ Sayyidah/Mrs, Miss and ?aniseh, occupational terms, first name, kinship terms (mainly xaltah, and ?oxti), and the last/family name.

In relation to the differences related to the use of such address forms in view of the married versus the unmarried employees, the same address forms are used to address both the unmarried and the married women, except for the ‘mother+of...’ form which is used exclusively to address the married women in the workplace. Besides, in line with the universal norm, Madam and its equivalents are used to address the married women, while ‘Miss’ and its equivalents are used to address the unmarried female employees.

In terms of the frequency of employment of the identified address forms, the most frequently address form used to address women in the workplace is utilizing the ‘first name’. This finding is in line with Okamura’s (2002:76) findings which indicate that interlocutors tend to use the first name as the most common form for addressing in most situations. In this study, first name is used more than 40% of the total 2000 occurrences, followed by the use of ‘polite words’, ‘Madam or Miss’, and ‘occupational terms’. On the contrary, the least used address forms were ‘kinship terms’ and ‘last/family names’.

Regarding the third question of the study about the social factors that may affect the speaker’s use of address term, the researcher has found that social factors (particularly, age, and rank) effect the tendency and preference of using address forms, and they are considered factors that influence the means of expressing attitude and values toward power and solidarity. This influence has led to a variation and adjustment in the use of address forms, which seems corresponding to Giles and Taylor’s (1977:322) contention that people accommodate and adjust their speech as a means of expressing attitudes towards others.

Such adjustments are evident in situations where participants tend to use only the ‘first name’ form to address the unmarried as well as the married women who are younger and of a lower rank than the speakers in an attempt to achieve solidarity and intimacy. Still, the same speakers avoid using ‘first name’ and ‘last name’ to address women who are older and higher in rank than the speakers in an attempt to maintain power-related distance.

Oyetade (1995) stresses that linguistic choices that are made by participants seem to be affected by social variables, mainly age and social status or rank. This is also on the same line of thought of Brown and Levinson (1978:96) and Holmes' (1993:159) indication to the effect of social factors on the employed strategies. In light of such studies, the present study has identified some features of the influence of social factors, in relation to age, gender, geography and residential area, level of education of interlocutors, and rank, on address forms used in the workplace.

As regards age impact, similar to the people of the Chinese culture, as mentioned by Ervin-Tripp (1972), the age in the Jordanian Arab culture is found essential in determining which address term should be used. Like Ervin-Tripp (1972:220), the researcher has found that limited address terms are usually used by speakers to address those who are younger than them or of similar age.

In addition, the researcher concluded that the older the speaker, the less varied forms of address are used. Similarly, the younger the speakers, the more tendency they have to use 'first name' form of address as their favorite. In addition, she found that the older the speakers, the more likely they tend to use 'first name' and 'mother+of...' forms. Conversely, she found that 'kinship terms' and 'last name' look as the speakers' least favourite forms of address.

When considering the rank together with the age of addressee, for example, there seems to have speakers' tendency to avoid the use of first or last name in addressing those women who are older and higher in rank in the workplace. This tendency may reflect the sensitivity in dealing with female superiors and the need of the speakers to maintain that level of power relationship between speakers and the women of higher rank. In comparison, in situations where the addressee women are equal to the speakers in rank or even lower, the speakers sometimes tend to use the 'first name' address form, even when the addressees are older or of the same age of the speakers. The researcher has also found that it is the power, which is represented in 'rank' in this study, which is more likely to influence the use of address forms.

This highlights that there is systematicity in such language behavior in Arabic (particularly, the Jordanian Arabic); and address forms in the workplace do have social functions, including showing politeness and respect, showing intimacy (especially when talking to women of lower ranks, and younger age), and displaying honor and social distance, especially when dealing with women who are older, married, and or of a higher rank (Yang, 2010:743; Thome-Williams, 2004:85).

This study shows that rank in the workplace is usually used to represent the status and position of people assuming certain roles, and thus, ranks entail the expected performance and address forms from interlocutors in any situation. This finding is similar to Goodenough's (1965) point in relation to the statuses as being determinant of concerning rights and duties. This study underlines that the higher the rank of the addressee, the more polite and far from the direct-naming address forms are used. Though, when the relationship between the interactants is equal in terms of rank and power, intimacy and solidarity are likely to imply symmetrical usage of address forms, as Fasold (1990) mentioned. In brief, similar to the findings of Brown & Ford's

(1961) study, this study stresses that status and intimacy between interlocutors are determining factors for selecting the forms of address.

It seems that even the situation itself has impact on the employed address forms. For example, when the same high official situations of the workplace (such as meetings) and less official situation of the workplace (such as lunch break) were used to find out the influence of age and rank together on the preference of using address forms, the researcher concluded, similarly to Keshavarz (2001:6), that setting and formality of context stress that context is also another factor that affects language use. In other words, linguistic and social behavior need be suitable for the situations wherein speakers use forms of address.

With regard to gender, highly significant differences have been identified in the frequency of speakers' use of certain address forms. For example, female speakers prefer to use the 'first name' nearly twice more than male speakers. Female speakers also tend to use the 'endearment terms' twice more than male speakers do. Besides, females use 'Madam, Sayyidah, Mrs, Ms' about 10 times more than male speakers. From the perspective of male speakers, they seem to use 'first name' as well as 'occupational terms' nearly with the same frequency. Male speakers use 'occupational terms' ten times more than the female speakers; and they doubled the use of 'polite words' over the female speakers' use of the same address form. The use of both 'kinship terms' and 'last name' forms was rare by the female speakers, and they were not used at all by male speakers.

In order to highlight any address form-related differences that are associated with the difference in regions of the same country, the researcher has found some differences in the frequency of using different address forms. The speakers of the central areas of Jordan tend to use the identified address forms twice more than the residents of the northern regions of the country. This might be related to the awareness level of the need and necessity to use the address forms in the workplace. For example, participants from the central region use the occupational terms 158 times in 20 situations, while participants from the northern cities used it 73 times.

First name is the most frequently used address form for both groups, with about 40% of the total occurrences of the northern cities' participants, and more than 47% of the central cities' total occurrences. Occupational terms are the second address form in terms of the frequency of use by the northern cities' group, while 'ʔanisety/ Miss' followed by 'occupational terms' are used relatively about the same frequency by the central cities' group. Endearment terms are used much more frequently by the participants coming from the northern cities (7.90%) than the second group (1.67%). In comparison, polite words are used more frequently by speakers coming from the central cities (8.33%) than those of the northern cities (2.90%), while kinship terms followed by 'last name' address form are of the lowest frequency of use by participants of the central cities.

However, using no form of address as in the cases where speakers used no address term at all, as in the lunch break when communicating with 'younger and equal in rank' unmarried/ married women, might be considered by the addressee as rude and showing disrespect, especially in cases of new arriving employees. This point is stressed by Yang (2010:744) who underlines that the absence of certain address forms especially in situations where the addressee expect

them is regarded rude. In this regard, the researcher is in line with Suryanarayan and Larina's (2012:10) point that women need to be held in respect, and any familiarity in Jordanian Arab culture might be misinterpreted.

What is also significant in this study is that the higher the academic level of speakers is, the less varied forms of address are used. Besides, it is worth reemphasizing that the lower the educational level of the speaker is, the more repeatedly he/she uses the academic title to address women in the workplace. Polite words are the preferred form of address used by people with the highest level of education (more than 50% of made occurrences), followed by 'first name' as their second choice (25% of the used address forms).

This limited number of address forms that are used by the highest academic level group might be because people with higher academic degrees in the Jordanian workplace usually receive respect by all employees more than any other groups; and they are usually appointed in higher positions than those of other groups, and thus they feel equal if not even higher than some employees. Therefore, all this qualifies them to feel some ease in using just a limited number of address forms such as polite words or even the first names. Bearing in mind the limited number of participants with an MA or higher degree in this study, it can be said that the higher the educational level speakers have, the less address forms they tend to use.

In light of politeness theory, since politeness is "culturally determined" Holmes (1995:285), it has been concluded in this study that the older the addressee, the more politeness is required from the speaker to show in the used address forms, which is the same finding of Wang (2003). The speaker should address the women in a way that shows positive politeness that values the addressee's status by demonstrating shared common ground that is achieved by the use of intimate forms of address (Brown and Levinson (1987:107). Nevertheless, exaggeration in intimacy and familiarity might be misinterpreted in the Jordanian Arab culture; thus, women should be held in respect, especially by male speakers. Therefore, even negative politeness ought to be applied to keep that distance and formality, especially with superiors, by using more formal address forms that use occupational terms, academic titles, polite words, and Madam/Miss.

Last but not least, it is important to mention that Suryanarayan and Larina's (2012:12) finding of the Indian society is in parallel with the finding of the present study in that: due to the hierarchical politeness system in workplace, politeness in Arab societies, such as the Jordanian are requires demonstrating the status of the addressee of the higher rank. Subordinates are required to apply negative politeness and avoid using first names and the intimate forms of positive politeness. It is essential for people in the same workplace to use the appropriate and acceptable address forms in accordance with the Jordanian Arab culture and social expectations.

This value of using the appropriate forms of address is considered by researchers in this field (such as Buss, 1999) as an etiquette that is followed to avoid being characterized as impolite or insulting. The speaker should assure the addressee married as well as unmarried women that he/she appreciates this value of her. Therefore, using the appropriate address forms is a way of reflecting politeness and respect to women, and acknowledging their value in hierarchy of politeness system in the workplace.

Different from Austin (1962:166) who pointed out that younger people tend to do more declining in defiance of their society cultural norms, results of this study show that the younger speakers and those with less academic degrees have more preference to use more varied address forms and more frequently than others. This might be due to their awareness of the importance of establishing relations with others in light of youth empowering and globalization trend throughout the country.

Kachru (1997:66) argues that "people who share a common language and culture have an easier time 'making sense' of each other's utterances and actions". Based on the discussion about the identified address forms used by the participants, and the relationship between the used address forms and social variables in relation to age, rank, gender, geography, level of education, degree of the officiality of the situation, and the bigger (Jordanian) social context, it can be said that address forms for Arab married and unmarried women in the workplace, particularly in Jordan, have a special patterning of can be understood and appreciated by people sharing the same socio-cultural background.

Despite the universality of the notion of using address forms, the findings emphasize that address forms in the workplace are society or culture specific. In addition, as Parkinson (1985) stated, forms of address are not and should not be selected randomly, and they are rather governed by factors such as those related to the addressee, where and when such terms are used. This study underlines that the attitude of a workplace society towards a female employee is well demonstrated in the way linguistic address forms are used to address the unmarried as well as the married women (Akindele, 2008:3).

Ssummary

The current study has investigated the most persistent Arabic address forms as usually used in the workplace for addressing married and unmarried women, and affecting social variables. Communication in the workplace where hierarchical relations exist seems not an easy task, which implies care about choosing the appropriate terms of address to be used. This special attention is due to the correlation between the social variables that govern communication in workplace context, including gender, age, formality of the setting, hierarchical status and rank, etc. Saying that, today's dyadic interactions in a workplace, where friendship and intimacy between employees may develop over the time, would affect the power, intimacy and solidarity level, and thus influence the address terms in place.

This study is meant to find and identify what titles the Jordanian employees use to address their female companions in the workplace, and what the social factors that affect the speaker's use of one address term over another. A total of 100 randomly chosen male and female employees working for the JHAS participated in the study. Participants came from different offices, positions and locations; yet, they belonged to the same bigger agency for which the researcher herself works. Working for the same agency, the researcher found it useful to find more cooperative employees in her study, and thus rendering more reliable elicited data and findings. Participants were of various groups of age, gender, residential area, educational level and ranks. This variety helped her weigh the employed forms of address against such variables. She used DCT of 20 situations prompting the use of address terms in response to each real life

related situation, where the addressee might be equal, higher/lower in rank, older or younger than the speaker.

Upon the completion of the data gathering, data were categorized and statistically analyzed, following the traditional address forms categories used by former researchers in the field (Brown & Gilman, 1960; Yassin, 1975; McConnell-Ginet, 1978; Zhou, 1998; Okamura, 2002; Aliakbari&Toni, 2008; Yang, 2010; Afzali, 2011; and Suryanarayan&Larina, 2012). The classification was based on the following broad labeling: Academic titles, Occupational term, Endearment terms, Madam, Mrs, Ms, Miss titles, First name, Last name, Kinship terms, Polite words, and umm+ of. The provided 2000 responses by participants constituted the corpus of study. The gathered data were checked if related to any of set address form categories mentioned, with a door open for registering any emerging category. All identified address forms were tabulated, described, and compared in relation to the intended social variables.

Conclusions

Studying forms of address is a sociolinguistic issue that can explicitly show the role that speech may play in interpersonal relationships of a speech event (Hymes, 1964) as address terms generally refer to and can convey social information concerning interlocutors, as well as speech event's place and time (Parkinson, 1985:1).

The addressee's characteristics entail differences in the used address terms and their lexical meanings (Braun, 1988:7). Using a certain form of address can assign a particular role to the addressee (Goyvaerts, 1972:4), as whether being a superior, a stranger, an intimate, etc. This study classified the gathered instances of terms of address into major patterns. It could shed light on the idea that address forms really encode a great deal of information about the speaker-addressee relationship. The researcher showed that the Arab, particularly the Jordanians', are in affinity with the universal trend of using the address forms; however, some society specifics seem to stand out, especially those related to the affecting social factors.

This study could highlight the different concepts of address theory such as power and solidarity and politeness principle. It also showed how these concepts are applied to the Arab culture, particularly to the Jordanian society. Because address forms are believed to manifest social relationships, this study could show variety in the types/categories, deletion, and changes in the frequency of employment of each form in light of changes in situations and characteristics of the interlocutors.

Results showed that the Jordanian employees use various address forms toward their female companions in the workplace, including: Academic titles, endearment terms, polite words, using 'mother+of...' form, Madam/ Sayyidah/Mrs titles, Miss and ?aniseh titles, occupational terms, personal first name, personal last/family name, and kinship terms (mainly xaltoh, and ?oxti). Positive address forms such as personal 'first names' and 'last names', and 'kinship terms' were used largely. Similarly, negative address forms such as 'occupational terms' and 'academic titles' were also used. Having said that, negative politeness address forms were more frequently used to address married and unmarried woman in the workplace.

This study has provided evidence that speakers' choices of forms of address do help us understand the typical and complex systems of interpersonal communication in workplace's daily interactions. According to Brown and Gilman (1960), social meanings and use of every language lexical items can be mapped onto the power as well as solidarity levels. Jordanian employees seem very dependent on relations, which may justify the tendency of establishing less formal style of forms of address even with superiors. This also emphasizes the importance of solidarity between workers.

Regarding the used forms of address for married and unmarried women, the same address forms were used to address both the unmarried and the married women, except for the 'mother+of...' form and 'Madam' title which were used exclusively to address married women. The most frequently address form that was frequently used to address women in the workplace is utilizing the 'first name'. Conversely, 'kinship terms' and personal 'last/family names' were the least used address forms.

Furthermore, social factors have been identified as key factors that influence the use of address forms. Most participants used a large number of address forms in their interaction with others, but with different frequency. The study highlighted the impact of social factors on the variation and adjustment in the use of address forms, which seems corresponding to Giles & Taylor's (1977:322) contention that people accommodate and adjust their speech as a means of expressing attitudes towards others.

With regard to age influence, the researchers concluded that the older the speaker, the fewer varied forms of address are used in favor of the frequent use of 'first name' and 'mother+of...' forms. Concerning the rank effect, the study concluded that speakers tended to avoid using the personal first or personal last name in addressing those women who are older and higher in rank. This displays that honor and social distance, especially when dealing with women who are older and of a higher rank, should be maintained. Moreover, this study underlines that the higher the rank of the addressee, the more polite address forms that are far from the direct-naming are used. Though, in situations that involve communicators who are equal or even lower in rank, address forms are likely to be characterized by intimacy.

The researchers could reveal that formality of context is another factor affecting on address forms' use that should be appropriate to the situation. Address terms used in a lunch break were more intimate and positive than those used in official meetings. With regard to gender, female speakers prefer to use the personal 'first name' as well as 'endearment terms' nearly twice more than male speakers to address women in the workplace. Female speakers also tend to use the titles of 'Sayyidah, Mrs, Ms' far more than male speakers. In comparison, male speakers use 'occupational terms' far more than the female speakers; and they doubled the use of 'polite words' over the female speakers' use. What seems to be in common is the rare use of both 'kinship terms' and personal 'last name' forms by both female speakers and male speakers.

With reference to the country region-based variations, speakers of the central areas of Jordan tended to use the identified address forms twice more than the speakers coming from the northern regions of the country. This could be ascribed to the awareness level about the need to

use the address forms in the workplace. This study showed that the higher the academic level of speakers is, the less varied forms of address are used.

Because of the hierarchical politeness system in workplace, politeness entails the demonstration of the status of the addressee, especially that of the higher rank, by using negative politeness. This study underlines that in an Arab workplace, subordinates should avoid using first names and the positive politeness/address forms when addressing women who have higher ranks than the speakers, especially when she is older. It is essential for people in the same workplace to use the appropriate and acceptable address forms in accordance with the Jordanian Arab culture and social expectations. Using no form of address at all, or inappropriate address term, might be considered by the addressee as rude and a sign of showing disrespect

About the Authors:

Mays Qasem Ajlouni

Department of English language and literature Faculty of Arts, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.

Dr. Lutfi Abulhaija

Head of Department, Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.

References

- Afzali, K. (2011). The address forms of spouses in different social strata in Iran and its sociolinguistic implications. In *International Journal of Linguistics*, 3, 1:10.
- Akindele, D. (2008). Sesotho address forms, *Linguistik Online*, 34, 2, 3-15.
- Aliakbari, M. & Toni, A. (2008). The realization of address terms in modern Persian in Iran: A sociolinguistic study. *Linguistik Online* 35, (3), 3-12.
- Braun, F. (1988). *Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Language and Cultures*. Berlin: mouton de gruyter.
- Broom, L, Lancaster, J.&Zubrzycki, J. (1968). Social stratification in Australia. In J. A. Jackson (ed.), *Social Stratification*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P.& Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage, Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics*. New York: Cambridge university press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, R.& Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In: Sebeoki, Thomas A. (ed.). *Style in Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, . 253 -276.
- Brown, R. & Ford, M. (1961). Address in American English. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 62, 375-85.
- Buss, S. (1999). Appearing respectful: The moral significance of manners. *Ethics*, 109, (4), 795-826.
- Carter, S. (2001). Rudeness has a first name. *Christianity Today*, 45,(13), 108-109.
- Collins, S. & Moore, E. (2004). Cross-cultural differences in preferred forms of address: implications for work with African American adults. *Advances in Social Work*, 164-171

- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1972). On Sociolinguistic Rules: Alternation and Co-occurrence. *Directions in Sociolinguistics. The Economic Journal of Takasaki City University of Economics*, 45(1), 71-94.
- Farghal, M. Shakir, A. (1994). Kin terms and titles of address as relational social honorifics in Jordan Arabic. *Journal of Anthropological Linguistics*, 36,(2), 240-253.
- Fasold, R. (1990). *Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford.
- Giles, H., Bourhis, R.& Taylor, D. (1977). Towards a theory of language and ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (ed.). *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations: European Monographs in Social Psychology*, 307-348. London: Academic Press.
- Goodenough, W. (1965). Rethinking "status" and "role": toward a general model of the cultural organization of social relationships. In Banton M. (ed.) *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology Monographs*. London: Tavistock.
- Goyvaerts, D. (1972). Linguistic behaviour and the acquisition of social roles: one aspect of linguistic performance', in *StudiaLinguistica*,26,(1), 1-13.
- Holmes, J. (1995). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics: Learning About Language*. London: Longman.
- Hymes, D. (1964). *Modes of Address, Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology*. NY : Harper and Row.
- Keshavarz, H. M (2001). The role of social context, intimacy, and distance in the choice of forms of address. *International Journal Social Language*, 148, 5-18.
- Masson, L. (2001). Ask an expert: Explaining the etiquette effect. *CA Magazine*, 134, 3, 18.
- McConnell-Ginet, S. (1978). Address forms in sexual politics. In *Women's Language and Style*, eds. Butturff, D. and Epstein, E. Akron. OH: University of Akron Press.
- Mehrotra, R. (1985). *Sociolinguistics in Hindi Contexts: Contributions to the Sociology of Language*. New York: mouton de gruyter.
- Okamura. A. (2002). How do English speakers address their Japanese colleagues? *In Multilingua*, 28, 355- 377.
- Owen, L. (1995). The role of teachers' education in nurturing honorable and principled teaching. *Educational Horizons*, 74, 43-48.
- Oyetade, S. (1995). A sociolinguistic Analysis of address terms in Yoruba. *Journal of Language and Society*, 24: 515-53.
- Parkinson, D. (1985). *Constructing the Social Context of Communication: Terms of Address in Egyptian Arabic*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Philipsen, G. and Huspek, M. (1985). A Bibliography of Sociolinguistic Studies of Personal Address. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 27, (1), 94-101.
- Ray, J. (1971). The questionnaire measurement of social class. *Australian and Newzealand Journal of sociology*, 7, 58-64.
- Scollon, R and Scollon, S. (2001). *Intercultural Communication* (2nd ed). Backwell.
- Suryanarayan, N. and Larina, T. (2012). English and Hindi Address Forms in a Bilingual Context. Reproduced by LAUD Linguistic Agency University of Duisburg-Essen.
- Thome-Williams, A. (2004). Sociolinguistic aspects of forms of address in Portugal and Brazil: Tu or Voce? *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 13, (3,) 85-99.
- Wang, J. (2003). A Comparative Analysis for Sino-English Appellation of Social Intercourse. *Journal of Harbin University*, 8, 48-50.
- Wierzbicka, A. (2010). *Experience, Evidence, and Sense: The Hidden Cultural Legacy of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Wood, L. & Kroger, R. (1991). Politeness and forms of address. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 3, 145-68.
- Yang, X (2010). Address forms of English: rules and variations. In *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1, 5, 743-745. Academy Publisher: Finland. doi:10.4304/jltr.1.5.
- Yassin, M. (1975). A linguistic study of forms of address in Kuwaiti colloquial Arabic. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Leeds.
- Yassin, M. (1977). Kinship terms in Kuwaiti Arabic. *Journal of Anthropological Linguistics*, 19,(3),125-132.
- Yousef, H. (2012). A sociolinguistic study of the terms of address in business in Jordanian Arabic. Jordan: Yarmouk University.
- Zhou, X. (1998). The comparison of terms of address between Chinese and American English. *Journal of Guangdong Education College*, 1, 88-9.