Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi

Hacettepe University Journal of Education

A Sociopragmatic Analysis of the Address Forms in Turkish High School EFL Textbook Dialogues[*]

Ahmet Can UYAR[**], Nalan KIZILTAN[***]

1. INTRODUCTION

In a world where the field of language education is a dynamic experience with modern perspectives emerging each day, the exchange structure of greeting as "Good morning, class! – Good morning, teacher!" is one of the static practices of a typical English language classroom in Türkiye. Following the teacher's line, the learners greet the teacher by addressing him/her as 'teacher'. Although this drill is frequently used and may be perceived as regular in a classroom full of non-native learners of English, addressing teachers by their occupational titles is not a regular practice in English. For instance, Webster (1988), who provided a useful guide to the address practices in English in many contexts, did not elaborate on any instances of such an address pattern between learners and teachers. In fact, learners usually address their teachers as Mr/Mrs + Last Name (LN) in English, and if there is a close relationship between the learners and the teacher, they may address them by their first names (FNs) (Clyne, Norrby, & Warren, 2009).

Addressing plays a crucial role in social interactions, and it is a common practice during communication (Chen, 2010). The various forms of address serve as tools for expressing respect, affection, or disrespect towards others (Yang, 2010). In a similar vein, Brown and Levinson (1987) contended that addressing is a fundamental component of interaction since it reveals the speakers' attitudes towards their conversation partners. Moreover, using appropriate address forms is key for individuals to establish their affiliation with a particular social group, while making incorrect choices in this regard can negatively impact the interaction. While this holds true, the introductory example above casts doubt on to what extent the appropriate addressing is emphasized in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms in Türkiye. Regarding the fact that the current vogue in language teaching is to promote communicative competence, including pragmatic and sociopragmatic competences, addressing should be paid close attention in language teaching classrooms and the learners' awareness on this issue should be raised. In this regard, the fact that the development of pragmatic competence involves "pragmatically appropriate input" (Bardovi-Harlig, 1996, p. 24) gives rise to the role of EFL textbooks in terms of providing a good command of input encompassing the elements of appropriate addressing.

[**] Instructor, Sivas Cumhuriyet University, School of Foreign Languages, Sivas-TÜRKİYE. e-mail: ahmetcanuyar97@gmail.com (ORCID: 0000-0003-2438-9877)

[***] Prof. Dr., Ondokuz Mayıs University, Faculty of Education, Department of Foreign Language Education, Samsun-TÜRKİYE. e-mail: kiziltannalan9@gmail.com (ORCID: 0000-0002-7427-363X)

1.1. Sociopragmatics

Sociopragmatics is the "sociological interface of pragmatics" (Leech, 1983, p. 10). Along with pragmalinguistics, it is one of the methodological approaches to pragmatics (Marmaridou, 2011). Pragmalinguistics is the cognitive-oriented side of pragmatics which is more interested in the encoding and inferencing processes, while sociopragmatics is society-oriented, thus it overlaps with sociolinguistics (Holmes, 2018). In a sense, pragmalinguistics is related to the linguistic resources of a certain language, while sociopragmatics deals with the social conditions in which these linguistic resources are supposed to be used accordingly. On a similar basis, sociopragmatic competence is the ability to select the appropriate language style in accordance with the conventions of a society (Van Compernolle, 2014) and to use linguistic resources in a "contextually appropriate fashion" (Delahaie, 2015, p. 255).

In recent years, the circle of sociopragmatics and sociopragmatic competence has been expanding with new studies interconnecting diverse disciplines, such as historical sociopragmatics (Leitner & Jucker, 2021), identity (Blitvich & Georgakopoulou, 2021), learner language development (Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2008; Hendricks, 2008; Lundell & Erman, 2012; Saleem, Anjum, & Tahir, 2021), and language teaching materials (Bababayli & Kızıltan, 2020). Likewise, Leech (2014) associated sociopragmatics with the phenomenon of politeness, and he composed a model which includes a set of sociopragmatic scales to assess the appropriate degree of politeness during the interaction:

a) Vertical distance between the interlocutors, which is related to the hierarchical relationships of status, power, role, age, and so forth.
b) Horizontal distance between the interlocutors, which refers to the dimensions of intimacy, familiarity, closeness, and so forth.
c) Cost/benefit, which refers to the value of the transaction between the interlocutors.
d) Strength of socially defined rights and obligations, which is related to the rights and obligations that people hold in line with the social roles they possess in society.
e) Self-territory and other-territory, which refers to the perceptions of in-group and out-group membership of the individuals in relation to the culture.

These sociopragmatic scales have been argued to have impacts on the language use during the interaction. In other words, people make shifts in their style of language in accordance with the values determined by these sociopragmatic scales. In this sense, it can be argued that the address forms are one of the linguistic means which are affected by these dimensions. As a matter of fact, Mendes de Oliveira (2017) postulated that the address forms fall under the realm of sociopragmatics.

1.2. Sociopragmatics and Addressing

Early studies on address behaviour investigated the effect of power and solidarity on the choice of address forms, that is, vertical distance and horizontal distance in Leech's (2014) model. For instance, Brown and Gilman (1960), who are among the pioneers of the modern address research, explored that power difference and solidarity have impacts on the use of the two types of second person singular pronoun in certain languages. Subsequently, Brown and Ford (1961) explored that high intimacy between the interlocutors leads them to use mutual FNs to address each other, while the status difference between them leads the lower status person to use formal address forms.

The studies conducted in more recent decades yielded similar results. In this respect, Formentelli (2009) found out that when the vertical and horizontal distance decrease between the students and the teaching staff at a university context, the students tend to use more informal forms to address the teaching staff, while the teaching staff members generally use informal forms to address the students. On a similar basis, Formentelli (2018) disclosed that the high vertical distance between the interlocutors leads the lower status person to use formal address forms and receive informal ones from the superior interlocutor, finding evidence to support the role of the vertical distance in address strategies. On the other hand, Rendle-Short (2007), who examined the address forms used between the journalists and the political entities in certain interview sessions, found out that the journalists usually address the politicians as their formal titles and last names, while they generally receive FNs.

The value of the transaction between the interlocutors, or the cost/benefit scale, has been cited as a factor in language style for several decades. People tend to be more polite and indirect when they ask for something that poses a cost for the hearer (Brown & Levinson, 1987). As for the address forms, Gagne (2018), who investigated the interactions between customers and service providers at a butcher's shop, found out that the customers use familiarizer address forms to lessen the degree of the imposition while shopping. Similarly, rights and obligations have impacts on the language style used by the speakers, as they tend to be more polite when asking for something that is not under the obligation of the interlocutor (Thomas, 1995).

Gender has also been of interest in exploring the dynamics of addressing, as well as it has been a major topic in many linguistic inquiries. According to a number of researchers, gender is one of the factors affecting the address practices. For instance, Kramer (1975) found out that females have a more restricted repertoire of address forms when compared to males, and females are more likely to receive familiar address forms when compared to males. Similarly, Rubin (1981) found out that within the same age group of professors, the male professors are more likely to receive title forms of address, while the female professors are

more likely to receive FNs. Supporting Rubin's (1981) findings, Takiff, Sanchez, and Stewart (2001) and Files et al. (2017) found similar results.

Address forms can be regarded as the important elements of social interaction, and they are frequently used during communication (Chen, 2010). Address forms used in an interaction are significant, since they reflect the interlocutor's attitude towards the addressee, in terms of showing respect, disrespect, fondness, and so forth (Özcan, 2016; Yang, 2010). Antonova and Travina (2014, p. 375) noted that "correct and appropriate addressing a person is the guarantee of a productive and fruitful conversation." Therefore, speakers, as well as language learners, should be able to perform the appropriate address behaviour which necessitates the assessment of sociopragmatic dimensions.

1.3. Sociopragmatics and Language Teaching

The importance of teaching pragmatics in language education has been rising for several decades, and many scholars stated the need to integrate pragmatics into language teaching. Likewise, sociopragmatics should be taught in second or foreign language classrooms to prevent possible sociopragmatic failures (Gündüz, 2016). Many studies revealed that foreign language learners suffer from the deficiency of sociopragmatic competence, resulting in sociopragmatic failure and breakdowns during the interaction (e.g., Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2008; Hendricks, 2008; Lundell & Erman, 2012; Mendes de Oliveira, 2017; Pham & Yeh, 2020; Saleem, Anjum, & Tahir, 2021).

Bardovi-Harlig (1996, p. 24) claimed that providing "pragmatically appropriate input" is essential for learner language development in pragmatic competence, and she highlighted the role of the language input which learners are exposed to through textbooks or classroom interactions. In this regard, textbooks play crucial roles for providing input for the learners, since they are regarded as important materials in language learning and teaching (Limberg, 2015). Specifically, textbook dialogues have been cited to feature essential roles for language learners to develop and practice certain conversational skills (Jones, Kiteu, & Sunderland, 1997; Grant, 1987).

1.4. Purpose of the Study

Although many scholars support the idea that textbooks should present a good command of pragmatic input, it has been revealed that many textbooks suffer from this characteristic (e.g., Ren & Han, 2016). Language teaching textbooks used in many countries were investigated in terms of the certain pragmatic content they included, such as Croatia for speech acts (Jakupčević & Ćavar Portolan, 2021), Germany for speech act of apologizing (Limberg, 2015), Vietnam for general pragmatic instruction (Nu, Anh, & Murray, 2020) and so forth. Several researchers also scanned some EFL textbooks used in Türkiye from various aspects (e.g., Ulum, 2015; Aksoyalp & Toprak, 2015; Çubukçu & Atay, 2017; Bababayli & Kızıltan, 2020). However, little or no attempts have been made to investigate the address forms in Turkish EFL textbook dialogues. Regarding the fact that addressing is a crucial aspect of communication and EFL textbooks should provide a good command of input for the address forms in the target language, it is of great importance to analyze the use and the presentation of address forms in Turkish EFL textbook dialogues.

Taking the above-mentioned point into consideration, this study aims to examine the texture of the address forms used in Turkish high school EFL textbook dialogues with reference to sociopragmatic features and seeks answers to the following research questions:

1. Is there a significant relationship between the address forms and the genders of the interlocutors in the textbook dialogues?
2. Is there a significant relationship between the address forms and the vertical distance between the interlocutors in the textbook dialogues?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the address forms and the horizontal distance between the interlocutors in the textbook dialogues?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the address forms and the cost/benefit between the interlocutors in the textbook dialogues?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the address forms and the rights/obligations between the interlocutors in the textbook dialogues?

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Research Design

The study was conducted by implementing the content analysis method with a quantitative research design. "Content analysis is a research method that uses a set of procedures to make valid inferences from text" (Weber, 1990, p. 117). Content analysis method can be utilized while investigating any written material, such as documents, interview transcriptions, and so forth (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). Since the research questions of the study aimed to reveal the significance of the difference

between the address forms regarding the sociopragmatic scales of politeness in the textbook dialogues, a quantitative design was adopted to extract statistical evidence from the collected data.

2.2. Materials

The materials in this study involved the EFL textbooks which are approved by the Turkish Ministry of National Education (MoNE) to be used in high schools in Türkiye. The reason behind the selection of high school textbooks instead of elementary school textbooks was based on the argument that sociopragmatic competence develops later than the pragmalinguistic competence in foreign or second language learners, as several studies suggested (e.g., Ellis, 1992; Trosborg, 1995; Rose, 2000; Rose, 2009). Based on this literature, it becomes clear that the presentation of sociopragmatic elements holds greater importance in the later stages of language education. Therefore, the following high school textbooks were selected for this study.

1. *Teenwise 9 Student's Book*, written by Ebru Bulut, Funda Baydar Ertopçu, Seda Umur Özadalı, Sibel Şentürk and published by MoNE in 2019.
2. *Ortaöğretim İngilizce 10 Ders Kitabı*, written by Çiler Genç Karataş and published by Gizem Yayıncılık in 2018.
3. *Silver Lining 11 Student's Book*, written by Ebru Akdağ, Funda Baydar Ertopçu, Kader Uyanık Bektaş, Seda Umur Özadalı, Tuğba Kaya and published by MoNE in 2019.
4. *Count Me In 12 Student's Book*, written by Fethi Çimen, Bilgen Taşkıran Tiğin, Ayten Çokçalışkan, Nihan Özyıldırım, Mustafa Özdemir and published by MoNe in 2019.

2.3. Instrument

A data collection instrument in line with the research questions of the study was generated (Appendix). The data collection instrument includes the sociopragmatic politeness scales by Leech (2014). The last scale, self and other-territory, was excluded from the data analysis of the present study because Leech (2014) argued that it is related to the non-Western languages. Thus, it is irrelevant to the current study. However, it was still included in the data collection instrument regarding the probability that this instrument may be used in some future research to be conducted on non-Western languages. In addition, the instrument also includes the gender information of the speakers (S) and the hearers (H).

2.4. Data Collection and Data Analysis

Textbooks generally involve dialogues in written format, audio format, and audio-visual format. For a better perspective to the population, all the dialogues in the textbooks were transcribed verbatim. After transcribing the dialogues, the data collection procedure was conducted by the purposive sampling strategy. Purposive sampling strategy is deployed when the researchers seek certain figures or characteristics in the text (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). The dialogues containing any address forms were purposefully sampled. Besides, the dialogues containing more than two participants were excluded to provide a more comprehensive perspective to the sociopragmatic relations between the interlocutors.

While coding the data, certain symbols (>, <, =, -, +) were used to encode the scales of vertical distance, horizontal distance, cost/benefit, and rights/obligations. If the speaker was vertically higher than the hearer, "S > H" code was used. If the speaker was vertically lower than the hearer, "S < H" code was used. When the speaker and the hearer were vertically equal, "S = H" code was used. As for the horizontal distance, if the speaker and the hearer were horizontally distant from each other, "S + H" code was used. If they were horizontally close, "S - H" code was used. As for the cost/benefit scale, if the speaker got the benefit and the hearer got the cost, "S > H" code was used, while "S < H" was used when the speaker got the cost and the hearer got the benefit. Rights/obligations scale was coded with a similar method, as "S > H" code was used if the speaker had the rights and the hearer held some obligations, while "S < H" was used for the opposite situation. On the other hand, "S - H" code was used if there was no rights/obligations relationship between the interlocutors. The genders were coded using the actual words as 'female' and 'male'. Finally, the address forms were coded utilizing the address form categories by Leech (1999), which are "endearments", "family terms", "familiarizers", "familiarized first names", "first names", "title and surname", "honorifics" and "others". The coding procedure was conducted by providing intercoder reliability.

After the data collection and coding stage, the data were transferred into the statistical computing software "The R Project for Statistical Computing" for statistical data analysis. The dependency of the address forms on the sociopragmatic dimensions was revealed by operating "Fisher's Test" with 95% reliability of the results. Following the data analysis, the results were cross tabulated and interpreted accordingly.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the results and the related discussion in line with the research questions of the study. The study was conducted with the account of 148 address forms in total. In the cumulative data, 28 (18.9%) of the address forms were collected from the 9th grade EFL textbook, 51 (34.5%) from the 10th grade textbook, 29 (19.6%) from the 11th grade textbook, and 40 (27.0%) from the 12th grade textbook. Additionally, among the 148 address forms, it was revealed that 10 (6.8%) of them were endearments, 10 (6.8%) were family terms, 23 (15.5%) were familiarized FNs, 78 (52.7%) were FNs, 16 (10.8%) were title plus

surnames, 7 (4.7%) were honorifics, and 4 (2.7%) were other forms of address. According to the data, there were found no instances of familiarizer terms of address in the analyzed textbook dialogues.

3.1. Findings of the Genders and the Address Forms

The first research question aims to shed light on the relationship between the genders and the address forms used in the textbook dialogues. This research question has been viewed from three different perspectives: the genders of the speakers, the genders of the hearers, and the gender pairs of the dialogues.

The primary approach to the first research question focuses on the genders of the speakers and investigates if there is a statistically significant relationship between the genders of the speakers and the address forms used in the textbook dialogues. According to the results in Table 1, there is a statistically significant relationship between the genders of the speakers and the address forms they use ($p < 0.05$).

Table 1.
Crosstabulation of the Genders of the Speakers and the Address Forms

| Address Forms | Genders of the Speakers | | | |
| | Female | | Male | |
	N	%	N	%
Endearments	7	9.5	3	4.3
Family Terms	4	5.4	6	8.6
Familiarized FNs	13	17.6	10	14.3
First Names	41	55.4	37	52.9
Title + Surname	1	1.4	11	15.7
Honorifics	5	6.8	2	2.9
Others	3	4.1	1	1.4
Total	74	100	70	100

$p = 0.037$ ($p < 0.05$)

Gender has been of particular interest in language studies for many decades. Studies on gendered language have revealed that males and females make use of the language in different ways, even with the fillers 'um' and 'uh' (Tottie, 2011; Acton, 2011). Not surprisingly, address forms have been documented to be used in different manners by males and females (e.g., Kramer, 1975; Rubin, 1981). Therefore, it is essential to include the gender variable in linguistic research to understand the dynamics of language use and the perceptions of genders in society.

The variable of the speaker gender has been investigated with the account of 144 address forms, as 4 address forms have been eliminated from the data sample because of the uncertainty of the gender of the speaker in one of the dialogues. Among the 144 address forms analyzed, it has been revealed that the types of the address forms are statistically dependent on the genders of the speakers. In other words, the female and the male speakers in the textbook dialogues have been found to use the address forms different from each other in a statistically significant way.

Apart from several notable differences, it can be seen in Table 1 that the speakers from both genders predominantly use FNs in the textbook dialogues. This is followed by the use of familiarized FNs. However, familiarized FNs are used by the female speakers (17.6%) more frequently than the male speakers (14.3%). This may be explained by what several scholars (e.g., Tannen, 1990) remarked in that females are likely to create a language of connection and intimacy, while status and independence are emphasized by males. The excerpt (1) from one of the textbook dialogues demonstrates this finding, where the male speaker (M) uses the full name of the interlocutor, while the female speaker (F) uses the familiarized form of the interlocutor's name.

(1)   "F: Jamie, guess what? I have found lots of photos for our presentation which is for the friendship day. Come and have a look.
M: Good job, Phoebe. Wow! Henry Ford and Thomas Edison, huh? Were they really close friends? I know their great inventions, but I never heard that they had a sincere friendship." *(Silver Lining 11, Track 54)*

According to Rubin (1981), female speakers make use of the familiar address forms more frequently than male speakers. In the same manner, the female speakers use endearment terms (9.5%) more frequently than the male speakers (4.3%) in the textbook dialogues. For instance, the dialogue excerpts in (2) and (3) between "mother (M) – son (S)" and "father (F) – son (S)" demonstrate this finding, as the mother speaker uses endearment terms, while the father uses family terms.

(2)   "M: Don't get me wrong dear, but in order to help with our budget you must initially unplug your mobile phone charger then. I never see it unplugged. Don't you think so?
S: Come on, mom. You're exaggerating. It cannot be the only reason for high electricity bills.

M: OK, OK, just kidding, honey. What can be done individually? What are the other things we should focus on? Any recommendations?" *(Count Me In 12, Tapescript 8.1)*

(3)   "S: I can't stand people staring at my face, dad. I hate my pimples. They're so embarrassing.
         F: Tell me about it, son. When I was at your age my face was full of pimples and scars." *(Silver Lining 11, Track 20)*

Besides, it has been found that title and surname address forms are used by the male speakers (15.7%) more frequently than the female speakers (1.4%). In line with what Tannen (1990) notes, the male speakers in the textbook dialogues emphasize status and independence more frequently than the female speakers. After all, it has been found that there is a statistically significant relationship between the genders of the speakers and the address forms in the textbook dialogues. Thus, it can be argued that the textbook dialogues present the address forms in line with what literature suggests, as the address literature presents that the genders of the speakers are one of the factors affecting the address strategies. Literature also suggests that while investigating the address behavior, the genders of the hearers should also be taken into account (Dunkling, 1990).

The second approach to the first research question focuses on the relationship between the genders of the hearers and the address forms they receive in the textbook dialogues. According to the results in Table 2, there is no statistically significant relationship between the genders of the hearers and the address forms they receive in the textbook dialogues ($p > 0.05$).

Table 2.
Crosstabulation of the Genders of the Hearers and the Address Forms

| Address Forms | Genders of the Hearers | | | |
| | Female | | Male | |
	N	%	N	%
Endearments	6	7.4	4	6.0
Family Terms	7	8.6	3	4.5
Familiarized FNs	9	11.1	14	20.9
First Names	44	54.3	34	50.7
Title + Surname	11	13.6	5	7.5
Honorifics	2	2.5	5	7.5
Others	2	2.5	2	3.0
Total	81	100	67	100

$p = 0.333$ ($p > 0.05$)

Table 2 depicts that FNs are the most frequently used address forms for both genders. Although the test results show no statistically significant relationship, it can be argued that certain types of address forms are used for one gender more frequently than the other. For instance, the female hearers (8.6%) receive family terms more frequently than the male hearers do (4.5%). Similarly, titles are used for the female hearers (13.6%) more frequently than the male hearers (7.5%). In fact, literature uncovers that titles are used for males more frequently than females, due to the assumption that females are perceived as lower in status than males (e.g., Files et al., 2017). Therefore, it can be argued that the textbook dialogues attempt to avoid the stereotypic perceptions of the genders by the help of the address forms.

Brown and Ford (1961) posited that males are rarely addressed as their FNs in full in American English, as their names are frequently abbreviated or familiarized, while females are more frequently addressed as their FNs in full. In parallel with this, the address forms in the textbook dialogues reflect this finding, as familiarized FNs are used for the male hearers (20.9%) more frequently than the female hearers (11.1%). For instance, the excerpt in (4) is from a dialogue between a male and a female friend. While the female speaker (F) uses the familiarized form of the name Steven, Steve, the male speaker (M) does not use the familiarized form of Jane, such as Janie. Besides these points, the remaining types of address forms are used for both genders with approximately similar ratio, as presented in Table 2.

(4)   "F: Hey, Steve! How is it going?
         M: Hi, Jane. Not bad, thanks. And you?" *(Ortaöğretim İngilizce 10, Video 1.1)*

The third approach to the first research question focuses on the gender pairs of the dialogues, and it aims to investigate if there is a significant difference between the address forms used in male-to-male, female-to-female, and mixed gender textbook dialogues. According to the results in Table 3, there is a statistically significant difference in the address forms regarding the gender pairs of the dialogues ($p < 0.05$).

Table 3.
Crosstabulation of the Gender Pairs and the Address Forms

| Address Forms | Gender Pairs | | | | | |
| | Male - Male | | Female - Female | | Mixed | |
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Endearments	-	-	3	10.3	7	7.2
Family Terms	3	16.7	4	13.8	3	3.1
Familiarized FNs	3	16.7	2	6.9	18	18.6
First Names	12	66.7	19	65.5	47	48.5
Title + Surname	-	-	-	-	12	12.4
Honorifics	-	-	-	-	7	7.2
Others	-	-	1	3.4	3	3.1
Total	18	100	29	100	97	100

$p = 0.034$ ($p < 0.05$)

According to Table 3, certain types of address forms are not used in male-to-male and female-to-female dyads in the textbooks, while mixed gender dialogues present all the types of the address forms. In male-to-male dialogues, only three types of address forms are presented, which are FNs (66.7%), familiarized FNs (16.7%), and family terms (16.7%). Endearments, titles, honorifics, and other types of address forms are not used in male-to-male textbook dialogues. This finding is reminiscent of what Leech (1999) notes, that endearment terms of address are typically not used between males. Similarly, the textbook dialogues demonstrate no endearment terms used in male-to-male dyads. Males generally address each other with forms like 'dude' to generate a masculine solidarity with other males, as well as to maintain heterosexism (Kiesling, 2004). On the other hand, female-to-female dialogues exclude the use of titles and honorific address forms, while they include endearments (10.3%), family terms (13.8%), familiarized FNs (6.9%), FNs (65.5%), and others (3.4%). In contrast to males, endearments are used between females, as can be illustrated as in excerpt (5).

(5)   "F: Oh, I see. She's wearing a headscarf.
        F: Yes, dear. She's my favorite sportswoman. And do you see Steve Jones?" *(Teenwise 9, Track 20)*

Finally, it can be concluded that gender is reflected in the address forms in a statistically significant manner for the genders of the speakers and the gender pairs of the dialogues. As the literature on gendered language presents, males and females use the language in quite different ways. It seems that the addressing in the textbook dialogues is no exception.

3.2. Findings of the Vertical Distance and the Address Forms

The second research question aims to find out if the vertical distance between the interlocutors is reflected in the address forms in the textbook dialogues. According to the results in Table 4, the vertical distance is statistically well reflected in the address forms in the textbook dialogues ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.
Crosstabulation of the Vertical Distance and the Address Forms

| Address Forms | Vertical Distance | | | | | |
| | S > H | | S = H | | S < H | |
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Endearments	3	15.8	5	6.7	2	3.7
Family Terms	1	5.3	-	-	9	16.7
Familiarized FNs	-	-	23	30.7	-	-
First Names	14	73.7	46	61.3	18	33.3
Title + Surname	-	-	-	-	16	29.6
Honorifics	-	-	-	-	7	13.0
Others	1	5.3	1	1.3	2	3.7
Total	19	100	75	100	54	100

$p < 0.001$ ($p < 0.05$)

Vertical distance has been one of the most cited dimensions in address research ever since the publication by Brown and Gilman (1960), though it has been recognized with different concepts throughout the years, such as power and status. This dimension has been documented to be one of the most influential factors in language style during the interaction, as well as in addressing. Studies reveal that when the speakers are vertically lower than the interlocutors in a dyad, they tend to be more polite. On the other hand, when they are vertically higher than the interlocutors, they do not have the same concerns about being polite as much (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

In line with what the related literature suggests, the vertical distance dimension between the interlocutors is reflected in the address forms in the textbook dialogues. When the speaker is vertically higher (S > H), we do not encounter any instances of

titles and honorific address forms. As the address research reveals (e.g., Formentelli, 2009; Formentelli, 2018; Burt, 2015), the vertically higher interlocutor typically does not address the interlocutor by formal forms of address. In "S > H" cases, the most frequently used address forms are the FNs (73.7%), followed by endearments (15.8%), family terms (5.3%), and others (5.3%).

On the other hand, when the speakers are vertically lower than the interlocutors (S < H), they use formal forms of address, such as titles (29.0%) and honorifics (13.0%). The excerpt in (6) demonstrates an asymmetrical relationship between a teacher and a student, where the vertically higher interlocutor, the teacher uses the first name of the student, while the student addresses the teacher with a title.

(6)   "Mrs. Williams: I'm sure you'll be successful, David. Please, let me know if you need any help.
        David: Thank you very much, Mrs. Williams.
        Mrs. Williams: You're welcome, David. You should hit the books as soon as possible.
        David: Yes, Mrs. Williams. I'll study very hard this week. Have a nice day." *(Ortaöğretim İngilizce 10, Audio 1.3)*

When the vertical relation is equal (S = H), the most frequently used address forms are FNs (61.3%) and familiarized FNs (30.7%), followed by endearments (6.7%). Given the fact that one of the most frequently used equal vertical relations is "friend-friend" dyads, it can be argued that the address forms are used appropriately. The excerpts in (7) and (8) demonstrate the address forms used in vertically equal dyads between friends (S = H).

(7)   "Vincent: Hi, Doreen. There is a new Batman movie on at the cinemas. How about seeing it on Tuesday afternoon?
        Doreen: Well, I'd love to, but I can't. I have a photography class." *(Teenwise 9, p. 39)*

(8)   "Kate: Would you mind watering my plants while I'm away?
        Jennifer: Yeah, that's fine. Sure.
        Kate: Ah, sweetheart. Thank you so much." *(Count Me In 12, p. 64)*

From a general perspective, it can be stated that the vertical distance between the interlocutors is well reflected in the address forms in the textbook dialogues. It can be argued that the address forms are used in accordance with the vertical relations between the interlocutors, in line with the address literature.

3.3. Findings of the Horizontal Distance and the Address Forms

The third research question aims to find out if the horizontal distance between the interlocutors is reflected in the address forms in the textbook dialogues. According to the results in Table 5, the horizontal distance between the interlocutors is statistically well reflected in the address forms in the textbook dialogues ($p < 0.05$).

Table 5.
Crosstabulation of the Horizontal Distance and the Address Forms

| Address Forms | Horizontal Distance | | | |
| | S + H | | S - H | |
	N	%	N	%
Endearments	2	3.5	8	8.8
Family Terms	-	-	10	11.0
Familiarized FNs	-	-	23	25.3
First Names	32	56.1	46	50.5
Title + Surname	16	28.1	-	-
Honorifics	7	12.3	-	-
Others	-	-	4	4.4
Total	57	100	91	100

$p < 0.001$ ($p < 0.05$)

Horizontal distance has been argued to be one of the most influential factors in the choice of language style, as well as in addressing. In fact, it is one of the dimensions investigated in almost every address research, along with vertical distance. The related literature suggests that people tend to use a more informal language style when they interact with the people with whom they are familiar, while they use more formal style when interacting with socially distant ones (e.g., Brown & Gilman, 1960; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Thomas, 1995).

According to the results in Table 5, regardless of the horizontal distance, the most frequently used address forms are the FNs. Apart from this commonality, the other types of address forms are used in line with the horizontal distance dimension between the interlocutors. In the dialogues where the interlocutors have high social distance (S + H), the most frequently used address forms (besides FNs) are titles (28.1%), followed by honorifics (12.3%). Endearments are the least frequently used address forms (3.5%). For instance, consider the excerpt in (9) which demonstrates a high social distance encounter (S + H), between a ticket agent and a customer.

(9)   "Ticket agent: Good morning. Heathrow Airlines. How can I help you?
       Customer: Good morning. I'd like to book a flight, please.
       Ticket agent: OK, madam. What city would you like to fly to?" *(Ortaöğretim İngilizce 10, Audio 5.4)*

On the other hand, in the dialogues where the interlocutors have low social distance (S – H), the most frequently used address forms (besides FNs) are familiarized FNs (25.3%), followed by family terms (11.0%). It also should be noted that when the horizontal distance is low (S – H), endearments are used more frequently (8.8%), while some other address forms are not used at all. Indeed, endearment forms of address indicate the maximum closeness and intimacy between the interlocutors (Wood & Kroger, 1991). Justifiably, there are not any instances of titles or honorifics used when the horizontal distance between the interlocutors is low (S – H). The excerpt in (10) exemplifies a low distance relationship (S – H), between a mother and her daughter, where they use family terms and endearments.

(10)   "Elsa: Mom, I've decided to apply for the talent show, prepared for the sports club in our university. I have to sign up first and then wait for them to call me.
       Mother: Oh, my sweetheart, I'm so glad to hear that. As you've been swimming so well since you were four." *(Silver Lining 11, Track 10)*

Eventually, it can be argued that the horizontal distance between the interlocutors is well reflected in the address forms in the textbook dialogues. In line with what address literature suggests, more formal forms of address are used when there is high social distance between the interlocutors (S + H), while informal forms of address are more frequently used when the distance is reduced (S – H).

3.4. Findings of the Cost/Benefit and the Address Forms

The fourth research question aims to find out if the cost/benefit relationship between the interlocutors is reflected in the address forms in the textbook dialogues. According to the results in Table 6, there is no statistically significant relationship between the address forms and the cost/benefit scales between the interlocutors ($p > 0.05$).

Table 6.
Crosstabulation of the Cost/Benefit and the Address Forms

Address Forms	Cost/Benefit			
	S > H		S < H	
	N	%	N	%
Endearments	2	4.0	8	8.2
Family Terms	6	12.0	4	4.1
Familiarized FNs	10	20.0	13	13.3
First Names	27	54.0	51	52.0
Title + Surname	3	6.0	13	13.3
Honorifics	1	2.0	6	6.1
Others	1	2.0	3	3.1
Total	50	100	98	100

$p = 0.298$ ($p > 0.05$)

The value of the transaction during a particular interaction is one of the determiners as to what extent one would be polite (Leech, 2014). In other words, people are typically more polite while borrowing money from someone than they are while asking the time. Similarly, it can be argued that the address forms that people use may vary in line with the cost/benefit relationship in the context. In fact, Gagne (2018) found out that people may use familiarizer forms of address to lessen the degree of the cost they pose to the hearers while requesting. Therefore, it is important to include this scale while analyzing address practices.

The textbook dialogues have been found to reflect no statistically significant relationship between the cost/benefit scale and the address forms. In other words, whether the interlocutors are getting benefit and posing a cost to the hearers, or vice versa, they do not make shifts in their address choices. This finding can be exemplified with the excerpt in (11) from the textbook dialogues.

(11)   "Andy: Sue, can I come in?
       Sue: Sure, Andy. Welcome.
       Andy: It says 'don't enter' on the door.
       Sue: It's not for you, Andy. For my parents. Come in and make yourself a home.
       Andy: I have a 'keep out' sign for my little brother. Wow! What a nice room.
       Sue: Thanks. This is my favorite place with my blue bed and wardrobe.
       Andy: It's really big. What do you have in your wardrobe, Sue?" *(Teenwise 9, Track 8)*

The example in (11) demonstrates a number of utterances with different cost/benefit values. For instance, in the first line, the speaker asks a question which poses a cost to the hearer and benefit to the speaker (S > H), in the second line, the interlocutor answers the question which is a cost for the speaker and benefit for the hearer (S < H), in the fourth line, the speaker explains something to the hearer (S < H), and in the seventh line, the speaker asks a question again (S > H). Throughout the dialogue and the different cost/benefit scales, the same type of address form is used.

Eventually, it has been found that the cost/benefit relationship between the interlocutors is not reflected in the address forms, although the cost/benefit scale is one of the frequently cited factors in linguistic politeness, and it has been proposed that it has impacts on the language use.

3.5. Findings of the Rights/Obligations and the Address Forms

The fifth research question aims to find out if the rights/obligations relationship between the interlocutors is reflected in the address forms in the textbook dialogues. According to the results in Table 7, there is a statistically significant relationship between the rights/obligations and the address forms ($p < 0.05$).

Table 7.
Crosstabulation of the Rights/Obligations and the Address Forms

Address Forms	Rights/Obligations					
	S > H		S < H		S - H	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Endearments	5	9.6	4	5.3	1	4.8
Family Terms	1	1.9	9	12.0	-	-
Familiarized FNs	-	-	20	26.7	3	14.3
First Names	38	73.1	25	33.3	15	71.4
Title + Surname	6	11.5	10	13.3	-	-
Honorifics	1	1.9	6	8.0	-	-
Others	1	1.9	1	1.3	2	9.5
Total	52	100	75	100	21	100

$p < 0.001$ ($p < 0.05$)

Each interlocutor of a dialogue holds certain rights and obligations which prescribe the expectancy from one another (Fraser & Nolen, 1981). People bear certain roles in society, and they usually acknowledge these roles while interacting with others, such as the interaction between a patient and a doctor, or between two friends (Spencer-Oatey, 2004). As a result of these predefined roles, people have predefined rights and obligations which influence their level of politeness strategies employed towards each other. For instance, a customer may not feel the need to be polite while asking the waiter for the menu at a café, since he has the right to do this, and the waiter is obliged. Therefore, it is important to take the rights/obligations scale into consideration while investigating language variation, including address practices.

In cases where the speaker has the rights and the hearer has the obligations (S > H), the most frequently used address forms are FNs (73.1%), followed by titles and surnames (11.5%), endearments (9.6%), family terms (1.9%), honorifics (1.9%), and others (1.9%). On the other hand, when the speaker has the obligations and the hearer has the rights (S < H), the most frequently used address forms are FNs (33.3%), followed by familiarized FNs (26.7%), titles and surnames (13.3%), family terms (12.0%), honorifics (8.0%), endearments (5.3%), and others (1.3%).

The excerpt in (12) demonstrates a dialogue between a guest and a receptionist, which has the traces of certain rights and obligations. The address forms used by the receptionist indicate the "S < H" relationship in terms of the rights and obligations. That is, the receptionist has some obligations, and the guest has some rights on the occasion. It is noticeable that the obliged party of the dialogue uses honorifics, while the other party does not use any address forms.

(12)   "Guest: Good afternoon.
         Receptionist: Good afternoon, sir. How can I help you?
         Guest: I'd like to book a room, please.
         ...
         Guest: Thank you very much.
         Receptionist: You're welcome, sir." *(Ortaöğretim İngilizce 10, Audio 5.5)*

Similarly, the excerpt in (13) from an emergency call dialogue further exemplifies a similar case, where the obliged party, the operator, uses an honorific address form even in such a case of emergency.

(13)   "Operator: 911. What is the emergency?
         Caller: I'm in the SEF Bank. There's a robbery happening right now.
         Operator: What is the address of the bank, sir?" *(Teenwise 9, Track 52)*

In the dialogues in which the interlocutors hold no rights/obligations relationship, the most frequently used address forms are FNs (71.4%), followed by familiarized FNs (14.3%), others (9.5%), and endearments (4.8%). It is salient that when there is no rights and obligations relationship, the speakers do not use any formal forms of address, such as titles and honorifics. This may be a sign that the interlocutors in the textbook dialogues are not likely to use polite address forms when they have a neutral relationship with the others.

Eventually, as the analysis reveals and the sample examples demonstrate, it can be stated that the rights/obligations relationship between the interlocutors is well reflected in the address forms in the textbook dialogues. Considering the fact that rights and obligations have been documented to have impacts on language style in real life (e.g., Thomas, 1995), it is felicitous for language learners to observe this experience by the textbook dialogues while learning the language.

4. CONCLUSION

This study was conducted with the aim of attempting to highlight the importance of teaching addressing on the basis of sociopragmatic domains in EFL classrooms. Considering the fact that the current trends in language teaching promote the development of learner communicative competence including pragmatic and sociopragmatic competences, teaching the appropriate behaviour of addressing seems essential. From this point of view, it has been realized that EFL textbooks should provide a good command of address input in the dialogues, since they play key roles in providing the target language input to the learners. With this aim in mind, the address forms used in the dialogues in four EFL textbooks which are approved by MoNE to be used in high schools in Türkiye were analyzed with reference to sociopragmatic scales of politeness proposed by Leech (2014), which encompassed vertical distance, horizontal distance, cost/benefit, and rights/obligations. In addition, genders of the interlocutors in the textbook dialogues were included in the analysis.

It was found that some of the sociopragmatic scales were statistically reflected in the address forms in the textbook dialogues, while some others were used statistically independent from the address forms. According to the findings, the genders of the speakers, the gender pairs, the vertical distance relations, the horizontal distance relations, and the rights/obligations relations were found to be statistically reflected in the address forms in the textbook dialogues. It can be argued that this finding is in line with what address literature suggests. Thus, it can be stated that the reflection of these scales in the address forms is felicitous for language learners in terms of experiencing the real use of the target language. The teaching process involving these textbooks should engage learners with these sociopragmatic dimensions in the dialogues by getting their attention to how these dimensions are reflected in the address forms. After reading or studying each dialogue, teachers can ask questions focusing on the address forms and the interpersonal relationships in the dialogues to raise the learners' awareness like "Why do you think this person calls the other one Mr…?". By this way, learners can have a chance to realize the effect of vertical distance, horizontal distance, and other dimensions on addressing.

On the other hand, it would be more apt for language learners if the cost/benefit relations were also reflected in the address forms, since the related literature boils with studies which suggest that this variable can affect the language style in society. In addition, the study revealed that the genders of the hearers were irrelevant to the address forms they receive. Although this finding contrasts with much of the existing literature, it can be regarded as a positive and admirable development in favor of social justice for gender differences.

One of the major drawbacks of the textbook dialogues is the finding that there were found no instances of familiarizer address forms in the examined textbooks. Familiarizer address forms, such as *man*, *dude*, *buddy*, are among the most frequently used address forms in real life. Therefore, it can be stated that not presenting the learners with these address forms is a notable deficiency in terms of the authenticity of the textbook dialogues. Although they are not presented in the textbook dialogues, teachers of these textbooks should introduce these address forms by the help of other materials or activities brought to the classroom. Further, this finding highlights the necessity of the modification of teacher talk in the classroom in terms of teaching address forms. In other words, teachers can modify their classroom talk in order to present several address forms in a way that gets the learners' attention. In addition to the textbook dialogues, teacher talk can be useful for both emphasizing the address forms presented in the dialogues and introducing new ones.

Another related handicap that should be mentioned is the fact that several dialogues lacked the essential information about the context of the conversation, such as the gender of the speaker in the dialogue. It can be argued that the textbook dialogues should be presented with clues to every aspect of the context, since they can create a schema in learners' mind as to how to use the language in the presented milieu. In these situations, teachers can modify the presented dialogue by re-structuring it to a role-play activity. By this way, learners can be saved from the uncertainty of the speech situation in the given dialogue, and they can master the synchronization of the speech situation and the address forms in a better way.

The current study was conducted with the aim of analyzing the address forms present in the textbook dialogues; therefore, the dialogues which hold no presentation of any address forms were excluded from the sample. During the sampling stage, it was noticeable that many dialogues in the textbooks had been constructed without using any address forms at all, a case which brings about unnatural conversations, due to the fact that address forms are frequently used in almost every interaction in daily life. In this regard, the textbook writers should attach importance to constructing more natural dialogues with the inclusion of

the address forms. Teachers who use these textbooks can bring extra materials to the classroom which highlight the use of address forms to compensate this drawback of the textbooks. On the other hand, these textbook dialogues which present no address forms can be utilized to test the learners' sociopragmatic development by asking thought-provoking questions like "Which address form would you use in this situation?". This method can raise learners' consciousness and lead them to reflect upon their sociopragmatic competence.

In line with the findings and suggestions made accordingly, there can be enhancements not only in the construction of the dialogues in EFL textbooks but also in the practice of teaching in the classroom. By this way, the functionality of the language teaching process can be maximized in terms of teaching the appropriate use of the address forms with reference to sociopragmatic values.

Research and Publication Ethics Statement

This study was extracted from the first author's master's thesis which was supervised by the second author. In this study, content analysis method was employed to investigate the content of the selected language teaching textbooks. Therefore, application to the Ethics Commission was not required.

Contribution Rates of Authors to the Article

The preparation of this paper encompasses the same level of contribution by both of the authors from the determination of the study subject to the reporting of the data.

Statement of Interest

There is no conflict of interest between the authors.

5. REFERENCES

Acton, E. K. (2011). On gender differences in the distribution of um and uh. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics, 17*(2), 1-9.

Akdağ, E., Baydar Ertopçu, F., Uyanık Bektaş, K., Umur Özadalı, S., & Kaya, T. (2019). *Silver lining 11 student's Book*. Ankara: MEB.

Aksoyalp, Y., & Toprak, T. E. (2015). Incorporating pragmatics in English language teaching: To what extent do EFL course books address speech acts? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature*, *4*(2), 125-133.

Antonova, Y. S., & Travina, I. I. (2014). Study of addressing (vocative) as linguistic pragmatic category (in the context of secondary school). *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 154*, 374-380.

Bababayli, I., & Kızıltan, N. (2020). A comparative sociopragmatic analysis of the dialogues in Turkish and Azerbaijani B1-B2 EFL textbooks. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 16*(3), 1500-1522. Doi: 10.17263/jlls.803869

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996). Pragmatics and language teaching: Bringing pragmatics and pedagogy together. In L. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (Vol. 7, pp. 21–39). Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, Division of English as an International Language.

Blitvich, P., & Georgakopoulou, A. (2021). Analysing identity. In M. Haugh, D. Kádár, & M. Terkourafi (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of sociopragmatics* (Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics, pp. 293-314). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781108954105.017

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, R., & Ford, M. (1961). Address in American English. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62*(2), 375–385. doi:10.1037/h0042862

Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 253-276). Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Bulut, E., Baydar Ertopçu, F., Umur Özadalı, S., & Şentürk, S. (2019). *Teenwise 9 student's book*. Ankara: MEB.

Burt, S. M. (2015). 'There's not a lot of negotiation": Address terms in an academic department. In M. Terkourafi (Ed.), *Interdisciplinary perspectives on im/politeness* (pp. 71-90). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Chen, Y. (2010). Cultural differences in Chinese and American address forms. *Asian Culture and History, 2*(2), 82-85.

Çimen, F., Taşkıran Tiğin, B., Çokçalışkan, A., Özyıldırım, N., & Özdemir, M. (2019). *Count me in 12 student's book*. Ankara: MEB.

Clyne, M., Norrby, C., & Warren, J. (2009). *Language and human relations: Styles of address in contemporary language.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. New York: Routledge.

Çubukçu, F., & Atay, S. (2017). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe ve İngilizce ders kitaplarının edimsel yeti gelişimi açısından karşılaştırılması / A comparison of Turkish and English textbooks as a foreign language in terms of pragmatic competence development. *Gaziantep Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 1*(1), 8-20.

Delahaie, J. (2015). Sociopragmatic competence in FFL language teaching: Towards a principled approach to teaching discourse markers in FFL. In K. Beeching and H. Woodfield (Eds.), *Researching sociopragmatic variability* (pp. 253-275). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dunkling, L. (1990). *A dictionary of epithets and terms of address*. New York: Routledge.

Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2008). Internal and external mitigation in interlanguage request production: The case of Greek learners of English. *Journal of Politeness Research, 4*, 111–38.

Ellis, R. (1992). Learning to communicate in the classroom: A study of two learners' requests. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 14*, 1-23.

Files, J. A., Mayer, A. P., Ko, M. G., Friedrich, P., Jenkins, M., Bryan, M. J., Vegunta, S., Wittich, C. M., Lyle, M. A., Melikian, R., Duston, T., Chang, Y. H., & Hayes, S. N. (2017). Speaker introductions at internal medicine grand rounds: Forms of address reveal gender bias. *Journal of women's health (2002), 26*(5), 413–419. https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2016.6044

Formentelli, M. (2009). Address strategies in a British academic setting. *Pragmatics, 19*(2), 179-196.

Formentelli, M. (2018). Strategies of address in English lingua franca (ELF) academic interactions. *Linguistics and Literature Studies 6*(6), 298-306.

Fraser, B., & Nolen, W. (1981). The association of deference with linguistic form. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 27, 93-109. doi:10.1515/ijsl.1981.27.93

Gagne, C. (2018). Indirectness and entitlement in product requests in British service encounters. *Journal of Pragmatics, 133*, 1–14. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2018.05.015

Genç Karataş, Ç. (2018). *Ortaöğretim İngilizce 10 ders kitabı*. Ankara: Gizem Yayıncılık.

Grant, N. (1987). *Making the most of your textbook*. London: Longman.

Gündüz, N. (2016). Sociopragmatic elements and possible failure in EFL teaching. *Dil Dergisi, 167*(1), 49-65.

Hendriks, B. (2008). Dutch English requests: A study of request performance by Dutch learners of English. In M. Pütz and J. Neff-van Aertselaer (Eds.), *Developing contrastive pragmatics: Intercultural and cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 335-354). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Holmes, J. (2018). Sociolinguistics vs. pragmatics. In C. Ilie and N. R. Norrick (Eds.), *Pragmatics and its interfaces* (pp. 11-32). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jakupčević, E., & Ćavar Portolan, M. (2021). An analysis of pragmatic content in EFL textbooks for young learners in Croatia. *Language Teaching Research, 00*(0), 1-24.

Jones, M. A., Kitetu, C., & Sunderland, J. (1997). Discourse roles, gender and language textbook dialogues: Who learns what from John and Sally? *Gender and Education, 9*(4), 469–490. doi:10.1080/09540259721204

Kiesling, S. F. (2004). "Dude." *American Speech, 79*(3), 281-305.

Kramer, C. (1975). Sex-related differences in address systems. *Anthropological Linguistics*, *17*(5), 198–210.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman.

Leech, G. (1999). The distribution and function of vocatives in American and British English conversation. In H. Hasselgard and S. Oksefjell (Eds.), *Out of corpora: Studies in honour of Stig Johansson* (pp. 107-120). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Leech, G. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Leitner, M., & Jucker, A. (2021). Historical sociopragmatics. In M. Haugh, D. Kádár, and M. Terkourafi (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of sociopragmatics* (Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics, pp. 687-709). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781108954105.035

Limberg, H. (2015). Teaching how to apologize: EFL textbooks and pragmatic input. *Language Teaching Research, 20*(6), 700–718. doi:10.1177/1362168815590695

Lundell, F. F., & Erman, B. (2012). High level requests: A study of long residency L2 users of English and French and native speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics, 44*, 756–75.

Marmaridou, S. (2011). Pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics. In W. Bublitz and N. R. Norrick (Eds.), *Foundations of pragmatics* (pp. 77-106). Berlin: Walter De Gruyter.

Mendes de Oliveira, M. (2017). Sociopragmatic failure revisited: The case of intercultural communication between Brazilians and Americans. *RBLA, Belo Horizonte, 17*(2), 307-334.

Nu, T., Anh, T., & Murray, J. (2020). Pragmatic content in EFL textbooks: An investigation into Vietnamese national teaching materials. *TESL-EJ*, *24*(3), 1-28.

Özcan, F. H. (2016). Choice of address terms in conversational setting. *International Journal of Human Sciences, 13*(1), 982- 1002. doi:10.14687/ijhs.v13i1.3489

Pham, T. M. T., & Yeh, A. (2020). Politeness of Vietnamese students in writing request email in English: A course-based and socio-pragmatic study. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, *2*(2), 109–128. https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v2i2.202

Ren, W., & Han, Z. (2016). The representation of pragmatic knowledge in recent ELT textbooks. *ELT Journal, 70*(4), 424-434.

Rendle-Short, J. (2007). "Catherine, you're wasting your time": Address terms within the Australian political interview. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*(9), 1503–1525. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2007.02.006

Rose, K. (2000). An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 22*, 27–67.

Rose, K. (2009). Interlanguage pragmatic development in Hong Kong, phase 2. *Journal of Pragmatics, 41*(11), 2345-2364.

Rubin, R. (1981). Ideal traits and terms of address for male and female college professors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41*, 966–974.

Saleem, T., Anjum, U., & Tahir, S. (2021). The sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic strategies in L2 pragmatic competence: A case of Pakistani ESL learners. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 50*(2), 185–206. doi:10.1080/17475759.2021.1877176

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2004). Rapport management: a framework for analysis. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures* (pp. 11-46). London: Continuum.

Takiff, H. A., Sanchez, D. T., & Stewart, T. L. (2001). What's in a name? The status implications of students' terms of address for male and female professors. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 25*, 134-144.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: William Morrow.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. New York: Routledge.

Tottie, G. (2011). Uh and um as sociolinguistic markers in British English. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 16*, 173–197.

Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Ulum, Ö. G. (2015). Pragmatic elements in EFL course books. *Western Anatolia Journal of Educational Science, INOVED Special Issue*, 93-106.

Van Compernolle, R. A. (2014). *Sociocultural theory and L2 instructional pragmatics*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Weber, R.P. (1990). *Basic content analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Webster, J. (1988). *Forms of address for correspondence and conversation*. London: Templar Publishing.

Wood, L. A., & Kroger, R. O. (1991). Politeness and forms of address. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 10*(3), 145–168. doi:10.1177/0261927x91103001

Yang, X. (2010). Address forms of English: Rules and variations. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*(5), 743-745.

APPENDIX

Data Collection Instrument

№:				
Interlocutors	S		H	
Gender				
Vertical Distance				
Horizontal Distance				
Cost/Benefit	S		H	
Rights/Obligations				
Self vs. Other T.				
Address Form				