Hebron University

Faculty of Graduate Studies

English Department

Applied Linguistics and Teaching of English

A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Terms Husbands Use to Address their Wives in Rural and Urban Areas in Palestine

Submitted By
Heba Rajeh E'mar

Supervised By

Dr. Mahmoud Eshreteh

This Thesis is Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Applied Linguistics and Teaching of English, College of Graduate Studies, Hebron University, Palestine

April, 2021

Hebron University

Faculty of Graduate Studies

A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Terms Husbands Use to Address their Wives in Rural and Urban Areas in Palestine

Prepared by

Heba Rajeh A'mar

This Thesis was successfully defended on 22, 4, 2021 and approved by:

Defense Committee Members	Signature
— Dr. Mahmoud Eshreteh	Supervisor ....
— Dr. Hazem Bader	Internal Examiner ....
— Dr. Mohammad Thawabteh	External Examiner ....

Dedication

This work is dedicated

To my dear parents who paved the way for me to get the best education

And for their overwhelming support and

Encouragement

,To the people who were great supporters during this long journey

To my best friend Raneen,

To the people who were part of my life and were also great supporters

No words can express my gratitude and appreciation for those who are and were part of my life during my M.A. Journey

Acknowledgments

First, I would like to dedicate my deepest gratitude to Allah the Almighty who granted me to begin and end this long journey. Second, I have no words to express my appreciation to my great supervisor Dr. Mahmoud Eshreteh for his patience and support and handling me over this journey. He devoted his time to supervise me, guide me and help me by providing me with his endless advice and encouragement. Many thanks to those who offered me help for the sake of the study. To add, I would also express my gratitude to my professors and instructors who were good models for me and built up my knowledge throughout years of study at Hebron University.

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

FN= First Name

LN= Last Name

T= Title

T+FN= Title + First Name

T+LN= Title +Last Name

PN= Positive Nickname

Pet N= Pet Name

NN= NN

Tek= Teknonym

KT= Kinship Term

Z= Zero term

Table of Contents	
Contents	**Page**

\

List of Tables

Table 1	**The Sample's Distribution**
Table 2	**Sample's Distribution Analysis**
Table 3	**Survey Questions Analysis**
Table 4	**Social Functions Analysis**
Table 5	**Survey Analysis**
Table 6	**The Interview Results**
Table 7	**Observation Data Results**

List of Appendices

No of the Appendix	Title	Page
Appendix A	**Address Term Usage Survey in English**	**84**
Appendix B	**Address Term Usage Survey in Arabic**	**86**
Appendix C	**Address Term Usage Interview Questions in English**	**88**
Appendix D	**Address Term Usage Interview Questions in Arabic**	**89**

Abstract

A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Terms Husbands Use to Address their Wives in Urban and Rural Areas in Palestine

This qualitative/ quantitative study aims at investigating the terms that husbands, living in Hebron City, an urban area in Palestine, and Yatta district , a rural area in the Southern part of Hebron, use while addressing their wives, the factors that affect their usage, and the social meanings these terms may convey. The population of the study included 100 participants from different parts of Hebron and Yatta regions. The sample was selected randomly but certain criterion such as age, educational and vocational level, number of children, and the length of marriage period were taken into consideration. The researcher has used three data collection methods. In the quantitative phase, surveys were distributed to 100 wives living in different parts of Hebron and Yatta districts. In the qualitative phases, interviews and direct observation were used. The study showed similarities of address term usage between Hebron and Yatta districts. The types of address terms that husbands use are FN, LN, T, PN, NN, KT, Tek, and Z address terms. The factors that affect address term usage are age, educational and vocational level, setting, number of children, length of marriage period, degree of intimacy, mood of the husband, personality of the husband, and formality and informality of the context. The social functions address terms convey are to show intimacy, respect, solidarity, anger, mockery, and degradation. However, husbands who are living in urban areas tend to be seen more prestigious and extrovert. People who are living in rural areas are quiet shy and conservative of showing their emotions in front of other people.

Abstract in Arabic

ملخّص الدراسة

صيغ المخاطبة التي يستخدمها الأزواج لمخاطبة زوجاتهم في المناطق الحضرية والريفية في فلسطين

تهدف هذه الدراسة، النوعية والكمية، الى دراسة صيغ المخاطبة التي يستخدمها الأزواج لمخاطبة زوجاتهم في مدينة الخليل، والتي تعتبر مدينة حضرية في فلسطين، ومحافظة يطا والتي تعد منطقة ريفية في جنوب مدينة الخليل، وذلك لإيجاد اجابات عن أنواع صيغ المخاطبة التي يستخدمها الأزواج لمخاطبة زوجاتهم في مدينة يطا والخليل ،والعوامل التي تؤثر على استخدام هذه الصيغ، و الوظيفة الاجتماعية التي تؤديها استخدام مثل هذه الصيغ. اشتملت عينة الدراسة من 100 شخص من مناطق مختلفة من يطا والخليل. تم اختيار هذه العينة عشوائياً ولكن تم أخذ بعض الاسس بعين الاعتبار كالعمر، المستوى التعليمي والمهني لكل من الزوج والزوجة، عدد الأطفال، وعدد سنوات الزواج. استخدمت الباحثة منهجين مختلفين لجمع البيانات: المنهج الكمي، والمنهج النوعي. ففي مرحلة تجميع البيانات الكمية، تم توزيع استبيان على 100 زوجة من مناطق مختلفة من مدينة يطا والخليل. في مرحلة تجميع البيانات النوعية، تم استخدام اسلوب المقابلات و أسلوب الملاحظة المباشرة. أظهرت النتائج تشابهاً في صيغ المخاطبة التي يستخدمها الأزواج لمخاطبة زوجاتهم في مدينة الخليل وهي كالآتي: الاسم الاول، اسم العائلة، اللقب، صيغ التحبب، صيغ القرابة، صيغ سلبية، وعدم استخدام أي صيغة للمخاطبة. أما بما يتعلق بالعوامل التي تؤثر على استخدام هذه الصيغ فهي كالآتي: العمر، و المستوى التعليمي والمهني لكل من الزوج والزوجة، و عدد الأطفال، وعدد سنوات الزواج ، و درجة التقارب بين الزوجين، و مزاج الزوج، و شخصية الزوج ،و درجة الرسمية للموقف. على الصعيد الآخر، فان العوامل الاجتماعية التي تتضمنها استخدام هذه الصيغ هي لإظهار الاحترام، التحبب والتقارب، التضامن، الغضب، الاستهزاء، والشتيمة. كما وضحت الدراسة أن هناك تقارب شديد في استخدام صيغ المخاطبة ما بين كل من مدينة الخليل ومحافظة يطا، غير أن سكان مدينة الخليل يحاولون الظهور كأناس مرموقين ومنفتحين بينما سكان محافظة يطا يميلون الى كونهم   أكثر   تحفظاً   وخجلاً   من   اظهار   مشاعرهم   أمام   الناس.

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1.Introduction

In this chapter, the researcher presents the background of the study, the statement of the problem, the significance of the study, the questions of the study, the objectives of the study, the hypotheses of the study, and the limitations of the study.

1.2. Background of the Study

The process of human communication involves the employment of symbolic signs to convey meaning. Communication is important in interpreting humans' interaction and conveying their feelings, desires, and needs. Language is known as a method used for human communication through words or gestures. This kind of communication is important to interpret interpersonal relationships and to understand humans' feelings, desires, and emotions; however, the analysis of human communication is not as easy as it seems.

Language and discourse have always been part of social life and they both affect each other. Language may affect society and society may affect humans' linguistic choices. From this viewpoint, several studies have been conducted to study the relationship between language and society and the factors that affect them both. Moghaddam and *et al*. (2011, p.55) note that the "use of language in interaction entails more th an simply exchanging information about thoughts and factual things between one person to another; it is an important process in which the relationships among people are outlined and negotiated." In this sense, the term sociolinguistics has appeared to analyze language and society to understand the roles they play in interpreting human communication.

The use of address terms has been one of the researched topics in sociolinguistics over decades. Scholars have aimed at studying address terms people use in communication to understand interpersonal relationships, the factors that affect their usage, and the socia meanings these terms might convey.

It is well known that context plays an important role in discourse and that people speak differently in different social contexts, i.e., what is used in one social context may not be used in another, Brown and Yule (1989, p. 54) argue that "in different social contexts different terms of address will be used." Moreover, the linguistic items can be interpreted differently in different contexts. The same term can be used to convey different social meanings depending on certain factors such as the formality of the context, the mood of the speaker, and other factors.

Language use varies from one society into another. Even within the same society, it shows different linguistic verities in terms of lexis and other aspects of language. Hickey (2007) indicates that "language use in society applies to all groups, young and old, male and female, rural and urban." However, these groups can be considered factors that affect people's use of language; i.e., the language that people use in rural areas can be different from the language used in urban areas within the same society.

Therefore, recent studies have started investigating language use in rural areas versus language use in urban areas since linguistic variables differ from city to city and from district to another. Most countries are cut into the rural- urban binary where language plays an important role in establishing cultural divide between rural and urban areas.

In order to achieve these goals, both qualitative and quantitative research methods were used. In the quantitative aspect of the study, questionnaires were distributed to a hundred wives chosen randomly and who are living in different parts of Hebron, a Palestinian city, and Yatta, a district in the southern part of Hebron, in order to investigate the different types of terms that husbands use when they address their wives, the factors that affect their usage, and the social meanings these terms may convey. In the qualitative part of the study, fifteen wives of different ages, educational and vocational levels, periods of marriage, places of residence, and different number of children were interviewed. Moreover, observational method technique was used to collect spontaneous and naturally occurring data. The researchers played the role of a complete observer and recorded the conversations the occur in daily life situations.

This thesis is organized into five chapters which are briefly described below. In Chapter One the researcher gives a brief description about language, language and society, and the research methodology. The researcher introduces then the statement of the problem, significance of the study, objectives of the study, the research questions, the hypotheses of the study, and the limitations of the study. Chapter Two is devoted to provide the theoretical framework of the study and review the literature of research related to terms used in addressing. It provides information about the theoretical background of addressing terms, their types, factors that affect their usage, and the social meanings they convey. Chapter Three describes the research design and the methodology employed for carrying out the study. It provides detailed description about the participants, the instruments used for collecting the data, and finally data analysis techniques. Chapter Four presents the analysis and discussion of the instruments used for collecting the data, and discussion of the results of the

questionnaires, interviews, and the observation of the naturally occurring situations. Chapter Five presents the conclusion of the study and recommendations for further research.

1.3. Statement of the Problem

Studying language is important to manifest interpersonal relationships among the members of a speech community including the relationships among spouses. Address terms are considered one of the main concepts in the field of sociolinguistics that provide information about interpersonal relationships. However, not much research has investigated address term usage among spouses to interpret interpersonal relationships.

Moreover, from one region to region and from one speech community to another, different terms are might be used. This study is an attempt to provide a better understanding of the similarities and differences among rural and urban societies. Furthermore, the researcher tries to investigate the possible factors that affect address terms that husbands use in rural and urban areas, and the social meanings these terms may convey. This study is an attempt to differentiate between people's linguistic choices in rural and urban areas, and the possible factors that affect language in these two different areas.

1.4. Significance of the Study

Reviewing the literature in the context of address terms that husbands use while addressing their wives in Hebron and Yatta has revealed an absence of research investigating the address terms used by husbands in rural and urban areas. Moreover, not much research has been conducted to investigate address terms that are used by

husbands while addressing each other. This study is also significant in terms of highlighting the terms husbands use while addressing their wives in Hebron and Yatta. Furthermore, it aims at investigating the factors affecting the speakers' use of address terms, and uncovering the functions of terms husbands use to address their wives. This study may also be significant in highlighting cross-cultural differences that might help in avoiding misunderstanding between people belonging to different cultures and different districts.

1.5. Questions of the Study

The current study aims at answering the following questions:

1. What are the types of terms husbands use while addressing their wives in Hebron and Yata districts?

2. What are the social factors that affect husbands' use of addressing terms?

3. What are the functions or the social meanings of the terms husbands use in addressing their wives?

1.6. Objectives of the Study

This study aims at investigating the following:

1. The types of terms husbands use while addressing their wives in rural and urban areas.
2. The factors that affect husbands' use of address terms.
3. The functions of the terms that husbands use while addressing their wives in relation to Wardhaugh's theory of address terms (2006) and Brown and Fraser's study (1979) of speech as a marker of situation.

1.7.Hypotheses of the Study

The current study hypothesizes the following:

1.   Husbands in Hebron tend to use certain terms of address such as endearment addressing terms and KTs to show intimacy and solidarity while husbands in Yatta tend to use Teks more to express respect.

2.   People living in rural areas tend to be conservative and introvert in relation to familial life more than people who are living in urban areas.

3.   Factors, such as age, length of marriage period, place of residence, number of children, formality and informality, the context, personality of the speaker, educational and vocational level, and the degree of intimacy between spouses are considered important determiners of address term choice.

4.   Terms that husbands use while addressing their wives are used to express certain social meanings, such as intimacy, solidarity, respect, formality, anger, mockery, and degradation.

1.8.Limitations of the Study

Several studies were conducted to investigate address term usage; however, researchers have not focused their attention on investigating the terms that husbands use while addressing each other. Even the studies that are conducted in this respect are not thorough or profound since other researchers focus their attentions on a specific factor and on two or three types of addressing terms. Another problem is that, since the questionnaires are distributed to wives rather than husbands, wives tend to show that they have healthy and perfect relationships with their husbands. The researcher believes that the data of the questionnaire are not 100% correct and authentic.

Another limitation of this study is that it focused on two regions in Palestine; therefore, the results of this research might not be applicable to other regions in the Palestinian society. Other factors might affect address term usage and do not exist in Hebron and Yatta societies.

Chapter Two

Theoretical Background and Literature Review

2.1.Introduction

This chapter is divided into two main parts. The first part presents some theories and concepts related to the topic of the research**.** It starts with an investigation of language and society, sociolinguistics, address terms, their social meanings, and the factors that affect their use. The second part is a review of previous works of research that examine address terms in different languages and cultures.

2.2. Section One: Theoretical Background

2.2.1. Language

Language is a human specific attribute that people use to communicate with each other, even most intelligent primates and chimpanzees are incapable to use it in communication. Although non-human species can communicate and exchange information, they cannot use a complex communication system comparable to human language.

Language can be defined as a system of symbols and signs agreed upon by convention used for communication and information interchange. It is the medium through which social relationships are organized within a particular community. Hall (1968) as cited in Josiah (2016, p. 4) states that language is "the institution whereby humans communicate and interact with each other by means of habitually used oral-auditory, arbitrary symbols."

People use language, whether verbal or nonverbal, in their daily life mainly to communicate and to express certain functions, such as anger, love, hostility, hatred,

admiration, and other feelings. These feelings can be interpreted through the language people use when they talk. For example, when a person is angry, he/ she may use an address term that conveys his anger to the hearer.

Moreover, Fromkin *et al*. (2003, p.3) state that people "live in a world of language." In this world, people communicate with each other including fiends, strangers, family members, colleagues, or acquaintances using language by different instrumentalities whether face-to-face, or by using technology such as mobile phones.

Recent works of research have focused on studying language to understand how it functions and how people use it in communication. The study of language is called Linguistics. Widdowson (1996, p.17) as cited in Widiatmaja (2014) says that "by understanding linguistics, it will be easier for people to deliver or convey their thoughts and feelings to other people through language."

As a matter of fact, language is important in understanding humans' communicative speech acts. Examining the way people use language among each other provides crucial information about how language functions in the speech community and, in the same time, it also manifests interpersonal relationships. Spolsky (1998, p.3) asserts that language can be used to impart information or convey meaning, establish and maintain interpersonal relationships.

Language usage is determined by the people who use that language and the social factors that determine language choice. When people use language, it mirrors the societal norms and values of the society within which that language is used and it reflects the interpersonal relationships between the members of the speech community.

Recent studies have focused on investigating the relationship between language and society and how language shapes and influences society since it mirrors the norms, values, and the traditions of society. Chaika (1982) asserts that studying language apart from society is infeasible since it plays an important role in shaping language.

2.2.2. Language and Culture

The relationship between language and culture is deeply rooted. Several disciplines have investigated the interaction between language and culture such as linguistics, sociolinguistics, ethno-linguistics, cultural linguistics, and cultural studies. To understand the psychology of humans, one needs to investigate the cultural influence (Henrich, J., Heine , J. S., Norenzayan, A., 2010).

By examining culture and language, culture is considered a set of beliefs, attitudes, customs, values, conventions, and social behaviors shared by a group of people. Whereas language is considered the medium that members of a given society use to express these values, beliefs, and social behaviors. Hantrais (1989) as cited in Nabi (2017) indicates that "culture is the beliefs and practices governing the life of a society for which a particular language is the vehicle of expression."

The relationship between language and society creates what is called culture. People first learn the language of their speech community and then they develop knowledge about the culture of that community. According to Yule (2006, p. 228) culture is "socially acquired knowledge" that the members of a speech group learn through the assumptions they construct about the nature of people and things.

Therefore, it is possible that people of a certain speech community may construct a culture that is different from other communities. This means that language and linguistic choices are culture-dependent. That is to say that language and its pragmatic meaning differ from one culture into another, and what is used in one culture may not be suitable in another.

One of the frequently conceptual tools that researchers have investigated to understand culture and behaviors is individualism-collectivism dimension for comparing cultures and understanding human nature. Individualism seeks the desires and the needs of the individual person, on the other hand, collectivism stresses the aims of the group as a whole.

2.2.2.1.Collectivism and Individualism

Since 1980s, studies have focused on investigating the constructs of individualism and collectivism and their impact on the different speech communities in relation to their values, practices, norms, social behaviors, and linguistic behaviors. These concepts are used to describe the cultures of the different societies to investigate societal norms and linguistic variations.

In individualist cultures, people have view themselves independently from others, they have their own values, beliefs, and social behaviors apart from in-groups. They view themselves as unique and independent from the other members in the community. On the other hand, the social behaviors in collectivist cultures are norm-driven, and the values, beliefs, norms are compatible with in-groups. The collectivists seek social harmonization.

According to Hofstede (1980) as cited in Kim (1995) individualistic societies emphasise "I" consciousness, autonomy, emotional independence, individual initiative, right to privacy, pleasure seeking, financial security and need for specific friendship. Collectivistic societies, on the other hand, stress "we" consciousness, identity, emotional dependence, group solidarity, sharing and need for stable friendship." Moreover, Gelfand et.al (2004) mention that "collectivists view people in their family (e.g., parents, spouse, children, siblings, and so forth), as a continuation of their selves."

Research has focused on investigating collectivism and individualism in different societies to examine and understand their impact on the cultures of these societies and on the relationships among the members of the societies (e.g., Hui, 1988; Kokila, 2018).

Some studies have focused on investigating individualism and collectivism in Western and non-Western societies to confirm that collectivism is a trait of non-Western societies, whereas individualism characterizes Western societies. Darwish and Huber (2003) have studied individualism and collectivism in Germany and Egypt, Western and non-Western societies. The findings showed that collectivism was higher in Egypt than in Germany, whereas individualism was detected more in Germany than in Egypt.

To sum up, collectivism and individualism are both traits that may exist in individuals as well as in societies. Collectivists are characterized by the we- identity where they identify themselves as part of a larger group. However, individualists are characterized by the self- identity where they identify themselves as independent and self-reliant individuals apart from other members of the society.

2.2.3. Sociolinguistics

The term sociolinguistics is composed of the cooperation of two concepts. The term *socio* relates to society, and the term *linguistics* relates to language. Bussmann (2006, p.1089) as cited in Safitri (2016) indicates that this scientific branch of study is a process of the cooperation of linguistics and sociology that aims at investigating language, language use in the society, and the conditions and factors of linguistic and social structure.

This branch of study aims at examining the relationship between language and society. As stated by Hymes (1974), sociolinguistics is considered the "most recent and the most common" branch which connects linguistics with anthropology. Based on the above explanation, it should be noted that language and society have a strong relationship.

Several studies have been done on investigating the relationship between language and society and how language may influence the societal behaviors or how society may influence people's linguistic choices. According to Wardhaugh (2006, p.10), the relationship between language and society can be interpreted as follows: First, society may influence or determine the linguistic structure or behaviour. Second, language may influence or determine the social structure or behavior. Third, language and society may determine and influence one another. Fourth, language and society may have no relationship in the sense that they do not influence one another.

The study of language and society can be dated to the early 1960s. William Labov (1966) is considered the first pioneering scholar in the field of sociolinguistics who has investigated the varieties of English of New York city. The study (1966) has focused on the pronunciation of /r/ by the employees of three different department

stores in New York city to investigate the influence of social variation in relation to status on the linguistic variation.

The importance of studying society lies on shaping and understanding how human language functions in communication. In fact, language and society are considered inseparable when it comes to the investigation of human language and how language works. It is noteworthy to mention that language reflects the norms, values, and the traditions of the society. According to Holmes (1992), sociolinguists is concerned with studying the relationship between language and society through examining the differences in which a particular language is used in different social contexts and the functions and the social meanings that language conveys.

The way people use language differs from one context to another. Social factors can determine and influence the choice of a word in a conversation. A person may address another differently in different contexts. According to Abugharsa (2014), "sociolinguists have always been concerned with the role of social factors in accounting for the nature of systematic variation of languages."

Moreover, this branch of study highlights how certain social factors such as age, class, gender, personality, etc. affect people's choice of language in different sociocultural contexts.

2.2.4. Address Terms

Address terms, also 'forms of address' as mentioned by Afzali (2011), are defined as interaction-oriented words and expressions used to refer to the addressee in an interaction. Braun (1988, p.7) provides a simplified definition of address terms. Address terms are defined as words that people use when they call or address others.

Similarly, Oyetade (1995, p.515) defines address terms as "words or expressions used in interactive, dyadic and face-to-face situations to designate the person being talked to."

Researchers in the different fields of study including sociolinguistics, anthropology, and pragmatics have begun investigating address terms in different societies and different languages since 1960s. Keshavarz (2001, p.6) pins down that sociolinguistics, social psychologists, anthropologists have been interested in studying address terms since they provide a wealth of information about the relationship between language and society.

In recent years, there were attempts to explain address terms since they are considered one of the linguistic behaviors used in communication. Afful (2011, p.92) points out that "address forms constitute an important part of verbal behavior through which the behavior, norms and practices of a society can be identified."

The importance of examining address terms lies in manifesting interpersonal relationship among the participants in the conversation and providing a wealth of information about the speaker, the addressee, their interpersonal relationship, and the societal norms and values of a speech community. Daher (1987, p.144) says that address terms help us in understanding language, and the more we know about address terms, the more we know about language.

To conclude, different terms used in addressing are used to refer to the addressee, attract his/ her attention, show the social status or rank of both the speaker and the addressee, indicate kinship, express feelings, emotions, and interpersonal relationships, and manifest biological and personality features.

2.2.4.1.Types of Address Terms

Language varies from one speech community into another. Even within the same speech community, people may use language differently when they communicate with others in different situations and contexts. One of the main areas in linguistic variation is the lexical items, i.e., vocabulary or word choice.

Accordingly, address terms are considered one of the lexical items that may vary from one speech context into another. When people usually address each other, they use a variety of terms depending on who the person is, when and where these terms are used, and who are the people involved in the interaction; i.e., the bystanders. Parkinson (1985, p.3) states that, in different speech communities, people use different terms of address.

Address terms have continued to attract the attention of scholars in the field of sociolinguistics. Most attention has been paid to the different terms that people use when they refer to others. These terms have been classified differently in different speech communities. Chaika (1982) has set the following types of address terms: FN, T+LN, T, LN, and nicknames.

Similarly, Wardhaugh (2006, p.268) has declared that the types of address terms people use to refer to others are FN, T+LN,T ,LN ,Pet N , KT , combination of these terms, and ZT. Similarly, Salami (2004) has found that the terms that married women in Yoruba use to address their husbands are FN, Tek , and pet N.

2.2.4.1.1. First Name

First Name or proper name is the name given to a child after his/her birth. Wardhaugh (2006, p.268) states that First Names are generic names, such as "*Heba*",

"*Rajeh*". These given names are used to designate and differentiate the person being talked to from other members in the same family.

First naming is considered the most widespread way of addressing (Rifai and Prasetyaningrum ,2016). People from different parts and of the world use FN when they talk to strangers, friends, and family members because these terms are the most suitable concerning culture differences. Most people in most languages are referred to and addressed by their FN.

Moreover, firs names are usually used as a routine practice. When people communicate with each other constantly, they tend to use FN more than other terms. When a father calls his child, he usually uses his/her personal name, when the teacher calls his/her student, he/she also uses the student's name. Therefore, it is the most widespread term used for addressing.

Based on the above explanation, FN can be used to indicate closeness and familiarity, or they can be used to show unfamiliarity or power differential when they are used in asymmetric relationships. For example, a teacher uses his student's FN when he/ she addresses him/ her; however, the student cannot use the teacher's FN. Wardhaugh (2006, p. 269) states that people of higher status or rank tend to call people of lower status by their FNs but not the other way around.

2.2.4.1.2. Title

Ts are considered a way of addressing others by using terms such as "Doctor", "Mr." and other terms. These terms include professional or academic titles such as, "Dr.", "Professor", etc., formal titles such as, "Your Majesty" , "Your Honor",

religious titles such as, "Haj" ,"Imam" ,etc., and titles that refer to gender and the marital status of a person such as, "Mr.", "Mrs.", etc.

These terms are used to indicate status or social distance. Wardhaugh (2006, p.269) states that T is considered the least intimate way of addressing. People use T mostly when the relationship between the addressor and the addressee is formal and distant. Similarly, Yassin (1977, p.227) as cited in Alharbi (2015) asserts that the use of Ts presupposes a social distance between speaker and addressee and the degree of this distance is revealed by the choice or non-choice of Ts.

2.2.4.1.3. Last Name

LN name or as called family name or surname is the name given to refer to a whole family consisted of several members including grandparents, parents, cousins, aunts, brother, sisters, etc. In all cultures, family name is considered part of the person's full name to identify him/her from other people. Family names are usually passed to children by law or convention. In collectivistic cultures, as it is the case in Palestine, people care a lot about the use of family names. It is important to identify a person as belonging to a group or a family.

 Family names may be used to differentiate a person from the other members who have the same FN. A teacher may call a student by his LN to distinguish him from other student(s) in the same class having the same FN.

Addressing by using LN can be used to show that the person is of a higher status. Wardhaugh (2006, p. 268) asserts that the asymmetric use of LN between the addressor and the addressee indicates power differential.

2.2.4.1.4. Title plus Last Name

The use of T+ LN indicates unfamiliarity and equality. This type of addressing is used in asymmetric relationships in which the relationship between the participants is unequal. In Arab societies, surnames are inherited or given from the paternal side.

Wardhaugh (2006, p. 268) states that people use T+ LN more in formal interactions in which the degree of intimacy between the interlocutors is nonexistent; however, it is considered more intimate than T alone. This type of addressing is usually used by people of lower status to address others of higher status.

2.2.4.1.5. Pet Names or Nicknames

Scholars in the field of sociolinguistics have been interested in investigating nicknames and the role they play in social life since they constitute an essential part of the address system. Almost all languages and cultures have this type of addressing in their lexical system.

Pet N or as called nickname or endearment is a name used instead of the addressee's FN. It could be a diminutives FN, such as '*Johny*' instead of '*John*' or an endearment term, such as 'sweetie' etc. It should be noted that diminutives FN in Arabic are used to express either intimacy or degradation based on the expression and the context within which the term is used. Pet N is generally used to express affection and endearment toward the addressee. Taha (2010, p.10) affirms that Pet N are used to show acceptance, closeness, and endearment toward the addressee. Eshreteh (2017) indicates that diminutives are used to express several functions. One of the functions of diminutives in adult- directed speech is to show love and kindness.

Nicknames can be classified into two types. The first type of nicknames is PN which is used to show affection and intimacy, such as 'darling', 'sweetie' etc., the second type is NN which is used to show negative feelings toward the addressee, such as "stupid", 'duff' etc.

In Arab societies, people use the term 'laqab' as a nickname to refer to the person being talked to or talked about. These nicknames could have positive or negative connotations. However, Hussein (2013) provides a distinction between the two terms 'laqab' and 'kunya' in Arabic. He (2013) asserts that "laqab" is used to refer to the person's defect.

2.2.4.1.6. Kinship Term

KT is a term used to show blood relations between the members of the family to identify the person being talked to as a father, a mother, a sister, etc. This term can reflect blood relations between the family members and relatives by marriage. According to Braun (1988, p.9), "kinship terms are those used for blood relations" and for relatives by marriage.

Khalil and Larina (2018) set two types of KT: true and fictive KT. True KTs are terms used to designate blood relations or marriage relations, such as "father" , "mother", "father-in law", etc. These terms are used mostly in all cultures and languages. People from different speech communities use these terms to refer to blood relations.

On the other hand, fictive KTs are used to reflect non-relative relations. These terms are in most cases used with older people to show respect. People in Arab

societies use these terms with non-relatives and strangers mainly to show respect and politeness toward the addressees (Hussein, 2013; Larina, 2018).

The use of these terms, whether among relatives or non-relatives, fosters intimacy, solidarity, and respect between the interlocutors. Moreover, these terms enhances interpersonal relationships and increases the degree of respect and solidarity. KTs may be sometimes used to indicate formality or informality depending on the context and the interlocutors involved in the interaction.

2.2.4.1.7. Teknonym

The term *Tek* was coined by the English anthropologist and the founder of cultural anthropology Edward Burnett Tylor in 1889. It refers to the act of calling a person by the name of his/ her son, brother, father, or mother instead of using his /her personal name. For example, a man called '*Ali*' and his son's name is '*Islam*', is likely to be called *'abu Islam'* which means *'Islam's father*' instead of using his personal name.

This practice of addressing is deeply rooted in the Arab culture since Arab people are oriented toward the we-group and we-identity since they like to emphasise interpersonal relationships and like to be identified mostly by the name of their children. Parkinson (1985) stresses out that people in Arab societies give a great value "to the act of producing sons" (p. 123).

Khalil and Larina (2018) provide a distinction between two categories of Teks: true Teks and fictive Teks. True Teks are used to refer to people who have children and are named by the name of their eldest son. For example, a man called *'Ali'* and his eldest son's name is *'Mohammad'*, then people might call him *'Abu*

Mohammad' (L. Mohammad's father). In some regions in Palestine, only the eldest son can name his newborn baby after his father, whereas others are not allowed.

On the other hand, fictive Teks are used with people who have no children yet. In this case, the man can be called by the name of his father, for example, a man whose name is *'Mohammad'* and his father's name is *'Ali'*, may be called as *'Abu Ali'* on the basis of having a child and naming him after his father's name, or the man can be called by the name of his own choice (Darrar, 2003), for example, a man called *'Mohammad'* and he wants to be addressed '*Abu Ali'* (L. Ali's father), people can address him that way.

Teks are mostly used among people who know each other very well and among people of the same family. A husband may call his wife using Tek to show respect. Braun (1988) states that Teks are used among acquaintances to show familiarity, or as way of avoiding addressing other's by his/ her names. Larina (2018) adds that the use of Teks in addressing shows respect and closeness towards that addressee.

2.2.4.1.8.   Zero Term

Zero term refers to the avoidance of using any term while addressing others and using expressions or attention getters instead such as "Good Morning" ,"Hi" etc., In this type of addressing, the speaker avoids using any name related to the addressee including FN, LN, T, nickname, or any type of addressing.

The avoidance of using address term is considered cultural- specific. Wardhaugh (2006, p.270) notes that the use of Z address terms is considered impolite

in some languages such as in French. However, in other cultures and languages, it is acceptable to avoid addressing others using Z address term.

Z address terms can be used in some languages and cultures to show formality or informality depending the formal or informal greetings being used. Moreover, people can avoid using address terms in formal and informal conversations. A person may avoid using any address term with acquaintances and relatives or with strangers. Z address term is usually used in daily life routine among relatives or acquaintances or is used to show formality.

Z address terms can be used to convey several social meanings. They can be used to show politeness, anger, indifference, formality, unfamiliarity, informality and other meanings depending on the context, the speakers, the hearer, and the audience. Aliakbari and Toni (2008) indicate that Z address terms can be used to express anger or annoyance of the addressee or when the speaker is in doubt of how to address others.

2.2.5. Rural and Urban Societies and Addressing Women

Men usually use different forms to address women of different relationships in different situations. A man may use the woman's FN (e.g. *Heba*), T (e.g. Madam or Doctor), KT (e.g. mama, "my mother"), Teks (e.g. *ʔom Mohammad*, "Mohammad's mother"), or endearment term (e.g. *ħabibti*, "my love)."

Brown and Ford's (1961) study status and intimacy as the main factors for choosing address terms between interlocutors. The relationship between men and women is mostly determined by the relationship between them. Supporting Brown and Ford's (1961) study, husbands in Hebron, an urban city in Palestine, and Yatta, a

rural district in the Western part of Hebron, might be superior and responsible for their wives. A husband is not only the head of the marriage institution, but he is also seen as the guardian of his family as stated by the saying of prophet Mohammad (peace and blessings be upon him): "Every one of you is a shepherd and is responsible for his flock. The leader of people is a guardian and is responsible for his subjects. A man is the guardian of his family and he is responsible for them."[1] Moreover, some husbands in Hebron and Yatta might follow Allah's instructions as stated in the Holy Quran: "And among His Signs is this, that He created for you wives from among yourselves, that you may find repose in them, and He has put between you affection and mercy."[2]

Following Allah's instructions and the prophet's teachings, husbands are demanded to show intimacy, solidarity, and respect in their relationship with their wives. Therefore, religion might be considered a factor that might affect husbands' choices of terms while addressing their wives in the areas of Hebron and Yatta.

Not only this, Hebron is considered the most conservative city of all Palestinian cities. Moreover, the rural areas that surround Hebron show a high degree of conservatism. This may due to the fact that people in Hebron and its urban areas are more attached to the societal norms and values of older generations that restrict people from showing intimacy and love in front of others.

To sum up, the norms of the society are considered important because they limit language use and determine the social behaviors and the linguistic behaviors of the individuals in a speech community.

---

[1] https://abuaminaelias.com/dailyhadithonline/2011/07/03/shepherd-his-or-her-flock/

[2] https://quran.com/30/21?translations=18,19,20,95,17,21,22,85,34,84,101

2.2.6. Brown and Fraser's (1979) Study of Speech as a Marker of Situation

Brown and Fraser (1979) investigate the relations between speech markers and situations through proposing a framework for analyzing situations. A situation is defined by Brown and Fraser (1979, p.34) as "the context within which interaction or the speech event occurs."

The concept *situation* is considered of great importance in studying the human verbal behavior. Recent studies have shown considerable interest on the study of situations to get a better understanding of human behaviour (e.g., Kelley *et al.*, 2003; Edwards & Templeton, 2005; Furr, 2009). Brown and Fraser (1979, p.34) define situation as "the context within which interaction or 'the speech event' occurs."

Situation is used to include all factors and the state of affairs that occur at a specific time and place that may affect the individual's behaviour. Fishman(1972, p.48) as cited in Brown and Fraser(1979) mentions that "a situation is defined by the occurrence of two (or more) interlocutors related to each other in a particular way, communicating about a particular topic, in a particular setting."

Similar to Hyme's (1972) SPEAKING model, Brown and Fraser(1979) have set three main concepts that contribute in every situation. These three concepts are the setting, the participants, and the purpose or the goal. The setting and the participants together comprise what is called the scene. The scene in which an interaction occurs can be formal or informal.

2.2.6.1.Setting

The setting of the speech event refers to the time, the place where language is used, and the bystanders. The place of the interaction could be the home, the school,

25

the street, etc. where the speech event is taking place, the time of the interaction could be on 2020, Jan 18th, or 5 a.m, etc.

The bystanders are the people who are present at the moment of speaking but do not take part in the course of the interaction. Bystanders could be relatives and acquaintances or strangers. Hyme (1972) uses the term *audience* to refer to participants other than the speaker and the addressee. Salami (2004), in his investigation of address terms, has found out that the bystanders play an important role in address term usage. Therefore, it can be noted that the bystanders play an important role in language usage.

Setting is important in terms of language use. People may use different language in different settings depending on the time, the place of the interaction, and the audience. Goffman (1974) has used the terms spatial and temporal boundaries to refer to both time and place.

2.2.6.2.Purpose

The purpose is connected with the other two concepts, the participants and the setting. Brown and Fraser (1979) consider purpose as "the motive force" in examining a situation since it guides the participants through a situation. They(1979) have proposed that each purpose comes in sets of scopes: the maxi- purposes, the mini-purposes, and the un-prefixed purposes.

The maxi- purposes include a series of different situations in which more than one situation is included to form a major situation. The mini- purposes include changes that occur moment-by- moment in the course of utterances. Speech acts (e.g.,

26

apologizing, requesting, arguing,…etc.) are considered an example of mini- purposes that change every moment.

The unprefixed- purposes are those that guides the participants' activities throughout a situation to accomplish a task. These purposes take into consideration the activity type and the subject matter. The activity type is constrained by the goal of activity(e.g., imparting information, chatting, negotiating, narrating, ..etc.) and the roles activated in the activity (e.g., teacher- student roles, doctor-patient roles,....etc.).

The subject matter is the content or the topic of the conversation about which participants are talking. Brown and Fraser (1979) have pointed out that the subject matter indicates a detailed specification of the content. The topic or the subject matter determines language vocabulary and lexicon.

2.2.6.3.Participants

Participants are the interlocutors involved in a speech event, i.e., the speaker and the hearer. The speaker and the hearer could be any two persons whether they know each other or not. Nevala (2004, p.2125) states that language usage is "governed by the relationship between two participants the speaker and the hearer".

Brown and Fraser(1979) indicate that speech can be interpreted on the basis of the individual speakers' characteristics and the relationship between the participants. The individual speakers' characteristics can be divided into those that identify the individual as an individual and those characteristics that mark the individual as a member of a social group.

The individualistic characteristics that mark the individual as an individual can be determined based upon individualistic stable features, such as personality,

27

appearance, social identity, etc., and it can be determined based upon individualistic temporary traits, such as emotions, feelings , moods, etc.

On the other side, the individual can be marked based upon those characteristics that mark him/her as a member of a social group, such as age, gender, social class, race, etc. These social varieties are said to be one of the factors that play a role in language usage and language choice.

Another basic point made by Brown and Fraser (1979) in investigating the role of participants as a social marker of situation is concerned with the relationship between the participants in an interaction. They (1979) have divided the relationship between participants into interpersonal relationships and relationships that are related to roles and categories.

Interpersonal relationships are those relationships that are interpreted at an interpersonal level and related to emotional feelings and affection between the speaker and the hearer and to the degree of knowledge and liking between them.

Brown and Fraser (1979) have added another subcategory related to the relationships between the participants. This category is role and category relationships which are related to social rank, power, status, etc. Power or status usually exists in asymmetric relationships in which the status between the speaker and the addressee is unequal and formal.

2.2.7. The Social Meaning of Address Terms Based on Wardhaugh's (2006) Theory of Addressing

Keshavarz (2001) notes that the functions of address terms are to draw other people's attention or to refer to them in the course of the conversation. In fact, address

terms are good indicators of the type of the relationship among interlocutors. Also, they can reflect social norms and values of a specific speech community.

According to Wardhuagh (2006), address terms are used to express the formality or informality of the context, show intimacy, and signal power differential in the relationship between the participants.

2.2.7.1.Formality or Informality of the Context

One of the points concerning language is the degree of formality of the context within which the conversation is taking place. When people are formal, they are usually indirect and distant. In these contexts, people use language that is formal and convenient for the situation within which the interaction occurs.

However, being formal does not mean that the interlocutors are distant and non-relatives. In certain contexts and due to some social factors, such as the bystanders, the subject matter, and other variables, participants may express formality and distance in their interaction.

On the other hand, informality is usually used in contexts in which the degree of intimacy between the interlocutors is high. In this case, the degree of informality is at its outmost.

2.2.7.2.Degree of Intimacy

Intimacy refers to the degree of closeness and familiarity between the interlocutors. It measures the level of emotional closeness and interpersonal belonging and association between the addresser and the addressee. This terms involves some concepts, such as affection, closeness, emotions, and understanding of the other.

The degree of intimacy between the interlocutors is related to human social bonds that are created through the familiarity and knowledge of the other person being talked or written to. When people are intimate, the atmosphere between the speaker and the addressee is generally cozy and friendly.

Intimacy is usually decreased by the formality of the context and the social distance between the interlocutors. According to Chaer (2004, p.71), intimacy is considered on a higher degree of informality. When people are intimate, they express a high level of informality and familiarity; otherwise, when people are distant, they express a high level of formality.

Examining the degree of intimacy between the interlocutors in the course of interaction can serve as a predictor of the types of terms that people use when they address each other and the social behaviors that people engage in their interpersonal relationships with others.

2.2.7.3.Power differential

Power differential refers to inequality in power between the speaker and the hearer. In this type of relationship, the speaker and the hearer are of two different position or ranks. The speaker or the hearer is of a high status and the other speaker or the hearer is of a low status.

The person of a high status usually uses informal language when he/she addresses the person of a low status. On the contrary, the inferior uses formal language when he /she refers to the superior.

Wardhaugh (2006, p.268) states that the asymmetric use of FN, T, T + FN in addressing indicates a power differential in the relationship between the speaker and

the addressee. He points out that the mutual use of FNs indicate equality and familiarity. This type of addressing is used usually between people of the same status or ranks, friends, or acquaintances. However, the use of T+ LN indicate formality and inequality. This type of addressing is considered the least intimate and the most formal way of addressing.

2.3. Section Two: Previous Studies and Related Works

2.3.1.   Previous Studies on Address Terms used among Spouses

Etaywe (2018) has investigated the types of terms that husbands, coming from the northern rural Jordanian speech community, use to address their wives when they are (not) alone and for what functions. The results have showed that husbands use Teknonymss, epithets, forenames, Zero form and endearment terms when they address their wives. Also, the results have showed a significant impact of the spouses' age, educational and academic level, and the length of marriage period on the choice of address terms.

On the other hand, Salami (2004) has investigated the terms that Yoruba-speaking women in the city of Ile-Ife use with their husbands and the factor that determine address usage by Yoruba women. The results have showed that Yoruba women use FN, Tek, and pet N when they address their husbands. The study has also showed the influence of age, level of education, region of origin, and the speech context on the choice of address terms.

Similarly٫ Esmae'li (2011) has carried out a study to investigate the impact of social context on the different usage of address terms (first name, pet name, and respect name) used among spouses when they are together alone, in the presence of child(ren), and in the presence of the husband/wife's parents taking into

consideration the spouses' age and their educational level. The results have showed that Iranian husbands use pet N when they are alone to show intimacy, and respect name and FN in the presence of children and in the presence of the husband/wife's parents to show respect. Also, the results have showed a significant impact of age and educational level on the address terms used among spouses.

Afzali (2011) has studied the terms that spouses use when they address each other in different social strata in Iran. The findings of the study have indicated that Iran's religious and patriarchal society play an important role in the way spouses address each other. Moreover, the results showed that with the increase of educated and working women, the relationship between spouses is moving towards solidarity.

2.3.2. Previous Studies on Address Terms used in Some Arab Societies

Aliakbari and Toni (2008) have conducted a study to identify the different types that Perisan interlocutors use in different contexts. These terms are personal names, general and occupation Ts, kinship related terms, religious oriented expressions, honorifics, terms of intimacy, personal pronouns, descriptive phrases and Z address terms or attention getters.

Khalil and Larina (2018) have carried out a study that aimed at identifying some types of Arabic address forms that may be used in different socio-cultural contexts and the factors that affect them. The findings have showed that although Arabic forms of address share some universal features with other languages, they still exhibit some peculiarities which are pre-determined by culture and cultural values.

In 2008, Afful has conducted a study enTd "*Non-kinship Address Terms in Akan: A Sociolinguistic Study of Language Use in Ghana*". The researcher has

attempted to describe and analyze address terms among the Akans of Ghana. Using observation as the main research tool corroborated by interview and introspection, the study has showed that address terms used in Ghana can be divided into nine principal terms of address, for instance, personal names, catchphrases and attention getters. The use of these terms was dictated by sociocultural factors such as gender, status, age and the relationship of the interlocutors, as well as pragmatic factors.

2.3.3. Previous Studies on Address Terms drawn upon Wardhaugh's (2006) Theory

Widiatmaja (2014) has carried out a sociolinguistic study to identify the types of address terms used by Rohr, the main character in Runaway Jury, the factors that determine address term usage, and their functions. The types of address terms were FN, T+ LN, T, LN, and pet N. These terms were used to show intimacy, power differential, and respect. Based on Wardhaugh's theory (2006) of addressing, the study has revealed seven social factors that affect address term usage. These factors were the particular occasion, rank of other, age, family relationship, occupational hierarchy, transactional status, and degree of intimacy.

Similarly, Pribadi (2016) has studied the variations of the types of address terms, the equivalence of reasons of choosing the address terms, and the social factors affecting the use of address terms found in *The Blood of Olympus* novel and its translation. The types of address terms were T, T+ LN, T +FN, FN, short FN, diminutive FN, LN, full name, endearment term, kinship term, mockery term nickname, Tek, and endearment plus FN. The researcher has found that these terms were used to show intimacy, superiority, respect, anger, familiarity, to assert power, to offer solidarity, and to mock. The research also showed that the factors that affected

address term usage were the degree of intimacy, rank of other, family relationship, transactional status, occupational hierarchy, and the particular occasion.

Abdul Khalik (2014) has aimed at analyzing the address forms used in the "Hitch" movie, and the factors that affect address terms usage. The researcher has found that characters have used FN, LN, nickname, T+ LN when they address each other. These types were used to show respect, politeness, seriousness of the subject, familiarity with the speaker, and compassion.

2.3.4. Previous Studies found on Address Terms in Movies and Novels

Qin (2008) have studied the similarities and differences exist between Chinese and English on terms of address. The findings have showed that beside interpersonal relationship, factors in a context including who, when, where, to whom the address form is used and with what kind of intentions also play an important role in determining the choice of terms of address, both in Chinese and English.

Tauchid (2018) has investigated the terms that characters used in *The Secret Island* novel and their social implications. The results have showed that characters used FN when the relationship between the interlocutors is very close or intimate, T+LN when their relationship is not so very close or with older people, and KTs with close familial relationships.

Similarly, Rifai and Prasetyaningrum (2016) have investigated the use of address terms by the characters in *Tangled* Movie. The research has showed that there are five kinds namely, addressing using name (fist name, full name, and last name), addressing using intimacy, addressing using kinship, addressing using respect, and addressing using mockery. The study has found seven reasons of addressing terms in

the movie. These terms were used to show solidarity, intimacy, mockery, power, respect, and anger.

2.4. Conclusion

To summarize, several studies have examined address term usage and the factors that affect them, and few of them have focused on investigating address terms that spouses use in their interaction. However, these studies have not focused fully on all the possible terms that people in general and spouses in particular use when they address each other, and the factors that affect their usage, and the social meanings that these terms convey. This chapter presents reasonable information about address term usage through introducing its theoretical background, its history, its types, the factors that affect them, and the social meanings that address term usage convey.

Chapter Three

Methodology

3.1. Introduction

Several studies (Salami, 2004; Esmae'li, 2011; Afzali, 2011; and Etaywe, 2018) are carried out to investigate some specific types of terms that spouses use when they address each other such as FNs, endearments, and KTs, also to investigate the main factors that affect their usage, and the possible social meanings they convey. However, this study focuses on all the possible terms that spouses use while addressing, and the factors that affect their usage, and all the possible social implications they convey.

This chapter describes the methodology of this research. The first section describes the participants or the sample of the research. The second section describes the data collection method and the instruments used in carrying out the study. The third section describes the procedures and the materials used in conducting the study. Finally, the fourth section describes how the data were analyzed.

In this study, both qualitative and quantitative research methods were used. In the quantitative part of the study, questionnaires were distributed to 100 wives from different parts of Hebron and Yatta randomly to find out the possible different types of address terms that were used by husbands, the factors that affect their usage, and the messages they convey from their wives' points of view. In the qualitative part of the study, fifteen wives were interviewed, seven wives from Yatta district and eight wives from Hebron, to find out the most used term by husbands, the factors that affect their usage, and how some terms are used negatively.

36

3.2. Participants

The sample of the study consists of 100 married women chosen randomly from different parts of Hebron City and Yatta, of different ages that range between 20- 60 years, of different educational and vocational level, and different periods of marriage. The number of children is also taken into consideration. The distribution of the sample that was given questionnaires was fifty wives from Hebron and fifty wives from Yatta.

In addition, fifteen wives are interviewed, seven wives are from the city of Hebron and eight are from Yatta. Moreover, ten wives were observed in naturally occurring situations, five of them are from Hebron City and five are from Yatta. Table 1 shows the distribution of participants according to their age, educational and vocational level, periods of marriage, and the number of children.

Table 1: The Sample's Distribution

District	Age				Educated and practitioner		Period of marriage			No. of children		
	20-30	30-40	40-50	50-60	Educated and practitioner	Non- educated	Less than 5 years	5-10 years	More than 10 years	0	1-5	More than 5
Yatta	14	12	12	12	25	25	10	20	20	10	20	20
Hebron	14	12	12	12	25	25	10	20	20	10	20	20

3.3. Data collection

The data was collected through using two different instruments. In the quantitative phase, questionnaires were distributed to married women from different parts of Hebron and Yatta. In the qualitative phase, interviews were used to collect

data about the different types and their specifications that husbands use when they address their wives, the factors that affect their usage, and the terms that convey negative social meanings from the wives' points of view. Moreover, the researcher has collected naturally occurring data through observation to collect realistic information about the different types of terms that husbands use in real life situations.

3.3.1. Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of information related to both groups of participants including their ages, educational and vocational levels, number of children, and the length of marriage period. Moreover, it presents questions that aim at defining all the possible terms that husbands use, and the role of the bystanders including children, spouses' parents, strangers, female and male relatives, and friends on address term usage.

Furthermore, the questionnaire (Appendix A) focused on interpreting the possible social meanings that these terms convey from the perspective of wives such as expressing anger, solidarity, intimacy, mockery, respect, and degradation.

The researcher has translated the questionnaire into Arabic and has distributed the Arabic version of it to the participants. The two versions of the questionnaire were edited by my supervisor, and by three other (raters) instructors in Hebron University. They asked for some amendments, and deletion of some unnecessary and ambiguous questions. Their observations were taken into consideration and amendments were applied accordingly.

3.3.2. Interview

The interview consisted of seven questions. The following are the wives' interview questions and the rational for using them:

1. What are all the possible terms that your husband uses when he addresses you? This question is designed to find out all the possible terms that husbands use while addressing in different life situations. This helped the researcher identifying all the terms that husbands use in urban and rural areas in the Palestinian society.

2. What is the most common term used in addressing?

This question focuses on finding out the most used term that husbands in rural and urban areas use when they address their wives. This question helps in studying the mentality of husbands in these areas and whether these areas differ/ resemble each other.

3. Have the terms of address changed in the course of time? How? This question aims at investigating the influence of time on the relationship that husbands maintain and whether these terms change over the course of time. Also, it aims at determining whether these terms change in a negative/ positive way.

4. What titles (occupational , religious, …) your husband uses when he addresses you? In what situations? This question focuses on distinguishing between the different titles that husbands use when they address their wives. This question helps in examining the different titles that husbands use and the factors that influence titles usage.

5. What is the influence of the daily routine on address term usage? This question is designed to find out the influence of the daily routine on the relationship that spouses maintain, and whether this routine influences address term usage. This

question helps in determining the most common term that husbands use when they address their wives.

6. What term(s) he uses in the following: in face to face situations, on the telephone, when he texts you? This question is designed to find out the influence of the context on address term usage. This question helps in defining the terms that husbands use in different contexts, and whether these terms differ from one context into another.

7. Name the term(s) he uses that affect (s) you negatively. In what situations these terms are used? This question is designed to determine the terms that may convey negative social meanings from the wives' points of view, and what negative meanings these terms convey.

3.3.3. Observation

Naturally occurring situations were observed to provide a reliable and naturalistic data. The researcher has collected data through observing the spouses' daily interactions . At the beginning, the participants were not told that they were recorded and noted down because the researcher aimed at collecting accurate and realistic data . After collecting the data, wives were told that their conversations with their husbands were recorded and they approved and gave the researcher the permission to include these situations in the study for the purpose of scientific research.

To obtain the data, direct observations are applied to collect reliable and naturalistic data. Direct observations are applied to "obtain a better, more substantive picture of reality; a richer, more complete array of symbols and a means of verifying the participants" (Berg, 1989).

In this phase of the study, the researcher is a complete observer in which she observes the spouses' interactions in daily situations. The researcher does not participate; she only records and notes down the situations where data are collected through direct observation as soon as possible after they have occurred. These situations were noted down with paper and pencil all year round of observation, and some of the conversations were recorded using the recorder app on the researcher's mobile phone.

This study aims at observing spouses' interaction in daily situations in order to identify the terms that husbands use when they address their wives, determine the factors that may influence address terms usage, and examine the social meanings that these terms convey.

3.4. Procedures

The researcher has distributed 100 questionnaires to wives from different parts of Hebron City and of Yatta equally. This questionnaire focuses on the types of the terms that husbands use when they address their wives, the factors that affect address term usage such as the setting which includes the time, the place, and the bystanders involved in the course of the interaction, the purpose of the interactional event, and information about the spouses including their ages, educational and vocational levels, length of period marriage, the mood of the speaker, and number of children.

After that, interviews were applied to collect information about all the possible terms that husbands use when they address their wives, the influence of marriage period, daily routine, and interpersonal interaction on address term usage. Moreover, interviews were used to identify the different subcategories of the Ts that husbands

use. Also, interviews aim at determining the terms husbands use that affect their wives negatively; i.e., convey negative social meanings.

In the naturally occurring data collection phase, the researcher records all the possible terms she encounters through spouses' daily situations' interactions. Not only this, she focuses on the possible factors that may affect address term usage which include age, the bystanders, the setting, the spirit of the participants in the interaction, the spouses' vocational and educational level. Moreover, the researcher aims at determining the social meaning that these terms convey such as expressing anger, solidarity, intimacy, respect, mockery, and other social meanings.

3.5. Data Analysis

The qualitative data in this research are analyzed through using interviews and naturally occurring situations. The questions of the interviews were short and were used to collect specific data concerning the different types of addressing terms, the factors that affect their usage including age, educational and vocational level, number of children, length of marriage period, and the presence of others. Moreover, they aimed at defining the negative meanings that these terms convey.

Some of the data were accumulated by observation conducted over the course of a year; however, these data could not easily be collected in this way due to the fact that husbands tend to avoid addressing their wives in the presence of others. However, the researcher was able to obtain the data needed for the research results through constant observation of the spouses' daily life situations.

The qualitative data in this research are analyzed through using questionnaires. A total of 100 wives were given questionnaires, 50 women were from the city of

Hebron and 50 were from Yatta. The questions aimed at investigating the types that husbands use in different contexts, the factors that affect their usage which include age, vocational and educational level, length of marriage period, number of children, and the possible bystanders that surround them. Also, these questionnaires focused on the social meanings that these terms convey such as expressing solidarity, respect intimacy, mockery, anger, and degradation.

3.6.Conclusion

The research's sample is a total of 100 wives distributed equally on wives from different parts of Hebron City and from Yatta. A total of 15 wives among the sample were interviewed. The questions of the interview and the questionnaire focused on examining all the possible types of terms that husbands use in addressing, the factors that affect their usage, and the social meanings these terms convey. The researcher also used naturally occurring situations as a method of collecting data to collect reliable and realistic data to make reliable conclusions.

The number of the participants can be considered sufficient to enable us to draw conclusions about address term usage, the factors that affect them, and the social meanings they express.

Chapter Four

Results and Discussions

4.1.Introduction

After the application of the study methods and gathering the data through questionnaires, interviews, and naturally occurring situations, this chapter presents the answers to the research questions. Data were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. On the one hand, the questionnaire data were statistically treated by using the Statistical Package for Social Science(SPSS) to give results about the types of the terms that husbands use in addressing, the factors that affect their usage, and the social meanings these terms convey from the wives' points of view. On the other hand, the wives' responses to the interview questions were collected and analyzed to give results about the most common term used in addressing, the types of Ts used in addressing, the effects of marriage period, daily routine, the bystanders, and the context on address term usage, and the negative social meanings these terms convey. Finally, this chapter presents the data gathered from naturally occurring situations and analyzed to give results about the types of the terms used in addressing, the role of the bystanders on address term usage, and the social meanings these terms convey.

4.2. Questionnaire Results

To complete this study properly, it is necessary to analyze the data collected in order to test the hypothesis and answer the research questions. This section is based on the results of the questionnaire and deals with a quantitative analysis of data. Questionnaire were distributed to a hundred wives, fifteen wives are from Hebron and 50 are from Yatta. The researcher has used SPSS for collecting data. The questions of

the questionnaire were drawn upon Wardhuagh's (2006) theory of addressing terms and Brown and Fraser's(1979) study of speech as a marker of situation. Data gathered through the questionnaire were subjected to frequency counts. In other words, the subjects' responses for each individual question were added together to find the highest frequency of occurrence (i.e. the number of times that a particular response occurs). These responses to the questions, which are quantified, are then presented in percentage forms. This analysis is presented in a tabular form.

In general, the questionnaire results showed that there are certain variables affecting address term usage. These variables include age, educational and vocational status, length of marriage period, number of children, mood of the speaker, setting, and people who are present at the moment of speaking but do not take part in the course of the interaction. The results of the questionnaire data show similarities between Hebron and Yatta districts. However, some differences are noticed in relation to the use of PN and T. The most common ways of addressing are FNs and Z address term in all age groups, the least common way of addressing is through the use of T. The questionnaire shows that with certain variables such as age, educational and vocational level, children, and years of marriage, husbands head towards respect and solidarity. Moreover, the results show that people who are present at the moment of speaking but do not take part in the course of the interaction are considered an important factor that determines address term usage.

4.2.1. Discussion of the Questionnaire Results

The questionnaire part of this research provides the researcher with sufficient information about the social factors that determine address term usage and the social meanings these terms may convey. The questionnaire consists of sixteen questions

distributed to 100 wives living in different parts of Hebron and Yatta districts. Demographic data are taken into consideration including age, educational and vocational level, number of children, and length of marriage period. This section is meant to support the research hypotheses.

Table 2: Sample's Distribution Analysis

variable	level	Yatta		Hebron	
		Num.	Percent	Num.	Percent
Age	20-30	14	28.0	14	28.0
	30-40	12	24.0	12	24.0
	40-50	12	24.0	12	24.0
	50-60	12	24.0	12	24.0
Educated and practitioner	educated	25	50.0	25	50.0
	Non- educated	25	50.0	25	50.0
Period of marriage	Less than 5 years	10	20.0	10	20.0
	5-10 years	20	40.0	20	40.0
	More than 10 years	20	40.0	20	40.0
No. of children	0	10	20.0	10	20.0
	1-5	20	40.0	20	40.0
	More than 5	20	40.0	20	40.0

Table (2) shows that the highest percentage of the target age group in both Hebron and Yatta was (20-30) by (28.0). The reason of choosing this age group to be the highest percentage is that they use a variety of address terms, and they are most likely to be affected by the other factors that determine address term usage. It also shows that questionnaires were distributed to educated and practitioner wives on the same portion in both Hebron and Yatta districts with the percentage of (50.0).

Regarding the period of marriage, Table (2) shows a percentage of (20.0) to the group of spouses who have been married for less than five years. On the other hand, both groups, people who have been married from five to ten years and people who have been married for more than 10 ten years, show the same percentage of (40.0) in both Hebron and Yatta districts.

Table 3: Survey Questions Analysis

question	FN	L N	T	FN+T	L N+ T	PN	NN	Kin	Tek	Z T
					Hebron					
What are the terms that your husband normally uses when he addresses you?	98.00%	6.00%	18.00%	8.00%	0.00%	95.00%	96.00%	94.00%	100.00%	100.00%
What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses when you are alone?	98.00%	0.00%	4.00%	0.00%	0.00%	94.00%	40.00%	78.00%	20.00%	88.00%
What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses during courtship?	38.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	94.00%	0.00%	14.00%	0.00%	58.00%
What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of your children?	100.00%	4.00%	20.00%	00.00%	00.00%	28.00%	90.00%	60.00%	20.00%	100.00%
What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of his parents?	94.00%	6.00%	6.00%	0.00%	0.00%	30.00%	30.00%	92.00%	24.00%	80.00%
What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of your parent?	98.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.00%	0.00%	30.00%	18.00%	86.00%
What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of female relatives?	50.00%	0.00%	4.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	96.00%	94.00%	80.00%
What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of male relatives?	30.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	76.00%	90.00%	100.00%
What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of his friends?	30.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	76.00%	90.00%	100.00%
What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of strangers?	56.00%	0.00%	4.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	4.00%	16.00%	100.00%

Yatta									
What are the terms that your husband normally uses when he addresses you?	98.00%	26.00%	30.00%	20.00%	0.00%	88.00%	100.00%	88.00%	94.00%	100.00%
What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses when you are alone?	92.00%	0.00%	28.00%	20.00%	0.00%	60.00%	80.00%	58.00%	20.00%	80.00%
What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses during courtship?	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	88.00%	0.00%	4.00%	0.00%	58.00%
What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of your children?	100.00%	12.00%	14.00%	0.00%	0.00%	12.00%	96.00%	42.00%	26.00%	100.00%
What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of his parents?	92.00%	26.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.00%	60.00%	82.00%	50.00%	76.00%
What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of your parent?	98.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	24.00%	74.00%
What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of female relatives?	40.00%	0.00%	6.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	86.00%	84.00%	86.00%
What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of male relatives?	18.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	78.00%	94.00%	100.00%
What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of his friends?	46.00%	0.00%	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	3.00%	80.00%	100.00%
What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of strangers?	20.00%	0.00%	60.00%	0.00%	0.00%	18.00%	0.00%	20.00%	30.00%	100.00%

Table (3) above shows the role of the setting on address term usage in Hebron

and Yatta districts. It includes the husband and the wife when they are alone, during

courtship, and in the presence of other bystanders. The bystanders are the people who

are present at the moment of speaking but do not take part in the course of the

interaction. They include the husband's parents, the wife's parents, children, female relatives, male relatives, friends, and strangers.

Table (3) shows that the highest mean of address term usage regarding the first question "What are the terms that your husband normally uses when he addresses you?" in Hebron districts was through the usage of Z term and Tek with a percentage of 100%, second highest rate was through the use of FNs with a percentage of 98%. On the other hand, Yatta district shows a highest percentage of address term usage through the use of NNs and Z address terms with a percentage of 100%, second highest rate was through the use of FNs with a percentage of 98%. As seen from Table (3), the most common ways of addressing in Hebron district in everyday life situations is through Z address terms, Teks, and FNs. However, the most common ways of addressing in Yatta district in everyday life situations is through Z address terms, NNs, and FNs.

The answers of the second question " What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses when you are alone?" shows that the highest percentage of address term usage in Hebron district was through the use of FNs with a percentage of 98% and PNs with a percentage of 94%. On the other hand, the answers to the same question of the interview in Yatta district show that the highest percentage of address term usage was given to FNs 92%, PNs and Z address terms with a percentage of 80%.

The answers to the question" What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses during courtship?" shows that the highest percentage of address term husbands use while addressing their wives in Hebron and Yatta districts was through the use of PNs with the percentage of 94% in Hebron district and 88% in Yatta. Other terms used during courtship in Hebron district are Z address with a percentage of 58%, FNs with

a percentage of 38%, and KT with a percentage of 14% . In Yatta district, Table (3) presents the terms husbands use while addressing their wives during courtship as follows: Z address with a percentage of 58%, FNs with a percentage of 20%, and KT with a percentage of 4% .

The question " What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of your children?" shows different percentages in the use of address terms that husbands use in front of their children. The highest detected percentage of address terms in Hebron district is for FNs and Z address terms with a percentage of 100% . Other terms are NNs with a percentage of 90%, KTs with a percentage of 60%, PNs with a percentage of 28%, Ts and Teks with a percentage of 20%, and LNs with a percentage of 4%. On the other hand, the highest detected percentage of address terms in Yatta district is FNs with a percentage of 100%. Other terms are NNs with a percentage of 96%, KTs with a percentage of 42%, PNs, Teks with a percentage of 26%, Ts with a percentage of 14%, and LNs with a percentage of 12%.

The results for the question "What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of his parents?" show that husbands living in Hebron and Yatta city use mostly FNs with the percentage of 94% in Hebron and 92% in Yatta when they address their wives in front of their parents. The questionnaire also shows that husbands use KTs, LNs, Ts, PNs, NNs, Teks, and Z address terms. On the other hand, answers to the second questions show that husbands in both Yatta and Hebron use FNs, KTs, Teks, and Z address terms. However, the answers to this question show that husbands in Yatta never use PNs in front of their parents. On the other hand, some husbands living in Hebron district have been detected using PNs in front of their wives' parents.

The answers to the question of the questionnaire" What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of your parents?" show that the highest percentage for address terms usage in Hebron and Yatta districts is by using FNs with the percentage of 98% and Z address with the percentage of 86% in Hebron district. In Yatta district, the percentages are 98% for FNs and 74% for Z address terms.

The analysis of the question " What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of female relatives?" shows similarities between Hebron and Yatta districts. Husbands in both areas use FNs, Ts, KTs, Teks, and Z address terms. However, there is a difference in the percentages of address term usage. Table (3) above shows that the most common term that husbands use in front of female relative is KT with a percentage of 96% . Similarly, husbands living in Yatta district use KT with a percentage of 86% and Z address terms with a percentage of 86% while addressing their wives in front of female relatives.

On the other hand, the analysis of the questionnaire shows that husbands in Hebron and Yatta districts use FNs, KTs, Teks and Z address terms when they address their wives in front of male relatives. The results show similarities in address term usage that husbands use while addressing their wives between Hebron and Yatta districts. Table (3) above shows that husbands mostly tend to avoid addressing their wives by any term in front of male relatives. Moreover, the answers show that husbands use Teks when they address their wives in front of male relatives.

The answer to the question "What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of his friends?" shows that husbands in Hebron and Yatta districts use FNs, Ts, KTs, Teks, and Z address terms. The most common way of addressing is the avoidance of any term of addressing. The results show similarities between the two

districts, however, there is a difference in the percentages of using Ts in both areas. Table (3) shows that husbands living in Yatta district use Z address terms with the percentage of 100% and Teks with the percentage of 80% and in Hebron with a percentage of 90%.

The answers to the last question of the questionnaire " What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of strangers?" show similarities of address term usage between husbands living in different parts of Hebron and Yatta districts. However, there are differences in the percentages of the different terms used in both districts. Table (3) shows that the most common way of addressing is the avoidance of an address term. In Hebron, husbands mostly tend to address their wives using Z address term with the percentage of 100%, and FNs with the percentage o 56%. On the other hand, Table (3) shows that the most common terms husbands , who are living in Yatta, use while addressing their wives are Z address terms with the percentage of 100%, and Ts with the percentage of 60% with the percentage of in front of strangers.

Table 4: Social Functions Analysis

question	FN	LN	T	FN+T	LN+T	PN	NN	KT	Tek	Z T
Hebron										
What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show respect?	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	28.00%	0.00%	58.00%	60.00%	0.00%
What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show mockery?	0.00%	6.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	96.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
What is/are the term(s) your husband uses to express degradation?	0.00%	6.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	96.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show solidarity?	46.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	60.00%	0.00%	80.00%	66.00%	0.00%
What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show intimacy?	38.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	98.00%	0.00%	30.00%	10.00%	0.00%
What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show anger?	98.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	58.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Yatta										
What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show respect?	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	18.00%	0.00%	80.00%	72.00%	0.00%
What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show mockery?	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
What is/are the term(s) your husband uses to express degradation?	0.00%	6.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show solidarity?	40.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	58.00%	0.00%	80.00%	68.00%	0.00%
What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show intimacy?	42.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	92.00%	0.00%	40.00%	12.00%	0.00%
What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show anger?	98.00%	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%

Table (4) above is an analysis of the social meanings that address terms may convey. The analysis of the first question "What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show respect?" shows similarities of the different types that husbands living in Hebron and Yatta districts use while addressing their wives. Table (4) shows that husbands in both districts use FNs, PNs, KTs, and Teks to show respect. The answers

show that the use of Teks is considered the most common way to show respect in Hebron with the percentage of 60%, on the other hand, the use of KT is considered the most common way of addressing in Yatta district with the percentage of 80%. The analysis of the question" What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show mockery?" shows similarities between Hebon and Yatta districts. Table (4) shows that the most common way husbands in Hebron and Yatta districts use to express mockery is through the use of NNs. NNs have the highest percentage in Hebron district with the percentage of 96% and with the percentage of 100% in Yatta district. LN is also considered a way to express mockery. Table (4) shows that in Hebron, LN has the percentage of 6%, and in Yatta has the percentage of 20%.

The analysis of the question " What is/are the term(s) your husband uses to express degradation?" shows that the most common terms that husbands use to express degradation are NNs and LNs. The percentages show that NNs have the highest mean with a percentage of 96% in Hebron district and with the percentage of 100% in Yatta district. LNs have the percentage of 6% in both districts.

Table (4) shows that the highest mean of terms that show solidarity in Hebron and Yatta districts is through the use of KT with a percentage of 80%. Other terms used to show solidarity are FNs, PNs, and Teks.

The analysis of the question "What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show intimacy?" shows that the most common terms that husbands use while addressing their wives are PNs. Hebron shows a percentage of 97% of PNs that show intimacy, on the other hand, Yata shows a percentage of 92% of PNs. Other terms that husbands use in both districts to show intimacy are FNs, KTs, and Teks.

The question in Table (4) above " What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show anger?" analyses the terms that husbands use when they are angry. Table (4) above shows similarities in Hebron and Yatta districts of address term usage use by husbands while addressing their wives. The analysis of this question shows that husbands in both districts use FNs, Ts, and NNs while addressing their wives when they are angry, but with different percentages. Table (4) shows that husbands in Hebron district uses FNs with the percentage 99% while addressing their wives when they are angry. On the other hands, husbands in Yatta district use NNs while addressing their wives when they are angry with the percentage of 96%.

Table 5: Survey Analysis

variable	level	FN	LN	T	FN+T	LN+T	PN	NN	KT	Tek	ZT	Total
					Hebron							
Age	20-30	25.0	0.0	56.2	12.5	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16
	30-40	28.5	0.0	28.6	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21
	40-50	50.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8
	50-60	60.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5
Educated and practitioner	educated	45.5	0.0	18.2	22.7	0.0	13.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22
	Non- educated	10.7	25.0	0.0	0.0	17.9	10.7	0.0	10.7	0.0	25.0	28
Period of marriage	Less than 5 years	13.3	0	60.0	26.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15
	5-10 years	43.8	0.0	12.5	43.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16
	More than 10 years	57.9	0.0	0.0	42.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19
No. of children	0	18.2	0.0	63.6	9.1	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11
	1-5	26.9	0.0	50.0	3.8	3.8	11.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	26
	More than 5	46.2	0.0	0.0	38.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.4	13

variable	level	FN	LN	T	FN+ T	LN+T	PNs	NNs	KT	Tek	ZT	Total
Yatta												
Age	20-30	21.4	28.6	21.4	21.4	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14
	30-40	25.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	16.7	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	12
	40-50	20.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	12
	50-60	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	41.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	12
Educated and practitioner	educated	24.0	36.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	16.0	0.0	25
	Non- educated	8.0	0.0	0.0	32.0	0.0	0.0	16.0	0.0	20.0	24.0	25
Period of marriage	Less than 5 years	50.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10
	5-10 years	10.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	35.0	15.0	15.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20
	More than 10 years	5.0	15.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	20
No. of children	0	20.0	40.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10
	1-5	15.0	0.0	0.0	55.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20
	More than 5	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	30.0	20

Table (5) shows that husbands between the age group 20- 30 use a variety of terms when they address their wives; however, as seen in Table (5), the percentage differs from one term into another. In general, husbands of this age group in both districts tend to use terms such as FNs, LNs, Ts, NNs, and PNs when they address their wives. On the other hand, husbands of older age groups tend to use terms such as Teks and KTs. By comparing between Hebron and Yatta districts, the results show that husbands in Hebron tend to use PNs, and FNs more than husbands in Yatta districts.

In relation to educational and vocational level, results show that husbands in Hebron and Yatta districts use FNs, KTs, Teks, NNs, and PNs similarly but with a slight difference in the percentages. Table(5) shows that education plays a slight role on address term usage in terms of the use of Ts only; however, education and vocation do not affect other terms.

In relation to marriage period, the results show that husbands in Hebron and Yatta districts use KTs and Teks more through years of marriage. The results also show that husbands use FNs and PNs more in early years of marriage.

Based on Table (5) above, the results show correlation between number of children and address term usage. With the increase of the number of children, husbands in Hebron and Yatta districts tend to use KT and Teks when they address their wives. Moreover, the use of NNs decreases with the increase of the number of children.

4.3. The Interview Results

The interview part of this research provides the researcher with sufficient information to answer the following research questions: What are the social factors that affect husbands' use of addressing terms as presented by Wardhaugh (2006) and Brown and Fraser (1979)? And what are the functions or the social meanings of the terms husbands use in addressing their wives using Wardhaugh's theory (2006) of address terms and Brown and Fraser's (1979)? In general, the interview results showed that address terms usage change in the course of time due to several reasons, such as children, responsibilities, and habituation. Moreover, the results showed that the social meaning of an address term depends largely on the context within which

this term is used. The interview results showed a variety of terms of address which can be classified in six categories as table (2) below shows.

Table 6: The Interview Results

	Type of term of address	Terms of address used
1	FN	ربى، سمر، هبة، أسيل، كفاية ، أمل، اسراء، غدير، ايمان، محفوظة، ليلى، هنادي، منار ،مريم، فاطمة.
2	Endearment terms	زغلول ، سنفورتي ،عمري، حبي، روحي، حبيبتي، قمري، بطتي، بطة، بيبي، دلوعتي، أم غمازات. Other endearments are diminutive FNs, such as: أمونة، ام اليوي، هبوش، هبو، رورو، ياسمينة، ياسمينو،سمورة، سمور، أس، أسولة،أمولة ، سوسو ، غدورة، زازا،هنودة ، مريومة، فطوم ،فوفا .
3	Teks	أم سامر، أم محمد ، أم زيد، أم عبود، ام أشرف، أم رامي، أم براء، أم سامي، أم يزيد، أم تميم، أم تيم، أم زين، أم اسلام، أم قيس
4	Ts	مدام، ست، انسة، افندية، أم العيال، مرة، بنت Some terms are religion-related terms, such as:حجة Some terms are occupation-related terms, such as: مديرة، مس، دكتورة، معلمة ، مربية الأجيال، رئيسة الوزراء، الحكومة، وزارة الداخلية.
5	KTs	مدامتي، مرتي، زوجتي
6	Address terms that convey negative meanings	غبية، بقرة، هبلة، مجنونة، طبرة، حمارة، عديمة الفهم، مثقفة، فهمانة، جاهلة، متخلفة.

4.3.1. Discussion of the Interview Results

The wives' interview results are discussed through analyzing the wives' responses for each question.

The responses to the first question "What are all the possible terms that your husband uses when he addresses you?" show that almost most husbands use FNs, Ts, nicknames, KTs, Teks, and Z address terms when they address their wives, few husbands use their wives' family names. The wives clarify that their husbands use these terms when they address them, but with different percentages. Among the fifteen interviewees of Hebron district, only two wives indicated that their husbands use their family names in addressing in certain situations. One of the wives states that "my husband uses my family name but not always. He uses my family name only in front of others when he wants to express mockery or degradation" (see Appendix B). In general, husbands use these terms almost every day, but in different contexts and in different situations.

In responding to the second interview question "What is the most common term used in addressing, and in what situations this term is used?" show that all the interviewees' husbands use their wives' FNs and Z address term in almost everyday situations. They use FNs when they are alone, in front of their children, in front of his/ her parents, in front of relatives. However, nine wives of the interviewees state that their husbands avoid using their FNs in front of strangers or in front of their friends. They mostly avoid using any term of addressing. One of the interviewees states that" he uses my FN almost in 89% of our daily life, however, he avoids using it in front of strangers. I keep asking him why he avoids using my name in front of strangers or your friends, he always replies that he does not really know why, but he does not feel

comfortable mentioning my name in front of them" (see Appendix B). Moreover, FNs can be used to convey several social meanings as wives state. Wives indicate that their husbands use their FNs when they want to show intimacy, respect, solidarity, and anger. The difference between these function is the tone of the speaker. One of the wives states" the way my husband calls my name depends on his mood and the situation. For example, when my husband is angry, he shouts my name and calls me loudly, but when he expresses a desire or requests something, he uses a tender, calm tone" (see Appendix B). Another wife states that " my husband uses my name to express intimacy when we are alone, to express solidarity in front of my parents, but when he calls my name in front of his father, he calls my name angrily. I don't know why although there is nothing going on between us, he expresses anger when he calls my name in front of his father" (see Appendix B).

Wives' responses to the third interview question " Did the terms of address change in the course of time? How?, show that the terms that husbands use while addressing their wives change in the course of time. The wives indicate that in the early years of marriage, their husbands tend to use terms that show respect, solidarity, and more specifically endearment and love. One of the interviewees says "in our first year of marriage, my husband used to call me by my name in maybe 10% of the daily situations and in 90 % of our daily life he used to call me by terms that show love and endearment, such as "*my love*," and other terms that show endearment and affection; however, after 7 years of marriage, he uses endearment terms much less than before. I think the last time when I heard a pet N was two weeks ago" (see Appendix B).

Based on the wives' responses to the fourth interview question "What Ts (occupational, religious, or other Ts) your husband uses when he addresses you? In what situations?", the responses show that husbands in Hebron and Yatta use Ts to

show pride, humor, and formality. All the interviewee wives, from Yatta district, indicate that their husbands use the term 'women' or the term 'girl' when they address them to show formality in front of others, and to show power differential when they are alone or in front of family members. On the other hand, husbands in Hebron use the term 'girl' when they address their wives in front of others, or alone to show formality and power differential. One of the participants living in Yatta district states that" my husband addresses me by Z address term and by the term 'woman' in front of strangers or friends to express formality and distance, and he uses these terms when we are alone as a sign that he is the man and he is the one who is responsible of this institution" (see Appendix B). Another wife from Hebron states that her husband uses the term 'girl' when he addresses her to show formality in front of others and to express machismo. Moreover, two of the interviewee wives add that their husbands use Ts to express pride. One of the interviewee wives living in Yatta says, "my husband uses the term 'doctor' when he addresses me to express pride and honor of my vocational status" (see Appendix B). Another interviewee wife from Hebron district states, "my husband uses the term 'headmaster' in front of everybody including strangers, friends, relatives, children ,and even when we are alone to express pride" (see Appendix B). The interviewees also indicate that their husbands use Ts to express humor. Wives from both districts indicate that their husbands use the Ts to express humor. A wife from Hebron district states that her husband uses the T 'prime minister' when he refers to her as a sense of humor, another wife from Yatta district states that her husband uses the term 'authority' when he addresses her to mean that she is the man of the house and she is the one in charge.

According to the wives' responses to the fifth question " What is the influence of the daily routine on address term usage?", the interviewee wives in Hebron and

61

Yatta districts show that their husbands usually use FNs and Z address terms when they address them in everyday situations. One of the interviewee wives in Hebron states, "my husband uses my name normally when he addresses me because this terms is the most common term for addressing, also it does not denote any social meaning on the opposite of other terms such as endearment terms that denotes intimacy" (see Appendix B). Furthermore, the avoidance of addressing terms has been showed to be the most common way of addressing. Z address term is used in everyday situations. A husband may addresses his wife without using any term. For example, when he asks for something, he usually asks for it without any addressing term.

In responding to the sixth question" What term(s) your husband uses in the following: in face to face situations, on the telephone, when he texts you?", wives show that the terms their husbands uses when addressing them depend largely on what Brown and Fraser (1979) has called in their theory the instrumentalities. Wives, who are living in Hebron and Yatta districts, show that the media through which addressing terms are used affect largely on address term usage. They say that husbands usually feel more comfortable using endearment terms through the telephone or text messages. One of the interviewee wives who is living in Hebron says, "my husband uses a variety of endearment terms when he texts me, but in face-to- face situations he feels shy expressing his love using pet Ns. On the other hand, he uses NNs much more on the telephone or when he texts me more than in face-to- face situations" (see Appendix B). The responses show that in face- to- face situations, husbands use a variety of terms such as FNs, Ts, NNs, PNs, LNs, Teks, KTs, and Z address term. On the other hand, husbands use FN, PNs, NNs, KT, and Z address terms when they address their wives on the telephone or through text messages. The results of the interview questions were the same in both Hebron and Yatta districts.

The wives reveal a wide range of terms their husbands use when they address them when they are alone, in front of their children, in front of their parents, in front of strangers, in front of friends, and in front of their relatives in responding to the seventh interview question" What term(s) your husband he uses when you are alone, in front of your children, in front of your/ his parents, in front of strangers, in front of friends, and in front of your female/ male relatives?". The wives' answers show that husbands use a variety of terms depending on the bystanders, the people who are present at the moment of speaking but do not take part in the course of the interaction. The results show similarities of address term usage depending on the bystander in both Hebron and Yatta districts; however, there was a difference of endearment term usage among husbands living in Hebron. The questions show that in Hebron and Yatta districts husbands use FNs, KTs, Ts, endearment terms, and Z address term when they are alone, they use FNs, KTs, Ts, and Z address terms in front of their children. The results also show that husbands use FNs, Teks, KTs, Ts, LNs, and Z address term in front of his parents; however, in front of her parents husbands never use the wife's family name because they use it as a kind of insult. Endearment terms are never used in Yatta district in front of family members; however, some wives who are living in Hebron City state that their husbands use endearment terms in front of others. One of the wife's was asked about the reason why her husband uses endearment term in front of others, she states, "my husband used to live abroad for several years and he was accustomed to hearing people expressing their love using pet names in front of others" (see Appendix B). Another wife was asked about the reason why her husband uses endearment terms in front of others although her brothers- in-law were never detected using endearment term in front of others. She says, "my husband is different from his brothers. He is more extroverts and open but his brothers

always feel shy to express their feelings. So you can say that it depends on the personality of the speaker. Not only this, the degree of intimacy and appreciation between us is much more than that between other couples in the family" (see Appendix B). The answers also indicate that husbands use FNs, KTs, Teks, Ts, and Z address term in front of female relatives, however, in front of male relatives, they avoid using their wives' FNs in most cases, KT, Teks, and Z address term. They also use Ts such as 'woman', 'girl' and occupation- oriented Ts such as 'doctor.' In front of strangers or friends, husbands use KTs, Teks, Ts, but the most common way of addressing is avoiding addressing them by any term.

The responses to the last interview question "What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses that affect (s) you negatively. In what situations these terms are used?" show that husbands show similarities in both Hebron and Yatta districts in relation to terms that convey negative feelings. The answers to the questions all show that husbands use NNs when they address their wives, the wife's LN, or her FN. One of the interviewee wives states that, "my husband uses NNs such as 'retarded', 'handicapped' and other negative nicknames to show anger or mockery. He uses my FN to express anger, but the tone when he calls me by my FN is loud and thundering. In some cases, in front of his parents and when he is angry, he uses my family name to show mockery and insult. I don't know why most husbands use the wife's family name as a sign of mockery and insult, but I have never heard a husband addresses his wife using her family names except for the sake of expressing mockery and insult" (see Appendix B).

4.4. Observation Results

The speech sample consists of the naturally occurring speech of ten speakers stratified by age, educational and vocational level, setting, purpose, participants, the formality or informality of the context. The study has focused on naturally occurring situations to collect reliable results. By observing the way husbands address their wives, the research has come to the conclusion that setting and the purpose of the speech act both play an important role in address term usage. The results show that the place within which the conversation occurs, the bystanders including family members, friends, or strangers, the degree of the formality or informality, and the participants including individual speakers' characteristics and the participants' interpersonal relationship are all considered factors that affect address terms usage. The following table shows that types of terms the research has collected from naturally occurring situations that husbands use when they address their wives. The naturally occurring data results showed a variety of terms of address which can be classified in six categories as table (3) below shows.

Table 7: Observation Data Results

	Type of term of address	Examples of terms of address used	Social meaning
1.	FN	نهلة، غدير، هبة، أسيل، ريهام، إسلام، سجى، أثير، أماني، صباح، فائزة، نفوز، وصال، ربى، نداء، فاطمة، فلسطين.	- to show anger - to request

2.	Tek	أم أشرف، أم تميم ، أم الزين، أم رامي، ام حمزة، أم زيد، أم أحمد، أم سامي، أم يزيد، أم تميم، أم تيم، أم زين، أم اسلام، أم مكروم	- to show respect - to request something. - To show formality - To show intimacy
3.	T	مدام، ست، انسة، مثقفة، أفندية، فهمانة، المرة، بنت، ولة، أم راس، دكتورة، القائدة، رئيسة الوزراء Some terms are religion-related terms, such as: حجة	- to show mockery - to show formality - to show power differential - to show humor - to show pride
4.	KT	مرتي	- to show respect
5.	T + Family name	بنت ابو عرام، بنت العمور.	- to show mockery
6.	Z Address terms	هيه ، تعالي، هاتي، صباح الخير.	- to show formality - to show normality
7.	Address terms that convey negative meanings	غبية، بقرة، هبلة، مجنونة، طبرة، حمارة، عديمة الفهم.	- to show mockery - To insult

66

4.4.1. Discussion of Observation Results

The types of terms that husbands use when they address their wives, the variables that affect them, and the social meanings these terms may convey are analyzed and interpreted through naturally occurring situations among spouses, who are living in Hebron and Yatta districts, in their daily life interactions when they are in front of their family members including their parents, male/ female relatives, friends, and strangers. The data were collected in different settings: in the family house, in the street, in the grocery, and in the pharmacy. Certain factors are taken into consideration such as the spouses' ages, educational and vocational level, the mood of the speaker, the setting, and the purpose of the interaction. The researcher has estimated the spouses' ages. Also, she is aware of their educational and vocational level since these participants are acquaintances. The researcher has also relied on the body language and the facial expressions of the speakers to analyze the underlying psychological state or the mood of the speaker.

The results of naturally occurring data situations show that husbands in both Hebron and Yatta use the same types of address terms. Moreover, in both districts, similar factors affect address term usage such as age, the bystanders, the mood of the husband, the husband's personality, and the social situation within which the interaction occurs. The researcher's observation of a total of ten couples, five couples are from Hebron City and the other five are from Yatta, and their interactions in daily life situations show that the types these couples use are FNs, Ts, family names, KTs, Teks, PNs, NNs, and Z address terms.

The most common terms that husbands in Hebron City use when they call their wives are FNs, KTs, Teks, PNs, and Z address terms. All of the observed

husbands use FNs, such as "*Ghadeer*," "*Heba*" ,or KTs when they address their wives, such as "*marati*," which means "my wife" or "el-madam" which means "the madam." The husbands of older ages use Teks and FNs when they address their wives. The results show that most husbands, whose ages range from 40- 60 years old, use Teks and FNs while addressing. The husbands of this age group use the KT "marati" which means "my wife" in front of male family members, FNs in front of their children, their parents, and in front of female family members, and Z address terms or Teks in front of family members, friends, and strangers. A fifty four year old doctor uses the Tek *'Um Samer'* (L. the mother of Samer) when he addresses her in front of family members, especially in front of male family members, or her FN *'Leila'* when he addresses her in front of female family members, or in front of his children. In general, husbands of this age group use FNs, Teks, and KTs while addressing their wives. However, One of the husbands is a doctor and his wife is also a doctor and he only uses the T "doctor" when he addresses her in front of others. This is the only case where occupational Ts are used in observation. In this case, one can assume that the personality of the speaker plays a role in address term usage since none of the educated participants has used the wife's T while addressing.

The other age group of husbands from Hebron City are ranges from 20- 40 years old. In this age group, two out of five husbands use PNs in front of female family members. The researcher has observed one of the husbands, who is living in Hebron district, usually uses the term "*habibi*" ,which means "my love", in front of his mother, his sisters, and his female cousins. However, he calls her by her FN "*Ghadeer*" or he uses the KT "*marati*" which means "my wife" in front of his father and his brothers. However, his brother, who is older than him by two years, has never been heard addressing his wife using pet Ns, but he addresses her by her FN in front

of family members and by the KT "*marati*" which means "*my wife*" or the Tek "*Um Qais*" or Z address term in front of male family members, strangers, and friends. Although the two brothers have the same age group and they are both architects, one of them uses pet Ns in front of the female family members, the other has never been heard using pet Ns while addressing his wife. This may be related to the husband's personality and the individual's distinctive character.

In general, terms that convey negative social meanings where not detected while observation. This can be due to the fact that they tend to be seen as prestigious people though selecting terms that convey positive social meanings, or to the fact that women in Hebron City do not accept being addressed by terms that convey negative meanings in front of others. Through observation, it is found that the terms that husbands use while addressing show respect such as KTs and Teks, intimacy such as FNs and pet Ns, to show pride such as the use of the T "*doctor*."

On the other hand, five husbands were observed in naturally occurring situations in Yatta. The types of terms these husbands use when they address their wives are FN, Tek, Kin, T, T + LN, Z address terms, and other terms that convey negative meanings. Taken into consideration age as a factor that affects address term usage, the results show that husbands of age group that ranges from 20- 40 use FNs in almost all situations. However, in front of others including strangers and friends, observation shows that husbands use Teks such as '*Um Ahmed*' (L. Ahmad's mother) to request, show formality, or show respect or the term *'el-mara'* which means *'the woman'* to show formality. On the other hand, husbands of older generation whose ages range from 40-60 use FNs less than husbands of younger generation. Similarly, results show that husbands of this age group use the term *'el-mara'* which means *'the woman'* and Teks such as *'Um Islam'* which mean (Islam's mother) but with higher

69

percentage. Moreover, they tend to use Teks more as a sign of respect and appreciation.

KT is used mostly among spouses of younger generation to show solidarity and respect. Results of the observation show that husbands whose ages range from 40-60 years old rarely use KTs to address their wives. In this case, it can be noted that age plays a factor on KT usage. However, Teks are not related with age and the number of children. In fact, people in Arab societies decide the name of their children before getting married, and after marriage they start using the Tek when they address their wives as a sign of intimacy. One of the participants who has no children yet uses Tek when he addresses her wife.

Another term that husbands use in Yatta society is title plus the wife's family name. However, this term is mostly used by the husband in front of his parents to show mockery. This term is used more with husbands of younger generation, and by educated and uneducated husbands. In one of the situations, one of the participants has called his wife using title plus her family name to show mockery that women in this family care about superficial things in life such as fashion, dancing, etc.

 They use their wives' FNs to request something to be done for them, to show respect, and to show anger. The difference between these functions can be interpreted through the manner or the tone of the speaker or through his facial expressions. For example when a husband calls his wife using her FN in high dudgeon, his tone and facial expressions can tell that the speaker is angry.

The results show that husbands in Yatta society never use PNs when they address their wives in front of their children, parents, male or female relatives, strangers, or friends. On the other, they use FNs to express anger, solidarity, and

diminutive FNs to express intimacy. Husbands of older ages use KTs and Teks more than husbands of younger ages to show respect.

Naturally occurring situations results of address terms usage in Hebron district show that husbands whose ages range from 20- 50 use FNs in most situations to show intimacy, anger, formality or informality, and respect. The way husbands address their wives differs depending on the bystanders, and the situation. One of the husbands addresses his wife by her name in a tone that shows formality in front of his father, however, his tone when he addresses her by her FN shows informality and intimacy when he calls her in front of others. The reason is that the personality of the bystanders may affect the husband's tone of address term usage. i.e., a husband my call his wife in a tone that shows formality, and firmness in front of his father.

4.5. Conclusion

To sum up, this chapter has provided and explored all the information needed to answer the research questions. The researcher analyses the results of the questionnaire, interview, and naturally occurring data situations to justify her answers to the research questions.

To begin with, the results show that husbands in Hebron and Yatta districts use FNs, Ts, LNs, PNs, NNs, Teks, KT, and Z address term when they address their wives.

In relation to the first, second, and fourth hypotheses, the results show that husbands in Hebron tend to use PNs more than husbands in Yatta. Husbands who are living in Hebron district tend to be seen prestigious and they are more open than husbands who are living in Yatta district. Moreover, Husbands in Yatta district tend to

use Teks, Ts, and Z address terms than husbands who are living in Hebron. They also show solidarity, respect, NNs, formality, mockery, and degradation more than intimacy. On the other hand, hand, husbands in Hebron district show intimacy, informality, and solidarity more than people who are living in Hebron district.

Ultimately, the third hypothesis "Factors, such as age, length of marriage period, place of residence, number of children, formality and informality, the context, personality of the speaker, educational and vocational level, and the degree of intimacy between spouses are considered important determiners of address term choice" was proved through the analysis of the instruments used. However, educational and vocational levels of the husband and the wife do not appear to have a strong impact on address term usage in both districts.

Chapter Five

Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1. Conclusion

The study of language and society is considered important to understand interpersonal relationships. In this chapter, some important points are outlined. First, the conclusion contains a summary of the research findings related to the formulation of the problems and the objectives of the research. Then suggestions are included to pave the road for other researchers who want to conduct similar research.

Based on the research findings and discussions of this study, the first conclusion is concerned with the types of address terms that husbands from Hebron and Yatta districts use while addressing their wives, the second conclusion is related to the factors that affect address term usage, and the last conclusion is related to the social meanings these terms convey.

1. There are nine types of address terms used by husbands in both Hebron and Yatta districts. They are FN, T+LN,T, LN, PN, NN , Tek, KT, and Z address term.

    The type of address terms which is mostly used by husbands in both districts Hebron and Yatta is FN, then Z address term follows. These two terms are almost used in all daily life situations. FNs are used when the spouses are alone, during courtship, in front of children, in front of his/ her parents, in front of male/ female relatives, in front of strangers, and in front of friends. FNs are used to show respect, intimacy, anger, and solidarity. The second most appearing type of address terms used by husbands in Hebron district is Tek. This term is used

when spouses are alone, in front of their children, in front of his/ her parents, female/ male relatives, friends, and strangers. It is used to show respect, solidarity, and intimacy. The following most common term used is NN. It is used when the spouses are alone, in front of children, in front of the husband's parents, and in front of female relatives. NNs are used to show anger, degradation, and mockery. The fourth common terms used for addressing are PNs and KTs. PNs are used when the spouses are alone, in front of children, during courtship, in front of his/ her parents, and in front of female relatives. PNs are used to show respect and solidarity. KTs are used the spouses are alone, in front of children, during courtship, in front of his/ her parents, and in front of female/ male relatives, friends, and strangers. KT is used to show respect, solidarity, and intimacy. The least common ways of addressing used by husbands in Hebron district are Ts and LNs. Ts are used when the spouses are alone, in front of their children, and in front of his parents to show respect, and mockery. LNs are used in front of the husbands' parents to show mockery and degradation.

The most common terms that husbands in Yatta city use are as follows: NNs and Z address terms, FNs, Teks, KTs and PNs, Ts, and LNs.

2. In this research, the social factors that affect address term usage are divided into fifteen. These factors are the setting, the bystanders, age, educational and vocational level of the spouses, number of children, length of marriage period, the mood of the speaker, the personality of the speaker, the degree of intimacy between the spouses, region of origin, the formality and informality of the context, power differential, the daily routine, the instrumentalities, and the purpose. However, these factors differ from one person into another and from one district into another. It should be noted that the results show similarities of

address term usage and the circumstances that affect them between Hebron and Yatta districts.

3. Related to the second objective, there are six functions of address terms. They are to show respect, intimacy, solidarity, anger, mockery, and degradation. Respect is expressed through the use of FNs, KT, and Teks. Intimacy is indicated through the use FNs, PNs , KTs, and Teks. FNs, Tek, and KT are used to express solidarity. On the other hand, anger is expressed through the use of FNs, NNs, and Z address terms. Mockery and degradation are both expressed through the use of Ts and NNs.

On the other hand, certain differences were detected based on the research. People in rural areas has shown a great extent of respect and solidarity when they grow older more than people in urban areas. However, younger generation in urban areas heads toward showing intimacy and affection due to the fact that husbands in rural areas, whether young or old, are governed by the norms of the society which impose a certain degree of conservatism.

5.2.Recommendations

From the analysis of the research above, the researcher's recommendation for the other researcher is that this research is culture- specific and what applies to one speech community may not be applied for another. For example Teks are considered specific for Arab countries, not western countries. Moreover, factors may differ from one speech community into another and the social meanings may also differ. In other words, a term that is used to express anger in one community may not be used in another. The researcher should be aware of the culture of the community under study and tries to take all the circumstances in consideration.

This study is only preliminary for any other advance research in the future. Other researchers may extend their research to include other factors that might affect address terms usage. Moreover, they may explore more social functions that address terms might convey. Researchers may give advance study on the use of address terms to explore the similarities and differences of address term usage between rural and urban areas for the reason that what is considered applicable in one context might not be suitable in another.

References

Abugharsa, A. (2014). Terms of Address in Libyan Arabic Compared to Other Arabic Varieties. *Online Submission*, (June), 1–13. Oklahoma State University. (Retrieved, January 18. 2019, from: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED546487.pdf_).

Afful, J. B. A. (2008). Address Forms and the Construction of Multiple Identities among University Students in Ghana. *Sociolinguistic Studies, 1*(3), 461–481. doi: https://doi.org/10.1558/sols.v1i3.461

Afful, J. B. A., and Nartey . M (2011). 'Hello Sweetie Pie': a Sociolinguistic Analysis of Terms of Endearment in a Ghanaian University. *The International Journal of Social Sciences*, 17 (1), 92-101.

Afzali. K. (2011). The Address Forms of Spouses in Different Social Strata in Iran and Its Sociolinguistic Implications. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 3(1), 1-8. doi:10.5296/ijl.v3i1.721. (Retrieved December 12. 2019, from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/268297850_The_Address_Forms_of_Spouses_in_Different_Social_Strata_in_Iran_and_Its_Sociolinguistic_Implications).

Alharbi, T. (2015). *A Socio-Pragmatic study of forms of address and terms of reference in Classical Arabic as represented in the Chapter of Joseph in the Holy Quran*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Leeds, School of Languages, Cultures and Societies. (Retrieved March 04, 2019, from: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/42605036.pdf_).

Aliakbari, M., & Toni, A. (2008). The Realization of Address Terms in Modern Persian in Iran: A Sociolinguistic Study. *Linguistik online* 35, 3/08. (Retrieved February 24. 2019, from: http://www.linguistikonline.de/35_08/aliakbari.html).

Berg, B. L. (1989). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Sydney: Allyn and Bacon.

Braun, F. (1988). *Terms of Address: Problems and Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures.* Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1989). *Discourse Analysis.* Cambridge: New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P. & Fraser, C. (1979). *Speech as a Marker of Situation.* Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, (eds.) Scherer, 1979. (Retrieved June 12. 2020, from: https://pure.mpg.de/pubman/item/item_66661/component/file_532275/Brown_Speech_1979.pdf).

Brown, R, & Ford, M. (1961). Address in American English. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 62, 375-85.

Chaer, A. (2004). *Sosiolinguistik Perkenalan Awal*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Chaika, E. (1982). *Language: The social mirror*. Boston, MA: Heinle. (Retrieved May 16. 2020, from: https://archive.org/details/languagesocialmi00chai/page/258).

Daher, N. (1987). Arabic Sociolinguistics: State of the Art. *Al-Arabiyya,* 19 (1 & 2) 5-159. Retrieved May 3, 2020, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/43191693

Darrar, M. (2003). Khalfiat Al Taqatu bain Al Asma' wa Al Alqab wa Al Kuna: Al Tahaul Al Dalali wa taqatuhu fi Al Asma' wa Al Alqab wa Al Kuna. *The Journal of Linguistic Studies.* University of Mantouri Qasntinah, 2, 79-97. Retrieved, April 05. 2020, from: http://search.mandumah.com/Record/631644 (In Arabic)

Darwish, E. A., & Huber, L. G. (2003). Individualism vs. Collectivism in Different Cultures: A Cross-cultural Study. *Intercultural Education*. 14(1), 47-56.

Edwards, A. J., & Templeton .A. (2005). The Structure of Perceived Qualities of Situations.

    European Journal of Social Psychology, 35 (6), 705-723.

Elias, A. (2021, January 21). Hadith on responsibility: Each of you is a shepherd for his flock.

    Daily Hadith Online.

    https://abuaminaelias.com/dailyhadithonline/2011/07/03/shepherd-his-or-her-flock/

Eshreteh, M. (2017). A Pragmatic Analysis of Diminutives in Palestinian Society.

    International Journal of Language Studies. 11(1), 45-62.

Esmae'li. S. (2011). Term of Address Usage: the Case of Iranian Spouses. University of

    Isfahan. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1 (9), 183-188

    (Retrieved September 22. 2020, from:

    http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol._1_No._9_Special_Issue_July_2011/20.pdf).

Etaywe, A. (2018). A Sociolinguistic Study of Husband-to-Wife Address Forms and

    Functions in Rural Jordanian Community. *Macrolinguistics*. 5(7), 84 – 117. doi:

    https://doi.org/10.26478/ja2017.5.7.5

Fishman, J.A. (1972). The Sociology of Language, in P.P. Giglioli (ed.) *Language and Social*

    Context. Harmondsworth, Middix.

Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2003). An *Introduction to Language*: 7th Edition.

    Rosenberg Publishing. Boston: Thomson..

Furr, R. M. (2009). Profile Analysis in Person–situation Integration. *Journal of Research in*

    Personality, (3), 196–207.

Gelfand, M., Bhawuk, D., Nishii, H. L., Bechtold, D. (2004). *Individualism and Collectivism*.

    Sage Publications, Inc. doi:10.1002/9781118783665.ieicc0107

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hall, R. A. (1968*). An Essay on Language.* Philadelphia: Chilton Books/Educational Division.

Hantrais, L. (1989). *The Undergraduate's Guide to Studying Languages*. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.

Henrich, J., Heine , J. S., Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. 33 (2-3), 61-83. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X

Hickey, R. (2007). Language and Society. (Retrieved October 19. 2019, from: https://docplayer.net/28704436-Language-and-society-1-language-and-society.html).

Holmes, J. (1992). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.

Hofstede, G. (2011). *Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context.* Online reading in Psychology and Culture, 2 (1).

Hui, C, H. (1988). Measurement of Individualism-Collectivism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 22. 17-36.

Hussein, K. (2013). *Forms of Address in Prophet Muhammad's Hadith*. University of Mosul. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.2.21137.28002

Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (eds.) *Directions in Sociolinguistics*: *the ethnography of communication*. New York.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Josiah, U. (2016). Between Arbitraries and Logic: Revisiting Universal Traits in Natural Languages. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*. 5(1), 38-45. doi: 10.18488/journal.23/2016.5.1/23.1.38.45

Kelley, H. H., Holmes, J. G., Kerr, N. L., Reis, H. T., Rusbult, C. E., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2003). *An Atlas of Interpersonal Situations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Keshavarz (2001). The Role of Social Context, Intimacy, and Distance in the Choice of Forms of Address. *International Journal of Society and Language*, 148, 5-18. doi: 10.1515/ijsl.2001.015

Khalik, A. (2014). The Use of Address Forms in Hitch Movie: A Sociolinguistic Study. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 1, 1-7. (Retrieved December 04. 2019, from: http://jurnalvivid.fib.unand.ac.id/index.php/vivid/article/view/2).

Khalil, A. & Larina, T. (2018). Arabic Forms of Address: Sociolinguistic Overview. *The European Proceedings of Social & Behavioural Sciences EpSBS.* (2357-1330). doi: 10.15405/EPSBS.2018.04.02.44

Khan, M. (2021). Surah Ar-Rum - 30:21. *Quran.Com.* https://quran.com/30/21?translations=18%2C19%2C20%2C95%2C17%2C21%2C22 %2C85%2C34%2C84%2C101

Kim, U. (1995). *Individualism and Collectivism*. Nordic Institute of Asian Studies: NIAS, Report Series, No 21

Kokila, V. (2018). A cross Cultural Study on Individualism and Collectivism among Indian People. *Journal of Management (JOM)*, 5, 191-202.

Labov, W. (1966). *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, D. C: Centre for Applied Linguistics.

Larina, T. (2018). Arabic Forms of Address: Sociolinguistic Overview. *Social & Behavioural Sciences EpSBS.* (2357-1330). Doi:10.15405/epsbs.2018.04.02.44

Moghaddam, A. S., Azdanpanah, L., & Abolhassanizadeh, V. (2011). The Analysis of Persian Address Terms Based on the Theory of Politeness. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*, 10 (3), 55-71, (Retrieved January 22. 2020, from: https://docplayer.net/50249095-The-analysis-of-persian-address-terms-based-on-the-theory-of-politeness-azadeh-sharifi-moghaddam-leyla-yazdanpanah-vahideh-abolhassanizadeh.html.)

Nabi, A., (2017). Language And Culture. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science*. 22(11), 91-94.

Nevala, M. (2004). Accessing Politeness Axes: Forms of Address and Terms of Reference in Early English Correspondence. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 36 (12), 2125-2160. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2004.02.001

Oyetade, S (1995). A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Address Forms in Yoruba. *Language in Society*. *24*, 515–535.

Parkinson, D. (1985). Constructing the Social Context of Communication. Terms of Address in Egyptian Arabic [M]. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pribadi, A. M. (2016). A Sociolinguistic Analysis on Address Terms Found in The Blood of Olympus Novel and its Translation. (Unpublished master's thesis). Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta. (Retrieved May 25. 2019, from: http://eprints.ums.ac.id/44184/2/FRONT%20PAGE.pdf

Qin, X. (2008). Choices in Terms of Address: A Sociolinguistic Study of Chinese and American English Practices. *North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics*. 1, 409-421.

Rifai, D. , and Prasetyaningrum, S .(2016). A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Addressing Terms Used in Tangled Movie Manuscript. *Journal Penelitian Humaniora*,17(2), 123-134.

Safitri, T. (2016). *The Analysis of Directive Utterances Used by the Main Characters of Hotel Transylvania Movie and its Application in Teaching Speaking at Tenth Grade Students of Senior High School*. (Unpublished master's thesis).   Purworejo Muhammadiyah   university.   doi: http://repository.umpwr.ac.id:8080/bitstream/handle/123456789/2606/122120139-TITI%20SAFITRI.pdf?sequence=1

Salami, O. (2004). Deference and Subordination: Gender Roles and Other Variables in Addressing and Referring to Husbands by Yoruba Women. *Linguistik online,* 21(4), 65- 80. doi: 10.13092/lo.21.1069

Spolsky, B. (1998). *Sociolinguistics. Oxford introductions to language study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taha, A. T. (2010). Etymological Sources of Address Terms in Dongolawi Nubian. *Semantic Scholar Journal*. XXXV(1), 1-22.

Tauchid. A. (2018). In Search of Address Terms in Novel**.** *English Studies Journal*. 13 (2), 15- 28, doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.32678/loquen.v13i2

Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* 5th Edition. UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Widiatmaja, A. (2014). A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Address Terms Performed by the Main Character in Runaway Jury Movie. (Unpublished master's thesis). Yogyakarta State University. (Retrieved July 26. 2019, from: https://eprints.uny.ac.id/17543/1/Aji%20Widiatmaja%2010211141024.pdf).

Address Terms Usage Survey in English

This questionnaire was developed with the aim of investigating the terms husbands use when they address their wives, the factors that affect address term usage, and the social meanings these terms convey. Please read the questions below and answer them carefully. This questionnaire is confidential and will be used only for the sake of scientific research. It consists of two sections:

Section A: Personal Information

Husband's age :

The husband's level of education:

The wife's level of education:

The husband's occupation:

The wife's occupation:

Length of marriage period:

Number of children:

Section B: Please complete the following questionnaire by placing a cross(✖) in the appropriate box:

FN : First Name   **N :** Nickname

LN: Last Name   **KT:** Kinship Term

T: T   **Tek:** Teknonym

FN+ T: First Name + T   **Z :** Zero Term

LN + T: Last Name + T

No.	Questions	Types								
		FN	LN	T	FN + T	LN + T	N	KT	Tek	Z
1	**What are the terms that your husband normally uses when he addresses you?**									
2	**What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses when you are alone with him?**									

3	What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in intimate situations?									
4	What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of his parents?									
5	What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of your parent?									
6	What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of your children?									
7	What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of female relatives?									
8	What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of male relatives?									
9	What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of his friends?									
10	What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses in front of strangers?									
11	What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show respect?									
12	What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show anger?									
13	What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show solidarity?									
14	What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show intimacy?									
15	What is/are term(s) your husband uses to show mockery?									
16	What is/are the term(s) your husband uses to express degradation?									

Appendix B: The Survey Section in Arabic

<div dir="rtl">

استبيان حول صيغ المخاطبة التي يستخدمها الأزواج في مخاطبة زوجاتهم

تم تصميم هذا الاستبيان بهدف دراسة صيغ المخاطبة التي يستخدمها الأزواج لمخاطبة زوجاتهم والعوامل التي تؤثر على اختيار صيغ الخطاب المناسبة والدلائل وراء استخدام هذه الصيغ. الرجاء الاجابة على الاسئلة الواردة أدناه بعناية. هذا الاستبيان سري وسيتم استخدامه لأغراض البحث العلمي.

- القسم الاول: المعلومات الشخصية

عمر الزوج:

التحصيل الأكاديمي للزوج:

التحصيل الأكاديمي للزوجة:

مهنة الزوج:

مهنة الزوجة:

عدد سنوات الزواج:

عدد الاطفال:

- القسم الثاني: الرجاء تعبئة الجدول التالي من خلال وضع إشارة (✖) في المربع المناسب.

	انواع صيغ الخطاب								
	الاسم الاول	اسم العائلة	اللقب	الاسم الأول + اللقب	اسم العائلة + اللقب	اسماء مستعارة	استخدام مصطلح زوجتي	استخدام مصطلح أم فلان	عدم استخدام أي صيغة مخاطبة
1. ما الصيغ التي يستخدمها زوجك عادة لمخاطبتك؟									
2. ما الصيغة/ الصيغ التي يستخدمها زوجك لمخاطبتك أثناء التحدث بأمور حياتية اعتيادية؟									
3. ما الصيغة/ الصيغ التي يستخدمها زوجك للتودد؟									
4. ما الصيغة/ الصيغ التي يستخدمها زوجك أمام والديه؟									
5. ما الصيغة/ الصيغ التي يستخدمها زوجك أمام والديك؟									
6. ما الصيغة/ الصيغ التي يستخدمها زوجك أمام الاولاد؟									
7. ما الصيغة/ الصيغ التي يستخدمها زوجك أمام الاقارب الاناث؟									
8. ما الصيغة/ الصيغ التي يستخدمها زوجك أمام الأقارب الذكور؟									
9. ما الصيغة/ الصيغ التي يستخدمها زوجك أمام اصدقائه؟									
10. ما الصيغة/ الصيغ التي يستخدمها زوجك أمام الغرباء؟									
11. ما الصيغة/ الصيغ التي يستخدمها زوجك لإظهار الاحترام ؟									

</div>

									ما الصيغة/ الصيغ التي يستخدمها زوجك عندما يكون الزوج غاضبا؟	12.
										ما الصيغة/ الصيغ التي يستخدمها زوجك تشير الى التوافق؟	13.
										ما الصيغة/ الصيغ التي يستخدمها زوجك لإظهار الود والمحبة؟	14.
										ما الصيغة/ الصيغ التي يستخدمها زوجك والتي تشير الى الاستهزاء والتهكم؟	15.
										ما الصيغة/ الصيغ التي يستخدمها زوجك للإهانة ؟	16

Appendix C: Address Term Usage Interview Questions in English

1. **What are all the possible terms that your husband uses when he addresses you?**
2. **What is the most common term used in addressing?**
3. **Did the terms of address change in the course of time? How?**
4. **What Ts (occupational , religious, …) your husband uses when he addresses you? In what situations?**
5. **What is the influence of the daily routine on address term usage?**
6. **What term(s) he uses in the following: in face to face situations, on the telephone, when he texts you?**
7. **What terms your husband uses in front of his parents, your parent, female or male relatives, friends, strangers? Explain the role of the bystanders on address term usage.**
8. **What is/ are the term(s) your husband uses that affect (s) you negatively? In what situations these terms are used?"**

Appendix D: Address Term Usage Interview Questions in Arabic

<div dir="rtl">

نموذج ل اسئلة المقابلة مترجمة الى العربية

1. ما هي الصيغ التي يستخدمها زوجك أثناء مخاطبتك.

2. ما هي الصيغة الأكثر استخداماً للمخاطبة؟

3. هل تغيرت الصيغ المستخدمة مع مرور الزمن؟ كيف ذلك؟

4. ما هي الألقاب (سواء أكانت دينية، وظيفية، أم غير ذلك) والتي يستخدمها زوجك أثناء مخاطبتك؟
   وما هي المواقف التي تستدعي استخدام مثل تلك الصيغ؟

5. ما هو تأثير روتين الحياة اليومية على استخدام صيغ المخاطبة؟

6. ما هي الصيغ التي يستخدمها الزواج في كل من: المواقف التي تحدث وجهاً لوجه، على الهاتف، أو
   من خلال الرسائل النصية؟

7. ما هي الصيغ التي يستخدمها زوجك أمام كل من: والديه، والديك، الأقارب الذكور، الأقارب الإناث،
   الأصدقاء، أو الغرباء؟ بيني دور المتفرجين على استخدام صيغ المخاطبة.

8. ما هي الصيغ التي تؤثر بك بشكل سلب؟ وفي أي المواقف تستخدم مثل هذه الصيغ؟

</div>