

Addressing Practices in Multilingual Student-Teacher Interaction in Pakistani English

MUHAMMAD ARIF SOOMRO *

*Department of Foreign Languages
Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University)
Moscow, Russia*

&

*Department of English
Quaid-e-Awam University of Engineering, Science & Technology
Nawabshah-Sindh, Pakistan
muhammadarif@quest.edu.pk*

TATIANA V. LARINA

*Department of Foreign Languages
Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University)
Moscow, Russia*

ABSTRACT

Address forms in varieties of pluricentric languages can be influenced by local values and cultural specificities, which reveal the bilingual and bicultural identity of the speakers. The paper explores the Pakistani variety of English and focuses on addressing practices in university student-teacher interaction in top-down and bottom-up contexts. The study aims to identify the categories of address forms used by students and teachers in Pakistani English and to find out lingua-cultural, axiological, and socio-pragmatic factors that impact their choices and preferences. The data were collected through a questionnaire and open-ended written interviews with the participation of 252 students and 130 teachers and supplemented by 13 hours of audio-recorded classroom observation. The data were subjected to linguacultural, sociolinguistic, pragmatic and discourse analysis drawing on pragmatics, the theory of forms of address, the theory of politeness, the World Englishes Paradigm and cultural studies. The findings revealed that both teachers and students use a mixture of different categories of English and native address forms, and their combination resulted in hybrid forms to express their values and attitudes. The findings provide new data on the impact of sociocultural and axiological factors on address forms and may have implications for the World English paradigm, cross-cultural pragmatics, cultural linguistics and second language (S.L.) teaching.

Keywords: address form; bi-multilingual; sociocultural values; student-teacher interaction; Pakistani English

INTRODUCTION

With the rise in academic mobility and the impact of diverse demographic and migration patterns, academic discourse has grown notably heterogeneous in both linguistic and cultural aspects. This diversity poses challenges in student-teacher interactions. Representatives of a particular culture are affected by their own understanding of the way academic interaction occurs and reveal certain communicative patterns (Zbenovich et al., 2024), which is observed in a multicultural classroom in the performance of different speech acts (Zhou et al., 2023).

Addressing represents a highly context-sensitive practice, and selecting the appropriate address form is crucial for fostering effective communication in interpersonal interactions. Address forms vary due to the situational, social and cultural contexts. Each language has its own system of address forms, which are intertwined with the social and cultural norms and values of

the community. They also demonstrate culture-specific features of functioning in various situations and discourses. Address forms differ not only across languages but also across the varieties of the same language, which is clear evidence of the impact of culture on language and its functioning.

Culture is one of the most influential factors affecting addressing practices. It is viewed as a core tool that guides peoples' actions in line with socially acceptable norms and prototypical practice (Triandis & Gelfand, 2012) and shapes their communicative ethnostyles (Larina, 2015). Thus, the study of addressing practices across cultures demonstrates the interconnectedness of language, cognition and communication. Therefore, we focus on forms of address in multicultural settings of Pakistani universities and aim to reveal their social, pragmatic and functional variations.

Studies conducted on address forms in English varieties within the framework of socio-cognitive linguistics, pragmatics and bilingualism (e.g. Formentelli & Hajek, 2016; 2023; Wong, 2006) demonstrate how bilinguals manipulate English and resort to their native language when they do not find the means to express the norms and values of their native culture. However, the study of address forms in a bilingual context has been paid little or no attention. Moreover, in general, the discursive and pragmatic features of the varieties of pluricentric languages are insufficiently studied. To this point, we have not encountered any research that handles categories of address forms in the teacher-student and student-teacher interaction in the bi-multilingual contexts of Pakistani universities.

We focus on Pakistani universities due to their multilingual and multicultural environment. The purpose of the study is to identify the categories of the address forms used by Pakistani English speakers in a multilingual university setting and to determine the sociocultural, axiological and socio-pragmatic factors that influence the individuals' choice of an address form. The study hypothesises that bi-multilingual background sociocultural and axiological factors, among others, influence the choice of address forms used among bi-multilingual interlocutors. However, we also explore the reasons that lead to a particular address form choice in different contexts according to variational sociolinguistics (Labov, 1972) and World Englishes Paradigm (B. Kachru, 1985; Proshina & Nelson, 2020). The main research questions of the study are:

- What categories of address forms are used by students and teachers in classroom settings.?
- How frequently do the students and teachers use native address forms while speaking Pakistani English?
- How do English and native forms of address differ pragmatically?
- What sociocultural, axiological and socio-pragmatic factors influence the choice of address forms in the interaction?

This paper gives a brief introduction to the research problem and reasons for choosing a university setting, followed by a literature overview; then we describe the data, methods, and analytical framework and move to the findings, discussion section and concluding remarks.

ADDRESS FORMS IN ACADEMIC SETTING

Speakers use address forms to establish their social affiliation and to show that they are associated with the communicative situation and context in which they are. In other words, addressing terms defines and establishes human relations and indicates a close link to one's cultural value system (Prakova, 2017). Forms of address are reflectors of the linguistic and social system of the culture and language used in the given settings (e.g. Clyne, 2009; Suryanarayan & Khalil, 2021; Tazik & Aliakbari, 2023, among many others). As noticed by Zhang & Zhang (2019), "the correct and appropriate use of address terms closely relates to culture" (Zhang & Zhang, 2019, p. 243).

Address forms in academic communication are a common concern for teachers and students, and it has received considerable attention from scholars (e.g., Abalkheel, 2020; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2018; Formentelli, 2009; Formentelli & Hajek, 2016; Larina & Suryanarayan, 2023; Soomro & Larina, 2023; Zhou & Larina, 2024.). Teachers and students in universities come from different backgrounds, which results in differences in communication and misunderstandings that may affect interactions. For instance, Abalkheel (2020) highlights the use of social and academic terms by students in their interactions with teachers in Saudi universities and the avoidance of names and surnames. Zhou and Larina (2024) reveal significant differences in the pronominal usage of T and V address forms in teacher-student interactions in Chinese and Russian settings. It can be observed that teacher-student communication adheres to cultural and social aspects for the proper use of address forms.

The choice of address forms may be based on various social, contextual, and cultural variables such as degree of acquaintance or familiarity, cultural background, and formal or informal relationships (Rau & Rau, 2016). In a multicultural environment, interlocutors express their social, ethical, ethnic, and cultural belongingness and communicate with each other by using a form of address which they find appropriate for a particular context. So, it is necessary for students and teachers to be aware of the norms of addressing other cultures to understand properly the communicative intention of another culture interlocutor.

MULTILINGUALISM AND TRANSLANGUAGING IN PAKISTANI UNIVERSITIES

Translanguaging "is an unavoidable phenomenon in bi/multilingual societies" (Atta & Naqvi, 2022, p. 151), and its existence differs depending on the multilingual and cultural environment of universities. Translanguaging handles challenges of language production, language functions, effective communication, and the thought processing behind language use, and it has applications to any situation and context by multilingual speakers (García, 2009). Canagarajah (2013) differentiated the terms *multilingual* as "the relationships between languages in an additive manner (i.e. combination of separate languages)" and *translingual* as "the synergy, treating languages as always in contact and mutually influencing each other, with emergent meanings and grammars" (Canagarajah, 2013, p. 41).

Pakistan is a multicultural country. Accordingly, there are 78 spoken languages (Eberhard et al., 2020); among the most frequently spoken are Punjabi, Pashto, Sindhi, Urdu, Balochi, Seraiki, Brahui, Potohari, Kashmiri, and others; English is an official language (Rahman, 2008). The multilingual and multi-ethnic identities of Pakistanis have been established, and they maintain their uniqueness (Bugchio, 2014). These multi-ethnic and multilingual Pakistanis encounter each

other on a common platform in universities. Undergraduate students and teachers in Pakistani universities are mainly multilingual and have different cultural backgrounds. Therefore, with a variety of lingua-cultural affiliations, when teachers and students address each other, the possibility of (mis)understanding is high. Address forms are largely determined by cultural values. Along with global cultural values, among the Pakistani culture cores are respecting others (in particular, the elders), kindness, honour (*izzat*), brotherhood, relationships (*wasta*—when individuals turn to a close friend or relative for help), interdependence, dignity, faith, generosity, patriotism, and adaptability (Evason et al., 2016). Respect for elders and solidarity or brotherhood are the most important cultural values of Pakistani and broader Muslim society. They predetermine the use of different forms of address and are observed in different types of discourse, including academic discourse, where translanguaging is a common phenomenon.

WORLD ENGLISHES AND INDIGENISATION OF ENGLISH

The World Englishes (WE) paradigm originates from Braj B. Kachru's (1985) model of the three circles of English. The Inner Circle includes English of native English-speaking countries (the UK, Ireland, the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand); the Outer Circle involves English of the colonised and post-colonial countries that use English for educational and non-educational institutes (e.g. India, Pakistan, Nigeria, Singapore, etc.), and the Expanding Circle includes the varieties of English used as a lingua franca for tourism, business, technology, Internet and other purposes (e.g. Russia, China, Poland, Germany, etc.). The Indian subcontinent has experienced what has been referred to as the nativisation of English due to the regional needs and uses of the language (B. Kachru, 1985).

All varieties of English go through the process of changes due to local cultural, social and linguistic factors. Speakers' native values, lingua-cultural identity, mindset and worldview are expressed through the World Englishes paradigm. Lexis, syntax, phonetic and grammatical levels are used to illustrate this conceptual cultural component of identity (Proshina & Nelson, 2020, p. 530). However, pragma-discursive features of the varieties of English have not been paid much attention by scholars and are understudied.

English in Pakistan has remained the official language and medium of instruction in educational institutes since the colonisation by the British. However, English has gone through the process of indigenisation or nativisation in Pakistan. Baumgardner (1993) found that the English language used in Pakistan has been indigenised in its morphological, phonological, lexical and syntactical forms. Rahman (2008) described phonetic, phonological, syntactic and lexical features of this variety of English. Scholars highlight that the nature of English spoken in the Muslim world is not at all like the English spoken in colonial countries; English in Pakistani is influenced by Islamic values (Mahboob, 2009; Rahman, 2008). As reported by Mahboob (2009), Pakistani English embodies South Asian Islamic sensibilities and reflects Islamic principles.

DATA AND METHODS

DATA COLLECTION AND INSTRUMENTS

The paper explores addressing practices in Pakistani English and focuses on university student-teacher interaction in top-down and bottom-up contexts. It aims to identify the categories of address forms used by students and teachers in Pakistani English academic discourse and to highlight lingua-cultural, axiological and socio-pragmatic factors that impact their choices and preferences. We used three tools for the data collection: i. the survey; ii. open-ended written interviews; and iii. classroom observation. Data for the analysis were gathered through a survey adapted from Larina and Suryanarayan (2023) and were distributed and contextualised to fit the academic context of this study. It was further supplemented with ethnographic validation of students' and teachers' interactions. The survey consisted of nineteen open-ended questions focusing on different situations and why and what address forms students and teachers employed in the formal university settings, e.g. the classroom/office. We provide some samples of situations given in the survey:

- How do you address your classmates in class?
Male _____
Female _____
- How do you address your junior fellow in the department?
Male _____
Female _____
- How do you address your teacher in class?
Male _____
Female _____
- How do you address your teacher in the office?
Male _____
Female _____
- How do you address your teacher in a group of friends?
Male _____
Female _____

The respondents were informed to indicate address forms used by students and teachers. The goal of the survey was to identify forms of address used by student-teacher and teacher-student interaction in formal contexts. We received 252 survey responses from students and 90 from teachers.

Besides, 50 teacher-to-student interactions were analysed from open-ended written interviews, reaching the total number of responses to 392. The open-ended written interviews were conducted in person with the participants from different departments.

However, we provide some sample questions and situations included in open-ended written interviews:

- What do you want to express by using English kinship terms (e.g. brother/bro) when you address your classmate? You can choose more than one option.

Formality Informality Distance Closeness/intimacy Respect Other

Your comment

- Whom do you address by using English kinship terms?

Senior students, Junior students , or all

- What do you want to express by using English kinship terms (e.g. brother/bro) when you address your colleague? You can choose more than one option.

Formality Informality Distance Closeness/intimacy Respect

Other

Your comment

A purposive sampling technique was used for data gathering. A total of 392 participants who were studying at public universities took part in the study. Participation was voluntary, and a consent form was obtained from the participants. The undergraduate students ranged between 18 to 21 years old; they reported all being multilingual. The bi-multilingual environment of Pakistani English speakers shows that participants possessed the ability to communicate in one, two, or even three indigenous languages, as noticed by the survey. Most of the participants in this study are speakers of Sindhi and Urdu.

The classroom observation findings on students' and teachers' interaction were used to supplement and verify the findings of the survey. Classroom observation was conducted with consent from the concerned head of the department/chairperson and the teachers. The classes were observed at Quaid-e-Awam University of Engineering, Science and Technology, Nawabshah-Sindh. The randomly observed classes were the Department of Mechanical Engineering, Department of English and Department of Telecommunication. The focus of audio-recorded data was on the identification and use of different categories of address forms in natural discourse. The content of the lecture, however, was given less emphasis. A total of 13 hours of observations were audio-recorded. We identified 185 address usages from audio-recorded data. In this paper, we share 13 interaction excerpts from the classroom observation recording. These interaction excerpts were transcribed as plain text without observing non-linguistic cues. All the names of the participants are pseudonyms.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The data were analysed drawing on address forms theory (Baumgarten & Vismans, 2023; R. Brown & Gilman, 1960; Clyne, 2009; Formentelli, 2009; Zhang & Zhang, 2019) the theory of politeness (P. Brown & Levinson, 1987; Leech, 2007, 2014; Leech & Larina, 2014; Soomro & Aqdas, 2023. Watts, 2003) and identity (Bilá et al., 2020; Eslami et al., 2023; Larina et al., 2017), World Englishes Paradigm (B. Kachru, 1985; Y. Kachru & Nelson, 2006; Proshina & Nelson, 2020) and cultural studies (Hofstede, 2011; Triandis & Gelfand, 2012).

We aim to explore the impact of native culture on the choice of address forms among students and teachers when interacting in Pakistani English in bi-multilingual universities. Our discussion part of this study mainly focuses on how social, cultural and axiological factors influence the categories' preference and use of different address forms in student-teacher and teacher-student interaction.

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

The data were analysed in both quantitative and qualitative forms. Part 1 contained information on gender, age, qualification, and linguistic background, and part 2 contained data on addressing practices. All data were analysed through SPSS v.20 in terms of descriptive percentage and frequency. The data set included both English address forms and those that were derived from indigenous languages, namely Sindhi and Urdu. These address forms are referred to as 'native' address forms to comprehensively capture the address forms used in the context of Pakistani student-teacher interaction.

For analytical purposes, we adopted Braun's (1988) scheme of address categories. The scheme consisted mainly of names, kinship terms, honorifics, titles, occupational terms and endearment terms. It is widely used by researchers who investigate address forms from different languages and cultures' perspectives (e.g. Formentelli, 2009; Khalil & Larina, 2022). The findings are presented in descriptive statistics in percentage and frequency for each address form used, and this is further supported by qualitative discussion.

FINDINGS

The use of address forms in our study was examined in classroom settings. The findings of address forms in student-teacher interaction are presented in the first section, and address forms in teacher-student interaction are examined in the second section. The findings from the survey were analysed in frequency and percentage, while open-ended written interviews disclose socio-pragmatic and axiological factors, further verified by classroom observations.

FORMS OF ADDRESS USED IN STUDENT-TEACHER INTERACTION

The categories of address forms used by multilingual Pakistani students to address their teacher were honorifics, hybrid terms of address, caste terms, and occupation-based terms (see Table 1).

Honorifics appeared to be the most frequently used category (71.5%). They were both English (50.0%) (*Sir or Madam*) and native (21.5%) (e.g. *sain* spiritual guide' in Sindhi, to some extent equivalent to *sir*). The except here illustrates the case in point.

- (1) Student: *Sir*, how are you doing? (Honorific)
- (2) Student: *Ma'am*, may I come in? (Honorific)
- (3) Teacher: Memory is an important component of the human mind. So, does anyone of you remember the types of memory?
Student: Yes, *sain*, I know. (Honorific in Sindhi)

The analysis of the data showed that caste terms can be used as address forms. It should be mentioned that the use of caste as a term of address is a common culture-specific practice in Pakistani society. The caste in Pakistani society is defined as a marker of identity and respect (Mumtaz et al., 2022). In our data, caste address terms such as *Soomro*, *Qureshi*, *Talpur*, and *Shaikh* were used by 9.1% of respondents for addressing teachers with the addition of *sahib* (Male) / *sahiba* (Female) ('a token of respect' in Sindhi/Urdu). The caste address forms show an individual's identity and express respect and intimacy. For instance, the students in interaction 4 used *Shaikh sahib* to the teacher, which shows the identity of belongingness to a particular group or community.

- (4) Student: *Shaikh sahib*, you seem exhausted today.
Teacher: Yes, *beta*. I have been taking classes since the morning.

In this excerpt, the student uses the form '*Shaikh saab/sahib*' to indicate respect when addressing the teacher. Otherwise, the use of only caste without adding *sahib* (M) / *sahiba* (F) for teachers is considered disrespectful. At the same time, the teacher's use of the *beta* 'son' (Urdu term) shows intimacy and closeness. Moreover, it is noteworthy to mention that students' choice of caste address term for teachers is limited to those who have a mutual understanding of the same caste. However, in this analysis, we excluded the social taboos and ideologies of superiority and inferiority. We focused on caste as an identity marker and form of address.

While elaborating on social factors, students used occupation or profession-based address form, i.e. *teacher* (6.0%). It was used in the formal context of classrooms to show a professional attitude in interactions. It is worth mentioning that students chose only an English profession-based term for teachers; none from native languages was observed. Furthermore, judging by the results of the interviews, students' choice of '*madam*' shows formality in communication, whereas '*ma'am*' demonstrates intimacy and informality in interaction.

- (5) *Teacher*, could you please give more examples?
- (6) *Madam*, when is mid-break?

In addition to English and native terms of address, we have revealed hybrid address forms composed of English and native address forms (13.4%) or their culture-specific usage. Two and three-component models have been observed. On the whole, we identified eight hybrid models/patterns, which are a combination of English and native forms of various categories or present their culture-specific combination.

1. English honorific Sir/Madam + first name (e.g. *Sir Hassan /Madam Mehrosh*)
2. Native honorific + first name (e.g. *Sain Turab*)
3. English honorific + first name + local honorific sahib/sahiba

4. Title + first name (e.g. *Dr. Mustafa*)
5. Title + first name + local honorific (e.g. *Dr. Mustafa sahib*)
6. Honorific + caste (e.g. *Sir Soomro, Sir Channa*, etc.)
7. English honorific + caste + native honorific *saab/sahib* (e.g. *Sir Talpur sahib*)
8. Title + first name + native honorific (e.g. *Dr Mustafa sahib, Professor Jamila sahiba*).

The patterns are illustrated here:

- (7) *Sir Mustafa*, today we are going to participate in a sports gala. Can we leave early from the class early? (Honorific + First name F.N.)
- (8) *Ma'am Jasmine*, what about our marks? (Honorific + First name)
- (9) *Madam Jamila sahiba*, there are many theories of literary criticism... (English honorific + first name + native honorific)
- (10) *Sir Soomro sahib*, do you think every drama reflects a particular class of society, or can we generalise them? (English honorific + caste + native honorific).
- (11) *Dr. Mustafa sahib*, you come forward, please. (Title + first name + native honorific)

The findings highlight the influence of Pakistani cultural values, particularly the emphasis on respect for teachers and on the selection of address forms. When English address terms fell short of meeting socio-pragmatic communication needs, students resorted to blending address forms from both English and native languages, resulting in hybrid address forms (13.4%). This fusion of English and local address forms underscores the bilingual identity of Pakistani English speakers.

TABLE 1. Addressing practices in student-teacher interaction

No	Categories of address forms	Examples	%
1	English	Sir, Madam/Ma'am	50.0
	Native	<i>Sain</i> ¹ 'Sir' (Sindhi), <i>saab/sahib</i> 'master' (Sindhi/Urdu)	21.5
2	Hybrid address forms	Sir/Madam+FN, e.g. <i>Sir Mustafa, Madam Mehrosh</i> ; Honorific + caste, e.g. <i>Sir Soomro</i> ; English honorific + caste + local honorific <i>saab/sahib</i> , e.g. <i>Sir Soomro saab/sahib</i> , title + F.N. + native honorific (e.g. <i>Dr Mustafa sahib</i>)	13.4
3	Caste address terms	Soomro, Qureshi, Talpur, Memon, Syed, etc.	9.1
4	Occupation-based	Teacher	6.0
Total			100.0

FORMS OF ADDRESS USED IN TEACHER-STUDENT INTERACTION

In our open-ended written interviews, the teachers were asked to choose appropriate address terms for addressing students in formal situations (classroom/office). The results revealed that teachers when addressing students, use names, kinship terms and caste terms of address (see Table 2). As expected, most frequently, teachers use first names (61.5%) to show intimacy or closeness. In our open-ended written interviews, teachers were prompted to select suitable address terms for

¹ *Sain* (spiritual guide) is a Sindhi language term that can roughly be replaced with 'Sir'. However, the semantics of *sain* vary in the contexts and interlocutor's relations. For instance, it can be used for the Holy Qur'an in some regions, and the most prominent Sindhi Poet, Shah Abdul Latif Bhittai, used it to address Allah (the God). But in this study, the term can be replaced with 'Sir'.

addressing students in formal settings, such as the classroom or office. The findings unveiled that teachers employ a variety of address terms when interacting with students, including names, kinship terms, and caste terms (refer to Table 2). Notably, it was observed that teachers predominantly utilise first names (61.5%) to convey intimacy or closeness in their interactions.

(12) *Ehsan*, what's the matter? (First name)

29.5% of teachers used kinship terms to refer to the students in the classroom/office interactions, such as '*beta*' son' (Urdu)] and *ada* 'brother' (Sindhi).

(13) Student: *Ma'am*, what about marks? (Honorific)

Teacher: Yes, *beta*. Come to my office. (Kinship term in Urdu)

(14) Student: *Sir*, how were the sources distributed during partition? (Honorific)

Teacher: *Beta*, the sources were distributed on some formula after the partition... (Kinship term in Urdu)

(15) Student: *Sain*, may I know your name? (Honorific)

Teacher: *Ada*, my name's Raheel. (Kinship terms in Sindhi)

The final category of address forms used by teachers towards students comprises caste terms (9%). Typically, this category is employed by teachers in interactions with students with whom they share a mutual understanding and a closer relationship compared to others. However, it's noteworthy that the use of caste terms with students is generally avoided, as discussed further in the subsequent section.

(16) Do you believe that sudden climax makes drama effective, *Jamali*?
 (Caste address terms)

Table 2 provides a summary of the categories employed by teachers when addressing students. The results indicate that teachers primarily use first names (61.5%) alongside native kinship terms (29.5%) and caste address terms (9.0%). These discursive patterns can be understood within the framework of Pakistani cultural norms. Within Pakistani society, teachers hold significant social status and often adopt a paternal role, reflected in their use of native kinship terms to convey both closeness and a nurturing attitude towards students. Additionally, the use of caste terms signifies closeness, although it is typically reserved for students with whom teachers share a particularly close bond.

TABLE 2. Addressing practices in teacher-student interaction

No	Categories of address forms	Examples	%
1	Names	First names, e.g. Mustafa (male), Mehrosh (female)	61.5
2	Kinship terms	<i>Beta</i> 'son' (Urdu), <i>ada</i> 'brother' (Sindhi)	29.5
3	Caste address terms	Soomro, Qureshi, Talpur, Rajper, Syed, etc.	9.0
Total			100.0

DISCUSSION

The study revealed a range of address form categories utilised in Pakistani English (PakE) academic discourse by students (in top-down interactions) and teachers (in bottom-up interactions), indicating a nuanced requirement to convey diverse relationships and attitudes. Two primary socio-pragmatic objectives were identified: firstly, the inclination to demonstrate heightened respect towards the teacher while fostering a sense of closeness, and secondly, the teacher's inclination to cultivate intimacy with students, often articulated through kinship terms. Another significant finding pertained to language usage, with students observed employing both English and native address forms, as well as hybrid combinations.

The findings demonstrate the influence of local language and culture on the manner in which students address their teachers, a phenomenon evidenced through various manifestations. First, in addition to English *sir* and *madam*, other categories and forms are imported from native languages (e.g. *sain* 'spiritual guide' is Sindhi). Second, the influence of the native language and culture is not limited to the set of address forms but is also manifested in their functioning (e.g. Sir + first name, Dr./Professor + first name). Thirdly, Pakistani students employ hybrid address forms when addressing their teachers, blending English and native elements across various categories. These combinations, such as "*Sir Arif sahib*" and "*Madam Jamila sahiba*," reflect the cultural attitudes and values guiding their interactions with teachers. The hybrid forms convey a heightened level of respect towards their teachers while simultaneously maintaining a sense of closeness in accordance with the norms of Pakistani politeness.

Pakistani teachers, in addition to first names, address their students by native kinship terms and caste terms, which indicate closeness and intimacy. The teacher's choice of the kinship term *beta* 'son' (Urdu) demonstrates that teachers want to play dual roles of being one related to professional behaviour and, at the same time, desire to be a parental figure to students in the classroom. In another example, teachers choose *ada* 'brother' (Sindhi) to help students express politeness and intimacy. The native address term '*ada*' shows a polite and respectable gesture, whereas the use of '*beta*' shows not only code-mixing but also parental patronage for the students in the classrooms. The choice of kinship terms for non-blood relatives indicates the we-identity of the Pakistanis as representatives of the we-culture (Larina et al., 2017) and the family orientation of Pakistani society.

These discursive features can be interpreted through Pakistani culture and values. As teachers are held in high regard in Pakistani society as having fatherly qualities, they communicate with students using terms of kinship, demonstrating their attitudes toward them. The same is true of caste address terms, which also express closeness, which is confirmed by the fact that they are limited to those students with whom they are close.

The findings reveal that students often switched to native *sain* 'a spiritual guide' (Sindhi), and *sahib* 'a token of respect' (Sindhi/Urdu). Historically, *sahib* (Male) / *sahiba* (Female) 'a token of respect' roughly equals the English term 'master'; the term was used for addressing or speaking to Europeans (namely British officers or administrators) among native residents of the sub-continent (India-Pakistan) during the British colonisation. The choice of native terms by students for teachers demonstrates their need to express more respect and honour in accordance with Pakistani politeness in comparison to English honorifics such as *Sir/Ma'am*. A similar trend was noticed in Indian English in bilingual academic contexts; the students adhered to social norms when addressing teachers by adding the particle *ji/jee* (a marker of increased respect in Hindi) to *sir* and *madam*, for example, *sir ji/jee* and *madam ji/jee* (Larina & Suryanarayan, 2023). These

tendencies reveal that in bi-multilingual, the interlocutor's choice of address forms is regulated by context, level of formality or intimacy and symmetrical and asymmetrical relations. Formentelli (2009) noticed that in the British academic setting, students mainly employ formal vocatives towards teachers, whereas teachers use first names and informal expressions. This tendency demonstrates an asymmetrical distribution in the choice of address forms. In another example, we found that students also choose to address teachers with occupation/profession-based 'teacher' terms. This choice further strengthens the claims that interlocutors desire to show formality also in their communication behaviour.

To explain the identified categories in the choice of address forms, we turned to the pragmatic meanings. The findings show some socio-pragmatic variations between English and native language/s forms of address. When the students want to show more formality, they use English terms of address; when they want to show more respect and, at the same time, closeness, they use native and hybrid forms of address.

Thus, the findings suggest that the English and native address forms have different pragmatic meanings and demonstrate different cultural values. Both students and teachers typically use English to convey a professional attitude, but choosing native terms demonstrates an increased intimacy. The variations in the choices were noticeable, where English forms of address could not fulfil the expected pragmatic purposes of interlocutors. For instance, the students used the native term *sain* (Sindhi), which is, to some extent, equivalent to the English word 'sir'. Moreover, the addition of *sahib/sahiba* with titles and caste demonstrates that interlocutors rely on native forms of address when they find English terms of address pragmatically inequivalent. They switch to a creative mixture of address forms to meet social, pragmatic and axiological needs of communication.

The findings indicate the bicultural and bilingual identity of Pakistani English speakers, which are manifested in addressing practices. On the whole, the results indicate that the bilingual and bicultural identity of Pakistani English speakers is reflected in the usage of both English and native address forms (A.Fs), and their combination resulted in hybrid forms. The findings testify to the fact that respect for hierarchy, as well as closeness and intimacy, are among the most important values in Pakistani culture and essential axiological components of the identity of its representatives, which guide their communicative behaviour. Our findings demonstrate that though English is an official language in Pakistani universities, the impact of native cultural and social values is dominant in the choice of address forms.

Thus, the results of the study demonstrate how speakers from different linguistic cultures adapt borrowed languages to suit their communicative needs, thereby shaping the development of pluricentric language varieties. The findings affirm that multilingual speakers possess a broader range of codes, strategies, and nuances due to their command over multiple linguistic systems (Y. Kachru & Nelson, 2006). Furthermore, they shed light on the pivotal role of language, particularly discourse, in shaping ethnic identity while also highlighting how identities can actively shape discourse construction (Larina et al., 2017).

CONCLUSION

In this study, our objective was to investigate the address forms utilised by both students and teachers in Pakistani English within both bottom-up (student-teacher) and top-down (teacher-student) contexts. Additionally, we sought to identify the lingua-cultural, axiological, and socio-pragmatic factors influencing their selection and preference. The study unveiled distinctions in the types of categories employed by both teachers and students. Apart from conventional categories found in English varieties of the inner circle, such as names, titles, honorifics, and profession-based terms, participants also utilised culture-specific categories like kinship terms and caste terms.

The findings indicate that both English and native forms of address are employed, often resulting in hybrid variations. These hybrids exhibit pragmatic differences, with English address forms typically conveying formality and distance, while local forms express a blend of closeness and respect. Local address forms among Pakistani English speakers reflect their lingua-cultural identity and embody their values and attitudes, particularly in terms of respect for social status, age, and intimacy in relationships (Proshina & Nelson, 2020; Soomro & Larina, 2022, 2023).

Thus, this study illustrates the occurrence of code-mixing and the Pakistani English speakers' adherence to their native values. The findings of the study imply that, in conjunction with other linguistic variables, address forms play a significant role in shaping Pakistani English as a distinct variety of English. This underscores the profound interdependence of language, culture, cognition, and communication.

The study has some limitations concerning participants and contexts. Further research may be extended to out-of-class situations as well as email communication. The interactions of higher-rank administrative staff such as HOD/Chairman, Dean, Vice Chancellor, and lower-rank administrative staff, for example, lab attendants and peons, can also be explored. Further prospects are seen in identifying ethnocultural forms of address and the peculiarities of their functioning in other discourses, as well as in identifying other factors that shape English varieties at the pragma-discursive level.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This publication has been supported by the RUDN University Scientific Projects Grant System, project № 050738–0-000. <<*Diagnosis of Cognitive Violations and Success/Failure in Rehabilitation Practice and Educational and Scientific Activities*>>. Peoples' Friendship University of Russian (RUDN University), 6, 117198, Russian Federation.

REFERENCES

- Abalkheel, A. (2020). How to Address Your Instructor: An Analysis of Classroom Discourse at Saudi Arabian Universities. *Studies in English Language and Teaching*, 8(4). 122-129. <https://doi.org/10.22158/selt.v8n4p122>
- Atta, A., & Naqvi, S. B. (2022). Exploring Translanguaging Praxes in Pakistani Multilingual ESL Classrooms of First-Year Students at University Level. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature® The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 28(3). 149-167. <http://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2022-2803-10>
- Baumgardner, R. J. (1993). *The English Language in Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Baumgarten, N., & Vismans, R. (Eds.). (2023). *It's different with you. Contrastive perspectives on address research* [TAR 5]. John Benjamins.
- Bilá, M., Kačmárová, A., & Vaňková, I. (2020). The encounter of two cultural identities: The case of social deixis. *Russian Journal of Linguistics* 24(2), 344-365. doi: 10.22363/2687-0088-2020-24-2-344-365
- Braun, F. (1988). Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures. *Contributions to the Sociology of Language*, 50. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110848113>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T.A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in language*. Cambridge: MIT Press. 253–276.
- Bughio, M. (2014). Determining the Status and Use of Languages Spoken in Pakistan. *Sustainable Multilingualism*, 4(4). 46–56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7220/2335-2027.4.3>
- Canagarajah, S. (2013). Negotiating Translingual Literacy: An Enactment. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 48(1). 40–67. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24398646>
- Clyne, M. (2009). Address in intercultural communication across languages. *Linguistik online*. 2016. 6(3). 395-409. <https://doi.org/10.1515/IPRG.2009.020>
- Eberhard, D. M., Simons, G. F., & Fennig, C. D. (2020). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (23rd ed.). SIL International. <http://www.ethnologue.com>
- Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2018). “Mr Paul, please inform me accordingly”: Address forms, directness and degree of imposition in L2 emails. *Pragmatics: Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA)*, Vol. 28(issue 4, 489–515). <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.17025.eco>
- Eslami, Z. R., Larina, T. V., & Pashmforoosh, R. (2023). Identity, politeness and discursive practices in a changing world. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 27(1), 7–38. doi: 10.22363/2687-0088-34051
- Evason, N., Memon, I., & Saeed, H. G. (2016). Pakistani culture: Core concepts. Retrieved from <https://culturalatlas.sbs.com.au/pakistani-culture/pakistani-culture-core-concepts>
- Formentelli, M. (2009). Address Strategies in a British Academic Setting. *Pragmatics*, 19(2). 179-196. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.19.3.02for>
- Formentelli, M., & Hajek, J. (2016). Address practices in academic interactions in a pluricentric language: Australian English, American English, and British English. *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA)*, 26(4), 631-652. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.26.4.05for>
- Funk, K. (2001). What is a Worldview? Accessed on 17 February 2023 from <https://web.engr.oregonstate.edu/~funk/Personal/worldview.html>
- García, O. (2009). Education, Multilingualism and Translanguaging in the 21st Century. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. Mohanty & M. Panda (Ed.), *Social Justice through Multilingual Education* (pp. 140–158). Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691910-011>
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>
- Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism. The English language in the outer circle. In Randolph Quirk & Henry G. Widdowson (eds.), *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures*, pp. 11–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Reprint: Bolton, Kingsley & Braj B. Kachru (eds.). 2006. *World Englishes: Critical Concepts in Linguistics* 3. 241–269. London; New York: Routledge.
- Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian Contexts*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

- Khalil, A., & Larina, T. (2022). Terms of Endearment in American English and Syrian Arabic Family Discourse. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 13(1), 27-44. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2022-13-1-27-44>
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Larina, T. (2015). Culture-specific communicative styles as a framework for interpreting linguistic and cultural idiosyncrasies. *International Review of Pragmatics* 7 (5). Special issue: Communicative Styles and Genres. 195–215.
- Larina, T., Ozyumenko, V. I., & Kurteš, S. (2017). I-identity vs we-identity in language and discourse: Anglo-Slavonic perspectives. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics* 13 (1), 195 – 215
- Larina, T., & Suryanarayan, N. (2023). Address forms in academic discourse in Indian English. In Nicole Baumgarten and Roel Vismans (eds.) *Forms of Address in Contrastive Contexts*. 142-170. John Benjamins Publ.
- Leech, G. (2007). Politeness: Is there an East-West divide? *Journal of Politeness Research*, 3(2). 167–206. <https://doi.org/10.1515/PR.2007.009>
- Leech, G., & Larina, T. (2014). Politeness: West and East. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, (4). 9–34. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-9380>
- Mahboob, A. (2009). English as an Islamic language: A case study of Pakistani English. *World Englishes*, 28(2). 175–189. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01583.x>
- Mumtaz, Z., Jhangri, G., Bhatti, A., & Ellison, G. (2022). Caste in Muslim Pakistan: a structural determinant of inequities in the uptake of maternal health services. *Sexual and Reproductive Health Matters*, 29(2), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26410397.2022.2035516>
- Portolés, L., & Martí, O. (2017). Translanguaging as a teaching resource in early language learning of English as an additional language (EAL). *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 10(1). 61-77. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/jtl3.698>
- Prakova, D. (2017). *Intercultural differences: varieties of address strategies in a British academic setting*. Master thesis, University of Huddersfield.
- Proshina, Z. G., & Nelson, C. L. (2020). Varieties of English and Kachru's expanding circle. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 24(3). 523–550. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-2020-24-3-523-550>
- Rahman, T. (2008). Language policy, multilingualism and language vitality in Pakistan. In A. Saxena & L. Borin (dd.). *Lesser-Known Languages of South Asia: Status and Policies, Case Studies and Applications of Information Technology* (pp. 73–106). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197785.1.73>
- Rau, D., & Rau, G. (2016). Negotiating Personal Relationship Through Email Email Terms of Address. In: Chen, Ys., Rau, DH., Rau, G. (ed.). *Email Email Discourse Among Chinese Using English as a Lingua Franca*. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-888-5_2
- Shaari, A. H. (2020). Accentuating Illocutionary Forces: Emoticons as Speech Act Realization Strategies in a Multicultural Online Communication Environment. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature® The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 26(1). 135 – 155. <http://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2020-2601-10>
- Soomro, M. A. (2023). Sociocultural Values and Pragmatics of Caste Address Form in Multilingual Pakistani Student and Teacher Discourse. *Integration of Education*, 27(4). 694–703. <https://doi.org/10.15507/1991-9468.113.027.202304.694-703>
- Soomro, M. A., & Aqdas, S. (2023). Research in Im/Politeness Across Cultures and Contexts. *Journal of Academic Research for Humanities*, 3(3). 122–129A. Retrieved from <https://jar.bwo.org.pk/index.php/jarh/article/view/281>
- Soomro, M. A., & Larina, T. (2022). Categories of address forms in Pakistani English at a multilingual academic setting. *Philological Sciences: Scientific Essays of Higher Education*. 6s*. 50-55. DOI: 10.20339/PhS.6s-22.050.
- Soomro, M. A., & Larina, T. (2023). Mister, bro, or ada? Styles of Addressing among Multilingual Pakistani Students. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, 23(2). 241-257. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17576/gema-2023-2302-13>
- Suryanarayan, N., & Khalil, A. (2021). Kinship terms as indicators of identity and social reality: A case study of Syrian Arabic and Hindi. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 25(1), 125-146. doi: [10.22363/2687-0088-2021-25-1-125-146](https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-2021-25-1-125-146)
- Talib, I. S. (2002). *The Language of Post-colonial Literatures: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Tazik, K., & Aliakbari, M. (2023). Kinship terms variation among speakers of Bahmaie dialect in Khuzestan Province of Iran. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 27(1), 194-215. doi: [10.22363/2687-0088-30135](https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-30135)

- Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (2012). A theory of individualism and collectivism. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology*, 498–520. Sage Publications Ltd. DOI: [10.4135/9781446249222.n51](https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446249222.n51)
- Watts, R. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wong, J. (2006). Contextualising Aunty in Singaporean English. *World Englishes*, 25(3-4), pp. 451–466. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2006.00481.x>
- Zbenovich, C., Larina, T., & Ozyumenko, V. (2024). Culture and identity in critical remarks: A case study of Russian and Israeli academic classroom discourse. *Pragmatics and Society*, 15(3), 351-375. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.20064.zbe>
- Zhang, L., & Zhang, J. (2019). The influences of cultural different politeness on the use of address terms in Chinese and in English discourse. *Journal of Humanities and Education Development (JHED)*, 1(5), 243–249. <https://doi.org/10.22161/jhed.1.5.4>
- Zhou, Q., Laiche, S., & Larina, T. V. (2023). Emotional effect of teachers' discourse in a multicultural classroom. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya 2. Yazykoznanie* [Science Journal of Volgograd State University. Linguistics], 2023, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 123-137. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2023.1.10>
- Zhou, Q., & Larina, T. V. (2024). Power and solidarity in pronominal forms of address: A case study of Chinese and Russian teacher-student interactions. *Training, Language and Culture*, 8(1), 87-100. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2521-442X-2024-8-1-87-100>