Many languages of the world have more than one second person pronoun whose usage has been a subject of study from different points of view. Among Indo-Aryan languages, Sanskrit offers a five-fold choice in addressing a person.

The pioneering work on pronominal address was carried out by Brown & Gilman (1960). They carried out their study on the usage of second person pronouns in different languages like French, German and other European languages. In French, they studied the use of second person pronouns tu and vous, and in German they studied du and Sie. They also studied the equivalent familiar (—T pronoun) and formal (—V pronoun) second person pronouns in other European languages including Spanish and Italian. They found that the second person singular pronoun was used with inferiors/subordinates and intimate persons, while as the plural forms of the second person pronoun, in the languages studied, were used with the superiors and non-intimates. They concluded that the use of pronouns was governed by the social dimensions of power and solidarity. Power and solidarity, according to Brown and Gilman, are the two possible kinds of relationship that exist between the addresser and addressee. They define power as the relationship implying authority and superiority of one person over the other. In this case, the person who has power or superiority over the other uses Tu, and receives the deferential Vous from the addressee who has no power or in an inferior position to the speaker. Therefore the use of pronominals in power relationships is non-reciprocal.

By contrast, the dimension of solidarity is reciprocal as it involves the relationship between equals, peers or people who are close to have a
relationship of intimacy. In the solidarity/intimacy dimension, the same pronoun *Tu* will be reciprocally used by interlocutors.

Brown and Gilman (1960) have also pointed out that pronominal usage and patterns of address change over time. This change in the pronominal usage and address patterns depends on special circumstances which differ across speech communities. They also opine that pronominal usage is heading to extend the solidarity ethic to everyone as a modern direction of change in pronoun usage. These important observations about power and solidarity dimensions as postulated by Brown & Gilman in relation to address behavior have also been shown to exist in the American system of address where a person can be addressed by first name (FN) or title and last name (TLN).

Brown and Ford (1961) working on American English, showed that the distinction between address by first name or by title and last name functioned in the same way as the distinction between T pronouns and V pronouns (called a T/V distinction) in European languages. They also observed that the choice of address form usage —is not predictable from properties of the addressee alone and not predictable from properties of the speaker alone but only from properties of the dyad (Brown and Ford 1961, p.375). Examining varied data from different sources, Brown & Ford observed that three main patterns emerged in the analysis: reciprocal use of FN, reciprocal use of TLN, and non-reciprocal use of FN where a person is addressed with TLN in return to his FN given to the interlocutor. Brown and Ford explained the choice of either one of these three patterns referring to them as being governed by social factors such as acquaintance, intimacy, age, and occupational status. The analysis in this study showed that Americans address people with whom they are casually acquainted by mutual TLN; but as soon as they get into an intimate relation with each other, a shift happens from TLN to FN. The study has also revealed that the non-reciprocal use of nominal address is governed by two kinds of relations, namely occupational status and difference in age, with the former
outranking the latter. Apart from these three main patterns of address, other forms exist in American system of address like: last name alone, title without name and multiple names; the use of each of these patterns correlates with a certain level of intimacy between the speaker and the addressee.

Following from these pioneering works by Brown & Gilman (1960) and Brown & Ford (1961), an array of studies on address from in different languages and societies have been carried out with a huge scope and broader depth contributing to the development of address theory.

Das (1968) describes pronouns of Bengali as used in different social relationships and shows how the use of pronouns is related to other terms of address.

Ervin-Tripp (1972) integrated the studies of Brown and Gilman's 1960 within a sociolinguistic framework. She was aiming at providing a survey of the types of norms governing speech in an interactional situation, and she attempted to discover the basis underlying the choices provided by a language in terms of address forms. She was focused to know the basis of the selection of one linguistic variant over the other. For Trip, address is a case of alternation. She enumerates the variation in address rules address behavior. The approach adopted by Trip for studying address behavior and hence looking for new dimensions of address behaviour gave theoretical depth to Brown and Gilman's study.

It is worth mentioning that a number of studies have been carried out on address behaviour which are either in consonance with the classical study of Brown and Gilman or contradict their findings.

One such study, designed to test the validity of Brown and Gilman's study, was carried out by Fontanella de Weinberg's (1970) and Weinerman's (1976) in Argentina. They found that the mutual/symmetrical/reciprocal address pattern is gaining ground and hence taking over the asymmetrical one.
According to them the increase in the reciprocal use of T is significant. They also observed that pronominal rules of address are associated with the place of residence and social origin of the speakers.

In contrast to the findings of Fontanella de Weinberg’s (1970) and Weinerman’s (1976), Keller (1974, 1975) found that in Latin America and the US, the nonreciprocal T-V address pattern is still very much in use. In Columbia Lambert and Tucker (1976) got the same results as gotten by Keller in Latin America and the US. Lambert and Tucker (1976) questioned Brown and Gilman’s claim that the solidarity dimension is taking over the power dimension. They observed that in many cases where the symmetrical use of the address was expected, the asymmetrical address was witnessed. They also intended that their studies explore the socio-psychological significance of address forms. On the basis of the results gotten by them, they concluded that there are different meanings of the different patterns of address for each of the partners communicative event and that any address pattern carries multiple, indirect and subtle adjuncts to the more purposeful interaction (Lambert and Tucker 1976: 143).

Similarly, Hudson (1980) notes that a significant dimension of variation in the terms of address has to do with cultural patterns that exist for a particular population in general due to their beliefs, social values and customs.

Jain (1973) has studied the second person pronominal usage in Hindi. According to Jain, there are two meanings associated with the pronouns in Hindi: a "normal" and a "contextual" meaning. These two types of meanings expressed by the second person pronouns in Hindi are extensively worked upon by Jain. He clarifies that the three second person pronouns of Hindi (i.e. tu, turn and- ap) are used with five possible verbal forms, which yield six acceptable combinations. He reveals that certain forms of the pronouns found in spoken Hindi dialect are not described in any grammar of Hindi. He proposes that the pronominal choice is based on the context and relationship between the
interlocutors. Jain elaborates the meaning of different forms of pronouns used by a speaker. He also describes the relationship between the pronoun meanings and the attitudes of people towards their usage and how one affects the other.

Jain observed that pluralization is not a grammatical process only; it is a social process also. He elaborates the social basis of pluralization. He shows that the deleted pronouns can be recovered using rules of social usage of pronouns. He asserts that the syntactic rules in such cases are insufficient. Rules of pronominal usage are considered in relation to other forms of speech behavior. Jain also suggests that the kinship address terms and pronominal address go hand in hand and their usage occurs on the same lines.

Bhatnagar (1975) has also worked on the second person pronouns in Hindi. He discusses the second person pronominal usage and presents the modes of address in the domains like family, educational institutions etc. He observes that the social factors like status, age, sex, etc determine the choice of the pronominals and address terms.

Mishra (1977) in his study points out that the pronominal forms and the address terms act as markers to signal equality, status difference, intimacy and distance, etc., in Indian society. He claims that the terms of address and pronominal variants are used speakers to show their social attributes. He explains the co-variances between the various kinds of social relationships (defined on the basis of family status and caste attitudes etc.) and modes of address.

Introducing his study, Mishra talks about how the usage of the terms of address and the pronominals of address is correlated with caste attitudes, family relationships and social status. He describes the pronominals of Hindi in their different case forms. He includes the first name, diminutive first names, second person pronouns, terms of address, and terms associated with professions. Mishra has outlined the structure of the society on the lines of caste. He has
also given due consideration to the social customs, organization of families and the interpersonal relationships in giving the outline of the social structure.

For explaining the pronominal usage, Mishra enumerates the two main axes as:

1. The contextual dimension
2. The Dyadic relational dimension

The dimensions set by Mishra for explaining the usage of pronominals and address terms are essentially the basis for the usage of the linguistic variables under study. With reference to the dimensions set up by the researcher, the usage of the second person pronoun and address terms is described taking into consideration the professional, social and familial relations of the speakers.

Working on Malayalam, Venkitachalam (1981) gives a brief description of the morphological and the semantic features of personal pronouns. He discusses socially restricted common forms of address based on caste. He says that in Malayalam, among relations and friends, the reciprocal /nii/ is used within the family, elders use non-reciprocal /nii/, but in all other situation the more polite form /ninna/ is used. Pronominal usage also varies according to status differences. Professional titles as well as honorific address form /saar/ are also widely in use.

Working on the non-kin terms of address in Hindi and the relation of these non-kin terms of address to the socio-cultural context of the dyads using them, Mehrota (1981) observes that address terms act as an important stage in the whole face to face communicative act. The address terms not only act as the bridge between the interlocutors but the emotional value associated with the address terms can help achieve specific results. He further affirms that the differential use of terms of address has been institutionalized as a tool of defining and affirming both identity and status of the addressee and the addressee. "In fact, a good deal of information regarding the social structure
and psychological makeup of the addressing dyad can be inferred from an examination of these verbal art forms in their two indispensable and interrelated dimensions-linguistic and sociolinguistic." Mehrotar (1981)

Mehrotar (1981) working on the address terms in Hindi, classifies these terms of address into nine categories: names, honorifics, titles, situation factors, multiple uses of address forms, greeting, invocation, addressing pets and avoidance of address term.

Aiming at exploring the changing norms of address in China since the founding of People's Republic in 1949, Fang, H and J.H. Heng (1983) discuss why the official titles remain to be the preferences among the Chinese officials. They talk about the term tongzhi 'comrade' as well as some other address terms relevant to it. They further talk about how the old terms such as xidnsheng 'Mr.', tditai 'Mrs.' And xidojie 'Miss' have undergone changes; finally the use of the second person singular pronouns of both the regular form ni and the honorific nin are discussed. The paper also highlights the changing address terms for women and some naming patterns relevant to address.

Koul O. N. (1984) discusses the modes of address in Kashmiri. His study focuses on the relationship existing between the addressee in the society. Koul talks about the patterns of address in the two communities, Hindu and Muslim, classified on the basis of religion. Within these communities, Koul talks about the social groups within each community which are predominantly profession or occupation based. Koul classifies the address pronominals into the following categories.

1. Non-honorific singular,

2. Honorific singular and,

3. Plural (both honorific and non-honorific).

The honorific singular and plural forms are the same. Koul also presents enumerates and names other modes of address which include names (first
name, diminutive name, nick name, surname), interjections (both honorific and non-honorific), and titles. The use of these modes of address is described under three main headings: social, professional and familial dyadic relations.

Working on the modes of address and pronominal usage in Punjabi, Koul and Madhu Bala (1989) state that the modes of address are determined by the relationships of power and solidarity existing between the dyads involved in the act of communication. Social status plays a significant role in determining the mode of address. The other social factors of significance in shaping the modes of address include age, gender, caste etc. The authors believe that the factors mentioned operate in the broader Indian context.

On the basis of religion, Koul and Madhu Bala classify the native speakers of Punjabi into three categories: Hindu, Sikhs and Muslims. On the basis of profession, Koul and Madhu Bala classify the Punjabi native speakers into four classes: Agricultural class, Business class, Artisan class, and Labour class. According to the authors, the second person pronominal choice and address form are based on the relationship between the addresser and the addressee and the situation of the communicative act.

Knowing the social structure is important for understanding the use of address terms in a society. Koul and Madhu Bala classify the modes of address into the following categories: interjections, second person pronouns, kinship terms and names of address (nick names, family pet names, diminutive first names, surnames, professional titles, etc.). The authors further maintain that like many other languages, the pronominal address is very frequently used in Punjabi language. Koul and Madhu Bala describe the structure of Punjabi pronouns in the light of the traditional and the modern grammars of Punjabi. The various structural peculiarities of the pronominals are discussed and the case forms of the pronouns are also described.

Koul and Madhu Bala explain further that there are two pronominal forms of address in Punjabi i.e., tu: tusi: /a:p/ in a singular, /tusi: lok/, tusi: in
plural. The non-honorific second person singular is usually used in informal situation to address friends, and people of lower status. It is also used with the youngsters to show affection towards them.

The pronoun /tusi:/ is used as singular and plural both. But here /tusi:/ is used in informal situations to address more than one person, for instance for addressing a group of one's friends, sometime lok is added to /tusi:/ to show plurality. The second person singular honorific form of address /tusi:/ /aːp/ is used to address elders and others who are higher in social status. It is also used for friends in formal situations, and for youngsters for showing affection or for being sarcastic. This form of address is normally used by educated people, whereas the second person non-honorific plural pronominal forms. /Tuanu:, tuaattho/ are used both for honorific singular as well as for non-honorific plural. The term /tuattho/ is usually used by parents to address their children. A parent or an elder brother may use this term to address his /her children or youngster in anger. Koul and Madhu Bala also classify the various modes of address including pronominal forms under three main types of dyadic relationships:

1. Familial dyadic relations,

2. Social dyadic relations, and

3. Professional dyadic relations.

They point out that familial dyadic relations include relationships both from the paternal as well as the maternal side. The usage of different modes of address and pronominal forms depends on the types of relationship an addressee may have with the addressee in the hierarchy of kinship relations. Social dyadic relations include the various roles a person plays in society e.g., landlord, tenant, neighbor, friend, a stranger, an acquaintance, etc. The use of modes of address and pronouns of address depends upon different factors in the interpersonal relationship. Professional dyadic relations are developed when two persons come into contact through their professional practice:
doctor/patient, shopkeeper/customer, client/lawyer, etc. Normally, the participants address each other by their full names, surnames, surnames plus honorific suffixes, professional titles plus honorific suffixes, etc. In the conclusion of their study, they state that the use of terms of address and second pronouns is correlated with social structure and culture patterns of the people who speak the given language natively. They confirm that the use of address form is not independent of pronominal usage. The use of terms of address and pronouns of address is governed by the same type of rules.

Parkinson (1985) carried out a study on the address terms in Cairo. He gathered data from different speech events in natural settings. The data for the study was collected over a period of one year. The data was collected to cover the social variables like sex, age, social class, and other variables. This information was gathered by the study team, which was composed of the researcher and his Egyptian assistants, from a wide variety of situations. What is interesting about this study is that at the end of the year in Cairo, after gathering all the data together and transcribing it onto cards, the research team found that they amassed over five thousand instances of EA term of address usage, representing a large number of situation types and terms which is a significant evidence of how address terms are integral and indispensible component of the EA social system and structure. These data involve lots of examples of speakers and addressees of all ages, sexes, and social classes, and from several parts of the town. This study is significant because it is of the very few studies that examined address in an Arabic-speaking community and because it did not only look for traditional —linguistic structure or form, but also described the EA term of address system from a sociolinguistic point of view as it also looked for the social structure of the terms as a linguistic subsystem. It focused on how the speaker using these terms of address would be able to function effectively in a whole communicative situation rather than merely the ability to produce grammatical sentences (Parkinson, 1985, p.3).
Interestingly, the two axes of—solidarity and power—that Brown and Gilman (1960) postulated in their study proved to be strongly present in the structure and usage of many address terms in EA.

Working on the Kiel University Project (1980) Braun (1988) has observed that no language showed homogeneity in terms of the modes of address. She concluded it after working on a number of languages in the Kiel University Project (1980). Braun (1988) concluded that there are no universal rules in the address theory as claimed by Brown and Gilman, Brown and Ford, and Ervin Tripp. There is rather a huge diversity in within and across the languages when it comes to the patterns and modes of address. In addition, it has been found that in using terms of address, speakers apply their own personal meaning, thus often differing from the conventional interpretation (Braun 1988, Sequeira, 1993).

Keshavarz (1988) in his study of address terms in post revolutionary Iran, found that the revolution led to the emergence of solidarity which is reflected in the use of the terms like ‘brother’ and ‘sister’. These findings emerged while looking for the political function of the address terms.

According to Wardhaugh (1986)—How we say something is at least as important as what we say. He points out that when we speak, we must constantly make choices of many different kinds: what we want to say, how we want to say it, and words and sounds that best unite the ‘what’ with the ‘how’. He also points out that the content and the form of address are quite inseparable. Certain linguistic choices a speaker makes indicate the social relationship that the speaker perceives to exist between him/her and the listener. According to Wardhaugh (1986), many languages have a distinction corresponding to the tu–vous (t/v) distinction in French, where grammatically there is a Singular ‘you’ tu (T) and a plural you vous (V). The (T) form is sometimes described as the familiar form and (V) form as ‘polite one’. Other languages with similar T/V distinction are Latin (tu /vous), Russian (ty /vy),
Italian (tu / lei), German (du / sie), Swedish (du / ni) and Greek (esi / esis). English itself once had a _thou/you_ distinction.

Fasold (1990, p.25) notes that the definition of solidarity dimension and the level of solidarity required for reciprocal address varies substantially from one society to another, and from one individual to another.

Working on the personal names in Kashmiri, Koul (1995) observes that a study of terms of address in any language is important to the socio-linguistic research. He points out that these terms are determined by certain factors as social structure, cultural pattern and geographical setting. He elaborates that usage and selection of terms of address are shaped by socio-economic status, literacy level, caste, age and sex. He further asserts that historical and other factors also play a role in the address behavior in a language.

According to Al-Bainy (1996) interpersonal communication requires a strategy to open it. The strategic elements in an interpersonal communication are the address terms which Al-Bainy defines as—a certain word that is used to draw the attention of the addressee.

Due to the fact that African languages have not been studied systematically and because they were reported in the literature of address behavior research less than European languages, Oyetade (1995) is one of the early efforts that studied address behavior in an African context that intended to provide a springboard for similar studies on other African languages. Oyetade (1995) provided a descriptive analysis of the entire system of address forms in Yoruba, a Defoid language of the Niger-Congo phylum, spoken primarily in the western part of Nigeria. Examining data from short radio and TV plays, unobtrusive observation of actual usage, and introspection, Oyetade revealed the choices made by interlocutors are guided by the perceived social relationship that exists between them. He also discovered that the principal indices of this among the Yoruba are age, social status, and kinship. Oyetade also noticed some certain peculiarities. For example, the dichotomy of power
vs. solidarity postulated by Brown & Gilman (1960) becomes blurred with respect to Yoruba kinship terms of address; thus he concluded that solidarity does not imply equality among the Yoruba.

Martiny (1996: 765) studied forms of address other than T and V such as indefinite pronouns and first person plural pronouns in French and Dutch. This approach has been referred to as a socio-pragmatic approach, because it considers co-occurrence of address forms such as first name, or French tu and vous with speech acts. Martiny (1996) points out that forms of address play an important role in the performance of speech acts. First, similar to vocatives they can serve to catch the attention of the addressee, or, if there are several persons present at the place and time of speaking, to select the person to whom a particular speech act is directed. Second, they may also be used to boost or to attenuate the force of a speech act (Martiny 1996: 767).

Zhou (1998) conducted a study in which he investigated the modes of addressing non-family members among Chinese and Americans. The tool used by Zhou was questionnaire. The findings of Zhou’s study reveal that because of the cultural and social differences, there are huge differences in the address patterns of Chinese and Americans.

Firstly, kinship terms are extended to non-family members in Chinese while it is rare in American English. Chinese use kinship terms, such as grandpa, grandma, aunt, uncle, brother and sister, to address their parents’ friends, their colleagues and friends. However, Americans use general social terms of address to address these non-family members, such as Mr., Ms., Miss or given names. Second, titles are used more often to address superiors by Chinese than by Americans.

Fitch (1998) carried out a study on the variety of relationship among participants in Columbia. He notes five categories of address terms: proper names, second-person pronouns, kinship terms, nicknames titles and adjectival terms.
Kashavarz (2001) studied the choice of forms of address in Tehran, Persia. The essence of this study lies in that it takes into consideration the two important aspects that determine the address forms. The two factors considered by Kashavraz are: social context and intimacy/distance. These factors, though playing a key role in the choice of the address forms, have not been studied to the great extent. The study also examined variation in the use of address forms according to the interlocutors' social characteristics of age, sex, and social class. The results of the study reveal that the use of intimate forms of address is inversely proportional to social distance and the formality of context. Kashavarz observed that as —social distance and degree of formality of context increase, the frequency of familiar terms decreases." The results also indicate that in informal familial situations, age is more significant than sex and social class in determining forms of address. However, the data analysis also showed that under formal circumstances, sex is a stronger determiner in the use of address forms.

In sum Keshavarz’s analysis of the role of social context, intimacy and distance in the choice of addresses (to or šoma) is only quantitative and the lack of qualitative analysis is evident. The objective is to investigate the relative influence of the sociolinguistic features such as gender, age, power and intimacy on the choice of pronominals form in Persian both qualitatively and quantitatively.

Serrano (2001) states that regarding the pronominal paradigm of address, image and social deixis are factors that condition the appearance of one pronoun or another and its function in a specific discourse context. This paradigm is built based on the conception of personal deictic centers. For Serrano, the pronouns tú-vosotros anchor the idea of proximity with the interlocutor while usted-ustedes signal distance with regard to that personal deictic center.
Zhang (2002) in his study of bilingual creativity in Chinese English, emphasizes the significance of studying terms of address. According to him, address terms play a significant role in conveying huge cultural information. These terms are the conveyers of the status of the interlocutors involved in the act of communication and about the relationship existing between them.

Wang (2003) also observed the differences between American English and Chinese in terms of using titles and kinship terms when addressing people. He ascribed these differences to different socio-cultural factors and politeness rules. For example, seniority is regarded respectful and privileged in Chinese than in the U.S. Therefore, age is considered as a crucial factor in determining the choice of terms of address in Chinese. Moreover, it is considered polite to be humble and to show respect to others in Chinese culture while it is standard for most relationships to be regarded as equal in American culture. Therefore, more nonreciprocal exchanges of address are used in Chinese while there are more reciprocal exchanges in English.

In addition to Brown and Gilman’s discussion of power and solidarity, Benavides approached study of address forms with different basis. Benavides distinguished between the familiar and the familial relationships to account for the address norms. Familiar relations exist among the acquaintances of long standing, friends, or members of the family etc and are thus informal. The higher the degree of acquaintance and contact between two persons, the higher is the degree of familiarity between them. Familial relations on the other hand exist between the family members in a family unit. That is, for example, relations between parents and their children, between siblings and between cousins. (2003:8)

Manjulakshi (2004) working the Kannada language in Mysore, classified address terms into nine categories. This classification of address terms was a part of her attempt to describe the modes of address in Kannada language. The nine categories of address terms identified by the researcher are:
Personal name, Kinship term, Caste Name, Names by which the exalted status of individuals are revealed or implied, Professional term, Personal name-kinship term, Personal name-professional term, Professional-Names for exaltation, and Non-respectable term.

Manjulakshi observes that terms and modes of address are significant in any society for purposes of identification and expression of ideas. She considers social rank, age, gender and communicative situation as the important factors in determining of choice of the address from. She also indicates that the selection and usage of address terms is guided by the relationship that exists or is perceived to exist between speakers and addressees.

Afful (2006) carried out a socio-linguistic study of non-kinship address terms among the Akans of postcolonial Ghana. This brought a new dimension to the address behavior as the speech community, Fantes of Ghana, was a little known speech community. Afful used observation, interview and introspection as the tools for collecting the data and came up with nine principle categories of address terms. In his analysis, Afful could see the reflection of westernization and modernism in the use of personal names and catch phrases. Afful also noticed that with differing levels of frequency and saliency, the use of these address terms among the Akans was dictated by socio-cultural factors such as gender, status, age and relationship of interactants as well as pragmatic factors. Afful (2006) asserts that his study and earlier studies in African communities have confirmed the socio-cultural situatedness of address terms in these communities similar to the findings of sociolinguistic studies on address terms in non-African settings.

In his other study of the year 2006 Afful (2006) distinguishes between address terms and reference terms. To him, address terms are the linguistic expressions used by the speaker to designate a person in a face to face communication. With reference to the social functions of address terms, Afful
(2006) also observes that sociolinguistic investigations on address terms show that they are dependent on a wide range of factors such as socioeconomic status, age, sex, the relationship that exists between interlocutors and the domains of a communicative encounter.

Iragiliati (2006) worked on the forms of address in the framework of politeness and looked at address forms as expressions of politeness in the Indonesian medical discourse. The study revealed that the positive face is achieved by using kinship terms and thus establishing solidarity with the interlocutors. In addition, the results revealed that negative face is achieved and hence furthering the distance by using impersonal address forms through deference by using the —surname‖ or —title.‖

According to Wardhaugh (2006) choices of address terms are governed by different social factors. He maintains that social status and rank of the addressee, the particular occasion of the conversation, sex, age, occupational hierarchy, family relationships, and the social dyadic relations are among the most significant social variables determining the choices of address terms.

Hao et al. (2008) studied common forms of terms of address in American and Chinese cultures. The results revealed that the choices in Chinese culture are more diverse than that of the American culture. The results revealed that the Americas used first name or no name in informal settings while as Chinese used diversified choices. Furthermore, acculturation played a role in Chinese respondents‘ language change concerned with their choices of address terms.

Qin (2008) conducted a sociolinguistic study on Chinese and American choices of terms of address. The data for this study were collected from the movies assuming that the movies represented the social reality at all levels. The result showed that interpersonal relationship is one of the most determinant factor of address term usage. In addition to the interpersonal relationship as a determinant factor, the factors such as who, when, where, to whom address
terms are used and the type of interactions which are contextual in nature were found to be very significant in determining the choice of address terms in Chinese and English.

Sharifian (2009) has also worked on the Persian pronominals. He, however, says that there is not a two-way dichotomy in the pronominal usage in Persian. The Persian pronominal and agreement system makes a range of degrees of respect possible. He says: "conceptualizations are found in entirely different languages, namely Persian, and specifically, in the case of the second-person plural pronoun šoma. This pronoun is used as a second person singular honorific and the third person plural pronoun īšan is also used as an honorific for the third person singular. Plurality as a marker of respect is not only marked in the pronoun system but can also be optionally marked by the verb ending. In fact, the interaction between the choice of pronoun, verb ending and the verb can yield a hierarchical system in terms of the degree of respect that each sentence conveysl (Sharifian, 2009: 9)

Yui (2009) studied address terms in Japanese and English by using movies and TV dramas as database. Yui considered the address terms as vocatives and pronouns in this study. Yui (2009) discussed the function of vocatives and the way address terms are used as pronouns. The results of the study revealed that the address terms concerning politeness work very differently in the two given languages. Whereas vocatives in English realized positive politeness, they can be negative in terms of their politeness value in Japanese. The pronouns on the other hand are positive in terms of their politeness value in Japanese.

Chen (2010) in his study, compared English and Chinese address terms. The results showed that the Chinese address terms were more complex. It was found that the number of address terms in Chinese was huge with a wider range of application. Furthermore, they were found to be deeply associated with the culture and the cultural differences. The value concepts such as, sense of
hierarchy, sense of equality and their different attitudes toward the role of family could have great affects on how the Chinese and English address terms are used.

Aghagolzadeh and Asadpour (2010) worked on a selected Persian corpus to show how they usually work by the two variables: power and intimacy. The results showed that the use of terms of address in Farsi is affected by age, sex, occupation, ideology, political and social status of the interlocutors. The results reveal that there is a strong relationship between social structure and the address terms in Farsi.

Nanbakhsh (2011) deliberates on the sociolinguistic functions of address pronoun switching and the mismatch construction. He attempts to come up with answers to two questions by a sociolinguistic data analysis. The two questioned raised by Nanbakhsh are:

3. What are the different social functions served by second person singular and plural pronouns and suffixes in Persian?

4. What are the sociolinguistic and pragmatic functions that pronoun switching and mismatch construction (e.g. šoma + 2SG verb agreement) serve?

Nanbakhsh, in an attempt to answer the first question, asserts that a sociolinguistic variable may harbor a wide range of functions which in their essence are social and pragmatic with a change of stance in discourse. The analysis reveals that the deferential or polite overt pronominal šoma may indirectly show the following three functions in discourse:

4. contrastive emphasis

5. in-group identity marker (deference)

6. topic shift (organizational task and norm).
Two social functions were seen to be associated with the deferential verbal agreement: attention seeking and the balancing of power.

Kashmiri language like other languages of the world shows influence of various social norms in the language use. The socially organized concepts like power and solidarity demonstrate the use of pronouns and terms of address. This aspect of sociolinguistic research of Kashmiri language has been unexplored till date.

The present study is an attempt to explain social norms that shape the usage of pronouns and the terms of address in Kashmiri society.