

'Yes sir, no baas, three bags full'

Rita Ribbens

Introduction

In this article forms of address are contrasted with preferred forms of address in research that was undertaken in 1993, months before the dawn of the new democracy in South Africa. In this large-scale study the opinions of 1870 respondents in the mining communities of Khutsong, Wedela and Kokosi on the West Rand were recorded. The respondents were mainly speakers of Sotho, Shangaan, Tswana, Xhosa, and Zulu¹.

The use of first names (FN) versus titles plus surname or 'last name' (TLN) are examined by applying the models of Brown and Gilman (1960) and Brown and Ford (1961). Terms of address are symbols of social structure and encode positions of equality, status or of dominance versus subordination. Apart from terms of address, status can also be expressed by means of pronouns for example *tu* and *vous* in French, *du* and *Sie* in German, *o* versus *le* in Sotho, *ty* versus *vy* in Russian (Fay 1920; Friedrich 1964) and so on. In most languages status and respect structures expressed by means of complex forms of address markers and these are well documented, e.g., Korean (Martin 1964) and Japanese (Howell 1968), to name but two. English does not have a differentiating pronominal form of address as *you* is used in the vertical status dimension for both superiors and inferiors.

Intercultural Contact in S.A.

In South Africa intercultural contact dates back to the contact between the colonists and the Khoikhoi at the Cape in the seventeenth century, and to the

¹ Because the names of the languages were called in this manner at the time, and agreed upon by the members of the community who were co-owners of the project, they have not been changed to reflect current usage.

first decades of the nineteenth century in the farming communities of the Eastern Cape (Kaschula 1989). One of the earliest references to terms of address during contact between cultural groups is to be found in Giliomee's (2003:50) account of relationships:

Slave and burger children played with each other as friends but when they grew up the master-slave hierarchy came into place. The burger child became the master; the slave remained a slave. Even in adult life a slave continued to be addressed as a *jong* (boy) or *meid* (girl), to be called by his or her first name and to go barefoot.

In the years that followed the first contacts very little changed as far as relationships and forms of address are concerned. During the opening ceremony for the first democratically elected Parliament in 1994, President Nelson Mandela pleaded for an end to racism in forms of address. He said: 'No more should words like Kaffirs, Hottentots, Coolies, Boy, Girl and Baas be part of our vocabulary' (<http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/mandela/1994/sp940524.html>).

"No more should words like 'kaffirs', 'Hottentots', 'coolies', 'boy', 'girl' and 'baas' be part of our vocabulary" (*The Pretoria News*, 25 May 1994:11).

Until places of learning and sport opened their doors to all members of society in the mid-1990s, cultural groups had very few opportunities for social interaction as the bulk of intercultural contact occurred in the workplace. An investigation into Intergroup Relations (Marais 1985) found that most intercultural communication took place in the workplace. It transpired that more than half of the respondents had not had contact with someone from a different culture the previous day, and where this had taken place, it was generally task-oriented and occurred in structured, vertical situations (such as supervisor/worker or customer/shop assistant).

These relationships in terms of address systems have never been researched in any depth. Van Jaarsveld's (1988) research, conducted at universities across the country, comes closest to a large-scale investigation. By means of 550 questionnaires, translated into Northern Sotho, Southern Sotho, Tswana, Xhosa and Zulu, he obtained responses from undergraduate and post-graduate students. Amongst others, his findings shed light on how

directives in Afrikaans cause confusion and misunderstanding and how politeness, forms of greeting, values and phatic communication differ cross-culturally. At the other end of the data collection continuum as far as size and method are concerned, we have Gough's (1996) report on his informal meetings with six farmers he befriended. He reports that in the past the term 'baas' (boss) was used in jocular fashion among this group of close-knit farmers. Apart from these two studies, we have no hard evidence of how the asymmetrical social structure of the 'old' South Africa was expressed verbally. As for methodology in South African sociolinguistic research, Chick (1992) voiced his suspicions about the 'narrowness' of the empirical base of studies conducted at universities. He expressed reservations as to whether it was possible to generalise findings from micro-interactional contexts to the macro-context of a wider society. Therefore, when it became possible to gain access to a particularly large contingent of people in the mining industry, the opportunity of obtaining data of a sociolinguistic nature was regarded as an important opportunity for research.

In this article the data that was obtained is reported on, after a description of the mining project and a short discussion of suitable and less suitable methods of data collection. Because of the research design employed in the investigation, the findings can, according to the statisticians contracted for the project, be generalised to the 152 000 people of the four communities. Anshen (1978:1) mentions the lack of statistical sophistication of some linguists, saying 'the only numbers in Bloomfield's *Language* appear at the top of the pages' but the tremendously rich body of research in linguistics that has made use of sophisticated statistical research designs obviously invalidates this statement. I was very fortunate that the mining company that commissioned the major research project also footed the bill for the statisticians that advised on procedures and interpretation of data obtained by means of close on two thousand questionnaires, because that made it possible for me to overcome statistical hurdles I would not have been able to face on my own, as I, too, lack statistical sophistication.

The Research Context

The research opportunity arose when the management of a mining company commissioned the Adult Basic Education Unit at the Human Sciences Research Council to conduct research to establish the aspirations and

educational needs of mining communities at its West Rand operation (Wydeman and Ribbens 1993). The management of the mine wanted to involve the hostel dwellers who worked in the mine as well as the inhabitants of three mining communities in a project aimed at fostering a culture of learning.

Data Collection in the Gold Mine Project

In order to establish the educational needs of the people on the West Rand, great care was taken to identify the leaders and representatives of various stakeholders. Meetings were held to ensure that all interested parties were involved, and the culture-of-learning concept was addressed by means of workshops. When all concerned were satisfied that all issues that needed to be investigated had been identified, an interview schedule was drawn up. Questions on home language, the preferred medium of instruction, and English language skills deemed necessary for work, all formed part of this questionnaire.

In his well known research on three department stores in New York in the 1970s, Labov avoided the observer's paradox because the respondents had no inkling that he was interested in the pronunciation of [r] and not in their 'fourth floor' answers. (He found that the variant correlates with socio-economic groupings and levels of formality.) Similarly, a section entitled 'Effective communication in the workplace' was included in the research by Wydeman and Ribbens (1994) to ascertain how learners wanted to be addressed in the envisaged Learning Centre. The question consisted of five sub-questions (see below and Appendix 1). As the sociolinguistic question in the interview schedule was slipped into a much larger survey that focused on issues of adult education, it may be assumed that the respondents were not consciously alerted to issues of social status. The sociolinguistic nature of the question perhaps explains why many of the respondents ignored some of the sub-questions, as the figures below illustrate:

- | | |
|--|------------------|
| 1. How are you currently addressed? | 1109 respondents |
| 2. How do you <i>want</i> to be addressed? | 1153 respondents |
| 3. How do you address your superiors? | 1161 respondents |
| 4. How do you <i>want</i> to address your superiors? | 1158 respondents |
| 5. How do you want to be called when you cannot hear because | |

of noise in the environment? (Beckoning movement) 1048 respondents

The field workers/ interviewers were all members of the community, elected by the community to represent them and all spoke at least one of the local languages. A total of 2 300 structured interview schedules were distributed systematically in a manner prescribed by the statisticians. Of these 1 870 were returned. This exceptionally high response rate (81,3%) can be ascribed to the co-ownership of the project by the field workers and respondents, since the project had the potential of improving their lives.

The sample drawn from each community took into account variables such as age, sex, educational level, status of employment, and living conditions. Responses were received for the whole spectrum of age groups from 16 to over 59 years. The largest number of responses was in the age group 20 to 49 years, with the highest concentration (23.6%) between 30 and 34 years. In total 1306 men and 563 women responded. The largest number of responses was received from the mining division, while workers employed elsewhere represented 39 different occupations.

The interview schedule was prepared in English only, but every respondent was interviewed in the language of his or her choice because the field workers from each community who had volunteered to interview members of their respective communities, acted as interpreters. The schedules were completed by the field workers on a one-to-one basis because of the high rate of illiteracy among the population surveyed. As far as level of education is concerned, the responses were distributed more or less evenly from Standard 1 (i.e. Grade 3) or lower level up to standard 10, with the highest concentration around Standard 1/lower level (18.9%) and the Standard 6/7 level (18.5%).

Methodological Issues

In the quest for the most suitable sociolinguistic data collection instruments, the analogy of the net used for fishing is appropriate: it is known that the size of the holes in the net and the size of the net determine the size of the fish caught. No pronouncements can be made about smaller fish that escape through the holes.

When weighing up methods of elicitation versus those of observation, many factors come into play, and as yet no magic formula for

research methodology can be prescribed, as illustrated by Wolfram and Fasold's explanation (1974, in Coupland and Jaworski 1997:92) of field methods used in the study of social dialects. They say,

The question of optimal sample size for the study of [social dialects] is still undetermined. On the one hand, there is the tradition of linguistics which generally relies on very small samples. In some cases, one or just a few individuals serve as informants, and sometimes the linguist acts as his own informant. On the other hand, the tradition of sociological surveys is to have rather substantial numbers of subjects, often in the hundreds or thousands.

In their discussion of methods for studying language in society, Coupland and Jaworski (1997:69) caution against 'safe places' such as colleges and universities as data sources and contrast these with 'field methods'. In the latter case researchers engage in real world activities, such as conversations. Gough's (1996) close observation and report of terms of address of six farmers is probably the closest to what Coupland and Jaworski (1997:69) had in mind. Although it would have been impossible to observe or record and then analyse conversations in the Culture-of-Learning Project commissioned by the mining company, the stratified sample is representative of the real world and does not draw on the 'safe' audience of a student body, as in other cases on terms of address mentioned below. The disadvantages of questionnaires / structured interviews have been documented as not being natural data, but at least they do present a picture of informants' awareness (Braun1988:71-76).

Braun's (1988) publication *Terms of address: Problems of patterns and usage in various languages and cultures* refers to the research done by Gilman and Brown (1958), Brown and Gilman (1960) and Brown and Ford (1961) as the 'standard works' as they were regarded as initiators of modern sociolinguistic investigations of forms of address. Brown and his colleagues reported how FN (first names) and FN versus TLN (titles plus last names) were used in American plays. For a study of terms of address in Hindi, Misra (1977) too, uses literature (four novels by a prominent novelist of the 1930s). As Misra was familiar with the region described in the novels, he was able to supplement the information contained in the works of literature and present

an accurate picture of social relationships determined by family status, caste and official hierarchies. Today researchers are able to capture delicate nuances of oral interaction and non-verbal gestures by means of technology, the Göteborg project being a case in point. It is now possible to do fine-grained analyses by replaying video and audio tapes of real interaction (Allwood, et.al. 2001).

Towards the end of the twentieth century Givon (1997:vii) complained that human language is acquired and used most commonly in the context of face-to-face communication, yet most theory building does not benefit from the study of face-to-face communication. Fortunately this lament does not apply to the model developed by Brown and Ford (1961) on forms of address, as they backed up their initial research of American literature by gathering data through observation of spontaneous interactions of people in work-related environments. They recorded these interactions between men and women of different occupational status, and in their observation discovered a 'reciprocal pattern' in dyads. They noticed that both interlocutors used FN to each other, or that both used TLN to each other, and that it was the superior who initiated the step towards intimate forms of address.

Braun's (1988) monumental work, carried out in Kiel, reports on research of terms of address with foreign students in 17 languages. In these studies, one to four native speakers per language were interviewed originally, but because it was felt that a high degree of subjectivity could skew the findings in data of such small samples, more comprehensive investigations were carried out and twenty to thirty informants were interviewed to satisfy the need for statistical representativeness.

Against this history of data collection in terms of address research, the findings of the mining project are presented.

The Findings of the Mining Project

In order to interpret the 1 870 schedules that were returned, appropriate statistical techniques were applied by statisticians appointed for this purpose. For the final phase of the statistical analysis, they recommended relevant multivariate techniques to be applied to enable a more nuanced analysis of the data.

In total eleven languages were represented by the responses received. They are given below in alphabetical order, together with the percentage they represent of the total response.

HOME LANGUAGE	Number of speakers	Percentage
Afrikaans	10	0.5%
English	24	1.3%
Ndebele	12	0.6%
Pedi	52	2.8%
Shangaan	134	7.2%
Sotho	479	25.9%
Swazi	86	4.7%
Tswana	434	23.5%
Venda	12	0.6%
Xhosa	477	25.8%
Zulu	128	6.9%
Other	1	0.1%

The statisticians advised that it would not be possible to apply statistical tests or to make meaningful inferences when groups are small; consequently the smaller language groups (Afrikaans, English, Ndebele, Pedi, Swazi, and Venda) were lumped together in a category termed 'Other' instead of each being treated on its own. After this was done the order of representation (in terms of number of speakers) of the languages was the following:

Sotho	479	25.9%
-------	-----	-------

Reproduced by Sabinet Gateway under licence granted by the Publisher (dated 2010)

Xhosa	477	25.8%
Tswana	434	23.5%
Shangaan	134	7.2%
Zulu	128	6.9%
Other	197	10.7%

While all the other languages of the sample were distributed more or less equally between the hostels and towns, Tswana was well represented only in the towns and not in the hostels.

The general findings of the Culture-of-Learning Project commissioned by the mining company are beyond the scope of this article, but what may be of interest to language planners is that English was chosen as the preferred medium of instruction although less than 2% of the respondents were English speaking. The respondents were told that they would be instructed in the medium of their choice provided that there was a demand for this (Wydeman and Ribbens 1994:43). Of the 1 648 respondents who answered this question, more than two-thirds (68,4%) indicated that they wanted English as medium of instruction, while Sotho (9,4%) and Xhosa (8%) were the only other languages selected enough times to be of any statistical significance. Together these two language groups account for roughly half of the respondents.

The Sociolinguistic Questions

The model developed by Brown and Ford (1961) was used to test the use of FN (first or familiar name), versus TLN (title and last name). 'Title' ranged from 'mnumzane' to 'inkosikazi', 'morena', 'Mister', 'mosadi', 'Miss', 'Ms', 'meneer' and 'madoda'. Respondents first had to answer how they, as subordinates in the workplace, were currently addressed and how they in turn address a supervisor (or superior). They also had to express their preferences for each category.

How Subordinates are Addressed

	Current usage	Preferred form of address
First name (FN)	66%	57.7%
Surname only (LN)	20.6%	31%
Title plus surname (TLN)	11%	10.9%

Generally respondents seemed satisfied with the informal mode that was used when they were addressed. Two-thirds indicated that their first names were used, and 57.7% indicated that they wanted to be addressed in this way. Of the 1 153 respondents, only a fifth were called by their surnames, while 10% more would have liked this to be the case. This possibly indicates some dissatisfaction and a desire to be awarded more status.

The breakdown of how superiors are addressed compared with how the respondents would like to address them follows:

How Superiors are Addressed

	Current usage	Preferred form of address
First name (FN)	33.4%	41.7%
Surname only (LN)	32.2%	31.3%
Title plus surname (TLN)	32.3%	25.7%

A desire to decrease social distance and to use more familiar terms becomes apparent when we study the responses. A third of the respondents called their seniors by their first name, while slightly more than two-fifths wanted to do so. A third of the workers used titles, while only a quarter wanted to use this form. When the two formal terms (T + LN) are grouped together, the picture that emerges shows that almost two-thirds used formal terms, while slightly more than two-fifths wanted to use more familiar first-name terms.

As this information was obtained by means of a questionnaire, I was not able to probe why interviewees did not use more familiar FN terms.

According to the 'reciprocal pattern' model proposed by Brown and Ford (1961) it is the 'right' of the superior to initiate more intimate forms of address. They identify the two major dimensions which condition the choice of address as power and solidarity. Power is associated with social status. Wolfson (1989) describes Brown and Ford's (1961) model as 'extraordinarily powerful' as it was tested successfully not only in English, but also in a number of European languages. The findings of the four mining communities do not fit the common mould, because the reciprocal pattern is conspicuously absent. What the analysis confirms is a social structure of dominance versus sub-ordination. Can we say that this was a reflection of South African society at that time? It is revealing that the answers supplied by the respondents for *preferred* forms of address approximate the reciprocal pattern identified by Brown and Ford more closely.

It is acknowledged that Brown and Ford observed dyads in live interaction whereas the data for the mining project was obtained by means of a questionnaire. It is common knowledge that one of the weaknesses of data collection by means of a questionnaire is that respondents do not necessarily do what they say they do. However, in the case of the mining project where questions about FN versus TLN were not the focus of the investigation, we probably are closer to the 'truth' than would have been the case if other sociolinguistic features were being examined.

'Number Crunching' (The Value of Statistical Analysis)

When numerical data is viewed without recourse to statistical analysis, the picture that emerges is not as clear as when interpretive statistical procedures are used, because some procedures allow for the investigation of the interactive effects of a number of independent variables simultaneously, to indicate which relationships are not due to chance. In Van Jaarsveld's (1988) comprehensive study that also investigated address forms in a number of African languages, statistical procedures were not used, with the result that we are able to compare differences across language groups only for isolated features, without being able to come to a decisive conclusion about differences across the language groups as a whole. The present study, however, set out to determine whether there were significant differences that could be detected by means of statistical procedures. In order to determine whether a particular language group differed greatly from another in respect

of their preferences, statistical tests such as *McNemar's test of symmetry*, the *Kappa* test and a procedure known as *Logical Regression* were applied to uncover relations which may obtain between pairs of variables. (See Appendix 1.) These tests made it possible to ascertain whether the speakers of a particular language group preferred a specific form of address that differed from the choice of another group.

If I had been working independently from the Culture-of-Learning Project I might have been able to delve deeper as far as the sociolinguistic sub-questions were concerned. This would have enabled me to avoid lumping together the English and Afrikaans speakers with the speakers of African languages in the statistical analysis as these six groups had little representation. Had I been working on my own, I may have been able to ask the statisticians to use Varbrul (a multivariate analysis software that Variationist linguists use) to analyse the data that would have enabled me to present a picture of the preferences of these language groupings. I am nevertheless grateful that my co-partner allowed the inclusion of the sociolinguistic question in the form of ascertaining acceptable practice in the workplace.

The analyses revealed that the only variable that was statistically significant on the 5% level was the response to Question 3 (How do you address a senior?). An analysis of the responses revealed that the Tswana speakers and Zulu speakers were more formal when addressing seniors. Three-quarters of the Tswanas and Zulus indicated that they use formal terms (TLN or LN) when addressing superiors (cf. Appendix). Only half of the Sotho speakers, on the other hand, indicated that they used formal terms. It may have been expected that the Sotho group would be closer to the Tswana group on this issue, so finding a closer correlation between the Zulu and Tswana speakers was interesting. A variable that could have played a role and affected the data is that of the duration of acculturation, in other words, the length of time spent working in an industrialised society away from rural roots, or place of residence. The Zulu respondents were mostly hostel dwellers, whereas the Tswanas were residents of the communities under investigation.

The Variables of Age, Education, Home Language and Forms of Address

In order to determine the relationship between the variables age, education

and home language and the various forms of address, a statistical procedure called Logistic Regression was used. The independent variables that were used are the home language, with categories Sotho, Tswana, Xhosa, Shangaan and Zulu combined, and a combined variable of age and education with categories < 30 years and < Std 6, < 30 years and std 6 +, 30 + years and Std 6, and 30 + years and Std 6+. These combinations were used to provide for the interaction that may exist between age and education. In other words, the model would reveal whether persons older than thirty, who had not completed Std 6, responded differently from someone older than thirty who had completed Standard 6.

From the first table in Appendix 2 we are able to conclude that the way in which a person was addressed by a superior varied across the age and education categories. It was found that older, less educated people were addressed less formally by their senior at work. This behaviour could be a source of unhappiness for age is highly respected in African culture. When we study the second table, we observe that the probability of being addressed formally increases when the addressee falls in the higher education categories. Without recourse to sophisticated statistical analysis, this would not have come to our notice.

Non-verbal Communication: Body Language (cf. Question 5 in Appendix)

During the pilot phase of the another study on sociolinguistic relativity, I stumbled upon an interesting feature of non-verbal communication. While explaining what was meant by 'forms of address', the synonymous phrase 'how you are called' was used. Respondents who were being interviewed (in English) mentioned that a certain *gesture* was offensive. It transpired that 'calling' someone by beckoning with the hand was offensive to speakers of African languages. This form of beckoning entails pointing to someone and then indicating with one or two fingers of the hand that the person must come to the person who is beckoning. On further probing, I was informed that the finger beckoning form was the way one called dogs; to call people one was to make a large sweeping movement from the elbow. This corroborates the findings of Birdwhistell (1970), Ogden (1988:13) and Haworth and Savage (1989:238) who report on differences in use of non-verbal gestures

and indicate that there are other cultures in which this particular gesture is also regarded as suitable for calling dogs and not human beings.

In his comprehensive study on terms of address, Braun (1988:7) excludes aspects of non-verbal initiating contact (such as the beckoning gesture) but this feature was nevertheless included in the mining project. The non-verbal gesture of beckoning was therefore surreptitiously slipped into questionnaire of the research project commissioned by the mining company. More than two-fifths (44% of the 1 048 respondents) indicated that they found the non-verbal gesture offensive. Slightly more than a quarter (26.8%) indicated that they found the calling movement in which the whole hand was used offensive. When these two figures are added, it totals 70.8% of respondents that are repelled by this form of calling, while only 15.1% indicated that neither the head movement nor the hand gestures were offensive.

The findings obtained by means of the questionnaire were confirmed by another study where 50 people were interviewed on the factory floor in the East Rand (Ribbens 1994). (The aim of this more comprehensive study was to find ways of improving communication among members of the multicultural workforce.) A Discourse Completion Test was used. The respondents were given a range of choices from which they had to select the least appropriate form of behaviour. The scene described was very close to their daily experiences on the work floor. It was put to the respondents that, because of the noise on the work-floor the supervisor could not be heard when he had to call someone, that he therefore had to use some form of non-verbal communication to call the subordinate urgently. Various beckoning gestures were demonstrated and each respondent was asked which one(s) were not acceptable. I witnessed expressions of disgust passing over the faces of the people being interviewed when the hand movement commonly used by speakers of Afrikaans or English was demonstrated. One or two shuddered or looked away. Some said immediately that this form of calling was abhorrent to them. Others said that no gesture was acceptable and that the supervisor was compelled to call the operator by name. It had to be explained again that in the imaginary situation described, the noise level on the work-floor ruled out any possibility of a name being heard and therefore some kind of gesture was the only option. Reluctantly, the whole arm movement was then declared to be acceptable. The following gestures were considered inappropriate:

Arm movement	2%
Hand movement	72%
None of the above	8%
Other	10%
Both arm and head	8%

For 'other' respondents said that whistling, shouting and pointing were not acceptable forms to use for calling someone. Ways of attracting someone's attention, such as *Hey you!* or *Hey, boy!* or whistling, were also mentioned as sources of irritation.

Conclusion

The research reported on was conducted 'in the field' and not in a 'safe place' (Coupland and Jaworski's (1997: 69) categorization). The data was obtained empirically in the variationist tradition that Cameron labels the 'Labovian quantitative paradigm': a random sample was identified and findings judged to be representative of the community were studied. Under investigation were various forms of address and a non-verbal gesture as a means of initiating contact. Sophisticated statistical procedures were used to analyse the 1 870 responses. The research design and methodology employed in the project enabled the statisticians to rule that the findings could be generalised to represent the 152 000 people in the communities on the West Rand.

Cameron (1997:59) points out that descriptions without explanations result in what she calls 'butterfly collecting' (meaning, interesting, but to what avail?). With Cameron's observation in mind, we have to ask what was gained by studying the answers to the sociolinguistic question (actually 5 sub-questions) slipped into a large-scale investigation on adult education.

What was established was that a commonly used beckoning gesture by white people is regarded as offensive, and that this holds true for Sotho, Tswana, Xhosa, Shangaan and Zulu speakers. This finding is important for

successful intercultural communication in an industrial society, and cognisance should be taken of this for intercultural training courses. The literature on intercultural communication training and the many courses available world-wide for multi-racial workforces acknowledge the need to adapt to the dynamics of working and living alongside cultures that are different from one's own (Baird and Stull 1981; Crane 1986; Bush-Bacelis 1987; Armstrong et al. 1988; and Setliff and Taft 1988). There is an expressed need to sensitise participants to the importance of own-cultural awareness, other-culture awareness, understanding and appreciation, as well as to the need to develop skills such as listening, empathy and attendance to the non-verbal signals required for harmonious interaction.

When the research was conducted in 1993 it was established that the reciprocal pattern of address, identified by Brown and Ford (1961), was absent in the communities under investigation. An analysis of the responses revealed that respondents wanted to decrease social distance between superiors and subordinates as they expressed a desire to be on more familiar terms with them. Cameron (1997:57) rejects the notion that language reflects society as 'the correlation fallacy' in the light of the absence of an acceptable theory of the relation of language and society. She also claims that patterns identified are essentially descriptive statements about society and do not explain anything. Therefore, unless we are able to reduplicate the research, we are left to speculate whether the patterns identified in this study were a reflection of power relations as they existed in the 'old' South Africa. A theoretical contribution could be made if a similar study were to produce findings that support the Brown and Ford (1961) model.

The data presented is a record of the past, a snapshot of 'the way it was then'. As a result of the moves to transform power structures in South Africa, relationships have changed during the past ten years. Since the research was conducted, a democratically elected government has come to power and a more egalitarian society has been forged. When Nelson Mandela addressed parliament in May 2004, he proclaimed confidently, in sharp contrast to his plea ten years earlier, that after ten years of democracy, human dignity and respect had been achieved in a 'non-racial inclusive democracy' (SABINET). If a study on address terms were to be reduplicated and the findings proved to be closer to the patterns identified in Brown and Ford's (1961) tried and tested model, it would be able to say with

confidence, as Nelson Mandela boldly stated in 2004, that we have become an 'inclusive society'.

Department of Linguistics
University of South Africa

References

- Allwood, J., M. Björnberg, L. Gröönqvist, E. Ahlséén & C. Ottesjö 2001. The Spoken Language Corpus at the Department of Linguistics, Göteborg University. <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/3-00/-00allwoodetal-e.htm>
- Anshen, F. 1978. *Statistics for Linguists*. Rowley: Newbury House.
- Armstrong, R.N., R. Sisson, H.H. Page 1988. Cross-cultural Communication Training in Business: A Sensitizing Module. In: *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Eastern Michigan University Conference on Languages for Business and the Professions*. Ypsilanti: Eastern Michigan University.
- Baird, J.W. & J.B. Still 1981. *Communication Effectiveness in Multinational Organizations: Developing Universal Intercultural Skills*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association. (31st Minneapolis. May 21-25).
- Birdwhistell, R.L. 1970. *Kinesics and Context*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Braun, F. 1988. *Terms of Address. Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brown, R.W. & M. Ford 1961. Address in American English. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 62: 375-385.
- Brown, R. & A. Gilman 1970. The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity. In Fishman, J.A. (ed.): *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Brown, P. & S. Levinson 1978. Universals in Language Usage. In Goody, E.N. (ed.): *Questions and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bush-Bacelis, J.L. 1987. A Language Educator's First Sale: To Globalize Business Communication. *Languages and Communication for world Business and the Professions. Conference proceedings* 18-26.

- Cameron, Deborah 1997. Demythologizing Sociolinguistics. In Coupland, N, & A. Jaworski (eds.): *Sociolinguistics. A Reader and Coursebook*. New York: St. Martins Press, Inc.
- Chick, J.K. 1992. Exploring the Relationship between Interaction and Social Structure: An Ethnographic Study of a Desegregating Institution. In Herbert, R.K. (ed.): *Language and Society in Africa*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Coupland, N, & A. Jaworski 1997. *Sociolinguistics. A Reader and Coursebook*. New York: St. Martins Press, Inc.
- Crane, R. 1986. Business Language: Programs and Resources in Europe. In: *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Eastern Michigan University Conference on Languages for Business and the Professions*: Ypsilanti: Eastern Michigan University.
- Fay, P. 1920. The Use of *tu* and *vous* in Moliere. *University of California Publications in Modern Philology* 7: 227-286.
- Friedrich, P. 1964. Social Context and Semantic Feature: The Russian Pronominal Usage. In Gumperz, J.J. & D. Hymes (eds.): *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Giliomee, H. 2003. *The Afrikaners. Biography of a People*. Paarl: Paarl Print.
- Gough, David 1996. The English of White Eastern Cape Farmers in South Africa. *World Englishes* 15,3: 257-265.
- Givon. T. 1997. *Conversation. Cognitive, Communicative and Social Perspectives. Typological Studies in Language* 34. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Haworth, D.A. & G.T. Savage 1989. A Channel-ratio Model of Intercultural Communication. *The Journal of Business Communication* 26,3: 231-254.
- Howell, R. 1968. Linguistic Choice and Levels of Social Change. *American Anthropologist* 70:553-559.
- Kaschula, R.H. 1989. Cross-cultural Communication in a North-Eastern Cape Farming Community. *South African Journal of African Languages* 9,3:100-104.
- Marais, H.C. 1985. On Communication in a Divided Society. *Communicare* 2,2:38-43.

- Martin, J.N. 1986. Training Issues in Cross-cultural Orientation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 10,2:103-116.
- Misra, K.S. 1977. *Terms of Address and Second Person Pronominal Usage in Hindi*. New Delhi: Classical Printers.
- www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/mandela/1994/sp940524.html
- Ribbens, I.R. 1994. Language Use in Industry. Unpublished D. Litt. et Phil. thesis. Unisa.
2004. Address to Parliament by Former President Nelson Mandela. www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/mandela/2004/index.html
- Setliff, R.J. & L.A. Taft 1988. Intensive Language and Culture Orientation Program for Japan. In: *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Eastern Michigan University Conference on Languages for Business and the Professions*. Ypsilanti: Eastern Michigan University.
- Van Jaarsveld, G.J. 1988. *Gesprekstaboes en Misverstand: Taalhandelinge oor Kultuurgrense Heen*. Bloemfontein: Universiteit van die Oranje Vrystaat.
- Wolfram, Walt. & Ralph W. Fasold 1997. Field Methods in the Study of Social Dialects. In Coupland, N & A. Jaworski 1997. *Sociolinguistics. A Reader and Coursebook*. New York: St. Martins Press, Inc.
- Wolfson, N. 1989. *Perspectives. Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. New York: Newbury House.
- Wydeman, J.L. & I.R. Ribbens 1993. *A Survey of the Learning Needs of Adults from Four Communities in the Western Transvaal*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council. (Unpublished report)

Appendix 1

To apply the tests, variables that have bearing on address forms were identified and codified as 'informal' (first name) and 'formal' (surname only or title plus surname).

The frequencies of the four categories and their percentages are indicated in the table below. In each I in the first column equals **Informally**, and **F = Formally**.

Question 1: How are you addressed by a senior?

	Sotho	Tswana	Xhosa	Shangaan	Zulu
I	69.04% (136)	72.95% (89)	66.84% (125)	60% (125)	53.45% (31)
F	30.96% (61)	27.05% (33)	33.16% (62)	40% (32)	46.55% (27)

$$\chi^2 = 0.066$$

Question 2: How do you want to be addressed by a superior?

	Sotho	Tswana	Xhosa	Shangaan	Zulu
I	58.01% (105)	63.87% (76)	61.20% (112)	51.76% (49)	49.15% (29)
F	41.99% (76)	36.13% (43)	38.80% (71)	40.24% (33)	50.85% (30)

$$\chi^2 = 0.413$$

Question 3: How do you address a superior?

	Sotho	Tswana	Xhosa	Shangaan	Zulu
I	44.38% (79)	24.35% (28)	36.93% (65)	42.68% (35)	26.32% (15)

'Yes sir, no baas, three bags full'

F	55.62% (99)	75.65% (87)	63.07% (111)	57.32% (47)	73.68% (42)
---	----------------	----------------	-----------------	----------------	----------------

$$X^2 = 0.003$$

Question 4: How do you want to address a superior?

	Sotho	Tswana	Xhosa	Shangaan	Zulu
I	49.45% (90)	36.52% (42)	46.67% (84)	45.12% (37)	36.21% (21)
F	50.55% (92)	63.48% (73)	53.33% (96)	54.88% (45)	63.97% (37)

$$X^2 = 0.150$$

Question 5: Which gesture do you find offensive?

	Sotho	Tswana	Xhosa	Shangaan	Zulu
Head	10.61% (21)	18.5% (11)	7.69% (16)	12.82% (10)	15.25% (9)
Hand	29.80% (59)	27.41% (31)	29.33% (61)	29.49% (23)	18.64% (11)
Fingers	44.44% (88)	45.19% (61)	50% (104)	41.03% (32)	47.64% (28)
None	15.15% (30)	19.26% (26)	12.98% (27)	16.67% (13)	18.64% (11)

$$X^2 = 0.621$$

Appendix 2

LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODELS

Response	Independent	P Value
Question 1	AGE, EDUCATION	0.0002
Question 2	LANGUAGE, AGE, EDUCATION	0.0120 0.0011

ESTIMATED PROBABILITIES OF BEING ADDRESSED FORMALLY

Response to the question How are you addressed by a senior?

Independent variable	N	Prob.	Significant difference	P. value
Age, Education				
1. <30 yrs & < std 6	68	0.500	1 VS 3	0.0384
2. <30 yrs & std 6+	142	0.360	1 VS 4	0.0001
3. 30+ yrs & < std 6	268	0.362	2 VS 4	0.0110
4. 30+ yrs & std 6 +	267	0.240	3 VS 4	0.0022