



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

*Alexander Piperski, Ekaterina Aplonova,
Maria Grabovskaya, Ekaterina Gridneva,
Elizaveta Ivtushok, Viktoria Naumova,
Anastasia Orlenko, Diana Senkina*

**HOW MOTHERS AND FATHERS
ADDRESS THEIR SONS AND
DAUGHTERS IN RUSSIAN AND
VICE VERSA:
A QUANTITATIVE STUDY**

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: LINGUISTICS
WP BRP 69/LNG/2018

*Alexander Piperski¹, Ekaterina Aplonova², Maria Grabovskaya³,
Ekaterina Gridneva⁴, Elizaveta Ivtushok⁵, Viktoria Naumova⁶,
Anastasia Orlenko⁷, Diana Senkina⁸*

HOW MOTHERS AND FATHERS ADDRESS THEIR SONS AND DAUGHTERS IN RUSSIAN AND VICE VERSA: A QUANTITATIVE STUDY⁹

This paper discusses terms of address that are used in Russian child-parent communication focusing on the gender of the speakers. The data for the study come from a large-scale online survey completed by 1103 subjects. We identify 10 basic patterns of addressing parents and six basic patterns of addressing children. The results show that females tend to use more suffixed forms when addressing their parents, whereas males are inclined to use harsher-sounding forms of address like *batja* ‘father (informal)’. When addressing their children, females use suffixed diminutive forms and animal names more frequently than males.

JEL Classification: Z

Keywords: Russian, politeness, sociolinguistics, terms of address, gender, child-parent communication

¹ National Research University Higher School of Economics. Department of English Language for the Humanities: Tutor. Email: egridneva@hse.ru.

² National Research University Higher School of Economics. School of Linguistics: Master Student. Email: aploon@gmail.com.

³ National Research University Higher School of Economics. School of Linguistics: Lecturer, Postgraduate Student. Email: magrabovskaya@gmail.com.

⁴ National Research University Higher School of Economics. Department of English Language for the Humanities: Tutor. Email: egridneva@hse.ru.

⁵ National Research University Higher School of Economics. Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience. Master Student. Email: liza@nplus1.ru.

⁶ National Research University Higher School of Economics. School of Linguistics: Master Student. Email: vanaumova.hse@gmail.com.

⁷ National Research University Higher School of Economics. School of Linguistics: Master Student. Email: anastas.orlenko@gmail.com.

⁸ National Research University Higher School of Economics. School of Linguistics: Master Student. Email: di.senkina@yandex.ru.

⁹ The article was prepared within the framework of the Academic Fund Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE) in 2018 (grant №18-05-0013) and by the Russian Academic Excellence Project «5-100». Data annotation was performed by EA, MG, EI, and DS. The paper was written by AP, MG, EG, VN, AO, and DS.

1. Introduction: Studying terms of address

Terms of address have been extensively discussed in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology for more than half a century. The seminal paper by Brown & Gilman (1960) introduced the concepts of power and solidarity and described the evolution of the so-called T–V distinction in the pronominal systems of the languages of Europe. However, terms of address are not restricted to pronouns only. One can address other people in many various ways; for instance, Dunkling (1990) divide terms of address into names (in various forms), nicknames, transferred, substitute, and nonce names, family terms of address, endearments and terms of friendship, polite terms of address, etc.

A tentative comparative survey of terms of address in different languages can be found in Braun (1988). In this book, terms of address in Brazilian Portuguese, Georgian, Norwegian, and Jordanian Arabic are analyzed based on a questionnaire. The questionnaire used for this study occupies 54 pages (Braun 1988: 195–248), and it is emphasized that it should not be filled out by the informant themselves, but is rather intended to serve as a basis for a structured interview. The questionnaire includes questions about addressing members of the family; neighbors; university teachers, students, and employees; colleagues, subordinates, and superiors at the workplace; unknown addressees in the street, policemen, government officials, waiters, salesclerks, bus drivers, and taxi drivers. All questions are reciprocal; for instance, the questionnaire includes both the question “How do you address a male taxi-driver?” and the question “How are you addressed by a male taxi-driver?”.

However, the size of the questionnaire makes it hard to use it in real life for a large number of informants. The sample sizes for the four languages studied are very different, namely two persons for Brazilian Portuguese, one person for Georgian, 31 persons for Norwegian, and 21 persons for Jordanian Arabic. In the latter two cases, most subjects of the study are university students, which makes the sample skewed in terms of sociolinguistic variables such as age and social class. However, the author is fully aware of all these drawbacks, but she proves that using a questionnaire is still a better way to study terms of address than to use anecdotal evidence.

2. Russian terms of address within the family: A survey

Terms of address in Russian have also been studied in detail, with a primary focus on the T–V distinction in pronouns. A recent survey by Lagerberg et al. (2014) contains a comprehensive list of references on the topic, ranging from scholarly papers to guides on correct Russian usage.

In order to study terms of address in Russian, we ran an online survey focusing on the interaction between family members. The survey was conducted in spring 2018. We collected

personal data of the respondents such as name, age, gender, place of residence, list of family members living together with the respondent, list of other family members with whom the respondent regularly communicates, whether the respondent or their family follow any kind of religious or cultural tradition. The questions about the respondents' patterns of communication include how different members of the family (mother, father, grandmother, grandfather, etc.) address the respondents and how the respondents address these members of the family, respectively. It was also asked whether the respondents address somebody within their family using the form *Vy* 'you (polite)' or vice versa. The questionnaire also included several other questions about family communication; the total number of questions amounted to 37. The survey was disseminated using social networks such as Facebook, VK.com, and Odnoklassniki.

In total, we obtained 1103 responses. Obviously, these responses can be analyzed in manifold ways, but in this paper we only focus on a single aspect of communication within Russian-speaking families, namely on the influence of gender on the terms of address used in the interactions between parents and children.

The distribution of respondents by gender in our survey is given in Table 1.

Table 1. The distribution of respondents by gender

Gender	Respondents	%
Female	949	86.0%
Male	138	12.5%
Non-binary	5	0.5%
NA	11	1.0%
Total	1103	100.0%

The five responses classified as "Non-binary" included *ne opredeljaetsja* 'not applicable', *net* 'none', *ljuboj* 'any', *nebinaryj* 'non-binary', and *u menja tol'ko gender* 'I only have gender'. The latter response hints at the formulation of the question, which asked for *Vaš pol* 'Your sex'. We decided to use the word *pol* 'sex', assuming that it would cause discomfort to a smaller number of participants than the word *gender* 'gender', which looks too scientific. Clearly, we have no way of checking how many participants would be confused by the word *gender*, but only one critical response out of 1103 seems to be a good result.

It becomes immediately obvious from Table 1 that our sample is severely unbalanced with respect to gender. Such a distribution with a preponderance of female respondents is typical of online surveys (Smith 2008). This gender distribution cannot be deemed representative of the Russian-speaking population. According to the Federal State Statistics Service of the Russian Federation (*Rosstat*), the gender distribution in Russia in 2018 is 53.6% females to 46.4% males (in absolute figures: 78.8m to 61.1m).¹⁰ Given these counts, if we are aiming to infer percentages for the whole population, e.g. how many Russian-speaking people address their mothers as *mamočka* ‘mommy’, we must include weights into our model, i.e. weigh all male responses at $46.4\% / 12.5\% \approx 3.71$ and all female responses at $53.6\% / 86.0\% \approx 0.62$.¹¹ For each variable, these total weighted percentages are given below the table with statistics by gender; we warn our readers that these values do not come from the survey itself, and for this reason they are mere approximations and must be treated with caution.

However, because we are primarily interested in finding gender differences rather than in estimating parameters for the Russian-speaking population as a whole, we will be applying Fisher’s exact test to 2×2 contingency tables, and this statistical test does not require the two samples to be of comparable size.¹² Obviously, the test turns out to be less powerful given that the male sample is small, but this is not necessarily bad for our purposes, since it also reduces the probability of a Type I error (false positive). Thus, the skewed nature of our samples does not undermine the statistical validity of the comparison between the linguistic behavior of females and males.

3. Children addressing parents

3.1. Children addressing mothers

In our survey, 98.8% females and 98.6% males have indicated at least one way of addressing their mother.

¹⁰ http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/new_site/population/demo/demo13.xls

¹¹ This is obviously a simplification, since we assume that the proportions of different genders within the Russian-speaking population are equal to the proportions of different genders in the population of Russia. We are not stating that these two populations are identical; however, it would be extremely hard to obtain trustworthy percentages of females and males in the Russian-speaking population throughout the world.

¹² We are speaking of the two samples here, because we will only be concerned with females and males. This does not imply any discrimination against persons with non-binary gender, but we simply do not have enough data to make any reliable conclusions about their linguistic behavior.

Table 2. Presence/absence of answers on the terms of address to one's mother.

	Some term of address to mother	%	No term of address to mother	%	Total	%
Female	938	98.8	11	1.2	949	100
Male	136	98.6	2	1.4	138	100
Total	1074		13		1087	

Weighted total percentage: 98.7%

Based on manual annotation and grouping of similar answers, the patterns of addressing mothers were divided into ten categories:

- 1) *mama* 'mom';
- 2) *mamočka* 'mommy';
- 3) *mamulja* 'mommy';
- 4) the root *mam-* 'mother' with multiple diminutive suffixes (*mam-ul-ečk-a*, *mam-us-ik*, *mam-ul-ěk*, *mam-k-in*, *mamul'-k-in*);
- 5) a shortened form *ma* 'ma';
- 6) *mat* 'mother';
- 7) *maman* 'mother' (borrowed from French);
- 8) first name in any form;
- 9) first name + patronymic;
- 10) other nominations of any origin.

The word *mama* 'mom' is the most frequent form which is used by most respondents without any significant difference between genders (more than 90% males and females):

Table 3. The use of *mama* 'mom'.¹³

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	851	90.7	87	9.3%	938	100

¹³ Vocative forms *mam*, *maam*, *maaam*, etc. are also included in this table. It turned out that some respondents listed the vocative forms in their responses, but the answer of the type *mama* cannot be counted as an indication of the absence of the vocative from the speech of the respondent, which makes counting vocatives separately impossible. Vocatives are also counted together with the full forms in all other tables in this paper: e.g., *mamul'* 'mommy.VOCATIVE' is counted together with *mamulja* 'mommy', etc.

Male	123	90.4	13	9.6%	136	100
Total	974		100		1087	

Weighted total percentage: 90.6%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.88$

The suffixed forms *mamočka* 'mommy' and *mamulja* 'mommy' turn out to be used predominantly by females:

Table 4. The use of *mamočka* 'mommy'.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	183	19.5	755	80.5	938	100
Male	7	5.1	129	94.9	136	100
Total	190		884		1074	

Weighted total percentage: 12.9%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 7 \times 10^{-6}$ ***

Table 5. The use of *mamulja* 'mommy'.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	186	19.8	752	80.2	938	100
Male	14	10.3	122	89.7	136	100
Total	200		874		1074	

Weighted total percentage: 15.4%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.007$ **

The results for males and females are even more strikingly different in case of *mam-* with multiple diminutive suffixes (*mam-ul-ečk-a*, *mam-us-ik*, *mam-us'-ka*, *mam-ul-ěk*, *mam-k-in*, *mam-ul'-k-in*). As seen in the examples, these forms mostly contain one of the suffixes *-us-* or *-ul-*, which is followed by another diminutive suffix or even more than one suffix. Only one male reported using the form *mam-ul'-k-a*, whereas 8.6% of the females use such forms:

Table 6. The use of *mam-* with multiple diminutive suffixes.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	81	8.6	857	91.4	938	100
Male	1	0.7	135	99.3	136	100
Total	82		992		1074	

Weighted total percentage: 5.0%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.0002$ ***

The opposite situation can be observed with the shortened form *ma* 'ma'. It used by males 2.5 times more frequently than by females:

Table 7. The use of *ma* 'ma'.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	28	3.0	910	97.0	938	100
Male	10	7.4	126	92.6	136	100
Total	38		1036		1074	

Weighted total percentage: 5.0%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.02$ *

Thus, females tend to use longer words when addressing their mothers, whereas males prefer shorter terms of address. This is the principal gender difference observable in the terms for addressing mothers. For the remaining five categories, the difference between males and females is not statistically significant:

Table 8. The use of *mat* 'mother'.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	32	3.4	906	96.6	938	100
Male	6	4.4	130	95.6	136	100
Total	38		1036		1074	

Weighted total percentage: 3.9%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.62$

Table 9. The use of *maman* ‘mother’ (borrowed from French).

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	47	5.0	891	95.0	938	100
Male	10	7.4	126	92.6	136	100
Total	57		1017		1074	

Weighted total percentage: 6.1%; Fisher’s exact test: $p = 0.30$

Table 10. The use of first name when addressing one’s mother.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	40	4.3	898	95.7	938	100
Male	6	4.4	130	95.6	136	100
Total	46		1028		1074	

Weighted total percentage: 4.3%; Fisher’s exact test: $p = 0.82$

Table 11. The use of first name + patronymic when addressing one’s mother.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	32	3.4	906	96.6	938	100
Male	6	4.4	130	95.6	136	100
Total	38		1036		1074	

Weighted total percentage: 3.9%; Fisher’s exact test: $p = 0.62$

Table 12. The use of other nominations when addressing one’s mother.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	156	16.6	782	83.4	938	100
Male	21	15.4	115	84.6	136	100
Total	177		897		1074	

Weighted total percentage: 16.1%; Fisher’s exact test: $p = 0.81$

The terms of address included into the last category labeled as “other” are quite numerous. Some typical cases can be identified here. First, mothers are very frequently addressed as *babuška* ‘grandmother’ or the like (*babulja, ba*, etc.) in presence of their grandchildren; this conforms with the tendency to shift the naming perspective after a child is born into the family, which was observed by Buras & Krongauz (2013). Other typical cases include loanwords from various European languages, such as *mutti, mut(t)er* (from German *Mutti* ‘mommy’, *Mutter* ‘mother’), *mi madre, mamito* (from Spanish *mi madre* ‘my mother’, *mamita* ‘mommy’), *mamo* (from Ukrainian *mamo* ‘mother.VOCATIVE’). Some animal names also occur; these are mostly very idiosyncratic (*mamontėnok* ‘baby mammoth’, *kurica* ‘hen’, *koška* ‘cat’, *pudel’* ‘poodle’, *koza* ‘goat’), which makes them different from animal names used by parents addressing children, where we encounter many typical animals such as cats, rabbits, etc. (see below, Sections 4.1 and 4.2).

6 out of 1103 participants (4 females, 2 males) indicated that they do not use any word other than the 2SG personal pronoun *ty* to address their mother.

3.2. Children addressing fathers

In our survey, 89.7% of the females and 89.9% of the males indicated at least one way of addressing their father. The percentage for mothers was much higher, but this can be easily explained by the fact that single-parent households in the Russian-speaking environment are more often headed by mothers rather than by fathers. According to the Federal State Statistics Service of the Russian Federation, there are 5,002,700 single mothers and only 648,000 single fathers in Russia.¹⁴

Table 13. Presence/absence of answers on the terms of address to one’s father.

	Some term of address to father	%	No term of address to father	%	Total	%
Female	851	89.7	98	10.3	949	100
Male	124	89.9	14	10.1	138	100
Total	975		112		1087	

Weighted total percentage: 89.8%

¹⁴ http://www.gks.ru/free_doc/doc_2016/wo-man16.pdf

The patterns of addressing fathers were divided into ten categories, mostly similar to the categories used for mothers:

- 1) *papa* ‘dad’;
- 2) *papočka* ‘daddy’;
- 3) *papulja* ‘daddy’;
- 4) the root *pap-* with multiple diminutive suffixes (*pap-ul-ečk-a*, *pap-us-ečk-a*, *pap-an-čik*);
- 5) a shortened form *pa* ‘pa’;
- 6) *otec* ‘father’;
- 7) *batja* ‘father (informal)’ and its derivatives;
- 8) first name in any form;
- 9) first name + patronymic;
- 10) other nominations of any origin.

The default way of addressing fathers is *papa*, which is used by the majority of the respondents:

Table 14. The use of the word *papa* ‘dad’.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	743	87.3	108	12.7	851	100
Male	106	85.5	18	14.5	124	100
Total	849		126		975	

Weighted total percentage: 86.5%; Fisher’s exact test: $p = 0.57$

The most frequent suffixed forms *papočka* and *papulja* are not correlated with gender:

Table 15. The use of the word *papočka* ‘daddy’.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	68	8.0	783	92.0	851	100
Male	8	6.5	116	93.5	124	100
Total	76		899		975	

Weighted total percentage: 7.3%; Fisher’s exact test: $p = 0.72$

Table 16. The use of the word *papulja* ‘daddy’.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	81	9.5	770	90.5	851	100
Male	12	9.7	112	90.3	124	100
Total	93		882		975	

Weighted total percentage: 9.6%; Fisher’s exact test: $p = 1$

A statistically significant difference is observed in case of *pap-* with multiple diminutive suffixes (*pap-ul-ečk-a*, *pap-us-ečk-a*, *pap-an-čik*). Not a single male in our sample reported the use of such terms of address, whereas 3.2% of the females use such forms.

Table 17. The use of *pap-* with multiple diminutive suffixes.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	27	3.2	824	96.8	851	100
Male	0	0.0	124	100.0	124	100
Total	27		948		975	

Weighted total percentage: 1.6%; Fisher’s exact test: $p = 0.039$ *

As for the shortened form *pa* ‘pa’, our data is not sufficient to demonstrate that it is preferred by any of the two genders:

Table 18. The use of *pa* ‘pa’.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	21	2.5	830	97.5	851	100
Male	6	4.8	118	95.2	124	100
Total	27		948		975	

Weighted total percentage: 3.6%; Fisher’s exact test: $p = 0.14$

The next two terms of address, namely *otec* ‘father’ and *batja* ‘father (informal)’ and its derivatives, are used more frequently by sons than by daughters. This confirms the intuition that these forms are perceived to have an air of masculinity.

Table 19. The use of *otec* ‘father’.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	58	6.8	793	93.2	851	100
Male	16	12.9	108	87.1	124	100
Total	74		901		975	

Weighted total percentage: 9.6%; Fisher’s exact test: $p = 0.027$ *

Table 20. The use of *batja* ‘father (informal)’ and its derivatives.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	32	3.8	819	96.2	851	100
Male	13	10.5	111	89.5	124	100
Total	45		930		975	

Weighted total percentage: 6.9%; Fisher’s exact test: $p = 0.0025$ **

The remaining three terms of address do not exhibit a difference between males and females:

Table 21. The use of first name when addressing one’s father.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	42	4.9	809	95.1	851	100
Male	7	5.6	117	94.4	124	100
Total	49		926		975	

Weighted total percentage: 5.3%; Fisher’s exact test: $p = 0.66$

Table 22. The use of first name + patronymic when addressing one's father.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	24	2.8	827	97.2	851	100
Male	6	4.8	118	95.2	124	100
Total	30		945		975	

Weighted total percentage: 3.8%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.26$

Table 23. The use of other nominations when addressing one's father.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	101	11.9	750	88.1	851	100
Male	12	9.7	112	90.3	124	100
Total	113		862		975	

Weighted total percentage: 10.9%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.55$

Among other nominations, *ded* 'grandfather' and its derivatives are most frequently attested. Differently from mothers, fathers are rarely addressed using loanwords; there are only single instances of *daddy*, *papan* and *fater* (from German *Vater* 'father') in the list, whereas *maman* was so frequent with mothers that we allocated it a category of its own. We also encounter four instances of Old Church Slavonic vocative *otče*. The absence of animal names is noteworthy.

3.3. Children addressing mothers and fathers: a comparison

To sum up, for seven out of 20 contingency tables presented above there is a statistically significant difference between male and female speakers. Namely, terms of address that are used more frequently by females than by males are:

- 1) *mamočka* 'mommy';
- 2) *mamulja* 'mommy';
- 3) *mam-* with multiple diminutive suffixes;
- 4) *pap-* with multiple diminutive suffixes.

Terms of address that are used more frequently by males than by females are as follows:

- 1) *ma* 'ma';
- 2) *otec* 'father';

3) *batja* ‘father (informal)’ and its derivatives.

The most striking difference between male and female speakers concerns the use of terms of address with multiple suffixes such as *mamulečka* and *papusen’ka*. They are used (or at least their use is reported) almost exclusively by females. Females also prefer suffixed derivatives when addressing mothers, but a similar difference is not observed when addressing fathers. In turn, males use the shortened form *ma* more often than females, and they also prefer words *otec* and *batja* when addressing their fathers. The preference of females to use words with multiple diminutive suffixes and the preference of males to use somewhat harsher-sounding words such as *otec* and *batja* conforms to the stereotypical picture of the difference between female and male speech.

4. Parents addressing children

4.1. Parents addressing daughters

In our sample, 34.0% of females and 23.2% of males have at least one daughter:

Table 24. Presence/absence of answers on the term of address to one’s daughter.

	Has a daughter	%	No daughters	%	Total	%
Female	323	34.0	626	66.0	949	100
Male	32	23.2	106	76.8	138	100
Total	355		732		1087	

Weighted total percentage: 29.0%

The patterns of naming daughters were subdivided into six categories:

- 1) full names or standard short forms of the name;
- 2) suffixed diminutive forms;
- 3) other derivatives from the first name;
- 4) derivatives from the word *doč’* ‘daughter’;
- 5) names of animals
- 6) other nominations.

The first category requires a special comment. In Russian, many personal names have standard short forms which are perceived as neutral and can be used even in quite formal contexts, e.g. in classroom. Some examples are male names such as *Aleksandr* ~ *Saša*, *Mixail* ~ *Miša*, *Pětr* ~

Petja and female names such as *Ol'ga ~ Olja*, *Elizaveta ~ Liza*, *Ekaterina ~ Katja*. However, there are also names that lack such a form, e.g. male names *Nikita*, *Gleb* and female names *Polina*, *Alisa*. The attitudes to the standard short forms are changing, and the boundary between these two categories is not a strict one. For instance, some speakers of Russian perceive the variant *Ksjuša* based on the female name *Ksenija* as a neutral form, whereas other speakers find it very colloquial and informal. The same holds true for male names such as *Boris ~ Borja* and *Sergej ~ Serěža*. In parent–child communication, full names are only rarely used if a standard short form is present in the language: e.g., it is very uncommon for parents to call their son *Mixail* rather than *Miša*. However, such cases do exist, but if we encounter a name like *Ksenija* in our survey, we cannot say whether the parents use it because they find *Ksjuša* non-neutral or because they want to use a full name rather than a standard short form. For this reason, these two types of answers were collapsed into one category.

There is no significant correlation between gender and the use of full names and standard short forms:

Table 25. The use of full names and standard short forms when addressing one's daughter.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	176	54.5	147	45.5	323	100
Male	22	68.8	10	31.3	32	100
Total	198		157		355	

Weighted total percentage: 61.1%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.14$

The conventional significance threshold of 0.05 was not reached here, but we can still observe that males use such terms of address more frequently than females. This is probably linked to the fact that males use less standard terms of address such as non-standard diminutives, animal names and other words less frequently than females, as we will show below.

The use of suffixed diminutives turns out not to be gender-neutral at the 0.05 significance level. Namely, more females than males use suffixed diminutive forms when addressing their daughters. The most frequently used diminutive suffix is *-k-* which not only works alone but also goes together with other suffixes in cases like *Saš-ul'-k-a* or *Val'-uš-k-a*. The next three most frequent suffixes are *-uš- / -juš-* (as in *Al'-uš-a* or *Var'-uš-a*), *-očk- / -ečk-* (as in *Ir-očk-a* or *Žen-ečk-a*) and *-on'k- / -en'k-* (as in *Maš-en'k-a* or *Zo-en'k-a*).

Table 26. The use of suffixed diminutive forms when addressing one's daughter.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	217	67.2	106	32.8	323	100
Male	14	43.8	18	56.3	32	100
Total	231		124		355	

Weighted total percentage: 56.3%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.011$ *

The use of other derivatives from the first name is not influenced by the gender of the speaker. These other derivatives include forms like *Son'ča*, *Sonjata* (< *Sonja* < *Sofija* / *Sof'ja*), *Kèt*, *Kètrin*, *Katerina* (< *Ekaterina*), etc. It is sometimes hard to draw a line between suffixed diminutives and "other derivatives"; in all problematic cases, the decision was left up to the annotators.

Table 27. The use of other derivatives from the first name when addressing one's daughter.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	162	50.2	161	49.8	323	100
Male	13	40.6	19	59.4	32	100
Total	175		180		355	

Weighted total percentage: 45.7%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.36$

The use of the word *doč* 'daughter' and its derivatives (*doča*, *dočen'ka*, *dočulja*, *dočura*, etc.) does not depend on the gender of the speaker:

Table 28. The use of *doč* 'daughter' and its derivatives.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	79	24.5	244	75.5	323	100
Male	6	18.8	26	81.3	32	100
Total	85		270		355	

Weighted total percentage: 21.8%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.66$

As for animal names, it is much more common for mothers to use them than for fathers, and this difference is statistically significant:

Table 29. The use of animal names when addressing one's daughter.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	79	24.5	244	75.5	323	100
Male	2	6.3	30	93.8	32	100
Total	81		274		355	

Weighted total percentage: 16.0%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.015$ *

Animal names used by males are *medvežata* 'bear cubs' (referring to a single daughter) and *koza* 'goat'. The names use by females are very diverse. Apart from the common *myška* 'mouse', *zajka* 'bunny', *kotik* 'pussy-cat', they include *krysa* 'rat', *martyška* 'marmoset', *sovuška* 'owl.DIMINUTIVE', *kuročka* 'hen.DIMINUTIVE', etc. Interestingly, they do not necessarily belong to the feminine grammatical gender. Masculine terms of address to daughters include *burunduk* 'chipmunk', *čič* 'siskin', *krotik* 'mole.DIMINUTIVE', *tarakan* 'cockroach', etc.

Other nominations do not exhibit a significant difference between males and females:

Table 30. The use of other nominations when addressing one's daughter.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	152	46.8	173	53.2	325	100
Male	12	37.5	20	62.5	32	100
Total	164		193		357	

Weighted total percentage: 42.5%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.36$

The list of other nominations includes a great variety of interesting, amusing, and sometimes even sarcastic names. Many of them are derived from the adjectives meaning 'small', e.g. *malyška*, *melkaja*, *masen'ka*, *maljavka*, *meloč*, *kroška*. Many nominations are linked to food: *pončik* 'doughnut', *kolbasa* 'sausage', *kolbasa varënaja* 'boiled sausage', *kolbasa s ušami* 'sausage with ears', *sladost' saxarnaja* 'sugary sweet', *marcipanočka* 'marzipan', etc.

4.2. Parents addressing sons

In our sample, 30.6% of females and 22.5% of males have at least one son:

Table 31. Presence/absence of answers on the term of address to one's son.

	Has a son	%	No sons	%	Total	%
Female	290	30.6	659	69.4	949	100
Male	31	22.5	107	77.5	138	100
Total	321		766		1087	

Weighted total percentage: 26.8%

As with daughters, the patterns of naming sons can be classified into six categories:

- 1) full names or standard short forms of the name;
- 2) suffixed diminutive forms;
- 3) other derivatives from the first name;
- 4) derivatives from the word *syn* 'son';
- 5) names of animals
- 6) other nominations.

There is no significant correlation between gender and the use of full names and standard short forms:

Table 32. The use of full names and standard short forms when addressing one's son.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	186	64.1	104	35.9	290	100
Male	22	71.0	9	29.0	31	100
Total	208		113		321	

Weighted total percentage: 67.3%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.55$

The use of suffixed diminutives like *Timulja* (< *Tima* < *Timofej*), *Maksik* (< *Maks*), *Sanečka* (< *Sanja* < *Aleksandr*) turns out not to be gender-neutral. Namely, more females than males use diminutive forms when addressing their sons:

Table 33. The use of suffixed diminutive forms when addressing one's son.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	202	69.7	88	30.3	290	100
Male	16	51.6	15	48.4	31	100
Total	218		103		321	

Weighted total percentage: 61.3%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.045$ *

Other derivatives from the name include forms like *Dimastyj* (< *Dima* < *Dmitrij*), *Sander*, *Sančes* (< *Aleksandr*), *Lešas'* (< *Lěša* < *Aleksej*). The use of such derivatives is not influenced by the gender of the speaker:

Table 34. The use of other derivatives from the first name when addressing one's son.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	108	37.2	182	62.8	290	100
Male	14	45.2	17	54.8	31	100
Total	122		199		321	

Weighted total percentage: 40.9%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.44$

The use of the word *syn* 'son' and its derivatives (*synok*, *synulja* 'sonny') does not depend on the gender of the speaker:

Table 35. The use of *syn* 'son' and its derivatives.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	104	35.9	186	64.1	290	100
Male	8	25.8	23	74.2	31	100
Total	112		209		321	

Weighted total percentage: 31.2%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.32$

As for animal names, it is much more common for mothers to use them than for fathers, and this difference is statistically significant:

Table 36. The use of animal names when addressing one's son.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	83	28.6	207	71.4	290	100
Male	3	9.7	28	90.3	31	100
Total	86		235		321	

Weighted total percentage: 19.8%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 0.031$ *

Animal names used by males are *kotja* 'cat', *krevetka* 'shrimp', and *xorěk* 'ferret'. The females mostly use various forms of words for cats (*kisa*, *kisulja* 'pussy-cat', *kotik*, *kotěnok* 'kitten', etc.), hares / rabbits (*zajka*, *zajčik*, *zajushka*, *zain'ka* 'bunny, little hare', *krolik* 'rabbit'), and mice / rats (*myška*, *myšen'ka* 'mouse', *krys*, *krysěnyš* 'rat'). Non-mammals occur only rarely and mostly include birds (*solovej* 'nightingale', *gusěnok* 'gosling', *čížik* 'siskin') and the word *ryba*, *rybka* 'fish'. Somewhat extraordinary nominations are *farširovannaja ptička* 'stuffed birdy' and *pingvin — holodnye lasty* 'penguin cold flippers'.

Other nominations do not exhibit a difference between males and females:

Table 37. The use of other nominations when addressing one's son.

	Used	%	Not used	%	Total	%
Female	88	30.3	202	69.7	290	100
Male	9	29.0	22	71.0	31	100
Total	97		224		321	

Weighted total percentage: 29.7%; Fisher's exact test: $p = 1$

For fathers, the full list of these terms of address is as follows: *dorogoj* 'dear', *ljubimson* 'lit. darlingson'; *doktor* 'doctor'; *malyš* 'baby', *paren* 'chap'; *mužčina* 'man', *upyr* 'vampire', *razdolbaj* 'dunce'; *zlovred'ka* 'malignant', *red'ka* 'radish'; *lobzik* 'jigsaw'; *čěrtov psix* 'damn crazy'; *malyš* 'baby'; *Anatolij* 'Anatoly' (personal name different from the child's actual name), *Kartoxin* 'Potato (with a surname suffix)'. Though the sample is very small, we can see that three out of nine responses include words that are normally colored negatively: *upyr* 'vampire', *razdolbaj* 'dunce' (by the same respondent); *zlovred'ka* 'malignant'; *čěrtov psix* 'damn crazy'.

Mothers call their children differently. The word occurring most often in their responses is *malyš* ‘baby’, and the list also includes many loving and endearing nicknames such as *solnyško* ‘sun’ and names of sweets and bakery products, such as *pončik* ‘doughnut’, *slada-šokolada* ‘sweety-chocolate’, *krendel* ‘pretzel’, etc. Interestingly, there is a food type that occurs often both with daughters and with sons, namely *kolbasa* ‘sausage’: *kolbasa varěnaja* ‘boiled sausage’, *kolbason’ka* ‘small sausage’, *kolbasik* ‘sausage’. A word that is normally negatively-colored occurs only once in 88 responses: *balbes* ‘bonehead’.

4.3. Parents addressing sons and daughters: a comparison

It turns out that gender-specific patterns of addressing sons and daughters are very similar to each other. Out of 12 contingency tables presented in Sections 4.1 and 4.2, there are four tables that show statistically significant differences between female and male speakers. There is no significant difference between mothers and fathers with respect to the use of full names and standard short forms, non-standard derivatives of the name, the words *doč* ‘daughter’ / *syn* ‘son’ and their derivatives, and other nominations. However, mothers use diminutive forms significantly more frequently than fathers, and the same holds true for animal names; both of these observations apply to addressing daughters as well as sons.

As for differences between sons and daughters, it is worth noting that animal names used for daughters can belong both to the feminine and to the masculine grammatical gender, whereas animal names used for sons are predominantly masculine. An interesting gender-specific peculiarity can also be observed in the interaction between fathers and sons: namely, only in this case do we encounter terms of address that can be regarded as derogatory when used outside of the family.

Both mothers and fathers frequently use binomials, i.e. combinations of two words that are mostly rhymed. Such binomials include *slada-šokolada* ‘sweety-chocolate’, *pončik-batončik* ‘doughnut-candy bar’, *kisočka-sosisočka* ‘pussy sausage’, *miločka-buločka* ‘darling-bun’, *kotik-murkotik* ‘cat-kitty’, *kisunja-marmisunja* ‘kitty-marmisunja’; *Sašulja-krasotulja* ‘Sashulya (personal name)-pretty’, *Sašulja-kisulja* ‘Sashulya (personal name)-kitty’, *koza-dereza* ‘frisky goat’. Some of these terms of address are meaningless (*Buffa-bubufa*, *Buffočka-bubufočka*), but they sound endearing because of the rhyme.

The ways in which parents address their children do not always appear tender and loving to an outsider. For instance, not all animal names used by parents denote beings that are normally perceived positively. For instance, this list includes *skolopendra* ‘centipede’ and *gadjuša* ‘viper’ with the diminutive suffix *-uš-*, as well as *kobyła* ‘mare’. Some of pejorative

terms of address are linked to the appearance of a person, e.g. *nosjara* ‘big nose’, *upyr* ‘pučeglazjy’ ‘pop-eyed ghoul’, or *laxudra* ‘frowzy girl’.

5. Perceived terms of address

Our questionnaire also included questions about perceived terms of address, i.e. how the respondents are addressed. It seems interesting to compare what the respondents say about their ways of addressing parents and children and about the ways they are being addressed by their parents and children. Clearly, it is not the case that the same relationship is described from two points of view, because we only rarely have a response from both a parent and their child. Even more importantly, terms of address may be subject to generational differences (cf. Taavitsainen & Jucker 2003 for a selection of studies on diachronic change in terms of address), and this makes the answers to the questions “How do you address your mother/father/daughter(s)/son(s)?” and to the questions “How are you addressed by your mother/father/daughter(s)/son(s)?” even less comparable. Also, the answers to the latter set of questions call for a more detailed statistical analysis that will not be presented here.

However, some observations can still be made. It is noteworthy that answers to the question about how one is addressed only rarely include non-standard terms of address other than *mama* ‘mom’, *papa* ‘dad’ and their derivatives or first name (for children). For instance, the variety of animal names used by parents is much smaller than in the list provided by the parents themselves. However, the general patterns observed in Sections 3 and 4 seem to hold true. For instance, the responses confirm that parents are only rarely addressed by their children using animal names, whereas the opposite situation is much more common.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we presented a study of terms of address within Russian-speaking families based on a large-scale online survey. The analysis focused on the interactions between parents and children and, more specifically, on gender-related differences. We identified ten patterns of addressing mothers and ten patterns of addressing fathers, as well as six patterns of addressing daughters and six patterns of addressing sons. Out of these 32 patterns, we identified 11 statistically significant differences between male and female speakers. Our analysis shows that female speakers prefer using suffixed terms of address to mothers (*mamočka* ‘mommy’, *mamulja* ‘mommy’) and nominations with multiple suffixes when addressing both parents. In turn, male speakers use *ma* ‘ma’, *otec* ‘father’ and *batja* ‘father (informal)’ more frequently, which probably hints at somewhat more masculine style. The patterns of addressing sons and daughters

are very similar to each other, with a strong preference for suffixed diminutive forms and animal names exhibited by female speakers. These findings are also confirmed by a tentative inspection of the answers on how respondents are addressed by their parents and children.

Further directions of study include analyzing other questions of the survey, most importantly the questions about perceived forms of address. Another interesting direction of study might be conducting in-depth interviews with those respondents who gave their consent to provide further information on terms of address within their family if needed.

References

- Braun, F. (1988). *Terms of address: problems of patterns and usage in various languages and cultures*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Brown, R., Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T. A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*, 253–276. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Buras, M. M., Krongauz, M. A. (2013). Obraščeniya v russkom semejnomo ètikete: semantika i pragmatika [Terms of address in Russian family etiquette: semantics and pragmatics]. *Voprosy Jazikoznaniya*, (2), 121–131 [in Russian].
- Dunkling, L. (1990). *A dictionary of epithets and terms of address*. London: Routledge.
- Lagerberg, R., Kretzenbacher, H., Hajek, J. (2014). Forms and patterns of address in Russian: Recent research and future directions. *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies*, 28 (1–2), 179–209.
- Smith, G. (2008). Does gender influence online survey participation? A record-linkage analysis of university faculty online surveyresponse behavior. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 501717.
- Taavitsainen, I., Jucker, A. H. (eds.) (2003). *Diachronic perspectives on address term systems*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Contact details:

Alexander Piperski

National Research University Higher School of Economics. Laboratory of Linguistic Conflict Resolution Studies and Contemporary Communicative Practices: Research Fellow. School of Philology: Senior Lecturer. Email: apiperski@hse.ru.

Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.

© Piperski, Aplonova, Grabovskaya, Gridneva, Ivtushok, Naumova, Orlenko, Senkina, 2018