Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research
Volume 3, Issue 6, 2016, pp. 146-159
Available online at www.jallr.com
ISSN: 2376-760X

The Impact of Gender and Age on the Use of Animal Names as Forms of Address and Description in English and Persian

Mansour Shabani
Assistant professor of general linguistics, University of Guilan, Rasht, Iran

Mohammadamin Sorahi
Assistant professor of general linguistics, University of Guilan, Rasht, Iran

Atefeh Sadeghi *
MA student of TEFL, University of Guilan, Rasht, Iran

Abstract
Animal metaphors are used to describe various characteristics of human beings in different languages. This article aims to investigate whether gender and age have a significant impact on the use of animal names in Persian and English. Therefore, A questionnaire previously used by Halupka-Resetaa and Radic's study (2003) and Szamosfalvi's study (2011) with some slight changes contaminating 43 animal names were given to the participants. The questionnaire was distributed among 120 Persian and English monolingual participants and a structured interview was employed to gain a better understanding of the answers provided by participants. In this interview participants were asked to provide an example for the situation in which they used a certain animal name. Animal names which at least 40% of the participants had mentioned in the structured interview were primarily considered and analyzed. There were only 11 animal names which were commonly used by English and Persian participants. The results from the gender cross-tabulation in chi-square test indicated that 48% of English participants and 47% of the Persian participants who used the mentioned animal names were men and 52% of English participants and 53% of the Persian participants who used the mentioned animal names were women. Also age cross-tabulation in chi-square test indicated that 64% of English participants and 63% of the Persian participants who used the mentioned animal names were under the age of 30 and 36% of English participants and 37% of the Persian participants who used the mentioned animal names were above the age of 30. Thus, it was found that there are no significant differences between the Persian and English participants in using animal names in terms of the participants' gender and age. The findings of the present study are of importance since teachers or syllabus designers can use different types of metaphors including animal metaphors in their contexts and it can be of help to translators and error analysts since the cultural similarities and differences are their main area of focus.

Keywords: animal name, metaphor, gender, age, English, Persian

* **Correspondence:** Atefeh Sadeghi, Email: atefeh.sadeghi92@yahoo.com

INTRODUCTION

Pragmatics can be defined as the discipline that studies the relations of signs to interpreters (Morris, 1938) or as the study how people comprehend and bring linguistic actions in any context into life (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993). In other words, Levinson (1983) suggests that pragmatics addresses the relations of signs to interpreters while semantics studies the relations of signs to the objects to which the signs are applicable to. According to Von Heusinger and Turner (2006) pragmatics and semantics are closely related in many aspects. The term metaphor has been defined in various terms which include a wide variety of phenomena from literary uses of speech in academic backgrounds to daily life expressions used by ordinary people, and as Larson (1984) states, the latter are so commonly used that at least some have lost their metaphorical values and have become common everyday expressions. Metaphors have been classified in various forms by different researchers and scholars. The main focus of this study is on animal metaphors; however, definitions of other metaphors such as love and anger are also presented.

The main focus of this study is on animal metaphors which Faghih (2001) mentions it as one of the widely anticipated types of metaphors. Investigating the metaphoric usage of animal names can help to better study the cultural model of the particular defined society. Lakoff and Johnson (2008) state that animal name metaphors used for addressing people usually have cultural roots which might differ from culture to culture. Therefore, as intended in this research, establishing the usages of animal names as metaphors in a particular culture and the affectionate and abusive usage of such names is possible. Understanding the difference between the application of animal names in terms of meaning in English and Persian and, figuring out whether there are significant differences between the two languages in using animal names to address a male or female person are also other objectives of this study. One of the troublesome areas, especially for Iranian novice translators is the communicative competence in the target language, and, among other things, the importance of their attention to the probable differences between connotations of different metaphors in different languages should be emphasized. The difference between the characteristics of a specific animal metaphor in English and Persian, regarding its affectionate or abusive applications, is of much importance.

Previous research of such fields include Sorahi and Amozadeh's (2014) study on color and anger metaphors and Sorahi's (2014) research on a typological approach towards color metaphors in Persian language. In the former, a contrastive approach has been conducted. The researcher claims that similarities are mostly attributed to a universal motivation employed in these languages and the differences are mostly related to having different cultural-ideological backgrounds, information, understanding, and other factors. The present study intends to verify or refute this initiative assumption or common belief that animal metaphors are more frequently used as terms of abuse in most languages while, in a research conducted by Larson (1984), it is stated that at least a number of the animal names used in some languages also have positive connotations.

Also Shabani and Sorahi (in press) investigated the use of animal names in Gilaki (Eshkevarat variety) in addressing people both abusively and affectionately within the framework of cognitive approach. They used a structured interview referring to questions such as the use or the lack of the use of the animal name in addressing people (males or females), abusive or affectionate use, and describing the situation by providing an example based on about 58 animal names and reached several similarities and differences compared to other researches which studied animal metaphors in other languages. The similarities are the result of a universal motivation which can be explained within the framework of Embodiment theory. Also, context awareness, physical environment, and cultural context can be regarded as the main the reasons for the special use of animal metaphors in Gilaki.

As Nadežda (2013) states, animal metaphors demonstrate how certain aspects of animals and their instinctual, physical attributes, and behavior patterns are used for addressing human beings or objects. Nadežda (2013) asserts that, in many languages, animal imagery can be considered as one of the tools of creating social identity. There are some particular metaphors which only work in a given language or culture and they receive completely different interpretations in different languages. Owl is an example of this; it refers to something as ominous in the Persian language while it is the paradigm of wisdom in the English language. So, metaphorical meaning of animal names in the human domain can be divided into two groups: those that share the same meaning or metaphorical senses in different languages and cultures, and those which do not interpret the same meaning in all languages and cultures. Although the participants being selected and questioned are from one society, they might have different perspectives towards life with their own particular limitations, and probably originated from different cultural and family backgrounds. It would not, therefore, be possible to focus on these details. In addition, they have been selected from among the educated population that might enforce some limitations on our results since the participants' ideas and answers might be influenced by other languages that they might have proficiency in. In this case, uneducated people would be a better sample; however, since the present study was also conducted on participants in a foreign country, limiting the participants to uneducated selections would probably decrease the total number of participants.

Here, the comparative study is conducted only on animal names and expressions. It is notable that even though the respondents are asked to give examples for actual language use, they often provided samples they would use in a hypothetic situation; therefore, the original data gathered and analyzed should be viewed in the light of the fact that some might not actually be used in their daily lives. The truth is that since languages, especially the spoken ones, change from day to day, we can get the most authentic picture about language via asking language users directly. Therefore, in the current research we are not concerned with expressions or metaphors brought in dictionaries; rather, the focus will be on metaphors in the meaning of sentences, expressions, and phrases directly used by speakers in their daily lives. The present study has been delimited to a certain kind of metaphor, namely animal metaphor, and also to two specific languages, Persian and English. The participants of this study have been selected from two specific regions,

Edmonton (Canada) and Tehran (Iran). As mentioned above, the participants have only been selected among educated people. Although there are several metaphors to be studied on, the main focus of this study is on animal metaphors. The results of this study will help the students and learners of a second language get familiar with the similarities and differences between these two languages for further use in translation, teaching, and other fields of study and it attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. Does gender have a significant impact on the use of animal names in Persian and English?
2. Does age have a significant impact on the use of animal names in Persian and English?

The following null hypotheses are proposed:

1. Gender doesn't have a significant impact on the use of animal names in Persian and English.
2. Age doesn't have a significant impact on the use of animal names in Persian and English.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

An individual who is trying to learn a second language may commit errors due to the mother tongue interference which could occur in pronunciation, grammar, and other levels of language often referred to as "*interference*". Without realizing such differences we tend to see, hear and interpret things similarly based on the concepts gained from our native language. In fact, generally we interpret and understand things based on our prior knowledge and pre-conceptions from our native language. Contrastive analysis (CA) is the systematic comparison between two or more languages, with the aim of describing their similarities and differences (Yanti, 2010).

Hudson (2001) states that sociolinguistics is the study of language in relation to society. Sociolinguistic includes any discussions of the relationship between language and society or of the various functions of language in society and works with several key variables, along which the language used by different social groups can be investigated (Wardhaugh, 2010). Also, pragmatics studies language that is not directly spoken so the meaning is not determined only through the represented words on a special occasion.

As mentioned previously, this study mainly focuses on animal metaphors. Unlike traditional views, metaphors are not just a surface ornamentation of language but a phenomenon of human thought processes and thus, they are an important investigative focus. Understanding the process in which a metaphor works helps us to better clarify how people think, how they make sense of things, and how they communicate (Cameron, 2003). In the cognitive linguistic view, metaphor is defined as understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another one such as describing life or love in terms of a journey (Koveceses, 2002).A major way in which metaphors can be classified is their degree of conventionality. In other words, it can be asked how deeply established a metaphor is in everyday use by ordinary people for various daily purposes and how frequently they are used as a part of their daily conversations. A thorough study of

different types of metaphors has been carried out by Halupka-Rešetar&Radić, (2003) andLakoff and Johnson, (2008). In these studies, anger, love, food, and animal metaphors have been presented and various definitions from well-known scholars are discussed. Animal metaphors were the main subject of interest in this study. In the past few years there have been experts who devoted their time to do research on animal names used as metaphors, idioms, and expressions. Halupka-Rešetar and Radić (2003) investigated animal names used in addressing people in Serbian; Rodríguez (2009) made a survey about animal metaphors used for women in English and Spanish.

In a contrastive and descriptive study, Shahabi and Roberto (2015) compared and contrasted the most popular animal metaphors based on animals which people are closely in contact with in their daily lives. In this study, they intended to find out the reasons for the similarities and differences between the meanings in Persian and English. They believed that learning about the origins of metaphors can help explain the similarities and differences in meanings across languages and cultures. Their results demonstrate that the physical characteristics and behaviors of animals are not the only basis for the metaphorical applications or interpretations of animal names and other variables such as culture and language-specificity, as well as the behavioral characteristics of animals which are attributed to culture are also other important factors which lead to the interpretations of such animal terms. Estaji and Nakhavali (2011) also studied the meanings and applications of animal names in English and Persian proverbs. Although, since animal expressions based on culture, society, and human relations and thoughts convey different affectionate or abusive values in each society, a number of animal names which may cause cultural or communicational misunderstandings were also reviewed (Estaji & Nakhavali, 2011). Talebinejad and Dastjerdi (2009) studied the nature of metaphor by conducting a cross-cultural comparison of metaphor in English and Persian. To this end, animal metaphors were compared. In a study based on corpora of animal expressions in English and Persian, Estaji and Nakhavaly (2011) examined “dog” expressions based on semantic molecules approach introduced by Hsieh (2006) to explore the salient meanings and cultural backgrounds. They analyzed about 10,000 English and Persian proverbs showing that ninety seven English and two hundred and seven Persian “dog” expressions exist.

One of the earliest and most similar studies to our research based on animal metaphors was Faghih’s (2001) contrastive analysis of animal metaphors in Persian and English. Faghih (2001) studied the figurative use of animal metaphors and aimed to find out whether and to what extent the animal metaphors and their corresponding interpretations are similar in Persian and English. This research was concerned with metaphors used in everyday life in ordinary conversational exchanges thus the scope of the study was limited to metaphors relatively familiar to Persian and English ordinary speakers.

METHODOLOGY

Participants

For this study we had to make sure that the participants were not bilingual. 120 people participated in this study, 60 of whom are English native and monolingual speakers from Canada, Edmonton, while the other 60 are Persian native and monolingual speakers from the capital of Iran, Tehran. Participants of the study have been selected among the educated population but this might enforce some limitations on our results since the participant ideas and answers might be influenced by other languages that they might have proficiency on.

Instruments

A questionnaire previously used by Halupka-Resetaa and Radic's study (2003) and Szamosfalvi's study (2011) with some slight changes were given to the participants. The questionnaire contained 43 animal names including *donkey, cow, bear, hen, dog, horse, mouse, cat, chicken, monkey, wolf, fox, magpie, gorilla, goat, snake, calf, rooster, parrot, puppy, duck, frog, pig, bee, turkey, worm, lamb, snail, peacock, pigeon, louse, ostrich, rabbit, kitten, toad, skunk, mole, goose, squirrel, ox, bull, rat* and *vixen.* A structured interview was conducted for both groups of participants and they were also informed of the confidentiality of their responses.

Data collection procedures

In order to collect the responses required for the analysis and conclusion of this study, the participants were primarily handed a questionnaire containing 40 animal names and they were given enough instructions. The answers were gathered through a structured interview where questions were also one by one explained to them with no time limit being set for answering the questions and the participants were asked similar to the survey of (Halupka-Rešetar & Radić, 2003) to primarily write down their age and gender and state whether they used the mentioned animal names in their daily lives.

Data analysis

The data gathered from the participants were statically analyzed using SPSS software to investigate whether age and gender have a significant impact on using animal names in English and Persian. Thus Chi-square test was used for calculating the inferential statistics and the results obtained from the analysis were discussed and explained.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

As far as the frequency of animal names in English and Persian are concerned, many differences are observable. Persian participants used a wide range of animal names far more frequently than English participants.

The most frequent animal names used by Persian and English participants

The three most popular and frequent animal names used by English native participants are: *Chicken, dog,* and *pig* whilst the most three frequent animal names mentioned by Persian native participants are *donkey, cow,* and *bear*.

Primarily, it was intended to analyze animal names which at least 50% of the respondents had used in various situations, but unfortunately not many cases were found to be used by 50% of the English native participants interviewed. Therefore, the ratio was cut down to 40%. Based on this, English animal names which at least 40% of the English respondents (24 participants) had used included 14 animal names. But the number of Persian animal names which at least 40% of the respondents had used included 20 animal names.

According to the results, 14 most frequent English animal names used by the English participants are *chicken, dog, pig, cow, monkey, hen, turkey, mouse, fox, snake, cat, horse, donkey,* and *lamb* which are colored in red. From among these animal names 11 can be found around people in their everyday lives, which are mostly livestock being used for food or domesticated animals living around them including *chicken, dog, cow, pig, hen, mouse, cat, horse, lamp, donkey,* and *turkey*. It is interesting to note that *snake* and *fox* are the wild animals among the 14 most frequent English animal names. Similarly, the 20 most frequent animal names used in Persian are *donkey, cow, bear, hen, dog, horse, mouse, cat, chicken, monkey, wolf, fox, magpie, gorilla, goat, snake, calf, rooster, parrot,* and *puppy*. According to the results of this study, among the 20 most frequent animal names used by the Persian native participants, 14 animals can be found around people in their daily lives and 4 out of the 20 most frequent animal names including bear, snake, wolf, and gorilla are wild animals. This might suggest that people tend to use the animal names which are relatively closer to them on daily basis. Among the most frequent animal names used by both the English and Persian native participants are: *chicken, dog, cow, monkey, snake, cat, donkey, horse, fox, mouse,* and *hen.*

The most frequently used animal names in English and Persian in terms of the gender of the participants

The results demonstrate that the English native male participants most often use *donkey, pig, cow, dog, horse,* and *fox* whereas the English native female participants most often use *hen, mouse, monkey, turkey, cat, snake*, and *lamb*. The research shows that the Persian native male participants more often use animal names such as *donkey, bear, chicken, dog,* and *cow* whereas the Persian native female participants more often use *hen, horse, mouse, cat, monkey, snake, fox, magpie, gorilla, calf, rooster, parrot, wolf,* and *puppy.* As the results of the study suggest, the Persian and English participants tend to use the same animal names for addressing people and the difference mostly comes to animal names like *magpie, puppy, parrot, rooster, calf, gorilla*, and *wolf* which are more often used by the Persian females compared to the Persian male participants. Considering the examples mentioned by the participants, it can also be stated that the Persian female participants mostly use animal names such as *donkey, monkey, puppy, parrot,* and *mouse* for

addressing children. It is also evident that the differences between the frequencies of using animal names by the English and Persian male and female participants correspond to each other considering animal names such as *cow, hen, dog, mouse, monkey, snake,* and *lamb.* Thus, for example, the frequency of using hen among the English and Persian female participants is far more than the frequency of using this animal name by the English and Persian male participants.

Table 1. The most frequently used common animal names in English and Persian in terms of the gender of the participants

	English participants				Persian participants			
#	Animals	Frequency	Male	Female	Animals	Frequency	Male	Female
1	Donkey	24	13	11	Donkey	50	29	21
2	Cow	34	19	15	Cow	44	28	16
3	Hen	32	12	20	Hen	43	15	28
4	Dog	41	29	12	Dog	42	27	15
5	Horse	24	17	7	Horse	38	15	23
6	Mouse	29	8	21	Mouse	37	13	24
7	Cat	26	13	13	Cat	36	9	27
8	Chicken	41	21	20	Chicken	35	26	9
9	Monkey	33	7	26	Monkey	35	12	23
10	Snake	28	8	20	Snake	29	11	18
11	Fox	28	15	13	Fox	30	11	19

Among the all the animal names mentioned, 11 animal names were commonly used in both languages which have been presented in Table 1. Based on the related data of the 11 animal names common between Persian and English, the following statistics were derived and presented in terms of the gender of the participants. The results of Table 2 indicate that 48% of the English participants who used animal names were men and 52% of them who used animal names were women. Approximately the same results can be seen for the Persian participants where 47% of them who used animal names were men and the remaining 53% who used animal names were women.

Table 2. Gender cross-tabulation for 11 common animal names among English and Persian

		Group		Total
		English	Persian	
Gender	Male	48	47	95
	Female	52	53	105
Total		100	100	200

The following table shows the results of Chi-square test for animal names in Persian and English based on the participants' gender.

Table 3. Gender Chi-square tests

	Value	DF	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.020[a]	1	.887
Continuity Correction[b]	.000	1	1.000
Likelihood Ratio	.020	1	.887
Fisher's Exact Test			
Linear-by-Linear Association	.020	1	.888
N of Valid Cases	200		

In order to test the first null hypothesis of the study to check whether gender has a significant impact on the use of animal names in Persian and English the Chi-square test was used. As can be seen by the frequencies cross tabulated in Table 3, there are no significant differences among the Persian and English participants in terms of the gender of the participants and $x2(1, N = 200) = .02$, $p = .887$. As shown in the table based on the chi-square score and the degree of freedom (DF), the result is not significant at $p > .05$ since the p-value is higher than our assumed alpha level.

Apart from the 11 animal names between English and Persian, there were some animal names in English and some other animal names in Persian which were not considered in the above and following calculations since they were not common between the two languages. These animal names in English include pig, lamb, and turkey which the table below shows the gender cross-tabulation for these animal names. Also the animal names in Persian included *bear, rooster, puppy, parrot, calf, goat, magpie, wolf,* and *gorilla.*

Table 4. Gender cross-tabulation for uncommon animal names in English and Persian

		English			Persian
Gender	Male	44	Gender	Male	36
	Female	56		Female	64
Total		100	Total		100

The results of Table 4 indicate that 44% of the English participants who used these animal names were men and 56% of them were women. The results from the Persian participants for the animal names which were omitted indicate that 36% of the animal names were used by men and the remaining 64% were used by women.

The most frequently used animal names in English and Persian in terms of the age of the participants

Among the 14 most frequent animal names used by English and the 20 most frequent animal names used by the Persian native participants, besides gender, the parameter of age was also considered for the analysis. The average age of the Persian participants was 29.73 and the average for the English participants was 29.71. Thus, this study examines the answers of the participants under and above 30 years old for both the English and Persian native participants separately. The analysis of the data suggests that the English native participants under the age of 30 mostly use animal names such as *cow, hen, chicken,*

monkey, fox, and lamb whereas the participants above the age of 30 most often use *mouse, donkey, cat,* and *snake.*

Looking at the data obtained from the Persian native participants under the age of 30, it can be seen that animal names such as *bear, horse, mouse, cat, hen, chicken, dog, magpie, fox, goat, calf, rooster, puppy, monkey,* and *gorilla* are mostly used whereas the Persian native participants above 30 years old more often used *donkey, wolf, parrot,* and *snake.*

Table 5 presents the common animal names which were used by the English and Persian participants under and above 30 years old. Based on the acquired data of the 11 animal names similar between Persian and English, the following statistics were derived and presented considering the age of the participants.

Table5. The Most Frequently Used Similar Animal Names in English and Persian in terms of the age of the participants

	English participants				Persian participants			
#	Animals	Frequency	-30	+30	Animals	Frequency	-30	+30
1	Donkey	24	5	19	Donkey	50	24	26
2	Cow	34	28	6	Cow	44	22	22
3	Hen	32	29	3	Hen	43	31	12
4	Dog	41	23	18	Dog	42	22	20
5	Horse	24	14	10	Horse	38	29	9
6	Mouse	29	11	18	Mouse	37	29	8
7	Cat	26	18	8	Cat	36	26	10
8	Chicken	41	30	11	Chicken	35	18	17
9	Monkey	33	24	9	Monkey	35	29	6
10	Snake	28	10	18	Snake	29	12	17
11	Fox	28	26	2	Fox	30	23	7

The results of Table 6 indicate that 64% of the English participants who used animal names were under the age of 30 and 36% of them were above the age of 30. Also, approximately the same results can be seen for the Persian participants where 63% of them who used animal names were under the age of 30 and the remaining 37% were above the age of 30.

Table 6. Age cross-tabulation

		Group		Total
		English	Persian	
Age	-30	64	63	127
	+30	36	37	73
Total		100	100	100

Table 7 shows the results of Chi-square test for animal names in Persian and English based on the participants' gender:

Table7. Chi-square tests

	Value	DF	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.022[a]	1	.883
Continuity Correction[b]	.000	1	1.000
Likelihood Ratio	.022	1	.883
Fisher's Exact Test			
Linear-by-Linear Association	.021	1	.884
N of Valid Cases	200		

In order to test the second null hypothesis of the study to check whether age has a significant impact on the use of animal names in Persian and English the Chi-square test was used. As can be seen by the frequencies cross tabulated in Table 10, there are no significant differences in using animal names in Persian and English in terms of the age of the participants and $x^2(1, N = 200) = .022$, $p = .883$. As shown in the table based on the chi-square score and the degree of freedom (DF), the result is not significant at $p > .05$ since the p-value is higher than our assumed alpha level.

As mentioned earlier apart from the 11 animal names among English and Persian there were some animal names in English and some other animal names in Persian which were not considered in the above and following calculations since they were not common between the two languages. Table 8 shows the age cross-tabulation for these animal names.

Table 8. Age cross-tabulation for uncommon animal names in English and Persian

		English			Persian
Age	-30	60	Gender	-30	63
	+30	40		+30	37
Total		100	Total		100

The results of Table 8 indicate that 60% of the English participants who used these animal names were under 30 and 40% of them were above 30. The results obtained from the Persian participants for the animal names which were omitted indicate that 63% of the animal names were used by individuals under 30 and the remaining 37% were used by individuals above 30.

DISCUSSION

According to available cognitive views on metaphors, the existence of similarities among metaphors used in different languages can be ascribed to a global motivation, which can be studied considering the Embodiment theory, which stresses on the continuity and motivating character of the relationship between pre- or non-linguistic bodily experience, and cognition.

The setting in which an interaction takes place is also of importance. According to Ervin-Tripp (1964), the term setting is used in two senses, that of locale, or time and place, or that of situation in which people encounter one another. These situations include a fight,

faculty meeting, dinner with family, social situations, family interactions with a father, a mother or a sister or even a date. Social situations may be restricted by cultural norms, which specify the physical settings, the topics, the functions of discourse, and the linguistic terms used by either of the participants. For most sociolinguistic analyses, the important features of the participants will be sociological attributes which include sex, age, and occupation; roles of the participants towards another, such as an employer and an employee, or a mother and daughter, or typical friends or even social roles such as hostess and guest or a family and their neighbor. Therefore based on the above mentioned, the contexts in which the results of this study were gathered differed from case to case. In some cases, the participants were a friend, a colleague, or a classmate but the participants also included family members, teachers, strangers, and even gym mates.

From another perspective the form of communication may have an impact on the way an individual addresses others and uses linguistic structures. In this case, the channel in which the answers were gathered was a structured interview. The linguistic forms used by men and women in all speech communities differ in various aspects. Women and men do not speak in exactly the same way as each other in any community. Gender differences are the fundamental facts of social life and human differences which reflects that there is a long historical origin in language difference phenomenon (Holmes, 2013). Holmes (2013) states that in traditional concepts, women's language is kind and polite while men's is relatively simple, and firm and that inherent social expectation unwillingly becomes a powerful social stress which drives people to restrain their behaviors in terms of their. Also society makes different effect on boys and girls and expects the boy to become a true man, who can overcome dependence, fear and passivity. Speeches show manhood, so boys' speaking rudely or speaking with rude keynotes are accepted and acquiesced by the society even their talking is incoherent and clueless (Holmes, 2013). That might be the reason why most abusive terms used by the Persian male participants were addressed rudely towards a male or a female usually in social situations where for example an individual suddenly steers in front of them while driving, or the fact that women are barred by the society from going to football stadiums indicate that they feel men are extremely more rude compared to women. On the contrary, girls usually keep clean, tidy, and quiet to become gentle, virtuous, and kind-hearted ones. So they talk like elegant ladies with standard pronunciation and correct grammar but in most abusive cases mentioned by the Persian female participants, the terms used by women for addressing other women often reflect to terms such as decisive, nosy, insulting, dangerous, copycat, and headstrong. For example, "Snake" is usually used by women for addressing other women who don't let go of their personal life or the fact that a woman is beautiful from outside and yet decisive and manipulative.

There are some features of people's speech which vary at different ages. Vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar can be differentiated by age groups. For example, the English participants under the age of 30 used "Hen" as in terms of endearment for addressing a friend who is getting married since most females are likely to get married in this range of age and also often used "Hen" as terms of abuse for describing women who gossip a lot. The English participants above the age of 30 also mostly used "Hen" for addressing a

female who cheats. *Dog* was also mostly used by the English participants under the age of 30 for addressing a loyal friend and for addressing a person who cheats on his/her partner or a person who is bad tempered. *Fox* was another animal name used mostly by the English participants under the age of 30 for addressing a clever individual or an attractive woman. *Chicken* was used mostly by the English participants under the age of 30 for addressing a good looking woman or a person who doesn't have courage to do a task. Examples of animal names used mostly by the Persian participants under the age of 30 include *gorilla, monkey, horse, mouse, fox, calf, rooster* and *puppy. Gorilla* for instance was used for addressing a person, often a male with a huge physique or lots of hair. Considering the age factor, *donkey, snake, mouse, dog, pig,* and *cat* were animal names mostly used by the participants over the age of 30 and *chicken, cow, fox, hen, monkey, dog, pig,* and *lamb* were animal names mostly used by the participants under the age of 30. Dog and pig were animal names most commonly used by both groups. The analysis of the data from Szamosfalvi (2011) study points to the fact that the English participants under the age of 30 most often use *pig (let), cow, chick (en), monkey/ape, dog/puppy* and *donkey* which *pig, chicken, dog, donkey,* and *monkey* are similar compared to the results of this current study.

CONCLUSION

The present study aimed at investigating whether there is a significant difference between English and Persian participants in using animal names in terms of gender and age. To this end, a questionnaire based on the questionnaire used by Halupka-Resetaa and Radic's study (2003) and Szamosfalvi's study (2011), were given to participants containing 43 animal names was used in a context of a structured interview. We suggest that there were no significant differences between English and Persian in terms of gender. Also it was found that age does not have any significant impact on the use of animal names in English and Persian. The results from the gender cross-tabulation in Chi-square test indicated that 48% of English participants and 47% of the Persian participants who used the mentioned animal names were men. Also age cross-tabulation in Chi-square test indicated that 64% of English participants and 63% of the Persian participants who used the mentioned animal names were under the age of 30. The findings of the present study can be of help to teachers and textbooks and syllabus designers. Also, translators and error analysts can take advantage of the findings of this study since they are concerned with the cultural similarities and differences when it comes to translating Persian texts into English and vice versa. There are other metaphors such as love, anger, and food which can be studied in future research as a contrastive analysis between English and other languages commonly spoken in various parts of Iran such as Turkish.

REFERENCES

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1964). An analysis of the interaction of language, topic, and listener. *American Anthropologist*, *66* (6), 86-102.

Estaji, A., & Nakhavali, F. (2011). Semantic derogation in Persian animal proverbs. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *1*(9), 1213-1217.

Faghih, E. (2001). A contrastive analysis of the interpretations of animal metaphors in Persian and English. *The International Journal of Humanities, 8*(2), 1-15.

Halupka-Rešetar, S., & Radić, B. (2003). Animal names used in addressing people in Serbian, *Journal of pragmatics*, *35*(12), 1891-1902.

Holmes, J. (2013). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*, New York, Routledge.

Hudson, A. (2001). Diglossia. In B. Spolsky (Ed.), *concise encyclopedia of educational Linguistics* (pp. 37–42). New York: Elsevier.

Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). Interlanguage pragmatics: An introduction. *Inter-language pragmatics*, *3*, 15.

Kovecses, Z. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. New York, Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Z. (2003). *Metaphor and emotion: Language, culture, and body in human feeling*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, G., & Kövecses, Z. (1987). The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English. *Cultural models in language and thought*, 195-221.

Lakoff, G. (1993). *The contemporary theory of metaphor*.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2008). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, University of Chicago press.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Nadežda, S. (2013). Animal Metaphors and Semantic Derogation–Do Women Think Differently from Men? , *Gender Studies*, *12*(1), 319-332.

Rodríguez, I. L. (2009). Of women, bitches, chickens and vixens: Animal metaphors for women in English and Spanish. *Cultura, lenguaje y representación: revista de estudios culturales de la Universitat Jaume I*, *7*, 77-100.

Shabani M., & Sorahi, M. A. (to appear). *Human addressing and animal metaphors in Gilaki: A cognitive approach*. Unpublished article.

Shahabi, M., & Roberto, M. T. (2015). Metaphorical application and interpretation of animal terms, *Languages in Contrast*, *15*(2).

Sorahi, M. A., Amozadeh, M. (2014). A contrastive study of the metaphors of anger in Persian and English, *Journal of comparative Linguistic Researchers*, *3*(6), 39-60.

Szamosfalvi, Z. (2011). *A Comparative Study of Animal Names Used as Forms of Address and Description in English and Hungarian*. Unpublished masteral thesis, PázmányPéter Catholic University, Piliscsaba, 2011.

Talebinejad, M. R., & Dastjerdi, H. V. (2005). A cross-cultural study of animal metaphors: When owls are not wise. *Metaphor and Symbol*, *20*(2), 133-150.

Wardhaugh, R. (2010). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics: Sixth Edition*. United Kingdom: Printed in Singapore.

Yanti, W. (2010). *A Contrastive Analysis of Question words between English and Mandailing language*. Unpublished MA thesis, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia.