

THE PRAGMATIC MEANINGS OF ADDRESS TERMS SAMPEYAN AND ANDA

Djoko Susanto

English Education Department, UIN Malang

email: djosus@yahoo.com

Abstract: This research investigates the use of *sampeyan* and *anda* by the students from Pasuruan and Probolinggo. Address terms is one of important tools in communication in Javanese society as it is used, for example, to designate the person they are talking to or to show the possession of formal and informal manners. However, the use of this address terms may have different interpretation across regions. This research is undertaken to find out (1) factors that influence the choice of address terms *sampeyan* and *anda* in Pasuruan and Probolinggo and (2) situations in which the interlocutors use the address terms *sampeyan* and *anda*. Several theories are used to help analyze the data, which include address terms (Wardhaugh, 2002), *sampeyan* and *anda* (Wolf & Poedjosoedarmo, 1982), Politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987), and Power and Solidarity (Brown & Gilman, 1960). The data were obtained from the results of observations, questionnaires and interviews with the participants. The results of the study show that both *sampeyan* and *anda* were found to be commonly used by the participants to address their lecturer, instead of using *Bapak*. This is, of course, uncommon from either the perspective of standard usage of Javanese or Indonesian language. This study also indicates that the participants used *sampeyan* to lecturer/teacher, *kyai*, parent, and older sibling because they wanted to express (1) express politeness and (2) to indicate informality. Concerning to the use of *anda*, this study reveals that the participants use this address term because of (1) more formal and appropriate manners in environmental education, (2) respecting person of higher social status and older person, (3) more polite and more appropriate than *sampeyan*, and (4) the use of Indonesian as a formal language. In some respect, however, the participants use *anda* to lecturer/teacher, which is not appropriate because they were not socially equal to the lecturer/teacher. This study provide important findings which reveal that the address term of *sampeyan* and *anda*, which are widely understood by Javanese to express respect, and to express distant relationship, might be perceived and used in different way by the students coming from Pasuruan and Probolinggo. Thus, it contributes to knowledge that using the address terms *sampeyan* and *anda* to persons of higher social status should not be any longer regarded as impolite utterances because it has become social norms in those specific communities.

Keywords: Address terms, *sampeyan*, *anda*, kinship

MAKNA PRAGMATIS KATA SAPAAN SAMPEYAN DAN ANDA

Abstrak: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menyelidiki penggunaan kata sapaan *sampeyan* dan *anda* oleh siswa-siswa yang berasal dari Pasuruan dan Probolinggo. Kata sapaan merupakan media komunikasi yang penting di masyarakat Jawa karena, misalnya, dapat digunakan untuk merujuk pada lawan bicara atau menunjukkan sikap formal atau informal. Meski demikian,

penggunaan kata sapaan ini memiliki interpretasi yang beragam di tiap daerah. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui (1) factor-faktor yang mempengaruhi pemilihan kata sapaan *sampeyan* dan *anda* di Pasuruan dan Probolinggo, serta (2) situasi-situasi penggunaan kata sapaan *sampeyan* dan *anda* oleh lawan bicara. Ada beberapa teori yang digunakan untuk menganalisa data yang diperoleh, diantaranya adalah mengenai kata sapaan (Wardhaugh, 2002), *sampeyan* dan *anda* (Wolf & Poedjosoedarmo, 1982), teori *Politeness* atau Kesantunan (Brown & Levinson, 1987), dan teori *Power dan Solidarity* atau Kekuasaan dan Solidaritas (Brown & Gilman, 1960). Data diperoleh melalui observasi, kuesioner, dan wawancara dengan partisipan. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa baik kata *sampeyan* maupun *anda* merupakan kata yang lebih umum digunakan oleh para partisipan untuk merujuk pada dosen, daripada kata *Bapak*. Hal ini tentu saja merupakan hal yang tidak lazim dari sudut pandang penggunaan bahasa Jawa maupun bahasa Indonesia yang standar. Penelitian ini pun mengindikasikan bahwa para partisipan menggunakan kata *sampeyan* pada dosen/guru, kyai, orang tua, dan kakak sebagai bentuk (1) kesantunan dan (2) menunjukkan situasi informal. Sedangkan mengenai kata *anda*, penelitian ini mengungkapkan bahwa para partisipan menggunakannya karena (1) lebih formal dan lebih berterima untuk digunakan di lingkungan pendidikan, (2) menunjukkan penghormatan pada orang yang lebih tua atau status sosialnya lebih tinggi, (3) lebih santun dan lebih sesuai daripada *sampeyan*, dan (4) merupakan ungkapan bahasa Indonesia yang formal. Meski demikian, dalam beberapa hal, para partisipan juga menggunakan kata *anda* pada dosen/guru, yang penggunaannya kurang tepat karena mereka tidak memiliki kedudukan sosial yang setara dengan dosen/guru. Penelitian ini memberikan temuan penting yang mengungkapkan bahwa kata sapaan *sampeyan* dan *anda* yang umumnya digunakan oleh orang Jawa untuk mengekspresikan penghormatan dan jarak dalam suatu hubungan, dapat dipahami dan digunakan dengan cara yang berbeda oleh siswa-siswa dari dari Pasuruan dan Probolinggo. Oleh karena itu, hal ini turut berkontribusi pada pengetahuan bahwa penggunaan kata sapaan *sampeyan* dan *anda* pada orang yang memiliki status sosial yang lebih tinggi tidak lagi dianggap sebagai ungkapan yang tidak santun karena penggunaannya menjadi norma sosial dalam komunitas tersebut.

Kata kunci: Kata sapaan, *sampeyan*, *anda*, *kekerabatan*

Javanese people acknowledge different use of address terms, such as *Bapak*, *Ibu*, *Tuan*, *saudara* (commonly used in both formal and informal situation), and *kowe*, *sampeyan*, and *penjenengan* (commonly used within Javanese contexts). The English equivalent of such address terms are “Mr.”, “Mrs.”, “Miss”, etc., title plus last name (for example in English: “Mr. Taylor”, “Mrs. Engelson”, etc), first name (for example in English: “Harry”, “James”, etc and in Indonesia: “Afifah”, “Burhan”, etc), and sometimes multiple names, that can be a nickname (for example in English: “Bob”, “Jim”, etc. and in Indonesia “Nana”,

“Marcel”, etc.). The use of such address terms depends mainly on the relationship between addresser and addressee, the social status of individual involved in the conversation, the purpose and the situation of the conversation, the interlocutors’ age, social status, social relationship, sex, profession, marital status, politeness and other related aspects. Every address terms reflects the social characters of the speaker, of the addressee or of the relation between them. Address terms becomes an important tool in communication in Javanese society as it is used to designate the person they are talking to, to show the possession of formal

and informal manners and consideration of the people, to express his or her feelings of respect, solidarity, intimacy, and familiarity to the other people, and to maintain social relation that occurs in daily life. In addressing someone, the speaker must consider addressing using name, addressing of intimate terms, addressing of kinship terms, addressing of respectful terms, even addressing mockeries (Wardhaugh, 2002).

Failure to implement such address terms in Javanese context may cause disharmonious communication because the speaker could be regarded impolite, and as such the speaker may be considered as an uneducated person. The Javanese address term *sampeyan*, for instance, is used to address an intimate interlocutor who is older or senior. In other usage, the Javanese address term is also applied to people whom one addresses in *madyo* and with whom one is not intimate (Wolf & Poedjosoedarmo (1982).

However, the address term *sampeyan* and *anda* are common to be used by the students from Pasuruan and Probolinggo to address their lecturer. This is, of course, uncommon from either the perspective of standard usage of Javanese or Indonesian. It will be more appropriate if they use *Bapak*, for example. This kind of practice could not be regarded as a usual linguistic phenomenon, but there must be reason/s for them to use such address terms. This study is carried out to discover answers as why they use address terms *sampeyan* and *anda* to their lecturers.

Studies on address terms have been little explored, with the notable exception of Brown & Ford (1961) who proposed the semantic rules governing address in American English based on a varied collection of data. They found that the most common forms of address are the first name

(FN) and the title plus last name (TLN) in American English and that status and intimacy between speakers are the two major factors that determine the choice of address. This characteristic was later expressed as the Invariant Norm of Address (Brown 1965), which is claimed to constitute a culturally universal rule: that the linguistic form used to an inferior in dyads of unequal status is used in dyads of equal status among intimates, and that the linguistic form used to a superior in dyads of unequal status is used in dyads of equal status among strangers. This invariance has been confirmed for a variety of disparate European and non-European languages (Befu & Norbeck 1958; Brown & Ford 1961; Slobin 1963). Furthermore, Kroger's, et al. study claimed that the universal relationship between social power and intimacy can also be extended to Chinese (1979). Kroger, Wood & Kim (1984) further compared the usage of terms of address in Korean, Greek and Chinese, which revealed substantial cross-cultural consistency. However, Chinese is far distant from American English linguistically and culturally. First, Chinese is a member of the Sino-Tibetan language family and completely unrelated to Indo-European, to which English and most other European languages belong. Second, Chinese culture is one of the oldest surviving cultures which has developed separately for thousands years. In terms of address, the actual usages of addresses in these two societies are expected to vary. On one hand, terms of address reflect interpersonal relationships. In China, that the family is the basis of society is perhaps more true of China than of any other highly developed nation, hence the Chinese have been interested in relationship terms from ancient times until the present (Chen & Shryock 1932:623). However, the U.S. lacks China's long and continuous

history, and its population is more ethnically and culturally diverse, on the other hand, terms of address embody rules of politeness and underlying cultural ideology. Address forms are an integral part of polite language use and therefore they figure prominently in several of the strategies described by politeness theory (Brown & Levinson 1987). Since politeness rules vary in different cultures, terms of address will vary accordingly to adapt to different rules. Chao (1956) provided a detailed description of the conditions of actual use of terms in various interpersonal relations among Chinese people, the grammatical status of the terms of address, and the formal conditions for their occurrence. One outstanding characteristic of Chinese terms of address is it has a much more complicated kinship system than that of American English.

Zhou (1998) investigated how to address non-family members among Chinese and Americans by questionnaire. The findings suggested that great differences exist between the two languages because of the distant cultural tradition and social background. Firstly, kinship terms are extended to non-family members in Chinese while it is rare in American English. Chinese use kinship terms, such as grandpa, grandma, aunt, uncle, brother and sister, to address their parents' friends, their colleagues and friends. However, Americans use general social terms of address to address these non-family members, such as Mr., Ms., Miss or given names. Second, titles are used more often to address superiors by Chinese than by Americans.

Wang (2003) also noticed the differences between these two languages in terms of using titles and kinship terms when addressing people. He ascribed these differences to different sociocultural factors and politeness rules. For example, seniority

is regarded more highly in Chinese than in the U.S. Therefore, age is considered an important factor in determining the choice of terms of address in Chinese. Moreover, it is considered polite to be humble and to show respect to others in Chinese culture while it is standard for most relationships to be regarded as equal in American culture. Therefore, more nonreciprocal exchanges of address are used in Chinese while there are more reciprocal exchanges in English.

In the past, investigators have relied largely on questionnaires to obtain data in this regard. For example, Zhou (1998) investigated the actual usage of address among Chinese from 27 provinces and among Americans from 35 states by means of questionnaires. Kroger et al. (1979, 1984) designed a Chinese Forms of Address Questionnaire (CFAD) to collect data. Although one can collect a large amount of data in a short time by using a questionnaire, its disadvantages are substantial. First, when being asked which forms of address ought to be used *vis-à-vis* target persons, respondents usually gave answers based on imaginary situations. Being given only a question or a brief description of a situation, they could only rely on their memory of their own or others' experiences. Thus the responses were very likely unnatural, incomplete, or even inaccurate. Furthermore, if respondents have never had the occasion to address the target person, they may have to give a hypothetical answer. For instance, if they have never had a chance to address their parents' superiors, they would select a form of address for the questionnaire which may not be the one they would actually use in real communication. Additionally, most studies in the past are formulated according to certain interpersonal relationships.

A typical survey would ask how participants address people such as your

colleagues or your superiors. Kroger et al. (1979) conducted a survey through questionnaires which asked participants to select which forms of address are used *vis-à-vis* target persons from multiple choices. By doing this, interpersonal relationships become the only factor that determines the choice of term of address while other factors are ignored. In general conversation, both participants need greeting. Addressing someone before starting conversation is generally done by a number of people. Calling someone's name is the most common way of addressing. The speaker also uses different style in addressing someone.

To sum up, in terms of the comparison between Javanese, Chinese and American English, these studies draw on the following conclusions: 1) Status and intimacy are two factors influencing the choice of address, which indicates its substantial cross-cultural consistency; 2) the actual usages of address terms in these languages vary greatly. The system of address terms is more complicated in Javanese than that in Chinese and American English. Major differences are the usage of kinship terms and usage of titles; 3) the reasons leading to these differences can be traced to the cultural background, historical development, and social structure.

This study is carried out to answer the following question: "what are the pragmatic reasons for the students to use *sampeyan* and *anda* to lecturer/teacher, *kyai*, parent, and older sibling?" The results of this study will provide important findings revealing that the address term *sampeyan* and *anda*, which are widely understood by Javanese to express respect with intimate relationship, and to express distant relationship respectively, might be perceived and used in different way by the students coming from Pasuruan and Probolinggo. Thus, the results of this study will contribute to knowledge that using the

address terms of *sampeyan* and *anda* to persons of higher social status should not be any longer regarded as impolite utterances because it has become social norms in those specific societies.

This section presents approaches and studies which provide insights into the use of address terms *sampeyan* and *anda* in either Javanese or Indonesian linguistic contexts. The approaches employed in the present study are based on the consideration of social and cultural relations that are of significance in understanding human communication in the Javanese context. For example, when they speak among themselves, the Javanese will normally consider two important aspects: first 'who' and 'what' the participants are. These require the speaker to consider the interlocutor's social status, age, gender, level of education, heredity, and social rank; second, 'how' to express what needs to be said in the language, which requires the speaker/interlocutor to keep in mind Javanese communicative behaviour such as speech manners, respect, feelings of awkwardness, and indirection. These two aspects are important communicative instruments for Javanese speakers. Disregarding these communicative measures in interaction can result in disharmonious conversation.

Address terms

Address terms, defined loosely as words used in a speech event that refer to the addressee of that speech event, can be extremely important conveyors of social information (Parkinson 1985:1). The study of personal address has always been a popular topic within sociolinguistics, because address terms open communicative acts and set the tone for the interchanges that follow. Also they establish the relative power and distance of speaker and hearer.

In this study, the term “address terms” refers to vocatives, i.e. terms of direct address to call persons (Chao, 1956:217), such as *sampeyan* and *anda*. A large variety of titles and address terms are in everyday use by Javanese. Certain titles and address terms imply that the status of the addressee is lower than that of the speaker, and the degree of familiarity is of the sort associated with the *ngoko* speech level. These forms are found only with the *ngoko* speech level. Certain other titles and terms of address imply a high status and the degree of deference associated with honorifics. Such terms are only found in speech with honorifics. Otherwise, the system of address terms and titles operate independently of the speech levels and honorific system and add meaning component which is otherwise not expressed. For example, two teachers who have known each other for a long time and are close friends exchange *ngoko*, but they indicate their mutual recognition of each other’s position by addressing each other as *penjenengan* ‘you (honorific)’ and using honorifics with one another. One can still show affection with address terms even though caste or status differences require the use of *kromo*. For example, a son, who addresses his father *bapak* ‘father’ as well as *penjenengan* to show his intimate and affectionate relationship.

The term *penjenengan* is considered an honorific form of direct address and is usually accomplished by other *kromo inggil* forms to refer to the addressee. It occurs in all speech levels. The term *penjenengan* may be addressed to intimates or to people whom one does not know. For example, we have the recording of a son who gives his father *madyo*, addresses him as *penjenengan* and calls him *Bapak*. In another case a son uses *kromo* and *penjenengan* to his father. These all involve cases where a speaker is lower

than the addressee from some point of view (e.g., social position) but much higher from other points of view (e.g., age).

Somewhat similar in feeling to the use of a title or name plus title as a term of address is the use of *sampeyan*. It is most frequently used to people whom one addresses in *madyo* and with whom one is not intimate, although we have examples of *mang* as an agent of the passive verb addressed to people with whom one is intimate but with whom one uses *madyo*, for example: a son to his mother.

Politeness Theory

Brown & Levinson’s (1987) work on politeness theory is based on three main factors: (1) power relationships (P) (e.g. parent-children, boss-employee), (2) solidarity or social distance (D) (e.g. the degree of familiarity), and (3) the weight or rank of imposition of the speech act (R) (e.g. a criticism, admiration). Brown & Levinson divide politeness theory into four types of strategies: (1) bald-on-record, (2) positive politeness, (3) negative politeness and (4) off record strategy. These politeness strategies, according to Brown & Levinson, can sum up human politeness behaviour or Face Threatening Acts (FTAs). FTAs are acts which infringe on the hearers’ face. The term ‘face’ refers to the respect that an individual has.

The bald-on-record strategy illustrates interactions in which a speaker does not make any effort to reduce the impact of the FTA. In this case, the speaker is not concerned whether the interlocutor is embarrassed. The speaker makes the interlocutor feel uncomfortable and shocked by way of disrespecting cultural norms, for example, saying: “Give me that!” instead of saying: “Can you please give me that?”; “Turn the light on” instead of saying “Could

you please turn the light on?” (Brown & Levinson, 1987, pp. 96-100). This type of strategy frequently occurs between conversants who know each other fairly well and share values and cultures. Gardners-Chloros & Finnis (2003), who investigated how politeness mediates CS in Greek/Greek Cypriot culture, also found evidence indicating bald-on-record strategies. In their corpus data, they found a speaker expressed her surprise at seeing Kiki (a participant) entering the meeting. As well as being humorous, the language used is rather extreme (a curse), and the only way she can get away with it is to say it in a different language: Speaker: “Kiki! *What the devil!*” (italics indicates English translation from Greek).

Positive politeness is oriented towards the interlocutor’s positive face wants – the desire for approval. It is often associated with promoting concord, expressing interest, sympathy and approval, which is often followed with intonation or stress (e.g. “What a fantastic garden you have!”), using in-group identity markers (e.g. “mate”, “buddy”, “honey”, “brother” and “sister”); emphasising shared values and understanding, agreement. For example:

- A John went to London this weekend!
B ‘To London.’
(Brown & Levinson, 1987:101-128)

According to Brown & Levinson, positive politeness is used to satisfy the hearer’s positive face; therefore, it contributes to establishing relationships of intimacy and solidarity. Lakoff (1973, p. 298) describes positive politeness as ‘making the interlocutor feels good – be friendly’. For example, “You must be hungry; it’s a long

time since breakfast, how about some lunch?” (a speech act of attending to the hearer). This strategy is usually found among friends who know each other fairly well.

Negative politeness is oriented towards the interlocutor’s negative face – the right not to be imposed upon. Negative politeness is associated with avoiding discord: seeking to minimise the imposition of face-threatening speech acts on the hearer’s face. Therefore, negative politeness is associated with distance, self-effacement, formality and indirectness. Lakoff (1973) defines it as an effort not to impose on the interlocutor. It includes strategies such as: Can you pass the salt?; Would you mind lending me your bike?; I just want to ask you if I could use your computer. One of the consequences of applying this strategy is that there may be some social distance or awkwardness in the situation.

Finally, the off-record strategy serves a situation in which the speaker tries not to impose directly on the interlocutor by removing themselves from any imposition whatsoever. For example, “It’s cold in here” (a speech act of giving hints, e.g. to close the window), “Perhaps someone should have been more responsible” (a speech act of being vague).

Power and Solidarity

Another type of social relations encoded in language is social distance or closeness between individuals, or relations of ‘power’ and ‘solidarity’. Brown & Gilman (1960) argue that in some European languages, beyond the deictic functions of the second person pronouns *tu* (T) or *vous* (V), there are in the choice of either pronoun, signals of relationships of ‘power’ and ‘solidarity’, where ‘power’ reflects relative superior status, social distance, unfamiliarity, and

deference, and 'solidarity' reflects closeness, familiarity, common experiences and shared intimacies. Shared relationship of solidarity or differences in power relationships are reflected in reciprocal or non-reciprocal use of the T/V pronouns in address (Brown & Gilman 1960). Brown & Gilman (1960) established the notion that the use of T pronouns (the familiar, non-respect form) can have several social meanings. Reciprocal use of T by equals expresses solidarity, but between non-equals the giver of T is putting him/herself in a position of power, and the receiver is expected to respond with V. Similarly, reciprocal V usage implies mutual respect and social distance; any non-reciprocal use of these pronouns is an expression of a differential of power.

In diglossic situations the use of H or L varieties in a given social exchange (as distinguished from societal patterned usage as a whole) may be seen as the same kind of T/V situation. The use of L may be an expression of solidarity and may not be offered to speakers whose social position is superior or distant. Similarly H may be the only variety appropriate in a given situation because the use of L would imply a solidarity that is only reserved for members of a particular in-group. The use of Black English by white speakers of American English in conversations with African-Americans would probably be considered insulting unless individual allowances had already been negotiated. The use of L-variety Tamil by non-Indians is considered inappropriate by many educated Tamilians, who may respond in H-variety Tamil or in English unless the use of L-variety has already been negotiated (with explanations about the goals of the speaker and disclaimers about intended slurs and put-downs.) The use of H-variety German in Alemannic Switzerland conversely may be seen as a power-trip

designed to put the Swiss speaker at a disadvantage. The fact that the *Hochdeutsch* speaker may have no alternative L to use may be irrelevant; it certainly explains the desire to switch to 'neutral' English or French. In Luxembourg, however, L-variety and its use are expressions of *Lëtzebuergesch* nationality and ethnic solidarity, so while Luxembourg nationals expect L from all Luxembourgers, they switch readily to French or *Hochdeutsch* or English with foreigners, with no expectation that they will or should be able to speak L.

METHOD

The present study employs qualitative method to examine the use of *Sampeyan* and *Anda* in naturally occurring conversations. There were forty students of STKIP PGRI Pasuruan participated in this research. Most of them are from Pasuruan and Probolinggo. To obtain the data, direct observations, questionnaires, and interviews are applied. Direct observations are done to 'obtain a better, more substantive picture of reality; a richer, more complete array of symbols and a means of verifying the participants' perceptions in using *sampeyan* and *anda* (Berg, 1989, p. 4). Direct observation also allows a comprehensive description of the naturally occurring conversation (e.g. Saville-Troike, 1989, 2003; Patton, 1990; Silverman, 2001; McNeill, 2006). Patton (1990) highlights five significant points which need to be considered when carrying out observations: (1) the role of the observer, (2) the focus of the observations, (3) the observer's role in relation to others, (4) the purpose of observations, and (5) the duration of observations.

Questionnaire is administered to obtain a more comprehensive picture of the issues explored in this study. The first part of questionnaire asks for the participants'

personal details. The second part asks the participants' reasons for using *sampeyan* and *anda* in certain situations.

Semi-structured interview is also used to obtain more in-depth explanations about (1) the rationale for the participants to use *sampeyan* and *anda* (2) to check and confirm the answers given by the participants in the questionnaires. The interview asks the participants' perceptions when they are using *sampeyan* and *anda* to different people.

The data analysis is based primarily on the research questions of this study. All of the data obtained from observations, questionnaires, and interviews are classified. Particular attention for analysis is paid to the parts of conversations where *sampeyan* and *anda* occurred. The data obtained from the questionnaires are tabulated according to the answers given by the participants. The participants' answers from the questionnaires are presented in the form of percentages to classify the similar and different answers. Finally, the data gathered from the interviews are categorized and analysed according to the evidence found from the observations and the questionnaires. The interview data are very useful to explain the participants' reasons for using *sampeyan* and *anda*, as this information might not have been explicitly stated by the participants in their naturally-occurring conversations.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The discussion of the findings is based primarily on the research question: "what are the pragmatic reasons for the students to use *sampeyan* and *anda* to lecturer/teacher, *kyai*, parent, older sibling?" The use of each of these address terms is discussed separately below.

The pragmatic reasons for the students to use *sampeyan* to lecturer/teacher, *kyai*, parent, and older/ younger sibling.

First of all, it is necessary to observe the number of students' responses in using *sampeyan* to a number of people (see Table 1).

Table 1. The use of *Sampeyan* by the students

No	Addresser	N 40
1	Guru/dosen	N 40
2	Kyai	3
3	Orang tua kandung	14
4	Kakak kandung	25
5	Adik kandung	36
6	Teman lebih tua	17
7	Teman sebaya	34
8	Teman lebih muda	17
9	Orang yang belum dikenal	16
		16

As shown in table 1, the students used *sampeyan* to different people. Some usages of *sampeyan* were used appropriately based on Javanese cultural perspective. For example, it is widely acceptable when *sampeyan* is used to address to older brother/sister, older friend, and sometimes to younger brother/sister and unfamiliar person, but other usages is not so appropriate, for example, when they used it to lecturer/teacher, *kyai*, and parent. The discussion of this regard is presented in more detail in the sections that follows. As table 1 indicates, the highest number of the use of *sampeyan* is given to older sibling (36 participants), which is followed by older friend (34

participants), and parent (25 participants). Meanwhile, the least number is given to lecturer/teacher (3 participants). The reasons why the students used *sampeyan* to those people are (1) to express politeness and (2) to indicate informality.

One of the students argued that he used *sampeyan* to his older friends because he wanted to express a politeness.

Datum 1:

'Saya menggunakan kata sampeyan pada kakak kandung dan teman lebih tua karena bagi saya dua orang tersebut perlu dihormati tapi tidak harus terlalu sopan karena mereka orang yang tidak asing dan interaksi antara saya dan kedua orang itu tidak bersifat formal'.

"I used *sampeyan* to my older brother/sister and older friends because they need to be respected, although it should not be too polite because we know each other and our interaction is informal".

An expression of respect by the students is also delivered to their parent. Most of them claimed that they used *sampeyan* to their parents because they wanted to express a respect:

Datum 2:

Saya menggunakan sampeyan dengan orang-tua kandung karena saya dirumah berbicara dengan bahasa Jawa. Menurut ajaran yang telah diajarkan oleh orang tua saya bahwa kata sampeyan digunakan untuk orang yang lebih tua dan dihormati seperti kepada

orang tua kandung, kakak kandung, dan teman yang lebih tua.

"I use *sampeyan* to my parent because I speak Javanese at home. My parent teaches me to use *sampeyan* for older people. They need to be respected as we respect our own parent, older brother/sister, and older friends".

There are at least two points we can critically analyze from datum 1 and 2: (1) level of perception in using *sampeyan* and (2) practical change in using *sampeyan* from the theory. As presented in datum 1, the participant admitted that he used *sampeyan* to older sibling and older friend to express a respect, but he also realized that the level of a respect he gave should not be too polite because he was already familiar to whom he spoke to and their interaction was informal. The participant argued, as shown in datum 2, that according to his parent the use of *sampeyan* is spoken to older people and its function is to respect them. Using *sampeyan* to older friends was normal, but not to parent. According to Javanese norms and culture, the most appropriate use of address term to parent is *panjenengan*: the highest Javanese level, or generally called *krama inggil*. Some of the students argued that they used *sampeyan* to their parent as an expression of closeness to their parents, and they did not feel awkward to say it to them. The term *panjenengan*, as has been explained earlier, is an honorific form of direct address to parent and is usually accomplished by other *krama inggil*. The participant can still show his affection by using *panjenengan* to his parent. In addition, the participant can also use *bapak* or *ibu* to his parent to show his intimate and affectionate relationship.

The address term *sampeyan* is also associated with a sense of informality. As can be observed from datum 3, the participant claimed that he used *sampeyan* to express a respect to *kyai*. The reason for him to use *sampeyan* in this context is linked to the language used at home: Javanese, where a home is generally associated with informal situation which also affect the use of language.

Datum 3:

“Dengan kyai saya menggunakan sampeyan karena saya menghormati seorang kyai seperti guru atau orang tua saya. Kyai adalah guru mengaji di daerah rumah dan saya berbicara bahasa Jawa jika di rumah, maka saya berbicara dengan kyai menggunakan bahasa Jawa yang sopan dan halus (krama).”

“To *kyai* I use *sampeyan* to respect him, since I regard him as my teacher or as my own parent. *Kyai* is a teacher who teaches me reciting Koran, and I speak to him using refined and polite Javanese”

It can also be said that being *kyai* might be considered informal position, in which the participants’ perception toward *kyai* in using address term is also influenced by such informality. The most appropriate use of address term to lecturer/teacher, *kyai*, and parent is normally *panjenengan*, *Bapak*, or *Pak Yai*. Using *sampeyan* to these people can be regarded impolite. In Javanese culture when speaking to *kyai*, for instance, people usually wait unobtrusively until *kyai* speaks to them. This is because of a sense of *pekéwoh* (feeling awkward). This feeling may occur for the lower class members if, during the conversation, they are spoken to

in *krama* by their interlocutor who is of higher social status. If *krama* is used when *ngoko* is more appropriate, the speaker of lower class will feel *pekéwuh*, and in some circumstances, they may think that they may have done something wrong: for example, if a boss who normally speaks *ngoko* with their employees suddenly begins to speak *madya* or *krama* with them. Similarly, a younger person will feel awkward if they are spoken to in *krama* by an older person or *kyai*, because it does not reflect the normal degree of respect they should receive (Wolff & Poedjosoedarmo, 1982).

The use of *sampeyan* as an expression of respect to younger and older friends, for example, cannot be applied to *kyai* and parent. Parent and *kyai* should be given higher respect than younger or older friends. It would be more appropriate and polite for the students to use *panjenengan* to parent or *kyai*, as also confirmed by one of the students:

“... biasanya saya menggunakan sapaan panjenengan untuk menegaskan bahwasanya saya lebih muda dan untuk menunjukkan rasa hormat saya kepada sang kyai atau ustadz.”

“... usually I use address term *panjenengan* to state that I am younger than *kyai* and to show my respect to him.”

Some participants (14 participants) also admitted that they used *sampeyan* to address to their younger friends. Yet, there was no explanation from the participants as why they did it. However, it can be argued that they used it because they wanted to teach their younger friends politeness, with a hope that they would be respected in return of

sampeyan to which was meant to teach young friends to be polite. Sometimes, young friends will feel more *sungkan* to the addressee. As a result, the addressee will receive more respect from younger friends. *Sungkan* ‘feeling awkward or a feeling of hesitation’ is a feeling of respect or embarrassment from fear or awe of a person of higher status (Wolff & Poedjosoedarmo, 1982).

To younger audience, the students should normally use *kowe* and in some places like Malang and Surabaya people usually use *koen*. Although it is uncommon to use *sampeyan* for younger friend, 16 students stated that they did so. The reason is to respect the audience and at the same time also to teach them to respect the speaker. However, it was unusual or even unacceptable to use *sampeyan* to lecturer/teacher, *kyai*, and parent. Address term *sampeyan* is not the same as *panjenengan*. Normally, *sampeyan* is used as an expression of politeness to older brother/sister, older friend, or sometimes it is used to younger audience where older people are teaching young people to learn how to use Javanese speech levels properly. Address term *sampeyan* is *krama madya* (mid-Javanese speech level), whereas *panjenengan* is *krama inggil* (highest Javanese speech level).

The pragmatic reasons for the students to use *anda* to lecturer/teacher, *kyai*, parent, and older/ younger sibling.

Table 2. The use of *Anda* by the students

No	Addresser	N 40
1	Guru/dosen	33
2	Kyai	9
3	Orang tua kandung	5
4	Kakak kandung	-

5	Adik kandung	2
6	Teman lebih tua	-
7	Teman sebaya	9
8	Teman lebih muda	9
9	Orang yang belum dikenal	36

Unlike the use of *sampeyan*, the address term *anda* was mostly used by the participants to address their teacher or lecturer. As clearly indicated in Table 2, there were 33 participants confirmed this. There are several reasons why they use an address term *anda* to lecturer/teacher, *kyai*, parent, and older sibling: (1) more formal and appropriate manners in environmental education, (2) to respect person of higher social status and older person, (3) more polite and more appropriate than *sampeyan*, and (4) the influence of environmental education and the use of Indonesian as a formal language. Each of these reasons can be observed in detail in datum 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 below.

Datum 4:

“*Saya menggunakan Anda dengan guru/dosen karena lebih resmi dan sesuai dengan tata krama untuk di lingkungan pendidikan.*”

“I use *Anda* to address a teacher or lecturer because it is more formal according to social norms in educational environment.”

Datum 5:

“*Saya menggunakan Anda pada guru/dosen, karena untuk menghargai seseorang yang lebih tua. Walaupun terkadang di dalam perkuliahan ada beberapa dosen yang jauh lebih muda dari*

pada umur kita. Dan mungkin itu lebih sopan.”

“I use *anda* to address a teacher or lecturer because I want to respect older people although sometimes there are several lecturers who are younger, and using *anda* is more polite.”

Datum 6:

‘Penggunaan ‘Anda’ pada guru/dosen karena menurut saya Anda lebih sopan dan pantas ... dari pada memakai bahasa jawa ‘sampeyan.’

“According to me, the use of *anda* to a teacher or lecturer is more polite and appropriate ... than using *sampeyan*.”

Datum 7:

‘Saya menggunakan kata Anda kepada dosen, karena saya menggunakan bahasa Indonesia sebagai bahasa resmi ... dan kata Anda dalam bahasa Indonesia merupakan kata sapaan yang sopan.’

“I use *anda* to a lecturer because it is formal, ... and in Indonesian it is a polite address term.”

Datum 8:

‘Dengan guru/dosen karena beliau berada di ruang lingkup pendidikan yang kita harus berbicara secara formal.’

“I use *anda* to a teacher or lecturer because it is in educational environment in

which we have to speak formally.”

From the participants’ answers, it can be concluded that they use an address term *anda* to either a teacher or a lecturer because they think that it is more polite and formal. Yet, the address term *anda*, according to Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (KBHI), is an address term used in a conversation in which the speaker and listener have somewhat equal level, position, and age. From KBHI perspective, what the participants perceived toward the use of *anda* is the opposite, which means that when it is used to a teacher or a lecturer the address term *anda* is not an expression of politeness and of formality; instead there is a sense of socially equalizing the speakers themselves with the lecturer/teacher. Based on Javanese norms and culture, such usage is not appropriate and impolite. A Javanese proverb ‘*mikul duwur mendhem jero*’ which means young people are advised to respect older people and does not expose their weaknesses, requests young people to always respect older people especially parents, lecturer/teacher.

From the theory of politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987), the use of *anda* in this context can be categorized as following bald-on-record strategy in which a speaker does not make any effort to reduce the impact of the FTA. In this case, the speaker is not concerned whether the interlocutor is embarrassed. The speaker makes the interlocutor feel uncomfortable and shocked by way of disrespecting cultural norms. From the participants’ perspective, they might not realize that the use of *anda* can potentially insult the lecturer/ teacher as they are all Javanese.

From Brown & Gilman’s perspective (1960), the use of *anda* by the participants to

their teacher or lecturer is also inappropriate. As has been mentioned earlier, Brown & Gilman (1960) formulate the type of social relations encoded in language that include social distance or closeness between individuals, or relations of 'power' and 'solidarity'. They propose their theory based on the deictic functions of the second person pronouns *tu* (T) or *vous* (V) in some European languages. The use of *anda* by the participants did not signal relationships of 'power' and 'solidarity' because they were students who spoke to their lecturers. In that situation, their lecturers were more powerful and superior, where 'power' reflects relative superior status, social distance, unfamiliarity, and deference. The use of *anda* by the participants to their lecturer can be associated as T (Brown & Gilman, 1960), establishing the notion of familiarity, non-respect form. Reciprocal use of T by equals expresses solidarity, but between non-equals the giver of T is putting him/herself in a position of power, and the receiver is expected to respond with V. Since between the lecturer and the students are non-equals, the use of *anda* by the students can be said to express solidarity and cannot be regarded as putting themselves in a position of power that requires non-reciprocal use of V implying mutual respect and social distance; any non-reciprocal use of these pronouns is an expression of a differential of power.

However, when the address term *anda* is given by their lecturer to the participants, for example, it may infer 'solidarity' which reflects closeness, familiarity, common experiences and shared intimacies. Brown & Gilman (1960) argue that shared relationship of solidarity or differences in power relationships are reflected in reciprocal or non-reciprocal use of the T/V pronouns in address. Yet, the use of *anda* by the lecturer to the participants does not signal to receive

reciprocal *anda* from the participants (students), instead of receiving an address term *Bapak* (in Indonesian) or *panjenengan* (in Javanese).

In diglossic situations the use of high (H) or low (L) varieties in a given social exchange may be seen as the same kind of T/V situation. The use of *anda* made by the students to their lecturer can be classified as looking their lecturer socially similar (L) to them. The use of L in diglossic context is to express solidarity and may not be offered to speakers whose social position is superior or distant. Similarly H may be the only variety appropriate in a given situation because the use of L would imply a solidarity that is only reserved for members of a particular in-group.

CONCLUSION

Javanese people acknowledge different use of address terms, such as *Bapak*, *Ibu*, *Tuan*, *saudara* (commonly used in both formal and informal situation), and *kowe*, *sampeyan*, and *penjenengan* (commonly used within Javanese context). Their usage normally requires the consideration of social status and relationship. Yet, there has been developing use of *sampeyan* and *anda* which contains different perceptions toward its user. The use of address term *sampeyan* and *anda* as the focus of this study has different meaning and perceptions in Pasuruan. As indicated from the result of this study, the address term *sampeyan* has been used mostly to *kakak kandung*, *teman lebih tua*, *orang tua kandung* respectively as an expression of respect. A surprising finding is obtained when *sampeyan* is also used for *kyai* to express politeness. This claim is in contrast to the Javanese norm in which to speak to *kyai*, common people usually use *penjenengan*.

Another striking data shows that the address term *anda* was mostly used to lecturer/teacher (33) and to *kyai* (9). The address term *anda* was used to express formality, respect, and politeness. However, this usage does not completely follow Javanese norm and culture (Brown & Levinson, 1987, and Brown & Gilman, 1960). All of these theories consider that the use of *sampeyan* and *anda* by the participants violate the norms either from Javanese culture or the principles formulated in those theories.

Thus, the use of *sampeyan* and *anda* by the students in Pasuruan is a special linguistic case which cannot simply be ignored from research activity because it is used absolutely different from the general norm in Javanese society. This result may extend to an inquiry whether it is already establishing social culture? If yes, who is the closest community which builds that culture?

REFERENCES

- Befu, H & Norbeck, E. (1958). Japanese usages of terms of relationship. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 1, pp. 66-86.
- Berg, B. L. (1989). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Sydney: Allyn and Bacon.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1960). The Pronouns of power and solidarity. In P. Giglioli (1972) (Ed.), *Language in social context* (pp. 252-282). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Brown, R & Ford, M. (1961). Address in American English. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 62, pp. 375-85.
- Brown, R. (1965) (Ed). *The Basic Dimensions of Interpersonal Relationship*. *Social Psychology* (pp. 51-100). London: Free Press.
- Chen, T. S. & Shryock, J. K. (1932). Chinese relationship terms. *American Anthropologist*, 4, pp. 623-69.
- Chao, Y. (1956). Chinese terms of address. *Language*, 1, pp. 217-41.
- Gardners-Chloros, P., & Finnis, K. (2003). How code-switching mediates politeness: Gender-related speech among London Greek-Cypriots. *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, 4(2), pp. 505-532.
- Kroger, R., Cheng, K. & Leong, I. (1979). Are the Rules of Address Universal? A Test of Chinese Usage. *Journal of Cross-Cultural psychology*, 4 pp. 395-414
- Kroger, R. O. & Wood, L.A., Kim, U. (1984). Are the rules of address universal? III: Comparison of Chinese, Greek and Korean Usage. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 3, pp. 273-84.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness; or minding your p's and q's. *Paper from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 8, 292-305.
- McNeill, P. & Chapman, S. (2006). *Research methods (3rd Edition)*. London: Routledge.
- Parkinson, D. B. (1985). *Constructing the Social Context of Communication: Terms of Address in Egyptian Arabic*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. London: Sage.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1989). *The ethnography of communication. An introduction (2nd Edition)*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Saville-Troike, M. (2003). *The ethnography of communication. An introduction (3rd Edition)*. New York: Blackwell.

- Slobin, D. I. (1963). Some aspects of the use of pronouns of address in Yiddish.
- Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analysing talk, text, and interaction*. California: Sage.
- Wang, J. (2003). A Comparative Analysis for Sino-English Appellation of Social Intercourse. *Journal of Harbin University*, 8. pp. 48-50.
- Wardhaugh. R. (2002). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Wolff, J. U., & Poedjosoedarmo, S. (1982). *Communicative codes in central Java*. Linguistics series VIII. Southeast Asia Program, Department of Asian Studies, New York: Cornell University, Itacha.
- Zhou, X. (1998). The comparison of terms of address between Chinese and American English. *Journal of Guangdong Education College*, 1, pp. 88-92.