

**THE USE OF ADDRESS FORMS AND POLITENESS IN
INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION**

E R N I

Program Study Magister Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris

Universitas Mataram

Ernimissbima_84@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The aims of this research are to know the types of address forms in intercultural communication, what address forms are dominantly used and what factors motivating their use. This research was conducted in Mataram area. The participants were focused on those who are originally Sasak and Bimanese living in Mataram for years. Observation and recording were techniques used in getting the data. It was found that six (6) types of address forms were used in intercultural communication, 1. Personal pronouns (53%); 2. Kinship (kinship only, kinship plus occupation, kinship plus title and kinship plus nick name) (25%); 3. Personal names (Full name and nick name) (13%); 4. Title terms (title only/ title of occupation, title of rank, title of religious and other titles) (5%); 5. No-naming/zero address terms (4%); and 6. Third person's name marker (1%). Most of address forms used were Indonesian address forms. It could be seen from the data findings in 5 (five) types of address forms (proper/personal names were excluded). The findings showed, address forms in Indonesian were found in personal pronouns for 85%, kinship terms were 44%, titles were 76%, no-naming/zero address terms were 17% and third person's name markers were 17%. The data research also showed the two main factors motivating the use of address forms were social status (religious status) and educational level, and the two factors were closely related to politeness.

Key word: Address Forms, Politeness, Culture, Intercultural Communication

ABSTRAKSI

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui jenis-jenis bentuk kata dan tutur sapaan dalam komunikasi antar budaya, bentuk kata dan tutur sapaan yang dominan digunakan dan faktor-faktor apa yang mempengaruhi penggunaannya. Penelitian ini dilakukan di Kota Mataram. Partisipan difokuskan pada orang asli Sasak dan Bima yang tinggal di kota Mataram selama bertahun-tahun. Tehnik pengumpulan data penelitian adalah dengan pengamatan dan rekaman. Pada penelitian ini ditemukan terdapat enam (6) tipe bentuk kata dan tutur sapaan yang digunakan dalam komunikasi antar budaya. 1. Kata ganti (53%); 2. Tutur sapaan kekerabatan (25%); 3. Nama (13%); 4. Sapaan jabatan/titel (5%); 5. Tutur sapa tanpa nama (4%); dan 6. Afiksasi pada nama orang ketiga (1%). Bentuk kata dan tutur sapaan yang dominan digunakan adalah bentuk kata dan tutur sapaan dalam bahasa Indonesia. Hal itu ditunjukkan dari hasil penelitian, 85% dari kata ganti menggunakan bahasa Indonesia, 44% bentuk kata/tutur sapaan kekerabatan, 76% digunakan dalam kata/tutur sapaan jabatan/titel, 17% digunakan dalam tutur sapaan tanpa nama, dan 17% digunakan pada afiksasi nama orang ketiga. Data penelitian juga menunjukkan dua (2) faktor utama yang mempengaruhi penggunaan kata dan tutur sapaan dalam komunikasi antar budaya adalah sosial status (status keagamaan seseorang) dan tingkat pendidikan, dan kedua faktor ini sangat berkaitan erat dengan tingkat kesopanan sehingga mempengaruhi bentuk kata dan tutur sapaan yang ditujukan pada seseorang.

Kata Kunci: Kata Sapaan, Kesopanan, Budaya, Komunikasi Antar Budaya

A. INTRODUCTION

Individuals use language to communicate with each other for transactional or interpersonal communication. Language as a tool of communication is not only in verbal but also non-verbal.

Different cultures, languages and societies have various linguistic features, strategies and attitudes in intra-cultural and cross-cultural communication. The intensive communication among people from different cultural background has raised to the misperception phenomenon. Misperception is not only related to the language use, but also the cultural background reflected in someone's behavior.

One phenomenon that is raised in this article is about address forms and its relation to politeness. The use of address forms in every culture is addressed differently. Address forms are words or expressions used by an interlocutor to show his/her identity and reference. For example: the use of personal pronouns in some cultures, German (*Du, Sie*), French (*Tu, Vous*), Italian (*Tu, Lei/lei*), Indonesian (*Kamu, Anda*), Javanese (*Kowe, Panjenengan*), Sasak (*Kemu/Kamu, Side/pelungguh*) and Bima (*Nggomi, Ita*).

The different use of addressing address forms to someone determines the relationship among the addresser, addressee and the third party. Brown and Gilman (1960) are those who claimed that the two dimensions used as the consideration in addressing people with different forms are influenced by power and solidarity. These two dimensions can be found in the use of address forms in every interaction.

Misperception might occur in communication if the address forms are

addressed inappropriately. So that, this phenomenon becomes so important because of multi cultural community in Indonesia.

West Nusa Tenggara is one of the provinces in Indonesia which is a multicultural community, inhabited by three major ethnics; those are Sasak, Samawa and Mbojo or Bimanese ethnics. As the researcher have explained that different cultures, might have different languages, and address forms specifically. This phenomenon was motivated by social cultural values of each culture and the stratification level in the community.

The research was limited to two main ethnics, Sasak and Bimanese. Sasak ethnic has some varieties in language, so do the address forms. Traditionally, Sasak language has been classified into five dialects, *ngenó-ngené* (central west coast and central east to north east coast), *menó-mené* (around Praya, central Lombok), *ngetó-ngeté* (around Suralaga and Sembalun), *kutó-keté* (around Bayan, north part of the island), *meriaq meriku* (south central area around Bonjeruk, Sengkol and Pujut) (Mahyuni, 2006,p. 1). While, In Bima, the language is divided into four main dialects based on the level in phonology and lexicon, i.e. Serasuba, Wawo, Kolo and Kore (Mahsun, 2006).

The example of miscommunication that commonly happens in a multiethnic community as the researcher has observed in Sasak and Bimanese people was the use of address form of 'you' or *kamu* in Indonesian. For Bimanese people, addressing other people with *kamu* (you) to those who cannot speak Bimanese is normal because *kamu* is the national language and must be understood by Indonesian people and also has no stratification level. But, the case might be different, if the address form *kamu* (you) is

addressed to Sasak people. Addressing people with *kamu* (you) in Sasak community can be considered as impolite. For Sasak people the word *kamu* (you) is regarded as anger or degradation to someone else. In order to avoid misperception among the interlocutors in a multicultural community, the researcher did this research as one of the solution for this case. In this research, the researcher found out the characters of the people from different cultural backgrounds, then observed the way of their interaction, described the types of address forms in those communities, categorized the dominant uses of address forms in these communities and explained the factors affecting the differences.

In this research, there were three (3) problems that needed to be solved. People from different cultures were difficult to distinguish which address forms are classified into polite or impolite ones. This main problem arises because the understanding about being polite or impolite could be defined differently. As Leech (1980:19) defines politeness is “strategic conflict avoidance” and the establishment and maintenance of comity, and he suggests that it “can be measured in terms of the degree of effort put into the avoidance of the conflict situation”.

Through this research, it was hoped to find out the dominant address forms were used in two different cultures between Bimanese and Sasak communities. This research was also aimed to find out the factors motivating the use of address forms among interlocutors in intercultural communication.

The misperception might be faced by a new comer of different cultures communicate with the other one. The misperception won't happen if the interlocutors have known the cultural

background of his or her partner of speaking.

In recent years, Studies about the use of address forms and its connection to politeness have been conducted by some researchers such as Kurokawa (1972); Matsumoto (1988); Syahdan (1996); Mahyuni (2006); Yang (2010); and Leech (2014). Those studies were all about the variety of address form use in some different cultures. The related study about address forms was a study that was conducted by Agha (1994). His review becomes very important because honorific shared intersubjectively codes of behavior of each society. His review study about honorific phenomena consists of some types, including honorific pronouns and terms of address, politeness in language use, and honorific register. Honorific is needed in communication to avoid some inappropriateness codes among interactants. The use of honorific is not only among single society but will be very essential in communicating among cross culture community.

The most affecting framework for the research about pronominal can be found in some literature such as in Brown and Gilman (1960) entitled power and solidarity model of the pronominal usage. In this study, Brown and Gilman's theory appraises the historical development in the usage of the well known two-way pronominal contrast in European languages, for example the T form (French *tu*, Russian *ty*, German *du*) and the V form (French *vous*, Russian *vy*, German *Sie*). These two kinds of form in addressing people in some countries such as those mentioned here have the same semantic meaning. However, in the usage, those are applied differently in which T form is used to express informality which refers to the singular, while V-form is usually plural-marked and used to express politeness and

formality. The dissimilar usage of those address forms in interaction is influenced by power and solidarity that apply in some countries.

Power is an inherently asymmetric relation, the ability of one individual “to control the behavior of the other”, (Brown and Gilman, 1960, p. 255). This power is marked by nonreciprocal usage of pronoun forms. While solidarity is an inherently symmetric relation, based on the likeness of both individuals by membership in the same social group, such as family, religion, school, or profession, resulting in reciprocal usage. In other words, the balance in power will create the reciprocal pronominal usage or V-V or T-T, but if the power is imbalanced, the powerful speaker will receive V from the lower class speaker T form, or we call it an non-reciprocal usage.

Brown and Gilman (1960) argue that the attitude of the people has already changed, so do the two dimensions of power and solidarity, in which solidarity semantic has prevailed over the power semantic. The widespread of egalitarianism among European countries is said to be the factor of this shifting. However, this condition (solidarity prevailed over power) may apply temporarily.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

The research was conducted in qualitative method and ethnography approach. The researcher used ethnography approach because it was related to cultural background and the data obtained must be as natural as possible. The researcher did observation and recording in collecting the data. The data were transcribed into data text. After getting the data text, the researcher identified, classified, described and explained the data needed.

The total of participants in this research was 30. The participants were those who are living in Mataram for years. Background of the participants were also various, they come from different cultures, education levels, ages, etc. The researcher took the recordings by mobile recording application. This application was chosen to be used because it was simpler and eased the researcher in getting the natural data. In getting the natural data recordings, the researcher took the data without informing the participants, the researcher told them after getting the data and the researcher skipped the personal conversation and kept their names anonymous. In this research, the site was conducted in around Mataram city. The researcher was as one of the participants and also observer. The minimum duration of the recording was one hour. The focus of the research in the conversations was only limited to the use of address forms by the speaker, addressee and the third party in their communication. The total of recordings depending on the data needed.

The data were collected through two techniques, observation and recording. In this research, the participants and the sites were chosen freely, as long as the participants are originally Sasak and Bimanese people. There were four steps in analyzing the data. The first was identification, The researcher identified the address forms through color coding. The different colors coded the types of the address forms.

The second step in this research was classification. The address forms were classified based on the types through color coding. Then, the researcher counted and percentage the total of each type of address forms. The aim in counting it was to find the dominant address forms used in the recordings.

The next step was description. The researcher described the type of address forms based on the recorded data. Then described some address forms used based on the recording. And then the researcher described the address forms based on the example which were taken from the recordings.

The last step in this data analysis was explanation. In this step, the researcher explained the factors that influence the use of address forms in intercultural communication. The factors affecting the use of address forms could be seen through the types of address forms which were addressed.

C. FINDINGS

Based on the data finding and data analysis, there were 1,027 or 10 % address forms in different languages of 10.798 corpus. Several languages were found in data finding such as Indonesian , Sasak, Arabic, Loan word (borrowing words), Bimanese, Javanese, Sundanese, Malay, Dutch, and English.

Types of address forms	Frequency (f)	Language
Personal Pronouns:		
• 1 st singular person		
Saya	254	Indonesian
Aku/ku	13	Indonesian
Tiang	6	Sasak
Mada	1	Bimanese
• 2 nd singular person		
Side/de	54	Sasak
Anda	1	Indonesian
Kemu		
Ente	1	Sasak
Pelinggih	1	Arabic
Loe	1	Sasak
Kamu/mu	2	Chinese
You	5	Indonesian
Situ	9	English
Nggomi	1	Slang lang.
• 3 rd singular person		
Dia	2	Bimanese

• 1 st plural person	136	Indonesian
Kami		
Kita	2	Indonesian
• 2 nd plural person	49	Indonesian
kalian	1	Indonesian
Total	540	
Kinship terms:		
• Kinship only		
<i>Ummi/mi</i>	8	Arabic
<i>Ummi' /mi'</i>	7	Loan word
<i>Ibu/bu</i>	5	Indonesian
<i>Ibu' /bu'</i>	9	Loan word
<i>Mama'</i>	1	Loan word
<i>Bapak/pak</i>	24	Indonesian
<i>Mamiq</i>	1	Sasak
<i>amaq</i>	1	Sasak
<i>Abah/bah</i>	44	Arabic
<i>Ayah</i>	3	Indonesian
<i>Ponaan</i>	1	Loan word
<i>Paman</i>	1	Indonesian
<i>Om</i>	3	Indonesian
<i>Abang/bang</i>	4	Melayu
<i>Mbak</i>	11	Javanese
<i>Kakak/kak</i>	15	Indonesian
<i>Adek/dek</i>	4	Indonesian
<i>ariq</i>	1	Sasak
<i>Senine</i>	3	Sasak
<i>Istri</i>	6	Indonesian
<i>Suami</i>	3	Indonesian
<i>papuq</i>	1	Sasak
<i>Anak</i>	6	Indonesian
<i>Anaq</i>	1	Sasak
• Kinship + occupation		
Pak guru	1	Indonesian
• Kinship + title		
Pak ustadz	1	Indonesian
• Kinship + nick name		
Mbak + NN	2	
Om + NN	15	
Bang + NN	24	
Pak + NN	2	
Kang + NN	11	
Kak + NN	1	
Dek + NN	1	
Bu' + NN		
Total	256	
Personal names:		
• Nick name	116	-
• Full name	18	-

Total	134	
Titles:		
• Title only		
<i>Ustadz</i>	5	Arabic
<i>Polisi</i>	3	Indonesian
<i>Guru</i>	1	Indonesian
<i>Ibu rumah tangga</i>	1	Indonesian
<i>Honorer</i>	1	
<i>Broker</i>	2	Loan word
<i>Tukang sate</i>	1	Loan word
<i>Mahasiswa</i>	7	Indonesian
<i>Perampok</i>	1	Indonesian
<i>Pejabat</i>	1	Indonesian
<i>Calo</i>	1	Indonesian
<i>Mc</i>	1	Indonesian
<i>Dosen</i>	2	Indonesian
<i>Dokter</i>	4	English
<i>Preman</i>	1	Indonesian
• Title of rank	1	Indonesian
<i>Pengurus</i>		Indonesian
<i>Anggota</i>		
<i>Bendahara</i>	1	Indonesian
<i>Wakil sekretaris</i>	2	Indonesian
<i>Pengawas</i>	2	Indonesian
<i>Kaprodi</i>	1	Indonesian
<i>Sekretaris</i>	1	Indonesian
<i>Provos</i>	1	Indonesian
• Other titles & (endearment & derogation)	1	Indonesian
<i>Say (sayang)</i>	1	Indonesian
<i>Cin (cinta)</i>		Indonesian
<i>Sumpret</i>		Indonesian
<i>Setan</i>	1	Sasak
• Title of religious + NN	3	Indonesian
<i>Tuan + NN</i>	1	
<i>Tuan Sapi'i</i>	1	Sasak
Total	49	
No-naming (Φ)		
Assalamualaikum	14	Arabic
Walaikum salam	16	Arabic
Hai	2	Indonesian
hallo	4	Indonesian
Total	36	
3 rd person's NN marker		
• si + phisycal appearance		

si + kecil	2	Indonesian
• Name marker + NN		
<i>Loq + NN (male)</i>		
Loq fat	1	Sasak
Loq rom	1	
Loq angga	1	
Loq hul	2	
Loq andre	2	
<i>Leq + NN (female)</i>		
Leq ria	1	Sasak
<i>La + NN (fe/male)</i>	1	
La isti	1	Bimanese
La feri		
Total	12	

According to the data findings above, address forms in this research could be divided into six (6) types: personal pronouns (53%), kinship terms (25%), personal names (13%), titles (5%), no-naming/zero address terms (4%) and third person's nick name marker (1%).

The findings also showed that in all types of address forms, address forms in Indonesian were dominantly used. 461 address forms or 85% were Indonesian personal pronouns, Sasak 62 (11%) personal pronouns, and followed by English 9 (2%) address forms, Bimanese 6 (1%) address forms and the rest was Chinese and Arabic for 2 (0%) and 1 (0%) address forms. The example of personal pronouns in conversation.

H: **side** sudah berapa lama disana mbak Y?

‘ how long have **you** already been there sister Y?’

E: kan **dia** tinggal sama **saya**, sudah berapa bulan Y?

She lives with **me**, how many months Y?

‘she lives with me, doesn't she, how month is already Y?’

H: kalau **side** pulang gmana?

How if **you** go back home?

E: buka langsung, buka kos-kosan
'directly open for rooming house rental'
Y: dari
Agustus

'since August'

The use of personal pronoun is in sasak and Indonesian languages. The use of *side* (you) is the polite form in addressing someone in sasak community. H addresses *side* (you) to both of Y and E, because E and Y are older than H. while E addresses herself by *saya* (I) and *dia* (she) for Y in Indonesian language.

In Kinship terms, Indonesian terms were also dominantly used. 72 (44%) terms were Indonesian, Arabic terms were 52 (32%), Loan words/borrowing words were 18 (11%), Javanese, Sasak and Malay were 11(7%), 8 (5%) and 4 (2%) terms. The example of kinship address terms in conversation.

E: *mamiq* gimana kabarnya?
'How is your father?'
H: sudah sehat, lagi belajar jalan-jalan,
belajar ngomong
'he is already fine, trying to walk, trying to speak'
E: oh
Oh
'oh'
H: kalau jalan bisa dia pake tongkat
'He can walk by using stick'

Data showed the use of Sasak kinship term by a non family member. The use of *mamiq* (father) is addressed by a non family member and non sasak people has different meaning when the address form is addressed by a family member and sasak people. For non-sasak people the use of address form *Mamiq* (father) is only as a call name, because most of people call the man by that name. On the other hand, *mamiq* is a call for a father who has done

pilgrimage to Mecca and this call as a polite and respect form given by the society in some part in Lombok.

Indonesian address forms were also found dominantly in titles term. 37 or 76% are titles in Indonesian. Titles in Arabic were 5 (10%), and then followed by loan /borrowing words, Sasak and English for 3 (6%), 2 (4%) and 2 (4%). The example of title terms in Indonesian

H: aman disana mbak Y?
'is there safe sister Y?'
Y: Alhamdulillah aman
'thanks god everything is safe'
H: disini juga aman, ada *polisi* yang tinggal di pojok sana.
'here also is safe, there is a *policeman* who lives in the corner over there.'

In data above, the use of some titles such as policeman, doctor, professor is commonly used as address forms. But not all titles can be addressed to someone. H tells Y that his neighborhood is safe, and one of his neighbors is a policeman.

In no-naming/zero address forms, Arabic was mostly used, 30 or (83%) address forms. While Indonesian was 6 or (17%) address forms. The example in conversation:

E: hai, waalaikum salam...ais kayaknya udah janjian ya bercukur?

'hi, waalaikum salam, wow, it seems you both have promised to have a new hair cut

W: iya
'yes'
E: oh..begono
'oh, I see'
A: assalamualaikum
'assalamualaikum'
E: waalaikum salam
'waalaikum salam'

Data showed the use of no name address forms such as *hai* (hi) and *Assalamualaikum* (greeting in Arabic). These two address forms are usually addressed to someone who has known before or can be addressed to a stranger or new acquaintances. These two address forms are neutral, can be used in formal and informal situation.

And the last type of address forms was found Sasak 8 (67%), Indonesian 2 (17%) and Bimanese 2 (17%). The use of third person's name marker could be seen in the conversation below:

U: M, *sai leq bale meq to no? tiang ngaroq sembahyang*
 'M, who stay in your house there? I want to pray'
 M: *loq hul* bareng *loq Andre*
 'There are Hul and Andre'

In data above, U asked M whether M's house is empty or not. And M answered that there were two friends of him. He called his two friends with prefix *loq* (prefix preceded nick name) plus nick name. The use of *loq* is addressed to a male, while *laq* for female. These terms are usually used for third person. The use of this prefix depends on the relationship among those people. They address someone who has intimacy relationship with them, not based on the age.

From all types of address forms could be concluded that Indonesian address forms were used dominantly in intercultural communication.

Most of address forms are dominated by Indonesian forms. The use of *saya* (I) as the first personal pronoun is considered as the safest form in conversation. Because *saya* (I) has no defined level of speech, so it is possible for people to communicate even to a stranger. But, this form is little bit uncommon to be addressed to children.

Side/de (you, sasak) as the second pronoun is more preferred to be used in conversation rather than *kamu* (you, Indonesian). Although both of the forms were allowed, but *side/de* (you, sasak) is more polite than *kamu* (you, Indonesian). The consideration of politeness is important because when we talking to a person from different cultures, we have to consider the politeness rather than the literal meaning.

25% or 256 terms of kinship were used in intercultural interaction. The terms in intercultural communication as the data finding above was not merely related to the semantic/literal meaning, For example, the terms *ummi* (mother, Arabic), *ibu* (mother, Indonesian) *bapak/pak* (father, Indonesian), *abah* (father, arabic), *bang* (older brother, melayu) and *mbak* (older sister, Javanese). Mahyuni (2006) states "the compound terms *inaq-amaq* 'mother-father' refers not only to the mother and father in their literal sense; the mother or the father of a particular ego, but rather as an idiom to express solidarity".

The choice in using unrestricted sense in addressing someone was because the effect of social status, in this case could be specified to religious status of someone (not the wealth measurement) and educational level. The more educated, the more polite the address forms were used, the more religious, the more respectful address forms were addressed.

D. CONCLUSION

The total of corpus in all recordings is about 10.798. Ten (10) percents or 1.029 of the corpus are address forms. There are six (6) types of address forms found in this research, 1. Personal pronoun, 2. Kinship (kinship only, kinship plus occupation, kinship plus title and kinship plus nick

name), 3. Personal names (full name & nick name), 4. Title terms (title only/ title of occupation, title of rank, title of religious and other titles), 5. No-naming/zero address terms and 6. Third person's name marker. The percentage of the address forms of each type is various.

The percentage of personal pronoun is 53 % of the total of address forms. The percentage of kinship terms is about 25 % of the total of address forms. 13 % of the total of address forms is personal name which consist of full name and nick name. The percentage for titles, no-naming and third person's name marker sequentially are 5%, 4% and 1%.

The data findings showed that the dominant use of address forms in this research is the use of personal pronoun (53%) especially, Indonesian address forms (personal pronouns (85%), kinship terms (44%), titles (76%), no-naming/zero address terms (17%) and third person's name marker (17%). And the second dominant use of address forms is kinship terms (25%). Those two address forms are mostly used in daily interaction. It could be concluded that Indonesian address forms were mostly used in intercultural communication.

Social status and educational level were two main factors motivated the use of address forms in intercultural communication, while age has less impact in affecting the choice of address forms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agha, Asif. 1994. Honorification. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23:277-302.
- Brown, R., and Gilman, A. 1960. The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity. In T. A. Sebeok (ed.) *Style in Language* 253-276.. Cambridge, MA:MIT Press.
- Kurokawa, Shozo. 1972. "Japanese terms of address: some usages of the first and second person pronouns", *papers in Japanese linguistics* 1:228-238.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1980. *Explorations in Semantics and Pragmatics*. Amsterdam. Benjamins.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 2014. *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mahsun. 2006. *Distribusi dan Pemetaan Varian-Varian Bahasa Mbojo*. Mataram. Gama Media.
- Matsumoto, Y. 1988. Reexamination of the universality of face: politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of pragmatics* 12:403-426.
- Mahyuni. 2006. *Speech Styles and Cultural Consciousness in Sasak Community*. Mataram: Yayasan Cerdas.
- Syahdan. 1996. *Sasak-Indonesia Code Switching*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Arizona: University of Arizona.
- Yang, Xiaomei. 2010. Address forms of English: rules and variations. *Journal of language teaching and research*, Vol. 1, No.5, pp. 743-745.