

CHAPTER I

I N T R O D U C T I O N

1.1. BACKGROUND

The encoding of social distinctions is related to participant-roles, particularly aspects of social relationship holding between speakers and addressees or speakers and some referents. In many languages, distinction of fine gradation between the relative ranks of speaker and addressee is systematically encoded throughout, for example, regularly encoded in choosing terms of address in daily usage. Thus, terms of address can be seen as another instance of the way which a speaker locates himself in his social world when he speaks.

There are many terms of address to refer to second person singular used by the population of the research. They could be personal pronouns such as *kau, kamu, anda, saudara, kon, awakmu, panjenengan* or titles and personal names; kin terms of address such as *Bapak, Ibu*; demonstrative deixis and zero (implied) second person personal pronoun. These can raise problems in usage, because sometimes in language acquisition the kinds of reference are not clearly distinguished. It seems that language often encourages, or even forces, us to define our relations with what we talk

about and whom we talk to. Therefore, to study the usage of terms of address is an interesting subject matter.

The interesting thing about such terms of address is their close association with two dimensions fundamental to the analysis of all social life - the dimensions of power and solidarity. Every language might be expected to have some way of signalling differences in either power or solidarity or both, which could be explained by reference to the importance of both power and solidarity in relation between individuals.

The brilliant work of Brown and Gilman (1960) which initiated the recent wave of studies of address system was on a study of the term T and term V for the second person pronouns in European languages. In Brown's and Gilman's paper *The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity* (1960), it was explained that the European development of two singular pronouns of address began with the Latin *vos* and *tu* (in Italian they become *voi* and *tu*, in France *vous* and *tu*, in Spanish *vos* and *tu*, etc). These languages have two forms for 'you'; one is for people who deserve deference either because their social station is above the speaker or because the speaker does not have a sufficiently close personal relationship with them. The other one is used for people who are either close to the speaker, or of lesser social

standing. English speaker first used thou and ye and later replaced ye with you. As a convenience, Brown and Gilman proposed to use symbols T (from Latin tu) as generic destination for familiar or intimacy and the symbol V (from Latin vos) for a polite terms of address. They found that the use of deferential pronoun V and familiar pronoun T were governed by two forces, which they called power and solidarity. Power derives from higher social status and solidarity comes from intimacy and shared-fate. According to them, European dual second person pronoun system originally expressed power primarily and solidarity secondarily. Now, solidarity dominates power as the semantic sense that is most important in selecting T and V.

Although solidarity has succeeded power as the dominant semantic in French, German and Italian and the basis for solidarity seems to be broadening for speakers of all three languages, speakers of these three languages seemed to pick out different factors as the favoured bases for solidarity. For example, family relationships were more likely to lead to mutual T for German speakers, while 'shared-fate' (such as being fellow students or fellow countrymen abroad) appeared to be more important for French speaker. Italian speakers said they would use mutual T within the family to almost the same extent as German speakers would, and

surpassed even the French in their willingness to use T on the basis of camaraderie. Therefore, the writer has become interested in knowing the factors' underlying the favored bases for solidarity in the population of her research.

Some scholars have followed up Brown's and Gilman's research. While the broad outlines of Brown's and Gilman's analysis seem to be valid, some refinements seem to be necessary. Lambert and Tucker (1976) analyzed a mass of survey data from French speaking communities in French, Canada and also Spanish communities in Puerto Rico and Columbia. Bates and Benigni (1975) conducted their research on Italian in Rome. Those works make it clear that the application of the power and solidarity semantics can vary substantially not only from language to language, but from one community where the language is spoken to another, and for one social grouping to another in the same community.

The writer prefers to use their work to support the idea of asymmetrical - symmetrical relation of terms T and V. In Bahasa Indonesia, we find that terms of address for second person singular are more unique, because in addition to the two terms tu (T for examples : kamu, kau) and vos (V for examples: saudara, bapak, ibu), there is another neutral pronoun anda which is equal to you. The writer proposes to use the symbol TMV for this category. Realizing this fact, she becomes even more interested in studying this topic.

According to Brown and Gilman a norm for the pronominal and verbal expression of power compels a continuing coding of power. A norm for titles and names permits power to go uncoded in most discourses. The writer is also interested in studying terms of address variabilities. The dimension of power in these variabilities goes uncoded, such as multiple names, titles, cases of borrowings, mixing and switching, avoidance pattern, regional dialect.

Many studies have been done in different varieties of language about address forms by foreign writers. There are a great number of doctoral dissertations describing them in details for one or another language - sometimes throughout its history (Gedike, 1974; Grand, 1930; Johnston, 1904; Schliebitz, 1886) and sometimes for the work of particular author (Byrne, 1936; Fay, 1920). Friederich (1960) gave a description of the nineteenth century rules of Russian gentry. The address system of American English in particular has been analyzed by Brown and Ford (1961/1964) and by Ervin-Tripp (1972). Brown and Levinson (1987), have been complemented by an extensive comparative literature concerning politeness universals. Address systems are studied by Braun (1988), and pronoun system by Muhlhausler and Harre (1990). Asian system of address have been described recently. The pioneering work of Howell (1962) explained about Korean system and Geoghegan (1971) described

the naming system of the speaker of Bisayan, a Philippine language. A considerable amount of data is now available enabling the writer to extend and refined parts of Brown's and Gilman's hypotheses in accordance with materials of the object study in her research. It is to this literature that the present study aims to make a contribution.

Many studies have been done by Indonesian writers such as *Penelitian Bentuk Sapaan Bahasa Jawa Dialek Jawa Timur* (1986) by Departement of Education and Culture, *Bentuk Penuh dan Bentuk Singkat Sapaan Bahasa Jawa Dialek Malang* by Aminuddin (1983) which is limited only in Malang area. However, as far as the writer knows a study about address terms in a certain institution related with power and solidarity social dimension and their variabilities has not been done. A final test in this kind of analysis would be to see an institution as a permanent field of people, space, relative to the kinds of conversation that the moral order of the institution permits (P Muhlhausler and R. Harre 1990, p.30). It becomes another reason why she would like to know more about address term used in the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences Airlangga University Surabaya by analysing them through Sociolinguistic approach.

1.2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The writer tries to find out possible answers to the

following problems :

1. How are terms of address related with dimension power and solidarity used in social interaction at the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Airlangga University ?
2. Are there any dynamic variations in the usage of terms of address at the faculty ?

1.3. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

This study is intended to give clear description how terms of address are used in social interaction. The writer would limit her research in applying and developing Brown's and Gilman's research about semantic meaning of term V and T.

1.4. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Through this study, the writer will prove that linguistic behaviors particularly the use of terms of address is influenced, directly or indirectly, by social background in which language operates. The writer hopes that it will prove useful to comprehend our appreciation of the nuances of language.

1.5. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Language is a part of society and personal activity (Parera, 1977:19). In Sociolinguistic perspective, the term 'language' will not simply be understood merely as a system

of arbitrary vocal symbols by which thought is conveyed from one human being to another as Hughes had defined it, but language is related to its broad social aspect. Furthermore, Trudgill (1974:27) maintained that both physical and social environments of a given speech community may (and usually) do influence the structure of vocabularies and lexicons of their language. Furthermore, Trudgill said that a language may have certain social function to its (native) speaker, that is to say as a group identification and a group solidarity.

The fundamental sociolinguistic question is posed by the need to understand why anyone say anything (Labov, 1970) and answer to the question who speaks (or writes) what language (or what language variety) to whom and when and to what end ? (Fishman, 1965). Accordingly, a number of recent studies have addressed themselves to the problem of how factors in the social environment of speech events delimit the range and condition of the selection of message forms (Coklin, 1959; Brown and Gilman, 1960; Ervin-Trip, 1964, 1967; Friederich, 1966).

A variety of language can be understood as the presence of one or more specific characteristics differentiating one variety of language to other language or varieties of language. Fishman (1972:4) implied that the existence of

language variety in any speech community is common linguistic phenomenon. Trudgill (1974 :103) stated that variety of language is influenced by a speaker's social characteristics and also by the social context :

Language, in other words, varies not only according to the social characteristics of the speaker (such as his social class, ethnic group, age and sex) but also according to the social context in which he finds himself. The speaker uses different linguistic varieties in different situations and for different purposes.

The standard variety of language is most likely to be the variety that stands for the nation as a whole and for its most excited institutions of government, education and high culture in general. It is this variety which helps unite individuals who do not constitute an interaction network into symbolic speech community (Fishman, 1975).

The social situation here will be defined in accordance to Goffman (in Giglioli, 1977: 63) :

I would define a social situation as an environment of mutual monitoring possibilities, anywhere within which an individual will find himself accessible to the naked sense of all others who are 'present', and similarly find themselves accessible to him. According to this definition, a social situation arises whenever two or more individuals find themselves in one another's immediate presence, and it lasts until the next to last person leaves.

In any situation linguistic choices will generally reflect the influence of one or more of the following components ; participants (who is talking to), setting (the

social context of the interaction), topic (what is being talked about) and function (why are they speaking).

A social situation may be a formal or an informal one, and it needs, therefore, to consider what is meant by either a formal or informal social situation. The degree of formality here will be based on the formality or informality of the social context itself. It will, thus, not be based on linguistic factors because, as Trudgill said (1974: 110), it is very difficult to define formality in a definitive sense from linguistic perspective, that is to say from the degree of the formality of language itself. For the purpose of this study, the writer defines a formal social situation as occasions which are typified or characterized at least by the two following factors :

1. The participant has awareness of his or her intentional purpose in attending or taking part in such social gathering. It can also be that the social gathering itself is consciously arranged or planned for social, cultural or even official purposes.
2. It is a fact that all participants possess a relative understanding concerning the social or cultural norms governing the participants' behaviors in a given context.

As logical consequence, an informal social context may be

understood as occasions which are attended by the participants spontaneously or accidentally (in the sense that participants have no planned purposes), and there will relatively be no such cultural or official norms governing their behaviors.

The writer should supplement the definition of communication, with the hope that the classroom model serves as the representative form for the ideal speech situation. Peter Mühlhäusler and Rom Harré (1990: 23) define communication as :

Our definition of communication is : two or more people stand in a communication relation if the join product of their displayed intentions in uttering and their uptake in hearing one or more speech-acts affords for each a common basis for relatively co-ordinated actions.

Brown and Gilman condense an ocean of grammar into a drop of algebra. Their algebra of asymmetry and symmetry in forms of address, is created by the use of letters T and V, taken from the Latin imperial convention of addressing the emperor as Vos and every one else as Tu (P. Muhlhausler and R. Harre, 1990 : 135). The symmetry is for reciprocal uses of T and V, and asymmetry is for the giving or receiving of T and V when one has been the recepiet of T and V. Thus, T represents any address terms of condescension, intimacy and familiarity, while V represents any address terms of respect, politeness and formality. They found that the use

of familiar T and deferential V were governed by two forces, which they called power (derives from higher status) and solidarity comes from intimacy and shared-fate. Symmetrical uses are not clearly motivated by a continuum between 'like-mindedness' (T-T) and 'weak solidarity' (V-V), nor are asymmetries by anything so simple as power. This concept was later modified by Brown and Gilman to status and expressive shifts. Rapid shifts between pronouns are characteristic of emotionally charged conversation. These mid-conversational changes from T to V and V to T are those which Brown and Gilman called 'expressive shifts'. It will be worth setting the writer's analysis with these rules. She would follow this convention in accordance with the materials of her object of research.

1.6. METHOD OF THE STUDY

In doing this research, the writer uses qualitative descriptive method which tries to process the data counting the number of identified occurrences and then tries to describe terms of address in usage with respect to the fullest extent of interpretation of phenomena.

1.6.1. WORKING DEFINITION

In the context of pronoun usage, Brown and Gilman defined semantics as covariation between the pronoun used

and the objective relationship existing between speaker and addressee.

Pronoun. The word *pronoun* derives from Latin word *persona* meaning mask. It is used to translate the Greek word for dramatic character or role, and the use of this term by Grammarian derived from their metaphorical conception of language event as a drama in which the participant role is played by the first person, the role subsidiary to him by second person, and all other roles by the third person.

The grammatical category of person depends upon the notion of participant-roles and upon their gramaticalization in particular languages. Pronouns that distinguish the speaker (first person), from the person spoken to (second person) and the speaker spoken of (third person) are called personal pronouns. Personal pronouns have numbers ; singular and plural.

Terms of Address. Terms that indicate participants of address being talked to are called terms of address. Terms of address are the words speaker uses to designate the person they are talking to. While talking, a speaker must have a particular individual in mind in order to refer. In this study we exclude the reference and calls (summons) usage that will be discussed in the next chapter.

Power. Power, in short, is a universal phenomenon in

human societies. It is present in almost all social interaction. It appears even in the narrower sense of social relations that sociologist George Summel called relation of polite acquaintance. One person may be said to have power over another in the degree that he is able to control the behavior of the other. The power semantic is similarly non reciprocal in the sense that both cannot have power in the same area of behavior; that the superior says T (generic designation for familiar or intimacy terms of address) and receive V (generic designation for polite pronoun). The general relationship power semantic is asymmetrical. The relation called older than, parent of, employer of, richer than, stronger than are all asymmetrical examples. Here, the terms of address usage of expressing this power relation is also asymmetrical or nonreciprocal, with the greater power receiving V and lesser T.

Solidarity. A theory in sociology explains that the mutual interdependence of members of society offers a basis for a social organization based upon solidarity of interest. Solidarity semantic is concerned with a set of relations which are symmetrical, for example how much experience, characteristics they have shared (age, sex, relation, occupation, interest), how far they are prepared to share intimacies and other factors. In solidarity semantic, the

corresponding norms of address are reciprocal, that is both speaker and recipient use the same terms (the term V or T).

Term V. Term V is generic designation for a polite term of address in term of respect, proposed by Brown and Gilman (from Latin vos). It is utilized for second person which is developed as a form of address to a person of superior power. A recipient of V may differ from a sender or speaker in the strength, age, sex, birth or profession, and so on. In general, term V is linked with differences between two persons. The writer also uses this term in the research.

Term T. Term T is a generic designation for a familiar term of address proposed by Brown and Gilman (from Latin tu). It is used for second person singular which is developed as a form of address to a person of inferior power. It is also developed as a form of address to express equality and solidarity.

Term TMV. Term TMV is generic designation for *anda* proposed by the writer concerning its usage as neutral pronoun. *Anda* is an Indonesian second person singular pronoun invented by Sabirin in 1957 to equal you in English.

Rank. Rank refers to hierarchy within a working group, or to rank statuses like teacher - student.

1.6.2. LOCATION AND POPULATION OF RESEARCH

The usage of terms of address is most likely to be standard variety of language since it helps unite individuals which never constitute an interaction network into symbolic speech community. Its usage is likely employed in institution of government, education, and high culture in general (Fishman, 1975). According to Peter Muhlhausler and Rom Harré (1990), an institution is a permanent field of people, space, relative to the kinds of conversation that the moral order of the institution permits.

Based on the previous explanation, the writer is interested to know more about the relation between language used in a certain institution. The writer chooses the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Airlangga University, Surabaya for some reasons. The diversified background among the faculty's population is an interesting setting to study in relation to the usage of language. The linguistic aspects of adaptation to environment and circumstance, formation and expression of personality, social structure and interaction, cultural values and beliefs - all are facets of an on-going whole. This type of education background helps her to understand and comprehend the world around her. It can be an asset for this research that language as a communication means, and its social factors are important to study.

1.6.3. SAMPLING

In seeking out people and situation for collecting data, the combination of purposive and snowballing sampling will be used. It involves seeking out people and situation which are likely to be particularly revealing or fruitful with respect to the intended phenomena in this research. The writer proposes to divide the group into three, in accordance with each of their position. Davies (1989) stated that the term 'positioning' has been used for the way in which taking up certain story lines in a conversation constraints speakers in their subsequent choice of speech acts. Those groups are lecturers, students, and administrative staff members. For student group, the writer chooses about thirty participants. Twenty participants will be taken from each group of lecturers and administrative staffs members. Futhermore, the participants should be :

- adults of 20 years old or above.

1.6.4. TECHNIQUE OF DATA COLLECTION

I. OBSERVATION

Some observations are not intended to provide an exhaustive analysis, but to give detailed information of data. They have technical competence to make prediction, interpretations and analyze the implication of the data.

The observation is also done in public places such as the cafeteria, the parking area and so on. William Labov (1970) called it unsystematic observation, but such data can be very valuable as corrective to the bias of interview situation.

II. INTERVIEW

The writer utilizes interview to know how participants feel, what their experiences are and what they remember, what their emotions and motives are like and the reasons for acting as they do. The interview is done without the researcher proclaiming as one in order to get real or valid data.

Some techniques used for collecting data in this interview are as follows :

1. Technique of interview for getting information about terms of address in certain social interaction and situation.

2. Technique of elicitation. The writer uses some questions to elicit further reaction for getting information from participants, for examples ; 'Tell me about.....' , 'How do you address.....' , 'How about....', and hopes that they will mention terms of address in their responses.

For collecting data, the writer uses some interview instruments and tape recordings in certain circumstances.

1.6.5. TECHNIQUE OF DATA ANALYSIS

All the data which have been collected will be analysed systematically. The writer compiles the information into tables. The obvious step is to reduce all data to percentages, since it makes the analysis much easier, with the following formulation ; $\frac{N}{P} \times 100 \% = X$ (notation of abbreviation : N = the occurrences of the usage terms of address by participants, P = the number of all participants, X = the result percentage). Then it is continued by making or relating each table and discovering which differences between data are significant. After processing all the tables, it is continued with interpreting the result by looking at social context.

