USE OF ENGLISH FORMS OF ADDRESS BY JAVANESE STUDENTS OF EFL: A POTENTIAL AREA OF RESEARCH AS INFORMED BY THE EXISTING LITERATURE

Yazid Basthomi

Abstract: This article reviews the literature concerning the use of forms of address as one domain in the realm of interlanguage and pragmatics. It concerns the possibility of addressing the domain of the use of English forms of address by Javanese students of English as a foreign language (EFL). This article discusses the background which especially deals with a personal account of the present writer. This article also touches upon the existing interlanguage pragmatic studies and notions of forms of address. The concluding part of the essay suggests that research on the use of English forms of address by Javanese students of EFL need undertaking on the basis of an extended pragmatic approach which encompasses tripartite elements: speaker-hearer-audience.

Key words: Javanese, EFL, interlanguage, pragmatics, forms of address

As a Javanese EFL student, in 1993, when he was in his third year of an undergraduate study of English as a foreign language at one of the Indonesian institutes in Malang, East Java, Indonesia, the writer had an opportunity to participate in an international program of the first World Community Development Camp (COMDECA) in Malang, East Java, Indonesia. In the program, the writer was ascribed to assist the committee with

 Yazid Basthomi adalah dosen Jurusan Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Negeri Malang.

welcoming international participants including the participants from Great Britain. In the first meeting with the participants, he addressed one of the UK participants as Miss "X", following a question eliciting the participant's name. When the participant said: "I'm seventeen", the writer did not sensitively detect any meanings other than the mere information that she was seventeen years old.

The writer pondered why the UK participant told him about her age when he had not asked for such a piece of information. Therefore, he continued using the title Miss plus her last name until in the course of exchanges, the UK participant explicitly uttered: "Just call me X (mentioning her first name)." Only after this sentence was uttered did the writer realise that what she meant by telling him about her age was that she wanted the writer to address her using her first name. Another anecdote informing the writer is that as an English tutor, he frequently hears EFL students in Javanese settings greet him and other tutors with "Good morning, Sir", "Good morning, Ma'am", or even, "Good morning, Mister." As a student at an Australian university, the writer still had a feeling of "psychological uneasiness" when charged by the Australian norms to address his lecturers by their first names. These anecdotes might constitute reasons for conducting an investigation concerning the use of English forms of address. This potential investigation necessarily needs a review of the existing literature in the area.

LITERATURE REVIEW

As the current writer is a lecturer of English as a foreign language, he is cognisant of the use of English forms of address by Javanese students of EFL. It follows that the discussion needs to touch upon the realm of the teaching of English. As such, it pertains to the notion of communicative competence avowedly propagated in the area of TESL and TEFL.

Communicative Competence

The issue of communicative competence has, over the last three decades, captured the interest of those who are engaged in teaching of English as a foreign language (EFL). The 1960s witnessed "declaration" of the widely used concept of competence which is juxtaposed with perform-

ance. This concept was proposed by Chomsky (1965) who defined language competence as an ideal speaker-listener's knowledge of the rules of language. These rules are those which enable an individual to generate and understand an unlimited number of grammatical sentences. Unlike the competence, which is attributed to the psychological aspect, performance is the actual use of language and mirrors language competence. Yet, this reflection is likely to be corrupt due to the individual's psychological states (e.g., fatigue) as well as other constraints attributable to language operation in the real situation (Savignon, 1997).

Despite its enlightening scheme, Chomsky's dichotomy seems to cause confusion. His formulation of competence does not embrace an appropriateness aspect (sociocultural) of one's knowledge of a language (Hymes, 1979). Extending Chomsky's idea, Hymes observes that the ability to communicate in a language necessitates an individual knowing not only how to generate correct sentences in terms of grammar, but also rules which govern the use of the grammatically correct sentences. In other words, Hymes (1979) contends that communicative competence requires one to incorporate the sociolinguistic aspects of the language proper. O'Rourke (1996) notes it is this kind of sociolinguistic view which enabled the Communicative Approach to emerge in the 1970s, which, since then, has placed communicative competence as the primary goal of language teaching, including the teaching of English as a foreign language (TEFL).

In the work of Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983), the notion of communicative competence has a fuller and clearer being. In their formulation, communicative competence embraces some competences: grammatical, sociolinguistic, discoursal, and strategic. Grammatical competence denotes the mastery of the linguistic code which covers the phonological, morphological, lexical, and syntactic features or levels. It is concerned with the ability to recognise as well as manipulate the literal meanings of linguistic expressions. Sociolinguistic competence deals with the ability to measure and judge the sociocultural context so as to appropriately fit expressions into it. Appropriate expressions require appropriateness in meaning as well as in form. Canale's (1983) appropriateness in the sociolinguistic sense takes into account factors such as status of conversants or interactants, purposes of conversation and/or interaction,

norms of conversation and/or interaction. Included here is knowledge of materials to express, ways to express them, and when to as well as when not to express them.

Discourse competence is related to the knowledge and skills to interpret and generate either written or spoken texts so as to make them logical in terms of coherence and cohesion. This requires the speaker and hearer (writer and reader) to share world knowledge, linguistic code (convention), discourse structure, and social setting (Savignon, 1997). Strategic competence deals with communication strategies used for compensation. They are strategies to overcome communication breakdowns and deficiency in fluency. This competence encompasses the three aforementioned competences: grammatical, sociolinguistic, and discoursal (Savignon, 1997).

This formulation, admittedly intended for a starting framework, might lead to a query about the position of the use of forms of address. Ervin-Tripp (1972) and Wardhaugh (2002) discuss forms of address in the light of a sociolinguistic approach. Dunnet, Dubin, and Lezberg (1986) touch upon forms of address from an intercultural perspective. Similarly, in a recent work, Pachler (1999) includes forms of address within the discussion of teaching and learning culture. All seem to agree that the discussion of forms of address touches upon several aspects pertaining to language: linguistic, sociolinguistic, and cultural aspects, among others. We might say that the discussion of forms of address fits somewhere in the competences proposed by Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983). This, therefore, needs more discussion.

In the practice of teaching English, as is the case in Javanese settings, one might witness that students already know the word Mr., Mrs., Ms., Miss, Ma'am, first name, and last name which are widely used in English. However, it is quite probable that when they use them, it sounds inappropriate, against conventions or norms shared by native speakers of English. Possibly, that is due to the students' lack of knowledge concerning conventions or sociolinguistic aspects governing the use of forms of address. Yet, it is also possible that the students simply apply their first language (e.g., Javanese) conventions (sociolinguistic norms) governing the use of forms of address onto English, the result of which is the possible inappropriate use of English forms of address (Ellis, 1997; Hill, 1997).

In such a sense, it seems that the use of forms of address is mainly governed by the sociolinguistic aspect of the language (either in the students' first language or foreign language) which is relatively constant (Thomas, 1995). The discussion seems to overlook real-time negotiation of meaning and intention of the conversants or interactants, when the conversation or interaction takes place. Here, the contention is that, the sociolinguistic perspectives which are frequently used to approach the matter need an extension. As forms of address embrace the idea of acknowledging the power (status), solidarity (intimacy) and the possibility of manipulation of such elements in the real-time conversation, the discussion then falls within the realm of the pragmatic aspect which seems to be overlooked in Canale and Swain's framework (Hill, 1997). Besides that, as it deals with Javanese EFL students who are in the process of acquiring English, the matter falls within the area of interlanguage. It follows that the discussion cannot leave the field of interlanguage pragmatics.

Interlanguage Pragmatics

The term interlanguage was first introduced by Selinker (1972). It is the notion which refers to the "[learners'] mental system of L2 knowledge" (Ellis, 1997, p. 31). This notion is, however, referred to by others as "transitional competence" (Corder, 1967), "idiosyncratic dialect" (Corder, 1971) and "approximative system" (Nemser, 1971).

As it concerns the L2 (SL//FL) learners' language, which is likely to be short of perfect native speaker competence, it is characterised with errors and/or mistakes or, inappropriateness. This inappropriateness might occur in terms of grammatical, sociolinguistic, as well as discoursal dimensions. It might also happen in terms of pragmatics, which encompasses those grammatical, sociolinguistic, and discoursal competences as in Canale and Swain's (1980) and Canale's (1983) framework. Thomas (1983, p. 94) refers to pragmatic competence as "the ability to use language effectively in order to achieve a specific purpose and to understand language in context." Further, she makes a distinction between pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competence. Whilst the former is defined as the use of appropriate language to secure a speech act, the latter denotes the appropriateness of a speech act in a particular context. As regards the use of forms of address, it incorporates the negotiation, modulation, and

manipulation of interactants' power (status) and solidarity (intimacy), which is encapsulated in the choice of available forms of address in a given language shared by the conversants (interactants) (Brown & Gilman, 1960; Brown & Ford, 1964).

Referring to the choice of the available forms of address, it is pragmalinguistic, whereas in terms of the frame work in which the modulation of the power and intimacy is operated, it is sociopragmatic. The L2 learners' knowledge and use of both pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics (or pragmatics dimension) is understandably likely to be lack of native speaker competence. This is the focal concern of the researchers of interlanguage pragmatics. And the focus of the present interlanguage pragmatic study is the use of available English forms of address by Javanese EFL students.

In terms of interlanguage pragmatics, a number of studies have been conducted. These studies have observed students of various languages. Blum-Kulka (1982) reports a study of the speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. The subjects of this study included 44 adult learners of Hebrew as a second language; these 44 subjects were native speakers of English, 32 adult native speakers of Hebrew, and an additional 10 adult native speakers of English. She concludes that the speech act realisation of L2 learners might depart from native usage on three levels of acceptability: social acceptability, linguistic acceptability, and pragmatic acceptability. The use of direct command (pragmatically effective) in a restaurant represents an example of the matter of social acceptability. Problem of choice of utterances which belong to idiomatic speech realisations characterises linguistic acceptability. Use of the word "please" at the beginning of a request stands as the example for pragmatic acceptability.

Trosborg (1994) reports a study which analysed aspects of interlanguage pragmatics in Danish learners of English. This study focussed on communicative acts of requesting, complaining, and apologising. The study was dedicated to addressing many points: it compared the discourse competence of Danish learners of English with native speakers of English; it outlined the semantic formulae in acts of requesting, complaining, and apologising in English native speaker communication, Danish native speaker communication, and the interlanguage of Danish learners of Eng-

lish; it compared Danish interlanguage with native English conversational patterns; it found the differences/similarities of pragmatic rules of English and Danish; it pointed developmental patterns pertaining to the increase of competence in foreign language; and, it related the findings to communicative foreign language teaching.

Trosborg's study also determined the appropriateness of conversational patterns of Danish learners of English, by comparing the patterns with those of native speakers of English. The subjects of the study were varied: 1) students of secondary school, grade 9 (age 16) and commercial school level I (age 17-18), 2) students of high school (age 18-19) and commercial school level II (age 18-20), 3) university students (age 20-30) and business school (20-30), 4) native speakers of English (age 20-35), and 5) native speakers of Danish (age 20-35). Those of no 1, 2, and 3 were Danish learners of English. They represented different levels of linguistic competence.

The instrument used for data gathering was role play. The study found that the number of requests made increases as the level of linguistic competence ascends. This also occurs as with complaints; but, compared to those of native speakers, the number of complaints by even the highest level group was only slightly above half that of native speakers of English. Regarding the number of apologies, the study found no differences across the groups of subjects. Overall, the study found that requests and complaints are difficult for L2 (SL/FL) students to master.

Hill (1997) investigated the pragmatic aspect of making requests. He dealt with the development of pragmatic competence in making requests by Japanese learners of English. The main subjects were 60 Japanese undergraduate students of English with 3 levels of general English proficiency; there were 20 students at each level. These levels were used to represent phases of development of the learners' proficiency on which diachronic pragmatic competence of the subjects was based. Whilst the subjects' general English proficiency was assessed by means of a cloze-test, the pragmatic competence was assessed with a Discourse Completion Test (DCT). Data gathered from the Japanese subjects were compared with those of British university undergraduates of the same age. The findings showed that the Japanese subjects employed 1) more direct strategies, 2) fewer hints, 3) less internal and external modifications than the native

speakers did. However, there were micro-level strategies under the first two points where regression occurred. Development of micro-level strategies took place under the third point. Pragmatic transfer was one among the factors attributable to these subjects' performances.

More recent studies include Baba's (1999) study on compliment responses by learners of Japanese and English as a second language, and Hassal's (2001) study of requests by adult learners of Indonesian. Baba's study, which employed natural data gathering, took as its subjects graduate and undergraduate students at a major university in the US and two universities in Tokyo, Japan. Baba took four groups of subjects; two groups were language learners, one group represented Japanese learners of English and another group represented American learners of Japanese and the other two groups were native speakers, representing those of American English and Japanese. The data from the language learner groups were compared with those of other groups: native speakers of American English and native speakers of Japanese. There were 31 subjects in the language learner group and 29 in the native language speaker group. Since a conversation partner was needed to accompany each subject, there were 60 pairs participating in the study. This study led Baba to the conclusion that the overall pattern attested Brown and Levinson's prediction that Japan is a "Negative Politeness" culture and North America is a "Positive Politeness" culture. However, Baba also noted such a generalisation might be misleading, for variances were present. In terms of response to intensity of compliments, Baba found that both groups of subjects showed L1 transfer.

Hassal (2001) observed 20 undergraduate students undertaking a degree in Indonesian at an Australian university. The subjects consisted of 13 female and 7 male students. The study also included 18 Indonesian native speakers and employed interactive role-play as the main method for data gathering. Results showed that learners underused internal modifiers but often used supportive moves. In the light of the findings, Hassal argued that these two are the characteristics of second language learners in modifying requests.

Overall, the studies discussed have dealt with interlanguage pragmatics. Even though they had different foci of aspects of interlanguage pragmatics as well as different subjects and interlanguage, all have demon-

strated a unanimous pattern of mapping data gathered from the L2 learners onto those collected from the native speakers of the language being studied. Despite the fact that these studies are not concerned with forms of address, they provide a model, i.e., mapping the data gathered from EFL students to those from native speakers of the given language so that the present study is conducted in the same manner.

As is apparent, studies in interlanguage pragmatics have overlooked the communicative acts of addressing. There has been, to the best of the present writer's knowledge, no report on this area of investigation. Therefore, review of literature on forms of address necessarily refers to studies which have been conducted on languages which stand as L1s.

Forms of Address

Brown and Ford (1964) have led the research on forms of address. Their study covered forms of address in American English. They used four kinds of data which were drawn from: 1) modern American plays, 2) actual use in a Boston business firm, 3) reported usage of business executives, and 4) recorded usage in Midwest. Outcomes of the study are that Americans make use of first name (FN) and title plus last name (TLN). The use of FN and TLN might be symmetrical (reciprocal) as well as asymmetrical (non-reciprocal). The asymmetrical use between two speakers is due to occupational rank difference and/or age difference. This kind of difference is that usually referred to as "power." Multiple use of forms of address (interchangeably), however, might also be shared. This occurs when intimacy (solidarity) exists. In this sense, power (status) and intimacy (solidarity) are central. This is similar to Brown and Levinson's (1987) idea when dealing with politeness. This is understandable, as the use of forms of address has a politeness impact, for it deals with force.

Further to Brown and Ford's (1964) basic tenets, Ervin-Tripp (1972) investigated forms of address of American English. She approached the study from a sociolinguistic perspective. The sociolinguistic rules of forms of address yielded are to be regarded as the grammar (the competence). In this sense, the resulting sociolinguistic rules are to represent sociolinguistic rules of the ideal "competent adult members of western American academic community" (pp. 226-7).

Thus, Ervin-Tripp's sociolinguistic rules are likely to be different

from the real use of forms of address by conversants or interactants in real time conversations and/or interactions. She places emphasis on cautioning the reader of this difference, for she believes that real time use of forms of address needs another kind of approach. This is what Thomas (1995) means by pragmatics when she discusses the difference between sociolinguistics and pragmatics. Thomas (1995) observes that sociolinguistics deals with the relatively constant rules of use of language in society, whereas pragmatics is concerned with the real use of available rules where modulation, manipulation, improvisation of the rules gives certain force to the relationship between speakers which are made effective; pragmatics, then, is the "performance" aspect of sociolinguistics (Ervin-Tripp, 1972; Thomas, 1995).

In her work of the sociolinguistic analysis of American English forms of address, Ervin-Tripp (1972) provides an interesting diagram where possible realisation of the use of forms of address is determined. She provides selectors which regulate such possible realisation. Prominent among the selectors are the adult/child being of the addressee, status-marked situations, rank, and identity. Ervin-Tripp also discusses comparative studies on sociolinguistic rules of forms of address. She touches upon the differences in sociolinguistic rules of forms of address within the same language (English) and across languages (e.g., English, Russian, Korean, and Puerto Rican).

Brown and Ford (1964) and Ervin-Tripp (1972) seem not to be mindful of the enterprise of teaching second/foreign language, when they give their sociolinguistic account of forms of address (be it monolingual or cross-lingual). Similar to Brown and Ford (1964) and Ervin-Tripp (1972) in that he applies sociolinguistic perspectives in his endeavours to compare English and Korean forms of address, Hwang (1975), however, has in mind that his comparison is used to predict potential difficulties encountered by Korean learners of English, and English learners of Korean. His attempts to compare the forms of address in English and Korean are devoted to pedagogical implications the differences/similarities of forms of address in the two languages might bring about.

Indeed, sociolinguistic perspectives on forms of address have undoubtedly provided the study of forms of address with insightful ideas. Yet, as Martiny (1996) has commented, following Ervin-Tripp (1972), the

use of forms of address has been studied in the paradigm where conversants and/or interactants are in dyadic relationship; forms of address are viewed from the relational nature of the dyadic relationship between the two conversants and/or interactants. Martiny (1996) observes the importance of encompassing another party, the audience.

Martiny's (1996) proposal to incorporate the audience is used to provide a basis for a discussion of forms of address in French and Dutch. This discussion is conducted from a (socio) pragmatic point of view, for Martiny believes that forms of address are significant in performing speech acts. This means that the discussion departs, to some extent, from the sociolinguistic perspective, or more accurately, extension of the sociolinguistic approach. Martiny (1996) believes that the use of forms of address is influenced by elements previously mentioned in sociolinguistic literature such as the relationship between the speaker and addressee, sex, age, and socio-economic background; besides, the use of forms of address might be affected by the speaker's pragmatic needs to manipulate the force of the speech act and to capture the addressee's attention.

Similar to Martiny (1996), Nickerson and Bargiela-Chiappini (1996) report a study on forms of address in European languages other than English. Whilst Martiny (1996) deals with French and Dutch, Nickerson and Bargiela-Chiappini (1996) are concerned with Dutch and Italian. Whilst Martiny (1996), does not present any empirical data, Nickerson and Bargiela-Chiappini (1996) report a study where the empirical data were drawn from Dutch and Italian business discourse. Their study collected discourse from four authentic meetings, two meetings in Dutch and two meetings in Italian. This study focusses on "the mapping of the semantic shift that occurs in the non-prototypical use of personal pronouns, the pragmatic significance of the shift […], and contextual factors behind pronominal choices and personal address forms, e.g., first name and surname" (p. 743). The study concludes that Dutch use of pronominal choice shows stronger corporate image than Italian, which displays more self and other representation.

The discussion above has explored the idea that forms of address have been initiated through sociolinguistic perspectives. Early sociolinguistic approaches viewed the use of forms of address as governed by the relation between the speaker, in one party, and the addressee, in the other.

Recent development has included the third party, the audience. The recent development has incorporated a pragmatic perspective in dealing with forms of address. The recent pragmatic perspectives of studies on forms of address have also encompassed the spirit of cross-cultural studies which have been prominent since the initiation of sociolinguistic studies. As the present study concerns interlanguage pragmatics of the use of English forms of address by Javanese EFL students, significant in its discussion, as encapsulated by the notion of transfer (Baba, 1999; Hill, 1997; Selinker, 1972), is discussion of how the Javanese address each other in their daily interactions. The notion of transfer leads to the assumption that the Javanese might refer to and use their L1 pragmatic knowledge of Javanese forms of address when they use English forms of address, the result of which is the possibility that the Javanese EFL students' use of English forms of address is inappropriate viewed from English native speaker norms.

Javanese Forms of Address

The focus of the following part of the literature review is Javanese use of proper names and its possible modification and/or attributes. The choices available for the use of forms of address in Javanese daily conversation are not limited to options between the use of first name (FN) and the use of a title with the last name (TLN) as in American English (Brown & Ford, 1964). Forms of address in Javanese conversation (the Javanese conversation in general as well) is bound up with speech styles (Errington, 1988; Sadtono, 1972; Wardhaugh, 2002), which could be classified into high, middle, and low. Speech styles, in Sumukti's (1971) and Sadtono's (1972) words, are speech levels. Similar to Wardhaugh (2002), Sadtono (1972) generally categorises speech levels into "*Ngoko*" (low), "*Madya*" (middle), and "*Krama*" (high). However, Djajengwasito (1975) observes that there are also "*Krama desa*" (village Krama), "*basa Kedaton*" (palace language), and "*basa Kasar*" (vulgar language).

Concurring with Brown and Ford's (1964) formulation that the use of forms of address is dependent on the relational nature of the speaker and hearer, Errington (1988) observes that the use of Javanese forms of address also relies on the nature of relationship between the speaker and the hearer. He reports his informants' words: "Whenever two people meet

they should ask themselves: 'Who is this person? Who am I? What is this person to me?'" (p. 11). In other words, the use of forms of address in Javanese is part of the general Javanese socially ideal conduct of "unggah-ungguh" which comprises appropriate linguistic as well as non-linguistic acts (Errington, 1988).

Besides that, the use of Javanese forms of address is also due to the vast number of Javanese geographical as well as social dialects. It is daunting, if not impossible, to make rigorous claims of uniformity of forms of address among the dialects (Sadtono, 1972). Sadtono (1972) makes an approximation that there are about 30 Javanese geographical dialects, which he tentatively categorises into three major dialects:

The '*kulonan*' ('Western') or '*Pego*' dialect in the western part of Central Java, including Banten, Indramaju, and Tjirebon dialects in West Java.

The Central Javanese dialect in the eastern part of Central Java, extending to some western parts of East Java.

The East Javanese dialect in the rest of East Java, excluding those areas where Madurese is spoken (Sadtono, 1972, p. 36).

Regarding the geographical dialects, Poerwadarminta, as cited in Sumukti (1971), distinguishes ten Javanese geographical dialects, i.e., '1) Banten, 2) Tjirebon, 3) Banjumas and Tegal, 4) Bagelen, 5) Jogjakarta and Kedu, 6) Surakarta, Madiun, and Semarang, 7) Rembang, 8) Tuban, Gresik, and Surabaja, 9) Malang and Pasuruan, and 10) Banjuwangi' (Sumukti, 1971, p. 3).

With regard to the Javanese social dialects, Sadtono (1972) mentions that there are "Basa Kedaton" (the royal dialect of Surakarta court), "Basa Bagongan" (the royal staff dialect of Jogjakarta court), "*Basa Kasusastran*" (Belletristic dialect), and "*Basa Pedalangan*" (theatrical dialect)' (p. 38-39). Elsewhere, still amplifying the Javanese social dialects, he mentions that Standard Javanese is equal to "*Krama Madya*". The word "Krama Madya", here, reminds us of the speech styles or speech levels aforementioned. However, further discussions of the geographical as well as social dialects are beyond the present essay; instead, it is focussed on the seemingly "universal" aspects of the use of Javanese forms of address. In other words, the discussion is limited to sociolinguistic as well as pragmatic dimensions. Referring to the previous discussion, the sociolin-

guistic aspect refers to the relatively constant rule governing such use, whereas the pragmatic aspect deals with the modulation, manipulation, or improvisation which generates a certain force (subjectively deliberate) within the "acceptable" sociolinguistic framework in a given society or language variety (e.g., Javanese). Articulating Sadtono's (1972) observation, sociolinguistically, key factors attributable to the use of Javanese forms of address are:

- the gradation of respect for different people concerning age, social status, social stratum, and genealogical and kinship relationship and
- the principle of self-condescension.

This formulation is not different from that of others (e.g., Brown & Ford, 1964; Ervin-Tripp, 1972) except for the principle of self-condescension. Pragmatically, however, the extent to which the measurement of such sociolinguistic factors can be articulated is hard to gauge, for it works (inter) subjectively between the parties involved in real-in-time conversations or interactions (Errington, 1988). As previously mentioned, the "unggah-ungguh" in Javanese is the influential determinant of the use of forms of address; yet, the oscillatory "manoeuvres" in terms of the linguistic as well as non-linguistic choices (including forms of address) which are possible within the "*unggah-ungguh*" framework, are (inter) subjectively determined.

As the relationship between the interactants continues over time, pragmatically, the interactants are always on guard, monitoring their relationship, and therefore, modulating the use of forms of address within the acceptable sociolinguistic framework ("*unggah-ungguh*" in the case of Javanese). This is what Errington (1988) means by "[t]he ways [*priyayi*] directly or indirectly corrected my usage, instructed others in how to address me, and changed their linguistic usage to fit their changing relations with me and others led me to see that more rides socially on use of some speech elements than others. These relatively interactively important elements I have come to think of as relatively *pragmatically salient*" (pp. 17-8, emphasis original). Here, the writer (as a Javanese), would add that what Errington (1988) reports is not limited to "*priyayi*." Those other than priyayi are very likely to offer similar comments.

As mentioned above, Javanese are obliged as to choice of the speech styles (levels). Since the subjects of the present study are ordinary Java-

nese, vis-a-vis the royal elite (*priyayi*) circle, the possible speech styles shared are believed to be "ngoko" and "*krama*." Errington (1988) equalises "*ngoko*" and "*krama*" to French T/V form phenomena; "ngoko" is equal to "tu", whereas "*krama*" to "vous." In terms of the use of proper names, it is unlikely that within the use of "*krama*", one addresses the addressee with a "*njangkar*" proper name (a name without any additional term either royal or kinship terms), for "*njangkar*" signifies "intimacy" which is unlikely to be realised in daily "krama" conversation between or among ordinary Javanese people (Errington, 1988). It follows that the use of "*njangkar*" is likely to be realised within "*ngoko*" conversations. But, this phenomenon is difficult to account for from the constant sociolinguistic perspective.

Crucial in the discussion of forms of Javanese address is the notion of "trap-trapan" or application. As Errington (1988) puts it, "shared knowledge of conventions of use must always be assimilated to knowledge of the code-contingent, *hic et nunc* of interaction by gauging message content, presence of bystanders, location of interaction, enduring biographical relation, and a huge variety of variably relevant information that eludes normative descriptions of pragmatic value" [italic original] (pp. 107). Drawing from the previous sociolinguistic perspectives, the variables might be categorised into those attributable to the power (status) and intimacy (solidarity) framework. Yet, there is one variable that refers to a similar idea of Martiny's (1996) "audience", i.e., Errington's (1988) "bystanders." This element has been overlooked in the traditional sociolinguistic framework (e.g., that of Brown & Ford, 1964 and Ervin-Tripp, 1972). In view of the notion of (pragmatic) transfer, audience might be one of the determinant factors attributable to the pragmatic realisation of Javanese EFL students' use of English forms of address.

CONCLUSION

To summarise, empirically, studies on interlanguage pragmatics lack evidence of how EFL students use English forms of address. The studies have been focussed on speech acts of apologies, requests, complaints, compliment response, and refusals. The key point that can be drawn from the existing literature on interlanguage pragmatics is that interlanguage pragmatics studies often necessitate the use of data gathered from native

speakers to provide "norms" on to which data collected from the EFL sub-jects can be mapped. Theoretically, discussion of forms of address re-quires not only sociolinguistic perspectives where rules governing the use of forms of address are viewed as relatively constant or stable, but also pragmatic consideration. Theoretically as well, studies on forms of ad-dress have concentrated on the notion that use of forms of address is af-fected only by the dyadic relational nature between conversants or interac-tants. Recent development has demonstrated, however, that audience serves as an attributable factor for the use of forms of address. Therefore, the focus of the potential study is the endeavour to explore how Javanese EFL students use English forms of address in situations where not only factors of dyadic conversants, which include power (status) and intimacy (solidarity), but also the third party of audience is involved; power and solidarity are then viewed in the relations among three parties of speaker-hearer-audience.

REFERENCES

Baba, J. 1999. *Interlanguage pragmatics*: Compliment responses by learners of Japanese and English as a second language. Muenchen: Lincom Europa.

Blum-Kulka, S. 1982. Learning to say what you mean in a second language: A study of the speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second lan-guage. *Applied Linguistics*, 3 (1): 29-59.

Brown, R., and Ford, M. 1964. Address in American English. In D. Hymes (Ed.), *Language in culture and society: A reader in linguistics and anthropology* (pp. 234-244), New York: Harper & Row.

Brown, R., and Gilman, A. 1960. The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T. Se-beok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 253-276). New York: MIT Press.

Brown, P., and Levinson, S. 1987. *Politeness*: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canale, M. 1983. From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards and R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp. 2-28). London and New York: Longman.

Canale, M., and Swain, M. 1980. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1 (1): 1-47.

Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Corder, S. P. 1967. *The significance of learners' errors*. IRAL, 5 (4): 161-169.

Corder, S. P. 1971. *Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis*. IRAL, 9 (2): 147-160.

Djajengwasito, S. 1975. Javanese Speech Styles: A Multiple Discriminant Analysis of Social Constraints. Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI.

Dunnet, S. C., Dubin, F., and Lezberg, A. 1986. English language teaching from an intercultural perspective. In J. M. Valdes (Ed.), Culture bound: Bridging the cultural gap in language teaching (pp. 148-161). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. 1997. Second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Errington, J. J. 1988. Structure and style in Javanese: A semiotic view of linguistic etiquette. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M. 1972. Sociolinguistic rules of address. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics (pp. 225-240). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Hassal, T. 2001. Modifying requests in a second language. IRAL, 39: 259-283.

Hill, T. 1997. The development of pragmatic competence in an EFL context. Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI.

Hwang, J. K. 1975. Role of sociolinguistics in foreign language education with reference to Korean and English terms of address and levels of deference. Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI.

Hymes, D. 1979. On communicative competence. In C. C. Brumfit and K. Johnson (Eds.), The communicative approach to language teaching (pp. 5-27). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martiny, T. 1996. Forms of address in French and Dutch: A sociopragmatic approach. Language Sciences, 18 (3-4): 765-775.

Nemser, W. 1971. Approximative system of foreign-language learners. IRAL, 9 (2): 115-123.

Nickerson, C., and Bargiela-Chiappini, F. 1996. At the intersection between grammar and pragmatics: A contrastive study of personal pronouns and other forms of address in Dutch and Italian. Language Sciences, 18 (3-4): 743-764.

O'Rourke, M. 1996. Sociolinguistics and pragmatics of language teaching. In R. R. K. Hartmann (Ed.), Solving language problems: From general to applied linguistics (pp. 205-213). Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Pachler, N. 1999. Teaching and learning culture. In N. Pachler (Ed.), Teaching modern foreign languages at advanced level (pp. 76-92). London: Routledge.

Sadtono, E. 1972. Javanese diglossia and its pedagogical implications. Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI.

Savignon, S. J. 1997. Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice (2nd Edn.).New York: The McGraww-Hill Companies, Inc.

Selinker, L. 1972. Interlanguage. IRAL, 10 (3): 209-231.

Sumukti, R. 1971, Javanese morphology and morphophonemics, Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI.

Thomas, J. 1983. Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. Applied Linguistics, 4: 91-112.

Thomas, J. 1995. Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics. London: Longman.

Trosborg, A. 1994. Interlanguage pragmatics: Requests, complaints, and apologies. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wardhaugh, R. 2002, An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (4th edn.). Malden: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.