

The Indonesian Second Person Terms Of Address Used By Undergraduate Students of *Petra Christian University* in Social Network Sites and Face-To-Face Interaction towards Their Intimate and Distant Friends

Sugianto, N. ¹ and Flora Debora Floris, F.D.²

^{1,2} English Department, Faculty of Letters, Petra Christian University, Siwalankerto 121-131, Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia Surabaya, Indonesia
e-mails: nanami_yuk1@yahoo.com; Debora@peter.petra.ac.id

ABSTRACT:

The study deals with Indonesian second person terms of address used in social network sites and face-to-face interaction. The purpose of the study was to observe the use of Indonesian second person terms of address used by the respondents to address their intimate and distant friends when they communicated in social network sites and face-to-face interaction. The findings showed that there were 7 of 10 categories of Indonesian second person terms of address used by the respondents towards their intimate and distant friends in social network sites and face-to-face interaction. In conclusion, there was no significant difference in the use of the Indonesian second person terms of address used by the respondents in social network sites and face-to-face interaction toward their intimate and distant friends.

Keywords: Terms of Address, Social Network Sites, Face-to-Face Interaction

People communicate with others to express their feelings and ideas. In order to have a good communication, people need to address the person whom they talk to. The way people address others is called term of address. According to Kridalaksana, an Indonesian linguist (1985, p. 13), terms of address refers to “word, phrase or morpheme which can be used to address subjects in conversation”. The term of address which is used to address the interlocutor in the conversation is called second person terms of address (Ervin-Tripp, 1972, p. 227). Kridalaksana (1985, p. 14) categorizes Indonesian terms of address into nine categories.

1. Personal pronoun (*Kata ganti*)
e.g: *aku* (I), *engkau* (you), *ia* (he), *kami* (we), *kita* (we)
2. The names (*Nama diri*)
It is a person's name. e.g: *Galih*, *Ratna*
3. Kinship term (*Istilah kekerabatan*)
e.g: *bapak* (father), *ibu* (mother), *paman* (uncle), *adik* (sister)
4. Title (*Gelar dan pangkat*)
e.g: *dokter* (doctor), *suster* (nurse), *guru* (teacher)
5. *Pe* + Verbal form or *Kata pelaku*
e.g: *pembaca* (readers), *penonton* (audience), *pendengar* (listeners)
6. Nominal + *ku* (my) form
e.g: *Tuhanku* (my God), *kekasihku* (my love), *negaraku* (my country)
7. Demonstrative pronouns (*Kata penunjuk atau deiksis*)
e.g: *sini* (I), *situ* (you), *ini* (this)
8. Another noun form (*Kata benda lainnya*)
e.g: *tuan* (sir), *nyonya* (madam), *nona* (miss)
9. Zero features (*ciri nol*)
e.g: “*mau kemana?*” In the example there is no term of address used by the addresser toward the addressee but the addressee understands that the question was addressed for him/her.

There are some factors which might affect people in using language, including terms of address. According to Holmes (2001, p. 9), one of the factors is social dimensions which include: social distance, social status, formality, and functional. In this research, the writers focused on social distance which can influence people in using language, including terms of address. Akindele (2008,

p. 3) says that terms of address serve as an indicator of the social relationship between a speaker and a listener in terms of status and social distance. Thus, the writers concluded that social distance could be one of the important factors that affect people in choosing terms of address.

Nowadays, people communicate through social network sites and face-to-face interaction. According to Boyd and Ellison (2007, p.1), social network site is “web-based that allows individuals to construct a public or semi-public profile within a bounded system, articulate a list of other users with whom they share a connection, and view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within the system”. The examples of social networks are Twitter, Facebook, Google+, etc. Face-to-face interaction, according to Begley (2004, p.6), means “the exchanging of information, thoughts, and feelings when the participants are in the same physical space”.

The writers chose social network sites because people usually build social relations by sharing interests, activities, events, feeling and thought. The second reason for the writers to choose social network is because the users of social network in Indonesia has increased rapidly. *Facebook*, for example, has 43,06 million users in Indonesia which brings Indonesia to the third position in the world, according to data of Supratiwi (2012, par. 2).

The writers chose to observe university students because the users of social network mostly are university students (Nurfuadah, 2012, par. 6). They usually use social network sites to build connection with new friends and old friends, and also to maintain their relation from face-to-face interaction with their friends. In this study, the writers observed 190 undergraduate students of *Petra Christian University (PCU)* which studied at 19 departments.

The study was guided by following research questions:

1. What are the Indonesian second person terms of address used by undergraduate students of *Petra Christian University* in social network sites and face-to-face interaction towards their intimate and distant friends?
2. What are differences and/or similarities of the Indonesian second person terms of address used by undergraduate students of *Petra Christian University* in social network sites and face-to-face interaction towards their intimate and distant friends?

METHODS

The subjects of this research were 190 undergraduate students of *Petra Christian University (PCU)* which studied at 19 departments. In collecting the data, the writers applied several steps. The first step was creating a questionnaire. The questionnaire had four questions which were divided into two sections. Two questions for section 1 were for respondents' profile. The other two questions were about the terms of address used by the respondents.

After creating the questionnaire, one of the writers (Noviyana Sugianto) distributed 10 questionnaires to her friends as pilot projects. Some adjustments were made based on the results of pilot projects. The third step was Sugianto distributed the questionnaires herself to university students she met in campus, street around campus and her boarding house. The writers only needed 10 questionnaires from each department, so when Sugianto got the 10th questionnaire, for English Department, for example, she would discard other questionnaires filled in by English Department students. The next step was to classify the answer. The writer used some tables to help them to find out the answers stated by 10 respondents of each department.

The next step was to make the percentage in all categories of the Indonesian second person terms of address frequently used by the students in social network sites and face-to-face interaction. Thus, the writers would be able to recognize which terms of address were dominantly used. The formula to calculate the percentage was:

$$A = \frac{a}{\text{Tot}} \times 100\%$$

Finally, the writers figured out the terms of address used by the *Petra Christian University's* undergraduate students in social network sites and face-to-face interaction.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The following table showed the categories of second person terms of address used by the undergraduate students of *Petra Christian University* in social networks site and face-to-face interaction along with the differences and similarities.

Table of The Summary of the Frequency of The Second Person Terms of Address Used in Social Network Sites and Face-to-Face Interaction towards Their Intimate and Distant Friends

Categories of Terms of Address	Percentage																			
	Intimate										Distant									
	Social Network Site					Face-to-Face Interaction					Social Network Site					Face-to-Face Interaction				
	Σ	%	Example			Σ	%	Example			Σ	%	Example			Σ	%	Example		
T			Σ	%	T			Σ	%	T			Σ	%	T			Σ	%	
Personal Pronoun	93	49%	Kamu	93	100%	101	53,2%	Kamu Kon Lu	83 14 4	82,2% 13,8% 4%	135	71%	Kamu	135	100%	116	61,1%	Kamu Kon Lu	113 1 2	97,4% 0,9% 1,7%
The Names	53	28%	First name Nickname	36 17	70% 30%	57	30%	First name Nickname	30 27	52,6% 47,4%	41	21,6%	First name Nickname	38 3	92,7% 7,3%	50	26,3%	First name Nickname	42 8	84% 16%
Kinship term	30	16%	Koko Cece Bro Sis	6 7 10 7	20% 23,3% 33,3% 23,3%	20	10,5%	Koko Cece Bro Sis Guys	7 6 5 1 1	35% 30% 25% 5% 5%	11	5,8%	Koko Cece Bro	7 3 1	63,6% 27,3% 9,1%	19	10%	Koko Cece Kak	8 10 1	42% 52,6% 3%
Title	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Pe + Verbal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
My + Nominal	1	0,5%	Teman-temanku	1	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Demonstrative pronouns	1	0,5%	Situ	1	100%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Another Noun form	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Categories of Terms of Address	Percentage																			
	Intimate										Distant									
	Social Network Site					Face-to-Face Interaction					Social Network Site					Face-to-Face Interaction				
	Σ	%	Example			Σ	%	Example			Σ	%	Example			Σ	%	Example		
			T	Σ	%			T	Σ	%			T	Σ	%			T	Σ	%
Zero features	1 2	6%	Ask interlocutor Ask oneself	9 3	75% 25%	9	4,7%	Ask interlocutor Ask oneself	4 5	44,4% 55,6%	3	1,6%	Ask interlocutor Ask oneself	2 1	66,7% 33,3%	5	2,6%	Ask interlocutor Ask oneself	4 1	80% 20%
Misc	-	-	-	-	-	3	1,6%	Oi! Woi! Babe	1 1 1	33,3% 33,3% 33,3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Related to the first research question about the Indonesian second person terms of address used by the undergraduate students of *Petra Christian University* in social network sites and face-to-face interaction towards their intimate and distant friends, it was found that the students used personal pronoun (*kata ganti*), the names (*nama diri*), kinship term (*istilah kekerabatan*), my + nominal, demonstrative pronoun (*kata penunjuk*), and zero features (*ciri nol*).

The writers also noticed that there were three differences and one similarity of Indonesian second person terms of address used by the undergraduate students of *Petra Christian University* in social network sites and face-to-face interaction towards their intimate friends. The first difference was the number of second person terms of address used by the students. There were six categories of the Indonesian second person terms of address used by the students in social network sites, while there were five categories of the Indonesian second person terms of address used in face-to-face interaction.

The second difference was related to the terms of address in category of "personal pronoun". In social network sites, the only term of address used by the respondents was "*kamu*" (you). In face-to-face interaction, the terms of address used by the respondents were "*kamu*", "*kon*", and "*lu*" (you). This difference happened possibly because in face-to-face interaction the respondents felt more comfortable to address their intimate friends with informal language (e.g "*kon*", and "*lu*").

Third, there were some miscellaneous terms of address used in face-to-face interaction. They were "*Oi/Woi!*" and "*babe*". These terms of address were used by the respondents possibly because these terms of address were usually followed by the use of non-verbal language so they were not used in social network.

Besides the differences, there was also one similarity of Indonesian second person terms of address used by the undergraduate students of *Petra Christian University* in social network sites and face-to-face interaction toward their intimate friends. The similarity was that the three categories which were used most frequently. The categories were "personal pronoun", "the names", and "kinship term".

The writers also found a difference and a similarity of Indonesian second person terms of address used by the undergraduate students of *Petra Christian University* in social network sites and face-to-face interaction toward their distant friends. The difference was the terms of address in category "personal pronoun". In social network sites, the only term of address used by the respondents was "*kamu*" (you). In face-to-face interaction, the terms of address used by the respondents were "*kamu*", "*kon*", and "*lu*" (you).

Besides the differences, there was also a similarity of Indonesian second person terms of address used by the undergraduate students of *Petra Christian University* in social network sites and face-to-face interaction toward their distant friends. The similarity was the respondents used the categories of Indonesian second person terms of address used by the students in four categories ("personal pronoun", "the names", "kinship term", and "zero features") in both social network sites and face-to-face interaction.

There were also a difference and a similarity of of Indonesian second person terms of address used by the undergraduate students of *Petra Christian University* in social network sites towards their intimate and distant friends. The difference was the number of categories of Indonesian second person terms of address used by the respondents. There were six categories chosen by the students to address their intimate friends in social network sites. They were "personal pronoun", "the names", "kinship term", "my + nominal", "demonstrative pronouns", "and zero feature". For distant friends, there were four categories chosen by the respondents. They were "personal pronoun", "the names", "kinship term", and "zero features".

The similarity was that there were three categories of the Indonesian second person terms of address which were frequently used towards both intimate and distant friends. They were "personal pronoun", "the names", and "kinship term".

There were also two differences and a similarity of Indonesian second person terms of address used by the undergraduate students of *Petra Christian University* in face-to-face interaction towards their intimate and distant friends. The first difference was the category of Indonesian second person terms of address chosen by the students to be used toward their intimate and distant friends. In face-to-face interaction with their intimate friends, there were five categories chosen by the students. The second difference was that there were some miscellaneous terms of address found in

face-to-face interaction toward intimate friends, but they were not found in interaction toward distant friends.

Besides those two differences, there was also a similarity between Indonesian second person terms of address used by the undergraduate students of *Petra Christian University* in face-to-face interaction towards their intimate and distant friends. The similarity was the Indonesian second person terms of address were frequently used, namely “personal pronoun”, “the names”, and “kinship term”.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This research was about the Indonesian second person terms of address used by the undergraduate students of *Petra Christian University* in social network sites and face-to-face interaction towards their intimate and distant friends. The writers used the theory of Indonesian terms of address by Kridalaksana (1985) as their main theory to analyze the data. The data of this research was taken from questionnaires filled in by 190 undergraduate students of *Petra Christian University* studying at 19 departments.

Overall, it was found that the students used seven categories of Indonesian terms of address and they did not use ten categories of terms of address. There was no significant difference between Indonesian second person terms of address used by the undergraduate students of *Petra Christian University* in social network sites and face-to-face interaction towards their intimate and distant friends. They generally used similar terms of address, both in social network sites and face-to-face interaction towards their intimate and distant friends.

This research was only small scale of research, which observed the terms of address used by 190 respondents. Therefore it is recommended to conduct further studies by involving more social variables such as social status, gender, and age. In addition, other researchers are also encouraged to study terms of address from different perspectives such as by observing the functions of term of address.

REFERENCES

- Akindele, D. F. (2008). “Sesotho Address Forms”. *Linguistik Online*, vol. 34, 3-15
- Begley, K. A. (2004). *Making Human Connection in a Technology-Driven World*. Boston.
- Boyd, D. M. & Ellison N. B., (2007). *Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship*. Michigan State University.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1972). *On Sociolinguistic Rules: Alternation And Co Occurrence*. In Gumperz, J. J. and D. Hymes (eds.) *Directions in the Ethnography of Communication*. New York, Rinehart and Winston.
- Holmes, J. (2001). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Kridalaksana, H. (1985). *Fungsi Bahasa Dan Sikap Bahasa*. Ende-Flores: Nusa Indah.
- Nurfuadah, R. N. (2012, February 4). Apa Pengaruh FB ke Mahasiswa? *Okezone.com*. Retrieved December 12, 2012, from <http://kampus.okezone.com/read/2012/02/03/373/569206/apa-pengaruh-fb-ke-mahasiswa>
- Supratiwi, F. (2012, June 21). Pengguna Facebook di Indonesia tertinggi ketiga dunia. *ANTARA News*. Retrieved October 3, 2012, from <http://www.antaraneews.com/berita/317451/pengguna-facebook-di-indonesia-tertinggi-ketiga-dunia>