Research Article

THE CHOICE OF ADDRESS TERMS AT WORKPLACE BY INTERCULTURAL ENGLISH SPEAKERS AND ITS PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Astrit Maria* and Sudirman Willian

Department of Education, English Graduate Program, Mataram University, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT

Address terms indicate the speaker's attitude, intention, as well as relationship with the addressee that someone is talking to. While each culture has its own standard, the appropriate choice of address terms in intercultural communication remains blurry. As do very little literature elaborate this concern, this paper performs to thoroughly figure out the selected address terms used by intercultural work colleagues in addressing their interlocutors. This study applies audio recording as well as participant observation to collect data of the three intercultural speakers coming from Indonesia, England, and Canada and sharing occupation in one of English schools in Mataram. This paper manages to result that the speakers from three different cultures apply nearly all the existing terms of address regardless of the common patterns of address terms in each corresponding culture. Rather, the choices of address terms are due to three social factors. In brief, in language teaching, teacher must not only introduce the existing address terms in English, but also emphasize the importance of considering the all of the possible social factors.

INTRODUCTION

Communication is one significant way to connect people by sharing ideas, values, gratitude, and so on. To be a good communicator, one must load himself with strategies, knowledge, as well as awareness in interacting with others. Although communication allows people to speak their ideas freely, an appropriate interaction remains important. The National Archives (2013) explained that producing effective communication promotes individual's agreeable attitude in spoken interaction. As a result, an effective communication requires a proper framework that suits the content and the context. This also means that one speaker must concern on the message he conveys, the person whom he talks to, and the situation where it takes place. The proper way of how individual interacts surely provides greater chance for the message to be understood (Holmes, 1992).

In this respect, language use becomes influential on how good communication should be. In sociolinguistic studies, the use of linguistic in communication can portray the thoughts, attitudes, or even intention that a speaker conveys (Afzali, 2011). To understand how sociolinguistic studies take part in communication also means to build better relationship with people. Brown and Gilman (1960), Fasold (1984), Wolfson (1989), and many other experts confirmed that the way one

speaker addresses his speaking addressee is crucial as it indicates the speaker's attitude in communication. Besides, the forms of address describe the speakers' relationship with the addressee.

While intercultural interactions are now increasing, the standards of address terms are diverse among cultures. There is no such exact pattern of how one should address his cross-cultural interlocutor clearly. Hence, this paper thoughtfully investigates the way speakers of English from intercultural backgrounds address their speaking partners in daily communication among work colleagues in one of English schools in Mataram, Lombok. The participants are from varied cultural backgrounds that have different patterns of addressing. The three varied cultural origins are British, Canadian, and Indonesian.

The T-V theory

As mentioned previously that power and familiarity do impact on the choice of address terms, the theory related to this notion was proposed by Brown and Gilman (1960) about the Power and Solidarity dimensions. How the two dimensions impact on communication are presented using the informal ty and formal vy which are derived from Russian. Ty represents the pronoun of second-person singular and vy refers to the plural pronoun. Similarly, in some European languages, tu is the informal

Corresponding author: **Astrit Maria**
Department of Education, English Graduate Program, Mataram University, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia

address and vous is the formal address. In this study, the terms of ty and vy from Russian are used.

When speakers share similar age, social status, intimacy, occupation, they tend to use the informal ty over the other. Meanwhile, speakers who share equal status with no intimacy are prone to using the formal vy. Besides, they speak reciprocally where both speakers use the same address form such as, T and T, TLN and TLN, and so on.

Likewise, the ten schemes of Russian categorization by Friedrich (1966; 288) containing four sets were rearranged by Mühlhäusler and Harré (1990: 139) (taken from Mahmoodan, 2013; 26–27) as follows.

Content and Context

a. The content of the message: informal ty for intimate or less serious concern, and formal vy for serious concern.
b. The context of the message: ty for private, vy for public.

Biosocial Consideration

This set of scheme comprises four types; generation, age, distance within family relationship, and sex. The greater the differences of the types, the more formal vy is applied.

Relationship within Group

Those in the same neighborhood are more likely to produce informal ty. In spite of the fact, reciprocal ty is rarely used by a group of people sharing occupation—e.g. laborers.

Emotional Interaction

The usage of ty in conversations is prone to showing affection or emotional bond.

However, the complex as well as dynamic shifts between ty and vy appear to be significant to create lively communication.

Terms of address and naming in the UK

There are mainly five forms of addressing proposed by Wardaugh (1986:262), they are in the following.

1. Title (T)
2. First Name (FN)
3. Last Name (LN)
4. Nickname
5. Combination (TFN, TLN)

The choice of addressing terms is constructed due to the knowledge of the speakers' towards the person they are addressing to. The knowledge varies within the circumstance of the communication setting, power, and familiarity. Wardaugh and Fuller (2015) mentioned that the use of T, LN, combination of both, and TFN specify unfamiliar or unequal relationship between the speaker and the addressee. In addition, the use of T only describes the least intimacy between the two parties. Meanwhile, the choice of FN shows intimacy or more familiarity between addresser and addressee.

In fact, there is obviously a switch from using T to FN when addressing other people. This is due to the power that one speaker has over the other. On the other hand, the switch from FN to TLN or TFN mostly refers to a mother trying to decrease intimacy to her child for misbehaving in order that the child listens to the advice.

People in the UK abide by the high context cultures that tend to highly appreciate the context, message, and others' feelings instead of the speaker himself in a spoken interaction (Dickey 1997). Thus, the addressing patterns vary based on age, professional rank, formality, and intimacy. The use of T such as, Mr., Miss, Mrs., Sir, Madam, Doctor, and Professor, is commonly applied when British speaker is addressing a person whose name is unknown. Additionally, it is used to show some respectful manners to someone with high social status, people in office, or people with transactional relationship (e.g. doctor and patient, salesclerk and customer) (Dickey, 1997).

The use of FN is the informal address. FN is mostly used when both speaker and interlocutor are close like friends or fellow workers. Even so, some people at workplace may call their superior using FN due to age reason. They are somehow at the same age or some years different. Yet, the gap of position in this relationship is usually not too distant, just one level above or below. Brown (1965) also confirmed that the lack of formality in addressing is mostly caused by the close distance between speakers. Likewise, British speakers address someone by FN when the person he talks to is younger. In brief, the use of FN in British culture represents the terminology by Brown and Gilman (1960) about Power that when a speaker has power over the addressee, informal address is acceptable On the other hand, the use of LN is usually the formal address for someone familiar, but not intimate or someone younger (e.g. teacher to student) (Fasold, 1990).

British also uses nickname in spoken communication to call someone who is really intimate with the speaker, like close friends or best friends. This use of nickname is rather informal between best friends or the message being conveyed does not contain any serious intention.

People in the UK name their partners with combination of styles such as, TFN or TLN to refer someone in professional settings. TFN combination is commonly used between teachers, between employees, and so on. This address can be informal depending on the situation. On the flipside, when a speaker uses TLN combination at once, he is referring his colleagues in formal context. For instance, the employer and employees are having meeting and there is only small possibility for the people to call others in informal way. Consequently, they prefer using TLN.

Terms of Address in Canada

Generally speaking, there are two prominent types of Canadian culture based on their origins, they are French Canadians and Western Canadians (Hwang, 1991). In this respect, all Canadians do take matters of politeness seriously. People in Canada are more likely to be formal and appropriate showing high respect to whoever they are interacting with (Oyetade, 1995). Regarding this, the use of TLN are significantly found. Canadians will start calling by the FN when the interlocutor himself invites them to do so. If not, referring by TLN will remain used.

Meanwhile at workplace, both cultures propose two slightly different terms of address. This is inferred from the patterns done by each of them. Western Canadians are prone to referring close friends with their FN. Likewise, they will refer to their intimate colleagues with their FN in informal situation,

even when they are with many people. Unlike Western Canadians, French Canadians remain calling their fellow workers using their LN in public setting, but refer using FN when it is private. To French Canadians, one's academic title and degree must be highly respected. Therefore, its appropriate use is a must.

Terms of Address in Indonesia

Similar to British culture, Indonesian culture adheres to the high-context cultures as what other Asian countries do. Besides, Indonesian culture also believes in hierarchical relationship that manage to apply particular address forms based on vertical clustering (Susanto, 2014). Regarding this relationship, the addressing patterns are arranged vertically from different professional ranks, age, and intimacy (Gisle and Aijmer, 2011; Aliakbari and Toni, 2008). Indonesian culture does not categorize address terms based on the degree of formality as it is always formal at workplace or other formal situations and settings such as, transactional setting. Similarly, Indonesian people do not have family name as their last name that makes them call others by FN/ preferred name, always. The use of last name, as family name, does not exist in address form.

The professional ranks do define how people name others (Ozcan, 2016). Superiors surely refer to their employees by FN unless they are far older than the superiors. In this case, the superiors will refer them by T (e.g. Mr., Ms., Pak, Bu, Mbak, and etc) preceding FN to show politeness. Even so, the older employees call the superiors by T only, rarely by TFN. This is called the no-naming theory both by Ervin-Tripp (1969) and by Brown and Ford (1961). For Indonesian non-equal colleagues, formal address using T only is common as it is considered unpleasant to call someone in higher status by the name. Only the high status group can address by name. For equal fellow workers, the use of TFN combined is mostly found (e.g. Mr. Bryan, Ms. Lisa, Pak Mario, Bu Marta). When they are intimate, they may call others by FN, but rarely found in public setting. They mostly call their colleagues by the combination of TFN when in office, regardless of their intimacy.

Nonetheless, when colleagues are intimate and in the same age, it is possible for them to refer each other by name when the superior is not around. Even though it is acceptable to refer colleagues by name in formal setting, the use of T and name when addressing aims to show politeness to the superior, when he is around, indicating that everyone is treated equally important.

In concern of intimacy, most Indonesians refer others by name (FN) or nickname. Nickname is very common in Indonesia. However, age factor also plays a role in the use of nickname when addressing. Older speakers are acceptable to call younger communication partners by nickname to show intimacy and politeness. Wolfson (1989) explained that people with occupational relationship, similar social background, and age range promote greater informal address in verbal communication. This notion by Wolfson was inspired from the term Solidarity in the Power and Solidarity dimension proposed by Brown and Gilman (1960) beforehand. Hence, rather than calling younger fellows by T only (e.g. Dek, polite term for someone younger in Indonesian language) that sounds like a stranger, people generally call the name (FN) or nickname

instead to be closer psychologically with the person. Additionally, there are a number of polite address terms for someone whose name and age are unknown. The polite address terms are dek, mas, mbak, and kak. These terms are generally used when both speaker and the interlocutor are total stranger communicating in transactional settings.

Intercultural Communication

To be able to describe how proper intercultural communication should be done, its clear definition must be understood. First, the definition of culture is more likely to be difficult to explain. Matsumoto (1996:16) mentioned the following definition of culture.

"[...] the set of attitudes, values, beliefs, and behaviors shared by a group of people, but different for each individual, communicated from one generation to the next."
In other words, culture is what a group of society shares among members in terms of belief, value, custom, and tradition making it as the identity of the group that is distinct from another.

Second, Lustig and Koester (2006:46) described the definition of intercultural communication as *"a symbolic, interpretive, transactional, contextual process in which people from different cultures create shared meanings."* As intercultural communication performs to exchange information or other transactional needs, the success of it is strongly expected. Since it really attaches to the value of culture involved, the pattern of a good intercultural interaction is fuzzy. As a group of culture shares the same notion of how certain things are done, there surely is no problem when communicating with other members within the same group. However, when two different cultures or more are engaged in a social interaction, it might lead to misunderstanding or even offense due to the dissimilar perspective of proper interaction. To make a communication a success, both speakers must be aware of possible challenge that may appear from the standard of each culture. Otherwise, both parties will not make it to success.

Especially when talking to someone whose first language is different, one party might utter an expression that is considered unusual to native speaker, such as, the use of inappropriate lexis. Additionally, the use of unsuitable address terms often leads to uncomfortable situation for both speakers. Chi (2016) explained that communication across cultures requires a lot of adjustment and adaptation to the situation. Clarity also plays a big role in the interaction allowing people to apprehend the intended message more easily. This also applies in the addressing terms that may sound inappropriate in one's culture, yet is acceptable in another culture.

Therefore, there is no exact guideline of how one should address his interlocutor from different culture. It either follows the addresser's or the addressee's cultural pattern. Most of times, the term of address being used is the one that the speaker's adheres to (Chi, 2016). There are actually many people not knowing what their addressees prefers to be addressed. As the example, when one introduces his name to a speaking partner, it does not always mean that he wants to be called by that name directly. In some cultures, there should always be title/T preceding the name/FN or LN of the person due to the age or rank inequality. Meanwhile, some others

literally mean that the name they introduce to their speaking partner to be the addressed name.

Jandt (2013:81–83) described that people communicating across cultures have a number of potential barriers to overcome. Firstly, people concern on fulfilling the society's expectation while not knowing what the society expects them to. They are afraid of not being able to response an interaction properly. Also, they fear addressing others inappropriately. Secondly, Jandt (p.81) mentioned that one of barriers in intercultural communication is "assuming similarity instead of difference". When people are overseas, not few of them use the same address terms as in their culture. By so doing, different way of addressing partner allows miscommunication between the two. As each culture is uniquely different from another, this dissimilarity should not be discarded. Some people may think it is not a big deal, while some others do consider that the way they are addressed represents how they are respected. Especially in countries that embrace hierarchical relationship, like in most Asian countries, the form of address is a significant issue in social interaction. Therefore, one should better ask to avoid false assumption. Moreover, there is no harm in asking. Last but not least, ethnocentrism does exist. Ethnocentrism is an assumption of downgrading other's way of addressing as a less polite way by only taking one's own culture as the standard. This also performs to be a big encounter for communication across cultures.

METHODS

Qualitative approach is applied to figure out the terms of address used by intercultural speakers within the same workplace. The use of qualitative approach works best for this study as qualitative contributes to explore certain concern related to complexity of individual's use of address forms through words (Creswell, 2012).

This study collects data using two data elicitation methods, which are participant observation as well as audio recording of the authentic use of address forms in daily communication. The participant observation aims to truly experience the real setting of the condition being observed (Creswell, 2012). By so doing, the observer is able to record any authentic data occurred during the observations as she is the member of the society.

The recording session is done for twelve people with different ranks of occupation starting from the branch manager, senior teacher, three Indonesian teachers, two British teachers, one Canadian teacher, two class assistants, as well as two cleaning service men (CS, hereafter). The recording is also done several times during any conversation happening in the setting. These participants are engaged in accordance with the principles of purposive sampling which covers reachability aspect towards the participants. Besides, this group of participants represent intercultural society that best describes the phenomenon in natural settings.

After conducting audio recording for the participants of the study, the script of the discourse done by each speaker is transcribed and categorized based on each addresser talking to specific addressees. Then, data of address term patterns is obtained after categorizing the findings. After that, the description of findings is done. Detailed description through words in this step is conducted to find out the terms of address used by the participants of the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, the authentic data of address terms spoken by people sharing occupation in intercultural setting are exposed. There are mainly twelve people working together as well as using a number of different address terms. The address terms done by different professional ranks lead to different forms as well, yet the terms mostly rely on hierarchical relationship among speakers. On the flipside, the address patterns done by colleagues of equal ranks tend to be various due to personal intimacy, age, and many more. The use of the forms is presented in table 1 until 12 (the pattern of tables 1 to 12 is adapted from Qin, 2008).

The findings in Table 1 confirm the diverse terms of address used by a number of professional ranks. Starting from the branch manager, he calls almost everyone in the office by the FN. This is due to several reasons. One of which is the professional rank reason. As he has the highest position in the office, he has the power over the others to call them by their FN.

It is previously explained that Indonesians adhere to the hierarchical relationship that calling subordinates by name is very common. Moreover, his age is surely far older than most people in the office, except the elder CS. The elder CS is far older than the branch manager that makes him call the CS by T+nickname. The use of T represents polite manner and nickname is mainly to show intimacy towards the elder CS. Hence, it can be inferred that even when someone has the highest position at workplace, consideration of age, intimacy, and politeness does emerge as well.

Table 1 Terms of address used by the branch manager

Relationship	By branch manager to…	Address terms	Address terms in use
Superior to subordinates	Senior Indonesian teacher	FN	Ti, can you make sure that…?
	British teacher 1	FN	L, you finally finished your….
	British teacher 2	FN	E, did you have this class?
	New Canadian teacher	FN	V, do you have class after this? We need to talk about tomorrow's event.
	Indonesian teacher 1	FN	Am, do you finish planning?
	Indonesian teacher 2	FN	Ev, is Y your students?
	Indonesian teacher 3	FN	Did you have meeting, D?
	Class assistant 1	FN	R, next time when you're making certificate, please make from master data.
	Class assistant 2	FN	Er, do you finish your task?
	Elder cleaning service (CS, hereafter)	TFN	Mr. X, lantai dua apa sudah dibersihkan? (*Mr. X, have you cleaned the second floor?*)
	CS	FN	Ih, tolong itu dibereskan. (*Ih, can you please clean this up.*)

It is previously explained that Indonesians adhere to the hierarchical relationship that calling subordinates by name is very common. Moreover, his age is surely far older than most

people in the office, except the elder CS. The elder CS is far older than the branch manager that makes him call the CS by T+nickname. The use of T represents polite manner and nickname is mainly to show intimacy towards the elder CS. Hence, it can be inferred that even when someone has the highest position at workplace, consideration of age, intimacy, and politeness does emerge as well.

Table 2 Terms of address used by the senior teacher

Relationship	By senior teacher to…	Address terms	Address terms in use
Subordinate to superior	Branch manager	FN	Lk, how many was it?
Superior to subordinates	British teacher 2	FN	E, did you have this class?
	Indonesian teacher 1	FN	Am, do you need the…?
	Indonesian teacher 2	FN	Ev, I think we could….
	Indonesian teacher 3	FN	Was that you student, D?
	British teacher 1	FN	What happen, L?
	Class assistant 1	FN	R, can you please check the…?
	Elder CS	TFN	Mr. X, ada ininya? (*Is there any*…?)
	CS	FN	Ih, tau ini apa? (*Ih, do you know what this is?*)

Having seen the address terms by the senior Indonesian teacher (Table 2), the patterns are similar to the branch manager's. However, the senior teacher does not apply T when talking to the branch manager. This is contradict to what most Indonesians use to address someone with higher rank. Even so, age factor does impact on the senior teacher's address forms. She commonly uses FN to most of her speaking partners. The fact that the senior teacher has aged herself, the power of age seems to weigh more than the rank factor. Furthermore, she shows some respect to the elder by addressing him using TFN even though the rank is below her.

Table 3 Terms of address used by Indonesian teacher 1

Relationship	By Indonesian teacher 1 to…	Address terms	Address terms in use
Subordinate to superior	Branch manager	T	I have done it, Ms.
	Senior teacher	TFN	Ms. T, do you know that…
Work colleagues	Indonesian teacher 2	Nickname	Baby, is this correct?
Work colleagues	British teacher 1	FN	L, can I borrow this?
Work colleagues	British teacher 2	FN	Do you need something, E?
Work colleagues with different professional ranks	Class assistant 1	TFN	What happen, Miss R?

Table 4 Terms of address used by Indonesian teacher 2

Relationship	By Indonesian teacher 2 to…	Address terms	Address terms in use
Subordinate to superior	Branch manager	No-naming	Yes, I did it.
Subordinate to superior	Senior teacher	TFN	Ms. T, do you know this?
Work colleagues	Indonesian teacher 1	Nickname	Baby, how was yesterday?
Work colleagues	British teacher 1	TFN	Mr. L, did you watch it?
Work colleagues	New Canadian teacher	TFN	Ms. V, I have planned this and….

Work colleagues with different professional ranks	Elder CS	TFN	Mr. X, ininya abis. (*Mr. X, we're running out of this.*)
Work colleagues with different professional ranks	CS	FN	Ih, saya pesen lalapan. (*Ih, I want lalapan-type of Javanese food.*)

Table 5 Terms of address used by Indonesian teacher 3

Relationship	By Indonesian teacher 3 to…	Address terms	Address terms in use
Subordinate to superior	Branch manager	No-naming	Do you know that…?
	Senior teacher	TFN	Ms. Ti, do you teach this class?
Work colleagues	Indonesian teacher 3	TFN	Ms. Ev, are you gonna use the…?

Unlike the two previous participants, most Indonesian teachers, starting from teacher 1, 2, and 3, are more likely to use T+ FN, T only, FN only or nickname (e.g. baby) for daily communication. This matches the theory by Friedrich (1966) explained previously that context, sex, age and relationship between speakers also influences the address patterns. The closer the factors, the more intimate the speakers will be.

Although the use of T only is used by most people at the office to the branch manager, this choice of address terms only applies to Indonesian subordinates whose age is much younger than the manager. Some Indonesian teachers whose age is nearly the same as the manager address him by FN only or mentioning no name of his.

The similar pattern is used for the elder CS that everyone in the office call the elder by TFN. However, the address term used for the class assistant, which is lower in rank, is commonly the same with the pattern to address other Indonesian teachers whose age is older. The address pattern is the use of T preceding FN indicating politeness.

For British teachers (Table 6 and 7), the patterns used for daily interaction are mainly different. The only similarity they are showing is the use of FN to the manager. What is surprising from the patterns is that these British teachers address the manager by FN, while using T or TFN to the senior teacher whose rank is lower than the manager. In this phenomenon, content and context factors govern the discourse. The first British teacher (Table 6) tends to show intimacy to more people at the workplace, given the fact that he has been working there longer compared to the second British teacher. Thus, the intimacy showed is acceptable. Besides, he calls one of the Indonesian teachers by nickname "shorty" indicating closer friendship than with the other teachers. This also applies the informal (T) theory by Friedrich about the relationship with group and content and context factors. On the other hand, the second British teacher (Table 7) call other fellow workers of equal ranks by the use of T only (Ms.) to show professionalism or politeness towards others. Even with the class assistants, this British teacher 2 remains showing professionalism to them by addressing T as well. While the first British teacher commonly calls the elder CS by TFN, the second teacher prefers to use no name when addressing. This second British teacher applies the no-naming theory.

Table 6 Terms of address used by British teacher 1

Relationship	By British teacher 1 to…	Address terms	Address terms in use
Subordinate to superior	Branch manager	FN	Lk, is it now?
	Senior teacher	TFN	Ms.T, how do we get the…?
Work colleagues	Indonesian teacher 1	Nickname	Hey Shorty, how are you today?
	Indonesian teacher 2	FN	Erv, do you have the…?
	Indonesian teacher 3	FN	D, look at this.
Work colleagues with different professional ranks	All class assistants	TFN	Ms. R, do I have any… today?
Work colleagues with different professional ranks	Elder CS	TFN	Mr. X, can I get some lalapan?

Table 7 Terms of address used by British teacher 2

Relationship	By British teacher 2 to…	Address terms	Address terms in use
Subordinate to superior	Branch manager	FN	Yeah, sounds good, thanks, Lk.
	Senior teacher	T	Is it gonna be my class, Ms?
Work colleagues	Indonesian teacher 1	T	What is it, Ms?
	Indonesian teacher 2	T	Are you okay, Ms?
Work colleagues with different professional ranks	All teachers and class assistants	T	Ms., I will get one of those, do you want some?
Work colleagues with different professional ranks	All CS	No-naming	I want lalapan, please.

Table 8 Terms of address used by Canadian teacher

Relationship	By Canadian teacher to…	Address terms	Address terms in use
Subordinate to superior	Branch manager	No–naming	Did you think it's…?
Work colleagues	Indonesian teacher 1	No–naming	It's really pretty here.
Work colleagues	Indonesian teacher 2	No–naming	Yeah, how about this?
Work colleagues with different professional ranks	All class assistants	T	Is it available?
Work colleagues with different professional ranks	All CS	No-naming	Yeah, can I get this?

While everyone else applies a set of different patterns for addressing, this new Canadian teacher is prone to using the no-naming theory to everybody in the office (Table 8). The biggest rationale for this is that she does not adhere to the theory of calling colleagues, either equal or a level above, using the TFN. However, as she notices that addressing by FN only seems to be uncommon at the place, she prefers using none of the patterns. Further, the age factor appears to impact on the choice of addressing pattern given the fact that she has quite aged herself.

Table 9 Terms of address used by class assistant 1

Relationship	By class assistant 1 to…	Address terms	Address terms in use
Subordinate to superior	Branch manager	T	Yes, Ms.
Work colleagues with different professional ranks	All teachers	T	Excuse me, Ms.
Work colleagues	Class assistant 2	FN	R, have you got your lunch?
Work colleagues with different professional ranks	Elder CS	TFN	Saya pesen ini aja deh, Mr. X. (*I will just get this, Mr.X.*)

Table 10 Terms of address used by class assistant 2

Relationship	By class assistant 2 to…	Address terms	Address terms in use
Subordinate to superior	Branch manager	T	Already, Ms.
Work colleagues with different professional ranks	All teachers	T	I'm so sorry, Ms.
Work colleagues	Class assistant 1	TFN	Ms. Er, what should I do?
Work colleagues with different professional ranks	Elder CS	TFN	Makasih, Mr. X. (*Thank you, Mr.X.*)

Class assistants are the group of people who tend to call everyone using T only or TFN (Table 9 and 10). However, they sometimes address their junior using FN only, as they are younger in terms of age as well as the years of service at the place. It mostly happens when they talk in private. In public, they oftentimes call each other by TFN. Also, they always address whoever is older than them, even just for a couple of years, using TFN. It aims to replace the Indonesian address "mbak" for older female.

Table 11 Terms of address used by elder CS

Relationship	By Elder CS to…	Address terms	Address terms in use
Subordinate to superior	Branch manager	T	Sudah tadi saya cek, Ms. (*I have checked it out, Ms.*)
Work colleagues with different professional ranks	All teachers	T	Order, Ms.?

Table 12 Terms of address used by all CS

Relationship	By CS to…	Address terms	Address terms in use
Subordinate to superior	Branch manager	T	Ms, order?
Work colleagues with different professional ranks	All teachers	T	Do you want to order, Ms?

For all cleaning service persons, they name everyone using T only or TFN (Table 11 and 12). This is due to the professional rank factor. Especially for the branch manager, the address form will always be T only when speaking in person.

Regarding the twelve tables presented previously, it can be inferred that Indonesian, British, and Canadian speakers

propose different patterns of address forms at workplace domain. Indonesians mainly address their interlocutors based on the age, courtesy, and intimacy using T, TFN, FN only, and nickname. Only some Indonesian subordinates address the manager by T as a matter of professional rank. The use of T is influenced by the age and courtesy that forces them to do so. While the British speakers tend to use T, FN only, and nickname aiming to remain polite and keep the degree of intimacy among peers, Canadian teacher has a preference to call any speaking partners by mentioning no name of theirs.

Moreover, the findings also confirm that the pattern of address terms used by the intercultural speakers does not always stick to one's origin culture. Rather, the speakers must see the context and the habit at the place. Besides, one can choose whatever address form he is using by always considering whether the form is acceptable to the society. As long as the form of address is accepted, any form can be applied in the circle.

Pedagogical implications

The patterns of address terms used in real life conversation have shed light on the need for authentic materials in pedagogy. The findings of this study are valuable to the pedagogical needs of providing reliable source for better language learning. In this section, how the findings of the study contribute to pedagogy is exposed.

There are a number of rationales why the choice of address terms for communicating within intercultural setting is a significant lesson to focus on. Firstly, the rate of intercultural society has increased more widely. The need of knowing what to say is also required, including the form of address. How to properly address someone whose culture is distinct from the speaker's is worth mentioning. Spencer-Oatey and Franklin, 2009 even supported that overseas study requires Intercultural Interaction Competence (ICIC). That quite a number of countries do not use family name as their last name is indeed alarming. This allows them to call others by FN following T to express politeness. As most western countries do not call lecturers by their FN, this would be a big concern for international students, especially Asians, whose pattern of address terms is distinct.

Secondly, raising individual's awareness of differences is always a good notion to discuss. This awareness enables speakers from any cultures to always be prepared of dissimilarities in any term. This also means that speaker will always be understanding if there is another speaker from different culture addressing them in an uncomfortable way. Previously mentioned, it is natural to find people speaking foreign language uttering inappropriate lexis. As an aware native speaker, one should recognize this sort of error.

To implement this topic into English language teaching, there will be a series of suggested classroom activities for developing learners' awareness of applicable address terms when interacting to English speakers from across cultures. The four suggested activities are brainstorm, elicit, present, and practice. First, teacher can do brainstorming activity. This aims to see what students have known and have not. Students should brainstorm address terms existing in their native culture and in English culture. Second, teacher should better elicit when to use the mentioned terms, the difference, and many others.

Teacher can ask any questions that he considers important to lead to the core lesson.

Third, teacher can start presenting how to properly use appropriate address terms by agreeing to what students have answered beforehand or adding if there is more to explain. In this presentation stage, showing examples of dialogue using address terms is also a must. The conversations in the findings are very encouraged to use. Besides, teacher should tell the context and underlying factor when the address terms are acceptable to use. Then, in the practice stage, teacher can provide written and oral practice, such as, fill in the blank dialogue, role play from the completed dialogue, and many more. Furthermore, teacher can assign students to make use of the address terms from the findings of study into dialogue in pairs. If the class is considered strong and able to cope with more oral production, assigning more spoken activities is encouraged. Students can be assigned for creating their own conversation of proper address forms as a group using wider social contexts than the previous activities.

CONCLUSION

All in all, the authentic patterns of address terms used by people sharing profession within intercultural setting allows them to apply various patterns based on either their own cultural pattern or personal decision. Since the workplace is in Indonesia, most patterns are Indonesian's. Nevertheless, many teachers, including the international teachers, generally apply whatever patterns they adhere to such as, the no-naming address, FN, or even nickname.

In regard to the findings above, politeness and age are the two main aspects why people choose particular terms of address. Moreover, the degree of intimacy among equal fellow workers also influences the choice that make them address each other using nickname or FN only.

These terms of address used by intercultural speakers at workplace perform to be the authentic reference for an effective language leaning. Given the fact that the three factors are influential to the choice of address terms, it can be inferred that the three factors in social interaction must be highlighted. Therefore, an English teacher must not only introduce the English address terms independently without emphasizing the importance of knowing the possible social factors as well as the context of the interaction. Likewise, more frequent spoken practice is also encouraged to foster students' spontaneous use of appropriate address terms. This enables students to be more fluent and accurate at the same time.

References

Afful, Joseph Benjamin Archibald. (2006). Address Terms among University Students in Ghana: A Case Study'. Language and Intercultural Communication 6(1): 76–91.

Afzali, K. (2011). The Address Forms of Spouses in Different Social Strata in Iran and Its Sociolinguistic Implications. *International Journal of Linguistics*. *3*(1), 10.

Aliakbari, M. (2008). *The Realization of Address terms in Modern Persian in Iran: A Sociolinguistics Study*. Retrieved July 10 2018 from linguisticonly.de/35_08/aliakbari.pdf.

Brown R.W., and M. Ford. (1961). Address in American English. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 62:375–385.

Brown, R. & Gilman, A. (1960). 'The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity'. In T. Sebeoki (Ed.) *Style in Language*. Cambridge, MA: 253–276.

Brown, Roger & Albert Gilman. (1960). 'The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity'. In Thomas Sebeoki (ed.) Style in Language. Cambridge, MA: 253–276.

Brown, Roger. (1965). The Basic Dimensions of Interpersonal Relationship. Social Psychology, Ed. By Roger Brown, 51-100. New York/London: Free Press.

Chi, D., L. (2016). INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION: Differences between Western and Asian perspective. Unpublished master's thesis. Centria University of Applied Sciences.

Dickey, E. (1997). 'Forms of Address and Terms of Reference'. *Journal of Linguistics*, 33, 255-274.

Dickey, Eleanor (1997). 'Forms of Address And Terms of Reference'. Journal of Linguistics, 33, 255-274.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M. (1969). *Sociolinguistics*. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, ed. L. Berkowitz, vol.4, p.93–107. Excerpt published in *Sociolinguistics*, eds. J.B. Pride and J. Holmes, 1972. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Fasold, R. (1984). *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Fasold, R. (1990). *The Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Gisle, A. & Aijmer, K. (2011) *Pragmatics of society. Volume 5, Handbooks of Pragmatics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fasold, Ralph. (1990). The Sociolinguistics of Language. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Friedrich P. (1966). *Structural Implications of Russian Pronominal Usage*. Linguarum. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 288.

Gisle, A. & K. Aijmer. (2011). Pragmatics of society. Volume 5, Handbooks of Pragmatics. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Holmes, J. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.

Jandt E. F. 2013. *An Introduction to Intercultural Communication: Identities in a Global Community* (7th Ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Lamber, Wallace & Richard Tucker (1976). Tù, Vous, Used: A Social Psychological Study of Address Patterns. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Leech, Geoffrey. (1999): 'The Distribution and Function of Vocatives in American and British English Conversation'. In Hilde Hasselgard & Signe Oksefjell, (eds.): *Out of Corpora*. Studies in Honor of Stig Johansson. Amsterdam: 107¬118.

Lustig, M. W. and Koester, J. (2006). *Intercultural Competence: Interpersonal Communication across Culture* (5th Ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Mahmoodan, A. (2013). *The Semantics and Pragmatics of Address forms in Persian*. Published Thesis: Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU).

Matsumoto, D. (1996). Culture and Psychology. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Mühlhäusler P. and Harré R. (1990). *Pronouns and People*: The linguistic construction of social and personal Identity". Oxford: Blackwell.

Oyetade, S. O. (1995). 'A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Address Forms in Yoruba'. *Language in Society* 24: 515–535.

Oyetade, Solomon Oluwale. (1995). 'A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Address Forms in Yoruba'. Language in Society 24: 515–535.

Özcan, F. H. (2016). Choice of address terms in conversational setting. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 13(1), 9821002. doi:10.14687/ijhs.v13i1.3489

Susanto, D. (2014). The Pragmatic Meanings of Address Terms Sampeyan and Anda. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *4*(1), 140-155.

The National Archives. (2013). *Effective Communications: Raising the profile of your archive service*.

Wardaugh, R. (1986). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics: Fifth Edition*. Basil Blackwell Ltd.

Wardaugh, R., and Fuller, J. M. (2015). *An Introduction of Sociolinguistics: Seventh Edition*. West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing.

Wardhaugh, R. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 258-281.

Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. NY: Newbury House Publishers.

****