Interlanguage Discourse of Thesis Acknowledgements Section: Examining the Terms of Address

Yazid Basthomi
State University of Malang, Indonesia
Email: ybasthomi@um.ac.id

The present article addresses the under-researched issue of the use of terms of address in the (sub) genre of thesis acknowledgements sections written in English by Indonesian students of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). The corpus was composed of acknowledgments sections of 40 theses available at the State University of Malang, Indonesia. Focal to the findings is the notion that the thesis writers tend to use full-fledged academic titles in addressing the parties who have immediate contributions to the completion of the thesis. Those peripheral to the thesis completion are addressed using or alternatively without academic titles. The findings show that the seemingly respectful acknowledgements are not necessarily that innocently reverential. The findings also demonstrate that solidarity in social relations does not necessarily lead the writers to use neutral and/or endearing forms of address. This latter point puts a challenge to the conventional conceptions of "power" and "solidarity."

1. Introduction

There has been ample amount of research on certain genres of English writing (e.g., Mirahayuni, 2001, 2002; Ahmad, 1997; Susilo, 1999, 2004; Swales, 1990, 2004; Cahyono, 2001; Basthomi, 2006; Adnan, 2004). However, the sub-genre of thesis acknowledgements section has been overlooked. Among the (very) few works, a master's thesis by Erfan (2007) is probably the only one, I am aware of thus far, that explicitly analyzes the texts of thesis acknowledgements section. Despite this concern, it does not seem to come up with findings dealing with the use of forms of address which tend to densely occupy thesis acknowledgements sections. Erfan's project has not significantly shown additional information to that of its predecessor, that is, a work by Kadarisman (2005). Both, paying attention to the issue of "divine presence" that takes the form of expressing gratitude to God (before other parties such as thesis advisors) in thesis acknowledgements section, have overlooked the pragmatic use of terms of address by nonnative speakers of English and/or students of EFL. In my own work (Basthomi, 2004), the discussion of the use of terms of address by Javanese students of EFL does not relate to thesis acknowledgements section. This situation suggests that an aspect of the performance (reflecting competence) of EFL learners has not been adequately explicated.

The issue raised above relates to the writing performance of EFL students and nonnative speakers of English. In this strand, the advent of Kaplan's seminal work on contrastive rhetoric in the 1960s has stirred a number of other studies on various genres of writing, such as letter writing, academic writing, newspaper articles, and research articles (Cahyono, 2001; Mirahayuni, 2002; Adnan, 2004, Susilo, 2004; Basthomi, 2006). However, as suggested earlier, contrastive rhetoric studies of acknowledgements section as available, for instance, in Master's or doctoral theses, have been neglected. The fact that there have been quite a number of studies addressing the issues of graduate studies (e.g., Barnes, 2005; Bingman, 2003; Cox-Peterson, 2004; Falkner, 2001; Mehra, 2004; Notaro, 2000; Pullen, 2003) has not provided necessary documentation about the performance of graduate students in addressing other people for the purpose of showing their gratitude in the acknowledgements section of their theses. This situation warrants studies on how forms of address in acknowledgements section are

nacted in written discourse of theses, particularly, by those for whom English is a foreign language.

Swales and Feak (2000, p. 198) provide an argument why thesis acknowledgements section has not invited researchers to do some analyses. According to them, the situation is due to the fact that acknowledgements section is not to be examined. However, since the acknowledgements section is found in the beginning of dissertations or theses, Swales and Feak give a caveat to thesis writers, particularly, those to whom English is foreign, to be mindful when writing the section.

Despite the fact that acknowledgements section is not an essential part of thesis to examine, my own experience shows that one of my thesis examiners paid attention to my acknowledgements section; the examiner commented that my acknowledgements section was too long (running about five pages) and should be condensed so as to run well on two pages (to comply with guides for writing thesis in my University).

The foregoing discussion has been focused on the contrastive rhetoric area. Let us now move on to another area of research which also has to do with the performance and competence of EFL and nonnative speakers of English, that is, interlanguage pragmatics. Researchers in the area of interlanguage pragmatic studies have documented relatively ample findings comparing the pragmatic performance of native and non-native speakers of certain languages (see e.g., Baba, 1999; Blum-Kulka, 1991; Hill, 1997; Houck & Gass, 1996; Sasaki, 1998; Basthomi, 2004; Syahri, 2007). However, such studies have focused on speech acts of apologies, requests, complaints, compliment responses, and refusals, which are, in general, spoken. Since they deal with speech, it is argued that what they have tapped on links more intimately to performance than to competence. This is because spoken discourse tends to be actualized in real time, which does not grant much time to the speakers to have a thorough

consultation with their competence. This situation differs from written discourse in which the writer tends to have relatively plenty of time to carefully exhaust their faculty for the best; thus, she or he can demonstrate the best of her or his competence.

In relation to the above issue, scholars have discussed forms of address from different angles. Ervin-Tripp (1972) and Wardhaugh (2002), for instance, talk about forms of address in the light of a sociolinguistic approach. Dunnet, Dubin, and Lezberg (1986) touch upon forms of address from an intercultural perspective. More to the applied area, Pachler (1999) includes forms of address within the discussion of culture teaching and learning. In the area of foreign language teaching and learning, we can say that the discussion of forms of address deals with the linguistic and cultural competences to be attained by the learners.

In the practice of teaching English as a foreign language, as is the case in the Indonesian setting, one might witness that students already know the titles *Mr.*, *Mrs.*, *Ms.*, *Miss*, *Ma'am*, which are widely used in English. However, one might also notice that when Indonesian students use them, the use often sounds inappropriate, i.e., it is against the conventions or norms shared by native speakers of English. Possibly, that situation might be due to the students' lack of knowledge concerning the 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 or Indonesian) 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). Basthomi (2004) found that Javanese students of EFL tend to be short of the pragmatic competence in the use of English forms of address. Compared to that of native English speakers, the tendency of the Javanese students of EFL is that they are likely to resort to formal English forms of

address in situation where their counterparts tend to use more informal ones.

In brief, there has been no empirical research dedicated to investigating the use of terms of address in thesis acknowledgements section, and only very few have been devoted to analyzing the textual realization of thesis acknowledgements section as a genre or sub-genre in itself. The present paper is, accordingly, geared to fill this gap. It analyzes the texts of thesis acknowledgements section with a focus on the use of forms of address. Thus, relevant to the foregoing discussion, it aims to answer two questions, as follows:

1. Who are the human elements (parties) to acknowledge in thesis acknowledgements section written in English by Indonesian students of EFL?
2. How are the terms of address written in thesis acknowledgements section manifested?

2. Methodology

In gathering the data, purposive sampling (see e.g., Ary, et al., 2002; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003) was employed. The sources of data were theses written in English by Indonesian Master's students majoring in English Language Education at the Graduate Program, State University of Malang, Indonesia. Ten most current thesis acknowledgments sections were ·first randomly selected, and then analyzed. These ten texts were then cross-checked with another set of ten thesis acknowledgements sections, which were less current. However, since a point was found in the first ten acknowledgements sections which was not present in the second ten acknowledgements sections, analyzing another group of ten acknowledgements sections, less current than those in the second group, was deemed necessary. So, the third group served as an "adjudicator" to resolve the surfacing differences between the first and the second groups of thesis acknowledgements sections.

However, the third group showed a case which the first and second group did not have. Therefore, a decision was made to analyze another group of ten acknowledgements sections. So, in all, 40 thesis acknowledgements sections (out of 286 theses, as of January 17, 2008) were analyzed: ten each in 2007, 2006, 2005, and 2004.

3. Findings and discussion

Central to the presentation of the findings are issues about the parties to thank and the way to address the acknowledged parties in the thesis acknowledgements section.

3.1 The parties to thank

There are some parties the contributions of whom are mentioned in the thesis acknowledgements sections. Of the parties to mention, the first salient one is "God," with various ways of mentioning. This situation just endorses the findings of Kadarisman (2005) and Erfan (2007). However, this point will not be pursued further here; instead, the focus is on the rest of the parties to mention in the acknowledgements texts.

The texts show that usually the parties to mention after God are the thesis advisors. Following these parties, the thesis writers also usually acknowledge the Director of the Graduate Program, Convener of the English Language Education (ELE) Program, faculty members (lecturers) of the ELE (and Graduate Program in general), and the staff and librarians of the Graduate Program. Following these parties (central to the Graduate Program), the writers tend to also mention friends and/or classmates, and principal (vice principal), and English teachers whose schools were the setting of the writers' research projects. Alternatively, they may also mention significant others including the non-human parties, i.e., sponsoring body (or bodies), such as the local government of the writer's hometown. The last significant others to mention are usually their family members and/or relatives. Out of the family members and/or relatives, husband or wife is usually mentioned the last. It should be emphasized

that thesis advisors always appear in the texts of acknowledgement sections. Other parties may manifest and, at times, do not appear in the texts (there is a varying degree of likelihood of appearance). Table 1 summarizes the typical sequence of the mentioning of the parties to thank in the thesis acknowledgements texts.

Table 1. Human parties to acknowledge in thesis acknowledgements section by Indonesian master's students of EFL

No.	Parties to mention
1.	First thesis advisor
2.	Second thesis advisor
3.	Director of the graduate program
4.	Convener of graduate ELE program
5.	Faculty members, graduate program
6.	Staff (and librarians), graduate program
7.	Classmates and/or friends
8.	School principal (and vice principal)
9.	English teachers
10.	Students
11.	Family members and/or relatives
12.	Husband/wife (and children)

3.2 The manner of addressing

With regard to the use of terms of address in the mention of parties in the acknowledgements texts, out of the 40 texts, no single case was found where the writers mentioned the names of their first and second thesis advisors without the use of title(s), particularly, academic titles. Even when it happened that two writers did not use academic titles, still they referred to the parties using an Indonesian title of *Bu* and English titles of *Mrs.* and *Grandma*. This holds true with the mention of the Director of the Graduate Program and the Convener of the ELE Program. Without exception, the writers used academic titles, complementing the Director's and Convener's names. At times, the academic titles were also added to Indonesian titles of *Bapak* (for male) and *Ibu* (for female). All this shows respect on the part of the writer for the acknowledged individuals. However, faculty members, administrative staff, and librarians were mentioned without their names and titles. The writers, in this case, just mentioned their designations. This is also true of the mention of non-human parties (in the form of names of institutions supportive of the writers' studies).

As regards the mention of friends, classmates, family members/relatives, and spouse, the terms of address used were not consistent. Occasionally, the mentions did not use titles, but, at times, (and rather frequently), they also used academic titles. It should also be noted that when the writers used titles, they tended to use socio-religious titles. In this case, the salient titles are H which stands for *Haji* (for male) and Hj which stands for *Hajah* (for female). Both titles refer to the idea that the parties (who are Moslems) had done pilgrimage to Mecca. Table 2 summarizes the terms of address used to mention the human parties to acknowledge.

Table 2. Terms of address used to address the human parties in thesis acknowledgements section by Indonesian master's students of EFL

No.	Parties to mention	Alternative use of terms of address	Example (with pseudonym)
1.	First thesis advisor	1. *Bapak* (literally father) or *Ibu* (literally mother), positional title, socio-religio title, name(s)*, academic title(s). 2. *Bapak* (literally father) or *Ibu* (literally mother), positional title, academic titles, socio-religio title, names, and academic title(s). 3. Positional title, socio-religio title, names, academic titles. 4. Positional title, academic title, socio-religio title, names, and academic title(s). 5. Positional title, academic title(s), name(s). 6. Name(s) and academic title(s) 7. Academic title(s), name(s), academic title(s) 8. Kinship title and name(s)	1. Bapak Prof. H. Brojo Seputro, M.A., Ph.D. 2. Bapak Prof. Dr. H. Brojo Seputro, M.A. 3. Prof. H. Brojo Seputro, M.A., Ph.D. 4. Prof. Dr. Hj. Putri Rahayu, M.A. 5. Prof. Dr. Brojo **Seputro** 6. Brojo Seputro, M.A., Ph.D. 7. Dr. Brojo Seputro, M.Pd. 8. Grandma Putri Brojo Seputro
2.	Second thesis advisor	1. *Bapak* (literally father) or *Ibu* (literally mother), positional title, socio-religio title, name(s), academic title(s). 2. *Bapak* (literally father) or *Ibu* (literally mother), positional title, academic title(s), socio-religio title, name(s), and academic title(s). 3. Positional title, socio-religio title, name(s), academic title(s). 4. Positional title, academic title(s), socio-religio title, name(s), and academic title(s). 5. Positional title, academic title(s), name(s). 6. Name(s) and academic title(s) 7. Academic title(s), name(s), academic title(s) 8. Social title and name(s)	1. Bapak Prof. H. Brojo Seputro, M.A., Ph.D. 2. Bapak Prof. **Dr.** H. Brojo Seputro, M.A. 3. Prof. H. Brojo Seputro, M.A., Ph.D. 4. Prof. Dr. Hj. Putri Rahayu, M.A. 5. Prof. Dr. Brojo Seputro 6. Brojo Seputro, M.A., Ph.D. 7. Dr. Brojo Seputro, M.Pd. 8. Mrs. Putri Brojo Seputro
3.	Director of the Graduate Program	1. *Bapak* (literally father), positional title, socio-religio title, name(s), academic title(s) 2. Positional title, socio-religio title, name(s), academic title(s)	1. Bapak Prof. H. Brojo Seputro, M.A., Ph.D. 2. Prof. H. Brojo Seputro, M.A., Ph.D.
4.	Convener, Graduate ELE Program	1. *Ibu* (literally mother), academic title, socio-religio title, name(s), academic title(s) 2. *Ibu* (literally mother), academic title, name(s), academic title(s) 3. Academic title(s), name(s), academic title(s)	1. Ibu Dr. Hj. Putri Rahayu, M.Pd. 2. Ibu Dr. Putri Rahayu, M.Pd. 3. Dr. Putri Rahayu, M.Pd.
5.	Classmates and/or friends	1. Academic title(s), name(s), academic title(s) 2. Academic title(s), name(s) 3. Name(s), academic title(s) 4. Names 5. First name 6. Second name 7. Nickname	1. Drs. Braja Musti, M.Pd. 2. Drs. Braja Musti 3. Braja Musti, M.Pd. 4. Braja Musti 5. Braja 6. Musti 7. Pendekar
6.	School principal (and vice principal), English teachers	1. *Bapak* (literally father) or *Ibu* (literally mother), academic title(s), socio-religio title, name(s), academic title(s) 2. Academic title(s), socio-religio title, name(s), academic title(s) 3. Academic title(s), name(s), academic title(s) 4. Academic title(s), name(s)	1. Bapak Drs. H. Jamalus Sofa, M.Pd. 2. Drs. H. Jamalus Sofa, M.Pd. 3. Drs. Jamalus Sofa, M.Pd. 4. Drs. Jamalus Sofa
7.	Family members and/or relatives/ husband/wife	1. Academic title(s), name(s), academic title(s) 2. Academic title(s), name(s) 3. Name(s), academic title(s) 4. *Mas* (literally elder brother), name(s) 5. Names 6. Name 7. Nickname (endearing name)	1. Ir. Braja Musti, M.M. 2. Drs. Braja Musti 3. Braja Musti, S.Pd. 4. Mas Braja Musti 5. Putri Kinanthi 6. Putri 7. Manis
8.	Children	1. Name(s) 2. Endearing name(s)	1. Putri Kinanthi 2. Jagoan Cilik

* It is possible for an Indonesian to have only one name, usually, a given name. There is also a high probability that an Indonesian has two or more names, all of which are given names.

3.3 Some delineation

There are some points of possible explanation pertaining to the use of titles in mentioning thesis advisors, Director of Graduate Program, Convener of ELE Program, and some other parties. One interpretation relates to the idea that the writers are shaped by their imagined readers. I would predict, on the basis of my previous project (Basthomi, 2006), that the writers' imagined readers are limited to Indonesian readers, which is influential to the writing products of thesis acknowledgments texts. So, the writers are bound to do some

selection of the available resources whereby they can meet their needs which are, at the same time, constrained by concerns about (potential) audiences (Cohen & Riel, 1989; Bradbury & Quinn, 1991) and occasion. All these necessitate arrangement of ideas and linguistic resources, in this case, terms of address, so as to be unmistakable and etched in mind. Quite possibly, since the mental affiliation of the writers is to Indonesian readers (Basthomi, 2007), they decide on the Indonesian way of using terms of address. This is particularly apparent in the use of an Indonesian kinship term *Bu* and the English term *Grandma* which, in the context of use, sounds Indonesian; *Grandma* has the Indonesian kinship sense of *Eyang* or *(si)Mbah* which is applicable to any elderly individual. In fact, the individual addressed as *grandma* is the oldest among the faculty members in the ELE Program, Graduate Program, State University of Malang.

It is probably right that the thesis acknowledgements section is a place for the amalgamation of two different worlds: it lies in the tension between academic-ness and (inter)personal accentuation (Swales & Feak, 2000). English-speaking readers probably find it normal to read an address to thesis supervisors in the form of endearing nicknames. However, they may also find it normal to read one academic title (either Professor or Dr.) plus name for the purpose of addressing thesis advisors. This situation, however, might rarely happen in the acknowledgements texts by Indonesians.

In addition, the fact that the thesis writers were those learning English at an Indonesian university, which basically lies in an EFL setting (Debyasuvarn, 1981), cannot be ignored. As EFL students, the writers possibly had limited exposure to English; they had not had the luxury of rich exposure to the target language as much as those studying in immersion classes (Yan-Ping, 1991). Accordingly, they had had limited opportunity that allows them to pick up the "appropriate" idea of pragmatic use of English forms of address in their English texts of acknowledgments.

It also needs to be noted that the writers were those taught by a group of faculty members who are Indonesians. It follows that it seems inappropriate for the students to exercise the use of first names or nicknames when addressing, for instance, thesis advisors. The "impossibility" of using first names or nicknames to address thesis advisors is also due to the nature of the Indonesian lecturer-student interaction which, as part of the Asian culture, tends to be tainted with the lecturer's power (Flowerdew & Miller, 1995); the "egalitarian" use of forms of address (e.g., first name and modified first name), consequently, seems unthinkable in this context. Let me now further clarify this issue by referring to my own observations and experience as an Indonesian learner (and speaker) of English as a foreign language.

Based on my personal observation and experience, some American thesis writers would prefer addressing their thesis advisors using their first names or nicknames to using complete names. Conversely, some others can also easily write, for instance, Dr. (Peter) Sternberg and Dr. (Susan) McCarthy (leaving the professorship title) when addressing their advisors whose designation is Professor. However, the two American modes did not meet the Indonesian socio-pragmatic norms at my disposal as I was writing my thesis acknowledgements section. The first one was unthinkable. My knowledge of Indonesian linguistic and social conventions simply does not allow me to do so. The second one, even though much less severe than the first one, was still hard to adopt. Its mode does not indicate full respect on my part, for in the Indonesian academic setting, professorship is generally considered the pinnacle of academic career as a faculty member. So, addressing a Ph.D. holder whose designation is Professor without mentioning both the professorship title and the doctorate would sound belittling. But, probably, mentioning concomitantly both the doctorate and professorship would not sound quite as English as that usually expressed by native speakers of English, either.

Therefore, when I wrote a thesis acknowledgements section, I tried my best, as an Indonesian EFL learner, to sound as English as the native English writers do and, concurrently, to sound respectful to meet the Indonesian socio-pragmatic norms. Hence, I mentioned the professorship, but dropped the doctorate title. By so doing, the English conventional rules of addressing were not violated and, at the same time, the Indonesian addressing conventions were not "really" breached, for the highest academic status of professorship was mentioned. Even so, failure of expressing full respect can still be identified. This is because, in the Indonesian context, people need to aptly distinguish professors who are Ph.D. holders from those who are not. Professors without doctorate degree are unlikely entitled to be doctorate principal supervisor (at least, in my University). This situation means that to mention the doctorate degree of the professors who are Ph.D. holders is obligatory.

Supposing that the Indonesian thesis writers had not noticed the possible differences in addressing people in English academic setting, they would refer to the Indonesian way of addressing people in the Indonesian academic setting. This is because, as noted earlier, some of their imagined immediate readers would be their thesis advisors who are Indonesian. Therefore, as discussed above, Indonesian thesis writers tend to frequently use academic titles in addressing human parties in their thesis acknowledgements section. Showing respect is obligatory in addressing thesis advisors, the Director of Graduate Program, and Convener of Graduate ELE Program, School Principal and Vice Principal, and English teachers, and is optional in addressing classmates or friends, family members or relatives, including husband or wife. A summary of the foregoing discussion can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Human parties to address in thesis acknowledgements section and mode of the address

No.	Parties to Mention	Mode of Addressing
1.	First thesis advisor	Respectful
2.	Second thesis advisor	Respectful
3.	Director of the Graduate Program	Respectful
4.	Convener, Graduate ELE Program	Respectful
5.	School Principal and Vice Principal, English teachers	Respectful
6.	Classmates and/or friends	Endearing or neutral or respectful
7.	Family members and/or relatives	Endearing or neutral or respectful
8.	Husband/wife (and children)	Endearing or neutral or respectful

The literature on sociolinguistics and pragmatics (e.g., Ervin-Tripp, 1972; Brown & Gilman, 1960; Brown & Ford, 1964) stipulate that the degree of power and solidarity of the interactants (writers and audiences) significantly determines the pragmatic selection of forms of address. When the writers use complete academic titles in the mention of the names of thesis advisors, Director of Graduate Program, and Convener of ELE Program, the situation can be deemed normal. It is unthinkable that Indonesian students address their lecturers using their first names or nicknames in normal situation (Basthomi, 2004). In this regard, we can readily say that the writers feel bound to pay respect to the given parties. The institutional position (hence power) of the acknowledged parties requires the writers using the titles in the mention of the names of the acknowledged individuals. In such a situation, it can be construed that Indonesian

students tend to put themselves in asymmetric relation to their teachers.

However, such a mundane explanation has missed the issue about the mention of friends or wife (presumably equal in power and reasonably intimate to each other) using academic titles. If the academic titles are meant to show respect, there is an anomalous situation which questions the conceptions of power and solidarity mentioned above, for the writers and the parties to acknowledge (friends/classmates, wife/husband) are best conceived to have developed some degree of solidarity or intimateness. There should be an alternative interpretation to tease out this issue. For this purpose, I will now move on to two possible interpretations.

Let me now once again refer to my personal anecdotal experience. As an Indonesian, born in the countryside, I have the impression that to undergo training towards a graduate degree is economically taxing. This insinuates the idea that academic titles which show somebody's success in academic training bear some specific values. And in order to acknowledge the success, one might feel required to use them in addressing the given person with the given success (qualification). A similar interpretation relates to my impression of a repeated rumor that some Indonesian academics feel irritated when their names are mentioned without their complete academic titles, which include the titles of, for instance, professorship, doctorate, master's, and even first degree. This sort of rumor appears to be quite pervasive in the Indonesian academic setting. It is normal that people say, be it in jocular (or, at times, sarcastic) purposes or in a serious manner, "it is not easy to secure academic titles, so we have to make due appraisal of the difficulties." Hence, we need to use this context to read the mention of academic titles of the addressees (classmates, friends, husband, wife) who have intimate relationships with the writers.

Another possible interpretation is that, by mentioning people with complete academic titles, the writers try to lift up their own position. This is a sort of self-identification, if not self-aggrandizement. The presence of people of high status, as indicated by the titles, suggests that the writers belong to that particular group of people with the status. By showing that they have been encircled by individuals with some degree of qualifications, and that, particularly, their research projects have been supervised by academics of high qualification, the writers are in a position of stating that they belong to that specific circle of people and that their projects are also of particular quality. This is, in a way, an example of what Javanese people call *nunut mukti*, which may be translated as "hitching on the respectability of others for the purpose of gaining one's own respectability." In other words, by mentioning the complete academic titles of other people surrounding them, the writers secure two objectives in one hit: the writers show respect to others and, concomitantly, also try to gain their own respectability. Since Indonesians tend to uphold a principle which says, "pay respect to others if you want to gain respect from others," this situation hits the nail on the head.

4. Conclusion: Tension, pedagogical implication, and future research direction

The foregoing discussion has indicated my suggestion that Indonesian EFL learners submit to English socio-pragmatic norms in using English terms of address. This suggestion, however, might be counter-productive to the attempts of members of other postcolonial communities to challenge the domination of the English language. In this regard, I would contend that Indonesians are not comparable with members of other postcolonial communities, for instance, Caribbeans, who have the leverage to challenge the domination of English through, for instance, appropriation, abrogation, and subversion (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 1989, 1998).

I would think that Indonesians do not have the "right" to exert such a challenge, at least at the moment, for, by and large, they

are not brought up as native speakers of English. They are not normally considered the owners of the English language. As they do not own the language, they do not have the "feel" of it. Accordingly, they lack the ability to proffer some challenges to the domination of English, for instance, through the appropriation of the use of English forms of address. Were they in that position, they would run the risk of being labeled incompetent, deviant, or aberrant nonnative speakers of English. With regard to the notion that English is foreign to the majority of Indonesians, the findings of this study should be read against the backdrop of English as a foreign language (EFL) enterprise.

As noted earlier, Indonesian EFL students tend to refer to Indonesian use of forms of address in acknowledging significant parties in their thesis acknowledgements section. This situation suggests that attempts to foster communicative competence in EFL teaching and learning, including the cultural awareness of the use of forms of address, are not easy to make. The uses of terms of address in thesis acknowledgements sections by Indonesian students of EFL still underscores the idea that the learners' understanding of how to perform appropriately in a target culture, in this case in English, is not easy to achieve (Dobson, 2001). Pertinent to this, Kramsch, cited in Hinkel (1999), rightly observes "that even the non-native speakers who have had many years of experience with second culture may have to find their 'own place' at the intersection of their natal [and] target cultures" (p. 6).

Relevant to the point above, we may take into account Hill's (1997) observation that input and cognitive processes are crucial in EFL teaching and learning. In this line, the teacher is required to provide adequate examples of pragmatic uses of forms of address from which students can pick up the underlying rules at play. However, since the majority of English teachers in Indonesia are non-native speakers of English, they need to rely heavily on materials. Accordingly, the materials need to be selected to allow students to become familiar with a variety of pragmatic uses of English forms of address.

What the above point implies is that, as EFL students have limited exposure to the use of English (Yan-Ping, 1991), EFL teachers need to make attempts to explicitly compare the pragmatic uses of English forms of address with those available in the mother tongue of both the teachers and the students. This insinuates attempts that allow the students to be engaged in noticing the typical uses of English forms of address. This, when devised with a high frequency of appearances, will help sensitize students' awareness of the target language (Ellis, 2002) – necessarily, in this case, the uses of terms of address in English.

The present project has been limited to the EFL setting of Indonesia. Future research needs to be conducted in other EFL settings which have different cultural conventions from those in Indonesia. Such research will provide findings useful for comparison, which will, potentially, shed more light on the phenomena involving uses of terms of address within the context of world Englishes.

References

Adnan, Z. (2004). Citing behaviours in Indonesian humanities research articles. *ASAA E-Journal of Asian Linguistics & Language Teaching.* Issue # 6. (On-line). Available at http://www.arts.unsw.edu.au/languages/as aa_ejournal. Retrieved on 2 October 2005.

Ahmad, U. K. (1997). *Scientific research articles in Malay: A situated discourse analysis.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to research in education* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (1989). *The empire writes back: Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures*. London: Routledge.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (1998). *Key concepts in post-colonial studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

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

Barnes, B. J. (2005). *Success in graduate school: How exemplary advisors guide their advisees*. The Michigan State University Ph.D. Dissertation. Ann Arbor: UMI.

Basthomi, Y. (2007). Learning from the discursive practice of reviewing and editing: English research article publication in Indonesia. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran, 14*(1), 65-74.

Basthomi, Y. (2006). *The rhetoric of research article introductions written in English by Indonesians*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Malang: PPS UM.

Basthomi, Y. (2004). Pragmatic use of English forms of address by Javanese students of EFL. In B. Y. Cahyono and U. Widiati (Eds.), *The tapestry of English language teaching and learning in Indonesia* (pp. 125-141). Malang: State University of Malang Press.

Bingman, L. G. (2003). *African American doctoral student experiences: Factors that impact persistence and graduation*. The Michigan State University Ph.D. Dissertation. Ann Arbor: UMI.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1991). Interlanguage pragmatics: The case of request. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood-Smith, and M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign and second language pedagogy research* (pp. 255-272). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bradbury, N. M. & Quinn, A. (1991). *Audiences and intentions*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

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

Cahyono, B. Y. (2001). How English learning development influences EFL students' rhetoric of Indonesian essays. *BAHASA DAN SENI, 29*(1), 98-108.

Cohen, M. & Riel, M. (1989). The effect of distant audience on students' writing. *American Educational Research Journal, 26*(2), 143-159.

Cox-Peterson, D. L. (2004). *A qualitative analysis of a cohort doctoral program in educational administration*. Purdue University Ph.D. Dissertation. Ann Arbor: UMI.

Debyasuvarn, M. L. B. (1981). Will EIIL succeed where ESL and EFL failed? In L. E. Smith (Ed.), *English for cross-cultural communication* (pp. 83-93). London: Macmillan.

Dobson, A. (2001). Teaching of culture within foreign language teaching and its relationship to nationalism. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 24*(1), 61-73.

Dunnet, S. C., Dubin, F. & 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, N. C. (2002). Frequency effects in language processing. *SSLA, 24*, 143-188.

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

Erfan. (2007). *Cultural transfer and linguistic problems in writing thesis acknowledgements*. Unpublished master's thesis, Malang: PPS UM.

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

Falkner, T. M. R. (2001). *Expansion or reproduction in doctoral education: An exploration of doctoral program orientation*. The University of Minnesota Ph.D. thesis. Ann Arbor: UMI.

Flowerdew, J. & Miller, L. (1995). On the notion of culture in L2 lectures. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*(2), 345-373.

Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. (2003). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hill, T. (1997). *The development of pragmatic competence in an EFL context*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI.

Hinkel, E. (1999). Introduction: Culture in research and second language pedagogy. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 1-7), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Houck, N., & Gass, S. M. (1996). Non-native refusals: A methodological perspective. In S. M. Gass and J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures* (pp. 45-64). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kadarisman, A. E. (2005). Linguistic relativity, cultural relativity, and foreign language teaching. *TEFLIN Journal*, *16*(1), 1-25.

Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning*, *16*, 1-20.

Mehra, B. (2004). *The cross-cultural learning process of international doctoral students: A case study in library and information science education*. The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Ph.D. Dissertation. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI.

Mirahayuni, N. K. (2001). *Investigating generic structure of English research articles: writing strategy differences between English and Indonesian writers*. A paper presented at the 49th TEFLIN International Conference 2001 Kuta, Bali, 6-8 November 2001.

Mirahayuni, N. K. (2002). *Investigating textual structure in native and non-native English research articles: Strategy differences between English and Indonesian writers*. Ph.D. thesis, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

Notaro, S. J. (2000). *Ranking doctoral programs of health education*. The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Ph.D. Thesis. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI.

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

Pullen, F. J. (2003). *Perfectionism, procrastination, and other self-reported barriers to completing the doctoral dissertation*. The University of Iowa Ph.D. Thesis. Ann Arbor: UMI.

Sasaki, M. (1998). Investigating EFL students' production of speech acts: A comparison of production questionnaires and role plays. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *30*, 457-484.

Susilo, (1999). *Rhetorical patterns as reflected in argumentative discourse in the Jakarta Post articles*. Unpublished master's thesis, Malang: PPS UM.

Susilo, (2004). *Thought patterns as reflected in the linguistic features in Indonesian and English letters written by Indonesians*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Malang, PPS UM.

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. M. & Feak, C. B. (2000). *English in today's research world: A writing guide*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Syahri, I. (2007). *Acts of requesting as realized by EFL learners*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Malang: PPS UM.

Wardhaugh, R. (2002). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). Malden: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

Yan-Ping, Z. (1991). The effect of explicit instruction on the acquisition of English grammatical structures by Chinese learners. In C. James and P. Garrett (Eds.), *Language awareness in the classroom* (pp. 254-277). Essex: Longman Group UK Limited.