Anda is a second person pronoun introduced into Indonesian in 1957 and despite being intended as a
democratic, egalitarian address substitute for the range of status laden traditional forms it now
occurs predominantly in the restricted domain of public media. This apparent limited success of the
introduction of Anda highlights the important contribution social factors make to the success of
language planning initiatives, in this case the salience of social marking in address terms. This paper
explains how the social relations displayed in the choice of address reference in Indonesian have
resisted implementation of a particular language policy that seeks to level relative status. Anda
proves to be an excellent micro-level focus for examining the macro-level issues at stake in the
development of a national language and identity.
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1 Introduction

This paper brings together two areas of study not usually associated with each other; language
planning and address reference. Both areas are particularly rich sites for sociolinguistic analysis in
any context but particularly so for Indonesia which has depended to some extent on reconfiguring the
pronominal system as a means of developing a modern unified sense of nationhood. The introduction
of Anda provides a useful focus for examining the language planning attempts to influence the
linguistically instantiated social practices of a community.

The paper begins with an assessment of the reasons for the limited success of the introduction
of Anda, focusing on data taken from a synchronic variationist study of Anda’s frequency of
occurrence in the mainstream contemporary Indonesian print media. The success evinced by the high
levels of occurrence of Anda in this data is qualified by reference to the linguistic and non-linguistic
factors raised in the discussion that follows.

This paper presents a broad historical overview of relevant language planning issues and
details the processes and people involved in the introduction of Anda. This is followed by a necessary
description of certain aspects of diglossia in Indonesia. Its plurilingual environment partly

---

1 I am most grateful to the anonymous reviewers who commented so thoughtfully on an earlier version of this
paper. All the usual disclaimers apply.
constructs the use and attitudes of formal Indonesian, which is the focus of language planning efforts, and the degree to which planning initiatives are successful. A similarly broad overview of address reference in Indonesian is presented including a basic classification of the available forms. Language planning and address reference are then considered in tandem to see what they might reveal about each other. Anda provides a useful locus from which to consider the various terms in the metalanguage for describing the development of the lexicon. The complexity of both language planning and address reference at the macro-level is focused throughout the argument with reference to Anda as a single lexical locus.

2 A Synchronic Study of Anda in the Print Media

2.1 The Data

The data for this study are taken from ten mainstream Indonesian newspapers and magazines, published in Jakarta in 2005. Except for children’s texts, the language is predominantly formal. Pronoun choice proves an important barometer of content formality and intended audience age, and all pronominal tokens in the data are considered on a formal/informal continuum, with Anda as the most formal. The only forms counted are second person pronouns (see 4.1).

2.2 Summary of All 2nd Person Pronominal Usage per Publication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>C&amp;R</th>
<th>Forum</th>
<th>Gaddis</th>
<th>Gatra</th>
<th>Indo-post</th>
<th>Kompas</th>
<th>Menu Sehat</th>
<th>Menu</th>
<th>Tempo</th>
<th>Winnie the Pooh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anda</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamu</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mu</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirimu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamu-kamu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engkau</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kau</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Summary of all 2nd person pronouns per publication

Figure 1 illustrates the occurrence of each second person pronominal form by publication. It can be seen that seven of the ten publications show a high range of Anda use, from 100% to 73%. Menu Sehat, the recipe booklet, is the only publication featuring 100% use of Anda, related to its
impersonal key, and 73% use of *Anda* occurs in the youth oriented entertainment tabloid *Asian Plus*. The younger children’s magazines, *Gadis* and *Winnie the Pooh* exhibit only minimal use of *Anda*, but formal language is not expected in these publications because of the age of the intended audience. In *Gadis*, the high level of pronoun use is in itself indicative of the informality of its language. *Kompas* is a Sunday newspaper and exhibits 50% use of *Anda* because it has a large children’s section included. The publications aimed at children show unmarked informal use throughout.

*Anda* accounts for more than 60% of all second person pronominal use in all publications, even without discounting the influence of language intended for children. This shows the success of *Anda* in the print media; a modern public word for a modern public world. However, closer study reveals that in some areas its levels of occurrence fall away dramatically.

### 2.3 Summary of Percentages per Text Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Type</th>
<th>Menu</th>
<th>Sehat</th>
<th>Forum</th>
<th>Tempo</th>
<th>Indo-Post</th>
<th>C&amp;R</th>
<th>Gatra</th>
<th>Asian Plus</th>
<th>Kompas</th>
<th>Winnie the Pooh</th>
<th>Gadis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adverts</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All types</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Summary of Percentages per Text Type

Figure 2 refigures the data to reflect usage in four different text types; advertisements, direct quotes, interviews and letters. *Anda* maintains its status in advertising, with only *Gadis* not conforming. Indeed, the language of advertising is *Anda*’s ideal domain of use, ultra modern and ultimately impersonal in its address. Written interviews are stylised encounters and generally only include second person address reference from the interviewer, who usually has a considerably shorter turn. The data reveal all formal use of *Anda* in all interviews except those conducted for *Asian Plus*, where a more informal style evidently suits, and *Gadis*, where formality is not expected. The interesting point is the rare isomorphic distribution, supporting the stylised conception of these interactions.

Quotes are interesting because the literature suggests that *Anda* is not a common item in spoken language (see 4.2). Quotes are not speech but are purporting to represent speech. The drop in levels of *Anda* and the rise in the use of informal pronouns is noteworthy in this context and supports the argument that *Anda* does not have the interactional salience to be the unmarked form in direct quotes, even though it is the unmarked form for the overall publication.
Something of the same phenomenon occurs in letters, which, whilst a specifically written form, have more interactional salience than other text types in that they generally address someone, not just anyone. This is particularly the case in letters to the Editor and their replies. The most interesting feature revealed by the data is the total lack of pronouns used in letters in four of the adult newspapers/magazines. These letters contain address reference but it is all of the respectful fictive kin-term variety. Quotes are often quite expressive and involve all sorts of relationships between interlocutors and letters often require the maintenance of high levels of respect. The point is that both text types are more specifically interactive than other text types where the addressees are more generalised.

3 Language Planning

3.1 Language Planning History

The Indonesian language has been set up to play a pivotal role in the development of the nation state of Indonesia, from the time it was first declared the language of unity at the Second Indonesian Youth Conference of 1928, seventeen years before independence was gained. It is therefore unsurprising that Indonesia’s language planning appears to have had socio-political, rather than linguistic, objectives. More specific intentions were formulated at the First Language Congress, held in 1938, which established four basic areas of planning that were seen as essential to develop the language. These were (1) the creation of a faculty of language and letters, (2) standardisation of the grammar and orthography, (3) the writing of a dictionary, and (4) the creation of a modern terminology (Alisjahbana 1971: 181). In 1942, under Japanese occupation, the Dutch language was banned and “Indonesian overnight achieved the de facto status of official language” (Sneddon 9). The National Language Council, established in 1947, just two years after independence, generated the forming of language committees, and a reformulation of the four basic areas of planning into three. These were (1) the coining of new terminology, particularly in the domains of science, technology and economics, (2) writing a grammar and, (3) the coining of daily words (Alisjahbana 1971: 182). The last area is particularly relevant to this discussion and concerns the most interactionally potent lexical items

Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana is a central figure in the Indonesian language experience and is worth introducing because of his dual role as a participant in the processes of language planning and as an eminently qualified linguist and commentator. With first-hand insight, Alisjahbana explains how the general public and institutional bodies were called on to submit terms that were needed or already in use and “[t]he translators and other interested parties organised meetings to discuss and
codify the new terms” (1971: 182). The importance of these committees is reflected by the fact that both President Sukarno and Prime Minister Hatta were active committee members. Alisjahbana states that “[d]uring Sukarno’s reign, the army had a great deal of influence in the coining of new terms and words of daily usage” (1971: 186). In understanding the relationship between social development and linguistic development, it is an important point that “[l]anguage planners saw themselves as having a key role in both nation building and modernisation ...” (Wright 88). The other side to this coin is that non-linguists, whether army members, politicians, or ‘other interested parties’, made significant contributions to the language committees in their early years.

3.2 The Introduction of Anda

Anda was introduced in 1957, fifteen years after the National Language Council began its work and the sub-committees addressed the issues associated with the formulation and codification of new terminology, the writing of a grammar and the development of daily words.

This lexical item was adapted from a Kawi (Old Javanese court language) bound honorific (Ayah “father” + Anda “honoured” = Ayahanda “honoured father”). The original form and meaning persists, and appears in the data examined in this research, albeit only in one article, and there is the possibility of the word being interpretable as both an egalitarian marker and an honorific, although it would probably be contextually disambiguated. Further polysemy relates to its use as an intimate form when bound with the word for child (anak “child” + anda “honoured” = ananda “dear child”).

The initiative was suggested by Captain Sabirin, a forty year old Airforce Officer from Bukittinggi, West Sumatra. Other than this one claim to fame, Sabirin appears to have had a rather limited career, never rising above the rank of captain. However, he did serve at the Indonesian Airforce office in Washington from 1957 to 1959, perhaps receiving this posting on the basis of his linguistic contribution to the modernisation project. He died in 1970, by which time Anda was a commonly used pronoun in the Indonesian print media. Sabirin had taken the original meaning from Mohammad Zain’s (1950) Kamus Modern Bahasa Indonesia “Dictionary of Modern Indonesian” and the adaptation was discussed with Alisjahbana, and probably other committee members.

On the 28th of February, 1957, the adapted use was introduced in the Pedoman newspaper, edited by Rosihan Anwar. On the 14th of April 1957, Alisjahbana published an article in support of the new use, also in Pedoman newspaper. On the 28th of April 1957, Professor Poerbatjaraka, a Javanese academic who was involved in the Language Committees of the 1940s and 50s, published an article in the same newspaper criticising the adapted use (see Warsidi). It is interesting that this discourse was carried out in the public media, as this has become the common domain of usage for Anda, and is an important site for the promotion of the language. Anwar subsequently published a
twentieth birthday article in *Kedaulatan Rakyat*, a Yogja daily newspaper, on the 28th of February 1977. The other important domain in which Indonesian was established as the official language, is education, and all but the first three years of schooling are conducted in Indonesian throughout the archipelago. Issues of address reference in education, then, are relevant to implementation, but are outside the immediate scope of this paper.

Alisjahbana clarifies the central aim behind the introduction of *Anda* in the following statement:

> This word is designed to replace the multiplicity of words used to address the second person in traditional village and feudal aristocratic society. The hope is that *anda* will eventually have a status analogous to that of ‘you’ in English, which can be used to address anyone, old or young, of high or low social position.

(1974: 413)

The interesting point here is that *Anda* is not coined to supply a word for which the language has no terms; instead there are a “multiplicity of words” it is intended to replace. Thus, its introduction is an example of social engineering attempted through linguistic engineering, rather than the somewhat simpler introduction of a new item of terminology in the areas of science, technology or economics. Alisjahbana accepts that the language planners would have difficulties in promoting *Anda* because of social practices, saying that it was “clear that confusion over the use of pronouns will persist for a long time in everyday life in the various relationships between different groups of people, mainly because a number of traditional cultural reflexes will exert an indirect inhibiting influence” (Alisjahbana 1974: 413). This pessimistic view has been proven largely correct. *Anda* did not ‘replace the multiplicity’ – it added to it.

### 3.3 Diglossia

“The standard developed and promoted by the language planning agency was based on Johor-Riau Malay, the classic literary language, rather than on Bazaar Malay, the koine or lingua-franca developed for use in inter-group communication. This has caused a situation of diglossia” (Wright 89). Multilingual diglossic Indonesia is well described in the literature (see Moeliono; Errington 1986; Sneddon; Wright). In its original conception, the diglossic H (High) variety is defined as “a very divergent, highly codified superposed variety ... which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation” (Ferguson 336). This definition is useful in that it also delimits the appropriate situated (unmarked) use of *Anda*, and its domains of use. *Anda* also exemplifies the diglossic criterion of “paired items” (Ferguson 242), its most frequent pairing being with *kamu*, the common informal second person pronoun. It is important to mention that Indonesian differs from
Standard Average European languages with their dual formal/informal second person pronominal pairings (see Brown & Gilman), as there are potentially many informal forms that could be paired with Anda as the formal variant, not just one. Those found in the data are outlined above (Figure 1). Note that the inclusion of the Hokkien second person pronoun, elu, is a good example of the diverse influences on Indonesian. In this multilingual diglossia the language of everyday life may be one of the many local forms of Indonesian/Malay, one of the many local languages used across the archipelago, or a language brought by traders or colonial invaders throughout the last millennium and earlier.

4 Address Reference and Pronouns

4.1 Address Reference

The variety of address terms available for second person reference in Indonesian is made transparent in the title of an assignment written by Budiyanto, a student of Dr. George Quinn’s, in the late 1960s. The paper, 52 words for “you” in Indonesian (see Quinn 2003), was drawn from fieldwork done in Salatiga, a small city in Central Java. Budiyanto’s paper includes terms outside the definition of a pronoun. Here he shows that the fictive use of kin-terms is highly productive in Indonesian, with Bapak “father” and Ibu “mother”, being the common terms used to address adults in a respectful manner. This leads many western commentators to class fictive kin-terms as ‘pronoun-substitutes’, in that they commonly fill the subject or object position which, in a language like English, requires a default use of pronouns. Alves however, says that the use of the term ‘pronoun-substitutes’ is a particularly western interpretation that does not serve well in relation to Indonesian, or any other South East Asian language. This seems a reasonable challenge to the accepted characterisation, which affords pronouns a privileged position that they do not have in Indonesian.

This research is based on the assumption that there are four distinct classes of address reference in Indonesian; pronouns of address, kin-terms (literal and fictive), personal names (including nicknames) and titles (referring to occupation or official role). A main point of distinction between pronouns and other terms used is that pronouns have a first person equivalent (e.g. aku/kamu - informal “I/you” or saya/anda - formal “I/you”). Another point of distinction is that fictive kin terms encode gender but pronouns do not. McGinn uses these distinctions in his analysis of the language of comics and shows that pronouns are not used in familial situations; instead kin-terms and personal names are used invariably. However, the language of comics is somewhat artificial in its prescriptiveness and any claims about usage need to be qualified, as the actual distribution of these items is not strictly isomorphic and this qualification applies to all claims that could be made about
usage across Indonesia. Although experts can describe predominant patterns, people can, and do, use terms in marked opposition to the expected norms. In addition, the expected norms differ from region to region and even amongst differing communities of practice in the same region.

### 4.2 Pronouns

In describing the available second person pronouns, Purwo (55-6) initially offers only the informal variants *engkau, kau* and *kamu* and *Anda* is then afforded ‘special mention’, in the next paragraph and *saudara* “brother” is offered as a formal option. As *saudara* does not feature in the contemporary data used in the present study, it is not described in this paper.\(^2\) It is a telling point that before the introduction of *Anda* in its adapted form, the Indonesian second person pronoun set contained no formal form other than *saudara*. And even though Purwo (58) calls both *saudara* and *Anda* “formal pronouns”, his chart of Indonesian Personal Pronouns (57) does not include *saudara*.

Pronouns, by definition, are devoid of the necessary level of social recognition and consequently are not readily accepted as formal, polite items of use in Indonesian. In discussions of the appropriate use of *Anda* with many Indonesians, it is usually claimed that it is not for use in spoken language, other than in the most depersonalised contexts of public meetings and forums, or the language of the public media, especially advertising. For example, McGinn mentions “a speech-mode distinguished by the total avoidance of first and second person pronouns” (198), while Errington alludes to “unobvious but interactionally salient patterns of non-use of Indonesian pronominal resources” (1998: 9).

Confusion arises in second language learning over *Anda*’s description as a ‘formal’ pronoun. Whilst it is available for formal use, for example, in formal domains like meetings or public media, it is not appropriate for specific second person reference in formal situations. It is not that it is an inherently disrespectful form but rather it is a neutral form, marking no social status. Despite the Language Planners’ intentions, there remains a social requirement for status to be marked in respectful address, and this is commonly achieved by the appropriate use of fictive kin-term or title. Enfield (11) uses the term “bare” to describe the neutrality of certain pronouns in the Lao set and his description of this feature in Lao parallels the ‘neutrality’ of *Anda*, in that, although the ‘bare’ forms “are not intrinsically bad words (i.e. they are not curses or swear words)” (11), they do not supply the recognition of social status necessary for polite address. *Anda* is best described, then, as a formal written form, usually to be spoken in addressing the most general of audiences. However, this is not

\(^2\) Its use as an address term is carried over for a study currently being conducted, which shows its currency in Kompas newspaper decreasing in inverse proportion to the rise in frequency of *Anda* in the late 1960s and early 1970s.
to ignore the fact that some speech communities in Indonesia have adopted Anda and use it in the manner intended by the Language Planners. Definitive claims of isomorphic distribution are largely unsustainable in this complex linguistic environment.

The ranks of informal second person pronouns are augmented by borrowings from regional and European languages, as are the ranks of fictive kin-terms. A common second person pronoun in colloquial Jakartan use is elu, or ‘lu, which is borrowed from Hokkien Chinese. This is used with the first person pronoun gua, or gue, from the same source. It is interesting that Purwo lists the Hokkien first person form gua/gue, but does not list its second person equivalent, elu. Cooper (152) writes that some segments of the educated Jakartanese community have taken to using the English ‘you’, an interesting move in that it performs the same pragmatic function as intended for Anda by simply using the word on which Anda’s adaptation is modelled. Quinn (pc) notes that there is an interesting phenomenon at work with the borrowing of address forms from other languages, whereby their inclusion in the language has a sort of ‘Trojan horse’ affect in facilitating other borrowings. Other second person pronouns found in the data include various plural forms; kalian/sekalian/semu sekalian/kamu sekalian, the root form kalian, like Anda, being introduced. It must be noted that the plural form does not serve the secondary role of providing the polite/formal variant as it does in Standard Average European languages.

5 Language Specific Issues with the Assumed Universality of Language Planning Terminology

Various terms are used in the literature to describe the development of the lexicon by language planners. Both Cooper (153) and Errington (1986: 341) discuss the confusion over the use of such terms as ‘modernisation’, ‘elaboration’, ‘expansion’, and ‘cultivation’, and Errington notes that “[a]ll recognise with these terms a process of lexical expansion that renders language an efficient means to a communicative end” (341). It is true that these terms all involve varying aspects of the development of the lexicon and it is important variation that often goes unqualified. In the specific case of Anda, we can see that some of these aspects are more relevant than others. So, on the one hand, the introduction of Anda certainly represents an attempt at ‘modernisation’, with the language planners’ clear intention of overcoming the traditional need for status recognition. However, ‘elaboration’ is not so specifically relevant because Anda is intended to make the language somewhat less elaborate. The same may be said of ‘expansion’; it is more of a ‘contraction’ of the lexicon. ‘Cultivation’ applies by virtue of the conception of a modern social order implied by the acceptance of Anda, in its intended use. Anda then reveals some of the implications of these various terms, which are often
applied to development of the lexicon in general but can only be used with precision when describing the introduction of linguistic items at the micro level of specific lexical examples.

6 Conclusion

Anda is an active member of the address reference options available in Indonesian but is predominantly confined to contexts where the addressee is somewhat non-specific. This makes the written language of the modern print media an ideal setting for high levels of its use. Ultimately, this is not what Sabirin and Alisjahbana, and others involved in the National Language Council at the time, had in mind. The introduction of Anda adds a term to Budiyanto’s ‘52 words’, rather than supplanting them all with one word. However, it must be accepted that there has been some success in introducing the word. The study, after all, found an average of sixty tokens per publication.

Apart from measuring the success of this language planning enterprise, this study also reveals the benefit of examining macro-level planning issues from the micro-level perspective of attending to specific linguistic items and the intentions behind their promotion.
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