

An Analysis of Types of Address Terms in Kerobokan Village Community: A Sociolinguistic Study

Komang Permana Rio Danata^{1*}, I Gede Budasi¹, Ni Wayan Monik Rismadewi¹

¹Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha

permana.rio@student.undiksha.ac.id

*

ABSTRACT

Language plays an important role in maintaining social relationships, particularly through the use of address terms that reflect cultural values, social hierarchy, and interpersonal relationships. Although studies on address terms have been widely conducted in various cultural settings, limited research has explored their use in the Balinese-speaking community of Kerobokan Village, Buleleng Regency. Therefore, this study aims to describe the types of address terms used by the community of Kerobokan Village, Sawan District, Buleleng Regency, Bali. This study employed a descriptive qualitative approach. The data were collected through observation, interviews, and audio recordings involving purposively selected local community members who actively participated in traditional, religious, and social activities. A total of 46 address-term data were identified and analyzed using an interactive model consisting of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. The findings revealed eight types of address terms: kinship terms, special nicknames, pet names, title only, first names, title plus last names, occupational terms, and religious terms. Among these, kinship terms were the most frequently used, accounting for 24% of the total data. These findings indicate that the use of address terms in the Kerobokan community is strongly influenced by interpersonal closeness, social structure, and Balinese cultural values. This study contributes to the understanding of sociolinguistic practices in the Balinese language and provides insights for promoting effective cross-cultural communication and minimizing misunderstandings in social interactions.

This is an open access article under [CC-BY-NC 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license.



ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Address terms;
Balinese language;
Culture;
Kerobokan village;
Sociolinguistics

Article History:

Received: 11 June 2026

Revised: 10 June 2026

Accepted: 15 July 2026

Published: 16 July 2026

How to Cite in APA Style:

Dinata, K. P. R., Budasi, I. G., & Rismadewi, N. W. M. (2026). An Analysis of Types of Address Terms in Kerobokan Village Community: A Sociolinguistic Study. *Lexeme : Journal of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 377-390. <https://doi.org/10.32493/ljal.v8i2.60740>

INTRODUCTION

The use of language, particularly address terms, plays a crucial role in daily communication by reflecting respect, social status, interpersonal relationships, and cultural identity. As Yang (2010) emphasizes, address terms are essential for effective communication because they indicate social relationships and enable speakers to express respect, intimacy, or even negative attitudes. Similarly, Wardhaugh (2006) argues that systems of address are closely associated with the complexity of social structures and are influenced by factors such as age, gender, social hierarchy, and degree of familiarity. Furthermore, Rifai and Prasetyaningrum (2016) highlight that language serves as a reflection of the social identity and cultural values of its speakers.

In Bali, the use of address terms is highly influenced by local linguistic and cultural practices that vary across regions and communities. One such community is Kerobokan Village, located in Sawan District, Buleleng Regency, where Balinese is predominantly used in everyday communication. Despite sharing the same language, the village possesses distinctive sociocultural characteristics shaped by traditional customs, caste-related values, and local community practices. In recent years, increasing migration and demographic changes have intensified interactions between native residents and newcomers, making communication more diverse while simultaneously increasing the potential for misunderstanding in the use of appropriate address terms.

One common communication issue occurs when newcomers use informal expressions such as *cai* or *cingene* to address unfamiliar local residents. Although these expressions may not carry negative intentions, they are often perceived as impolite because they do not conform to the Balinese system of linguistic politeness and social hierarchy, particularly the distinction between the *Jaba* (Sudra) and *Tri Wangsa* (Brahmana, Ksatria, and Vaisya) social groups (Brown, 2020; Maulana & Putra, 2021). Consequently, inappropriate use of address terms may create discomfort, social misunderstanding, and potentially weaken harmonious relationships within the community.

Several previous studies have investigated address terms in different sociocultural contexts, including Pegayaman, Menyali, Lemukih, Sasak communities, Melbourne, and other regions. These studies mainly focused on identifying the types, functions, and factors influencing the use of address terms in their respective communities. However, little attention has been paid to the address-term system used by the Balinese-speaking community of Kerobokan Village, which possesses distinctive cultural practices and social interactions that differ from those of previously investigated communities. Therefore, there remains a gap in understanding how address terms are realized within this specific sociolinguistic context.

The novelty of this study lies in its focus on documenting and analyzing the address terms used by the Kerobokan Village community, a setting that has not been previously investigated despite its unique combination of traditional Balinese culture and contemporary demographic changes. By providing empirical evidence from this underexplored community, the study contributes to the sociolinguistic documentation of the Balinese language and broadens the understanding of how local cultural values influence the selection and use of address terms in everyday communication. Therefore, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What types of address terms are used by the community of Kerobokan Village, Sawan District, Buleleng Regency, Bali?
2. What are the functions of the address terms used by the community of Kerobokan Village, Sawan District, Buleleng Regency, Bali?

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Language is a fundamental means of human communication, enabling people to express ideas, emotions and intentions through a structured system of sounds and symbols (Sapir, 1921). Through language, individuals build and maintain social relationships within their communities. Sociolinguistics is the study of the relationship between language and society, focusing on how language is used in various social contexts (Hudson, 1996). Language variation is often influenced by social factors such as age, gender, social status and cultural background. One important area within sociolinguistics is the study of address terms, namely linguistic expressions used to refer to or address other individuals during interaction (Oyetade, 1995).

Forms of address serve as markers of social relationships and cultural values. According to Brown and Gilman (1968), the choice of forms of address reflects power relations and solidarity between the speaker and the addressee. These terms can take various forms, including first names, titles, kinship terms, occupational terms, religious terms, nicknames, and specific epithets (Rahmadani & Wahyuni, 2018). Given the variety of typologies proposed across studies, this research adopts a synthesized classification of eight types of address terms, namely: first name,

title plus last name, title only, pet name, kinship terms, occupational terms, religious terms, and special nicknames. This theory adapted from Rahmadani and Wahyuni (2018), Zavitri et al. (2018), Sari et al. (2021), and Suyana et al. (2022), as this framework best accommodates the caste, kinship, and religion, based forms of address found in Balinese communities. In communication, terms of address can be used to express a sense of respect, closeness, power differences, identity, and other social meanings (Wardhaugh, 2006).

Previous research has shown that forms of address play an important role in maintaining social interaction among different cultural communities. Research conducted in Menyali Village found that the use of forms of address is influenced by factors such as family relationships, occupation, age, social status, and ethnicity (Kresnantara et al., 2022). Similarly, Rajabul (2023) found that forms of address within the Sasak community reflect social status, family relationships, and the degree of closeness. In the context of Bali, Gusanto et al. (2025) report that forms of address are closely linked to identity, politeness, social hierarchy, and cultural norms.

Although numerous studies have examined terms of address in various communities, research focusing on the Kerobokan community remains limited. This study therefore aims to investigate the types and functions of terms of address used by the local community in Kerobokan, as well as to identify the social factors that influence their use. It is hoped that this study will contribute to our understanding of sociolinguistic practices within Balinese communities.

METHOD

This study used a descriptive qualitative approach, focusing on exploring the types of address terms used in the Kerobokan Village community. Qualitative methods were chosen because they allow the researchers to analyze the behavior, perspectives, and experiences of community members in terms of address (Gusanto et al., 2025). Data collection was conducted in the traditional village of Kloncing, located in Kerobokan Village, Sawan District. This location was chosen because of its diverse demographic composition across generations and unique socio-cultural characteristics.

A total of 4 informants participated in this study, consisting of 2 male and 2 female residents, aged between 17 and 70, in order to capture variation in address term use across generations and genders. The research subjects were selected through purposive sampling based on the following specific criteria: (1) the informant has resided in Kerobokan Village for at least 17 years and actively uses the local Balinese address system in daily interaction; (2) the informant holds a structural, occupational, or customary role within the village, such as *bendesa desa adat* (traditional village head), *kelian banjar* (community unit leader), or *guru* (teacher); (3) the informant is actively and regularly involved in the village's religious or traditional ceremonies, such as a *pemangku* (religious leader) or *serati* (ritual equipment preparer); and (4) the informant represents different age groups: young adult, middle-aged, and elderly to ensure generational variation in the data. Purposive sampling was applied to select informants who could provide rich and relevant information relevant to the research objectives

To obtain the research data, the researchers used three main instruments: (1) the researcher as the primary instrument, (2) an observation sheet to record the types and functions of address terms, and (3) an interview guide to gain deeper insights into the motivations and social factors behind the use of specific address terms. Additionally, audio recording was used during interactions to enhance the accuracy of the collected data. The data collection procedure included: requesting permission from the village head, identifying key informants, conducting observations and interviews, and recording everyday conversations. All interactions were transcribed and analyzed by categorizing utterances into specific types and functions of addressing terms based on the relevant theoretical framework. The data analysis adapted from Miles et al. (2014), and followed the interactive model of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. The categorized data were presented in tables to show the frequency and proportion of each type of address term used by the participants. To ensure the validity of the data, triangulation was

conducted by confirming the findings of the study with the respondents before and after data analysis, and the same type of triangulation was also conducted after the draft of the conclusion was made.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

There were 45 utterances that contain the use of address terms. They were divided into several types of address terms. The findings of this study can be seen in Table 1 below:

No	Types of Address Terms	Address Terms	Frequency	Percentage
1	Kinship Terms	<i>Ajik, Biang, Pekak, Niang, Ninik, Ibuk, Bapak, Memek, Adik, Bli, Mbok, Gusde</i>	12	24%
2	Special Nicknames	<i>Gus Tonklang, Dek Kenyat, Tut Kenyot, Dolar, Bunda, Bodag</i> (followed by children's first name)	6	13%
3	Pet Names	<i>Cicing, Nani, Ente, Wah, Sayang</i>	5	11%
4	Title Only	<i>Jero, Ajik, Mbok, Bli, Prof, Biang</i>	6	13%
5	First Name	<i>Gede/Putu, Made/Kadek, Komang, Ketut</i>	6	13%
6	Title Plus Last Names	<i>Gusti tangkas, Pak Ngurah, Prof Ayu, Gusti Aji Mendra</i>	4	9%
7	Occupational Terms	<i>Ajik Kelian, Pak Guru, Pak Mekel, Jero Bendesa</i>	4	11%
8	Religious Terms	<i>Ajik Mangku, Serati, Mbok Jero</i>	3	6%
Total			45	100%

Table 1 shows that eight types of address terms used by Balinese speakers in Kerobokan Village Community. The eight types of address terms include Kinship Terms, Special Nicknames, Pet Names, Titles Only, First Names, Titles Plus Last Names, Titles Plus Last Names, Religious Terms. Each of them is presented as follows:

Kinship Terms (KT)

Kinship terms covered 11 address terms for showing family relationships. The term is *Ajik, Biang, Pekak, Niang, Ninik, Bapak, Memek, Adik, Bli, Mbok, Gusde*. These terms were used only for their family members. Address terms of *ajik/bapak* refer to father. The term *ajik* is generally used to address fathers in polite language, while the term *bapak* is used by the younger generation to address their fathers. Address terms of *biang/memek* were used to address their mother. The term "*biang*" is generally used to address one's mother in polite language, while "*memek*" is used by the younger generation to address their mother. Address term *niang/ninik* refers to grandmother; *ninik* is used for those who marry from a caste and those who do not. If both marry from a caste, they are called *niang*, which is the term for grandmother. *Pekak* referred to the grandfather, and *mbok/bli* referred to older siblings. The term *mbok* is used to address sisters, and *bli* is used to address brothers. The use of *mbok* was for the older sister, whereas *bli* was used for the older brother. The term *gusde* is used to call children or friends of the same age. The real example of kinship terms used in the three dialogues can be seen in Data (1) below as follows.

- (1) Speaker A: "***Ajik*** jagi lunga kije?" (Dad, where are you going?)
 Speaker B: "*Ke banjar, ngijeng jumah ajak **biang** nggih?*" (I want to go to the village hall, you stay at home with Mom, right?)

Speaker A: “*Nggih jik*” (Alright)

- (2) Speaker A: “*Memek laku pesu ajak Bapak ke peken, Bli de ade pesu?*” (I want to go out with your dad to the market, are you going out later?)

Speaker B: “*Sing ade mek*” (No mom)

Speaker A: “*Amon keto melaang ngajak Adik e dijumlah*” (If so, please take care your little brother)

Speaker B: “*Nah mek*” (Alright Mom)

- (3) Speaker A: “*Pekak kal kije?*” (Grandpa, where are you going?)

Speaker B: “*Kal ngateh Niang e ke peken*” (I want to take grandma to the market)

Speaker A: “*Gusde nitip meli godoh biu kak*” (I will ask you to buy fried bananas)

Speaker B: “*Misi gula bali?*” (With Balinese Sugar?)

Speaker A: “*Misi*” (Yes, fill it in)

In dialogue (1), a child addresses his father with the term “*Ajik*,” indicating both respect and familiarity. Speaker A also uses the address “*Biang*,” which refers to a family member. Similarly, in dialogue (2), speaker A uses the addresses “*Memek*,” “*Bapak*,” “*Bli*,” and “*Adik*,” all of which refer to family members. The term “*Memek*” is used for his mother, “*Bapak*” is used for his father, and “*Adik*” is used for his younger sibling, demonstrating a strong kinship structure and the roles of responsibility among family members, as the mother asks her child to look after her younger sibling at home. In dialogue (3), the terms “*Pekak*” for grandfather and “*Niang*” for grandmother are used to buy *godoh biu* (fried bananas), demonstrating the emotional closeness between generations.

The findings show that kinship terms are the most frequently used from of address in the Kerobokan Village community, accounting for 24% of the total data. This dominance indicates that family relationships remain the primary foundation of social interaction within that community. According to Brown and Gilman (1968), forms of address reflect power and solidarity between the speaker and the addressee. In this study, kinship terms such as *Ajik*, *Biang*, *Pekak*, and *Niang* primarily express solidarity, respect, and emotional closeness among family members. These findings also support Wardhaugh’s (2006) view, which states that terms of address convey important social meanings, including respect, identity, and interpersonal relationships. Furthermore, these result align with the findings of Kresnantara et al. (2022), which indicate that family relationships are one of the primary factors influencing the use of terms of address in Balinese society.

The dominance of these kinship terms can be justified both empirically and theoretically. Empirically, field observations show that in Bali, the kinship system forms the foundation of the community’s social, cultural, and religious life, where kinship is understood not only as a biological relationship but also as a social network that binds individuals to their traditional communities. Theoretically, this finding is supported by Brown and Gilman’s (1968) theory of power and solidarity, which explains that kinship terms of address tend to reflect solidarity and emotional closeness rather than power relations. Wardhaugh’s (2006) perspective further strengthens this argument, as kinship terms serve to convey identity and close interpersonal relationships, as consistently evident in the data from this study through the use of terms such as *Ajik*, *Biang*, and *Pekak* in everyday interactions.

Special Nicknames (SN)

The Special Nickname covered six address terms. The terms *Bunda*, *Gus Tongklang*, *Dek Kenyat*, *Tut Kenyot*, and *Dolar* were used to refer to someone close and based on the person’s personality. Other than that, the term *bunda* was used to refer to our loved ones. Then, *Bodag* was used to refer to someone close, and it is also his real name. The real example of a special nickname in the three dialogues can be seen in the Data (2) below as follows:

- (4) Speaker A: “**Dek Kenyat**, *binsep rage melali kemu nah*” (Dek kenyat, I’ll visit there soon, okay?)
 Speaker B: “*Dadi gen*” (Sure, go ahead)
- (5) Speaker A: “**Dolar** *be medaar?*” (Dolar, have you eaten?)
 Speaker B: “*Sube, tuni medaar ajak Gus Tonklang di warung*” (Yes, I have, earlier I ate with Gus Tonklang at the stall)
 Speaker A: “*Nah-nah, mare lakar ngajakin medaar masi*” (Alright, I just wanted to invite you to eat)
- (6) Speaker A: “*Nyen kebaang nitip hpne tuni nah?*” (Who did I entrust my phone to before?)
 Speaker B: “*I Bodag ngabe hp ci ne*” (Bodag who brings your phone)
 Speaker A: “*Oh nah-nah, kaden Tut Kenyot ne ngabe*” (Alright, I think Tut Kenyot brought it)

In the three dialogues above, the use of Balinese in casual dialogues reflects a close relationship between speakers, marked by the use of special nicknames such as “*Dek Kenyat*”, “*Gus Tonklang*”, “*Bodag*”, and “*Tut Kenyot*”. The nickname “*Dek Kenyat*” refers to someone known for having a loud voice and is only used by close friends as a form of familiarity. Dialogue (4) shows a warm address and plans for a visit, meanwhile dialogue (5) discusses the habit of eating together using another nickname, and dialogue (6) presents an everyday situation related to entrusted goods using unique names. The use of these nicknames reflects the social and cultural practices typical of Kerobokan village society, which demonstrate the emotional closeness and social identity of the speakers in everyday communication.

The use of specific nicknames indicates close interpersonal relationships among members of the Kerobokan village community. Unlike formal forms of address, these nicknames serve as expressions of familiarity and solidarity among close friends. This finding aligns with Wardhaugh’s (2006) view, which explains that terms of address are used not only to identify individuals but also to express intimacy and social identity. Similarly, Rajabul (2023) found that the choice of forms of address is influenced by the level of closeness between individuals. Therefore, the use of special nicknames reflects the strong social bonds that exist within the local community.

Pet Name (PN)

The Pet name covered five address terms, indicating the names of animals, and was used to address someone that being close and had known each other for a long time. The term *cicing* refers to a dog, but it is used only for people that being already close. Then, there are terms of *ente/nani*, which are used to refer to “you”, but are used only for close people. Other than that, the term *wah*, is used to abbreviate the name of someone. Last, the term *sayang* was used to refer to someone who has a close relationship, like a boyfriend and girlfriend. The real example of a pet name that was used in the three dialogues can be seen in the Data (3) below as follows:

- (7) Speaker A: “**E Cicing**, *be ngumpul tugas cai?*” (Mate, did you already submit the assignment?)
 Speaker B: “*Konden*” (Nope)
- (8) Speaker A: “**Ente** *sing meli kopi jani?*” (Do you not want to buy coffee today?)
 Speaker B: “*Sing, sing mekite ngopi jani*” (Nope, I don’t want to drink coffee today)

(9) Speaker A: “*Poh **nanine** be wayah kekne, idih nah?*” (I think your mango looks ripe. Can I take some?)

Speaker B: “*Nah, jemak be ditu*” (Okay, take it)

Dialogue (7) shows that speakers A and B are friends and used the term. Speaker A wants to know if Speaker B has already submitted the assignment. It shows that both speakers had a close relationship with each other. It showed that the speaker used the term “*cicing*” to show intimacy. Then, dialogue (8) shows that Speaker A asked if Speaker B wanted to buy some coffee. The term used by the speaker is “*ente*” is used to show intimacy. Lastly, dialogue (9) shows that Speaker A wants to eat the mango and asks if he can have it. The term used by the speaker, “*nanine*,” is also used to show intimacy.

The findings indicate that terms of pet names are primarily used among speakers who share a close emotional bond. These forms of address reflect solidarity rather than social hierarchy, and emphasize affection and intimacy in everyday interactions. These findings align with the views of Brown and Gilman (1968), who argue that solidarity significantly influences the choice of terms of address among individuals in close relationships. They also support the perspective of Wardhaugh (2006), who explains that terms of address convey interpersonal meanings that go beyond mere identification.

Title Only (T)

The title only covered six address terms. These titles were used to show respect and were used when addressing someone for the first time. The address terms *Jero/Ajik* were used to address an older man who might have a similar age to the parents (lower or upper age could be considered), whereas *biang* was used to address an older woman who might have a similar age to the parents (lower or upper age could be considered). Then, there is the address term *mbok* was used to refer to an older girl, whereas *bli* was used to refer to an older boy. Other than that, the term *prof* was used to refer to someone who has proficiency in an academic field. The real example of a title only that was used in the three dialogues can be seen in Data (4) below as follows:

(10) Speaker A: “*Pacang lunga kije **Prof?***” (Where do you want to go, Prof?)

Speaker B: “*Lunga ke balai desa, wenten rapat drika*” (I want to go to the village hall because there are meetings there)

(11) Speaker A: “***Bli** sampun ngajeng?*” (Bli, have you eaten yet?)

Speaker B: “*Sampun, wau nunas*” (Yes, I have just now)

(12) Speaker A: “***Mbok**, titiang nunas toyane akidik, nggih?*” (Mbok, could I have some water, please?)

Speaker B: “*Nggih, dados. Jantos dumun nggih*” (Yes, you can. Wait a minute.)

Speaker A: “*Suksma*” (Thank you)

Dialogue (10) shows that speaker A’s class is lower than speaker B’s. It can be seen that speaker A addressed speaker B as *Prof* (Professor). Speaker A wants to ask where the professor will go. It shows that speaker A uses the terms to show respect for their status. Then, dialogue (11) showed that Speaker A asked if Speaker B had eaten yet. It shows that the speaker used the term to show respect because the speaker acknowledged that the addressee is older. Lastly, dialogue (12) shows that Speaker A wants to ask for water and asks if he can have it. It shows that the speaker used the term to show respect because the speaker acknowledged that the addressee is also older.

Unlike kinship terms and nicknames, forms that use only titles are generally used to express respect toward older people or those with higher educational or social status. These findings indicate that speakers carefully choose these forms of address to acknowledge authority and

maintain politeness during interactions. These findings support Wardhaugh's (2006) argument that terms of address express respect, identity, and social meaning. Furthermore, these results align with the findings of Gusanto et al. (2025), who reported that terms of address in the Balinese language reflect politeness, social hierarchy, and cultural norms.

First Names (FN)

First Name covered six address terms. In Kerobokan, the terms *Gede/Putu*, *Made/Kadek*, *Komang*, and *Ketut* were used to address people based on the ordinal birth of the people. These terms of address can be used for anyone, both men and women. The term *Gede/Putu* is used to refer to those who were born as the first child. Then, the term *Made/Kadek* is used to refer to those who were born as the second child. Last, the term *Komang* is used to refer to those who were born as the third child, whereas the term *Ketut* is used to refer to those who were born as the fourth child. A real example of a first name used in the three dialogues can be seen in Data (5) below as follows:

- (13) Speaker A: "**Komang**, dije meli celanane ene?" (Komang, where did you buy these pants?)
Speaker B: "*Meli di peken, beliang?*" (I bought them from the shop. Do you want one?)
Speaker A: "*Beliang sik nah*" (Yes, I want)
Speaker B: "*Nah*" (Okay)
- (14) Speaker A: "**Made**, sampun metanding canange?" (Made, have you already prepared the canang offering?)
Speaker B: "*Durung, benjang tanding tiang.*" (Not yet, I'll prepare it tomorrow.)
Speaker A: "*Nggih dados.*" (Alright then.)
- (15) Speaker A: "*Rahajeng semeng* **Ketut**, mai mani melali ke pasih." (Good morning, Ketut. Let's go hang out at the beach.)
Speaker B: "*Rahajeng semeng, Sing ngidang* **Putu** tugas kuliahe liu." (Good morning. I can't, Putu, I have a lot of college assignments.)
Speaker A: "*Tenang, tiang tulungin ngae.*" (Don't worry, I'll help you do them.)
Speaker B: "*Nggih, lamun keto lan ke sanur.*" (Alright, if that's the case, let's go to Sanur Beach!)

Dialogues (13), (14), and (15) speakers use first names such as "*Komang*", "*Made*", "*Ketut*", and "*Putu*" to address their interlocutors. These names are parts of the traditional Balinese naming system that reflects birth order, and are commonly used in informal situations or everyday conversation. The use of these forms of address serves not only to identify the interlocutor but also to indicate closeness and familiarity. The topics discussed are also light and familiar, such as asking about the origin of a purchase, preparing *canang* offerings, and inviting someone to go to the beach. The use of the first names in this context reflects the distinctive character of Balinese culture, which emphasizes warm and informal social relationships, particularly in interactions among friends or community members who already know each other well.

The use of first names reflects the uniqueness of the Balinese naming system, in which names indicate birth order rather than merely serving as markers of personal identity. These forms of address are generally used in informal interactions among speakers who already know one another. This finding supports Wardhaugh's (2006) view that names function as markers of identity and social relationships. This finding also reinforces the findings of Gusanto et al. (2025), who found that Balinese naming practices preserve cultural identity through everyday communication.

Title Plus Last Name (TLN)

Title plus last name covered four address terms, which were used to show respect, social

distance, or professional hierarchy. There are *Gusti Tangkas*, *Pak Ngurah*, *Prof Ayu*, *Gusti Aji Mendra*. The address term of *Gusti Tangkas* was used to address people who have a caste. *Gusti* is the Ksatria caste, and *Tangkas* is part of the family name. *Pak Ngurah* was used to address people who are older, respected, or hold a higher social status, particularly male individuals in Balinese society. *Prof Ayu* was used to address people who hold the academic title of professor and are respected figures in educational or professional settings. *Gusti Aji Mendra* was used to address people who carry the combined noble honorifics “*Gusti*” and “*Aji*,” signifying high social/caste status, as well as respected authority. The real-life example of the title plus last name format used in three dialogues can be seen in Data (6) below as follows:

(16) Speaker A: “*Om Swastyastu **Gusti Tangkas**, dados titiang sareng ring karyane benjang?*” (May God bless you, Gusti Tangkas. Can I join the events tomorrow?)

Speaker B: “*Inggih dados, benjang galahe jam 7 nggih.*” (Sure, you can come at 7 o'clock)

(17) Speaker A: “*Rahajeng semeng, nunas ampura **Prof Ayu**, titiang telat nika.*” (Om Swastyastu, excuse me, Prof. Ayu, I’m sorry I came late.)

Speaker B: “*Nenten napi **Pak Ngurah**, ngiring melinggih dumun.*” (It’s no problem, Pak Ngurah. Sit down first please.)

(18) Speaker A: “*Om Swastyastu, **Gusti Aji Mendra**. Kayun rauh ring banjar?*” (Om Swastyastu, Gusti Ajik Mendra. Are you coming to the banjar?)

Speaker B: “*Om Swastyastu, wenten rapat, nggih?*” (Om Swastyastu. There's a meeting, right?)

Speaker A: “*Inggih, indik karya desa.*” (Yes, it's about the village ceremony.)

Speaker B: “*Inggih suksma. Malih jebos titiang rauh.*” (Alright, thank you. Later I will come.)

Dialogue (16) the address “*Gusti Tangkas*” combines the Balinese royal title “*Gusti*,” which reflects caste background, and “*Tangkas*” as a surname. This form of address is used to convey a polite request to someone who is respected. In dialogue (17), the title “*Prof Ayu*” is used to show respect for the academic title “*Professor*,” while “*Ayu*” refers to the nickname; and “*Pak Ngurah*” is a general title of respect for adult men, as well as referring to the name. In dialogue (18), the title “*Gusti Aji Mendra*” combines two forms of honorific: “*Gusti*” as a noble title and “*Aji*” used to address someone highly respected, followed by the name “*Mendra*.”

The combination of titles and personal names highlights the importance of acknowledging social identity and social status within the Kerobokan village community. These forms of address are generally used when interacting with respected individuals or those holding noble or academic titles. This finding supports Brown and Gilman’s (1968) theory that forms of address reflect power relations between the speaker and the addressee. Furthermore, these results are consistent with the findings of Gusanto et al. (2025), which show that forms of address in the Balinese language maintain social hierarchy while preserving politeness in communication.

Occupational Terms

Occupational terms covered five address terms in Kerobokan village. These terms referred to people who had a particular occupation in the village. The occupational terms of *Ajik Mangku* were used to address people who perform spiritual duties as religious figures. *Ajik Kelian* refers to a head or leader of a banjar (community unit). *Pak Guru* common respectful address for schoolteachers or instructors. *Pak Mekel* was used to addressing the head of a desa dinas (administrative village). *Jero Bendesa* refers to traditional authority as the customary village head. The real example of occupational terms used in the three dialogues can be seen in Data (7) below as follows:

- (19) Speaker A: “**Pak Mekel**, *Dados titiang nunas surat pengantar ring kantor desa?*” (Pak Mekel, may I request a referral letter from the village office?)
 Speaker B: “*Nggih dados.*” (Sure)
- (20) Speaker A: “*Om Swastiastu **Jero Bendesa**, titiang matur indik benjang galahe jam 10 nika kamargiang pawiwahan nyane*” (om swastiastu jero bendesa, I request permission for tomorrow's wedding ceremony to begin at 10 o'clock.
 Speaker B: “*Inggih, Suksma*” (Yes, thank you.)
- (21) Speaker A: “**Ajik Kelian**, *ampura benjang titiang ten prasida nyarengin ring banjar, kari mekarya nika*” (Ajik Kelian, I'm sorry, I can't help you in village hall tomorrow. I have work to do.)
 Speaker B: “*Nggih, nenten kenapi.*” (Alright, no problem)

Dialogue (19) speaker, a villager, politely requests a letter of introduction to *Pak Mekel*. The term “*Pak Mekel*” is used to show respect for someone who holds an official position in the village administration. Furthermore, in dialogue (20), the speaker uses the address “*Jero Bendesa*” when requesting permission from the village chief regarding the timing of a wedding ceremony. The title “*Jero Bendesa*” is a very high form of respect, as it carries a traditional title that has spiritual and social authority at the village level. Similarly, dialogue (21) shows the use of the address “*Ajik Kelian*” by the speaker to one of the leaders of the village hall, namely the *kelian* (leaders of the village hall).

Titles based on occupation terms indicate that institutional roles continue to influence language use in everyday interactions. Speakers acknowledge the authority of teachers, village heads, and traditional leaders by addressing them according to their occupations. This finding supports Wardhaugh's (2006) argument, which explains that titles imply social identity and respect within a community. Similarly, Kresnantara et al. (2022) found that occupation is one of the main factors influencing the choice of titles in Balinese society.

Religious Terms

Religious terms covered three address terms there are *Ajik Mangku*, *Serati*, and *Mbok Jero*. Address terms of *Ajik Mangku* was used to address people who conduct the ritual ceremony, *Serati* was used to address people who made or prepare the ritual tools or equipment, and *Mbok Jero* was used to address women who have a role in religion, or used to address women who were originally commoners and then married to men of higher status. The example of religious terms used in the three dialogues in Data (8) below as follows:

- (22) Speaker A: “**Ajik mangku**, *titiang nunas tirta.*” (*Ajik mangku*, I humbly ask for holy water (*tirta*)).
 Speaker B: “*Nggih.*” (Sure).
- (23) Speaker A: “*Semeton **Serati**, dados sampun siaga ring jeroan nggih!*” (Serati people, please stand guard inside the temple!)
 Speaker B: “*Inggih*” (Alright)
- (24) Speaker A: “**Mbok Jero**, *napi malih sane dados titian sarengin?*” (Mbok Jero, is there anything I can help you with?)
 Speaker B: “*Sampun samian.*” (Everything is ready)

Dialogue (22) speaker A asks speaker B, who is addressed as “*Ajik Mangku*,” for *tirta* (holy water). This form of address is used as a sign of respect for a *pemangku* (village priest) who leads

religious ceremonies. Meanwhile, dialogue (23) shows the use of the form of address “Semeton Serati” by speaker A to convey instructions to a group of *Serati* members, specifically a community group responsible for managing offerings. Meanwhile, dialogue (24) shows the use of the address “Mbok Jero,” which was used by speaker A as a form of respect toward a woman of high status, typically the wife of a village priest or a traditional leader.

Although religious terms are the least frequently occurring category, they still hold significant cultural meaning because they are used exclusively in religious and ceremonial contexts. Their use reflects respect for religious authority and reinforces the close connection between language and Balinese cultural traditions. This finding aligns with Wardhaugh’s (2006) view, who argues that terms of address carry important social meanings, including respect and identity. This finding also supports the results of a study by Gusanto et al. (2025), who reported that terms of address in the Balinese language are closely linked to cultural values, religious traditions, and social hierarchy.

Based on these findings, this study identified eight types of terms used by the residents of Kerobokan Village: kinship terms, special nicknames, pet name, terms using only a title, first names, titles combined with last names, occupational terms, and religious terms. Among these categories, kinship terms are the most frequently used, indicating that family relationships remain central to everyday communication within the community. The purpose of this study is to identify the types of terms used by the residents of Kerobokan Village and to explain how these forms of address reflect the sociocultural characteristics of Balinese society. Overall, the findings indicate that the choice of terms is strongly influenced by social relationship, age, occupation, social status, religious roles and cultural traditions.

As a whole, the eight categories of greetings identified in Kerobokan show patterns that are partly consistent with and partly different from those found in previous similar studies. A study by Kresnantara et al. (2022) in Menyali Village identified twelve types of forms of address, far more than the eight types in this study; however, core categories such as kinship terms, special nicknames, pet names, title only, first names, and occupational terms consistently appeared in both studies, confirming that these categories constitute the foundational elements of the address system in Buleleng society in general. This difference in the number of categories is primarily due to the findings from Menyali, which included additional categories such as intimacy names, mockery names, pronouns, and zero address terms, which did not appear as separate categories in Kerobokan. Similarly, the study by Gusanto et al. (2025) in Lemukih Village identified twenty-seven forms of address grouped into five major categories (personal pronouns, kinship, first names, power/hierarchy, and mockery), which differ in their grouping methodology from this study, which classifies forms of address based on their lexical form rather than their social function; nevertheless, both studies emphasize the role of kinship and titles of authority as the primary determinants of form of address selection. Meanwhile, Rajabul’s (2023) study of the Sasak community in Lombok identified eight forms of address that are structurally similar to this study in terms of the number of categories, although the content of the categories differs because Rajabul included “borrowing patterns” (forms of address borrowed from foreign languages) that are not found at all in Kerobokan, whereas this study identified a “title plus last name” category explicitly linked to the caste system, an element not emphasized in Rajabul’s study because the Sasak community does not adhere to the Balinese caste system. This comparison shows that although the theoretical frameworks of Wardhaugh (2006) and Brown and Gilman (1968) are universally applicable to explain the function of forms of address as markers of solidarity and power, the concrete manifestations of these categories remain local in nature and are influenced by the social and religious structures of each respective community.

These findings support the sociolinguistic perspective put forward by Hudson (1996), who argues that language is closely linked to society and reflects social structure. These findings also reinforce the theory of Brown and Gilman (1968) that forms of address express both power and solidarity between the speaker and the addressee, while Wardhaugh (2006) emphasizes that terms

of address convey respect, identity, and interpersonal relationships. Furthermore, these findings align with previous research conducted by Kresnantara et al. (2022), Rajabul (2023), and Gusanto et al. (2025), which reported that the choice of forms of address is influenced by family relationships, social hierarchy, occupation, closeness, and cultural values. Therefore, this study contributes to sociolinguistic research by providing empirical evidence that the community of Kerobokan Village continues to preserve Balinese cultural identity through the use of various terms of address in everyday communication.

In addition to providing an overview of variations in forms of address, the findings of this study also demonstrate novelty compared to previous similar studies (Gusanto et al., 2025; Kresnantara et al., 2022; Rajabul, 2023). First, in terms of location, this study is the first to focus on the community of Kerobokan Village, specifically the Kloncing Traditional Banjar, which has never been the subject of sociolinguistic research before, thereby complementing the dialectological map and system of forms of address in the Buleleng region of Bali. Second, in terms of social conditions, this study highlights a contemporary phenomenon: the shift in the use of honorifics resulting from migration and interactions between native residents and newcomers. This dynamic has not been widely addressed in similar studies, which tend to focus on relatively homogeneous communities. Third, from a sociocultural perspective, this study explicitly links the use of honorifics to the Tri Wangsa and Jaba caste systems and demonstrates how the misuse of honorifics by newcomers can trigger social tension. These three novel aspects expand our understanding of the function of honorifics not only as markers of identity and closeness but also as instruments for maintaining social harmony in a society undergoing demographic change.

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations that must be considered when interpreting the findings. First, the study was conducted in only one traditional banjar, namely Banjar Kloncing in Kerobokan Village; therefore, the findings cannot necessarily be generalized to the entire Kerobokan Village or to other villages in Sawan Subdistrict, which may have different variations in the use of forms of address. Second, although informants were selected from various age groups and social backgrounds within the banjar to obtain a representative sample, the limited number of informants may affect the scope of the variations in terms of forms of address that were successfully documented. Third, the data in this study are synchronic and were collected over a relatively short period of time; thus, they cannot yet capture possible diachronic shifts in the use of forms of address resulting from the influences of migration and modernization. These three limitations indicate that generalizations of the research findings must be made with caution, and further research with a broader geographical scope and a larger number of informants is strongly recommended to obtain a more comprehensive picture of the Balinese system of forms of address.

Despite these limitations, these findings carry important theoretical and pedagogical implications. Theoretically, this study reinforces and enriches Brown and Gilman's (1968) theory of "power and solidarity" by demonstrating that in communities undergoing demographic change, such as Kerobokan, the dimension of solidarity can become more prominent than the dimension of power, particularly in the categories of kinship terms and pet names. This study also expands the application of Wardhaugh's (2006) theory on the functions of forms of address by incorporating the contexts of migration and cross-cultural interaction as variables influencing the selection of forms of address, an aspect that has not been extensively explored within that theoretical framework. Pedagogically, these findings are important for the teaching of the Balinese language and culture, both to younger native speakers and to newcomers or foreign language learners. Balinese language learning materials should incorporate sociolinguistic content regarding the system of forms of address and caste so that learners understand the appropriate contexts for using these forms of address, thereby preventing cross-cultural misunderstandings. Additionally, the results of this study can be utilized as cultural briefing material for newcomers settling in traditional Balinese communities to support harmonious social integration.

CONCLUSIONS

This study concludes that the people of Kerobokan Village employ eight types of address terms in their everyday communication. These include kinship terms, special nicknames, pet names, title only, first names, title plus last names, occupational terms, and religious terms. Among these categories, kinship terms emerged as the most frequently used term by the Kerobokan Village Community, highlighting the deep-rooted emphasis on familial relationships within the community's sociocultural context. The variety of address terms observed reflects a nuanced linguistic system shaped by social hierarchy, interpersonal closeness, customary roles, and spiritual designations, each of which carries specific cultural meanings in the local context. These findings provide both theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, they contribute to sociolinguistic studies by illustrating how address terms reflect social relationships and cultural values in the Kerobokan Village community. Practically, they may serve as a reference for promoting effective intercultural communication and reducing misunderstandings in interactions within local communities.

This study is limited to the categorization of address terms used within the local community of Kerobokan Village. Therefore, the findings cannot be generalized to other Balinese communities or different sociocultural settings, as the use of address terms may vary across regions and communities.

Considering that this study only focused on the categorization of address terms within the local community of Kerobokan Village, future researchers are encouraged to conduct comparative investigations across different regions or ethnolinguistic groups. Further research may also explore the factors influencing the choice of address terms, such as age, gender, educational background, and social status, within more diverse interactional settings.

REFERENCES

- Brown, L. (2020). Honorifics. In M. Aronoff (Ed.), *Oxford bibliographies in linguistics*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199772810-0265>
- Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1968). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the sociology of language* (pp. 252–275). Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110805376.252>
- Gusanto, A., Budasi, I. G., & Dewi, K. S. (2025). The terms of address used by local people “krama desa adat” in Lemukih Village. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 10(1), 516–525. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v10i1.671>
- Hudson, R. (1996). *Sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Kresnantara, G. B., Budasi, I. G., & Pratiwi, N. P. A. (2022). Address terms used by local people in Menyali Village. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Undiksha*, 10(3), 249–256. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbi.v10i3.57671>
- Maulana, I. P. A. P., & Putra, I. B. G. D. (2021). Metafora konseptual kasta dalam masyarakat Bali: Kajian linguistik kognitif. *PRASI*, 16(2), 92–104. <https://doi.org/10.23887/prasi.v16i02.37578>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Oyetade, S. O. (1995). A sociolinguistic analysis of address forms in Yoruba. *Language in Society*, 24(4), 515–535. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740450001900X>
- Rahmadani, R., & Wahyuni, D. (2018). Types and functions of address terms used by IPMK-SB Kampar students studying in Padang. *E-Journal of English Language and Literature*, 7(1), 132–142. <https://doi.org/10.24036/ell.v7i1.9906>
- Rajabul, M. G. (2023). A sociolinguistics analysis of address terms in Sasak language. *Deskripsi Bahasa*, 6(1), 50–59. <https://doi.org/10.22146/db.v6i1.7029>

- Rifai, D. M., & Prasetyaningrum, S. T. (2016). A sociolinguistic analysis of addressing terms used in *Tangled* movie manuscript. *Jurnal Penelitian Humaniora*, 17(2), 123–134. <https://doi.org/10.23917/humaniora.v17i2.2504>
- Sapir, E. (1921). *Language: An introduction to the study of speech*. Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Sari, C. K., Zainuddin, & Pulungan, A. H. (2021). Address system of Gayonese Lut and Deret in Bener Meriah. *Linguistik Terapan*, 18(2), 96. <https://doi.org/10.24114/lt.v18i2.27887>
- Suyana, Y., Suhandano, S., & Hariri, T. (2022). The zero-address form in the Japanese address system. *Japanese Research on Linguistics, Literature, and Culture*, 4(2), 141–152. <https://doi.org/10.33633/jr.v4i2.6229>
- Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (5th ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
- Yang, X. (2010). Address forms of English: Rules and variations. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(5), 743–745. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.1.5.743-745>
- Zavitri, I., Machmoed, H., & Sukmawaty, S. (2018). The address terms in English and Selayereese: A sociolinguistic perspective. *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya*, 6(1), 129–134. <https://doi.org/10.34050/jib.v6i1.4317>