

Research Article

Address Terms in Indonesian Screen Dialogue: A Corpus Analysis of 5 cm and Gundala

Anselmus Joko Prayitno ^{1*}, Berdinata Massang ², and Yustinus Joko Wahyu Yuniarto ³

¹ Sekolah Tinggi Pastoral Kateketik Santo Fransiskus Asisi Semarang

² Institut Agama Kristen Negeri Manado, Indonesia

³ Sekolah Tinggi Pastoral Kateketik Santo Fransiskus Asisi Semarang

* Corresponding Author: Anselmus Joko Prayitno

Abstract Address terms are linguistic resources that are not only used to address or identify interlocutors but can also contribute to the formation of interpersonal relationships in interactions. This study aims to analyze the form, interactional function, and relational positioning of address terms in Indonesian film dialogues. The study uses a corpus-assisted qualitative pragmatic analysis approach with data from the ProSub corpus covering the films 5 cm and Gundala. The corpus consists of 2,473 raw records and produces 527 address-term occurrences, namely 335 occurrences from 5 cm and 192 occurrences from Gundala. Quantitative analysis is used to map the distribution of address terms across all occurrences, while interactional functions and relational implications are analyzed contextually in selected excerpts. The results show that personal naming-based addressing is the dominant group. Full personal names, shortened or modified personal names, and nicknames reach 255 occurrences or 48.39% of the total data. Contextual analysis shows that a single form of address term can perform different functions, including attention/summons, recipient orientation, action targeting, greeting/recognition, affiliation, and deference. Address repetition was found in 93 occurrences or 17.65% of the data and functions as a feature that can strengthen attention to the recipient, urgency, and emotional involvement. At the relational level, address terms contribute to the formation of intimacy, solidarity, social distance, and power/deference. The research findings indicate that the interactional and relational value of address terms is contextual and cannot be determined solely based on lexical form. This research contributes to the study of Indonesian pragmatics by integrating variations in form, interactional function, and relational positioning in the analysis of screen dialogue.

Received: 17th February 2026

Revised: 18th March 2026

Accepted: 21th April 2026

Published: 30th June 2026

Curr. Ver.: 30th June 2026

Keywords: address terms; pragmatics; interactional function; relational positioning; screen dialogue; Indonesian films



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.

Submitted for possible open

access publication under the

terms and conditions of the

Creative Commons Attribution

(CC BY SA) license

([https://creativecommons.org/li](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)

[censes/by-sa/4.0/](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/))

1. Introduction

Address terms are a linguistic resource used by speakers to manage relationships with their interlocutors. These terms can include proper names, kinship terms, titles, honorifics, or social titles. In interactions, address terms not only indicate the target audience but also demonstrate how the relationship between the speaker and the interlocutor is positioned. (Manns, 2015), for example, shows that address terms in the interactions of Indonesian youth are related to framing, identity, intimacy, and solidarity. Thus, address terms can be

understood as part of a social practice that functions more broadly than simply addressing or calling someone.

The diversity of address forms is a prominent characteristic of the Indonesian context. Speakers can use proper names, kinship terms, social forms, and honorifics according to the relationship and interaction situation. Studies of Indonesian in multilingual communities also show that the choice of address terms can relate to different dimensions of social relations, including proximity and hierarchy (Yusra et al., 2022). In another context, (Olii, 2021) showed that address forms in Indonesian are also influenced by the social characteristics of the speaking community. These findings suggest that address terms need to be understood as part of a system of linguistic choices that is sensitive to social context.

The choice of form is also not always fixed. A person may be addressed by their full name in one context, then use a shortened form or a specific social form in another. These changes can result in differences in how interpersonal relationships are represented. In English-speaking workplaces in Indonesia, for example, the forms "Pak" and "Bu" are still used even though interactions take place in English because they carry specific identity and social values (Chandra et al., 2024). These findings suggest that address terms can retain social meanings that cannot be fully replaced by lexical equivalents from other languages.

Address terms also function beyond simply marking social categories. In interactions, forms of address can be related to the organization of action and participation. (Hamdani et al., 2022) show that address terms in Indonesian conversation are used to manage next-speaker selection and action formation. Address terms can help speakers determine the recipient of a particular action, while also addressing the issue of orientation between participants. Therefore, analysis of address terms needs to move from questions about the form used to questions about what is accomplished through that form.

This interactional perspective is important because one form of address term does not always have a single function. The form "Sir," for example, can appear as a direct address, as part of a response to an interlocutor, or as part of an action containing a request or respect. Similarly, proper names can be used to address someone, direct a question, give instructions, or establish closeness. Thus, the function of an address term cannot be determined solely based on its lexical form. The address term's position within the utterance and the ongoing action must be considered simultaneously.

The issue of function is directly related to interpersonal relationships. In interpersonal pragmatics, relationships between interacting participants are viewed as continually constructed and negotiated through language use. (Locher, 2013) explains that relational work encompasses how speakers use linguistic resources to manage interpersonal relationships. This framework provides a basis for viewing address terms not as labels for finished relationships, but as resources that can be used to maintain, change, or negotiate relational positions.

Address terms are also related to the positioning process. In a study of Indonesian political interviews, (Djenar, 2024) demonstrated that the choice of address and interlocutor reference can be used for leveling and differentiation. Names, kin terms, and titles can serve as resources for positioning oneself and one's interlocutor within specific social categories and structures. This finding is important for this study because it suggests that address choices can contribute to relationship formation, not simply reflect existing relationships.

Research on address terms in Indonesia has developed across various contexts, including youth interactions, natural conversations, multilingual environments, and academic settings (Hamdani et al., 2022; Manns, 2015). However, each context focuses on different issues. (Hamdani et al., 2022) study focuses on the function of address terms in conversational organization, while (Djenar, 2024) study emphasizes the relationship between address, reference, and positioning in political interviews. Other studies have focused more on the distribution of these terms and the social factors influencing their use. These different focuses provide opportunities to connect variations in form, interactional function, and relational value across different types of data.

Screen dialogue provides an interesting context for this development. Film dialogue is a fictional construct, but characters are still constructed through linguistic choices that are socially recognizable to the audience. Address terms can be used to convey closeness, solidarity, respect, conflict, or even changes in relationships between characters. Research on address terms in fictional works also shows that address choices can contribute to the representation of interpersonal relationships between characters (Rozumko, 2023). Thus,

screen dialogue can be treated as relevant data for examining how social relationships are represented through linguistic choices.

However, research on address terms in Indonesian and fictional discourse often focuses on a single dimension, such as form, social factors, identity, interactional function, or translation issues. What remains limited is an integrated approach that links address-form variation, interactional function, and relational positioning in a comparable corpus of Indonesian screen dialogue. This research positions itself in that space. Its focus is not to claim that address terms in film have never been studied, but to develop an analysis that connects these three dimensions in a single comparative corpus.

This study uses two Indonesian films, 5 cm and Gundala, as a comparative corpus. The corpus consists of 2,473 raw records, namely 1,370 records from 5 cm and 1,103 records from Gundala. From these records, 527 address-term occurrences were found, consisting of 335 occurrences from 5 cm and 192 occurrences from Gundala. The data shows a diversity of addressing forms that include personal names, shortened or modified names, nicknames, kinship terms, social-relational forms, titles or honorifics, endearments, group addresses, and complex forms.

Corpus exploration shows that personal naming-based addressing has a strong presence. Full personal names, shortened or modified personal names, and nicknames account for 255 occurrences, or approximately 48.4% of the total data. This pattern suggests that the representation of relationships in both films relies not solely on honorific and kinship terms. Variations such as Ian, Yan, Ta, Yal, Nta, Plek, Juplek, and Ndut demonstrate that name choice and modification are important resources in addressing practices.

These initial findings lead to the main research question: does an address term have a relatively fixed interpersonal value based on its form, or do its function and relational value change according to the interactional context? In this research corpus, the same form can appear in the context of summons, recipient orientation, action targeting, greeting, affiliation, and deference. Therefore, lexical form is not treated as the sole determinant of function. The analysis is directed at the relationship between form, context, ongoing action, and the relationship between characters.

Based on these issues, this research integrates three dimensions of analysis. The first dimension is address-form variation, which is the linguistic form chosen by speakers. The second dimension is interactional function, which is the interactional work carried out through address terms. The third dimension is relational positioning, which is the contribution of address term choice to the construction of intimacy, solidarity, social distance, and power/deference. This framework allows the research to move from a description of form to an interpretation of how interpersonal relationships are represented through language.

Thus, this study does not consider Pak, Mas, proper names, or nicknames as forms that automatically carry interpersonal meaning. The value of a form is understood as the result of linguistic use in context. This approach combines attention to the interactional function of address terms demonstrated in Indonesian conversation (Hamdani et al., 2022) with a positioning perspective that places address choices as part of social relationships (Djenar, 2024).

This study aims to analyze the form, interactional function, and relational contribution of address terms in the dialogue of two Indonesian films. Specifically, this study poses three research questions:

RQ1. What forms and distributional patterns of address terms occur in the Indonesian screen dialogues of 5 cm and Gundala?

RQ2. How are address terms used as interactional resources in selected dialogue contexts?

RQ3. How do address-term choices contribute to the relational positioning of characters?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Address Terms as Social Practice

Address terms are linguistic forms used to direct speech toward the interlocutor, but their use is also related to how social relationships are formed in interactions. In the

Indonesian context, forms of address can include proper names, kinship terms, titles, honorifics, and socio-relational forms. (Manns, 2015) shows that address terms in Indonesian youth interactions can be used to establish identity, solidarity, and intimacy. These findings indicate that address terms not only have a referential function but also convey interpersonal information.

This diversity is evident across various language communities in Indonesia. (Olii, 2021), for example, shows that the address system in the Gorontalo community exhibits variations related to social relationships and speaker characteristics. A similar pattern is found in the Balinese kinship system, where the choice of address terms is related to family relationships and social position (Septiari, 2023). Thus, address terms need to be understood as part of a social repertoire whose use is influenced by context.

The diversity of address terms is also found in other local communities. (Sunarti et al., 2019) showed that the address term system in the Pubian dialect of Lampung includes kinship terms, terms of endearment, proper names, customary titles, religious terms, and several other forms. These findings demonstrate that address systems can develop into complex linguistic systems when related to the social and cultural structures of a society.

More recent research continues to demonstrate this relationship. (Andreyana et al., 2025) found that address terms in the Sudaji community are related to politeness, social hierarchy, identity, familiarity, and intimacy. The use of these forms is also influenced by age, kinship, familiarity, and the communication situation. Thus, social context remains a crucial element in explaining address term choice.

2.2 Variations of Address Terms in the Indonesian Context

Variations in address forms occur not only between different communities but also within a single communication environment. (Yusra et al., 2022) show that borrowing address forms in multilingual communities can be used to manage certain dimensions of social relations. The choice of form can be a means of signaling closeness, group identity, and social relationships.

(Chandra et al., 2024) demonstrated a similar pattern through the use of Pak and Bu in English-language interactions in Indonesia. These forms persist because they carry specific social and identity meanings that cannot be completely replaced by English forms. Address terms, therefore, can retain cultural value even as the language of interaction changes.

Variation also occurs in digital communication. (Marnita, 2022) showed that "kak" (older brother) is the dominant form of address in online transactions via WhatsApp in Padang, and its use is relatively independent of the age or gender of the counterpart. This finding is interesting because it suggests that certain forms can undergo functional expansion and become more neutral forms of address in new communication environments.

(Giyatmi & Astuti, 2024) also demonstrated that address terms are used in communication via Instagram. The presence of address terms in the digital space demonstrates that addressing still functions as a tool for building relationships between speakers and recipients even when the interaction is not face-to-face.

Findings from institutional contexts also demonstrate the importance of social situations. (Yulianto & Daniela, 2025) show that the choice of address terms in academic settings is influenced by social dynamics and the context of interaction. Therefore, variations in form cannot be explained solely through formal-informal categories but must be interpreted in light of the participants' relationships and the communication situation.

2.3 From Form to Interactional Function

Classifying address terms based on form is an important initial step, but it fails to explain what speakers do through these forms. (Hamdani et al., 2022) demonstrated that address terms in Indonesian conversation can be used to manage next-speaker selection, recipient orientation, and action formation. These findings demonstrate that address terms are part of the organization of interaction.

From this perspective, the same form can have different functions. Pak can be used to attract attention, orient the response to the recipient, or appear alongside a differential act. Proper nouns can also be used as summons, as part of a question, or as part of an act that directs something toward the interlocutor.

Recent studies on the relationship between address terms and addressees also reinforce the importance of context. (Pawiro et al., 2025), for example, link address terms to the relationship between addresser and addressee. These findings reinforce that the interpretation of address forms requires consideration of the relationship between the participants, not just the lexical characteristics of the form.

(Rajabul, 2023) showed that address terms in Sasak are related to various social factors and interactional functions. This study shows that the use of address terms is influenced by social conditions and the relationship between the speaker and the interlocutor.

Therefore, this study distinguishes two levels of analysis: form category and interactional function. This separation prevents the assumption that a form automatically has a specific pragmatic function.

2.4 Address Terms, Identity, and Relational Positioning

In addition to organizing actions, address terms can contribute to the positioning process. (Djenar, 2024) shows that address and interlocutor reference in Indonesian political interviews can be used in the leveling and differentiation process. The choice of names, kin terms, and titles is part of how the speaker displays their relationship with the interlocutor.

(Manns, 2015) offers a different but complementary perspective. In youth interactions, address terms are related to framing and identity, including how solidarity and intimacy are constructed. Both studies demonstrate that address terms can be a resource for constructing interpersonal positions.

From a more general perspective, (Locher, 2013) views relational meaning as the result of relational work. Language use enables participants to maintain, negotiate, or transform interpersonal relationships. Address terms are particularly relevant within this framework because they directly categorize or position the recipient in the interaction.

This attention to relationships is also evident in research on institutional discourse. (Supriyono & Kuntjara, 2023), for example, demonstrate the link between the use of address terms and politeness strategies in public interactions. This reinforces the view that address forms cannot be separated from their accompanying interpersonal purposes.

2.5 Address Terms in Fiction and Screen Dialogue

Most research on address terms in Indonesia utilizes natural conversation, local communities, digital communication, or institutional contexts. However, the study of fiction provides an additional perspective because interpersonal relationships are constructed through characters' language choices.

(Rozumko, 2023) shows that address terms in fiction contribute to the representation of interpersonal relationships, and these changes are visible when address forms are translated into other languages. These findings suggest that addressing choices are part of the representation of relationships in fiction.

In a more directly audiovisual context, (Zavitri et al., 2018) used film dialogue as data to analyze address terms from a sociolinguistic perspective. This study demonstrated that movie dialogue can be used as a data source to examine the variation and use of address terms.

More recent research also used Indonesian film subtitles. (Mukminin et al., 2025) analyzed 179 address-term occurrences in the subtitles of *Perempuan Tanah Jahanam* and showed that the translation of address terms is influenced by cultural differences and social context. This study is significant because it demonstrates that address terms in Indonesian films carry social meanings complex enough to require specific translation strategies.

Other studies on film have also shown the relationship between address forms and social relations. (Andryani et al., 2024), for example, analyzed address terms in *Barbie: Princess Charm School* and found that forms were used to indicate intimacy, respect, and power differences.

These findings indicate that screen dialogue is a relevant data source for pragmatic and sociolinguistic studies. However, screen dialogue also differs from natural conversation because the interaction is designed to build character and storyline.

2.6 Research Gap

The literature shows that address terms have been studied from various perspectives: social variation, identity, kinship, multilingualism, digital interaction, institutional discourse, natural conversation, and fiction. Indonesian research has also shown that forms of address are sensitive to social context and the relationships between participants.

However, most research still places relatively separate focuses on form, function, or relational meaning. (Hamdani et al., 2022) study emphasizes interactional functions in conversation, while (Djenar, 2024) highlights positioning in political interviews. Audiovisual studies such as (Zavitri et al., 2018) and (Mukminin et al., 2025) focus more on the use or translation of address terms in films.

Based on these conditions, this study places a gap in the integration of three levels of analysis, namely:

Address Form → Interactional Function → Relational Positioning

With this framework, research asks not only what forms emerge, but also how those forms are used in specific actions and how their use contributes to the characters' interpersonal positions.

3. Research Methods

3.1 Research Design and Data Source

This research uses a corpus-assisted qualitative pragmatic analysis approach supported by descriptive quantitative analysis. This approach was chosen because the research has two complementary analytical needs. Quantitative analysis is used to describe the form and distribution of address terms in the corpus, while qualitative analysis is used to explain their interactional functions and their contribution to character relational positioning.

The research data were obtained from the ProSub (A Cross-Linguistic Study of Pronoun Substitutes and Address Terms) corpus. This corpus provides data and annotations for several Asian languages, including Indonesian, and uses the labels '1st', '2nd', 'address', and 'title' in its annotation scheme (Nomoto et al., 2023). The Indonesian film data in the corpus consists of captions for *Gundala* and *5 cm*.

This study uses two Indonesian films available in the corpus: 5 cm and Gundala. These films were selected based on the availability of annotated data and the diversity of character interactions that allow for the observation of various interpersonal relationships.

3.2 Corpus and Data Selection

The initial corpus consisted of 2,473 raw records, with 1,370 records from 5 cm and 1,103 records from Gundala. Of these records, the study extracted all records annotated with address in ProSub.

The extraction results yielded 527 address-term occurrences, consisting of 335 occurrences in 5 cm and 192 occurrences in Gundala. All 527 occurrences were used as the population for quantitative analysis.

In the next stage, the data were examined based on the form of the address term and the context of the utterance. No additional data was collected through interviews, questionnaires, observations, or experiments. Therefore, the study utilized the available public corpus entirely.

The ProSub schema served as the basis for initial identification because the corpus differentiates between 1st, 2nd, and address annotations. This study specifically focused its analysis on records with address annotations.

3.3 Data Coding and Analytical Categories

Coding was conducted at two levels of analysis. The first level focused on form and was applied to all 527 occurrences, while the second level focused on interactional function and was applied through contextual analysis to selected excerpts. With this distinction, interactional function is not assumed to be a fixed attribute of all occurrences, but is determined based on the context of use.

For form analysis, 527 occurrences were classified into ten categories: PNF (full personal name), PNS (shortened/modified personal name), NCK (nickname/marked relational form), KIN (kinship/age-relational term), TTL (title/honorific/role), SOC (social-relational form),

END (endearment), GRP (group address), MX (mixed/complex form), and CTX (context-sensitive form).

Form categories are not automatically assumed to have specific pragmatic functions. For example, "Pak" is not immediately categorized as a deference, while "nickname" is not automatically considered a marker of intimacy. This separation is necessary to avoid equating linguistic form with interpersonal value.

At the second level, interactional functions were analyzed contextually in selected excerpts. The functions used were ATT (attention/summons), ORI (recipient orientation), ACT (action targeting), GRE (greeting/recognition), AFF (affiliation/solidarity), DEF (deference/respect), and DIS (disalignment/confrontation). In addition, REP (address repetition) was recorded as an additional feature, not as a primary function. Because the functional analysis was contextual, the functional categories were not treated as a final distribution for all 527 occurrences.

This functional distinction is based on the context in which address terms are used. This approach aligns with research by (Hamdani et al., 2022), which shows that address terms in Indonesian conversation can relate to participation management, interlocutor selection, and action formation.

3.4 Analytical Procedure

The analysis was conducted in several sequential steps. First, all records with address annotations were extracted from the corpus. Second, each occurrence was examined and classified based on the form of the address term. Third, the frequency and percentage of each category were calculated to determine the distribution pattern in each film.

Fourth, the data is read contextually to determine the interactional function of the selected excerpts. The analysis considers not only the address term in isolation, but also its position within the utterance, the action being performed, and its relationship to surrounding utterances.

Fifth, a number of representative excerpts were purposively selected for in-depth analysis. The selection of excerpts took into account variations in form, interactional function, repetition of address, and diversity of relational contexts. These excerpts were then analyzed to explain how the choice of address terms contributes to intimacy, solidarity, social distance, and power/deference.

Quantitative and qualitative analyses thus serve different purposes. The 527 occurrences are used to provide a distributional overview of the corpus, while selected excerpts are used to explain how these patterns operate in interactional contexts. Therefore, the study does not claim that all 527 occurrences have achieved the same final interactional function; the interpretation of function and relational positioning is based on contextual analysis of the selected data.

3.5 Analytical Rigor and Ethical Considerations

Consistency of analysis was maintained by applying the same coding definitions to all data and re-examining the context when a form had more than one possible interpretation. Form coding and function coding were treated as two distinct processes to prevent the interpretation of function from being automatically determined by the form category.

The study did not use human participants or collect primary data. All data came from publicly available corpora, so no interviews, surveys, or additional personal information was collected. ProSub openly provides the dataset and corpus documentation. The reliability of the analysis is maintained through transparent category definitions, the separation of form and function analysis, the full use of dialogue context, and the storage of coding results in a traceable dataset.

4. Research Results

4.1 Corpus Profile and Distribution of Address Terms

The research corpus consists of 2,473 raw records from two Indonesian films: 5 cm and Gundala. A total of 1,370 records come from 5 cm, while 1,103 records come from Gundala. Of these records, 527 occurrences were annotated as address terms. A total of 335 occurrences come from 5 cm and 192 occurrences from Gundala.

Table 1. Corpus Profile

Film	Raw records	Address-term occurrences	Proportion
5 cm	1,370	335	63.57%
Gundala	1,103	192	36.43%
Total	2,473	527	100.00%

Table 1 shows that 5 cm has a greater number of address-term occurrences than Gundala. This difference needs to be read in conjunction with the number of raw records for each film, so it cannot be directly interpreted as evidence that one film has higher interpersonal interaction. In this study, both data sets were used as a comparative corpus to identify variations in form and usage patterns.

Of the 527 occurrences, 84 unique address forms were found after the normalization process. The most frequent forms include Yan, Plek, Nta, Mas, and Ian in 5 cm, while Pak, Bu, Ibu, and Sancaka are some of the prominent forms in Gundala. The distribution shows that addressing practices in both films involve a combination of proper names, modified names, nicknames, kinship terms, social terms, and honorifics.

4.2 Distribution of Address Terms Forms

The final form coding results revealed ten categories of address terms. The PNS category was the most common, with 103 occurrences (19.54%), followed by PNF with 101 occurrences (19.17%). Meanwhile, TTL had 77 occurrences (14.61%), KIN with 63 occurrences (11.95%), and SOC with 62 occurrences (11.76%).

Table 2. Distribution of Address Terms Forms

Category	Information	Frequency	Percentage
civil servant	Shortened/modified personal name	103	19.54%
PNF	Full personal name	101	19.17%
Date and Time	Title/honorific/role	77	14.61%
KIN	Kinship/age-relational term	63	11.95%
SOC	Social-relational form	62	11.76%
NCK	Nickname/modified relational form	51	9.68%
MX	Mixed/complex form	30	5.69%
CTX	Context-sensitive form	23	4.36%
GRP	Group address	10	1.90%
END	Endearment	7	1.33%
Total		527	100.00%

Note: three occurrences that previously had a REVIEW status in the KIN category have been resolved through context checking and assigned to the KIN category.

Table 2 shows that personal naming-based addressing is the most dominant group. PNF and PNS together account for 204 occurrences, or 38.71% of the total data. When NCK is also taken into account, personal naming-based addressing accounts for 255 occurrences, or 48.39%. In other words, nearly half of the address terms in the corpus are realized through full names, shortened or modified names, and nicknames.

These findings suggest that addressing in both films relies more than just on honorifics and kinship forms. Variations such as Ian, Yan, Ta, Yal, Nta, Plek, Juplek, and Ndut demonstrate that the way a name is used can be an important part of a character's interpersonal practices.

Among non-personal naming forms, date of birth (TTL) is the largest category, with 77 occurrences. This form primarily includes honorifics and role markers such as Pak and Bu.

The KIN and SOC categories are also quite prominent. KIN covers forms of kinship or age relations, while SOC includes forms such as Mas, Bang, and Mbak.

In contrast, the END category only has seven occurrences. Despite its low frequency, the endearment form remains pragmatically important because its use tends to occur in contexts of affection or interpersonal closeness.

Overall, the distribution shows that both films employ a diverse repertoire of address terms. Addressing practices are not dominated by a single form, but involve relationships between personal identity, age, kinship, social status, and interpersonal closeness.

4.3 Interactional Functions in Selected Contexts

The distribution of forms indicates the type of address terms used, but does not yet explain what the speaker is doing through them. Therefore, the analysis continues in the selected dialogue context to examine the interactional function of address terms.

Attention/Summons

Ian...

Yes!

Plex.

Sancaka!

In this example, the address term is the primary element used to attract the recipient's attention. Both personal names and nicknames can be used for this purpose. Because the address term stands alone or nearly alone, its primary function is not to convey information about the recipient, but to direct the recipient's attention to the speaker.

Recipient Orientation

What area is Tumpang, Nta?

Where do you work, bro?

I don't know, sir.

In this example, the address term isn't primarily used as a summons. It's attached to the ongoing question, statement, or response and clarifies the target of the utterance. In "I don't know, sir," the form "sir" doesn't automatically indicate deference. Its primary function is to orient the utterance toward the recipient.

Action Targeting

Ian, come on, hurry up.

Mas Ial, help me.

Come back Nta, come back!

Sir, don't die, sir.

Sancaka, go now to the factory.

In this example, the address term identifies the target party. Both personal names and honorifics can be used for this function. Thus, the action targeting function is not specifically tied to a particular form category.

Greeting/Recognition

Hello Dinda...

Hi... Sis Riani...

Hello, Ian...

How are you, auntie...

Rahayu. Sadba. Sasha. Hi.

In this example, the address term serves as the opening of the interaction or acknowledgement of the recipient's presence. This function can be realized through a personal name, title-plus-name, or social-relational form.

Affiliation

Thank you very much, sir.

Sorry, Yan.

I really miss you Riani.

I love you Riani.

Mom, Sancaka misses you.

So what do you think, honey?

In this context, the address term does not stand as a separate social element. Its interpersonal value emerges alongside the affective or relational action being performed.

Deference

Thank you very much, bro.

Sir, excuse me, sir.
With all due respect, sir.
Please help me, sir.

This example shows that honorifics do not automatically equate to deference. Evidence for the deference function is actually stronger when the address term is accompanied by markers such as *nuwun sewu*, *permisi*, *with all due respect*, or *mohon*.

Overall, contextual analysis shows that form and function do not have a one-form-one-function relationship. One form can be used for multiple functions, while the same function can be realized through different forms.

4.4 Relational Positioning in Selected Contexts

Contextual analysis also shows that address terms contribute to how characters are positioned relationally. The four most prominent dimensions are intimacy, solidarity, social distance, and power/deference.

Intimacy

So what do you think, honey?
I love you Riani.
Mom, Sancaka misses you.

In this example, the address term works together with the affective content of the utterance to strengthen the closeness between the speaker and recipient. Thus, intimacy is not only produced by the form of affection or mother, but by the relationship between that form and the affective action that accompanies it.

Solidarity

You can do it, Yan. I'm sure you can.
It's tiring, Plek, chasing love.

In this context, Yan and Plek are not merely recipient markers. These forms are present alongside support, evaluation, or shared experiences that strengthen the alignment between the characters.

Social Distance

Okay sir
Thank you sir

Social distance is more apparent in formal or institutional contexts. Forms like "Sir" and "Ma'am" can indicate a more structured relationship when used in formal situations. However, honorifics do not automatically imply social distance.

Power/Deference

With all due respect, sir.
Please help me, sir.

In such contexts, the choice of address terms works together with the structure of the utterance to reveal a more asymmetrical relationship between speaker and recipient.

These findings show that relational positioning cannot be predicted solely from the form of the address term. The Pak form can appear in attention, recipient orientation, action targeting, affiliation, or deference. Its relational value changes according to the context of use.

Repetition as an interactional feature

A total of 93 of the 527 occurrences showed repetition of address terms, while 434 occurrences did not experience repetition.

Table 3. Distribution of Address Repetition

Repetition	Frequency	Percentage
NO	434	82.35%
YES	93	17.65%
Total	527	100.00%

Repetition appears in a variety of functions and contexts. For example: *Mah.. mah.. mah... Wait a minute mah...; Yan, wake up Yan...; Sir, don't die, sir; and Plek, why did you stop Plek?*

In such cases, repetition increases salience for the recipient. In a directive context, repetition can strengthen the urgency or force of action. In an emotional context, repetition can strengthen interpersonal engagement.

Because repetition occurs alongside various functions, this study does not consider it a separate function. Instead, it is treated as an additional interactional feature that can enhance attention, action targeting, or the affective value of an utterance.

Overall, the contextual analysis of the selected excerpts shows that address terms in both films cannot be understood simply as social labels. These forms of address serve as resources that enable characters to direct attention, orient speech toward the recipient, target actions, initiate greetings, establish affiliation, and demonstrate deference. These functions can further contribute to the formation of intimacy, solidarity, social distance, and power in inter-character relationships.

5. Discussion

5.1 Address Terms as Relational Resources

The first important finding is the dominance of personal naming-based addressing. Full personal names, shortened or modified personal names, and nicknames account for 255 of the 527 occurrences, or 48.39% of the data. This pattern suggests that personal identity is a highly productive resource in addressing practices in both films.

These findings align with (Manns, 2015), who demonstrated that address terms in Indonesian youth interactions can relate to identity, solidarity, and intimacy. However, the patterns in this research corpus provide additional nuance. Personal naming not only serves to identify a person but can also be modified into forms such as *Yan*, *Ta*, *Yal*, *Nta*, and *Plek*. Such modifications make name forms part of ongoing interpersonal relationships.

(Djenar, 2024) shows that name choice, kinship terms, and reference forms can be used for leveling and differentiation. These findings help explain why variations such as *Ian*, *Yan*, *Ta*, *Yal*, and *Nta* should not be treated as meaningless orthographic variations. Shortening or modifying names can be an interpersonal choice.

Thus, the dominance of personal naming indicates that the relationships between characters in both films are largely represented through person-centered addressing. Closeness is not always expressed through endearment; the way a person's name is chosen and used can also build familiarity and solidarity.

5.2 The Same Form Can Perform Different Functions

Contextual findings show that a single address form does not have a single, fixed function. *Sir* is the most obvious example. In *Sir!*, the form functions as attention/summons. In *I don't know, Sir*, the form primarily functions as recipient orientation. In *With all due respect, Sir*, the context becomes clearer as deference.

This finding is consistent with (Hamdani et al., 2022), who showed that address terms in Indonesian are related to next-speaker selection and action formation. In other words, the function of address terms depends on the action being constructed through the utterance.

The same pattern is seen with personal names and nicknames. *Ian*, *Nta*, or *Plek* can stand alone as summons, but they can also appear as part of questions, information, directives, or evaluations.

Therefore, this research does not support simple relationships such as *Pak* = respect or *nickname* = intimacy. Form categories only provide a basis for classification; pragmatic function must be determined through context.

5.3 Address Terms as a Recipient-Orientation Resource

One important finding is the use of address terms as recipient orientation. In *Tumpang*, "What area do you have?" and "Where do you work?", address terms become part of the utterance and help clarify the target of the interaction.

This pattern shows that address terms can operate within an action, not just before it begins. This finding reinforces (Hamdani et al., 2022) explanation of the relationship between address terms and action organization.

(Pawiro et al., 2025) also positioned the addresser-addressee relationship as a crucial part of the meaning of address terms. In this research corpus, recipient orientation is one of the mechanisms connecting linguistic form with participant relationships.

The implication is that the frequency of a form cannot be directly translated into a specific social value. Frequently occurring forms such as *Mas* or *Pak* may reflect recipient orientation, not simply intimacy, solidarity, or deference.

5.4 Variations in Address Terms and Social Context

The research also shows that social and honorific forms remain important. *TTL* occurred with 77 occurrences, while *SOC* and *KIN* occurred with 62 and 63 occurrences, respectively.

This pattern aligns with Indonesian research showing that address terms are related to social factors. (Olii, 2021) and (Kresnantara et al., 2022) show that address forms can vary by community and social conditions. (Andrejana et al., 2025) also show that age, kinship, familiarity, and situational context influence the choice of address terms.

However, screen dialogue provides a different context. These social variations appear not only as descriptions of societal structures, but are used by characters to represent specific relationships to the audience.

In a digital context, (Marnita, 2022) shows how "*kak*" (older brother) can function as a relatively neutral term in online transactions. These findings help demonstrate that the value of an address term can shift as the communication context changes.

5.5 Address Repetition and Reinforcement of Recipient Salience

A total of 93 occurrences, or 17.65% of the data, showed repetition. Although repetition is not a primary function, this frequency indicates that the repetition of address terms is a fairly important interactional feature.

For example, *Mah.. mah.. mah..* Wait a minute, *mah..* shows repetition in the context of action targeting. *Yan, wake up Yan..* shows repetition in a directive, while *Pak, don't die, Pak* shows repetition in an emotional context.

This pattern suggests that repetition can increase recipient salience. By repeating address terms, the speaker maintains the interlocutor's attention or increases the force of the action being performed.

This finding also aligns with (Djenar, 2024) discussion, which shows that repetition of an address in a specific position can be associated with actions directed at the addressee. Because repetition occurs in various functions, this study treats it as a reinforcing feature, not a standalone functional category.

5.6 Relational Positioning: Intimacy, Solidarity, Distance, and Power

At the relational level, findings suggest that address terms can contribute to intimacy, solidarity, social distance, and power/deference. These values are not inherently inherent in the form.

The use of terms of endearment, for example, has intimate value when it occurs alongside affective actions. Conversely, nicknames like *Plek* can build solidarity when present in interactions that demonstrate shared experiences or encouragement.

These findings align with (Manns, 2015) perspective on identity, intimacy, and solidarity. They can also be interpreted through (Locher, 2013) concept of relational work, which positions interpersonal relationships as something that is continuously negotiated through language.

In formal contexts, honorifics like "*sir*" and "*ma'am*" can convey distance or power when used in asymmetrical relationships. However, the strongest evidence emerges when these forms are combined with deferential expressions like "*excuse me,*" "*with all due respect,*" or "*please.*"

This finding also relates to research by (Chandra et al., 2024), which shows that *Pak* and *Bu* carry social and identity values in Indonesian communication, even when used in English-language interactions.

5.7 Screen Dialogue as Relational Representation

The use of screen dialogue adds an additional dimension to the study of address terms. Research by (Hamdani et al., 2022) demonstrates the function of address terms in natural conversation, while studies by (Zavitri et al., 2018) and (Mukminin et al., 2025) demonstrate that films and film subtitles can be a data source for studying address terms.

(Mukminin et al., 2025) research is important as a comparison because they found 179 address-term occurrences in the subtitle *Perempuan Tanah Jahanam* and showed that address terms carry cultural and social content that influences the translation process.

(Andryani et al., 2024) research also found that address terms in films can represent intimacy, respect, and power differences.

This research moves in a different direction. Its focus is not primarily on the translation or classification of specific film functions, but on the relationship between the distribution of forms, interactional functions, and relational positioning in two Indonesian films analyzed comparatively.

Thus, screen dialogue can be understood not simply as a representation of conversation, but as a space where social relations are made visible through linguistic choices.

5.8 Research Contributions

This research makes three main contributions.

First, the study shows that personal naming is a dominant resource in the corpus. Nearly half of address occurrences come from personal names, modified names, and nicknames.

Second, the research shows that address terms are context-sensitive. Function cannot be determined solely from form. This finding extends previous interactional research by applying it to Indonesian screen dialogue.

Third, the research integrates form, interactional function, and relational positioning. This integration allows the relationship between corpus distribution and pragmatic interpretation to be explained within a single framework.

This contribution distinguishes this research from studies that merely describe types of address terms or identify pragmatic functions. The research's added value lies in connecting these three layers of analysis within the same corpus.

6. Implications

Theoretically, the research findings support the view that address terms need to be analyzed as linguistic phenomena that are both interactional and relational. Forms like "Pak," "Ms.," personal names, and nicknames do not always have the same social meaning. Their interpretation depends on the context of use.

Methodologically, the study demonstrates the benefits of a corpus-assisted approach. The distribution of 527 occurrences provides insight into the forms used, while contextual analysis of selected excerpts allows the study to elucidate function and positioning that cannot be obtained through frequency alone.

Practically, these findings can be applied in teaching Indonesian pragmatics. Learners cannot simply learn address terms as lexical equivalents, such as "Pak" = "Mr." or "Mas" = "Brother." They need to understand who uses these forms, to whom, in what situations, and for what purposes.

7. Conclusion

This study analyzed 527 occurrences of address terms in the dialogues of two Indonesian films, *5 cm* and *Gundala*. Corpus analysis showed that personal-name-based addressing was the dominant group. Full personal names, shortened or modified personal names, and nicknames accounted for 255 occurrences, or 48.39% of the total data. These findings indicate that personal naming is an important resource in the representation of interpersonal relationships in Indonesian screen dialogue.

Contextual analysis shows that address terms do not have a fixed interactional function. The same form can be used for attention/summons, recipient orientation, action targeting, greeting/recognition, affiliation, or deference. Therefore, the function of an address term needs to be determined through the context and the ongoing action, not just based on its lexical form.

Address repetition is also a relevant feature. Ninety-three occurrences, or 17.65% of the data, show the repetition of address terms. This repetition occurs in various actions and can strengthen attention to the recipient, urgency, and emotional engagement.

At the relational level, address terms contribute to the formation of intimacy, solidarity, social distance, and power/deference. However, these values are not automatically attached to a particular form. "Pak" doesn't always indicate deference, just as a nickname doesn't always indicate intimacy. Relational value emerges through the relationship between form, function, context, and the relationships between characters.

Thus, this study demonstrates that address terms in Indonesian screen dialogue are more accurately understood as context-sensitive interactional resources rather than mere social labels. The study's primary contribution lies in integrating address-form variation, interactional function, and relational positioning in a comparative corpus analysis.

Future research could expand the corpus to Indonesian films or series from different periods and genres. This expansion would allow testing whether the patterns of personal naming, honorifics, nicknames, repetition, and relational positioning found in this study also appear consistently in broader representations of Indonesian interaction.

Bibliography

- Andreyana, IK, Budasi, IG, & Juniarta, PAK (2025). The Terms of Address Used by Local People in Sudaji Village, North Bali. PEMA: Journal of Education and Community Service, 5(3), 1016–1024. <https://doi.org/10.56832/pema.v5i3.2644>
- Andryani, GAMT, Udayana, IN, & Maharani, SAI (2024). Address Terms Used by the Characters in Barbie: Princess Charm School Movie. Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai, 8(2), 33345–33351. Retrieved from <https://jptam.org/index.php/jptam/article/view/18667>
- Chandra, PC, Bhimasena, H., & Ekarina. (2024). MIXING OF INDONESIAN ADDRESSING TERMS IN THE LOCAL ENGLISH: MOTIVATIONS AND IDENTITY EXPRESSIONS. Indonesian Linguistics, 42(2), 413–423. <https://doi.org/10.26499/li.v42i2.634>
- Djenar, DN (2024). Leveling, differentiation and structure of feeling: Address and interlocutor reference in Indonesian political interviews. Discourse & Society, 35(4), 434–454. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265231226231>
- Giyatmi, G., & Astuti, PI (2024). Address terms used in discount account found in Instagram. HUMANICS, 30(2), 247–258. <https://doi.org/10.14710/humanika.v30i2.59603>
- Hamdani, F., Barnes, S., & Blythe, J. (2022). Questions with address terms in Indonesian conversation: Managing next-speaker selection and action formation. Journal of Pragmatics, 200, 194–210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2022.08.010>
- Kresnantara, GB, Budasi, IG, & Pratiwi, NPA (2022). Address terms used by local people in Menyali Village. Undiksha English Language Education Journal, 10(3), 249–256. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbi.v10i3.57671>
- Locher, M. A. (2013). Relational work and interpersonal pragmatics. Journal of Pragmatics, 58, 145–149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.09.014>
- Manns, H. J. (2015). Address terms, framing and identity in Indonesian youth interaction. NUSA: Linguistic Studies of Languages in and around Indonesia, 58, 73–93. <http://repository.tufs.ac.jp/bitstream/10108/84126/2/nusa5805.pdf>
- Marnita. (2022). "Brother": A neutral greeting in online transactional communication on WhatsApp. Indonesian Language Education and Literature, 8(1), 187–199. <https://doi.org/10.24235/ileal.v8i1.9326>
- Mukminin, MS, Putra, LD, & Ahmed, A. (2025). Translation strategy of Indonesian-English address terms in Perempuan Tanah Jahanam subtitles. Linguistics Initiative, 5(1), 62–74. <https://doi.org/10.53696/27753719.51245>
- Nomoto, H., Taniguchi, R., Nakamura, S., Nam, Y., Lestari, SB, Wittayapanyanon (Saito), S., Sornlertlamvanich, V., Kasuga, A., Okano, K., & Hlaing, T. (2023). Pronoun substitute annotation in seven Asian languages. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the Association for Natural Language Processing*, 2242–2247. https://www.anlp.jp/proceedings/annual_meeting/2023/pdf_dir/P9-4.pdf
- Olii, ST (2021). Defining the addressing terms in Indonesian language: A case study of Gorontaloese. Undiksha English Language Education Journal, 9(1), 85–90. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpbi.v9i1.34718>
- Pawiro, MA, Risnawaty, Hasibuan, A., Suherly, D., & Raza, MH (2025). Address terms and addresser-addressee relations in Javanese morning greetings. JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 13(4), 1631–1647. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v13i4.16882>
- Rajabul, MG (2023). A sociolinguistic analysis of address terms in Sasak language. Language Description, 6(1), 50–59. <https://doi.org/10.22146/db.v6i1.7029>
- Rozumko, A. (2023). Interpersonal relationships in translation: Address terms in the English and Polish translations of Henning Mankell's The Dogs of Riga. Journal of Pragmatics, 206, 19–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2023.01.013>
- Septiari, PA (2023). An analysis of address terms used in Indonesian (Balinese) kinship and English kinship systems. Indonesian Student Research Journal, 3(1), 20–25. <https://doi.org/10.36663/jpmi.v3i1.452>
- Sunarti, I., Sumarti, S., Riadi, B., & Putrawan, G.E. (2019). Terms of address in the Pubian dialect of Lampung (Indonesia). Kervan: International Journal of African and Asian Studies, 23(2), 237–263. <https://doi.org/10.13135/1825-263X/3609>
- Supriyono, OF, & Kuntjara, E. (2023). Gita Wirjawan's use of politeness in requesting and using addressing terms in two Endgame podcasts. Our Word, 11(3), 449–456. <https://doi.org/10.9744/katakita.11.3.449-456>
- Yulianto, A., & Daniela, L. (2025). Navigating addressing terms in an academic environment: Social context and dynamics at Jakarta International University in Indonesia. Teknosastik: Journal of Language and Literature, 23(2), 78–91. <https://doi.org/10.33365/teknosastik.v23i2.173>

- Yusra, K., Lestari, YB, & Simpson, J. (2022). Borrowing of address forms for dimensions of social relations in a contact-induced multilingual community. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 19(1), 217–248. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2021-0022>
- Zavitri, I., Machmoed, H., & Sukmawaty. (2018). The address terms in English and Selayarese: A sociolinguistic perspective. *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya*, 6(1), 129–134. <https://doi.org/10.34050/jib.v6i1.4317>