

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

5.1 Conclusion

Based on the empirical findings and comprehensive data analysis presented in Chapter IV, the researcher draws several conclusions corresponding to the study's core research questions.

First regarding the first focus on the types and classifications of Helangdohi terms of address, the study successfully identified a total of thirty-one distinct terms of address actively utilized by the speech community in Helangdohi Village. Applying Kridalaksana's (1983) taxonomic framework, these terms are systematically distributed into four primary linguistic categories. The first category is kinship terms, which represents the most complex and culturally significant domain with nineteen items. This includes bloodline labels such as Mama or Ama for father, Nina or Ina for mother, Bai Tua, and Nina Tua, as well as affinal markers like Wia and Opu or Opung. It also encompasses highly specialized cultural roles reflecting the patrilineal social structure, such as Hola for the designated family successor and Kwine for the clan-shifting sister. The second category consists of four pronominal forms used for self-reference and direct address, namely Go 'I', Mo 'you', We 'they', and Kame 'we'. The third category comprises six titles and ranks, including professional and institutional honorifics that denote administrative, religious, or instructional authority, such as Gambeing Desa 'village head', Wabeing Desa 'village head's wife', Pelinta 'pastor', Tuang Guru 'male teacher', Wabeing Guru 'female teacher', and Ata Lewo 'traditional community leader'. The final category encompasses two other

forms used as egalitarian markers among peers or familiar interlocutors, which are Soba ‘friend’ and Nama Diri ‘personal name’.

In relation to the second research focus concerning the sociolinguistic factors influencing the choice of address terms, the integration of fieldwork data with Poedjosudarmo’s (1979) sociolinguistic framework reveals that the linguistic configuration of the Helangdohi dialect is systematically governed by only two primary determinants out of multiple potential social variables, which are occupation and age. Occupation serves as a dominant, asymmetrical power marker that mandates formal linguistic distance and institutional deference. The empirical evidence proves that occupational status can strictly override biological age, meaning that terms like Gambeing Desa are maintained even when the official is chronologically younger than the speaker, as supported by the narrative evidence from respondents B and D. Meanwhile, age functions as a fundamental social contract and generational baseline regulating linguistic politeness in everyday discourse. Supported by the qualitative data from Respondents A and C, age influences interaction in two distinct dimensions, namely the absolute requirement of senior kinship honorifics such as Bai Tua and Nina Tua to prevent severe cultural breaches, and the metaphorical, asymmetrical expansion of kinship terms like Kakang or Tata and Aring, Ula, or Kau to non-kin members based entirely on relative age differentials to maintain community collectivism.

5.2 Suggestion

In light of the conclusions drawn above, several key suggestions are put forward to maximize the theoretical and practical contributions of this research across three main areas. For future linguists and researchers, since this study

primarily focused on the core taxonomy of address terms based on Kridalaksana (1983) and basic social factors based on Poedjosudarmo (1979), they are highly encouraged to explore other dimensions of the Helangdohi language. Future studies could investigate the shifting paradigms of address terms across generations due to globalization, the pragmatic impact of code-switching between the Alor-Malay dialect and the local Helangdohi tongue, or the specific non-verbal politeness markers that accompany these vocal greetings.

For English and language educators, particularly those working within the English Education context in local regions, these sociolinguistic findings can be utilized as authentic cultural materials in classroom curriculum designs. Integrating local linguistic values with foreign language instruction can effectively help students grasp cross-cultural pragmatics, enabling them to compare how respect, hierarchy, and family structures are mapped differently in Western cultures versus indigenous Indonesian societies.

Finally, for the local government and community of Helangdohi Village, the rich inventory of thirty-one terms of address, especially specific cultural titles like *Hola*, *Kwine*, and *Ata Lewo*, reflects an invaluable cultural heritage that defines the local societal ecosystem. The community and local elders should continue practicing these terms in everyday family circles to prevent language endangerment, while local administrative bodies can support this preservation by embedding native regional heritage within local cultural initiatives or village ordinance.